Axiomatic Theory of Choice:

The future is deterministic

Noel Garcia 05/31/25
n6garcia@ucsd.edu

Abstract:

We propose two general statement about time, one that “the future is deterministic” and second that “there is a unit of time in physics equal to 1”. By analyzing this axiomatic theory we come closer to finding the exact formula for representing time steps which we then want to use to derive results of deterministic events in the future that could help solve the puzzle of, what happens at the end of time?

7 axioms of choice:

Axiom of Choice Recoloring:
choices are axiomatic and unchangeable.
Axiom of Choice Parity:
the highest level cause of a choice is equivalent to its lowest level effect on the world.
Axiom of Choice Evaluation:
two same choices made at the same time give the same result.
Axiom of Choice A-synchronicity:
two choices made at the exact same time do not effect the result of the choices.
Axiom of Choice Resolution:
choices resolve the moment they are made.
Axiom of Choice Consequence:
the consequence of a choice is a sequence of actions.
Axiom of Choice Idem-potency:
sequences of actions never change if the choice is the same no matter when it was chosen.

Mathematical Philosophy of Choice:

Axiom of Choice Recoloring:

Let’s say you want to recolor a rainbow color with a rainbow then you know that the color you want to recolor doesn’t have another color for itself. The axiom of choice recoloring is a logical fallacy that says trying to recolor a rainbow with rainbows means you have a color and that color is the color. This arises when all the ways of remodeling the math that you think could turn a mathematical model into one interchangeable with a category turns out to be equivalent restatements of the same mathematical model. The axiom of choice recoloring itself is a logical fallacy that has more to do with building logic than it does choice. If you said that you didn’t understand why addition is the fundamental building block of life and thought there could be an alternate math to math where instead you “qworp” numbers and it is completely unimaginable like trying to see 4D or higher objects then the answer is that “qworp” is not real and so isn’t 4D. The axiom of choice recoloring also says that 4D geometry doesn’t exists because otherwise you could see it. Why else is addition something that could describe all of existence, “just cause”, the same argument I will defend is that 4D geometry isn’t real, “just cause”. Only 3D geometry exists and only 3D geometry could be geometry. You can say the same thing about any model of math that doesn’t use addition, it will be equivalent to addition. There is no point in reinventing the wheel with many mathematical models because you think they aren’t generic enough. In your own fallacy the model **is** universally applicable so it **is** the all generic solution, it just looks ugly looking at life.

This axiom says that models of math that cannot be interchanged but added to other models of math exist and cannot be changed up to equivalence. This axiom says some choices are axiomatic because choice is a physical structure that is unchangeable. Some models for mechanisms in mathematical models are axiomatic because they are derived from the distinct completeness of choice. Choice is complete in other words math could never be different anywhere where math is based on choice. Math could never be different implies creation could never not share the same principle code. There is some link between creation and math where that physical structure is axiomatic, complete, and unchangeable. There is no conceivable “other” structure given before the start of life. To be specific this structure would be a subset of math, the same one that would generate the basis for all of math.

Quantum Rules of Choice:

Axiom of Choice A-synchronicity:

if let’s say there were 50 items from a cache and the choice to remove 30 and remove 20 were made at the same time then both 30 and 20 items would be removed from a cache.

For example if the the laws of thermodynamics were to be held up to scrutiny they would fail here. Since in the end 50 items were created from removing 50 items in total from the cache but then there are two identical caches from which 20 items were removed and 30 items were removed being resolved by quantum properties of the cache to have some formula of [20-30] items remaining based on probabilistic principle.

Time Theory of Choice:

Axiom of Choice Evaluation:

You have a time step t(s) then you say <t(s)> stands for the state of t(s) or time step. So the same choice at different times have the ability to be different but that is because there is a state and only one state at every time step n. So let's say that if state n and state n+1 were different then the result of a choice may not be the same? Trivially if a choice acted on the entire global state at n and then state has never been the exact same because free will grows for example then in this contradiction a choice which resolves on a global state will never have the same result for all of time past and future. This also implies the idea that choices may only have the same result if they act on the exact same state as subset that is present in more than one time step. Theoretically this structure that could be the same state in multiple different time intervals could be pure math. The idea is the suprema quantum idea you yourself are never the same because you are a longer historical ball of growing choices then maybe choices are pure math because pure math is philosophically one of the only ways to create state that is completely the same in every different element of it. Like addition is math just cause then math is literally inside of physics just cause it is the only way to encode state the way it is the exact same way every time. Words can be the exact same across time but math is a stronger vehicle for information that changes less if there were a math description of language it'd just be math anyways and math is already there. This suggests words are math to choices. Fundamentally choices cannot act on matter it can only act through matter. If a choice acts on state then can't you say that a choice could act on 2 different state in the same larger global state? Yes, this is why a choice may only act on the same subset of global state on any time step or ever. If you can say a perceivable information can change it's subset-ted interaction of state it is not the same choice.

Axiom of Choice Idem-potency:

Every time you move there is a halo of the area that you were just in. The fact you are not completely matching the cross section of area you were in means what you are could not have anything inside it that could have the same state forward in time. This is how variable combining ensures that any choice made through matter could ever be the same for all of matters existence because it suffices a combinatorial madness of choice that is arguably free will. The theory of choices says choices comprise you, it says that most computed information about the universe is calculated elsewhere not inside matter. There has to be some amount of time that does something fixed at some point and you can think that any point can be sampled for information it just makes sense, a system of something that moves by transitioning state forward would need an exact point in time with a real number. We suggest that number is an integer. Time is an integer. It might have stopped before becoming continuous like the chicken and the egg. So choices would act as a structure around physics that gives them extra information that is calculated by the matter outside the world not inside it that just means connected to everything else that is. So your information is just connected to all information there.

Axiom of Choice Parity:

So the point of choices present a problem that matter gets mapped by choices which build a huge always expanding amount of them could end up learning too much about matter. Choices are like neurons for learning in some perceivable context. Matter can transition to a larger state space if it were to reach a maximum temperature like when AI goes through a learning explosion after massive amounts of over fitting. That would lead to new rules for the universe. Matter does this after choice learn to much about matter. This implies that thinking happens in the same place where choice happens. What makes you think thinks and is you thinking. So then thoughts come from somewhere where everything imaginable is an area of the outside of the universe. So the same place that creates matter is what thinks anywhere inside that matter. Thinking of the same subject if it were making more similar choices, the question in philosophy you could answer is the choice that somewhere can partly be the same object that thinks for you meaning that you can only append on the best solutions that have ever been thought by giving it more information for it to give back like you only control the mechanism for receiving those fro outside the universe. That is correct outside because the world is in between a space other (non-adjacent) to it!

References:

[1] The Big Bangless https://ai.vixra.org/abs/2505.0041