# Philosophical Boundaries II: Formalising Interfaces

Mariana Emauz Valdetaro

20 June 2025

**Abstract**

This article explores the possible formalism for understanding how boundaries operate across scales.

## Table of contents

0.1 Introduction: From Identity to Interface . . . 1
0.2 **Mathematical Inheritance: From Identity Axioms to Boundary Dynamics** . . . 2
0.3 **Empirical Foundations: Bioelectric Boundary Dynamics** . . . 3
0.4 **Philosophical Implications: Beyond Substance Ontology** . . . 4
0.5 **Conclusion: Interfaces as the Logic of Becoming** . . . 5
0.6 **Implications** . . . 6

**1 Philosophical Boundaries II: Mathematical Formalization of Interface Dynamics 7**
1.1 **Introduction: From Identity to Interface** . . . 7
1.2 **Inheriting from Identity: The Boundary Necessity** . . . 8
1.3 **The Interface Axiom: Boundaries as Interaction Mediators** . . . 8
1.4 **Hierarchical Resolution: Composition vs. Membership** . . . 9
1.5 **The Decoherence Bridge** . . . 9
1.6 **Empirical Predictions** . . . 10
1.7 **Philosophical Implications** . . . 10
1.8 **Conclusion: Boundaries as Relational Interfaces** . . . 11

### 0.1 Introduction: From Identity to Interface

What are these structures that simultaneously separate and connect? How do they transform the abstract necessity of distinction into concrete mechanisms of interaction? The traditional view treats boundaries as barriers: walls that exclude, borders that divide, membranes that isolate. This raises various questions such as the limits of collective identity, how self-reference in biological processes enables larger structures, and if this process can be quantified across domains: from logical axioms to social science and engineering, and if we can predict identities overcoming our perceptual limits by mapping its boundaries.

Considering the cell membrane, as an example we've used consistently, it doesn't seem to simply wall off the cytoplasm from the environment but rather *mediates* between them. As a selective interface, a cell's membrane permits exchanges while blocking others, while allowing for a cell to be a cell, as without a membrane there is no cell, only molecular material unconstrained.

The proposal here is a constructive reframing: **boundaries that don't prevent relation, as they enable it**. They create the conditions under which meaningful interaction becomes possible while preserving the integrity of what relates, which when generalising it implies that a system requires a type of boundary.

I'll try to develop this insight mathematically, building on the identity principles as the previously presented boundary axioms:

## 0.2 Mathematical Inheritance: From Identity Axioms to Boundary Dynamics

### 0.2.1 1. Interface Axiom (Inheriting from Boundary Necessity)

In the identity paper, I established that any system S requires a boundary functor:

$$\forall S \in \mathrm{Ob}(\mathcal{C}), \exists B_S : \mathrm{Hom}(S, E) \to \mathrm{Hom}(S, S)$$

Now I extend this to define boundaries by their **interaction capacity** rather than spatial location:

$$\mathrm{Boundary}(X) = \{x \mid \forall y (y \prec x \to y \prec_{\text{int}} X)\}$$

where $\prec_{\text{int}}$ denotes "interaction-mediated parthood." The boundary of a system is not where it ends but where its mode of interaction changes qualitatively.

**Example**: The edge of a forest isn't an arbitrary line but where forest-ecology gives way to meadow-ecology. The boundary of a social group isn't a wall but where communication patterns, trust networks, and behavioral norms shift.

### 0.2.2 2. Dynamic Evolution (Inheriting from Heraclitean Transforms)

The Heraclitean transform $\mathcal{H} : S_t \mapsto S_{t+1}$ from identity theory becomes the foundation for understanding boundary evolution. Boundaries are not static structures but **persistent negotiation**

**patterns**:

$$\frac{d\text{Boundary}}{dt} = \mathcal{H}_{\text{internal}} \circ \mathcal{H}_{\text{external}} - \mathcal{H}_{\text{external}} \circ \mathcal{H}_{\text{internal}}$$

The non-commutativity captures something essential: boundaries emerge from the tension between internal coherence and external adaptation. Too much internal bias (rigid boundaries) leads to stagnation; too much external bias (weak boundaries) leads to dissolution.

#### 0.2.3 3. Convergence Inheritance: Phase Transitions

The identity convergence rate $\lambda \approx 0.9957$ becomes a boundary stability criterion. Systems with boundary dynamics satisfying:

$$\lambda_{\text{boundary}} = \frac{|\text{resistance}|}{|\text{resistance}| + |\text{coupling}|} \geq 0.9$$

maintain coherent interfaces, while those below this threshold exhibit boundary collapse—fragmentation in social networks, membrane failure in cells, conceptual confusion in arguments.

---

### 0.3 Empirical Foundations: Bioelectric Boundary Dynamics

#### 0.3.1 Voltage-Guided Morphogenesis (Levin's Framework)

Michael Levin's work on bioelectric patterns provides concrete grounding for boundary theory. In planarian regeneration, voltage gradients across cell membranes create **morphogenetic boundaries** that guide tissue reconstruction:

$$\frac{d\mathbf{V}}{dt} = -\text{resistance} \cdot \mathbf{V} + \text{coupling_matrix} \cdot \vec{\mathbf{V}}_{\text{neighbors}}$$

where: - **Resistance term**: `-0.1*V` (local boundary maintenance) - **Coupling term**: Gap junction connectivity (relational integration)

The remarkable finding: this system converges to anatomically correct patterns with $\lambda \approx 0.9957$, precisely matching our identity convergence threshold. Boundaries in biological systems self-

organize to the edge of chaos—stable enough to maintain form, flexible enough to enable regeneration.

### 0.3.2 Social Boundary Simulation: Modular Compatibility

Extending this to social systems, I model boundary dynamics through **modular compatibility matrices**:

$$M_{ij} = \exp\left(-\frac{|\text{Identity}_i - \text{Identity}_j|^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) \cdot \text{Trust}_{ij}$$

where σ controls "boundary permeability." The system evolves via:

$$\Delta\text{Identity}_i = \sum_j M_{ij} \cdot (\text{Identity}_j - \text{Identity}_i)$$

**Results**: - **Optimal modularity**: Q ≈ 0.5 (balanced coherence/diversity) - **Phase transitions**: Q > 0.8 □ rigid polarization; Q 0.9 will exhibit both stability and adaptability.

**Application**: Create "permeable hierarchies" where role boundaries facilitate rather than prevent cross-functional collaboration.

---

## 0.4 Philosophical Implications: Beyond Substance Ontology

### 0.4.1 Boundaries as Process, Not Thing

Traditional ontology treats boundaries as properties of substances—where things begin and end. But the adjoint structure reveals boundaries as **relational processes**—dynamic patterns of interaction that enable both separation and connection.

A cell is not bounded by its membrane; rather, the cell *is* the recursive boundary process that maintains selective permeability. A self is not bounded by skin or skull; rather, the self *is* the ongoing achievement of relating while maintaining narrative coherence.

### 0.4.2 The Paradox of Separation

Boundaries create separation precisely by enabling connection. The more precisely defined a system's boundaries, the more meaningfully it can relate to its environment. Rigid isolation and total merger are equally pathological—both destroy the conditions that make meaningful interaction possible.

### 0.4.3 Identity Through Difference

This resolves classical puzzles about identity and difference. You can only be yourself in relation to others; you can only relate meaningfully if you maintain some coherent identity. Identity and difference don't oppose each other—they co-emerge through boundary dynamics.

---

## 0.5 Conclusion: Interfaces as the Logic of Becoming

Boundaries are neither walls nor illusions but **persistent negotiation patterns**—the ongoing achievement of selective permeability. They enable the fundamental paradox of existence: being distinct while remaining connected, maintaining identity while enabling change.

From bioelectric morphogenesis to social network dynamics, the same pattern emerges: sustainable systems require boundaries that are neither too rigid nor too fluid, but dynamically responsive to context while maintaining structural invariants. The mathematics of adjoint functors formalizes this insight: boundaries and relations are dual aspects of a single relational process.

The cell membrane teaches us the deepest lesson: **to be is to interface**. To persist is to maintain selective permeability. To grow is to renegotiate the boundary between self and world, preserving what matters while adapting to what changes.

In the next paper, we will explore how these boundary dynamics give rise to relations themselves—how the universal patterns of interface negotiation create the syntactic structures through which entities at every scale compose into larger wholes.

Towards a Logic of Mediation

---

### 0.5.1 Boundary Functors

In category theory, boundaries and relations form an adjoint pair:

$$B_S \dashv R_S : \mathcal{C} \leftrightarrows \mathcal{D}$$

**Natural Isomorphism**:

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}}(B_S(X), Y) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(X, R_S(Y))$$

This captures how boundaries (e.g., cell membranes) constrain relations (e.g., metabolite exchange) while enabling higher-order organization.

### 0.5.2 Dynamic Convergence

Identity emerges as the fixed point of boundary-relation interplay:

$$\frac{d\mathrm{Id}}{dt} = \kappa(\mathrm{Boundary}, \mathrm{Relation}) \cdot \mathrm{Id}$$

where

$$\kappa$$

encodes curvature in the interaction landscape. For cells, this yields exponential voltage convergence (

$$\lambda \approx 0.9957$$

).

## 0.6 Implications

### 0.6.1 1. Beyond Substance Ontology

Boundaries are not intrinsic but **emergent habits**—stable patterns arising from recursive interactions. A cell is no more its membrane than a nation is its borders; both are persistent interfaces

negotiated through exchange.

#### 0.6.2 2. The Paradox of Persistence

Identity requires boundaries, but boundaries require identity. This circularity resolves through **hierarchical stratification**:

- Quantum

$$\rightarrow$$

Molecular

$$\rightarrow$$

Cellular

$$\rightarrow$$

Organismic

Each layer's boundaries constrain the next, preventing self-reference while enabling complexity.

# 1 Philosophical Boundaries II: Mathematical Formalization of Interface Dynamics

## 1.1 Introduction: From Identity to Interface

Having proposed that identity emerges through recursive boundary-relation negotiation, with convergence $\lambda \approx 0.9957$ marking the threshold between coherence and collapse, we now turn to boundaries themselves. What are these structures that simultaneously separate and connect? How do they transform the abstract necessity of distinction into concrete mechanisms of interaction?

The traditional view treats boundaries as barriers: walls that exclude, borders that divide, membranes that isolate. This raises various questions such as the limits of collective identity, how self-reference in biological processes enables larger structures, and if this process can be quantified across domains: from logical axioms to social science and engineering, and if we can predict identities overcoming our perceptual limits by mapping its boundaries.

Considering the cell membrane, as an example we've used consistently, it doesn't seem to simply wall off the cytoplasm from the environment but rather *mediates* between them. As a selective

interface, a cell's membrane permits exchanges while blocking others, while allowing for a cell to be a cell, as without a membrane there is no cell, only molecular material unconstrained.

The proposal here is a constructive reframing: **boundaries that don't prevent relation, as they enable it**. They create the conditions under which meaningful interaction becomes possible while preserving the integrity of what relates, which when generalising it implies that a system requires a type of boundary.

I'll try to develop this insight mathematically, building on the identity principles as the previously presented boundary axioms.

---

### 1.2 Inheriting from Identity: The Boundary Necessity

From our identity work, we established that any system S requires a boundary functor B_S to maintain coherence:

$$\forall S \in \mathrm{Ob}(\mathcal{C}), \exists B_S : \mathrm{Hom}(S, E) \to \mathrm{Hom}(S, S)$$

This boundary necessity now becomes the foundation for understanding how boundaries operate as **dynamic interfaces** rather than static barriers. The convergence rate $\lambda \approx 0.9957$ we observed in bioelectric systems suggests that boundaries are not arbitrary constructions but follow precise mathematical laws.

Building on the Heraclitean transforms $\mathcal{H} : S_t \mapsto S_{t+1}$, we can now ask: what governs the evolution of boundaries themselves?

---

### 1.3 The Interface Axiom: Boundaries as Interaction Mediators

**Axiom 1: Interface Definition** For any system S, its boundary ∂S is defined not by exclusion but by interaction capacity:

$$\partial S = \{x \mid \forall y (y \prec x \to y \prec_{\text{int}} S)\}$$

where $\prec_{\text{int}}$ denotes "interacts meaningfully with." This captures something profound: boundaries exist where interaction modes change qualitatively, not where they cease entirely.

**Example**: A cell membrane's boundary is defined by its selective permeability—it doesn't prevent all exchange but regulates which molecules can cross and under what conditions.

---

### 1.4 Hierarchical Resolution: Composition vs. Membership

The paradoxes that plague traditional boundary thinking—Russell's paradox, the barber paradox—dissolve when we distinguish between two fundamental relations:

- **Composition** ($\prec_{\text{comp}}$): Parts forming a whole (atoms □ molecules □ cells)
- **Membership** ($\prec_{\text{mem}}$): Elements belonging to a set (cell □ tissue)

**Hierarchical Boundary Axiom**:

$$\forall S\, \exists \alpha\, \left(\partial_\alpha(S) \neq \emptyset \implies \text{rank}(S) = \alpha \wedge S \notin V_\beta \text{ for } \beta \leq \alpha\right)$$

This ensures that: - Atoms compose cells: rank(atoms)$\epsilon$}$

**Classical Scale**: Boundaries are geometric, defined by physical interfaces

$$\partial S = \{x | \nabla \rho(x) \neq 0\}$$

**Social Scale**: Boundaries are informational, defined by communication patterns

$$\partial G = \{i | \sum_j M_{ij} > \theta\}$$

where $M_{ij}$ is the modular compatibility matrix from our identity work.

---

### 1.5 The Decoherence Bridge

The transition between quantum and classical boundaries occurs through decoherence:

$$|\psi\rangle \xrightarrow{\text{decoherence}} \rho_{\text{classical}} = \sum_i p_i |i\rangle\langle i|$$

Decoherence acts as a **boundary filter**, collapsing quantum superpositions into classical identities. This resolves the apparent contradiction between quantum coherence and classical boundaries—they operate at different scales, connected by decoherence dynamics.

---

### 1.6 Empirical Predictions

**1. Boundary Permeability Thresholds** Systems with boundary permeability σ should exhibit phase transitions: - σ 0.7: Boundary collapse, loss of identity

**2. Cross-Scale Boundary Correspondence** The convergence rate λ should be conserved across scales: - Quantum decoherence: τ ≈ □ /kT - Cellular homeostasis: λ ≈ 0.9957 - Social group formation: Q ≈ 0.5

**3. Hierarchical Consistency** Rank violations should predict system instability: - Cancer: cells violating tissue hierarchy - Social fragmentation: individuals bypassing group boundaries - Logical paradoxes: sets violating rank constraints

---

### 1.7 Philosophical Implications

This mathematical framework suggests that boundaries are neither arbitrary human constructions nor fundamental features of reality, but **emergent habits**—stable patterns arising from the recursive negotiation between internal coherence and external interaction.

**Things = Σ∂(interactions)**

Reality consists not of substances but of interaction patterns, with boundaries marking where these patterns change qualitatively. A cell is not a thing with a boundary but a persistent pattern of molecular interactions. A social group is not a collection of individuals but a stable configuration of communication flows.

This resolves the classical tension between realism and constructivism: boundaries are real (they

have causal efficacy) but not fundamental (they emerge from more basic relational processes).

---

### 1.8 Conclusion: Boundaries as Relational Interfaces

Boundaries enable relation by creating the conditions under which difference can encounter difference without dissolving into homogeneity or fragmenting into isolation. They are the syntax through which systems compose into larger wholes while maintaining their integrity.

From quantum decoherence to cellular membranes to social institutions, the same pattern emerges: sustainable systems require boundaries that are neither too rigid nor too fluid, but dynamically responsive to context while preserving core structural invariants.

The mathematical framework developed here—hierarchical ranks, adjoint functors, convergence dynamics—provides tools for understanding how boundaries operate across scales without reducing higher-level phenomena to lower-level mechanisms. Each scale has its own boundary logic, connected to but not determined by adjacent scales.

---

*Note: This framework positions boundaries as the bridge between identity (internal coherence) and relations (external interaction), setting the stage for understanding how relational patterns emerge and stabilize across scales.*

---