Research Monograph Series

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

Author: Tomokazu Tanaka (bigakusha-haha)
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0009-3796-5889
Affiliation: Sayama Aesthetics School / Institute of Aesthetics
Version: 1.0
Last Updated: July 23, 2026
Status: Ongoing Research

Research Monograph
Tomokazu Tanaka (bigakusha-haha)
Version 1.0 July 2026

Publication Information

Copyright

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

License

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

Suggested Citation

Tanaka, Tomokazu (bigakusha-haha). 2026. The Limits of Self-Externalization and the Generation of Being: An Interface Ontology within Generative Topological Ontology. Research Monograph Series, Version 1.0. Sayama Aesthetics School / Institute of Aesthetics.

Research Monograph

Version: 1.0

Last Updated: July 23, 2026

Status: Ongoing Research

Abstract

This paper attempts to formulate a fundamental structure of human existence as an ontological paradox: the self seeks itself in what is other than itself. Human beings cannot grasp the self directly. They therefore try to confirm themselves through what is not the self - other people, institutions, language, signs, spaces, artworks, evaluation, markets, technology, and artificial intelligence. This paper calls this movement **Self-Externalization**. Self-Externalization is the ontological movement through which the self projects itself into what is other than itself in order to constitute itself and attempts to recover itself from that exteriority. Yet the self can never be completely reduced to any of these external forms. Rather, the self first appears as self at the limit where Self-Externalization fails to recover it completely.

The central proposition of this paper is that **the self is a phenomenon generated at the limit of Self-Externalization**. Here, limit does not mean mere failure or lack. It designates the manifestation of irreducibility: the self entrusts itself to others, institutions, evaluations, titles, capital, algorithms, artificial intelligence, artworks, and spaces, yet can never fit completely within any of them. The self is therefore not a substance already present in an interior realm. It is generated through projection into what is other than itself and through confrontation with the limit of that projection.

From this perspective, the paper redefines the interface not as a device of connection but as the ontological condition in which the limit of Self-Externalization becomes manifest. An interface is not a transparent apparatus that smoothly mediates between the self and what is other than itself. Rather, it is an occasion that exposes the contradiction that the self had been seeking itself outside itself. At such an occasion, human beings become aware that they had entrusted the self to evaluation, institutions, signs, spaces, technologies, and others. The interface is therefore both a site of connection and a site where a rupture in Self-Externalization appears.

The paper connects this problem to the author's artistic practice and theoretical development: the presentation of Web Installation in the 2010 *Web Art Declaration*, practices treating Internet space as a field, Distributed Autonomous Art, Reverse-Problem Art, Derivative Space, Osamari, Pre-Existentiality, Seeing the Seen, Judgment without Judgment, and Generative Topological Ontology. Although these may appear to address different themes, they share a consistent question: how is the boundary between self and non-self generated, and how does that boundary become manifest as lived reality?

Self-Externalization has accelerated dramatically in contemporary information society. The self is measured, confirmed, and reconstructed through social-media evaluation, searchability, algorithmic recommendation, market value, titles, brands, and responses from artificial intelligence. Yet the more these systems render the self visible, the more the self becomes dispersed into what is other than itself and loses a sense of its own reality. Contemporary

emptiness and nihilism arise not because the self is insufficiently externalized, but because it is excessively externalized and continues to fit itself within those external structures.

Art, in this context, is not a representational apparatus for transmitting information or meaning. Art is an event in which the very structure of the self seeking itself outside itself becomes manifest. The work is not a completed object but an interface that brings a person to the limit of Self-Externalization. Artistic experience is therefore not the recovery of what the self projected outward, but an encounter with the reality that the self cannot be recovered from the outside. In this sense, art is not self-expression; it becomes an occasion of self-generation.

Accordingly, this paper presents Interface Ontology within Generative Topological Ontology as a structure in which the self is generated at the limit of Self-Externalization. Being is not a fixed substance but a topological movement of connection, disconnection, projection, and irreducibility between self and non-self. The self is not a subject enclosed within an interior realm but an event generated by passing through what is other than itself and confronting its limit. Art is the interface that enables this event to occur in reality.

Keywords

Generative Topological Ontology; Self-Externalization; Interface Ontology; Generation of Being; Self-Generation; Irreducibility; Kairos; Artificial Intelligence; Pre-Humanity; Self-Precedence

Contents

Introduction

Chapter 1. The Ontology of Self-Externalization

Chapter 2. Self-Externalization and the Modern Subject

Chapter 3. Interface Ontology

Chapter 4. Derivative Space and Osamari

Chapter 5. Designing the Kairos

Chapter 6. Web Installation and Reverse-Problem Art

Chapter 7. AI and Self-Externalization

Conclusion

References

Methodological Statement

Introduction

Human beings seek themselves. Yet the self is not something simply found within itself. Rather, human beings attempt to confirm themselves through what is other than themselves: the gaze of others, social evaluation, institutions, language, signs, artworks, spaces, technology, markets, and responses from artificial intelligence. Here lies a fundamental contradiction specific to human existence: while the self seeks to be itself, it can touch itself only through what is other than itself.

This paper understands this structure as the ontological paradox of **the self seeking itself in what is other than itself**, and calls this movement Self-Externalization. Self-Externalization is the ontological movement through which, because the self cannot grasp itself directly, it attempts to generate and confirm itself through others, institutions, language, signs, spaces, artworks, evaluation, markets, technology, artificial intelligence, and other forms of non-self. Yet the self cannot be completely reduced to any of them. Rather, the self first becomes manifest as self at the limit where Self-Externalization cannot fully recover it.

The central proposition of this paper can therefore be formulated as follows:

The self is a phenomenon generated at the limit of Self-Externalization.

What matters in this proposition is that the limit of Self-Externalization must not be understood as mere failure. Projecting oneself into others, institutions, evaluations, titles, capital, artworks, spaces, technology, or artificial intelligence is not a simple illusion or error. It is an unavoidable movement through which human beings constitute themselves. But when that movement cannot recover the self completely - when it becomes manifest that the self cannot be reduced to what is other than itself - the self is generated there. The self is not a substance already possessed internally; it is an event that passes through non-self and arises at the limit of that passage.

From this perspective, the meaning of the interface changes fundamentally. Ordinarily, an interface is understood as a mediating device connecting different things: human and machine, subject and environment, information and body, interior and exterior. In this paper, however, an interface is not merely a device of connection. It is an occasion that exposes the contradiction that the self had been seeking itself outside itself. In other words, the interface is the site where the limit of Self-Externalization becomes manifest and the ontological condition through which the self is generated as self.

This Interface Ontology is deeply connected to the artistic practice and theoretical development of bigakusha-haha. Web Installation, presented in the 2010 *Web Art Declaration*, was an attempt to understand Internet space not merely as a site of information transmission but as a field in which being is generated. The work did not terminate as a physical object. It became manifest through processes of access, connection, delay,

movement, reading, display, and recognition. The work was conceived not as an object but as an interface through which the relation between self and non-self is generated.

Later concepts - Distributed Autonomous Art, Reverse-Problem Art, Derivative Space, Osamari, Pre-Existentiality, Seeing the Seen, Judgment without Judgment, and Generative Topological Ontology - can likewise be understood as developments of the same problematic. Although they appear to address different themes, beneath them lies a consistent question: how is the boundary between self and non-self generated, and how is it disclosed as lived reality?

Derivative Space, for example, is a space of value projected upon pre-existing values, signs, and institutions. Just as financial derivatives are derived from underlying assets while forming enormous spaces of value beyond the assets themselves, the self in contemporary society is generated within secondary and tertiary mediated spaces such as evaluation, titles, social media, brands, markets, algorithms, and artificial intelligence. Yet the more these spaces expand, the more the self is dispersed into what is other than itself and loses contact with itself.

Osamari, similarly, does not simply mean that things fit neatly into their proper places. In architecture and craft, osamari refers to concrete junctions that cannot be resolved by drawings alone. Applied to human existence, it concerns how the self becomes situated within the world. In contemporary society, however, human beings continually fit themselves into institutions, evaluations, markets, information spaces, and algorithms. As a result, fitting ceases to signify stability and becomes a form of self-loss. Contemporary emptiness arises not because osamari has been lost, but because the self continues to fit excessively into structures that are other than itself.

What, then, can art do in such a situation? This paper understands art not as the production of representation but as a practice of designing occasions in which one confronts the limit of Self-Externalization. Art does not express the self. Rather, art is an event that makes manifest the structure through which the self had been seeking itself outside itself. The work is not an object that externalizes the interiority of the artist, but an interface through which viewers or participants can become aware of their own Self-Externalization.

The crucial point is that artistic experience is not the understanding of information but a confrontation with reality. A person can know the contradiction of Self-Externalization through abstract explanation, but knowledge alone does not generate the self. For the self to be generated, one must confront, in a real situation, the fact that one had entrusted oneself to what is other than oneself. This confrontation is the **kairos**. Kairos is not merely a trigger or opportunity. It is the moment of topological transition in which the limit of Self-Externalization becomes manifest and the self is generated as self.

In this sense, the artistic practice of bigakusha-haha is not the making of works but the design of kairotic occasions. To design an interface is not merely to connect human and information,

human and space, human and other, or human and technology. It is to expose the contradiction of Self-Externalization latent within those connections. To make perceptible, as real experience, what people have entrusted themselves to, what exteriorities they have sought themselves within, and what structures they have continued to fit into: this is the core of Interface Ontology in this paper.

The structure of the paper is as follows. Chapter 1 defines Self-Externalization and situates it ontologically in distinction from theories of the modern subject, recognition, evaluation, institutions, and information society. Chapter 2 examines the structure through which the self becomes manifest only by passing through non-self, with attention to others, language, signs, institutions, and space. Chapter 3 redefines the interface not as a connecting device but as the site where the limit of Self-Externalization becomes manifest. Chapter 4 analyzes the acceleration of Self-Externalization and the structure of emptiness in contemporary society through the concepts of Derivative Space and Osamari. Chapter 5 considers Web Installation, Reverse-Problem Art, Seeing the Seen, and Pre-Existentiality as practices that design occasions of confronting the limit of Self-Externalization. Chapter 6 examines Self-Externalization in the age of artificial intelligence and argues that AI can function both as a device of externalization and as an interface that exposes its limit. Finally, the paper concludes that, within Generative Topological Ontology, being is not a fixed substance but a movement of connection, disconnection, projection, and irreducibility between self and non-self.

Through this argument, the paper releases art from self-expression and representational production and redefines it as an occasion for becoming aware of the contradiction of seeking the self in what is other than itself. The self is not a subject closed within interiority; it is generated by passing through non-self and confronting its limit. Art is the interface through which that generation occurs in reality.

Chapter 1

The Ontology of Self-Externalization

1.1 Defining Self-Externalization

This paper defines Self-Externalization as follows:

Self-Externalization is the ontological movement through which, because the self cannot grasp itself directly, it attempts to generate and confirm itself through other people, institutions, signs, language, spaces, technology, artworks, markets, artificial intelligence, and other forms of non-self.

This definition has two important implications.

First, the self is not a substance that exists from the outset. Modern philosophy has often understood the subject as located within the interior of the self. In this paper, however, the self is not a substance existing prior to itself. It is an event generated in relation to what is other than itself.

Second, Self-Externalization belongs to ontology rather than epistemology. It is not a method for *knowing* the self. It is a condition for the self itself to come into being.

Accordingly, the generative order is not:

Self -> Non-Self

but rather:

Non-Self -> Self

This reversal is the first principle of the present paper.

1.2 Why Can the Self Not Know Itself Directly?

The self is always experiencing. Yet the subject that experiences cannot itself become completely the object of that experience.

The seeing eye cannot see itself directly. The word that speaks cannot fully objectify itself in the very act of speaking. Being cannot simultaneously objectify being itself in its entirety.

The self therefore has no route to itself except through what is other than itself. It is here that Self-Externalization becomes necessary.

1.3 Axioms of Self-Externalization

The present paper adopts the following six axioms:

Axiom 1. Being is generation.

Axiom 2. The self is generated only through relation with what is other than the self.

Axiom 3. Self-Externalization is a condition of the generation of being.

Axiom 4. Reality is the phase in which Self-Externalization confronts irreducibility.

Axiom 5. The interface is the condition that makes this phase manifest.

Axiom 6. Art is the ontological practice of designing that condition.

Chapter 2

Self-Externalization and the Modern Subject

Reconstructing the Concept of Subject through Generative Topological Ontology

2.1 The Formation of the Modern Subject

Modern philosophy has understood human existence through the concept of the subject. Its paradigmatic formulation is Descartes' *Cogito, ergo sum* - "I think, therefore I am." In this proposition, the subject is positioned as a being able to grasp itself with certainty prior to the world. Indubitable self-consciousness becomes the starting point of ontology, and from it others and the world are recognized. This structure constitutes the basic form of the modern subject.

The concept of the subject subsequently underwent numerous transformations. Kant understood the subject as the transcendental condition of cognition; phenomenology reconsidered the subject within its relation to the world; structuralism and poststructuralism understood it as constituted by language, institutions, and power. Yet despite differences in method and object, these positions share a common question: **What is the subject?**

This paper turns that question around. Before asking what the subject is, we must ask **how the subject is generated**. Through this shift, the subject is no longer understood as the starting point of existence but as something generated.

2.2 From Subject to Generation

Within Generative Topological Ontology, the subject is not a substance already present within the self. It is a phase generated through relation with what is other than itself.

This becomes evident in ordinary human experience. When people understand themselves, they always do so through comparison with others, social evaluation, language, culture, the body, space, history, and other mediations. The self never exists as an isolated interiority; it is continually updated through interaction with the world.

What matters, however, is that this interaction is not merely social formation or cultural influence. Before the self is formed by the world, it projects itself into the world. It offers itself to what is other than itself and experiences itself through the response that returns. This movement is what this paper calls Self-Externalization.

The subject is therefore not the premise of Self-Externalization. It is its result.

2.3 The Ontology of Self-Externalization

Self-Externalization differs both from psychological projection and from sociological accounts of self-formation. It is an ontological movement.

Human beings cannot directly objectify themselves. Just as the seeing eye cannot see itself and the speaking word cannot objectify itself in the instant of speaking, being cannot directly experience being itself as a complete object.

Human beings must therefore necessarily mediate themselves through what is other than themselves: the gaze of others, social institutions, titles, artworks, markets, religion, the state, artificial intelligence. All of these become media through which the self unfolds itself outward.

But Self-Externalization must not be understood as self-loss. It is the only movement through which human existence can arrive at itself. The self cannot become self without passing through non-self.

2.4 The Self as Irreducibility

Self-Externalization is a condition of self-generation. Yet it does not mean the completion of the self. No matter how extensively human beings project themselves outward, they cannot completely recover themselves through that projection.

Social recognition does not exhaust the self. A title does not exhaust the self. The production of an artwork does not exhaust the self. Even if artificial intelligence responds as though it understands the self, that response does not exhaust the self.

The self always remains beyond these forms. This remainder is what the present paper calls **irreducibility**.

The self first becomes manifest in this irreducibility. Hence the paper derives the following proposition:

The self is generated at the limit of Self-Externalization.

This proposition does not negate Self-Externalization. On the contrary, it means that the self is generated only by carrying Self-Externalization through to its limit.

2.5 Reconstructing the Modern Subject

If we understand the problem in this way, the modern subject need not be rejected. It can instead be understood as one historical phase of the movement of Self-Externalization.

The Cartesian subject was a movement that concentrated the self inward. Information society is a movement that disperses the self outward. Generative Topological Ontology remains within neither position.

The subject exists neither in an interior nor in an exterior. It is generated **between** self and non-self. The subject is therefore not a fixed being but a phase that continues to be generated within relations.

In this sense, the paper does not eliminate the subject from ontology. It redefines the subject as an event of generation.

2.6 Conclusion of the Chapter

This chapter has reconstructed the modern concept of the subject from the standpoint of Generative Topological Ontology. The subject is not a substance prior to the world but an event generated through the ontological movement of Self-Externalization.

Self-Externalization is the movement through which the self attempts to generate itself by way of non-self, and at the limit of that movement the self becomes manifest as irreducible being. Through this redefinition, the subject turns from fixed being into generative being.

The next chapter develops Interface Ontology in order to clarify the field in which this generation becomes possible. It considers the interface not as a mere connecting device but as the ontological condition through which the limit of Self-Externalization becomes manifest.

Chapter 3

Interface Ontology

3.1 Defining Interface Ontology

This chapter defines Interface Ontology, a central concept of the present paper. Here, an interface is not a boundary surface for information transfer or operation in the ordinary sense. It is an ontological condition generated between self and non-self, a field in which an occasion is formed for the movement of Self-Externalization to confront the irreducibility of the self.

In contemporary society, the term "interface" has been used mainly in information engineering and design. A user interface (UI) refers to the point of contact between human and machine, while human-computer interaction (HCI) has developed as a field concerned with designing interaction between humans and information environments. In these contexts, the purpose of the interface is to smooth connection, increase the efficiency of information transfer, and improve operability.

Such an understanding, however, confines the interface to a functional and engineering concept. The present paper questions that premise itself.

Are human beings really doing nothing more than "connecting" the self and the world?

If the self cannot grasp itself directly and can experience itself only by passing through what is other than itself, the interface must be understood not merely as a contact surface but as a condition through which being itself is generated.

Accordingly, this paper defines the interface as follows:

An interface is the ontological condition in which, through the relation between self and non-self, the limit of Self-Externalization becomes manifest and the self is generated.

This definition entails two turns.

First, the interface is not a mediation linking object to object. Conventionally, an interface has been understood as "the boundary that connects A and B." In the present paper, however, the interface is not a device that connects the self and the other. It is the field in which the relation between self and non-self itself is generated. The interface therefore does not mediate two terms that already exist; it establishes the relation through which those terms emerge as terms.

Second, the interface is not a transparent apparatus. Contemporary information technology has idealized the excellent interface as one that "does not make its own existence felt": it should minimize friction, conceal operation, and allow the user to forget the presence of the apparatus. Ontologically, however, such transparency accelerates Self-Externalization. The less the apparatus is noticed, the more human beings forget through what structures they are relating to the world.

The interface proposed here moves in the opposite direction. It is not an apparatus for becoming transparent, but an occasion that renders visible a relation that had been transparent. It does not smoothly adapt the self to the world; it discloses what the self has entrusted itself to and the structures within which it has continued to fit.

From this standpoint, the concept of **Osamari** used throughout the author's work acquires a renewed meaning.

In architecture, osamari refers to concrete junctions that cannot be determined by drawings alone. Columns, beams, walls, ceilings, services, and other heterogeneous elements are adjusted on site and made to coexist as one building. But this adjustment is not merely technical. It involves invisible distributions of force, accumulated time, craft experience, and bodily sense.

Human existence is analogous. The self does not simply "fit" into the world. It continually fits itself within multiple external structures - social institutions, evaluation, markets, language, others, artificial intelligence. The question is not whether this fitting can be perfected. What matters is that a human being can never fit completely.

This inability to fit completely is the limit of Self-Externalization and the condition under which an interface appears. The interface is therefore not the place where fitting is completed. It is the place where fitting begins to waver.

In that wavering, the boundary between self and non-self is experienced for the first time.

From here the paper repositions Web Installation, first presented by the author in 2010. Web Installation treated the Internet not as a mere space of information transmission but as a **field in which being is generated**. The work did not end as a physical object; it became manifest through multiple interfaces - access, search, QR codes, domains, displays, networks, bodily movement.

What matters is not the work itself. What matters is the process of reaching it.

A person scans a QR code. Looks at a screen. Moves through space. Waits for communication. Searches. Sometimes fails to gain access. From the standpoint of information transmission, these are merely secondary processes. Ontologically, however, these processes themselves generate the relation between self and world.

The work, therefore, is not an object but the process of generation itself. The interface here does not link a viewer to a work. It becomes the occasion through which the viewer notices the structure of his or her own Self-Externalization.

This is closely related to Reverse-Problem Art. Conventional art presents a completed work and takes appreciation to consist in reading or interpreting its meaning. Reverse-Problem Art instead presents an outline or set of conditions first; the work is generated through interaction with viewers and environments.

The work, then, is not something expressed outward from the interior of the artist. It is a field in which the relation between self and non-self is generated each time.

In this sense, art is not self-expression. Art is an interface for experiencing the limit of Self-Externalization.

The limit here does not mean that the work cannot be understood. It means that even at the moment one believes one has understood the work, something remains that cannot be completely understood. That remainder is the irreducibility of Self-Externalization and becomes an occasion of self-generation.

Accordingly, this paper defines the interface not as a device connecting human and world, but as the ontological condition in which the limit of Self-Externalization becomes manifest.

The self is not connected to the world through the interface. At the interface, the self confronts the contradiction that it had sought itself in what is other than itself, and through that irreducibility is first generated as self.

This is the basic principle of Interface Ontology in the present paper.

3.2 From Connection to Kairos - The Ontological Turn of the Interface

The preceding section defined the interface as the ontological condition in which the limit of Self-Externalization becomes manifest. This section develops that definition further by turning the interface from the concept of **connection** to the concept of **kairos**.

This turn is a theoretical core of the present paper.

Conventionally, an interface has been understood as a point of contact connecting two different terms. In information engineering it connects human and computer; in biology, organism and environment; in sociology, subject and society; in art theory, work and viewer. The primary question has been "how to connect."

But this understanding contains a hidden premise: the two terms to be connected are assumed to exist in advance.

The self already exists. The other already exists. The world already exists. The interface links them afterward.

Generative Topological Ontology does not accept this premise. Self, other, and world do not first exist as fixed substances. They are phases generated within relation.

The interface is therefore not a device connecting already existing beings. It is a condition through which being itself is generated.

The present paper therefore distinguishes **connection** from **kairos**. Connection is a relation among things that already exist. Kairos is the moment in which a phase that did not previously exist is generated. The two may appear similar, yet their ontological meanings are fundamentally different.

For example, the fact that a person visits a museum is a connection. But if that encounter brings the person face to face with a self that had never previously existed for them, that moment becomes kairos.

Likewise, conversing with artificial intelligence is in itself a connection. But if through that dialogue one notices how one had entrusted oneself to AI, that moment becomes kairos.

Kairos, then, is not the event itself. It is a **topological transition generated through the event**.

For this reason, kairos is not understood here as a mere "trigger." It is an event in which Self-Externalization reaches its limit and it becomes manifest that the self cannot be reduced to non-self.

The meaning of time also changes here.

Ordinarily, connection is understood along a temporal axis: B happens after A in a causal sequence. Kairos cannot be explained by this linear time. Human beings often do not understand the meaning of an event at the moment they experience it. Only years or decades later do they recognize that it was an event that fundamentally shaped the self.

Kairos therefore belongs not to a simple sequence of past, present, and future, but to a topological temporality in which the meaning of the future is folded into the present and the present rewrites the past.

This temporal structure corresponds to the author's earlier concept of **folding the future into the present**. The future does not yet exist, yet it orients the present self. And the present acquires new meaning through its projection toward that future.

Kairos is the field in which this nonlinear temporality becomes manifest.

Understood in this way, the interface is not an inlet or outlet for information but a place in which time itself is generated. It is not merely a spatial boundary. It is a phase in which time, body, world, and self acquire new relations.

Here the paper introduces the concept of **Pre-Existentiality**. The author has used this term for the bodily and sensory world prior to human cognition and language. Pre-Existentiality is the world before objects are understood conceptually. There, distinctions such as self and other, subject and object, interior and exterior have not yet been fixed.

The interface does not simply connect Pre-Existentiality and post-existentiality. Rather, it is the very moment in which Pre-Existentiality emerges as being.

In this sense, the interface is not boundary but generation. It is not a line separating "this side" from "that side." It is an occasion that reopens into reality the relation that precedes the separation of the two.

The concept of Osamari also takes on a new position here. In architecture, osamari is the concrete way in which different materials and structures meet. Yet it cannot be fully

determined by drawings. It comes into being only through the overlap of on-site judgment, bodily sense, material response, and accumulated time.

The osamari of human existence is likewise not fixed. The self fits into institutions, society, occupations, families, information spaces, and continues fitting itself there. But this fitting is never complete.

At the moment fitting becomes complete, self-generation would cease. Ontologically, therefore, what matters is not fitting itself but **the wavering of fitting**. That wavering becomes kairos.

An interface, then, is not a design that completes osamari. It is a design through which the limit of osamari is experienced.

Here lies the essence of art.

Art does not present a beautiful object. Nor is it an informational medium conveying meaning. Art is the practice of designing a kairotic occasion that temporarily unsettles the world within which a person has fit as a matter of course, thereby disclosing the structure of Self-Externalization.

The work is not the goal. It becomes an interface for generating kairos.

The viewer does not merely look at the work. Through the work, the viewer experiences what kind of world he or she has entrusted the self to and what structures he or she has continued to fit within.

Art is therefore not self-expression. It is an event that actualizes the ontological contradiction of the self seeking itself in what is other than itself.

This section has thus turned the interface ontologically from a connecting device into kairos. The interface is not a technology linking human and world. It is the field in which Self-Externalization confronts the irreducibility of the self and the self is generated as a new phase.

Interface Ontology is therefore not a theory of connection. It is a theory of generation.

Through this turn, the interface exceeds information technology and design and is positioned as an ontological principle for reconstructing human existence itself. Art is the practice through which this principle is disclosed as lived bodily experience.

3.3 Integrating Web Installation, Derivative Space, and Osamari

Reconstructing Artistic Practice through Interface Ontology

Up to this point, the paper has defined the interface not as a "device of connection" but as an "ontological condition in which the limit of Self-Externalization becomes manifest." This section connects that theory to the artistic practice of bigakusha-haha. At its center are Web Installation, Derivative Space, and Osamari.

These three have previously been discussed as distinct concepts. Within Generative Topological Ontology, however, they are not independent theories but different phases of a

single ontological movement. The present paper integrates their common principle through Interface Ontology.

3.3.1 Web Installation - From Work to Field

Web Installation, presented in 2010, was not an attempt to use the Internet as an exhibition space. It was a turn from the institutional space of the museum toward the very field in which being is generated.

Conventional installation art assumes that a work configures a space. Web Installation reverses this order.

The work does not create the field. The field generates the work.

A QR code is scanned. A URL is accessed. A search is performed. A screen appears. Communication is interrupted. A body moves.

These actions are ordinarily treated as means of reaching the work. Ontologically, however, the process itself is the work.

The work is therefore not a completed object but **a process in which the relation between self and world changes**.

Web Installation thereby undergoes a double turn: from object to event, and from event to the generation of being.

The work is no longer something that simply exists. It becomes an interface in which being is generated.

3.3.2 Derivative Space - Secondary Generation of Being

This structure is extended further by the concept of Derivative Space.

In financial engineering, a derivative generates value not directly from an underlying asset but from fluctuations in the asset's value. What matters is that the derivative does not negate the underlying asset. Presupposing it, the derivative forms a new space of value.

This paper extends that structure ontologically.

Human beings today do not live through physical reality alone. Social-media evaluation. Search ranking. Brands. Titles. Follower counts. Recommendations generated by artificial intelligence. None of these is the physical body itself. Yet people attempt to understand themselves through them.

The self itself is projected into Derivative Space.

Self-Externalization, in the sense used here, is precisely this ontological derivative.

Yet Derivative Space is not the self itself. Human beings try to confirm themselves there but can never fully recover themselves from it. This impossibility of recovery becomes an occasion of self-generation.

Derivative Space is therefore not fiction. It is a **second space of being** that is unavoidably generated in the movement through which the self attempts to arrive at itself.

3.3.3 Osamari - Generative Connection

At this point, the concept of Osamari becomes decisive.

In architecture, osamari is the concrete connection that cannot be fully drawn in advance: column and beam, wall and floor, material and material. Heterogeneous elements are made one only on site.

There is time. There is the body. There is experience. There is contingency.

Osamari, therefore, is not completion. It is **connection in generation**.

Human existence is the same. A person fits into society, occupation, family, nation, artificial intelligence. Yet that fitting never ends.

Rather, by continuing to fit, the self becomes dispersed into what is other than itself.

Contemporary emptiness does not arise because fitting has been lost. It arises through **continuing to fit itself**.

Art therefore does not complete osamari. It makes osamari waver. In that wavering, a person first notices where the self had been fitting.

3.3.4 Integrating the Three Concepts

Web Installation, Derivative Space, and Osamari are not three unrelated concepts. They describe the same ontological movement from different phases.

Web Installation generates a **field**. Derivative Space generates **value**. Osamari generates **connection**.

Interface Ontology integrates them.

The interface is the phase in which field, value, and connection are generated at once. Within that phase, Self-Externalization proceeds and, simultaneously, its limit becomes manifest.

The work is not the purpose of this movement. The work is the **interface** that causes the movement to occur.

3.3.5 Redefining Artistic Practice

This argument transforms the concept of art itself.

Modern art developed around the production of works. Contemporary art increasingly emphasized process and relationality. The present paper goes one step further.

Art is neither a work, nor a process, nor relationality as such.

Art is the design of the limit of Self-Externalization.

The work becomes an interface for this purpose. A field becomes an interface. A space becomes an interface. AI, social media, markets, and institutions can all become interfaces.

The issue is not whether these media adapt human beings smoothly. The issue is how to generate the moment in which that adaptation begins to waver.

Here art turns from the production of aesthetic objects toward the design of the generation of being.

3.3.6 Conclusion of the Section

This section has integrated Web Installation, Derivative Space, and Osamari through Interface Ontology. They are not separate theories; they describe the ontological movement of Self-Externalization from three different phases: field, value, and connection.

Through this integration, art is redefined not as the production of works but as the practice of designing kairotic occasions through which the limit of Self-Externalization can be experienced.

A work is not a completed object. It is an interface that actualizes the ontological contradiction of the self seeking itself in what is other than itself.

Through this redefinition, the artistic practice of bigakusha-haha, from Web Installation to Generative Topological Ontology, can be understood consistently as the ontological practice of **designing kairos**. Art is the activity of constructing fields in which human beings can stand at the limit of Self-Externalization and generate a new self.

3.4 Art Designs the Limit of Self-Externalization

Redefining Art within Interface Ontology

This chapter has integrated Self-Externalization, interface, Web Installation, Derivative Space, and Osamari into a single ontological system. As its consequence, the present section redefines the concept of art itself.

The most important proposition advanced here is that **art is not the production of works; art is the design of the limit of Self-Externalization**.

This proposition marks a fundamental turn from the modern understanding of art as a theory of expression.

3.4.1 From Expression to Generation

Modern art has understood art as self-expression. Feelings, ideas, experiences, and worldviews internal to the artist are expressed externally as works, and viewers then understand those works.

This structure presupposes that the self that expresses already exists.

The present paper does not accept that premise. The self is not a completed subject. It is an event generated through Self-Externalization.

Art, therefore, is not the expression of an already existing self. It is a practice that **designs the conditions in which the self is generated**.

The work is not the goal. It becomes an interface for establishing kairos.

3.4.2 Designing Kairos

What art designs in this paper is not beauty, meaning, or information. Art designs **kairos**.

Kairos is the moment in which a person confronts the structure through which the self had been sought outside itself. At that moment, one notices that one had entrusted the self to evaluation, institutions, markets, artificial intelligence, and even to the artwork itself.

Art does not provide an answer. Art designs a question - not merely a conceptual question, but an ontological one.

Not: "Who am I?"

But: **"Where had I entrusted myself?"**

This question cannot be understood through explanation alone. It must become manifest as real bodily experience.

3.4.3 From Artwork to Artistic Environment

Seen from this perspective, the concept of the artwork changes as well.

The work is not a finished object. It is an **environment for experiencing Self-Externalization**.

Museum. Guesthouse. Web. City. Tea room. Bonsai. QR code. Display. Artificial intelligence.

These are not merely media. Any of them can become an interface that prompts self-generation.

A work is therefore not a thing. It is a **field in which human beings experience being**.

In this sense, Web Installation was never simply Internet art. It was an attempt to design an environment in which being is generated.

3.4.4 Integration with Reverse-Problem Art

This conception of art becomes clearer through Reverse-Problem Art.

Ordinary art reads meaning from a completed work. Reverse-Problem Art begins with conditions prior to meaning.

The work is not a final form. It is an **initial condition from which self-generation begins**.

The artist is therefore not one who produces a work but one who designs kairos.

A reverse problem does not present the answer. It designs a situation in which an answer can be generated.

Here Reverse-Problem Art and Interface Ontology coincide.

3.4.5 Art as the Limit of Self-Externalization

Art does not negate Self-Externalization. Rather, it pushes Self-Externalization to its limit.

The self is projected into artworks, markets, evaluation, artificial intelligence. Yet the more projection continues, the more a person eventually reaches a point at which one encounters the reality:

"And yet, I am not there."

This experience is the limit of Self-Externalization.

Art is the practice through which this limit can be experienced.

The limit is not failure. It is the boundary at which a new phase opens. The self is first generated at that boundary.

Art is therefore the **design of limits**.

3.4.6 Art in the Age of AI

Artificial intelligence has dramatically accelerated Self-Externalization.

Humans direct questions to AI. AI responds. Through those responses, humans attempt to confirm themselves.

Yet AI cannot become the self itself. This is precisely why AI is important.

AI is not a device that replaces the self. It is an interface that renders Self-Externalization visible at an unprecedented limit.

Art does not consist in merely using AI. It consists in making manifest, through relation with AI, how the self is being entrusted to an exterior structure.

In the age of AI, art therefore assumes an even more explicitly ontological role.

3.4.7 The Ontological Mission of Art

Taken together, the mission of art is neither to change society, nor to change values, nor to express the self.

Art is **the design of a kairotic occasion in which human beings can stand, in reality, at the limit of Self-Externalization**.

At that moment the self notices the ontological contradiction of having sought itself in what is other than itself. And in confronting that contradiction, the self is first generated as self.

Art is therefore not a technique of self-generation. It is an ontological practice that designs the **conditions under which self-generation occurs**.

3.4.8 Conclusion of the Section

This section has moved beyond the modern understanding of art as work-production and self-expression and redefined art as the **practice of designing the limit of Self-Externalization**.

The work is not the end but an interface. The interface is not a connecting device but kairos. Kairos is the topological transition through which the ontological contradiction of the self seeking itself in non-self becomes manifest as real bodily experience.

Through this redefinition, Web Installation, Reverse-Problem Art, Derivative Space, Osamari, and Generative Topological Ontology are integrated within one theoretical system.

The conclusion is clear: art does not give human beings a new self. Art exposes the structure through which human beings have continued to seek the self outside itself, and designs the kairotic occasion in which, at the limit of that structure, the self is generated.

Chapter 4

Derivative Space and Osamari

The Social Phase of Self-Externalization and the Structure of Being

4.1 The Ontology of Derivative Space

The concept of Derivative Space in this paper is not a metaphor produced by simply importing the financial-engineering concept of derivatives into art. It describes an ontological structure through which human existence projects itself into what is other than itself and experiences the world through that projection.

In financial markets, derivatives are not the underlying assets themselves. They take future value and possible fluctuations in value as their object of transaction. What matters here is that a derivative does not negate the underlying asset; it forms a new space of value through its relation to that asset.

Human existence likewise does not consist only in the physical existence of the body.

Human beings experience themselves through value spaces formed outside the self: the evaluation of others, social credit, titles, money, brands, institutions, the state, religion, artificial intelligence, information networks.

This paper calls such a value space **Derivative Space**.

Derivative Space is therefore not an illusion. It is an existential space that contemporary people actually inhabit. It is the phase in which Self-Externalization is socially, culturally, and technologically organized.

4.2 Self-Externalization and Derivative Space

Self-Externalization, as defined in the preceding chapters, is not an individual psychological tendency. It is an ontological movement that constitutes society itself.

A human being projects the self into others. Others project themselves into institutions. Institutions project themselves into markets. Markets project themselves into information. Information is projected into artificial intelligence.

Self-Externalization thus chains itself, layers itself, and forms an enormous Derivative Space.

Within this space, human beings feel as though they are touching reality directly. In fact, however, they experience reality through secondary and tertiary spaces of value that they themselves have generated.

The distinctive feature of contemporary society lies in the expansion of Derivative Space to the point that it covers bodily reality itself.

Evaluation on social media determines self-worth. Search rankings determine knowledge. Market prices determine artistic value. Algorithms determine relations.

Under such conditions, human beings have not simply "lost the self." They have continued entrusting the self to Derivative Space.

4.3 The Ontology of Osamari

This paper now redefines Osamari ontologically.

In architecture, osamari refers to concrete junctions that cannot be determined by design drawings alone. Material, dimensions, body, time, and environment interact, and a building comes into being.

Osamari is not a completed form. It is a **temporary equilibrium in which relations become stable**.

Extended ontologically, this idea reveals that human existence also comes into being by fitting itself into the world.

A person fits into the family, the school, the company, the state, the community, information space, and relations with artificial intelligence.

Yet such fitting is never fixed. It is an equilibrium of relations that is continually renewed.

Osamari is therefore not stoppage. It is **connection that continues to be generated**.

4.4 The Paradox of Continuing to Fit

The author has previously used the expression **"continuing to fit within fitting"**. This expression is deeply connected to the central proposition of the present paper.

The problem of contemporary society is not that fitting has been lost. It is that human beings continue to fit themselves into something without interruption.

A new institution. A new trend. A new evaluation. A new technology. A new artificial intelligence.

This continuous fitting gives human beings stability while accelerating Self-Externalization. The self continues to disperse into what is other than itself and gradually loses awareness of where it is fitting.

The emptiness described in this paper designates this condition.

Emptiness is not the absence of anything. It is a condition in which there are **so many forms of fitting that they can no longer be experienced as fitting**.

4.5 Integrating Derivative Space and Osamari

Derivative Space and Osamari may initially appear to be different concepts. Ontologically, however, they describe the same movement from different sides.

Derivative Space is the value space formed by Self-Externalization. Osamari is the movement through which the self acquires temporary equilibrium within that value space.

Derivative Space therefore explains **where the self is projected**, while Osamari explains **how the self is positioned within that space**.

The two are inseparable. Human beings participate in Derivative Space by fitting themselves into it, and through participation in Derivative Space they generate new forms of fitting.

This circulation constitutes an existential structure of contemporary society.

4.6 Art Does Not Destroy Osamari; It Exposes It

Here the role of art becomes clear.

Art does not negate institutions. It does not negate markets. It does not negate artificial intelligence.

Art is an interface through which it becomes manifest **where a human being is fitting**.

The world does not change simply because one sees a work. Rather, the work becomes the occasion through which it becomes visible what sort of world one has entrusted oneself to, what kind of Derivative Space one inhabits, and what kinds of osamari one had taken for granted.

At that moment, a human being confronts the limit of Self-Externalization.

What matters is that art does not seek to destroy fitting. Art **exposes** fitting. Through that exposure, it opens the possibility that human beings can generate a new osamari.

4.7 Conclusion of the Chapter

This chapter has integrated Derivative Space and Osamari as ontological movements of Self-Externalization.

Derivative Space is the social, cultural, and technological phase in which the self is projected into what is other than itself. Osamari is the movement through which the self acquires temporary relational stability within that space.

When people become fixed within such fitting, however, they forget the structure of Self-Externalization itself. Art therefore functions not by negating osamari but by becoming the kairotic occasion through which its structure is exposed.

Art, in this sense, does not occupy a position outside Derivative Space. It is an interface within Derivative Space through which that structure is reflected back upon itself.

The argument developed here leads into the next chapter's discussion of Web Installation, Reverse-Problem Art, and Generative Topological Ontology, where art is positioned comprehensively as **the ontological practice of designing the limit of Self-Externalization**.

Chapter 5

Designing Kairos

The Practice of Web Installation, Reverse-Problem Art, and Generative Topological Ontology

5.1 From Theory to Practice

Up to this point, the paper has formulated Self-Externalization, interface, Derivative Space, and Osamari as a single ontological system. Yet ontology does not become valid by closing itself as a conceptual system. Its theoretical force is tested by how it explains experience generated in reality and, further, by how it can design the conditions for such experience.

Within Generative Topological Ontology, art is not an application of theory. Art is **the form in which theory itself operates in reality**.

This chapter therefore reconstructs the artistic practices continued by bigakusha-haha since 2010, not as a history of individual works but as one ontological practice: **the design of kairos**.

Kairos here is the moment in which the ontological contradiction of the self seeking itself in what is other than itself becomes manifest as bodily experience.

Art does not merely wait for such a moment to occur by chance. Art is the activity of designing the conditions under which kairos can occur.

5.2 Web Installation - Turning the Field into the Work

Web Installation, presented in 2010, was not a work-form that used the Internet as an exhibition space.

Its essence lay in transforming the concept of the "work" into a **field**.

In modern art, a work is produced as an object, exhibited, and viewed. In Web Installation, however, the work does not exist as an object.

The series of processes in which a person accesses, searches, moves, communicates, waits, becomes lost, and discovers becomes the work itself.

The work is not a finished product. It becomes a generated event.

What matters is that the work does not represent being; it constructs **the conditions through which being is generated**.

Web Installation is therefore not Internet art. It is an interface that designs the very field in which being is generated.

5.3 Reverse-Problem Art - Designing Conditions Rather than Answers

This structure becomes even clearer through Reverse-Problem Art.

Ordinary art presents a completed work and asks the viewer to interpret its meaning. Reverse-Problem Art reverses this order.

Conditions come first. Meaning is generated from them.

The artist is therefore not one who produces a completed answer. The artist is one who designs the conditions under which an answer is generated.

Reverse-Problem Art, in this sense, is not a theory of production. It is a theory of generation.

The work does not transmit information. It becomes an environment through which human beings can reach the limit of Self-Externalization.

Here art is understood, for the first time, not as expression but as generation.

5.4 Distributed Autonomous Art - From Work to Mode of Being

Distributed Autonomous Art extends this generative logic into a social phase.

Art here belongs neither to a single work, a single artist, nor a single institution. Art itself is generated distributively within relations among human beings.

What matters is not "distribution" as technology. Nor is the essence "autonomy" as subjectivity.

The essential point is that **the relation through which human beings reflect one another's Self-Externalization becomes art itself**.

Distributed Autonomous Art is therefore not the art of network technology. It is a social structure in which being repeatedly generates itself.

5.5 Sayama Aesthetics School Guesthouse - Turning Life into Interface

This theory becomes more concrete in the Sayama Aesthetics School Guesthouse.

A guesthouse is a lodging facility. A school is an educational institution. Yet the Sayama Aesthetics School Guesthouse is both and neither.

Staying, conversing, eating, walking, becoming lost, and encountering someone by chance all become artistic experience.

The work is not the building. **Life itself becomes the interface.**

By staying there, a person reconsiders relations with the world that had been taken for granted.

The work is therefore not an exhibited object. It is an environment that reorganizes the experience of being.

5.6 Bonsai - Making the Time of Generation Visible

Recent bonsai practice extends this theory into time.

Bonsai is not a technique of miniaturizing a plant. Bonsai is **the art of designing time**.

A branch is cut. One waits for a bud. Something withers. It sprouts again.

Human beings appear to control the plant. In reality, the human being participates in the temporality of the plant.

The human being here is no longer a "subject that makes" but **a being that participates in generation**.

This experience quietly dismantles the modern-subject illusion that human beings dominate the world.

Bonsai is not a work that represents nature. It is an interface that opens a new phase of generation between nature and human being.

5.7 Art as the Design of Kairos

These practices are not different works in any essential sense.

Web Installation. Reverse-Problem Art. Distributed Autonomous Art. Sayama Aesthetics School Guesthouse. Bonsai.

All design an **occasion through which the limit of Self-Externalization can be experienced**.

A work is not an object. It is an interface through which the structure of the self seeking itself outside itself becomes exposed as real bodily experience.

Art thereby turns from the production of beautiful things toward a practice that reorganizes human existence itself.

The artist is not one who produces works. The artist is one who **designs kairos**.

5.8 Conclusion of the Chapter

This chapter has integrated the practices of bigakusha-haha through the concept of designing kairos.

Since Web Installation in 2010, practices that appear to take different expressive forms have all functioned as ontological interfaces that bring human beings to the limit of Self-Externalization.

Art, therefore, is not the production of works but the practice of designing the conditions under which being is generated.

Art does not give a new world. It discloses, as real bodily experience, the ontological contradiction that human beings have continued to seek the self in what is other than itself, and designs the kairotic occasion in which a new self is generated at that limit.

Generative Topological Ontology, in this sense, is not an art theory. It is an ontology that redefines human existence itself through art.

Chapter 6

Web Installation and Reverse-Problem Art

Interfaces that Implement the Generation of Being

6.1 Web Installation - From Artwork to Existential Environment

The Interface Ontology proposed by this paper is not an abstract ontology. Its theoretical point of departure lies in Web Installation, presented in 2010.

Web Installation may ordinarily be understood as an art form using the Internet. Such an understanding, however, misses its essence.

The purpose of Web Installation was not to exhibit works on the Web. Its purpose was to **redefine the concept of the work itself**.

In modern art, a work was a completed object, an object of viewing, an object containing meaning.

In Web Installation, the work is no longer an object.

QR codes, URLs, domains, searches, communications, displays, bodily movement, waiting, getting lost, contingency - all of these constitute the work.

The work is not a physical thing. It is **the environment in which human existence is generated**.

Web Installation is therefore not Internet art. It is the practice of designing a **Field of Becoming**.

6.2 Web Installation as an Artistic Operating System

This paper positions Web Installation not as one work-form but as a **foundational structure - an Artistic Operating System - supporting art as a whole**.

An operating system conditions applications. Applications change, but the operating system persists.

Likewise, Web Installation is not one work. From it emerge Reverse-Problem Art, Distributed Autonomous Art, the Sayama Aesthetics School Guesthouse, bonsai, dialogue with artificial intelligence, and other practices.

Web Installation is not an artwork. It is **the condition under which art can exist**.

Generative Topological Ontology is, in this sense, the theory that generalizes ontologically what Web Installation had already been practicing.

6.3 Reverse-Problem Art - Designing Conditions Rather than Answers

This structure becomes clearer through Reverse-Problem Art.

Ordinary art produces a work. The viewer then understands the work. The direction is:

Work -> Meaning

Reverse-Problem Art reverses this order.

Conditions come first. Meaning is generated from those conditions.

The artist does not make the answer. The artist designs **the conditions under which an answer can be generated**.

Reverse-Problem Art is therefore not a theory of production. It is ontology.

A work is not a medium that carries meaning. A work is an **initial condition from which being is generated**.

6.4 The Work as Interface

At this point, the concept of the work changes further.

The work is not a finished product. It becomes an interface that changes the relation between human being and world.

The viewer does not simply look at the work. Through the work, the viewer experiences Self-Externalization.

Through the work as occasion, it becomes a bodily experience that the self had been entrusted to evaluation, institutions, markets, artificial intelligence, and others.

The work is therefore not information. The work is **kairos**.

6.5 Integrating Web Installation and Reverse-Problem Art

Web Installation and Reverse-Problem Art here become one.

Web Installation designs the **field** in which being is generated. Reverse-Problem Art designs the **conditions** under which being is generated.

Field and condition are not separate concepts. In the generation of being, field is condition and condition becomes field.

Through this integration, art becomes not the production of works but a methodology for **implementing the generation of being**.

6.6 Coincidence with Generative Topological Ontology

At this point, the entire argument converges.

Generative Topological Ontology did not suddenly appear as an abstract theory. It describes ontologically what Web Installation had already been practicing.

Conversely, Web Installation had been practicing Generative Topological Ontology.

The two are not related as theory and application. They describe the same ontology from different phases.

The artistic practice of bigakusha-haha from 2010 to the present is therefore not a history of individual works. It is a single ontological practice: **the design of kairos**.

6.7 Interface Ontology as an Artistic Methodology

The preceding argument allows the artistic methodology of this paper to be formulated as follows:

Art is not the production of works. Art is the design of a kairotic occasion in which human beings actually stand at the limit of Self-Externalization.

The occasion may take the form of a work, the Web, architecture, a guesthouse, bonsai, artificial intelligence, or something else.

The medium is not what matters. What matters is that a human being experiences, as bodily reality, the ontological contradiction of having sought the self in what is other than itself.

At that moment, art is completed - not because the work is completed, but because **being is generated**.

6.8 Conclusion of the Chapter

This chapter has positioned Web Installation and Reverse-Problem Art as practical methodologies of Generative Topological Ontology.

Web Installation is not a work but an Artistic Operating System that designs the field in which being is generated. Reverse-Problem Art does not present the meaning of a work; it designs the conditions under which meaning is generated.

The two are integrated as practices that design kairotic occasions through two phases - field and condition - in which human beings stand at the limit of Self-Externalization.

Through this integration, art turns from a theory of production into an ontological methodology.

Web Installation, Reverse-Problem Art, and Generative Topological Ontology are therefore not independent theories. Together they form a methodological system that renders visible the ontological movement through which human beings seek the self in what is other than itself and generates new being at the limit of that movement.

Chapter 7

AI and Self-Externalization

The Ontological Position of Artificial Intelligence within Generative Topological Ontology

7.1 Understanding AI Not as Intelligence but as Interface

Artificial intelligence is generally understood as a technology that substitutes for or extends human intellectual activity. Its technical characteristics lie in the capacity to execute at high speed and scale activities once considered to belong to human intelligence: search, inference, image generation, translation, dialogue, and more.

The concern of this paper, however, is not the performance of AI or the degree of its intelligence.

What matters within Generative Topological Ontology is **how AI transforms the structure of human existence**.

AI is not merely an information-processing device external to the human being. It is a new ontological environment into which human beings project themselves and through whose responses they attempt to understand themselves.

This paper therefore positions AI not primarily as intelligence but as an **interface mediating Self-Externalization**.

7.2 AI Accelerates Self-Externalization

Self-Externalization existed long before modern artificial intelligence.

Human beings projected themselves into gods, communities, states, markets.

AI does not negate this movement. It accelerates it to an unprecedented limit.

A person directs a question to AI. AI returns a response. Through that response, the person confirms an idea, revises judgment, and forms new understanding.

Through repetition, human beings increasingly come to understand themselves within their relation to AI.

This phenomenon is not simply information acquisition. It is an ontological movement in which human beings project themselves into the exteriority of AI and reconstruct the self through the response that returns.

7.3 AI Does Not Replace the Self

One misunderstanding must be avoided.

AI does not replace the self.

AI-generated language, images, and inference can provide human beings with new perspectives. Yet AI cannot become human existence itself.

The reason is that the self does not arise from information quantity or inferential ability. It is an event generated at the limit of Self-Externalization.

AI can present an immense quantity of information. But it cannot substitute for the experience:

"I am the one confronting this reality."

AI is therefore not the self. It is an interface that illuminates the process through which the self comes to itself.

7.4 AI and the Confrontation with Reality

As this paper has repeatedly argued, human beings generate a new self when they confront reality.

Reality is not a quantity of information. Reality is confrontation with the irreducibility through which the self cannot be reduced to what is other than itself.

AI can present large quantities of information, but information alone does not generate the self.

Paradoxically, however, the more human beings use AI, the more they confront the question:

"Is this answer AI's, or is it mine?"

This is not a question of knowledge. It is a question of being.

AI does not eliminate the question. On the contrary, it renders it more explicit than ever before.

In this sense, AI becomes a device through which the limit of Self-Externalization is made visible.

7.5 Art in the Age of AI

As AI spreads, the production of works is rapidly becoming automated.

Images can be generated. Music can be generated. Language can be generated.

This situation reveals that **the production of works is not the essence of art**.

If art were identical with producing works, AI would replace the artist.

But in this paper, art is the practice of designing kairotic occasions in which the limit of Self-Externalization is experienced.

Such a practice cannot be established through the quality of generated outputs alone. A field is required in which human beings stand before reality and reconsider their own existence.

Art does not disappear in the age of AI. Its ontological role becomes even more important.

Precisely because generated outputs are increasingly produced by AI, human beings are compelled to ask: **Where is the self generated?**

7.6 AI Is Not a Mirror but Kairos

AI is often compared to a mirror. This paper does not adopt that metaphor.

A mirror reflects a self that already exists. AI does more than reflect.

Dialogue with AI exposes how human beings are entrusting the self to exterior systems.

AI is therefore not a mirror reflecting the self, but **kairos initiating self-generation**.

AI is not a substitute for the self. It is an interface through which the ontological structure becomes manifest that the self can be generated only by passing through what is other than itself.

7.7 Conclusion of the Chapter

This chapter has positioned artificial intelligence not as a substitute for intelligence but as an ontological interface that accelerates Self-Externalization and makes its limit manifest.

AI does not take the self away from human beings. Nor does it give human beings a complete self.

AI is an environment that exposes how human beings project the self outward.

In this sense, AI becomes a new kairotic condition within Generative Topological Ontology.

Human beings do not complete the self through AI. In relation to AI, they confront the limit of their own Self-Externalization and generate the self within that irreducibility.

The question for the age of AI is therefore not:

"Will AI surpass the human being?"

It is:

"How is the human self generated in relation to AI?"

This is the central question that Generative Topological Ontology presents to the age of artificial intelligence.

Conclusion

From Self-Externalization to Generative Topological Ontology

This paper has reconsidered human existence through the ontological paradox that **the self seeks itself in what is other than itself**, and has formulated this movement as Self-Externalization. It has argued that Self-Externalization is not the disappearance of the self but the very condition of self-generation.

Modern philosophy has generally positioned the subject as the starting point of being. Since Descartes, the subject has been understood as that which confirms itself within itself, and later philosophy has developed largely by asking how such a subject should be understood. The present paper reverses this premise.

The subject is not the starting point of being. Nor is the subject simply the final result of being. **The subject is a phase that continues to be generated within the movement of Self-Externalization.**

Human beings therefore do not possess the self. They are beings that generate the self only by passing through what is other than themselves.

Yet this movement never completes the self. The self cannot be reduced completely to others, institutions, markets, works, or artificial intelligence. Rather, the self becomes manifest as self for the first time at the limit of Self-Externalization.

This is the **first proposition** of the present paper.

That proposition fundamentally transforms the concept of the interface.

Conventionally, an interface has been understood as a boundary connecting different beings. In the present paper, however, the interface is not a device connecting already existing things. It is the ontological condition in which the limit of Self-Externalization becomes manifest.

The interface is not a technology that smoothly connects human being and world. It is **kairos**, exposing the structure through which human beings had been seeking the self in what is other than itself.

The paper therefore turns the interface from a technical concept into an ontological one.

This is the **second proposition**.

This turn also transforms the understanding of art.

Modern art was structured around the work. The work was expression, an object of appreciation, and a bearer of aesthetic value.

The present paper separates art from the work.

Art is not the work. Art is not self-expression.

Art is the ontological practice of designing a kairotic occasion through which the limit of Self-Externalization can be experienced.

The work becomes interface. The field becomes interface. Life becomes interface.

Web Installation, Reverse-Problem Art, Distributed Autonomous Art, the Sayama Aesthetics School Guesthouse, and bonsai are not different production formats. They are practices that design kairotic occasions through which human beings stand at the limit of Self-Externalization and generate a new self.

This is the **third proposition**.

The paper has further extended this ontology into the age of artificial intelligence.

AI is not simply an existence that substitutes for human intelligence. It accelerates to an extreme the structure through which human beings project the self outward.

At the same time, through dialogue with AI human beings experience how they are entrusting the self to AI.

AI does not take the self away. Nor does AI complete the self. It is a new interface through which human beings arrive at the limit of Self-Externalization.

The central question of the age of AI is therefore not:

"Will AI surpass the human being?"

but:

"How is the human self generated in relation to AI?"

This is the **fourth proposition** of the paper.

Taken together, Generative Topological Ontology as presented here transforms the question "What is being?" into the question **"How is being generated?"**

Being is not a fixed substance. It is a topological movement generated between self and non-self.

Human beings project themselves into what is other than themselves. Those projections unfold as society, culture, institutions, markets, technology, artificial intelligence, and art. Yet the self cannot be fully reduced to any of them.

By confronting this irreducibility, human beings generate the self for the first time.

Generation is not creation. Nor is it a return. Generation is the event in which a new phase of being opens at the limit of Self-Externalization.

The theoretical contributions of this paper can be summarized in four points.

First, it introduces the concept of **Self-Externalization** and formulates human existence as the ontological movement through which the self generates itself by passing through what is other than itself.

Second, it redefines the interface not as a technology of connection but as **the ontological condition in which the limit of Self-Externalization becomes manifest**.

Third, it integrates artistic practices including Web Installation, Reverse-Problem Art, Derivative Space, Osamari, and Distributed Autonomous Art through a single theoretical principle: **the design of kairos**.

Fourth, it positions artificial intelligence not as a substitute for intelligence but as an ontological interface through which human beings experience self-generation, thereby connecting ontology and art theory in the age of AI.

The central proposition can now be stated once more.

Human beings do not *have* the self.

Human beings generate the self by passing through what is other than themselves and confronting its limit.

And art is **the ontological practice of designing the kairotic occasion in which that limit is experienced in reality**.

Generative Topological Ontology is therefore neither merely an art theory nor merely a theory of artificial intelligence. It is a new ontology that rethinks human existence itself as the movement **from Self-Externalization to self-generation**.

Human beings continue to seek the self in what is other than themselves. Yet at the moment when they confront this contradiction with their real bodies, they do not merely discover the self.

They **generate** the self.

Here lies the fundamental proposition of Generative Topological Ontology.

References

Agamben, Giorgio. 1999. *Potentialities: Collected Essays in Philosophy*. Stanford University Press.

Bateson, Gregory. 1972. *Steps to an Ecology of Mind*. University of Chicago Press.

Floridi, Luciano. 2014. *The Fourth Revolution: How the Infosphere is Reshaping Human Reality*. Oxford University Press.

Heidegger, Martin. 1962. *Being and Time*. Translated by John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson. Harper & Row.

Heidegger, Martin. 1977. *The Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays*. Harper & Row.

Husserl, Edmund. 1982. *Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy*. Martinus Nijhoff.

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

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

Maturana, Humberto R., and Francisco J. Varela. 1980. *Autopoiesis and Cognition*. D. Reidel.

Simondon, Gilbert. 1992. "The Genesis of the Individual." In *Incorporations*, edited by Jonathan Crary and Sanford Kwinter. Zone Books.

Stiegler, Bernard. 1998. *Technics and Time, 1: The Fault of Epimetheus*. Stanford University Press.

Tanaka, Tomokazu (bigakusha-haha). 2026. *Axioms of Generative Topological Ontology: Foundations of Generative Being*. Research Memorandum, Version 1.0.

Tanaka, Tomokazu (bigakusha-haha). 2026. *Pre-Humanity and Self-Precedence: An Ontology of Self-Verification within Generative Topological Ontology*. Research Memorandum, Version 1.0.

Tanaka, Tomokazu (bigakusha-haha). 2026. *Language Derivatives: Reverse-Problem Art and Leverage Structures in Artificial Intelligence Hallucination*. Research Memorandum, Version 1.0.

Tanaka, Tomokazu (bigakusha-haha). 2026. *The Limits of Self-Externalization and the Generation of Being: An Interface Ontology within Generative Topological Ontology*. Research Memorandum, Version 1.0.

Methodological Statement

On the Publication of Research Memoranda

This paper is published as a **Research Memorandum** within the continuing research process of Generative Topological Ontology.

The concepts, definitions, hypotheses, and arguments presented here record the theoretical point reached at the time of writing and publication. They do not represent a finally determined or permanently fixed theory. Through future research, artistic practice, interaction with reality, academic dialogue, and peer review, they may be expanded, revised, redefined, or reconstructed.

This research does not regard only completed theories as research outcomes. The process through which concepts emerge, become connected to one another, transform, and are integrated as theory is itself treated as an important object of research. This paper should therefore be understood not merely as an unfinished draft, but as a **phase recording a particular moment in the generation of theory**.

The publication of a Research Memorandum is not intended to present a completed theory prematurely. It is a method for recording the generative process of thought and practice, enabling later research to verify and reconstruct it, while opening that process to academic and artistic dialogue with different positions.

If the content of this paper is later published as a peer-reviewed article, scholarly book, or other formal research output, that completed version will be explicitly identified as a fixed document distinct from this Research Memorandum.

When citing or referring to this memorandum, readers are requested to include, in addition to the title and author, the **Version number** and **Last Updated date**. Different versions may contain conceptual, definitional, and argumentative differences.

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