Research Monograph Series

The Dynamics of Evaluation, Proof, and Value:

Leverage Structures and Particular Concrete Contingency in 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 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 Dynamics of Evaluation, Proof, and Value:

Leverage Structures and Particular Concrete Contingency in Generative Topological Ontology

Research Monograph Series, Version 1.0.

Sayama Aesthetics School / Institute of Aesthetics.

Research Monograph

Version: 1.0

Last Updated: July 2026

Status: Ongoing Research

Introduction

The concepts of evaluation, proof, and value have long occupied central positions in philosophy, economics, sociology, aesthetics, and the sciences. They are commonly understood as mechanisms for measuring, verifying, or representing reality. Academic credentials certify knowledge, peer review validates research, market prices express economic value, and algorithmic rankings quantify social relevance. Although these systems differ in their institutional forms, they share a common assumption: evaluation is regarded as an objective operation performed upon an independently existing reality.

This assumption has profoundly shaped modern society. Human actions are generally understood as preceding evaluation, while evaluation itself is considered a secondary process that merely records or judges what already exists. Consequently, value appears to be discovered rather than generated, proof appears to reveal rather than construct legitimacy, and evaluation appears to reflect rather than organize reality.

This paper challenges that assumption.

Rather than treating evaluation as a neutral representation of reality, this study argues that evaluation, proof, and value constitute generative forces that actively participate in the production of existence. They do not simply classify actions after they occur; they organize the conditions under which particular actions become possible, recognizable, repeatable, and institutionally sustainable. Evaluation therefore functions less as an epistemological instrument than as an ontological force.

This argument is developed through the theoretical framework of Generative Topological Ontology (GTO). Unlike substantialist ontologies that regard being as a fixed entity or self-

contained object, GTO understands being as a continuously generated topological structure emerging through interactions among the self, others, and the environment. Existence is therefore relational before it is substantial, generative before it is static, and dynamic before it is complete.

From this perspective, evaluation cannot remain external to being. Every evaluation modifies the relational field within which existence unfolds. Every proof reorganizes the conditions of legitimacy. Every attribution of value alters future possibilities for action. Evaluation thus becomes one of the mechanisms through which reality itself is continuously generated.

The paper further argues that these mechanisms are recursively self-reinforcing. Once institutionalized, evaluation generates further evaluation; proof demands additional proof; and value becomes the condition for producing further value. This recursive amplification exhibits a structural similarity to leverage mechanisms in financial derivatives. In derivative markets,

financial instruments increasingly derive value from previously generated financial instruments rather than directly from underlying assets. Analogously, contemporary societies increasingly produce symbolic structures whose legitimacy derives primarily from previous evaluations rather than from concrete existential relations.

To describe this recursive dynamic, this study introduces the concept of the Evaluation Leverage Structure. This concept does not simply borrow a metaphor from finance. Instead, it identifies a common generative principle operating across institutional evaluation, symbolic production, knowledge systems, digital platforms, and cultural recognition. As recursive evaluation expands, symbolic systems progressively acquire autonomy from the concrete realities that originally grounded them.

The consequences of this transformation are ontological rather than merely sociological. Individual choices concerning education, employment, scientific research, artistic practice, and public life increasingly appear as expressions of personal freedom. Yet the horizons within which these choices become meaningful have already been organized by abstract systems of evaluation. Freedom is therefore experienced within structures that have already transformed contingency into necessity.

This paper subsequently examines the consequences of this transformation through the concepts of general abstract universality, Particular Concrete Contingency, and ontological discomfort. Abstract universality designates the institutional structures that render particular actions socially necessary. Ontological discomfort emerges where these structures fail to exhaust existential generation, functioning as an interface through which another topology of being begins to appear. Particular Concrete Contingency, finally, denotes a mode of existential generation that has not yet been evaluated, proven, or institutionalized. It constitutes neither randomness nor

irrationality, but the generative condition from which genuinely new forms of universality may emerge.

Within this theoretical framework, artistic practice assumes a distinctive ontological significance. Art is not primarily understood as the production of aesthetic objects or cultural value. Nor is it merely a critique of existing institutions. Rather, art functions as an ontological interface that reopens the generative conditions preceding evaluation itself. By recovering Particular Concrete Contingency before it is absorbed into recursive structures of evaluation, artistic practice creates the possibility for the emergence of new universality.

Accordingly, this paper seeks to make three principal contributions. First, it reconceptualizes evaluation, proof, and value as generative forces rather than representational mechanisms. Second, it proposes the concept of the Evaluation Leverage Structure as a general theory of

recursive symbolic amplification. Third, it positions artistic practice as the ontological interface through which the conditions for existential generation may be continuously renewed.

Taken together, these arguments aim to extend Generative Topological Ontology beyond the analysis of interfaces and relational existence toward a comprehensive theory of evaluation, contingency, and the generative dynamics of contemporary society.

Keywords

Evaluation; Proof; Value; Force; Generative Topological Ontology; Leverage Structure; Particular Concrete Contingency; General Abstraction; Particular Concretization; Self- Verification; Interface Ontology; Existential Generation

Contents

Chapter 1 1
Evaluation, Proof, and Value as Generative Forces

Chapter 2 4
General Abstract Universality as Necessity

Chapter 3 8
The Evaluation Leverage Structure

Chapter 4 13
The Ontology of Discomfort

Chapter 5 19
Returning to Contingency

Conclusion 25
References 28
Research Method 31

Chapter 1

Evaluation, Proof, and Value as Generative Forces

1.1 Beyond Representational Evaluation

Modern theories of knowledge have generally treated evaluation as a representational activity. Whether in science, economics, education, or aesthetics, evaluation is assumed to follow existence: an object, action, or event first comes into being, after which it is assessed according to established criteria. Evaluation, in this framework, is epistemological rather than ontological. It measures what already exists without fundamentally altering the conditions of existence itself.

This representational model has become deeply embedded in modern institutions. Academic peer review evaluates research already conducted. Market prices express the value of commodities already produced. Educational systems certify knowledge already acquired. Artistic criticism assesses works that have already been created. In each case, evaluation appears to occupy a secondary position, functioning as an external judgment upon an independently constituted reality.

Generative Topological Ontology challenges this assumption. If being is understood not as a fixed substance but as a continuously generated relational topology, evaluation cannot remain external to existence. Every evaluative act participates in the reorganization of the relational field through which existence is generated. Evaluation is therefore constitutive rather than merely descriptive.

1.2 Evaluation as Ontological Force

From the perspective of Generative Topological Ontology, evaluation is a force that directs existential generation.

An evaluation does not simply distinguish between success and failure, truth and error, or value and worthlessness. Rather, it reorganizes the field of possible actions by determining what becomes visible, legitimate, repeatable, and institutionally sustainable.

Evaluation therefore possesses an ontological function. It actively structures the conditions under which future actions may occur.

Proof operates according to the same principle. Conventionally, proof is regarded as the demonstration of truth. Yet proof also performs an ontological operation: it stabilizes particular configurations of knowledge and excludes alternative possibilities from institutional recognition.

What has been proven acquires durability not only because it is considered true, but because it becomes embedded within educational systems, disciplinary traditions, legal institutions, and technological practices.

Value likewise exceeds economic exchange. Value directs attention, distributes resources, organizes priorities, and determines which forms of existence receive continued support. Value is therefore neither an intrinsic property nor a subjective preference alone. It is a generative force that shapes the topology of social existence.

Evaluation, proof, and value thus constitute three mutually reinforcing dimensions of existential generation.

1.3 From Description to Generation

The distinction between representation and generation is fundamental to this study.

Representational theories assume that evaluation follows existence. Generative Topological Ontology proposes the reverse relationship: evaluation participates in the ongoing generation of existence itself.

This reversal fundamentally alters the status of institutions.

Universities do not merely evaluate knowledge; they participate in generating what counts as knowledge.

Scientific communities do not merely certify discoveries; they shape the conditions under which discoveries become scientifically meaningful.

Markets do not merely measure value; they organize the emergence of future value.

Digital platforms do not merely rank information; they actively generate the visibility through which information acquires significance.

Evaluation therefore precedes many of the realities it appears merely to describe.

Existence is not first generated independently and subsequently evaluated. Rather, existential generation unfolds within evaluative structures that continuously reorganize the field of possible relations.

1.4 The Dynamics of Generative Evaluation

Because evaluation functions as a generative force, its consequences extend beyond individual judgments.

Every evaluation modifies subsequent possibilities for evaluation.

Every proof establishes conditions for future proofs.

Every attribution of value reshapes the distribution of future values.

Generation therefore proceeds recursively.

An evaluation is never isolated. It alters the topological configuration within which subsequent evaluations become possible.

The same recursive principle applies to proof and value. Their significance lies not simply in their immediate outcomes but in their capacity to reorganize future relational structures.

Accordingly, evaluation should not be conceived as an event occurring at the conclusion of an action. It is an ongoing generative process continuously participating in the production of social reality.

1.5 Foundational Proposition

The preceding discussion allows the central proposition of this chapter to be formulated.

Evaluation, proof, and value do not merely represent existence. They function as generative forces that continuously organize the topology of existential generation.

This proposition establishes the ontological foundation for the remainder of the study.

The following chapter examines how these generative forces become institutionalized as General Abstract Universality, transforming contingent human actions into socially experienced necessity. This analysis provides the conceptual bridge toward the subsequent formulation of the Evaluation Leverage Structure, where recursive evaluation acquires autonomous generative

power independent of its original existential grounding.

Chapter 2

General General Abstract Universality as Necessity

2.1 The Generative Structure of Freedom and Necessity

Modern political philosophy, economics, and liberal social theory have generally regarded human beings as autonomous agents capable of making free and rational choices. Decisions concerning education, occupation, scientific inquiry, artistic practice, and everyday life are ordinarily interpreted as expressions of individual intention. Social institutions are subsequently understood as mechanisms that evaluate or regulate choices that have already been made.

Generative Topological Ontology proposes a different perspective.

The question is not whether human beings possess freedom, but how freedom itself is generated.

Freedom does not emerge outside social structures. Nor does it precede evaluation. Rather, what appears as individual freedom is already situated within a relational topology organized by evaluation, proof, and value. Human action is therefore experienced as voluntary while simultaneously being conditioned by historical and institutional structures that define what can appear as meaningful, legitimate, or desirable.

Freedom, from this perspective, is not external to necessity. It appears as a generated condition within a relational horizon continuously shaped by evaluation, proof, and value.

2.2 General Abstract Universality as a Generative Structure

To explain this process, this paper introduces the concept of General Abstract Universality.

Abstract universality does not refer simply to universal concepts or logical generalizations. Instead, it designates the historically accumulated systems of evaluation through which societies organize the legitimacy of action.

Universities, legal institutions, markets, governments, scientific disciplines, digital platforms, artistic canons, and systems of professional certification all participate in the production of general abstract universality. Although these institutions differ in function, they operate according to a common ontological principle: they establish general conditions under which particular actions become socially intelligible.

Abstract universality therefore precedes individual action.

Before an individual chooses a profession, occupations have already been evaluated.

Before a researcher selects a problem, disciplinary priorities have already been established.

Before an artist creates a work, historical systems of artistic recognition have already organized the field within which that work will acquire meaning.

The individual does not encounter an empty world of unlimited possibilities. One encounters a world whose relational topology has already been structured through accumulated evaluations.

2.3 The Production of Necessity

These evaluative structures transform concrete contingency into socially experienced necessity.

A person may believe that attending a prestigious university is the result of personal ambition.

A researcher may regard a particular field as naturally important.

An artist may pursue a style that appears entirely self-determined.

Yet each of these decisions unfolds within evaluative systems that have already determined which possibilities possess legitimacy, visibility, and institutional support.

Necessity therefore does not originate in the action itself.

It originates in the evaluative topology that renders certain actions significantly more probable than others.

From the standpoint of Generative Topological Ontology, necessity is neither metaphysical destiny nor causal determinism.

It is the cumulative effect of recursively organized evaluative structures.

Necessity is socially generated before it is individually experienced.

2.4 Concrete Actions and General Abstract Universality

The relation between particular actions and general abstract universality is not one of simple opposition.

Concrete actions remain singular events.

Each action occurs within a unique constellation of relations among the self, others, and the environment.

Nevertheless, the meanings attributed to those actions are organized through general abstract universality.

The significance of obtaining a degree, publishing an article, receiving an award, exhibiting artwork, or occupying a professional position depends not solely upon the concrete act itself but upon the evaluative structures through which society recognizes that act.

Accordingly, actions do not become socially effective simply because they occur.

They become effective because they enter pre-existing systems of evaluation.

Abstract universality therefore functions as the ontological medium through which singular actions acquire social necessity.

2.5 The Concealment of Generative Force

One of the most significant characteristics of general abstract universality is that it conceals its own generative operation.

Institutional evaluations frequently appear objective because they have become historically stabilized.

Their authority is interpreted as natural rather than generated.

As a consequence, individuals often attribute necessity to particular actions while overlooking the evaluative structures that have produced that necessity.

This concealment is itself constitutive of general abstract universality.

The more successfully evaluative structures reproduce themselves, the less visible their generative force becomes.

Evaluation appears objective precisely because its historical production has been forgotten.

Necessity appears natural precisely because the recursive dynamics through which it has been generated remain concealed.

2.6 Toward the Evaluation Leverage Structure

The preceding analysis reveals that evaluation, proof, and value do more than organize individual judgments.

They generate general abstract universality, and general abstract universality, in turn, transforms contingent actions into socially experienced necessity.

This process, however, does not remain static.

Once institutionalized, general abstract universality begins to reproduce itself recursively.

Evaluations increasingly derive legitimacy from previous evaluations rather than from the concrete existential relations from which they originally emerged.

At this point, evaluative structures acquire an autonomous dynamic.

Evaluation becomes the condition for further evaluation.

Proof becomes the condition for further proof.

Value becomes the condition for further value.

The following chapter identifies this recursive amplification as the Evaluation Leverage Structure. By analyzing its dynamics, the discussion moves from the institutional production of necessity to the autonomous self-expansion of symbolic systems within contemporary society.

Chapter 3

The Evaluation Leverage Structure

3.1 Recursive Evaluation and the Emergence of Autonomous Structures

The previous chapter argued that General Abstract Universality transforms contingent actions into socially experienced necessity through historically accumulated systems of evaluation. The present chapter advances this argument by examining what occurs once evaluative systems become recursively self-referential.

Evaluation is often assumed to terminate with a judgment. An examination is graded, a manuscript is accepted or rejected, a work of art receives critical recognition, or a market determines the price of an asset. Such events appear discrete and complete.

From the perspective of Generative Topological Ontology, however, evaluation never concludes with a single judgment. Every evaluation modifies the relational topology within which subsequent evaluations become possible. Each judgment functions simultaneously as an outcome and as the condition for future judgments.

Evaluation therefore possesses an intrinsically recursive structure.

This recursive character marks the transition from isolated acts of evaluation to an autonomous evaluative system.

3.2 Leverage Beyond Finance

The concept of leverage is conventionally associated with finance.

In financial derivatives, leverage enables relatively small changes in an underlying asset to generate disproportionately large gains or losses. More importantly, contemporary financial systems increasingly construct instruments whose value depends not directly upon physical assets but upon previously generated financial contracts.

The significance of leverage, therefore, lies not merely in amplification but in recursive mediation.

This paper argues that the same structural principle operates within symbolic and institutional systems.

Academic prestige generates further prestige.

Institutional authority generates additional authority.

Visibility generates greater visibility.

Recognition generates further recognition.

Citations generate subsequent citations.

Rankings reinforce subsequent rankings.

These processes should not be regarded as accidental social tendencies. They express a common generative mechanism through which symbolic structures increasingly derive legitimacy from previous symbolic structures rather than from their original existential grounding.

The concept of the Evaluation Leverage Structure designates this mechanism.

3.3 Definition of the Evaluation Leverage Structure

The Evaluation Leverage Structure may be defined as follows:

An Evaluation Leverage Structure is a recursively organized system in which evaluations, proofs, and values increasingly derive their legitimacy from prior evaluations rather than from direct existential relations, thereby generating autonomous symbolic amplification.

Several characteristics distinguish this structure.

First, recursive accumulation.

Evaluations accumulate historically rather than disappearing after individual judgments.

Second, institutional stabilization.

Repeated evaluations become embedded within organizations, disciplines, technologies, markets, and legal systems.

Third, symbolic autonomy.

The authority of evaluation gradually becomes detached from the concrete events that originally justified it.

Fourth, generative amplification.

Each new evaluation increases the probability of subsequent evaluations, producing nonlinear expansion throughout the symbolic system.

The Evaluation Leverage Structure therefore constitutes neither a psychological bias nor a sociological accident. It is an ontological mechanism governing the production of symbolic reality.

3.4 Symbolic Self-Amplification

Once recursive evaluation becomes institutionalized, symbolic systems acquire the capacity for self-amplification.

A highly cited article is more likely to receive additional citations.

A prestigious institution is more likely to receive greater resources.

A widely recognized artist is more likely to attract further exhibitions.

A popular digital platform becomes increasingly visible because its existing visibility attracts additional attention.

These phenomena are frequently interpreted through concepts such as reputation, network effects, or cumulative advantage.

While each explanation captures an aspect of the phenomenon, they remain primarily descriptive.

The Evaluation Leverage Structure seeks a more fundamental explanation.

The issue is not simply that success generates further success.

Rather, evaluation itself becomes productive.

Evaluation generates conditions under which future evaluation becomes increasingly probable.

Consequently, symbolic systems begin reproducing themselves independently of the existential situations from which they originally emerged.

3.5 From Existential Relations to Symbolic Topologies

Generative Topological Ontology distinguishes between existential relations and symbolic topologies.

Existential relations arise through concrete interactions among the self, others, and the environment.

They remain open, contingent, and capable of generating unforeseen configurations.

Symbolic topologies emerge when repeated evaluations stabilize these relations into institutional forms.

Initially, symbolic structures remain grounded in existential generation.

Over time, however, recursive evaluation increasingly privileges symbolic continuity over existential openness.

The symbolic system gradually begins to reproduce itself.

This transition represents a topological transformation rather than a merely institutional change.

Existence is no longer organized primarily through direct relational encounters.

Instead, it is increasingly mediated by historically accumulated symbolic evaluations.

Reality becomes accessible through symbols that have already evaluated reality.

3.6 Artificial Intelligence and Recursive Evaluation

The emergence of artificial intelligence provides a particularly significant example of the Evaluation Leverage Structure.

Contemporary AI systems learn from immense collections of texts, images, and other symbolic artifacts.

These artifacts are themselves products of previous evaluative histories.

Scientific publications have already undergone peer review.

Digital content has already been ranked through algorithmic visibility.

Images have already circulated through cultural systems of recognition.

Language itself carries accumulated histories of institutional selection.

Artificial intelligence therefore does not encounter an unevaluated world.

It encounters a recursively evaluated symbolic environment.

Its outputs inevitably participate in the continuation of those evaluative structures.

This observation suggests that AI hallucinations should not be understood solely as computational errors.

They may also reveal the autonomous dynamics of symbolic systems whose recursive evaluations have become partially detached from their original existential grounding.

Here, the Evaluation Leverage Structure converges with the Theory of Language Derivatives developed elsewhere within this theoretical framework.

3.7 The Limits of Recursive Evaluation

Despite its remarkable generative capacity, the Evaluation Leverage Structure cannot fully determine existential generation.

Recursive symbolic systems continuously expand, yet they remain incapable of exhausting contingency.

Every symbolic order presupposes existential relations that exceed its own evaluative framework.

These residual possibilities appear within institutions as anomalies, innovations, unexpected discoveries, artistic breakthroughs, and experiences of profound discomfort.

Such phenomena indicate the presence of generative conditions that remain irreducible to recursive evaluation.

The existence of these conditions demonstrates that symbolic autonomy is never complete.

Existential generation always exceeds symbolic reproduction.

3.8 Transition Toward Ontological Discomfort

The Evaluation Leverage Structure explains how symbolic systems recursively reproduce themselves.

It does not, however, explain how new modes of existence emerge from within these structures.

To address this question, the following chapter introduces the concept of Ontological Discomfort.

Ontological discomfort is not merely an emotional response or psychological unease.

It is the topological manifestation of a discrepancy between recursive symbolic evaluation and ongoing existential generation.

Precisely because existential generation can never be entirely absorbed into recursive evaluation, discomfort becomes the interface through which new topologies of being begin to emerge.

The analysis therefore now turns from the recursive dynamics of symbolic systems to the ontological significance of discomfort as the generative condition for transformation.

Chapter 4

The Ontology of Discomfort

4.1 Beyond Psychological Interpretation

Discomfort is ordinarily understood as a psychological or emotional state. It is commonly interpreted as anxiety, uncertainty, frustration, or dissatisfaction arising from a discrepancy between expectation and experience. Within this framework, discomfort is regarded as an internal reaction to external circumstances. Consequently, the solution to discomfort is assumed to lie either in adapting oneself to reality or in modifying external conditions.

Such interpretations remain insufficient from the perspective of Generative Topological Ontology.

Discomfort is not merely a subjective feeling. Nor is it simply an emotional disturbance requiring resolution. Rather, discomfort reveals a transformation occurring within the relational topology through which existence is continuously generated.

The question is therefore not why individuals feel discomfort.

The more fundamental question is:

What does discomfort disclose about the topology of existence?

This chapter argues that discomfort constitutes an ontological event. It marks the point at which recursive symbolic structures can no longer completely organize existential generation.

4.2 The Topological Gap

The Evaluation Leverage Structure continuously reproduces symbolic reality by stabilizing previous evaluations into institutional forms.

Yet no symbolic structure is capable of exhausting the generative openness of existence.

Existential generation always exceeds symbolic determination.

This excess produces what may be called a topological gap.

A topological gap does not indicate a lack of information or an error within a system.

Instead, it designates the difference between:

recursively stabilized symbolic structures, and

the ongoing generative movement of existential relations.

Whenever symbolic structures attempt to encompass reality completely, this gap necessarily appears.

Discomfort is the lived manifestation of this topological gap.

4.3 Discomfort as an Interface

Within Interface Ontology, interfaces are not boundaries that merely separate entities.

They are generative sites through which different topologies encounter one another and produce new existential configurations.

Ontological discomfort should therefore be understood as an interface.

Discomfort emerges when an individual encounters a situation in which existing evaluative structures no longer adequately organize lived experience.

At that moment,

two topologies coexist.

One is the stabilized symbolic topology generated through recursive evaluation.

The other is an emerging existential topology that has not yet acquired symbolic form.

Discomfort is precisely the interface through which these two topologies interact.

Rather than representing failure,

discomfort indicates that existential generation is exceeding institutional stabilization.

4.4 The Concealment of Discomfort

Modern societies tend to interpret discomfort negatively.

Educational systems attempt to eliminate uncertainty.

Organizations standardize procedures.

Digital platforms optimize user experience.

Markets reduce unpredictability.

Artificial intelligence increasingly minimizes ambiguity through probabilistic prediction.

Although these developments improve efficiency, they simultaneously reduce opportunities for existential generation.

The objective is no longer simply to solve problems.

It becomes the elimination of conditions under which discomfort may arise.

From the standpoint of Generative Topological Ontology, however, this tendency conceals one of the principal conditions of existential creativity.

The disappearance of discomfort does not necessarily indicate greater harmony.

It may instead indicate that recursive symbolic systems have become increasingly effective at suppressing alternative topologies of existence.

The more perfectly evaluation organizes reality,

the less visible existential generation becomes.

4.5 Artistic Practice and Ontological Discomfort

The ontological significance of art may now be reconsidered.

Art is frequently understood as representation, communication, self-expression, or institutional critique.

Each interpretation captures an important dimension of artistic activity.

Nevertheless, they remain incomplete.

Within the present theoretical framework,

artistic practice is fundamentally concerned with generating and sustaining ontological discomfort.

This does not imply that art seeks confusion for its own sake.

Nor does it celebrate instability as an aesthetic value.

Rather,

art interrupts recursive evaluation by exposing the topological gap concealed beneath symbolic stabilization.

A work of art becomes significant not because it immediately communicates meaning,

but because it reorganizes the relational conditions through which meaning may subsequently emerge.

Art therefore precedes interpretation.

It generates the conditions under which new interpretation becomes possible.

4.6 Discomfort and Particular Concrete Contingency

The emergence of discomfort simultaneously reveals another concept that has remained implicit throughout this study:

Particular Concrete Contingency.

Particular Concrete Contingency refers to existential generation prior to institutional evaluation.

It designates neither arbitrary randomness nor irrational unpredictability.

Instead,

it identifies relational possibilities that have not yet been incorporated into recursive symbolic structures.

Discomfort appears precisely because Particular Concrete Contingency resists immediate evaluation.

The symbolic order cannot fully classify what has not yet acquired institutional form.

Consequently,

discomfort signals the presence of existential possibilities exceeding established universality.

Rather than indicating disorder,

it marks the beginning of generative transformation.

4.7 Artificial Intelligence and Ontological Discomfort

The distinction between symbolic evaluation and existential generation also illuminates a fundamental limitation of contemporary artificial intelligence.

Current generative AI systems excel at recursive symbolic production.

They synthesize existing linguistic, visual, and conceptual structures with remarkable efficiency.

Yet their operations remain grounded primarily within historically accumulated symbolic evaluations.

Artificial intelligence therefore reproduces symbolic continuity with extraordinary precision.

What remains fundamentally difficult is the generation of ontological discomfort.

AI may imitate surprise,

simulate ambiguity,

or generate unexpected combinations.

However,

the existential significance of discomfort depends upon an encounter between a situated being and an emerging topology of reality.

Discomfort cannot be reduced to statistical novelty.

It arises through relational transformation.

This distinction clarifies why genuine artistic creation cannot be identified solely with computational originality.

Originality concerns difference.

Ontological discomfort concerns existential transformation.

4.8 Toward the Recovery of Contingency

The analysis developed in this chapter has shown that discomfort is neither an accidental emotion nor a defect within symbolic systems.

It is the ontological interface through which existential generation exceeds recursive evaluation.

Discomfort therefore possesses positive philosophical significance.

It reveals the incompleteness of every stabilized symbolic order.

More importantly,

it preserves the possibility that reality may become otherwise.

The following and final chapter develops this insight through the concept of Returning to Contingency.

If recursive evaluation transforms contingency into necessity,

then artistic practice may be understood as reopening contingency without abandoning reality.

The recovery of contingency is therefore not a rejection of institutions.

It is the continuous renewal of the generative conditions from which institutions themselves originally emerged.

Chapter 5

Returning to Contingency

5.1 Contingency Beyond Randomness

Throughout the history of modern philosophy, contingency has frequently been understood as the opposite of necessity. It has been associated with accident, unpredictability, chance, or the absence of causal determination. Within this conceptual framework, contingency represents what cannot be fully explained by rational systems.

Generative Topological Ontology proposes a fundamentally different understanding.

Contingency is neither disorder nor randomness.

Rather, contingency designates the generative openness of existence before its incorporation into institutional evaluation.

This distinction is crucial.

Randomness describes the absence of recognizable order.

Particular Concrete Contingency, by contrast, refers to relational possibilities whose order has not yet been institutionally stabilized.

Contingency therefore possesses structure.

Its structure, however, is generative rather than representational.

It is the topology through which unprecedented forms of existence become possible.

5.2 Necessity as the Historical Stabilization of Contingency

The preceding chapters demonstrated that recursive evaluation transforms contingent actions into socially experienced necessity.

This transformation should not be interpreted as the elimination of contingency.

Rather, necessity itself is the historical stabilization of previous contingencies.

Every institution was once contingent.

Every scientific paradigm emerged from uncertain inquiry.

Every artistic tradition originated through experimental practices that lacked institutional legitimacy.

Every social norm initially appeared as an exceptional possibility before becoming an accepted standard.

Necessity is therefore never primary.

It is the sedimentation of existential generation through recursive evaluation.

This reverses the conventional philosophical hierarchy.

Necessity does not precede contingency.

Contingency precedes necessity.

The history of civilization may consequently be interpreted as the continuous stabilization of previously contingent existential relations.

5.3 The Disappearance of Contingency

Modern societies have achieved extraordinary capacities for stabilization.

Educational institutions classify knowledge.

Scientific communities regulate truth.

Markets organize value.

Governments administer legitimacy.

Digital platforms optimize visibility.

Artificial intelligence predicts probable outcomes.

Collectively, these systems continuously reduce uncertainty.

Yet this reduction produces an unexpected consequence.

As evaluative systems become increasingly comprehensive, contingency itself becomes progressively less perceptible.

Human beings begin to experience necessity as if it were natural.

Institutionally organized possibilities appear self-evident.

Alternative topologies gradually disappear from collective imagination.

The disappearance of contingency is therefore not an ontological fact.

It is an effect of recursive symbolic stabilization.

Existential openness remains present, yet it becomes increasingly concealed beneath accumulated systems of evaluation.

5.4 Artistic Practice as the Recovery of Contingency

The ontological function of artistic practice may now be reformulated.

Art does not primarily create objects.

Nor does it merely communicate ideas, express emotions, or criticize institutions.

Its more fundamental operation consists in reopening existential contingency.

Art suspends the apparent inevitability of symbolic structures.

It interrupts recursive evaluation without abandoning the world in which evaluation operates.

Rather than destroying institutions, artistic practice reveals that institutions themselves originated from contingent existential generation.

This insight fundamentally distinguishes artistic creation from institutional innovation.

Innovation frequently seeks more efficient solutions within existing evaluative systems.

Art questions the topology through which those systems themselves have become possible.

Its objective is not optimization.

Its objective is ontological reopening.

5.5 Particular Concrete Contingency and the Emergence of New Universality

Particular Concrete Contingency should not be understood as the opposite of universality.

Instead, it constitutes the generative condition from which universality continuously emerges.

A genuinely universal structure cannot simply be imposed through abstract evaluation.

It must first emerge from concrete existential relations.

Only after repeated historical stabilization does contingency become recognizable as universality.

Accordingly,

universality is not a fixed principle existing independently of history.

It is the historical trajectory of existential generation.

This distinction allows a reformulation of universality itself.

Abstract universality organizes institutional stability.

Particular Concrete Contingency generates the conditions from which future universality becomes possible.

Without contingency,

universality becomes repetitive.

Without universality,

contingency remains historically unshared.

Existential generation requires both movements simultaneously.

5.6 Beyond Recursive Evaluation

The concept of Returning to Contingency should not be interpreted as a rejection of evaluation.

Evaluation remains indispensable.

Without evaluation, neither knowledge nor institutions nor collective action could achieve historical continuity.

The problem therefore lies neither in evaluation itself nor in institutional organization.

The problem arises when recursive evaluation forgets its own origin.

When symbolic structures begin referring only to previous symbolic structures,

their generative source gradually disappears from view.

Returning to contingency therefore signifies the recovery of the existential conditions that

continuously renew evaluation itself.

Evaluation requires contingency no less than contingency eventually requires evaluation.

Neither possesses ontological priority in isolation.

Their relation is recursive, dynamic, and mutually generative.

5.7 Contemporary Society and Existential Renewal

The contemporary world increasingly operates through recursively interconnected symbolic systems.

Financial markets evaluate previous financial evaluations.

Academic institutions evaluate previous institutional recognitions.

Digital platforms amplify previous visibility.

Artificial intelligence learns from historically accumulated symbolic productions.

These developments demonstrate the extraordinary power of recursive evaluation.

At the same time,

they reveal its intrinsic limitation.

No recursive symbolic structure can generate its own existential origin.

Every evaluative system ultimately depends upon concrete encounters among the self, others, and the environment.

Whenever these encounters produce configurations that exceed established symbolic frameworks,

new contingency appears.

The future of society therefore depends not solely upon improving evaluative systems,

but upon preserving the conditions under which existential generation remains possible.

5.8 Concluding Proposition

The arguments developed throughout this study may now be summarized through the following proposition.

Evaluation, proof, and value are not neutral mechanisms for describing reality. They are generative forces that organize the topology of existence. Their recursive amplification produces

the Evaluation Leverage Structure, through which contingency is progressively transformed into necessity. Yet existential generation can never be completely absorbed into symbolic evaluation. Ontological discomfort reveals this excess, and artistic practice reopens the Particular Concrete Contingency from which new universality continuously emerges.

This proposition completes the theoretical movement of the present study.

Beginning with the ontological reinterpretation of evaluation, proceeding through general abstract universality and recursive symbolic amplification, and culminating in the recovery of contingency, the theory demonstrates that existence is fundamentally a process of continuous topological generation.

To return to contingency is therefore not to abandon civilization, institutions, or knowledge.

It is to recover the generative openness through which civilization, institutions, knowledge, and art have always become possible.

Within Generative Topological Ontology, contingency is not the opposite of order.

It is the inexhaustible ontological source from which every future order must ultimately arise.

Conclusion

This study has argued that evaluation, proof, and value should no longer be understood merely as representational mechanisms for describing an independently existing reality. Rather, they constitute generative forces that actively organize the relational topology through which existence continuously emerges.

Beginning from the framework of Generative Topological Ontology (GTO), the discussion has proposed a fundamental reversal of the conventional relationship between existence and evaluation. Modern epistemological models generally assume that existence precedes evaluation and that evaluative practices merely classify or verify what already exists. In contrast, this study has demonstrated that evaluation itself participates in the continuous generation of existential reality. Evaluation directs possibilities for future action, proof stabilizes institutional legitimacy, and value organizes the distribution of existential continuity. These three dimensions should therefore be understood as mutually constitutive forces within a single generative process.

Building upon this ontological foundation, the paper introduced the concept of General Abstract Universality in order to explain how historically accumulated systems of evaluation transform contingent human actions into socially experienced necessity. Institutions do not merely regulate actions after they occur; they establish the relational horizon within which actions become recognizable, legitimate, and meaningful. Freedom, accordingly, is not eliminated by institutional structures, but generated within historically organized fields of evaluation.

The study then developed its central theoretical contribution through the concept of the Evaluation Leverage Structure. Unlike conventional accounts of reputation, authority, cumulative advantage, or network effects, this concept identifies a more fundamental ontological

mechanism. Recursive evaluation gradually acquires autonomy from the existential relations that originally grounded it. Evaluation increasingly derives legitimacy from previous evaluations; proof depends upon earlier proofs; value generates additional value through symbolic recursion. Contemporary society is therefore characterized by the expansion of self-referential symbolic systems whose generative dynamics resemble the recursive mediation observed in financial derivatives. The concept of leverage is consequently employed not as a metaphor but as a structural principle governing symbolic production itself.

The analysis further demonstrated that recursive symbolic systems can never fully encompass existential generation. Every stabilized symbolic order leaves an irreducible remainder that cannot be completely institutionalized. This remainder appears phenomenologically as Ontological Discomfort. Rather than interpreting discomfort as a merely psychological state, this

study has argued that it constitutes the interface at which recursive symbolic organization encounters emergent existential topology. Discomfort thus functions as the ontological condition through which alternative modes of being first become perceptible.

On this basis, contingency has been reconsidered. Contrary to its conventional interpretation as randomness or indeterminacy, Particular Concrete Contingency has been defined as existential generation prior to institutional evaluation. Contingency is not the absence of order but the presence of generative relational openness. Necessity itself is subsequently reinterpreted as the historical stabilization of previously contingent existential relations. This reversal dissolves the traditional opposition between contingency and necessity by demonstrating that universality continuously emerges through the recursive stabilization of contingent existence.

Within this theoretical framework, artistic practice acquires a distinctive ontological function. Art should not be understood primarily as the production of aesthetic objects, symbolic representation, institutional critique, or cultural communication. Rather, artistic practice reopens the generative conditions that precede recursive evaluation. By preserving Particular Concrete Contingency and sustaining ontological discomfort, art continually renews the existential source from which future symbolic structures may emerge. Art therefore serves not as an external critique of institutions but as the interface through which institutions remain capable of historical transformation.

The implications of this theory extend beyond aesthetics. Contemporary artificial intelligence, digital platforms, scientific institutions, financial markets, educational systems, and algorithmic governance all increasingly operate through recursive symbolic evaluation. These systems exhibit remarkable capacities for optimization, prediction, and self-reproduction. Yet none can generate the existential contingency from which genuinely new relational topologies arise. The

present study therefore suggests that the future challenges of contemporary society concern not only the improvement of evaluative systems but also the preservation of the generative conditions that continually exceed them.

Accordingly, the Evaluation Leverage Structure should be understood as a general ontological principle governing the recursive production of symbolic reality in late modernity. Its significance lies not simply in explaining institutional accumulation but in revealing the dynamic relationship between evaluation and existential generation. Recursive symbolic systems remain historically productive only insofar as they retain an interface with the contingent openness from which they originally emerged.

Taken together, the concepts developed in this paper—Generative Topological Ontology, General Abstract Universality, Evaluation Leverage Structure, Ontological Discomfort, and Particular

Concrete Contingency—constitute an integrated theoretical framework for understanding how existence is continuously generated through the interaction of symbolic stabilization and relational openness. Rather than opposing institutions to creativity, or necessity to contingency, this framework demonstrates their reciprocal and recursive co-constitution.

Ultimately, this study argues that the fundamental task of philosophy, art, and contemporary social theory is not merely to interpret existing symbolic structures, nor simply to criticize them. It is to design and sustain the interfaces through which existential generation remains possible. The future of human creativity, scientific discovery, technological innovation, and cultural transformation depends upon preserving those topological conditions in which contingency can once again become the source of new universality.

In this sense, Generative Topological Ontology is proposed not only as a philosophical ontology of being, but also as a general theory of existential generation capable of integrating aesthetics, artificial intelligence, social institutions, and symbolic systems within a single generative framework. The concepts developed throughout this study therefore represent not a conclusion, but the opening of a broader research program concerning the topological generation of existence in the age of recursive symbolic production.

References

Primary Works by Tomokazu Tanaka (bigakusha-haha)

Tanaka, Tomokazu (bigakusha-haha). 2026. Axioms of Generative Topological Ontology: A Fundamental 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. Pre-Humanity and Pre-Selfhood: An Ontology of Self-Verification in Generative Topological Ontology. Research Memorandum.

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

Tanaka, Tomokazu (bigakusha-haha). 2026. A Generative Theory of Force: Topological Transformation from Necessity to Contingency in Generative Topological Ontology. Research Monograph, Version 1.0.

Evaluation, Value, and Symbolic Power

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1984. Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste. Translated by Richard Nice. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1990. The Logic of Practice. Translated by Richard Nice. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1991. Language and Symbolic Power. Edited by John B. Thompson. Translated by Gino Raymond and Matthew Adamson. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Boltanski, Luc, and Laurent Thévenot. 2006. On Justification: Economies of Worth. Translated by Catherine Porter. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Boltanski, Luc, and Ève Chiapello. 2005. The New Spirit of Capitalism. Translated by Gregory Elliott. London and New York: Verso.

Power, Discipline, and Institutions
Foucault, Michel. 1977. Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison. Translated by Alan Sheridan. New York: Pantheon Books.
Foucault, Michel. 1978. The History of Sexuality, Volume 1: An Introduction. Translated by Robert Hurley. New York: Pantheon Books.
Weber, Max. 2002. The Protestant Ethic and the “Spirit” of Capitalism and Other Writings. Translated and edited by Peter Baehr and Gordon C. Wells. New York: Penguin Books.
Arendt, Hannah. 1958. The Human Condition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Value, Capital, and Economic Structure
Marx, Karl. 1976. Capital: A Critique of Political Economy. Vol. 1. Translated by Ben Fowkes. London: Penguin Books.
Marx, Karl. 1988. Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books.
Simmel, Georg. 2004. The Philosophy of Money. 3rd enlarged ed. Translated by Tom Bottomore and David Frisby. London: Routledge.
Polanyi, Karl. 2001. The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time. Boston: Beacon Press.
Baudrillard, Jean. 1981. For a Critique of the Political Economy of the Sign. Translated by Charles Levin. St. Louis: Telos Press.
Pragmatism, Experience, and the Generation of Value
Dewey, John. 1934. Art as Experience. New York: Minton, Balch & Company.
Dewey, John. 1920. Reconstruction in Philosophy. New York: Henry Holt and Company.
James, William. 1907. Pragmatism: A New Name for Some Old Ways of Thinking. New York: Longmans, Green, and Co.

Mead, George Herbert. 1934. Mind, Self, and Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Being, Difference, and Generation
Heidegger, Martin. 1962. Being and Time. Translated by John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson. Oxford: Blackwell.
Deleuze, Gilles. 1994. Difference and Repetition. Translated by Paul Patton. New York: Columbia University Press.
Whitehead, Alfred North. 1978. Process and Reality: An Essay in Cosmology. Corrected ed. Edited by David Ray Griffin and Donald W. Sherburne. New York: Free Press.
Simondon, Gilbert. 2020. Individuation in Light of Notions of Form and Information. Translated by Taylor Adkins. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

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.