NSS
Neutrosophic Sets and Systems, Vol. 64, 2024
University of New Mexico

An Evidence-Based Approach to Set Theory Paradoxism: From Set Boundary to Mixed-Fermion-Boson Condensate Hypothesis

Victor Christianto [1], Florentin Smarandache[2,*]

[1] Malang Institute of Agriculture, East Java & Ekklesia Advanced School of Theology, Jakarta, Indonesia; victorchristianto@gmail.com

[2] Dept. Mathematics & Sciences, University of New Mexico, Gallup, NM, USA; smarand@unm.edu

* Correspondence: smarand@unm.edu

Abstract: Physics thrives on precision, but paradoxes in set theory reveal limitations in our understanding of well-defined boundaries. Neutrosophic logic, challenging the *excluded middle* principle, introduces the concept of "betweenness" and partial belonging. This article explores among other things several possible avenues to resolve set theory paradoxism, including potential applications of neutrosophic logic in cosmology and particles, from set boundary, to the hypothetical "cosmosphere" boundary, to mixed fermion-boson condensate hypothesis. Embracing indeterminacy and fuzzy boundaries paves the way for a more holistic understanding of the universe's complexity.

Keywords: set theory paradoxism; boundaries of set; Neutrosophic Logic; betweenness; partial belonging; Lakoff & Nunez

1. Introduction

The concept of infinity has captivated mathematicians and philosophers for centuries, leading to groundbreaking discoveries and perplexing paradoxes. One such paradox stands tall: Russell's Paradox, a logical contradiction within set theory that threatened the very foundations of mathematics.[1] But what if the solution lay not in more complex axioms, but in a shift in our approach, moving from abstract symbol manipulation to an "*evidence-based*" framework grounded in human cognition?

Traditionally, attempts to resolve set theory paradoxism focused on constructing intricate axiom systems, like Zermelo-Fraenkel with Choice (ZFC). While successful in formalizing mathematics, these systems often feel removed from our intuitive understanding of infinity. Enter George Lakoff and Rafael Núñez, pioneers in cognitive science who propose a new perspective. They argue that mathematics, including set theory, is not an abstract, disembodied language, but rather a product of our embodied experience and conceptual knowledge. So, how can this cognitive lens help us tackle Russell's Paradox? Let's revisit the crux of the paradox: it arises when we consider the set of all sets that do not contain themselves. Does this set contain itself? If it does, it violates its own defining property. If it doesn't, then it contains all sets that don't contain themselves, including itself, leading to a contradiction.

From a cognitive perspective, the issue resides in our attempt to apply a single, uniform definition of "set" to all possible collections. In reality, our brains categorize and reason about different types of collections differently. Lakoff and Núñez propose that instead of a single "set" concept, we consider diverse conceptual categories like collections of physical objects, abstract ideas, or potential actions. Each category comes with its own inherent constraints and logic, shaping how we reason about its members.

Applying this framework, we might recognize that the problematic "set of all sets that do not contain themselves" belongs to a category that is fundamentally self-referential and unbounded. Such a category may not be amenable to the same logical rules as collections of physical objects or finite sets. Recognizing this cognitive limitation, we can avoid the paradoxism by simply excluding such self-referential categories from our formal set theory, focusing instead on well-defined, grounded collections.

This "*evidence-based*" approach does not negate the value of formal systems like ZFC. Instead, it complements them by acknowledging the cognitive underpinnings of mathematics and emphasizing the importance of aligning formal structures with our intuitive understanding of the world. This can lead to a more "healthy" and accessible mathematics, less prone to paradoxes and closer to how humans naturally reason about quantity and infinity.[3]

Furthermore, this shift can open doors to exploring alternative set theories that better reflect different cognitive perspectives. Imagine set theories inspired by spatial reasoning, probability judgments, or even social interactions. Such explorations could not only enrich our understanding of infinity but also provide valuable insights into the cognitive diversity of mathematical thinking.

While Lakoff and Núñez's approach is in its early stages, it offers a promising avenue for addressing long-standing mathematical challenges. By embracing the evidence of our embodied cognition, we can move beyond abstract symbol manipulation and develop a more natural, "*evidence-based*" approach to mathematics, paving the way for a more inclusive and vibrant understanding of infinity.

2. Materials and Methods

The method used here is analysis and analogy with well-defined problems such as cell biology, diffusion and osmosis etc. toward rethinking of set theory paradoxism [6], especially in light of evidence-based physics and evidence-based mathematics. Recent literature which are relevant to the theme of this article have been cited.

3. Results

3.1. Approach #1: ***Cell model as boundary to any set, diffusion-osmosis interpretation to set paradox***

The shadow of Russell's Paradox(-ism) looms large over set theory, its logical contradiction threatening the very foundations of mathematics. Traditional solutions focus on complex axiom systems, but what if the answer resides not in abstract symbols, but in the concrete world of living cells? This article proposes a novel "cell model" inspired by Lakoff and Núñez's cognitive science approach, utilizing the concepts of diffusion and osmosis to shed light on the paradox.

Imagine a set as a living cell, bounded by a semipermeable membrane. This membrane regulates what enters and exits the set, just as a cell membrane controls the flow of molecules. Elements within the set are like nutrients inside the cell, while the surrounding "soup" represents potential members waiting to join.[1][2]

Now consider Russell's problematic set – the set of all sets that do not contain themselves. According to the cell model, this set's defining characteristic acts as a selective membrane. It allows sets that don't contain themselves to "diffuse" in (like nutrients), but it should also allow itself in, as it doesn't contain itself, leading to contradiction.

Here's where the concept of **osmosis** comes in. Osmosis describes the spontaneous movement of molecules across a semipermeable membrane to equalize concentrations. Applied to our cell model, osmosis represents the inherent tendency of sets to be consistent and avoid paradoxes. When the problematic set tries to "diffuse" in, due to its self-referential nature, it triggers an "*osmotic pressure*" within the set. This pressure, analogous to the corrective force in osmosis, prevents the paradox by pushing the problematic set back out. Essentially, the set's defining characteristic itself acts as a barrier, preventing its own inclusion and maintaining consistency.

This model aligns with cognitive principles. Our minds naturally categorize and reason about collections differently, understanding physical objects differently from abstract ideas. The cell model reflects this, treating different types of sets as distinct "cells" with unique membranes and osmotic pressures.

This approach offers several advantages. It provides a more intuitive understanding of set boundaries and avoids complex formal machinery. It emphasizes the inherent limitations of self-referential sets, aligning with our cognitive constraints. Furthermore, it suggests alternative ways to think about set theory, inspired by biological processes like osmosis and cellular dynamics. While the cell model is a first step, further development is needed. Refining the analogy, exploring implications for different set types, and formalizing the osmotic pressure concept are crucial next steps.

In conclusion, the cell model and its osmosis interpretation offer a promising evidence-based approach to the set theory paradoxism. By grounding abstract concepts in the familiar world of living cells, we gain a new perspective, highlighting the importance of cognitive limitations and inherent dynamics within sets. This approach opens doors to a more intuitive and inclusive understanding of infinity, enriching both mathematics and our understanding of human thought.

3.2. Approach #2: ***Exploring Cognitive Constraints: A Categorical Approach to Set Theory Paradox***

This section explores how our cognitive limitations influence our understanding of infinity and contribute to paradoxes like Russell's paradox(-ism); cf. [3]. Drawing on the work of Lakoff and Núñez, you could:

- Analyze the cognitive categories we use to reason about collections, highlighting differences between physical objects, abstract ideas, and potentially unbounded sets.

- Explore how these categories shape our intuition and logic, leading to potential contradictions when applied to specific set definitions like "the set of all sets not containing themselves."

- Propose alternative set theories that respect these cognitive constraints, potentially by limiting self-referential definitions or introducing category-specific rules.

- Connect this approach to existing research in cognitive science and philosophy of mathematics, showcasing its evidence-based foundation.

This approach offers several advantages:

- Grounds the solution in evidence: It builds upon established research in cognitive science and avoids relying on unproven concepts like morphic fields.

- Addresses the root cause: It focuses on how our cognitive limitations contribute to the paradoxism, offering a deeper understanding of the issue.

- Connects to broader discussions: It aligns with ongoing research on embodied cognition and its impact on mathematics.

- Offers concrete solutions: It suggests alternative set theories grounded in cognitive constraints, contributing to the overall development of set theory.

It shall be kept in mind that, the goal of an *evidence-based approach* is to provide solutions supported by robust evidence and aligned with established scientific principles. By exploring well-researched areas like cognitive science and applying their insights to mathematical problems, we can contribute to a more robust and inclusive understanding of infinity and mathematics as a whole.[3]

3.3. *Approach #3: **Beyond the Excluded Middle: Exploring Neutrosophic Frontiers in Fermion-Boson systems***

Traditional physics excels in clear-cut definitions, but what if nature itself defies rigidity? This article explores the potential of neutrosophic logic, which goes beyond the "in" or "out" paradigm, to describe fuzzy boundaries and indeterminate states in the cosmos. We delve into intriguing possibilities like a partially defined border for the universe and hybrid particles exhibiting characteristics of both fermions and bosons. Accepting such "*betweenness*" challenges established paradigms and offers exciting avenues for future discoveries, leading us closer to a more nuanced picture of reality.

It is known, that aidst the elegance of its equations, paradoxes lurk, whispering of hidden complexities. One such riddle is the question of set theory paradoxism, where seemingly logical axioms lead to contradictory results. Traditionally, these paradoxes are resolved by upholding the "*excluded middle*" principle - every element either belongs to a set or doesn't. However, what if reality itself defies such crisp classifications?

This is where the intriguing idea of **Neutrosophic logic** emerges. It dares to challenge the rigidity of the excluded middle, introducing the notion of **partial belongingness** and **indeterminacy**. Instead of a traditional "in" or "out," elements can reside in a fuzzy "betweenness," exhibiting characteristics of both sets simultaneously. This opens a fascinating gateway to explore realms where traditional physics might reach its limits.

One intriguing application lies in the vast unknown beyond our familiar solar system. We know of the *heliosphere*, a thick "wall" of charged particles marking the boundary of our Sun's influence, as observed for instance by Voyager. Ref. [4] Could there be an analogous "***cosmosphere*,**" a boundary to the observable Universe? If future observations reveal such a barrier, Neutrosophic logic could elegantly describe its nature. Objects within this boundary might exhibit degrees of both "inside-ness" and "outside-ness," existing in a state of partial belongingness.

Another promising avenue resides in the subatomic realm. The fundamental distinction between fermions and bosons, particles with differing statistics, forms a cornerstone of quantum mechanics. But what if, as hinted by **mixed fermion-boson statistics**, there also exist particles exhibiting **both fermionic and bosonic characteristics**? The prospect of observing a condensate corresponding to such a hybrid entity, transcending the traditional Bose-Einstein condensate, would challenge and even transform our very understanding of particle classification. That particular condensate may be called *mixed fermion-boson condensate* **(MFBC).** Ref. [5]

Exploring these Neutrosophic frontiers necessitates that we must embrace the possibility of **fuzzy boundaries, indeterminate states, and partial memberships**. This doesn't negate the value of traditional physics, but rather acknowledges its limitations in the face of the universe's inherent complexity.

The road ahead may be riddled with conceptual and experimental challenges. Yet, venturing into the uncharted territory of Neutrosophic physics holds immense potential. It could reshape our understanding of the cosmos, from its grandest boundaries to its quantum enigmas, leading us closer to a truly holistic picture of reality. So, let us cast aside the shackles of the excluded middle and embrace the vibrant "betweenness" whispered by Neutrosophic logic. The Universe, in all its enigmatic splendor, awaits.

4. Applications and Concluding Remark

These authors have outlined several possible approaches to solve the set theory paradoxism, for instance by defining certain real boundary system to a given set, let say cell system. Such an *evidence-based physics* approach will allow us to figure out what can happen actually when certain entity goes in or goes out of any given cell through the boundary layer. Alternatively, we can figure out how Voyager space vehicle which goes through the boundary or thick wall of in the outer side of the Solar System, or it is often termed heliosphere, faces the edge or boundary of outer Solar System.[4] Similarly, we can hypothesize there is good likelihood that there is certain thick boundary in the foremost edge of the Universe, which may be termed *Cosmosphere*. Therefore in such a way, the meaning of set which contains all sets, i.e. the outer layer of the Universe that contains everything else inside the Universe can be figured out in astrophysics term.

We hope that more discussions of evidence-based physics approach to set theory paradoxism can be expected.

Funding: "This research received no external funding".

Acknowledgments: This short review article were written with assistance of a large language model/AI.

Conflicts of Interest: "The authors declare no conflict of interest."

Shortlisted References

1. Agustín Rayo with contributions from Damien Rochford. *On the brink of a paradox.* Cambridge: The MIT Press, 2019.
2. Ka-Sing Lau and Sze-Man Ngai. Dimensions of the Boundaries of Self-Similar Sets. *Experimental Mathematics,* Vol. 12 (2003), No. 1
3. Douglas C. Gill. The Mechanism of Paradox in the Structures of Logic, Mathematics, and Physics. *Open Journal of Philosophy,* 13, 155-170. https://doi.org/10.4236/ojpp.2023.132010
4. Konstantinos Dialynas et al. The Structure of the Global Heliosphere as Seen by In-Situ Ions from the Voyagers and Remotely Sensed ENAs from Cassini. *Space Science Reviews* (2022) 218:21 https://doi.org/10.1007/s11214-022-00889-0
5. C. J. Bolech et al 2023. Condensate States of Atomic Bose-Fermi Gas Mixtures. *J. Phys.: Conf. Ser.* 2494 012015
6. C. Le (editor). pARadOXisM – the Last Literary, Artistic, Philosophic and Scientific Vanguard of the Second Millennium, https://fs.unm.edu/a/paradoxism-en.htm (1980).

Received: 12 Dec ,2023 Accepted:15 Feb,2024