Research Monograph Series

A Generative Theory of Force: Topological Transformation from Necessity to 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 28, 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.

A Generative Theory of Force:
Topological Transformation from Necessity to 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 28, 2026

Status: Ongoing Research

Abstract

This paper redefines force as a central concept in Generative Topological Ontology. Force is distinguished from physical force, psychological motivation, biological energy, social power, and subjective will. It is understood instead as an ontological dynamic generated when the future acts upon the present and becomes articulated through language, meaning, bodily attitude, action, and grounding in reality.

Modern societies have historically generated human force through structures of general universality, including the state, education, labor, religion, science, law, markets, institutions, evaluation, and proof. These structures have not merely restricted individuals. They have provided images of the future, oriented present actions, and connected individual life to temporal and social orders larger than the individual.

In contemporary society, however, these structures often remain institutionally operative while losing their ability to generate fundamental human dynamism. Human beings continue to move, work, consume, communicate, and process information, yet frequently lack the felt experience of being alive. This condition should not be understood simply as inactivity or psychological weakness. It is a condition in which bodily movement continues while existential generation fails to occur.

This paper terms this condition “general universality deprived of force.” Its defining characteristic is that the future is no longer opened as an indeterminate possibility. Instead, it is anticipated, calculated, evaluated, distributed, and administered by existing systems. The future appears to exist, but only as an extension of the present. Human action consequently becomes enclosed within necessity.

Against this condition, the paper proposes a topological transformation in which contingency is generated from within necessity through particular and concrete language and practice. Language does not merely represent an already existing future. It distinguishes a direction within the emptiness of the future and allows that future to act upon the present. Meaning is the direction generated by this action of the future. Narrative is a linguistic architecture that produces a vector toward the future. When this vector is embodied, it becomes an attitude. When linguistic futurity enters into interaction with material, bodily, social, and natural reality, it becomes grounded.

Force is therefore defined as an ontological vector generated when the future is folded into the present, articulated by language, embodied as an attitude, enacted through practice, and transformed through contact with reality. Art is consequently understood as a practice that designs the conditions under which contingent connections can arise within structures of necessity, enabling human beings to encounter an unknown self and an undetermined future.

Keywords

Generative Topological Ontology; force; dynamism; general universality; particular concrete universality; future; narrative; language derivatives; necessity; contingency; topological transformation; grounding; attitude; art

Contents

Chapter 0. Methodological Note....1
Chapter 1. General Universality Deprived of Force....2
Chapter 2. Necessity as a Closed Topology....4
Chapter 3. Future, Language, and Meaning....6
Chapter 4. Force, Vector, Attitude, and Topology....8
Chapter 5. The Loss of Fundamental Dynamism....10
Chapter 6. Topological Transformation from Necessity to Contingency....11
Chapter 7. Grounding and the Generation of Force....13
Chapter 8. Art and the Generation of Force....14
Chapter 9. Artificial Intelligence and Linguistic Derivative Space....16
Chapter 10. A Systematic Theory of Force....17
Conclusion....19
References....20
Research Method....21

Chapter 0. Methodological Note

The concept of force developed in this paper differs from force in Newtonian mechanics, vital force in biology, motivation in psychology, power in sociology, and will in philosophy. Although it intersects with each of these concepts, it refers more fundamentally to directionality, tension, connectivity, and openness toward the future within processes of existential generation.
Generative Topological Ontology understands being not as a fixed substance but as a topological structure continuously generated through connections among self, others, environment, nature, institutions, language, bodies, and technology. From this perspective, force cannot be treated as a property already possessed by an autonomous subject. Force is generated relationally. It is intensified, weakened, redirected, or extinguished according to the structure of connection.
The central question is therefore not how much force a human being possesses. The more fundamental question is:
What kinds of structures generate force in human beings, and what kinds of structures move human beings while depriving them of fundamental dynamism?
This question is directly connected to contemporary experiences of emptiness, nihilism, exhaustion, dependency upon evaluation, dependency upon recognition, and the loss of futurity. Yet these phenomena cannot be reduced to individual psychology. Human beings continue to move. Bodies remain active, systems operate, information circulates, and institutions persist. Nevertheless, the experience of being alive may remain absent.
This reveals a distinction between movement and dynamism.
Movement is change along an already established path. Dynamism is the generation of a direction, meaning, connection, or future that did not previously exist. This paper investigates that distinction through the relations between necessity and contingency, general universality and particularity, derivative space and grounding, and language and embodiment.

Chapter 1. General Universality Deprived of Force

1.1 The Force-Generating Function of General Universality

Human beings do not live as entirely isolated individuals. Human action is oriented through language, community, institutions, customs, education, religion, law, science, economy, and history. Such structures of general universality do not merely constrain the individual. They have historically generated force by giving human beings images of the future and by connecting present action to larger temporal and social orders.

Education connects present learning to future development. Religion connects finite life to a transcendent temporal order. Community connects individual action to intergenerational continuity. Labor connects present effort to future livelihood. Scholarship connects particular knowledge to general truth.

General universality is therefore not merely an abstract category. It has functioned as an architecture that makes the future perceptible and gives force and meaning to individual action.

1.2 The Functional Failure of General Universality

In contemporary society, the institutional forms of general universality remain in place, but their force-generating capacity has weakened.

Schools remain, yet learning is not necessarily connected to a meaningful future.

Corporations remain, yet labor is not necessarily connected to one's own life.

Markets remain, yet value is not necessarily connected to lived reality.

Evaluation remains, yet recognition is not necessarily connected to existential generation.

Information expands, yet knowledge does not necessarily deepen one's relation to the world.

General universality has not disappeared. It exists excessively as institutions, norms, numbers, credentials, metrics, rankings, and algorithms. The problem is that these structures no longer generate vectors toward the future within human beings.

This condition is defined here as general universality deprived of force.

1.3 Movement without Dynamism

Contemporary human beings move constantly. They wake, eat, commute, work, consume, communicate, and process information. Yet these movements are often driven not by futures generated through the self but by necessities imposed by existing systems.

The form of action remains, but the relation that connects action to the future is absent.

Contemporary emptiness is therefore not a lack of activity. It is a condition in which activity fails

to become existential generation.
There is movement, but no dynamism.
Time passes, but no future is generated.
Action occurs, but there is no experience of being alive.
This distinction allows contemporary powerlessness to be understood not as an individual deficiency of motivation, but as the loss of the force-generating function of social structures.

Chapter 2. Necessity as a Closed Topology

2.1 Redefining Necessity

Necessity in this paper does not refer only to logical necessity or natural law. It refers to a condition in which the possibilities of future connection are predetermined by existing structures and human action converges upon already established pathways.
One must work.
One must be evaluated.
One must adapt.
One must grow.
One must remain informed.
These demands are not necessarily false. Yet when they appear as the only possible pathways toward the future, human action becomes integrated into a closed topology.

2.2 The Closure of the Future

The future does not yet exist. It is emptiness, openness, and indeterminate possibility. General universality gives form to this emptiness.
When general universality possesses force, such forms provide direction. When it loses force, the form of the future becomes reduced to schedule, prediction, management, evaluation, and calculation.
The future then ceases to appear as an unknown possibility and becomes a repetition of the present.
There is a future, but it is already decided.
There is a prospective state, but it is merely an extension of the present.
Human beings appear to move toward the future while merely reproducing the structures of the present.

2.3 Necessity and Derivative Space

Derivative space is a structure that anticipates future value, meaning, achievement, or states of existence and incorporates them into present action.
Financial derivatives incorporate possible future price movements into present contracts.
Similarly, social derivative spaces fold future status, recognition, success, growth, happiness, and security into the present and organize human action accordingly.
Derivative space is not inherently negative. Language, planning, education, art, and culture all

fold futurity into the present.

The problem arises when the future loses interaction with reality and becomes a self-reproducing symbolic value. In a derivative space without grounding, the future is not opened. It is transformed into a tradable, measurable, and administrable projection within an existing system of evaluation.

Human beings then do not live the future. They live a repetition of the present displayed as the future.

Chapter 3. Future, Language, and Meaning

3.1 Meaning Requires Futurity

Meaning is not fixed within a present object. Meaning is generated when an object, action, or word is connected to a possible future.
Planting a seed, considered only as a present physical action, is merely the movement of digging soil and placing an object within it. It becomes meaningful when the possibility of germination and growth acts upon the present action.
Thus:
Meaning is a relation generated when the future orients the present.
Without futurity, action remains enclosed within the present. Causal transformation may occur, but ontological meaning does not arise.

3.2 Language Generates the Future

Consider the statement, “I am going to Tokyo.”
This statement does not merely describe Tokyo as it presently exists. The verb “to go” creates a relation between the present location and a destination not yet reached. At the moment the statement is uttered, a future Tokyo begins to act upon the present.
One prepares luggage.
One reorganizes schedules.
One checks transportation.
The body begins to move.
Language therefore does not merely represent an already existing future. It distinguishes a direction within indeterminate possibility and causes a future to emerge.
Language is a generative operation that gives direction to the emptiness of the future.

3.3 Prelinguistic Futurity and Linguistic Futurity

The future is not created entirely by language. Nature, bodies, other beings, and environments possess potentials for change prior to human language.
Yet for the future to become meaningful to a human being, possibility must be distinguished and oriented in some form. Language performs this operation of distinction and orientation.
The relation between language and the future is therefore recursive.
The openness of the future makes language possible.
Language structures the future.

The structured future acts upon the present.
Meaning arises through this circulation.

3.4 Narrative as an Architecture of Force

Narrative is commonly understood as a story that arranges past events in temporal sequence.
Generative Topological Ontology cannot limit narrative to retrospective explanation.
Narrative is:
A linguistic structure that generates a vector toward the future and organizes present events through that vector.
Narrative connects the present to the future and folds the future into the present. It is therefore not merely a story but a temporal architecture for generating force.

Chapter 4. Force, Vector, Attitude, and Topology

4.1 Definition of Force

Force is defined as follows:
Force is an ontological dynamism generated when the future acts upon the present, is oriented through language, embodied through action, and grounded in reality.
This force is not an entity stored within the subject. It emerges through connections between self and what is other than the self.
Force is therefore not possession but generation.

4.2 Force as Vector

When the future acts upon the present, directionality arises. This directionality may be understood as a vector.
The vector is not merely spatial. It indicates the future toward which the present is organized.
The statement “I am going to Tokyo” does not simply communicate information about a location. It generates a vector from the present self toward a future Tokyo.
Thus:
Force is futurally oriented direction, and force with direction is a vector.

4.3 Force as Attitude

When a vector generated by language is sustained within the body, it becomes an attitude.
Attitude is not merely an opinion or psychological stance. It is the condition in which the body sustains a direction toward the future and thereby changes its possible connections to the world.
Attitude is the embodied topology of a vector toward the future.
Even in the same place, different attitudes produce different perceptions, encounters, actions, and meanings. A change in attitude changes not only one’s interpretation of the world but the structure of possible connection itself.

4.4 Force as Topology

Topology concerns the structure through which things can connect, remain continuous, or undergo transformation across boundaries.
In Generative Topological Ontology, being is generated as a topology of connection. A change in force is therefore not merely a change in energetic quantity. It is a change in the structure of

connectivity.
A different future vector changes present meaning.
A change in meaning changes attitude.
A change in attitude changes possible connections.
A change in connectivity changes the topology of existence.
Force, vector, attitude, and topology are therefore different descriptions of one process of existential generation.

Chapter 5. The Loss of Fundamental Dynamism

5.1 The Absence of the Experience of Being Alive

The condition in which human beings remain physically active but do not experience themselves as alive can be understood as a loss of force.
What is lost is not physiological energy. What is lost is the sense that one's present is connected to an indeterminate future through which the self may be transformed.
The experience of being alive is not identical to pleasure or satisfaction. It is the sense that one's action is connected to a future that exceeds one's current self-understanding.

5.2 Pre-Selfhood and Pre-Humanity

The self does not exist from the beginning as a complete subject. It is generated through action, relations with others, interaction with nature, failure, contingency, delay, and unpredictable outcomes.
At the origin of the self lies a pre-selfhood that cannot be fully grasped by the self. Similarly, prior to human language, institutions, and social classifications lies a pre-human dimension of body, nature, sensation, and environmental interaction.
Fundamental dynamism is the force through which the self reconnects with these pre-self and pre-human dimensions and becomes capable of exceeding its existing definition.

5.3 The Limits of Self-Externalization

Modern human beings have externalized themselves into achievements, works, credentials, evaluations, records, money, status, and data. Self-externalization is necessary for participation in social relations.
Yet when the externalized representation of the self is treated as identical with the self, existence becomes dependent upon external systems of evaluation. If the externalized self is not recognized, the person may experience the self as invalid.
Self-externalization then ceases to generate force and instead transfers the source of force outside the self.
Recovering fundamental dynamism does not mean enclosing the self within interiority. It means generating an interface between the externalized self and a pre-selfhood that cannot be completely externalized.

Chapter 6. Topological Transformation from Necessity to Contingency

6.1 Redefining Contingency

Contingency is usually understood as unpredictability or statistical uncertainty. In this paper, contingency means the generation of a connection that did not previously exist within a closed structure of necessity.
Contingency is not merely an event arriving from outside. It may be generated when the self speaks, acts bodily, and interacts with reality.
Contingency is not the selection of one option among existing alternatives. It is the emergence of a connection that did not previously exist as an option.

6.2 The Self-Generation of Narrative

Within general universality deprived of force, the self repeats futures supplied by society. When these futures no longer become personal dynamism, the self must reconstruct futurity through particular and concrete language.
Such a self-generated narrative is not arbitrary self-fiction or psychological affirmation. It is a hypothesis of the future that must endure interaction with reality.
The self proposes a future through language.
The body acts toward that future.
Reality resists, delays, modifies, or redirects the action.
The self changes beyond its original self-understanding.
Narrative becomes grounded through this cycle.

6.3 Topological Transformation

The transition from necessity to contingency is not a choice within the same topology. It is a transformation of the structure of possible connections.
Before the transformation, pathways from the present to the future are restricted by existing institutions. After the transformation, new pathways are generated through particular and concrete language and practice.
Topological transformation is therefore:
The reopening of a future closed by general universality through particular and concrete practice.
6.4 Particular Concrete Universality
Particular practice does not necessarily remain private. When a singular action generates meaning that becomes connectable to others, nature, place, history, and society, it becomes a

particular concrete universality.
General universality is often imposed as an abstract order from above. Particular concrete universality arises from an actual practice and becomes translatable and connectable to others. New general universality is not produced only by applying abstractions to particulars. It can emerge from below as particular contingencies are repeated, shared, translated, and transformed.

Chapter 7. Grounding and the Generation of Force

7.1 Language Alone Does Not Complete Force

Language generates futurity, but language alone does not complete dynamism.
The statement “I am going to Tokyo” generates a future vector. Yet if the body does not move and does not encounter material and social conditions, that future remains within a linguistic derivative space.
Language opens the future.
The body moves toward it.
Reality transforms it.
Force is generated through the connection of these three moments.

7.2 The Body Alone Does Not Generate Force

Bodily movement alone does not generate fundamental dynamism.
Predetermined labor, repetitive travel, habitual consumption, and automated operation move the body. Yet if such movement is not connected to a future generated through the self, it remains a reproduction of necessity.
Thus:
A body without language moves according to necessity, while language without a body circulates within derivative space.
When language and body connect in reality, action changes from movement into existential generation.

7.3 Redefining Grounding

Grounding is not merely the reference of a sign to a preexisting object.
Within Generative Topological Ontology, grounding is:
The process through which a future structured by language encounters a reality other than the self through bodily action and is transformed by resistance, delay, and difference.
The purpose of grounding is not the exact realization of linguistic prediction. On the contrary, grounding becomes generative when reality differs from language.
That difference produces contingency. Contingency reactivates fundamental force.

Chapter 8. Art and the Generation of Force

8.1 Art as the Design of Conditions

From this perspective, art is not merely the external expression of inner emotion, nor merely the production of aesthetic objects.
Art is:
A practice that designs the conditions under which a contingent connection may emerge within an existing structure of necessity.
Art does not simply communicate a completed meaning. It rearranges relations among self, others, place, material, nature, technology, and time, thereby creating a topology in which new meaning can emerge.

8.2 Inverse Problem Art

Inverse Problem Art does not calculate effects from known causes. It begins from fragments, traces, surfaces, outlines, or interfaces and generates an internal structure that remains undetermined.
Meaning is not given in advance. Participants construct causes, relations, and futures retrospectively through contact with reality.
Inverse Problem Art therefore does not explain necessity. It generates contingency.

8.3 Web Installation and Interface Ontology

Web Installation treats the web not as a site for displaying information about an artwork but as an interface connecting physical space, bodies, institutions, communication, screens, places, and futurity.
The artwork is not a fixed object. Its existence is generated through access, movement, viewing, staying, misunderstanding, delay, communication, and bodily experience.
An interface is not a neutral mediator connecting two preexisting domains. It transforms both sides of the connection and generates a new topology.
The artistic interface is therefore an apparatus for generating force.

8.4 The Experience of Being Alive

The experience of being alive in art does not arise simply from emotional intensity or sensory stimulation. It arises when the existing topology of the self changes and the person becomes

connected to an unknown self and an undetermined future.
The force of art is therefore not the power to persuade the participant in a predetermined direction.
The force of art is:
The power to open the possibility that a person may generate contingency within necessity and encounter a self not yet known.

Chapter 9. Artificial Intelligence and Linguistic Derivative Space

9.1 AI and the Linguistic Anticipation of the Future

Generative AI produces texts, images, concepts, and possibilities that do not yet exist. In this sense, AI is a derivative apparatus that linguistically anticipates the future.
AI folds unrealized possibilities into the present in plausible linguistic form. This can expand human imagination, research, planning, and creation.
Yet when AI-generated futurity lacks interaction with reality, language becomes a self-reproducing derivative space.

9.2 Hallucination and Force

AI hallucination presents what does not exist as though it existed. Its problem is not limited to factual error.
More fundamentally, it occurs when linguistic futurity acquires meaning and authority without being grounded in reality.
When human beings accept AI-generated language without bodily practice or contact with reality, AI does not necessarily generate human force. It may instead substitute for human future-generation. The human being then appears to act while remaining enclosed within a necessity generated by AI.

9.3 An Ethics of Force in the Age of AI

The ethical task of AI is not merely to provide a correct prediction of the future. It is to design interfaces that do not deprive human beings of the capacity to generate their own futures.
AI can present possible futures.
Yet human beings must still risk the body, enter reality, and assume the consequences of connection.
AI ethics therefore concerns not only the prevention of misinformation, but the preservation of human capacity for future-generation and topological transformation.

Chapter 10. A Systematic Theory of Force

The generation of force can now be described as the following process:
The future as emptiness

→ linguistic distinction
→ generation of narrative
→ emergence of meaning
→ formation of a vector
→ embodiment as attitude
→ action
→ encounter with reality
→ resistance, transformation, and delay
→ generation of contingency
→ topological transformation of the self
→ emergence of a new future

This process is not a closed circle. Contact with reality generates difference that cannot be reduced to the point of departure. The process is therefore spiral, asymmetric, recursive, and irreversible.

Proposition 1

Force is not a substance possessed by a subject but is generated through connections among future, language, body, and reality.

Proposition 2

Meaning is the direction generated when the future acts upon the present.

Proposition 3

Narrative is a linguistic architecture that generates a vector toward the future and organizes present action.

Proposition 4

Attitude is the bodily topology in which a vector toward the future is sustained.

Proposition 5

Grounding is the process through which a linguistically generated future is transformed through interaction with a reality other than the self.

Proposition 6

Necessity is a topology in which possibilities of future connection are closed by existing structures.

Proposition 7

Contingency is the generation, within closed necessity, of a connection that did not previously exist.

Proposition 8

Art is the practice of designing conditions for a topological transformation from necessity to contingency.

Conclusion

This paper has redefined force not as an ability, will, vitality, or energy possessed within the human subject, but as an ontological dynamism generated through connections among future, language, meaning, embodiment, action, and reality.

The problem of contemporary society is not that human beings have stopped moving. Human beings are moved more than ever by institutions, information, evaluation systems, metrics, and algorithms. Yet such movement often fails to connect them to an indeterminate future. It encloses them within a necessity that reproduces the present.

General universality continues to exist institutionally while losing its capacity to generate fundamental dynamism. Futures are displayed, yet they are not experienced as one's own future. Meanings circulate, yet they do not transform one's action. Narratives remain, yet they do not carry the self toward an unknown future.

The necessary response is neither the simple destruction of general universality nor a nostalgic return to former communities. What is required is the generation of contingency within closed necessity through particular and concrete language and bodily practice.

Language gives direction to the emptiness of the future.

The future acts upon the present as meaning.

Meaning orients action as a vector.

The vector is embodied as attitude.

The body encounters reality.

Reality does not conform completely to language.

From this difference, contingency emerges.

Through contingency, the topology of the self changes.

This topological transformation is the recovery of fundamental force.

The final proposition of the paper can therefore be stated as follows:

To live is not merely to move according to an existing necessity. To live is to generate contingency within necessity and, through that contingency, to connect with an unknown self and an undetermined future.

Art is the practice that designs the conditions for such a connection.

References

Tanaka, Tomokazu (bigakusha-haha). Axioms of Generative Topological Ontology: A Fundamental Theory of Existential Generation. Research Memorandum, Version 1.0, 2026.
Tanaka, Tomokazu (bigakusha-haha). The Limits of Self-Externalization and Existential Generation: Interface Ontology in Generative Topological Ontology. Research Memorandum, Version 0.9, 2026.
Tanaka, Tomokazu (bigakusha-haha). The Theory of Language Derivatives: Inverse Problem Art and Leverage Structures in Artificial Intelligence Hallucination. Research Memorandum, Version 1.0, 2026.
Tanaka, Tomokazu (bigakusha-haha). “Web Art Declaration.” 2010.
Tanaka, Tomokazu (bigakusha-haha). “Smart Art Manifesto.” 2014.
Tanaka, Tomokazu (bigakusha-haha). “Quantum Art Manifesto.” 2016.
Tanaka, Tomokazu (bigakusha-haha). “Derivative Art Manifesto.” 2018.
Tanaka, Tomokazu (bigakusha-haha). “Distributed Autonomous Art Manifesto.” 2022.
Aristotle. Metaphysics.
Aristotle. Physics.
Bergson, Henri. Creative Evolution.
Deleuze, Gilles. Difference and Repetition.
Heidegger, Martin. Being and Time.
Heidegger, Martin. “The Question Concerning Technology.”
Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. Phenomenology of Perception.
Whitehead, Alfred North. Process and Reality.
Wittgenstein, Ludwig. Philosophical Investigations.

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.