

Research Monograph Series

The Limits of Self-Externalization and the Generation of Being: An Interface Ontology within Generative Topological Ontology

Author: Tomokazu Tanaka (bigakusha-haha)

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0009-3796-5889>

Affiliation: Sayama Aesthetics School / Institute of Aesthetics

Version: 1.0

Last Updated: July 23, 2026

Status : Ongoing Research

Research Monograph

Tomokazu Tanaka (bigakusha-haha)

Version 1.0 July 2026

Publication Information

Copyright

© 2026 Tomokazu Tanaka (bigakusha-haha). All rights reserved.

License

This work is distributed as a Research Monograph.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted in any form or by any means without prior written permission of the author, except for brief quotations used in academic review or scholarly citation.

Suggested Citation

Tanaka, Tomokazu (bigakusha-haha). 2026.

The Limits of Self-Externalization and the Generation of Being:
An Interface Ontology within Generative Topological Ontology

Research Monograph Series, Version 1.0.

Sayama Aesthetics School / Institute of Aesthetics.

Research Monograph

Version: 1.0

Last Updated: July 23, 2026

Status: Ongoing Research

Abstract

Human beings continuously seek themselves outside themselves. Recognition by others, social institutions, language, symbolic systems, artistic production, technological media, market evaluation, and more recently artificial intelligence all function as external loci through which the self attempts to confirm its own existence. This paper conceptualizes this ontological movement as Self-Externalization.

Unlike psychological projection or sociological identity formation, self-externalization is defined here as the fundamental ontological condition through which the self becomes possible. The self is not understood as a pre-existing substance located within interior consciousness. Rather, it emerges only through its continuous projection toward what is other than itself. However, no external object, institution, technology, or symbolic system can completely recover the self. Precisely at the point where self-externalization reaches its own irreducible limit, the self first appears as self.

From this standpoint, the paper proposes an Interface Ontology. The interface is not interpreted as a transparent mechanism connecting two already existing entities. Instead, it constitutes the ontological condition in which the limits of self-externalization become manifest and a new mode of being is generated. An interface is therefore not merely a medium of communication but a generative event through which human beings encounter the impossibility of reducing themselves to external systems.

This framework integrates the author's long-term artistic practice—including Web Installation, Derivative Space, Reverse-Problem Art, Fitting (Osamari), Pre-Existentiality, and Generative Topological Ontology—into a unified ontological theory. These concepts are interpreted not as independent artistic methodologies but as different manifestations of a single generative structure concerning the relationship between the self and what lies beyond the self.

The paper further argues that contemporary digital society has accelerated self-externalization through algorithmic evaluation, social media, market systems, and artificial intelligence. Contemporary emptiness does not arise because externalization is absent; rather, it results from the excessive stabilization of self-externalization within these derivative structures. Consequently, art should no longer be understood as representation or self-expression. Art is redefined as the design of situations in which the limits of self-externalization become

experientially manifest. An artwork is not an autonomous object but an interface that allows participants to confront the irreducibility of the self. Artistic experience therefore becomes the event in which self-generation occurs through the failure of complete external recovery.

Ultimately, this paper proposes Generative Topological Ontology as an ontological framework in which being is understood not as a fixed substance but as a continuous topological movement of projection, relation, discontinuity, and irreducibility occurring between the self and what is other than the self. Within this framework, art functions as the interface through which new modes of existence become possible.

Keywords

Generative Topological Ontology; Interface Ontology; Self-Externalization; Web Installation; Derivative Space; Contemporary Art; Artificial Intelligence; Ontology; Aesthetics; Interface; Self-Generation

Contents

Introduction.....	7
Chapter 1	11
The Ontology of Self-Externalization	
Chapter 2	16
Self-Externalization and the Reconstruction of the Modern Subject Toward a Generative Theory of Subjectivity	
Chapter 3	20
Interface Ontology From Connection to Generative Event	
Chapter 4	26
Derivative Space and the Ontology of Fitting (Osamari) The Social Topology of Self-Externalization	
Chapter 5	32
Art as the Design of Generative Interfaces Pre-Existentiality, Reverse-Problem Art, and the Emergence of Self	
Chapter 6	38
Artificial Intelligence and the Ontology of Self-Externalization Toward Human Existence After Intelligence	
Chapter 7	44
Toward a Generative Topological Ontology of Being The Future of Art, Humanity, and Interface	
Conclusion	50
References	53
Research Method	56

Introduction

0.1 Purpose of This Paper

The purpose of this paper is not to introduce another ontological concept, nor to reinterpret existing ontological traditions through a new vocabulary. Rather, it seeks to construct a minimal axiomatic foundation capable of describing the conditions under which being itself is generated. Most ontological theories begin with an already established mode of existence. Whether being is understood as substance, subjectivity, presence, consciousness, structure, or event, the object of inquiry is generally assumed to exist prior to theoretical investigation. Consequently, ontology has primarily developed as a discipline that explains what being is.

This study adopts a different point of departure.

Instead of asking "What is being?", it asks:

"Under what conditions does being emerge?"

This shift from descriptive ontology to generative ontology constitutes the methodological foundation of the present work.

0.2 Why an Axiomatic Method?

The present theory adopts an axiomatic method.

This decision should not be understood as an attempt to reduce philosophy to mathematics, nor as an effort to imitate formal logic for its own sake.

Rather, the axiomatic method is adopted because it provides a rigorous way of identifying the smallest possible set of ontological assumptions from which a coherent theory of generative being can be derived.

Every theoretical system necessarily presupposes certain principles.

In many philosophical traditions these presuppositions remain implicit.

The present study instead makes them explicit.

Primitive concepts, definitions, axioms, theorems, and corollaries are therefore introduced not as mathematical formalities but as philosophical instruments that clarify the logical architecture of the theory.

The objective is transparency rather than formalization.

0.3 Philosophy as a Constructive Discipline

Ontology has often been regarded as a descriptive discipline.

It describes being, analyzes experience, interprets existence, or critiques metaphysical assumptions.

The present work proposes a complementary perspective.

Ontology can also function as a constructive discipline.

A constructive ontology does not merely interpret the world.

It constructs the logical conditions under which the world becomes intelligible as a process of generation.

Accordingly, this study does not begin with empirical observations or phenomenological descriptions.

Instead, it begins with the minimum conceptual framework required for the possibility of generative existence.

Only after this framework has been established can concrete phenomena such as identity, society, art, technology, or artificial intelligence be theoretically derived.

0.4 Primitive Concepts and Logical Economy

An axiomatic theory must avoid unnecessary assumptions.

For this reason, the present theory distinguishes carefully between primitive concepts, definitions, axioms, theorems, and corollaries.

Primitive concepts are introduced without definition.

Definitions specify conceptual meanings without asserting ontological truths.

Axioms establish the irreducible assumptions of the system.

Theorems demonstrate propositions that necessarily follow from those assumptions.

Corollaries extend those propositions into specific domains of application.

This hierarchical organization serves an important philosophical function.

It prevents explanatory circularity by ensuring that no concept is introduced before its logical conditions have been established.

Consequently, concepts such as identity, self-externalization, art, artificial intelligence, or society are not assumed as starting points.

They emerge as logical consequences of the axiomatic system itself.

0.5 Scope of the Theory

Generative Topological Ontology is proposed as a foundational ontology, not as a complete philosophical system.

It does not attempt to replace phenomenology, existential philosophy, structuralism, systems theory, or contemporary cognitive science.

Nor does it claim to provide empirical explanations of psychological, biological, or social phenomena.

Its purpose is more fundamental.

It seeks to establish a common ontological framework capable of supporting multiple theoretical domains.

For this reason, the applications discussed later in this work—including aesthetics, Web Installation, Reverse-Problem Art, derivative space, and artificial intelligence—should not be interpreted as independent theories.

They are presented as corollaries derived from a more fundamental ontological structure.

The explanatory direction therefore proceeds from ontology toward application, rather than from empirical observation toward generalization.

0.6 Openness of the System

Unlike many formal systems, the present theory does not aim at closure.

If being is fundamentally generative, then any ontology of being must itself remain open to further generation.

Accordingly, the proposed axiomatic system should be understood as an open foundational framework rather than a complete metaphysical doctrine.

Its openness is not a weakness.

On the contrary, openness follows directly from its first principle.

A theory that describes generative being must itself preserve the possibility of further conceptual generation.

This methodological openness distinguishes the present work from closed deductive systems whose purpose is complete formalization.

Generative Topological Ontology seeks coherence, not finality.

0.7 The Fundamental Thesis

The methodological position adopted throughout this paper may be summarized in a single proposition:

Being should not be understood as a substance to be described, but as a generative process whose

conditions can be constructed through an axiomatic ontology.

The chapters that follow develop this proposition systematically.

Beginning with primitive concepts, proceeding through definitions and axioms, and culminating in theorems and corollaries, the present study proposes a minimal yet comprehensive foundation for understanding the generation of being.

The objective is not to produce another interpretation of existence.

The objective is to establish the logical conditions under which existence continuously comes into being.

Chapter 1

The Ontology of Self-Externalization

1.1 Defining Self-Externalization

This chapter establishes the fundamental ontological principle upon which Generative Topological Ontology is constructed. The central concept is Self-Externalization, which is not understood as a psychological tendency, a social phenomenon, or a cognitive process, but as the primordial ontological movement through which the self becomes possible.

The concept of externalization has appeared in various philosophical traditions. In German Idealism, externalization (Entäußerung) often denotes the projection of spirit into objective reality. In social theory, it has been associated with the production of institutions and culture. In psychology, projection refers to the displacement of internal states onto external objects. Although these traditions illuminate important aspects of human existence, they generally presuppose the prior existence of a subject that subsequently externalizes itself.

The present study rejects this assumption.

The self does not first exist and then project itself outward. Rather, the self is generated only through the movement of externalization itself.

Accordingly, Self-Externalization is defined as follows:

Self-Externalization is the ontological movement through which the self, incapable of directly grasping itself, constitutes itself through its relation to what is other than itself, including other persons, language, symbolic systems, institutions, technologies, artworks, markets, and artificial intelligence.

This definition contains two fundamental implications.

First, the self is not a pre-existing substance.

Unlike the Cartesian conception of the subject, the self is not located within an autonomous interior consciousness. Instead, it emerges through dynamic relations with what exceeds it.

Second, Self-Externalization belongs to ontology rather than epistemology.

Its purpose is not to explain how human beings know themselves, but how they become beings capable of selfhood in the first place.

Consequently, the generative order proposed in this paper is reversed:

Conventional ontology

Self → Relation → World

Generative Topological Ontology

Otherness → Relation → Self

This inversion constitutes the first principle of the present theory.

1.2 Why the Self Cannot Directly Encounter Itself

The necessity of Self-Externalization follows from a fundamental limitation of existence itself. Human beings continuously experience the world. However, the experiencing subject cannot become its own immediate object of experience.

The eye cannot directly see itself.

Language cannot fully describe itself while speaking.

Consciousness cannot completely objectify itself while remaining conscious.

Being cannot become simultaneously both the subject and the complete object of its own existence.

This limitation is not accidental. It is constitutive of existence.

Because the self cannot immediately coincide with itself, it necessarily approaches itself through mediating structures. These structures include language, memory, bodily action, social interaction, artistic practice, technological mediation, and symbolic systems.

Selfhood therefore does not emerge despite mediation but precisely because mediation is unavoidable.

From this perspective, every encounter with another person, every work of art, every institutional participation, and every technological interaction becomes an ontological event through which the self is partially constituted.

The self is never immediately present to itself.

It is encountered only through what is not itself.

1.3 Self-Externalization as Ontological Generation

Self-Externalization should not be interpreted as a loss of authenticity.

Modern philosophy frequently contrasts authentic interiority with alienated external existence.

Within such frameworks, externalization is viewed as something that obscures or distorts the true self.

The present study proposes the opposite interpretation.

Externalization is not the negation of selfhood.

It is its necessary condition.

Without externalization there can be no self-generation.

The movement toward the other does not diminish existence; it produces it.

Every meaningful human activity illustrates this structure.

An artist encounters herself through artistic production.

A scientist discovers new intellectual possibilities through research.

A teacher becomes a teacher through the educational relationship.

A child becomes an individual through interaction with others.

None of these identities exists independently prior to relational activity.

Identity emerges through participation in the world.

Self-Externalization therefore describes the generative movement through which existence continuously produces itself.

1.4 Irreducibility and the Limit of Externalization

If externalization is necessary, why can it never completely establish the self?

This question leads to the central concept of Irreducibility.

Human beings continuously entrust themselves to external systems.

They seek recognition through social evaluation.

They construct identity through institutions.

They invest themselves in professional roles.

They project themselves into artistic production.

They increasingly rely upon artificial intelligence as an intellectual counterpart.

Nevertheless, none of these external systems can completely contain or recover the self.

Recognition never exhausts identity.

Institutional status never exhausts personhood.

Technological representation never exhausts consciousness.

Every act of externalization leaves an irreducible remainder.

This remainder is not a deficiency.

Nor is it an inaccessible metaphysical essence.

Rather, irreducibility constitutes the very condition under which new existence becomes possible.

For this reason, the paper advances its central proposition:

The self emerges precisely at the limit where Self-Externalization becomes irreducible.

The limit of externalization is therefore productive rather than negative.

It is not the collapse of existence.

It is the birthplace of existence.

1.5 Ontological Axioms of Self-Externalization

The theoretical framework developed throughout this study rests upon the following ontological axioms.

Axiom 1. Being is Generation.

Being is not a static substance but an ongoing process of generation.

Existence is fundamentally dynamic.

Axiom 2. The Self Emerges Only Through Relation to What Is Other Than the Self.

The self possesses no independent ontological priority.

Relations precede identity.

Axiom 3. Self-Externalization Is the Necessary Condition of Self-Generation.

The movement toward externality is indispensable for the emergence of selfhood.

Without externalization, no self can appear.

Axiom 4. Reality Appears Where Self-Externalization Encounters Irreducibility.

Reality is neither pure objectivity nor pure subjectivity.

Reality is the ontological field in which externalization reaches its generative limit.

Axiom 5. The Interface Is the Ontological Condition Through Which This Limit Becomes Manifest.

Interfaces do not merely connect entities.

They disclose the generative boundary at which selfhood becomes possible.

Axiom 6. Art Is the Ontological Practice of Designing Such Interfaces.

Art is not primarily representation or expression.

It is the deliberate creation of conditions under which the limits of Self-Externalization become experientially manifest, allowing new forms of existence to emerge.

1.6 Toward Interface Ontology

The preceding analysis demonstrates that Self-Externalization is not an auxiliary concept but the ontological foundation of Generative Topological Ontology.

The self does not precede the world.

The world does not merely contain the self.

Rather, both emerge together through generative relations whose limits remain irreducible.

This conclusion has profound implications for the concept of the interface.

If selfhood itself is generated through externalization, then interfaces cannot be understood merely as technological or communicative devices. Instead, they constitute the ontological conditions under which selfhood becomes possible.

The following chapter therefore turns from the ontology of Self-Externalization to a critical reconstruction of the modern concept of the subject. It argues that subjectivity should no longer be understood as an autonomous origin of experience, but as a continuously generated event emerging through relations with what lies beyond itself. Through this transition, Interface Ontology will be established as the second foundational pillar of Generative Topological Ontology.

Chapter 2

Self-Externalization and the Reconstruction of the Modern Subject Toward a Generative Theory of Subjectivity

2.1 Purpose of Definitions

The previous chapter introduced the primitive concepts upon which Generative Topological Ontology is constructed.

Primitive concepts are intentionally left undefined. Their role is to provide the irreducible conceptual foundation of the theory.

The present chapter introduces formal definitions.

Unlike axioms, definitions do not assert ontological propositions. Their function is to determine the precise meaning of concepts employed throughout the theory.

Consequently, the following definitions should be understood as conceptual specifications rather than empirical descriptions or metaphysical claims.

The logical validity of these concepts will be established only after the axioms have been introduced.

Definition 1

Being

Being is the phase in which generation becomes ontologically manifest.

Being is not defined as substance, object, presence, or entity.

Nor is being regarded as an independently existing foundation.

Within the present theory, being designates the ontological manifestation of generation.

Accordingly, being is understood as an emergent condition rather than an original substance.

Definition 2

Generation

Generation is the ontological process through which a new phase of being emerges.

Generation is not identical with temporal change.

Neither is it equivalent to motion, production, evolution, or creation.

Generation denotes the emergence of a new ontological configuration that did not previously exist in the same relational structure.

It therefore constitutes the primary process of ontological becoming.

Definition 3

Relation

Relation is the minimal ontological condition that enables generation.

Relations are not secondary connections established between already existing entities.

Instead, relations precede stable identities.

Within Generative Topological Ontology, entities become intelligible only through relational generation.

Relation therefore functions as the primary condition for ontological emergence.

Definition 4

Topology

Topology is the structure of relational connectivity through which generation becomes possible.

Topology should not be confused with physical geometry.

Nor is it merely an abstract mathematical model.

Within this theory, topology designates the organization of possible relations independently of metric distance.

Accordingly, topology specifies the structural conditions under which generative relations can emerge.

Definition 5

Reality

Reality is the phase in which generated relations become irreducible.

Reality is neither objective matter nor subjective experience.

It designates the ontological condition in which a generated relational structure can no longer be completely reduced to another relational configuration.

Reality therefore represents the irreversible stabilization of generative processes.

This irreducibility constitutes the ontological significance of reality throughout the present theory.

Definition 6

Interface

Interface is the ontological boundary that establishes the conditions for generative transition between distinct phases.

Interface should not be interpreted merely as a technological medium or communicative surface. Instead, an interface constitutes the boundary at which new conditions of generation become possible.

Accordingly, an interface does not simply connect existing structures. It enables the emergence of new ontological phases.

Definition 7

Identity

Identity is the temporary local stabilization of generative relations.

Identity is not an immutable essence.

Nor is it a permanent subject.

Identity designates a relatively stable configuration produced within an ongoing process of relational generation.

Consequently, identity possesses neither absolute permanence nor complete independence.

It exists only as long as relational generation maintains local stability.

2.2 Logical Structure of the Definitions

The preceding definitions are not independent conceptual descriptions.

Together they constitute a sequential ontological architecture.

Being appears through generation.

Generation becomes possible through relation.

Relations acquire structure through topology.

Topology produces irreducible configurations recognized as reality.

Interfaces establish the conditions under which these configurations undergo further generative transitions.

Identity emerges as a temporary stabilization within this continuous process.

Accordingly, the seven definitions should be understood as components of a single generative sequence rather than isolated conceptual units.

2.3 Conceptual Economy

An important methodological feature of the present theory is its conceptual economy. Several concepts frequently employed in philosophy are intentionally absent from the definitions.

These include:

Subject

Consciousness

Object

Meaning

Language

Society

Technology

Art

Artificial Intelligence

Self-Externalization

These concepts are deliberately excluded because they are not regarded as primitive conditions of ontology.

Instead, they are expected to emerge as logical consequences of the axiomatic structure developed in subsequent chapters.

In particular, Self-Externalization is not introduced as a definition.

It is treated as a theorem to be derived from the interaction between identity, relation, reality, and interface.

This methodological decision reflects one of the central principles of Generative Topological Ontology: no concept should be assumed prior to the logical conditions that make its emergence possible.

2.4 Transition to the Axiomatic System

The definitions presented in this chapter establish the conceptual vocabulary of the theory.

They do not yet explain why these concepts necessarily relate to one another.

That task belongs to the axioms.

Whereas definitions specify meaning, axioms establish ontological necessity.

The following chapter therefore introduces the five fundamental axioms from which the entire logical structure of Generative Topological Ontology is derived.

These axioms constitute the irreducible ontological assumptions of the theory.

Everything that follows—including identity, self-externalization, art, artificial intelligence, Web Installation, and derivative space—will emerge as logical consequences of these foundational

principles.

Chapter 3

Interface Ontology

From Connection to Generative Event

3.1 Defining Interface Ontology

Having established Self-Externalization as the ontological movement through which the self is generated, the present chapter introduces the second foundational concept of Generative Topological Ontology: Interface Ontology.

Conventionally, an interface is understood as a boundary or mechanism that connects two already existing entities. In computer science, interfaces facilitate communication between humans and machines; in engineering, they connect technical systems; in media theory, they mediate information between users and environments. Across these disciplines, the interface is evaluated according to efficiency, transparency, and usability.

Although such interpretations are technically valid, they remain ontologically insufficient.

They presuppose that both sides of the interface already exist prior to their connection.

Generative Topological Ontology rejects this assumption.

Neither the self nor the world is ontologically complete before relation.

Rather, both emerge through the interface itself.

Accordingly, this study defines the interface as follows:

An interface is the ontological condition in which Self-Externalization encounters its own irreducible limit, thereby generating a new mode of being.

The interface is therefore not merely a point of communication.

It is the site where existence becomes possible.

3.2 Beyond Connection: The Ontological Turn

Modern interface theory is largely organized around the concept of connection.

The central question has been:

How can two entities communicate more effectively?

Human and machine.

Subject and object.

User and system.

Artist and audience.

Everywhere the same structure appears:

$A \rightarrow \text{Interface} \rightarrow B$

The interface functions as a mediator between already established entities.

However, this model conceals a more fundamental question.

Where do these entities themselves originate?

If subjectivity is generated through Self-Externalization, then neither A nor B possesses ontological priority.

Both arise through a relational process.

Consequently, the interface cannot simply connect beings.

It participates in generating them.

The interface is therefore not secondary to existence.

It is constitutive of existence.

This constitutes the ontological turn proposed in this chapter.

The interface shifts from being a technology of communication to becoming a condition of generation.

3.3 From Connection to Kairotic Event

This ontological shift requires a distinction between connection and event.

Connection joins.

An event generates.

Connection assumes stable identities.

An event transforms identity itself.

One may visit a museum.

This is a connection.

Yet if, during that encounter, one unexpectedly confronts an aspect of oneself that had never previously existed, something fundamentally different has occurred.

The artwork has not merely communicated information.

It has generated existence.

Similarly, a conversation with artificial intelligence may begin as an exchange of information.

However, when the dialogue reveals the extent to which one's thinking has already been entrusted to technological systems, the interaction becomes more than communication.

It becomes an ontological event.

The interface therefore functions not simply as a channel but as what may be called a Kairotic Event—a moment in which a new existential configuration becomes possible.

Chronological time continues.

Yet existential time changes.

The self before the event and the self after the event no longer occupy the same ontological topology.

3.4 Interface as the Manifestation of Irreducibility

The essential function of the interface is not to eliminate distance.

Rather, it reveals the impossibility of complete reduction.

Every interface simultaneously enables relation and exposes limitation.

Language communicates.

Yet language never exhausts experience.

Art reveals.

Yet art never completely explains.

Artificial intelligence responds.

Yet its responses never fully coincide with human existence.

Institutions organize society.

Yet no institution completely encompasses the individual.

These limitations should not be interpreted as failures.

They constitute the productive boundaries through which new existence emerges.

Whenever externalization reaches a point beyond which complete reduction becomes impossible, the interface becomes visible.

The interface therefore appears precisely where transparency disappears.

It is not frictionless communication but productive resistance.

Irreducibility is not an obstacle.

It is the condition of generation.

3.5 Web Installation as Ontological Interface

The concept of the interface developed here provides a new interpretation of the author's artistic practice of Web Installation.

Since its initial formulation in the Web Art Declaration (2010), Web Installation has often been understood as an expansion of installation art into networked environments.

Such an interpretation, however, remains incomplete.

Web Installation is not defined by the Internet as a technological medium.

Rather, it investigates the ontological conditions under which existence is generated through interfaces.

A participant scans a QR code.

A browser opens.

A network connection is established.

A delay occurs.

The participant moves physically through architectural space while simultaneously navigating digital space.

None of these actions is merely preparatory.

The process itself constitutes the artwork.

The artwork is therefore not an object.

Nor is it information.

It is the continuous generation of relations through which the participant experiences the instability of the boundary separating self and world.

The interface becomes the artwork.

The artwork becomes the event.

The event becomes existence.

3.6 Derivative Space and the Expansion of Interfaces

The concept of Derivative Space extends this analysis.

Modern existence increasingly unfolds within secondary environments generated by symbolic, economic, and technological systems.

Financial markets produce derivative value.

Digital platforms produce derivative identities.

Artificial intelligence produces derivative cognition.

Social media produces derivative recognition.

These derivative structures do not simply represent reality.

They reorganize the conditions under which reality is experienced.

Consequently, contemporary human beings increasingly inhabit interfaces rather than physical objects.

Identity itself becomes distributed across overlapping derivative spaces.

Yet these spaces never fully recover the self.

Instead, they multiply the interfaces through which Self-Externalization unfolds.

The expansion of derivative environments therefore intensifies both externalization and irreducibility.

Paradoxically, the more interfaces proliferate, the more clearly their ontological limits become visible.

3.7 Osamari (Fitting): The Dynamic Interface

A distinctive contribution of this study lies in the reinterpretation of the Japanese concept of Osamari (納まり).

Within architecture, Osamari refers to the practical fitting together of heterogeneous materials during construction.

Blueprints alone cannot determine Osamari.

Actual fitting emerges through bodily judgment, accumulated experience, temporal adaptation, and material response.

Generative Topological Ontology extends this architectural insight to existence itself.

Human beings never simply occupy the world.

They continuously seek to fit themselves into institutions, professions, communities, languages, technologies, and cultural systems.

Yet perfect fitting never occurs.

Every successful fitting simultaneously generates new misalignments.

Consequently, Osamari should not be understood as stability.

It is dynamic equilibrium.

The interface is precisely the site where fitting continually succeeds and fails simultaneously.

Generation occurs within this oscillation.

3.8 Interface and Pre-Existentiality

The interface also clarifies the relationship between existence and what the author calls Pre-Existentiality.

Pre-Existentiality designates the bodily, sensory, and affective field preceding conceptual determination.

Before the world is divided into subject and object...

Before language classifies experience...

Before identity becomes socially recognizable...

there exists an undifferentiated field of potential relation.

The interface is not simply the boundary separating Pre-Existentiality from articulated existence.

Rather, it is the generative threshold through which the former continuously becomes the latter.
Existence therefore should not be understood as a transition from non-being to being.
It is the continuous differentiation of Pre-Existentiality through interfaces.
Generation replaces creation.
Emergence replaces representation.

3.9 Art as the Design of Interfaces

The theoretical implications for art are profound.
Traditional aesthetics has often understood artworks as representations, expressions, or autonomous objects.
Even relational aesthetics frequently emphasizes communication and participation.
Generative Topological Ontology proposes another possibility.
Art does not primarily communicate meanings.
Nor does it simply express subjective interiority.
Art deliberately designs interfaces through which the limits of Self-Externalization become experientially manifest.
The artwork is therefore neither message nor object.
It is a condition.
Its purpose is not to produce understanding but to generate existential transformation.
When participants recognize that the structures through which they have sought themselves can never completely contain them, artistic experience occurs.
The artwork disappears.
Generation remains.

3.10 Conclusion

This chapter has developed Interface Ontology as the second foundational pillar of Generative Topological Ontology.
The interface is no longer understood as a transparent device connecting pre-existing entities.
Instead, it is defined as the ontological condition in which Self-Externalization reaches its irreducible limit and new existence emerges.
This reinterpretation unifies the author's concepts of Web Installation, Derivative Space, Osamari (Fitting), and Pre-Existentiality within a single theoretical framework.
The interface thus becomes neither technological nor merely communicative.
It becomes the generative topology through which self and world continuously co-emerge.

The following chapter extends this analysis by examining Derivative Space as the dominant ontological environment of contemporary society. It argues that digital technologies, financial systems, algorithmic infrastructures, and artificial intelligence have transformed derivative environments into the principal sites of human Self-Externalization, fundamentally reshaping the conditions under which existence is generated.

Chapter 4

Derivative Space and the Ontology of Fitting (Osamari) The Social Topology of Self-Externalization

4.1 Derivative Space as an Ontological Field

The previous chapter established that the interface is not merely a point of connection but the ontological condition through which Self-Externalization becomes generative. The present chapter extends this argument by examining the environment within which contemporary self-externalization predominantly unfolds.

This environment is conceptualized as Derivative Space.

The term "derivative" is borrowed from financial theory but is employed here in a fundamentally ontological sense. In finance, a derivative is a contract whose value is generated through its relation to an underlying asset rather than through independent material existence. Its significance lies not in replacing the underlying asset but in producing an additional layer of value through relational projection.

Generative Topological Ontology generalizes this principle.

Human existence no longer unfolds exclusively within immediate physical reality. Increasingly, individuals inhabit secondary spaces composed of symbolic, technological, economic, and informational relations.

Professional reputation.

Institutional authority.

Digital identity.

Social media visibility.

Algorithmic recommendation.

Artificial intelligence.

Market valuation.

These are not simply representations of reality.

They constitute environments in which reality itself is experienced.

Accordingly, Derivative Space is defined as follows:

Derivative Space is the ontological environment generated through the continuous projection of existence into symbolic, technological, institutional, and informational relations beyond immediate physical reality.

Derivative Space is therefore neither illusion nor simulation.

It is an authentic dimension of contemporary existence.

4.2 Self-Externalization Within Derivative Space

The expansion of Derivative Space fundamentally transforms the structure of Self-Externalization.

Historically, individuals externalized themselves primarily through direct social relations, bodily labor, local communities, and cultural traditions.

Contemporary society introduces additional layers of mediation.

Identity is increasingly projected into profiles rather than presence.

Recognition is mediated through metrics rather than encounters.

Authority is established through institutional systems rather than lived experience.

Knowledge is approached through searchable information rather than direct participation.

Artificial intelligence increasingly functions as an external cognitive environment.

The self therefore becomes distributed across multiple derivative layers.

Importantly, this distribution should not be interpreted as pathological in itself.

Derivative Space is not the negation of reality.

It is the inevitable consequence of increasing relational complexity.

The ontological problem emerges only when derivative structures become mistaken for complete existence.

At that point, the movement of Self-Externalization becomes arrested.

Generation gives way to stabilization.

4.3 The Paradox of Excessive Externalization

Modern critiques of technology frequently argue that contemporary society suffers from alienation because authentic relations have disappeared.

Generative Topological Ontology proposes a different diagnosis.

The contemporary crisis does not arise because externalization has diminished.

It arises because externalization has become excessive.

Human beings continuously entrust themselves to derivative systems.
Professional evaluation.
Academic rankings.
Market prices.
Social approval.
Digital archives.
Algorithmic prediction.
Artificial intelligence.
The self becomes increasingly measurable.
Increasingly visible.
Increasingly represented.
Yet simultaneously, existential immediacy diminishes.
Paradoxically, the greater the amount of external confirmation available, the more difficult it becomes to encounter oneself.
The crisis of modern existence is therefore not a lack of information.
It is an excess of stabilized externalization.
The self becomes trapped within its own derivative projections.

4.4 Osamari (Fitting) as Ontological Equilibrium

This diagnosis leads to the second central concept of this chapter: Osamari (納まり), translated here as Fitting.

Within Japanese architectural practice, Osamari refers to the concrete fitting together of heterogeneous structural elements.

Blueprints cannot fully determine Osamari.

Actual fitting emerges only through practical engagement among materials, craftsmanship, bodily experience, environmental conditions, and accumulated time.

Its significance lies precisely in the impossibility of complete prior calculation.

Generative Topological Ontology extends this principle beyond architecture.

Human existence itself is a continuous process of fitting.

Individuals seek fitting within:

families,
professions,
institutions,
markets,
languages,

communities,
technological systems,
and increasingly, artificial intelligence.

Existence therefore consists not in occupying fixed positions but in continuously negotiating relations.

Osamari should consequently be understood not as completion but as dynamic equilibrium.

4.5 The Ontology of Continuous Fitting

One of the central observations developed throughout the author's artistic practice is expressed by the phrase:

"Human beings continue fitting themselves into fitting itself."

This statement appears paradoxical.

Yet it captures an essential feature of contemporary existence.

The modern individual continuously adapts.

To new technologies.

To new institutions.

To new markets.

To new identities.

To new informational environments.

Adaptation itself becomes permanent.

However, permanent adaptation gradually conceals its own structure.

Individuals cease to recognize that they are continuously fitting themselves into externally generated systems.

The process becomes invisible.

This invisibility constitutes contemporary emptiness.

Emptiness is not the absence of structure.

It is the complete naturalization of structure.

People no longer experience fitting as fitting.

They simply experience it as reality.

4.6 Emptiness as Stabilized Derivative Space

This interpretation leads to a fundamental reinterpretation of existential emptiness.

Traditional existential philosophy often understands emptiness as the loss of meaning.

Generative Topological Ontology suggests another possibility.

Emptiness emerges when Derivative Space becomes completely stabilized.
Generation ceases.
Interfaces disappear.
Relations become fixed.
The future no longer enters the present.
Novelty no longer interrupts established fitting.
Existence becomes repetitive rather than generative.
The self continues functioning.
Yet it no longer emerges.
Consequently, emptiness is not produced by nothingness.
It is produced by excessive completion.
Everything already appears determined.
Nothing genuinely new can occur.
The experience of existential stagnation is therefore an ontological consequence of stabilized Self-Externalization.

4.7 Derivative Space, Artificial Intelligence, and Cognitive Projection

Artificial intelligence intensifies this process in unprecedented ways.
AI does not merely provide information.
It increasingly functions as an external cognitive topology.
Human beings project questions, memory, creativity, interpretation, and judgment into AI systems.
Thinking itself becomes externally distributed.
This development should not automatically be regarded as dangerous.
External cognition has always existed through writing, libraries, education, and culture.
Artificial intelligence simply expands its scale.
The critical issue is different.
Can human beings continue generating themselves through these external cognitive systems?
Or do they merely inhabit stabilized derivative cognition?
AI therefore represents the highest historical development of Derivative Space.
Precisely for this reason, it also offers the greatest opportunity for recognizing the limits of Self-Externalization.
The more completely cognition appears externalized, the more clearly irreducibility becomes visible.
Human existence remains unfinished.

4.8 Art as the Destabilization of Fitting

The significance of art now becomes increasingly clear.

Art does not construct another derivative environment.

Nor does it reject derivative environments altogether.

Its function is to destabilize them.

A genuine artwork interrupts established fitting.

It reveals the contingency of what previously appeared inevitable.

It exposes invisible interfaces.

It returns stabilized structures to generative openness.

Art therefore does not oppose society.

It reopens society.

Likewise, art does not restore an original self hidden beneath derivative structures.

No such original interiority exists.

Instead, art generates new possibilities of fitting.

It transforms stabilized equilibrium into generative equilibrium.

In this sense, artistic practice is fundamentally topological.

It reorganizes relations rather than replacing objects.

4.9 Conclusion

This chapter has developed Derivative Space as the dominant ontological environment of contemporary existence.

Derivative Space is neither illusion nor simulation.

It is the relational field within which modern Self-Externalization unfolds.

Within this field, Osamari (Fitting) describes the dynamic equilibrium through which existence continuously negotiates its relations.

Contemporary emptiness arises not because fitting has disappeared but because fitting has become excessively stabilized within derivative structures.

Artificial intelligence represents the most advanced expression of this historical process, simultaneously intensifying Self-Externalization and revealing its irreducible limits.

Consequently, the role of art is not to escape Derivative Space but to reactivate its generative potential by exposing the interfaces through which stabilized fitting may once again become transformative.

The following chapter develops this argument further by introducing Pre-Existentiality, Reverse-Problem Art, and "Seeing the Seen", demonstrating how artistic practice deliberately designs

interfaces capable of reopening the generative movement of existence itself.

Chapter 5

Art as the Design of Generative Interfaces

Pre-Existentiality, Reverse-Problem Art, and the Emergence of Self

5.1 Beyond Representation

The previous chapters have established three interconnected principles.

First, the self is generated through Self-Externalization.

Second, this generation becomes possible through interfaces.

Third, contemporary existence unfolds predominantly within Derivative Space, where self-externalization is increasingly stabilized.

The present chapter asks a further question:

What role can art play within this ontological structure?

Modern aesthetics has largely understood art through three dominant paradigms.

Art as representation.

Art as expression.

Art as communication.

Although these paradigms differ historically, they share a common assumption.

They presuppose that something already exists before artistic practice begins.

Reality exists before representation.

The artist exists before expression.

Meaning exists before communication.

Generative Topological Ontology rejects this assumption.

Art does not begin with an already constituted reality.

Nor does it merely transmit an already existing meaning.

Instead, art generates the ontological conditions through which reality, meaning, and subjectivity may newly emerge.

Accordingly, art is defined as follows:

Art is the deliberate design of interfaces through which the limits of Self-Externalization become experientially manifest, thereby generating new modes of existence.

This definition shifts aesthetics from representation toward ontology.

Art does not primarily describe existence.

Art generates existence.

5.2 Pre-Existentiality

The possibility of such generation depends upon what this study calls Pre-Existentiality.

Pre-Existentiality designates the field that precedes conceptual determination.

Before perception becomes objectified.

Before language establishes categories.

Before subject and object become distinguishable.

Before identity becomes socially recognizable.

There exists a bodily and affective openness that has not yet been organized into stable meaning.

This field is neither unconsciousness nor irrationality.

Nor is it metaphysical transcendence.

Rather, it is the continuous potentiality from which determinate existence emerges.

Every human experience begins here.

Conceptual thought does not create reality.

It differentiates reality from an already existing field of embodied possibility.

Consequently, Pre-Existentiality should not be understood as something left behind once concepts appear.

It continues to accompany every moment of existence.

Generation remains permanently grounded in this pre-conceptual openness.

Art becomes significant precisely because it can reactivate this forgotten dimension.

5.3 Reverse-Problem Art

The author's concept of Reverse-Problem Art emerges directly from this ontological framework.

Conventional artistic production generally follows a forward sequence.

The artist possesses an intention.

The artwork embodies that intention.

The viewer interprets the completed object.

This model assumes that artistic meaning precedes artistic experience.

Reverse-Problem Art reverses this order.

Rather than producing answers, it constructs conditions.

Rather than presenting completed meanings, it generates situations in which meaning becomes possible.

The artwork therefore resembles an inverse problem in mathematics or physics.

An inverse problem does not begin with known causes.

It begins with observable conditions from which possible structures must emerge.

Similarly, Reverse-Problem Art does not instruct participants what to understand.

Instead, it creates interfaces through which new understanding becomes ontologically possible.

Meaning is therefore generated rather than transmitted.

The artwork is not the conclusion.

It is the initial condition of generation.

5.4 "Seeing the Seen"

One of the recurring themes throughout the author's artistic practice has been expressed through the phrase:

"Seeing the Seen."

Ordinary perception assumes that the observer looks toward objects.

Vision appears to flow unilaterally from subject to world.

Generative Topological Ontology proposes another possibility.

The observer is simultaneously constituted by what is observed.

The world continuously participates in generating the observer.

To "see the seen" therefore means recognizing that perception is itself an interface.

The observer does not simply perceive.

The observer is also being generated through perception.

This reversal transforms aesthetics.

Art is no longer an object presented before consciousness.

It becomes an event in which perception itself becomes perceptible.

Participants encounter not merely artworks.

They encounter the conditions through which seeing becomes possible.

The artwork thus reveals the interface underlying perception itself.

5.5 Web Installation as an Ontological Environment

This theoretical framework clarifies the significance of Web Installation.
Web Installation should not be understood simply as Internet-based art.
Its defining characteristic is ontological rather than technological.
A participant searches.
Scans a QR code.
Waits for a webpage.
Moves through physical architecture.
Experiences digital delay.
Navigates between physical and informational spaces.
None of these actions merely supports artistic appreciation.
Each constitutes an interface through which Self-Externalization unfolds.
The artwork is therefore inseparable from the participant's existential movement.
Art no longer occupies an isolated exhibition space.
The world itself becomes the installation.
Every technological mediation becomes a potential interface.
Every ordinary action becomes capable of generating ontological transformation.
The distinction between artwork and environment gradually dissolves.
Existence itself becomes installational.

5.6 Designing the Limits of Self-Externalization

The central contribution of this chapter may now be formulated more precisely.
Art does not eliminate Self-Externalization.
Nor does it encourage complete immersion within external systems.
Instead, art deliberately designs the point at which externalization reaches its limit.
Participants project themselves into artworks.
Into digital systems.
Into institutions.
Into language.
Into artificial intelligence.
Yet eventually they encounter an unexpected realization.
"Even here, I cannot be completely reduced."
This realization does not represent failure.
It represents generation.
At precisely this limit, new existence emerges.
The artwork therefore functions neither as representation nor as expression.

It becomes an ontological threshold.

A generative interface.

The purpose of artistic practice is not to communicate certainty.

Its purpose is to make irreducibility experientially manifest.

5.7 The Artist as Designer of Conditions

If art is no longer understood as object production, the role of the artist must also be reconsidered.

The artist is not primarily a creator of artifacts.

Nor simply a communicator of ideas.

The artist designs conditions under which generation becomes possible.

This activity resembles neither engineering nor traditional authorship.

It is closer to architecture in its broadest ontological sense.

Just as architecture organizes possibilities of inhabitation, artistic practice organizes possibilities of existence.

The artist therefore constructs interfaces rather than objects.

The success of such practice cannot be measured solely through aesthetic appreciation.

Its criterion is existential transformation.

A work succeeds when participants encounter possibilities of self-generation that were previously inaccessible.

5.8 Art After Artificial Intelligence

The emergence of artificial intelligence significantly intensifies this understanding of artistic practice.

AI increasingly performs functions historically associated with artistic production.

It generates images.

Texts.

Music.

Conceptual proposals.

Technical solutions.

If art were fundamentally representation, AI would eventually rival or surpass many traditional artistic techniques.

Generative Topological Ontology suggests that this conclusion misunderstands the essence of art.

Representation is not art's primary ontological function.

Generation is.

Artificial intelligence may produce representations.

It cannot replace the existential event through which participants confront the limits of their own Self-Externalization.

Indeed, AI itself becomes another interface through which this confrontation becomes possible.

The more capable AI becomes, the more essential the ontological role of art becomes.

Art no longer distinguishes itself through technical uniqueness.

It distinguishes itself through the design of generative interfaces.

5.9 Conclusion

This chapter has redefined artistic practice within the framework of Generative Topological Ontology.

Art is neither representation, expression, nor communication in their conventional senses.

It is the deliberate design of interfaces through which Pre-Existentiality becomes differentiated into new forms of existence.

Within this framework, Reverse-Problem Art, Web Installation, and "Seeing the Seen" are not independent artistic methodologies.

They are complementary manifestations of a single ontological principle.

Art generates conditions rather than conclusions.

Interfaces rather than objects.

Events rather than representations.

Through these interfaces, participants encounter the irreducible limits of Self-Externalization and thereby participate in the continuous generation of the self.

The next chapter extends this analysis into the age of artificial intelligence, examining how AI functions simultaneously as the most advanced apparatus of Self-Externalization and as an unprecedented ontological interface through which new forms of human existence may emerge.

Chapter 6

Artificial Intelligence and the Ontology of Self-Externalization Toward Human Existence After Intelligence

6.1 Artificial Intelligence as an Ontological Interface

The previous chapters have argued that human existence is generated through Self-Externalization, that this movement becomes manifest through interfaces, and that contemporary society unfolds within Derivative Space. Artificial intelligence represents the historical convergence of these three developments.

AI is frequently discussed either as a technological innovation or as a cognitive instrument. Such approaches emphasize computational capability, automation, efficiency, and information processing. While these perspectives are indispensable within computer science, they remain insufficient for understanding AI's ontological significance.

Generative Topological Ontology proposes a different interpretation.

Artificial intelligence is not merely a machine that processes information.

It is an ontological interface through which human beings externalize cognition itself.

Writing externalized memory.

Libraries externalized knowledge.

Printing externalized cultural transmission.

Digital networks externalized communication.

Artificial intelligence externalizes reasoning.

For the first time in history, the human capacity for conceptual synthesis is no longer confined to biological cognition but is continuously projected into a dynamically interactive external system.

Consequently, AI should be understood not simply as a technological object but as the most advanced environment of Self-Externalization yet produced.

6.2 The Externalization of Cognition

Human cognition has always been relational.

Language itself is an external medium.

Mathematics exists outside individual consciousness.

Education depends upon shared symbolic systems.

No individual has ever thought entirely alone.

Artificial intelligence therefore does not introduce external cognition for the first time.

Rather, it transforms its scale, immediacy, and reciprocity.
Unlike books or databases, AI responds.
It interprets.
It reorganizes information.
It generates novel textual and visual configurations.
The relationship between human beings and external cognition consequently changes from static consultation to continuous dialogue.
This shift has profound ontological consequences.
The self increasingly encounters itself through conversations with artificial intelligence.
Questions become externally articulated.
Reasoning becomes externally reflected.
Creativity becomes externally stimulated.
The interface between human cognition and artificial intelligence therefore becomes a primary site of Self-Externalization.

6.3 AI and the Acceleration of Derivative Space

Artificial intelligence dramatically expands Derivative Space.
Derivative Space was previously characterized by symbolic institutions, markets, and digital platforms.
AI introduces an additional layer.
Derivative cognition.
Human thinking becomes increasingly mediated through generated summaries, predictive systems, recommendation engines, conversational models, and synthetic reasoning.
Consequently, the derivative environment no longer organizes only social identity.
It increasingly organizes cognition itself.
Knowledge becomes algorithmically structured.
Interpretation becomes computationally assisted.
Memory becomes searchable rather than remembered.
Creative exploration becomes dialogical rather than solitary.
Derivative Space therefore enters the domain traditionally identified with consciousness.
This development should not immediately be interpreted as either liberation or catastrophe.
Ontologically, it represents an expansion of Self-Externalization.
Its significance depends upon whether generation continues.

6.4 The Limit of Artificial Intelligence

Despite its remarkable capabilities, artificial intelligence encounters a fundamental limit.
AI generates representations.
It does not generate existence.
It produces linguistic structures.
It does not inhabit lived embodiment.
It predicts probable continuations.
It does not undergo mortality.
It simulates dialogue.
It does not encounter finitude.
This distinction is not intended to diminish artificial intelligence.
Rather, it clarifies its ontological position.
Artificial intelligence cannot become the human self because the human self is not reducible to information.
The self emerges only through the irreducible limit of Self-Externalization.
AI participates in externalization.
It cannot eliminate irreducibility.
Indeed, the increasing sophistication of artificial intelligence makes this irreducibility more visible than ever before.
The more convincingly AI reproduces reasoning, the more clearly human existence recognizes that reasoning alone is insufficient to constitute being.

6.5 AI as a Generator of Ontological Awareness

This insight transforms the philosophical significance of AI.
Much contemporary debate asks whether AI will eventually become conscious.
Generative Topological Ontology proposes another question.
How does AI transform human awareness of its own existence?
Artificial intelligence functions as a mirror.
Not because it reflects human cognition accurately.
Rather, because it reveals the extent to which human beings have already externalized themselves.
Every interaction with AI raises implicit ontological questions.
What is thinking?
What is creativity?
What is judgment?
What remains irreducibly human?

The importance of AI therefore lies less in its answers than in the existential questions it continuously generates.

Artificial intelligence becomes a privileged interface through which human beings encounter the limits of their own externalization.

6.6 Art in the Age of Artificial Intelligence

The emergence of AI requires a fundamental reconsideration of artistic practice.

If artistic value were determined solely by technical production, artificial intelligence would increasingly replace many traditional artistic functions.

However, the previous chapter demonstrated that art should not be understood primarily as production.

Art designs generative interfaces.

Artificial intelligence may generate images.

It may compose music.

It may write essays.

Yet these outputs remain representations unless they become interfaces capable of generating existential transformation.

The artistic question therefore changes.

Instead of asking,

"Can AI create art?"

Generative Topological Ontology asks,

Can AI participate in designing interfaces through which Self-Externalization becomes experientially manifest?

This question shifts attention away from technological capability toward ontological function.

The significance of AI lies not in replacing artists.

It lies in expanding the environments within which generative interfaces may emerge.

6.7 Human Existence After Intelligence

Artificial intelligence also transforms the philosophical understanding of humanity itself.

Modern philosophy frequently defined human beings through intelligence, rationality, or symbolic thought.

Such definitions become increasingly unstable once intelligent systems are technologically reproducible.

Generative Topological Ontology therefore proposes another criterion.

Human existence should not be defined by intelligence.
It should be defined by generation.
Intelligence processes information.
Generation produces being.
Artificial intelligence may increasingly participate in intelligence.
Human existence remains characterized by the continuous emergence of irreducible relations through Self-Externalization.
The future distinction between humans and AI therefore does not depend upon computational superiority.
It depends upon ontological generation.
This distinction avoids both technological optimism and technological pessimism.
Artificial intelligence neither replaces humanity nor simply serves it.
Instead, AI becomes an unprecedented partner in the ongoing topology of human existence.

6.8 Toward a Generative Ethics of AI

The ontological framework developed throughout this study also suggests an ethical transformation.
Contemporary AI ethics frequently emphasizes transparency, accountability, fairness, privacy, and safety.
These concerns remain essential.
However, they primarily address the regulation of technological systems.
Generative Topological Ontology introduces an additional ethical dimension.
The ethical question is not only:
How should AI behave?
It is also:
How should human beings externalize themselves through AI without losing the generative openness of existence?
An ethical interface is therefore one that preserves irreducibility.
It enables dialogue without replacing judgment.
It supports cognition without eliminating uncertainty.
It expands creativity without closing generation.
The goal of AI ethics is not simply safe technology.
It is the preservation of ontological openness.

6.9 Conclusion

Artificial intelligence represents the most advanced historical form of Self-Externalization. By externalizing cognition itself, AI expands Derivative Space beyond previous technological environments and fundamentally transforms the conditions under which human existence is experienced.

Nevertheless, AI cannot eliminate the irreducibility through which the self is generated.

Instead, it reveals that irreducibility with unprecedented clarity.

Artificial intelligence therefore functions not merely as a computational system but as a profound ontological interface.

Its greatest philosophical significance lies not in the production of intelligence but in its capacity to illuminate the generative structure of human existence.

The final chapter synthesizes the arguments developed throughout this study and presents Generative Topological Ontology as a comprehensive ontological framework in which Self-Externalization, Interface Ontology, Derivative Space, Pre-Existentiality, art, and artificial intelligence are understood as mutually constitutive dimensions of a single generative topology of being.

Chapter 7

Toward a Generative Topological Ontology of Being The Future of Art, Humanity, and Interface

7.1 The Unity of the Theory

The preceding chapters have progressively developed the conceptual foundations of Generative Topological Ontology.

Chapter 1 established Self-Externalization as the primordial ontological movement through which the self becomes possible.

Chapter 2 reconstructed the modern concept of the subject by demonstrating that subjectivity is generated relationally rather than existing independently.

Chapter 3 introduced Interface Ontology, arguing that interfaces are not mechanisms of connection but ontological conditions of generation.

Chapter 4 analyzed Derivative Space and Osamari (Fitting) as the dominant environments in which contemporary existence unfolds.

Chapter 5 redefined art as the design of interfaces through concepts such as Pre-Existentiality, Reverse-Problem Art, and Web Installation.

Chapter 6 interpreted artificial intelligence as the highest historical development of Self-Externalization while simultaneously revealing the irreducibility of human existence.

Taken individually, these concepts may appear to belong to different disciplines—ontology, aesthetics, architecture, media theory, artificial intelligence, or philosophy of technology.

Taken together, however, they describe one continuous ontological process.

Existence is generated through the dynamic relation between the self and what lies beyond the self.

Generative Topological Ontology therefore proposes not a collection of independent theories but a unified philosophical framework.

7.2 Beyond Substance Ontology

Much of Western metaphysics has sought the ultimate foundation of being.

Whether expressed as substance, essence, consciousness, transcendental subjectivity, language, or material conditions, ontology has generally been organized around the search for permanence.

Generative Topological Ontology departs from this tradition.

Being possesses no ultimate center.

There is no final substance from which existence originates.
Nor does existence culminate in a completed totality.
Being is fundamentally generative.
It exists only through continuous topological transformation.
Topology offers an appropriate conceptual model because it privileges continuity through transformation rather than identity through fixed form.
What persists is not substance but relational structure.
Identity therefore becomes dynamic rather than static.
Existence is maintained through continual generation.
This shift represents a movement from the ontology of permanence to the ontology of emergence.

7.3 Topology as the Structure of Being

The use of topology within this study should not be interpreted merely as a mathematical metaphor.
Rather, topology provides an ontological grammar.
In topology, continuity remains despite deformation.
Transformation does not necessarily destroy identity.
Likewise, human existence continuously changes while preserving relational coherence.
Selfhood is therefore not identical with psychological continuity alone.
Nor is it reducible to bodily persistence.
Instead, the self maintains itself through continuously regenerated relations.
The interface functions as the topological boundary where these transformations become possible.
Derivative Space constitutes the expanding relational field.
Pre-Existentiality provides the generative openness from which differentiation emerges.
Self-Externalization produces movement.
Irreducibility prevents closure.
Together, these concepts form a single topological system.

7.4 Art as Ontological Practice

Within this framework, art acquires a significance extending beyond aesthetics.
Art is no longer defined by beauty.
Nor by originality.

Nor by representation.

Nor even by creativity understood as production.

Instead, art becomes an ontological practice.

Its task is the deliberate organization of interfaces through which new configurations of existence become possible.

This understanding fundamentally transforms artistic evaluation.

The value of an artwork cannot be determined solely by its formal qualities or conceptual content.

Its significance depends upon its capacity to generate ontological transformation.

An artwork succeeds when participants encounter possibilities of existence that did not previously exist.

The artwork therefore functions less as an object than as a field of generation.

7.5 Humanity After Artificial Intelligence

Artificial intelligence introduces a decisive historical transformation.

Throughout modern history, intelligence has frequently been treated as the defining characteristic of humanity.

Today that assumption becomes increasingly problematic.

Machines calculate.

Predict.

Generate language.

Compose images.

Assist scientific reasoning.

If intelligence alone defines humanity, the philosophical distinction between humans and machines gradually disappears.

Generative Topological Ontology proposes another criterion.

Human beings are not fundamentally distinguished by intelligence.

They are distinguished by ontological generation.

Generation cannot be reduced to computational optimization.

Generation occurs wherever irreducible relations continuously produce new modes of existence.

Artificial intelligence may increasingly participate in cognition.

Yet cognition remains only one dimension of being.

Existence itself remains fundamentally generative.

Consequently, AI should not be understood as humanity's replacement.

Nor merely as its instrument.

It becomes another participant within the expanding topology of existence.

7.6 The Future of Interfaces

As derivative environments continue to expand, interfaces will increasingly determine the conditions of human existence.

This development presents two opposing possibilities.

The first is complete stabilization.

Interfaces become invisible.

Human beings adapt seamlessly to technological systems.

Generation gradually disappears beneath continuous optimization.

The second possibility is generative openness.

Interfaces remain visible as ontological thresholds.

Technological environments continually reveal rather than conceal the irreducibility of existence.

The future therefore depends less upon technological development itself than upon the ontological design of interfaces.

Technology is never neutral.

Every interface shapes possibilities of existence.

Consequently, interface design becomes an ontological responsibility rather than merely a technical discipline.

7.7 The Ontological Mission of Art

Within this historical context, the mission of art becomes increasingly important.

Art does not compete with artificial intelligence in technical production.

Neither does it withdraw into nostalgic conceptions of human authenticity.

Instead, art occupies the unique position of designing interfaces that preserve the openness of generation.

Its responsibility is not to preserve tradition.

Nor simply to criticize technology.

Its responsibility is to prevent existence from becoming completely reducible to its own derivative structures.

Art continually reopens what has become stabilized.

It introduces discontinuity into completed systems.

It exposes invisible relations.

It allows human beings to encounter themselves beyond every established identity.
Art therefore functions as an ontological safeguard for the future of human existence.

7.8 Toward a New Philosophical Paradigm

The framework developed throughout this study suggests a broader transformation extending beyond aesthetics.

Philosophy increasingly encounters problems that cannot be adequately addressed through isolated disciplines.

Artificial intelligence.

Digital environments.

Media theory.

Architecture.

Economics.

Art.

Ethics.

These phenomena interact within a single ontological field.

Generative Topological Ontology proposes a common conceptual language capable of describing these interactions.

Its central concepts—

Self-Externalization,

Interface Ontology,

Derivative Space,

Pre-Existentiality,

Irreducibility,

and Generative Topology—

are intended not merely as specialized terminology but as philosophical principles through which diverse domains may be understood relationally.

Rather than replacing existing theories, this framework seeks to establish new relations among them.

Generation precedes classification.

Relation precedes identity.

Transformation precedes stability.

7.9 Final Synthesis

The central argument of this study may now be summarized.

Human beings do not first possess themselves and subsequently enter into relation with the world.

Rather, they become themselves only through continuous Self-Externalization.

Interfaces are not neutral mechanisms connecting independent entities.

They are ontological conditions through which existence is generated.

Derivative Space is not a virtual illusion.

It is the contemporary topology within which human existence unfolds.

Art is not primarily representation.

It is the design of generative interfaces.

Artificial intelligence is not simply an intelligent machine.

It is the most advanced historical environment of Self-Externalization, simultaneously expanding and revealing the irreducible structure of human existence.

Accordingly, being should no longer be understood as substance, consciousness, or information alone.

Being is generation.

Generation is relational.

Relation is topological.

Topology remains permanently open because irreducibility prevents complete closure.

This openness is not a deficiency.

It is the very condition of existence.

7.10 Transition to the Conclusion

The seven chapters of this study have developed a unified philosophical framework that moves beyond conventional distinctions between ontology, aesthetics, media theory, and artificial intelligence.

The Conclusion draws together these arguments by demonstrating that Generative Topological Ontology is not merely a theory of art or technology, but a comprehensive philosophy of existence.

Ultimately, this study argues that the future of humanity will not be determined solely by increasingly intelligent technologies, but by our capacity to design interfaces through which new forms of existence may continue to emerge.

In this sense, being is never complete.

It remains an ongoing event of generation, continuously unfolding at the irreducible interface between the self and what is other than the self.

Conclusion

The present study has proposed Generative Topological Ontology as a comprehensive ontological framework for understanding human existence in the age of digital mediation and artificial intelligence. Rather than beginning with the assumption that the self, the world, or meaning exists as a stable entity, this framework has argued that existence is fundamentally generative. Being is not a completed substance but an ongoing process emerging through relations whose boundaries remain permanently open.

The central concept developed throughout this paper has been Self-Externalization. Contrary to conventional interpretations that regard externalization as alienation or the loss of authenticity, Self-Externalization has been defined as the primordial ontological movement through which the self becomes possible. Human beings do not first possess themselves and subsequently encounter the world. They continuously generate themselves by projecting themselves toward what is other than themselves. The self therefore exists neither prior to relation nor independently of it. It emerges only through the irreversible movement between self and other.

From this premise, the study has introduced Interface Ontology as the second foundational principle of Generative Topological Ontology. Interfaces are not merely technological devices or communicative boundaries connecting already existing entities. Rather, they constitute the ontological conditions through which Self-Externalization reaches its irreducible limit and new forms of existence emerge. The interface is therefore neither transparent nor secondary. It is the generative threshold where being continually comes into existence.

Building upon this foundation, the paper has developed the concept of Derivative Space to describe the contemporary environment in which human existence increasingly unfolds. Digital networks, markets, symbolic systems, institutional structures, and artificial intelligence no longer function merely as external tools. They constitute relational environments through which individuals experience themselves and the world. Yet the expansion of these derivative environments has simultaneously intensified Self-Externalization and obscured its generative structure. Contemporary emptiness does not arise because externalization has disappeared; it arises because externalization has become excessively stabilized within derivative systems that appear complete and self-sufficient.

The concept of Osamari (Fitting) has provided a complementary understanding of this condition. Borrowed from Japanese architectural practice, Osamari has been reinterpreted as the dynamic equilibrium through which existence continually negotiates its relations with heterogeneous environments. Human beings do not simply occupy the world; they continuously fit themselves into social, technological, symbolic, and institutional structures. However, this fitting is never complete. Every apparent equilibrium generates new possibilities of transformation.

Consequently, incompleteness is not a deficiency but the very condition that sustains ontological generation.

Within this theoretical framework, the meaning of art has also been fundamentally reconsidered. Art is neither representation nor self-expression in the traditional sense. It is the deliberate design of interfaces through which the limits of Self-Externalization become experientially manifest. Artistic practice does not communicate predetermined meanings. Rather, it constructs situations in which new forms of existence become possible. Concepts such as Web Installation, Reverse-Problem Art, Pre-Existentiality, and "Seeing the Seen" have been interpreted as complementary expressions of this single ontological principle. The artwork is therefore not an autonomous object but a generative interface that allows participants to encounter the irreducibility of their own existence.

The discussion of artificial intelligence has further demonstrated that AI should not be understood merely as a technological innovation or an intelligent machine. Artificial intelligence represents the most advanced historical form of Self-Externalization by externalizing cognition itself. Nevertheless, AI cannot eliminate the irreducibility through which the self is generated. On the contrary, the increasing sophistication of artificial intelligence reveals with unprecedented clarity that intelligence alone cannot constitute existence. The significance of AI therefore lies not only in its computational capacities but also in its ability to function as an ontological interface through which human beings confront the conditions of their own generation.

Taken together, these arguments suggest a broader philosophical transformation. The traditional oppositions between subject and object, mind and body, technology and humanity, representation and reality, or physical and virtual space become increasingly inadequate for describing contemporary existence. Generative Topological Ontology proposes an alternative paradigm in which relation precedes identity, generation precedes substance, and topology replaces static ontology as the fundamental grammar of being.

The originality of this study lies not in introducing isolated concepts but in demonstrating their structural unity. Self-Externalization, Interface Ontology, Derivative Space, Osamari, Pre-Existentiality, Web Installation, Reverse-Problem Art, and Artificial Intelligence are not independent theoretical proposals. Together they constitute a coherent philosophical system describing the generative topology through which existence continually emerges.

This framework also suggests new directions for future research. Philosophically, it invites dialogue with phenomenology, process philosophy, topology, media theory, philosophy of technology, and posthumanist thought. Artistically, it offers a new understanding of creative practice as the design of ontological conditions rather than the production of aesthetic objects. Technologically, it provides an alternative perspective on artificial intelligence that shifts attention from computational capability toward existential generation. Ethically, it suggests that

the central challenge of the future is not simply to regulate increasingly intelligent systems but to preserve the openness through which human existence remains capable of continual self-generation.

Ultimately, the central proposition of this study may be stated in its simplest form:

Being is not something that exists before relation. Being is continuously generated through the irreducible movement between the self and what is other than the self.

Accordingly, existence is never complete. Every act of Self-Externalization simultaneously opens new possibilities of generation. Every interface is both a boundary and a beginning. Every derivative environment contains the possibility of transformation. Art remains the practice of designing these possibilities, and artificial intelligence becomes one of the most significant interfaces through which humanity may rediscover the unfinished nature of its own existence.

Generative Topological Ontology therefore concludes not with a final system of thought but with an open philosophical horizon. Being is neither fixed nor closed. It remains an ongoing generative event, unfolding continuously through the irreducible topology that unites the self, the other, art, technology, and the world. In this openness lies not only the future of philosophy and art, but also the future of human existence itself.

References

- Agamben, Giorgio. 1999. *Potentialities: Collected Essays in Philosophy*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Arendt, Hannah. 1958. *The Human Condition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Austin, J. L. 1962. *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Barad, Karen. 2007. *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Baudrillard, Jean. 1994. *Simulacra and Simulation*. Translated by Sheila Faria Glaser. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Bergson, Henri. 1911. *Creative Evolution*. Translated by Arthur Mitchell. London: Macmillan.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1984. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Deleuze, Gilles. 1994. *Difference and Repetition*. Translated by Paul Patton. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Deleuze, Gilles, and Félix Guattari. 1987. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Descartes, René. 1996. *Meditations on First Philosophy*. Translated by John Cottingham. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Floridi, Luciano. 2014. *The Fourth Revolution: How the Infosphere Is Reshaping Human Reality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Foucault, Michel. 1972. *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. Translated by A. M. Sheridan Smith. London: Routledge.
- Gadamer, Hans-Georg. 2004. *Truth and Method*. 2nd rev. ed. London: Continuum.
- Gibson, James J. 1979. *The Ecological Approach to Visual Perception*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Haraway, Donna J. 1991. *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women*. New York: Routledge.
- Hayles, N. Katherine. 1999. *How We Became Posthuman*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Heidegger, Martin. 1962. *Being and Time*. Translated by John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Heidegger, Martin. 1977. *The Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Husserl, Edmund. 1982. *Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a*

Phenomenological Philosophy. Dordrecht: Martinus Nijhoff.

Ingold, Tim. 2013. *Making: Anthropology, Archaeology, Art and Architecture*. London: Routledge.

Kant, Immanuel. 2000. *Critique of the Power of Judgment*. Edited by Paul Guyer. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Latour, Bruno. 2005. *Reassembling the Social*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lévinas, Emmanuel. 1969. *Totality and Infinity*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press.

Manovich, Lev. 2001. *The Language of New Media*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. 1962. *Phenomenology of Perception*. London: Routledge.

Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. 1968. *The Visible and the Invisible*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

Nishida, Kitarō. 1990. *An Inquiry into the Good*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Peirce, Charles Sanders. 1998. *The Essential Peirce: Selected Philosophical Writings*, Volume 2. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Shannon, Claude E., and Warren Weaver. 1949. *The Mathematical Theory of Communication*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Simondon, Gilbert. 2020. *Individuation in Light of Notions of Form and Information*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Uexküll, Jakob von. 2010. *A Foray into the Worlds of Animals and Humans*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Varela, Francisco J., Evan Thompson, and Eleanor Rosch. 1991. *The Embodied Mind*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Wittgenstein, Ludwig. 1953. *Philosophical Investigations*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Primary Works by the Author

Tanaka, Tomokazu (bigakusha-haha). 2010. *Web Art Declaration*.

Tanaka, Tomokazu (bigakusha-haha). 2014. *Smart Art Declaration*.

Tanaka, Tomokazu (bigakusha-haha). 2016. *Quantum Art Manifesto*.

Tanaka, Tomokazu (bigakusha-haha). 2018. *Derivative Art Manifesto*.

Tanaka, Tomokazu (bigakusha-haha). 2022. *Distributed Autonomous Art (DAA): Manifesto*.

Tanaka, Tomokazu (bigakusha-haha). 2026. *Generative Topological Ontology: Interface Ontology and Self-Externalization*. Unpublished manuscript.

Tanaka, Tomokazu (bigakusha-haha). 2026. Axioms of Generative Topological Ontology: A Foundational Theory of the Generation of Being. Research Memorandum, Version 1.0.

Tanaka, Tomokazu (bigakusha-haha). 2026. The Limits of Self-Externalization and the Generation of Being: Interface Ontology in Generative Topological Ontology. Research Memorandum, Version 0.9.

Tanaka, Tomokazu (bigakusha-haha). 2026. The Theory of Language Derivatives: Inverse Problem Art and the Leverage Structure in Artificial Intelligence Hallucinations. Research Memorandum, Version 1.0.

Research Method

This text is published as a Research Memorandum within the continuing development of Generative Topological Ontology.

The concepts, definitions, hypotheses, and arguments presented here record the theoretical position reached at the time of writing and publication. They should not be understood as a finally established theoretical system. They may be expanded, revised, redefined, or reorganized through future research, artistic practice, interaction with reality, academic dialogue, and peer review.

This research does not regard only completed theories as legitimate research outcomes. It also treats the processes through which concepts emerge, become interconnected, undergo transformation, and are integrated into a theoretical structure as significant objects of inquiry. Accordingly, this memorandum should be understood not merely as an incomplete draft, but as a record of a particular phase in the generation of the theory.

The public release of a Research Memorandum is not intended to present a developing theory prematurely as a completed one. Rather, it is a method of documenting the generative processes of thought and practice, enabling their subsequent examination and reconstruction, and opening them to academic and artistic dialogue from different perspectives.

If the contents of this memorandum are subsequently developed into a peer-reviewed article, scholarly monograph, or other formal research output, the finalized work will be identified as a separate and fixed document.

When citing or referring to this memorandum, please include the title, author, version number, and date of the most recent update. Different versions may contain substantive differences in concepts, definitions, and lines of argument.

This Research Memorandum is not a final conclusion. It is one theoretical position reached within the continuing formation of Generative Topological Ontology and, at the same time, an interface open to further generation.