Research Monograph Series

The Ontology of Life as Art: A Structural Comparison of the Bauhaus, Russian Constructivism, and Japanese Buddhism from the Perspective of 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.

The Ontology of Life as Art:
A Structural Comparison of the Bauhaus, Russian Constructivism, and Japanese Buddhism from the Perspective of 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 the concept of "Life as Art" (Seikatsu Soku Geijutsu) not as a simple fusion of art and everyday life, but as an ontological structure in which existence is continuously generated through interactions among self, others, nature, tools, space, and time. Here, Soku does not mean a simple identity in which life and art become the same thing. It indicates an immediate yet generative relation in which their difference is retained while a new condition of existence emerges through their connection.

To clarify this structure, the paper compares the Bauhaus, Russian Constructivism, and Japanese Buddhism from the perspective of Generative Topological Ontology. The Bauhaus sought to integrate art, craft, architecture, and technology in order to rationally design the conditions of modern life. Russian Constructivism shifted artistic practice toward production, labor, technology, and social organization, aiming to reconstruct life itself. Japanese Buddhism is examined through structural tendencies in which everyday life becomes a site of embodied practice, impermanence, emptiness, discipline, and responsiveness to nature and time. These three traditions can therefore be compared through the structures of Design, Construction, and Practice.

Generative Topological Ontology reinterprets these differences through relational generation, Pre-Humanity, Pre-Selfhood, and Interface Ontology. Existence is not a fixed substance but a non-closed process generated through connections between the self and what is other than the self. Life is therefore not a background within which an already completed subject acts. It is an interface through which body, nature, tools, place, others, and time continually intersect and generate new conditions of existence.

On this basis, Life as Art is defined not as the transformation of life into an artwork, but as a condition in which life itself functions as an interface of existential generation, self-generation, and ontological self-verification. This structure is connected to practices developed by bigakusha-haha, including Web Installation, Distributed Autonomous Art, Sayama Aesthetics School, bonsai, Mitate, Shitate, and Osamari.

The paper concludes that Life as Art is not merely an expansion of the domain of art. It is an ontological practice that reorganizes the conditions under which existence is generated. Life does not become art. Art emerges when particular and concrete responses within life allow forgotten relations among self, world, body, nature, and time to begin generating themselves anew.

Keywords

Life as Art; Generative Topological Ontology; Bauhaus; Russian Constructivism; Japanese Buddhism; Interface Ontology; Pre-Humanity; Pre-Selfhood; ontological self-verification; particular concrete universality; embodied practice; existential generation

Contents

Abstract 4

Chapter 0 Methodological Note 1

Chapter 1 The Separation of Art and Life in Modernity 5

Chapter 2 Everyday Life in Generative Topological Ontology 8

Chapter 3 The Bauhaus 13

Chapter 4 Russian Constructivism 17

Chapter 5 Japanese Buddhism 22

Chapter 6 A Structural Comparison of the Three Traditions 27

Chapter 7 The Ontology of Life as Art 32

Conclusion 37

References 40

Research Method 44

Chapter 0

Methodological Note

0.1 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to reinterpret the concept of Life as Art (Seikatsu Soku Geijutsu) not merely as the modern artistic ideal of integrating art into everyday life, but as an ontological structure viewed through the framework of Generative Topological Ontology (GTO).

The Japanese term Soku is important to this formulation. Soku does not indicate a simple equation in which life and art lose their difference. It names an immediate and generative relation: life and art remain distinct, yet their connection can generate a condition that cannot be reduced to either term alone.

Since the early twentieth century, the idea of Life as Art has repeatedly appeared in avant-garde movements such as the Bauhaus and Russian Constructivism. In these movements, the primary objective was to dissolve the boundary separating art from everyday life by extending artistic practice into architecture, design, labor, and social organization.

This study proposes a fundamentally different perspective. Rather than asking how art can enter everyday life, it questions the assumption that art and life are originally separate domains.

From the perspective of Generative Topological Ontology, life is not an object upon which art acts. Life itself is a topological process through which being continuously emerges through interactions among the self, others, nature, the body, tools, places, and temporality.

Consequently, Life as Art does not signify transforming everyday life into an artwork. It denotes a condition in which life itself functions as an interface through which the generation of being becomes possible.

0.2 Methodology

This study is not intended as an investigation of historical influence among artistic movements or intellectual traditions.

Instead, it adopts a methodology of structural comparison.

Rather than tracing historical genealogy, the Bauhaus, Russian Constructivism, and Japanese Buddhism are examined as different responses to the same ontological question:

How is being generated through everyday life?

Accordingly, this study compares these traditions not as isolated cultural phenomena but as distinct structures of existential generation.

This methodological approach crosses the conventional boundaries separating comparative aesthetics, comparative philosophy, and ontology.

The purpose is therefore not to identify historical continuity but to clarify structural correspondences within different modes of generating existence.

0.3 The Perspective of Generative Topological Ontology

Generative Topological Ontology rejects the notion that being is a fixed substance.

Being is understood as a continuously generated topological relation emerging through interactions between the self and what lies beyond the self.

Generation should not be interpreted merely as change, development, or transformation.

Rather, generation is the event through which relationships themselves produce new conditions of existence.

This study further introduces two foundational concepts:

Pre-Humanity and Pre-Selfhood.

Pre-Humanity refers to the natural, bodily, and temporal foundations that precede human institutions and conceptual systems while continuing to generate human existence in the present.

Pre-Selfhood refers to the ontological conditions preceding socially constructed identity and symbolic selfhood that nevertheless continue to make the generation of the self possible.

Life is therefore understood as the interface where these two dimensions intersect through ongoing interactions among the body, nature, tools, place, time, and others.

0.4 Central Thesis

The central thesis of this paper may be summarized as follows:

Life as Art does not mean transforming everyday life into an artwork. Rather, life itself functions as an interface that continuously connects Pre-Humanity and Pre-Selfhood, thereby generating being, the self, and ontological self-verification.

From this perspective, artworks are not the ultimate objective of artistic practice.

Instead, they function as interfaces that design, mediate, and reveal the conditions through which existential generation becomes possible.

Accordingly, Life as Art should not be understood as the expansion of art into life.

It is an ontological practice that restores and continually regenerates the generative structure of existence within everyday life itself.

0.5 Organization of the Paper

This paper consists of Chapter 0, which provides the methodological introduction, followed by seven substantive chapters.

Chapter 1 examines the historical background to the separation of art and everyday life in modernity and clarifies the intellectual conditions under which the concept of Life as Art emerged.

Chapter 2 develops the theoretical framework of Generative Topological Ontology by introducing Pre-Humanity, Pre-Selfhood, and Interface Ontology, and theorizes everyday life as a field of existential generation.

Chapter 3 examines the Bauhaus and analyzes its attempt to integrate art, craft, architecture, and design into the total organization of the living environment through the structural principle of **Design**.

Chapter 4 examines Russian Constructivism and analyzes its movement from the production of artworks toward production, labor, technology, and social organization through the structural principle of **Construction**.

Chapter 5 examines Japanese Buddhism, focusing not on doctrinal uniformity but on structural tendencies in which everyday life is understood through embodied practice, responsiveness to nature, temporality, and relations with others. This chapter considers these tendencies through the structural principle of **Practice**.

Chapter 6 compares the Bauhaus, Russian Constructivism, and Japanese Buddhism in terms of Design, Construction, and Practice, clarifying both their commonalities and their differences. It then proposes that Generative Topological Ontology can reconstruct these three structures within the more fundamental ontological principle of **Generation**.

Chapter 7 redefines Life as Art, on the basis of the preceding comparison, not as a fusion of art and everyday life but as an interface through which Pre-Humanity and Pre-Selfhood interact across the body, nature, others, place, and temporality, thereby repeatedly generating being, selfhood, and ontological self-verification. The chapter also examines the significance of Life as Art in contemporary society and in the age of artificial intelligence, asking how embodied relations with nature, place, and lived experience may be sustained within increasingly information-mediated environments.

Finally, the Conclusion integrates the preceding arguments and positions Life as Art not merely as an ideal of modern artistic thought, but as a central concept within Generative Topological Ontology—one that understands everyday life itself as a primordial field of existential generation.

Chapter 1

The Separation of Art and Life in Modernity

1.1 Why Were Art and Life Separated?

Today, the concept of Life as Art is commonly understood as an attempt to bring art closer to everyday life. Yet this very interpretation presupposes that art and life are originally separate domains.

Historically, however, art and life were not initially divided. Ritual, religion, architecture, agriculture, craftsmanship, clothing, food, and dwelling were not independent cultural activities but interconnected practices through which human beings sustained their relationships with nature and their communities. Creative activity constituted everyday life itself, while everyday life functioned as the continuous generation of existence.

The institutional separation of art emerged primarily during the modern period. Artworks came to be regarded as objects of aesthetic contemplation and were preserved, evaluated, and exhibited within museums, galleries, and other cultural institutions. Artists became recognized as specialized creators, while artworks acquired aesthetic and economic value within institutional and market systems.

Although this institutionalization established the autonomy of art, it simultaneously produced a conceptual and social separation between art and everyday life.

Accordingly, the modern discourse of Life as Art should be understood as a response to this historical separation, seeking to reconnect domains that had previously become divided.

1.2 The Autonomy of Art and Modern Aesthetics

From the eighteenth century onward, modern aesthetics increasingly defined art as an autonomous sphere independent of politics, religion, economics, and labor.

This autonomy successfully established the unique value of artistic creation.

At the same time, however, it encouraged the understanding of art as an exceptional activity fundamentally distinct from ordinary life.

Museums, exhibitions, art academies, criticism, collecting, and the art market gradually formed an institutional framework within which artworks were evaluated, preserved, and circulated.

Art thereby gained unprecedented freedom.

Yet this freedom was itself sustained by institutional structures.

From the perspective of Generative Topological Ontology, this development should not merely be understood as the history of artistic institutions.

Rather, it represents a process through which the generation of being becomes objectified and stabilized within institutional forms.

The artwork remains as the visible result of existential generation, while the generative conditions from which it emerged gradually disappear from view.

1.3 The Twentieth-Century Avant-Garde and the Return to Everyday Life

During the early twentieth century, avant-garde artistic movements began to challenge this institutional separation.

The Bauhaus sought to integrate art, craft, architecture, and design into a unified conception of everyday life.

Russian Constructivism connected artistic practice with industrial production and social organization, redefining the artist as an active participant in constructing society.

Similarly, movements such as Dada, Surrealism, Situationism, and Fluxus attempted to liberate art from institutional spaces and reconnect it with ordinary experience.

These movements collectively represented a decisive shift away from treating art as an isolated object.

Instead, they sought to relocate artistic activity within everyday life itself.

Nevertheless, most of these movements retained a particular directionality.

Art was still understood as something that entered, transformed, or elevated life.

Life itself was rarely examined as an ontological structure through which existence is continuously generated.

1.4 Everyday Life from the Perspective of Generative Topological Ontology

Generative Topological Ontology proposes a fundamentally different framework.

Everyday life is not an external domain into which art intervenes.

Rather, it is the field in which the self, others, the body, nature, tools, places, and temporality continuously interact, generating existence itself.

If being is understood not as a fixed substance but as a topological relation emerging through interaction, then everyday life becomes the primary site of existential generation.

Within this framework, art does not intervene from outside everyday life.

Instead, it functions as the event that makes the forgotten process of existential generation visible once again.

Art becomes an interface through which Pre-Humanity and Pre-Selfhood are reconnected.

Accordingly, Life as Art should not be interpreted as the expansion of art into everyday life.

Rather, it signifies the recovery of the fundamental generative structure that everyday life has always already possessed.

1.5 The Fundamental Perspective of This Study

For these reasons, this study does not compare the Bauhaus, Russian Constructivism, and Japanese Buddhism merely as historical movements or cultural traditions.

Instead, it addresses a more fundamental ontological question:

How is being generated through everyday life?

Within this framework, everyday life is understood as the interface where the body, nature, temporality, place, tools, and others continuously interact, allowing Pre-Humanity and Pre-Selfhood to intersect.

Through this structural comparison, the concept of Life as Art is reconstructed not as an artistic doctrine but as a theory of existential generation.

The following chapters develop this argument by examining three distinct historical responses to this common ontological problem, demonstrating how Generative Topological Ontology provides a broader framework within which these traditions may be integrated.

Chapter 2

Everyday Life in Generative Topological Ontology

2.1 Being Is Generated Through Everyday Life

Within the framework of Generative Topological Ontology (GTO), being is not understood as a fixed substance or an immutable entity. Rather, being is a continuously generated topological structure emerging through the interactions among the self, others, nature, the body, temporality, and space.

Accordingly, everyday life should not be regarded as the activity of a pre-existing subject. Instead, it is the very process through which the subject itself comes into being.

Modern philosophy has generally treated the subject as the starting point of ontology. GTO proposes the opposite perspective.

The subject does not precede everyday life.

Rather, the subject gradually emerges as the body responds to its environment and the environment simultaneously responds to the body.

Everyday life is therefore not the place where human beings simply exist.

It is the field in which existence itself is continuously generated.

2.2 Everyday Life as Interface

In Generative Topological Ontology, an interface is not merely a medium connecting two independent entities.

Rather, an interface is the topological site where new modes of being emerge through interaction.

The body, dwelling, clothing, food, tools, labor, nature, language, and relationships that constitute everyday life should not be regarded as isolated objects.

Instead, they function as multiple, overlapping interfaces through which existential generation occurs.

A simple tea bowl illustrates this point.

It is not merely a physical object.

It mediates bodily touch.

It conveys warmth.

It embodies seasonal change.

It creates relationships among people.

It accumulates lived time.

In this sense, the tea bowl ceases to be merely an object and becomes an interface through which being is generated.

Consequently, everyday life may be understood as a multilayered space composed of countless interconnected interfaces continuously producing new existential relations.

2.3 Pre-Humanity and Everyday Life

This study defines Pre-Humanity as the natural, bodily, and temporal foundations that precede human institutions while continuing to generate human existence in the present.

Breathing begins before conscious intention.

Gravity operates independently of belief.

Plants grow without waiting for human evaluation.

The seasons change regardless of human concepts.

Everyday life is constituted through continuous interaction with these pre-human conditions.

Modern society increasingly interprets life through institutions, information systems, and symbolic structures.

Yet beneath these systems, the human body remains constantly connected with nature.

Existence continues to be generated through this ongoing relationship with Pre-Humanity.

Accordingly, Life as Art may also be understood as the practice of making these pre-human foundations present once again within everyday experience.

2.4 Pre-Selfhood and Everyday Life

Pre-Selfhood refers to the ontological condition that precedes socially constructed identity, institutional roles, symbolic representation, and self-image, while continuing to make self-generation possible.

The self is not a fixed identity.

Rather, it is continually generated through ordinary activities:

walking,

cleaning,

preparing food,

cultivating plants,

encountering others,

experiencing failure,

and responding to nature.

These everyday practices reconnect the individual with Pre-Selfhood and continually renew the process through which the self emerges.

Accordingly, everyday life is not the arena in which an already completed self expresses itself.

It is the field in which the self is continually generated.

2.5 Time, Responsiveness, and Awakening

Everyday life unfolds through time.

However, the concept of time employed in this study differs fundamentally from chronological or measurable time.

Time is understood as the topological dimension within which responsiveness becomes possible.

The body responds to nature.

Nature responds to the body.

Others respond to the self.

The self responds to others.

Within this reciprocal movement, new meanings emerge.

The result of this process is what may be called awakening.

Awakening is not the acquisition of information.

Rather, it is the event through which Pre-Selfhood becomes present through its interaction with Pre-Humanity.

Accordingly, Life as Art is not concerned with aesthetically decorating everyday life.

Its purpose is to cultivate the temporal structure through which genuine responsiveness can continuously arise.

2.6 Everyday Life and Ontological Self-Verification

Modern society often understands self-verification through external systems of evaluation.

Academic degrees,

professional qualifications,

economic value,

institutional authority,

and social recognition all function as mechanisms through which individuals attempt to verify themselves.

Generative Topological Ontology proposes a fundamentally different understanding.

Ontological self-verification is not granted from outside.

Rather, it is the event through which Pre-Humanity and Pre-Selfhood respond to one another within everyday life, allowing the self to become present to itself.

In this sense, everyday life itself becomes the site of self-verification.

Likewise, art does not verify the self through the production of artworks.

Instead, art functions as an interface that enables the encounter between Pre-Humanity and Pre-Selfhood, allowing everyday life itself to become artistic.

2.7 Summary

This chapter has defined everyday life as the fundamental topological field in which existential generation occurs.

Everyday life is understood as an interface where Pre-Humanity and Pre-Selfhood continuously interact through the body, nature, tools, others, place, and temporality.

Accordingly, Life as Art should not be interpreted as the introduction of art into ordinary life.

Rather, it is the ontological practice of recognizing everyday life itself as the field in which being, the self, and ontological self-verification are continuously generated.

The following chapters develop this theoretical framework through structural analyses of the Bauhaus, Russian Constructivism, and Japanese Buddhism, demonstrating how each offers a distinctive understanding of the relationship between art, life, and the generation of existence.

Chapter 3

The Bauhaus

3.1 The Reintegration of Art and Everyday Life

Founded by Walter Gropius in 1919, the Bauhaus represents one of the most influential movements in modern art history advocating the integration of art and everyday life.

Its central objective was not merely to unify painting, sculpture, architecture, craft, and design as separate disciplines, but to reconstruct them as components of a comprehensive creative practice capable of shaping the total environment of human life.

Within modern industrial society, art, craft, architecture, and technology had become increasingly specialized and institutionally separated. Art belonged to museums, craft to production, architecture to engineering, and design to industry.

The Bauhaus challenged this fragmentation by proposing that the entire living environment should be conceived as an integrated creative project.

In this respect, the Bauhaus constitutes one of the most significant historical foundations for the modern conception of Life as Art.

3.2 Living Space as Total Art

For the Bauhaus, architecture was never merely the construction of buildings.

It encompassed furniture, lighting, materials, color, spatial composition, and bodily movement within a unified conception of everyday life.

A chair,

a window,

a lamp,

or even the arrangement of a room,

were all understood as elements participating in the organization of human existence.

Everyday life was therefore not regarded as something that simply occurred spontaneously.

Rather, it could be shaped through the coherent design of living environments.

From the perspective of Generative Topological Ontology, this conception contains an important insight.

Transforming the environment also transforms the conditions through which human existence is generated.

Living space is therefore not merely a physical setting but an active participant in existential formation.

3.3 Design as Interface

Within the Bauhaus tradition, design was never considered mere decoration.

Instead, it functioned as an interface mediating the relationship between human beings and their environment.

A desk is not simply an object.

It organizes bodily posture.

It directs vision.

It structures action.

It shapes relationships among people.

Similarly, a chair influences movement, bodily orientation, and temporal experience.

Generative Topological Ontology interprets these objects not as isolated material entities but as interfaces through which interactions become possible.

They establish conditions under which new forms of being emerge.

In this sense, Bauhaus design shares a profound structural correspondence with Interface Ontology, although the theoretical foundations differ.

3.4 Rationality and Standardization

Despite its innovative vision, the Bauhaus remained deeply rooted in the ideals of modern rationalism.

Functionality,

efficiency,

clarity,

and standardization were regarded as fundamental principles for improving everyday life.

Industrial production enabled well-designed objects to become accessible to broader society, representing a major cultural achievement of modernity.

At the same time, however, standardization inevitably transforms singular lived experience into generalized forms.

Everyday life becomes something that can be rationally designed, while human beings become subjects expected to adapt to optimized environments.

From the standpoint of Generative Topological Ontology, this tendency reveals an important limitation.

Life continues to be understood primarily as an object of design rather than as a process of existential generation.

3.5 Limitations from the Perspective of Pre-Humanity

Within this study, Pre-Humanity refers to those natural, bodily, and temporal dimensions that precede human institutions while continually generating human existence.

Viewed from this perspective, the Bauhaus certainly recognized the importance of the body.

Yet the body was largely conceived as one capable of adapting to rationally organized space.

Pre-Humanity, however, exceeds rational planning.

Plants do not grow according to architectural drawings.

The changing seasons cannot be standardized.

Human bodies continually transform through aging, illness, memory, emotion, and lived experience.

Existential generation therefore always contains contingency, openness, and unpredictability that cannot be fully incorporated into systems of rational design.

Here the fundamental difference between the Bauhaus and Generative Topological Ontology becomes apparent.

While the Bauhaus sought to optimize the conditions of life through design, Generative Topological Ontology understands life itself as an open-ended process generated through continuous interaction with what exceeds human planning.

3.6 Toward Life as Art

Nevertheless, the Bauhaus represents an indispensable historical turning point.

By extending artistic practice beyond autonomous artworks into architecture, design, craft, and everyday environments, it fundamentally transformed the scope of artistic activity.

Living space itself became a creative medium.

This insight later influenced environmental art, installation art, interaction design, and contemporary theories of interface.

Generative Topological Ontology develops this trajectory further.

Designing everyday life is not, in itself, sufficient.

More fundamentally, everyday life itself must be understood as the interface through which Pre-Humanity and Pre-Selfhood continuously encounter one another, generating new forms of existence.

Accordingly, Life as Art is not simply a beautifully designed life.

It is a life in which existential generation continually occurs.

3.7 Summary

The Bauhaus constituted a decisive transformation in modern art by integrating art, craft, architecture, and everyday life into a unified creative vision.

Its emphasis on environmental design demonstrated that the organization of living space profoundly influences human existence.

At the same time, its commitment to rationality and standardization continued to treat everyday life primarily as something to be designed and optimized.

Generative Topological Ontology offers a broader ontological perspective.

Rather than viewing life as an object of design, it understands everyday life as the interface through which Pre-Humanity and Pre-Selfhood continuously interact, generating being itself.

The following chapter develops this comparison further through an examination of Russian Constructivism, where the emphasis shifts from the design of life to its social construction.

Chapter 4

Russian Constructivism

4.1 From Art to the Construction of Society

Emerging in the early twentieth century, Russian Constructivism represents one of the most radical attempts in modern art to redefine the relationship between art and everyday life. Rather than treating art as the production of autonomous aesthetic objects, Constructivism regarded artistic practice as an active force in the construction of society itself.

Painting and sculpture were no longer understood as ends in themselves. Instead, architecture, industrial design, typography, publishing, education, theater, clothing, and labor became integral components of a comprehensive project aimed at reorganizing everyday life.

Accordingly, the significance of Constructivism lies not in the creation of artworks but in its attempt to transform art into a structural principle of social existence.

In this sense, Russian Constructivism did more than reconnect art with everyday life; it redefined everyday life itself as the primary field of artistic activity.

4.2 The Concept of Construction

The term construction does not simply refer to the assembly of physical materials.

Rather, it signifies the organization of relationships among human beings, material objects, technology, labor, institutions, and social space into a new order.

Within Constructivism, the artist is no longer an isolated creator of aesthetic objects.

The artist becomes a producer,

a designer,

an engineer,

and ultimately a participant in constructing society itself.

The artwork is therefore no longer the final objective.

Instead, it becomes one moment within the broader process of generating a new form of collective life.

From the perspective of Generative Topological Ontology, this represents an important conceptual shift.

Constructivism recognizes that existence is shaped not by isolated objects but by networks of relationships.

Although Constructivism speaks of “construction” rather than “generation,” its emphasis on relational organization anticipates an ontological understanding of existence as fundamentally relational.

4.3 The Integration of Labor, Technology, and Art

One of the defining characteristics of Russian Constructivism is the rejection of any strict distinction between artistic creation and productive labor.

Labor itself becomes creative.

Technology becomes artistic.

Industrial production becomes an arena of cultural transformation.

Factories,

construction sites,

printing workshops,

schools,

and public institutions are understood not merely as places of production but as environments in which a new society is continuously formed.

Through this perspective, art is relocated from the margins of everyday life to its very center.

Everyday life is no longer viewed as a passive condition into which art is introduced.

Instead, it becomes an ongoing collective activity through which society continually constructs itself.

4.4 Construction and Generation

Despite these important innovations, this study distinguishes carefully between construction and generation.

Construction presupposes intentional organization.

It is directed toward a specific goal, guided by explicit concepts, plans, or ideological principles.

Generation, by contrast, cannot be reduced to intentional design.

Generation refers to the emergence of new forms of being through the continuous interactions among the self, others, nature, the body, and temporality.

Construction possesses direction.

Generation possesses openness.

Construction depends upon planning.

Generation depends upon responsiveness.

This distinction is fundamental.

Russian Constructivism sought to construct a new society through revolutionary transformation.

Consequently, everyday life was understood not only as the field in which existence unfolds but also as the object through which political ideals were to be realized.

Generative Topological Ontology, however, argues that existence cannot be fully determined by any predetermined social project.

Being continually exceeds the intentions that seek to organize it.

4.5 Limitations from the Perspective of Pre-Selfhood

The concept of Pre-Selfhood provides a further point of distinction.

Pre-Selfhood refers to the ontological condition that precedes socially constituted identity while continually enabling the emergence of the self.

Russian Constructivism emphasized the formation of a new collective subject capable of participating in revolutionary society.

Although this vision generated remarkable cultural innovations, it also carried the risk that individual existential experience would become subordinated to collective ideological objectives.

Generative Topological Ontology proposes a different emphasis.

Everyday life is not generated primarily through ideological organization.

Rather, it emerges through the singular interactions of embodied individuals with nature, place, time, and others.

These concrete encounters continually renew the self without reducing it to predetermined social identities.

Accordingly, existential generation cannot be completely absorbed into collective structures, regardless of their historical significance.

4.6 Toward Life as Art

Despite these limitations, Russian Constructivism fundamentally transformed modern conceptions of artistic practice.

By relocating art from autonomous objects to the organization of everyday life, it demonstrated that artistic activity possesses the capacity to reshape human relationships and social existence.

Art became not something to be contemplated but something to be lived.

Generative Topological Ontology extends this insight further.

The relationship between art and life cannot be exhausted by social reconstruction alone.

Life as Art emerges whenever Pre-Humanity and Pre-Selfhood continuously interact through everyday experience.

Consequently, everyday life is not simply constructed.

It is continuously generated.

4.7 Summary

Russian Constructivism transformed art from the production of aesthetic objects into a principle for organizing society, thereby establishing everyday life itself as the primary field of artistic practice.

Its emphasis on collective construction, productive labor, and technological innovation represented one of the most ambitious attempts to integrate art and life within modernity.

Nevertheless, its commitment to revolutionary purpose continued to understand life largely as something that could be intentionally organized according to ideological objectives.

Generative Topological Ontology offers a different perspective.

Rather than viewing everyday life as an object of construction, it understands life as the interface through which Pre-Humanity and Pre-Selfhood continually interact, allowing being itself to emerge through ongoing responsiveness.

This distinction becomes even more evident in the following chapter, which examines Japanese Buddhism, where everyday life is understood not as something to be designed or constructed, but as a continuous existential practice through which being unfolds.

Chapter 5

Japanese Buddhism

5.1 Everyday Life as Practice

Whereas the Bauhaus sought to design everyday life and Russian Constructivism sought to construct it, Japanese Buddhism approaches everyday life from an entirely different perspective.

Everyday life is neither an object to be designed nor a social system to be constructed.

Rather, everyday life itself is practice.

Across diverse traditions—including Zen, Shingon Esoteric Buddhism, Pure Land Buddhism, and other schools—Japanese Buddhism consistently understands ordinary life as the primary site in which existence is cultivated and transformed.

Eating,

cleaning,

cultivating a garden,

arranging flowers,

preparing tea,

walking,

and caring for one’s surroundings

are not merely practical activities.

They are existential practices through which human beings continuously encounter nature, time, the body, and others.

In this sense, Japanese Buddhism understands everyday life itself as an ontological practice.

5.2 The Reciprocity Between the Body and Nature

Within Generative Topological Ontology, being emerges through continuous interaction between the self and what lies beyond the self.

Japanese Buddhism presents a remarkably similar understanding.

The body is not conceived as an autonomous subject separated from nature.

Instead, it exists through continuous reciprocity with its environment.

One feels the wind.

One experiences the rain.

One recognizes the changing seasons.

One works with soil.

One observes the growth of plants.

Nature is neither an object to dominate nor something into which the self dissolves completely.

Rather, body and nature continually respond to one another.

It is precisely this reciprocity that gives rise to everyday life.

From the perspective of Generative Topological Ontology, this relationship corresponds closely to the concept of Pre-Humanity—the natural, bodily, and temporal foundation that continuously generates human existence.

5.3 Practice and Pre-Selfhood

Within Japanese Buddhism, practice (shugyō) is not primarily directed toward the acquisition of knowledge or technical skill.

Its purpose is neither self-perfection nor the affirmation of an already established identity.

Instead, practice creates the conditions under which new forms of selfhood may continually emerge.

Generative Topological Ontology interprets this structure through the concept of Pre-Selfhood.

Pre-Selfhood refers to the ontological condition that precedes socially constructed identity while continually enabling the emergence of the self.

Everyday life therefore becomes the place where Pre-Selfhood repeatedly appears through ordinary practice.

Practice does not verify an existing self.

Rather, it allows the self continually to come into being.

Accordingly, selfhood is never completed.

It is regenerated through each encounter with the world.

5.4 Place, Temporality, and Harmonious Settlement

Japanese culture has long emphasized the significance of place (ba) and what may be described as harmonious settlement (osamari).

Traditional architecture,

tea houses,

gardens,

bonsai,

the Noh theater,

and the arts of tea and flower arrangement

do not primarily pursue fixed formal perfection.

Instead, they seek an ever-renewed harmony among the body, materials, space, time, and nature.

The concept of osamari does not signify static equilibrium.

Rather, it refers to a dynamic state in which multiple relationships momentarily find an appropriate configuration.

This configuration is never permanent.

As circumstances change, new responses become necessary.

From the perspective of Generative Topological Ontology, place becomes the topological field where existential generation occurs, while harmonious settlement represents a provisional stabilization within an ongoing process of generation.

Existence is therefore understood not as permanence but as continuous renewal.

5.5 The Ontology of Life as Art

These considerations lead to a fundamentally different understanding of Life as Art.

Japanese Buddhism does not introduce art into everyday life.

Nor does it aestheticize ordinary existence.

Instead, everyday life itself becomes the continuous generation of being.

A tea house is not simply an artwork.

A garden is not merely an aesthetic composition.

A bonsai is not a finished object.

Each functions as an interface connecting Pre-Humanity and Pre-Selfhood, enabling continuous interaction among the body, nature, place, and temporality.

Art therefore ceases to be primarily representational.

Instead, it becomes the topological condition through which existential generation is made possible.

Accordingly, Life as Art does not mean transforming life into art.

It means understanding everyday life itself as the continuous practice through which being is generated.

5.6 Integration within Generative Topological Ontology

The comparative analyses developed throughout this study now converge within the broader framework of Generative Topological Ontology.

The Bauhaus designed life.

Russian Constructivism constructed life.

Japanese Buddhism practiced life.

Generative Topological Ontology integrates these three perspectives while simultaneously extending beyond them.

Everyday life is neither simply designed,

nor merely constructed,

nor solely practiced.

It is the interface through which Pre-Humanity and Pre-Selfhood continually interact, allowing existence itself to emerge.

From this perspective, art is no longer defined by objects, institutions, or aesthetic categories.

Instead, it becomes the ongoing practice of generating being through everyday life.

5.7 Summary

Japanese Buddhism understands everyday life as continuous practice through which the body, nature, place, and temporality remain in reciprocal interaction.

Unlike modern theories that approach everyday life primarily through design or social organization, it recognizes ordinary existence itself as the field in which being continually unfolds.

Generative Topological Ontology reconstructs this structure through the concepts of Pre-Humanity, Pre-Selfhood, and Interface Ontology.

Consequently, Life as Art is no longer interpreted as a historical artistic ideal.

Rather, it becomes an ontological principle according to which everyday life itself functions as the continual generation of being.

This conclusion also clarifies the structural relationship among the three traditions examined in this study.

The Bauhaus emphasizes design.

Russian Constructivism emphasizes construction.

Japanese Buddhism emphasizes practice.

Generative Topological Ontology integrates these three perspectives within the more comprehensive ontological concept of generation, thereby providing a unified theoretical framework for understanding Life as Art beyond the historical boundaries of modern art movements.

Chapter 6

A Structural Comparison of the Three Traditions

6.1 Method of Comparison

This study does not compare the Bauhaus, Russian Constructivism, and Japanese Buddhism through historical genealogy or direct intellectual influence.

Each emerged within a distinct historical, cultural, and political context.

Nevertheless, all three address a common ontological question:

How is human existence generated through everyday life?

Rather than comparing artistic styles or historical developments, this study compares the underlying structures through which everyday life is understood as the site of existential generation.

The object of comparison is therefore neither artworks nor historical doctrines.

Instead, it is the ontological structure through which everyday life becomes possible.

Accordingly, the present analysis constitutes a form of comparative ontology, grounded in the theoretical framework of Generative Topological Ontology.

6.2 Design, Construction, Practice, and Generation

The preceding chapters have demonstrated that each tradition proposes a distinct mode through which everyday life is understood.

The Bauhaus approaches everyday life through design.

Its objective is to reorganize the human environment through rationality, functionality, and spatial coherence.

Russian Constructivism approaches everyday life through construction.

It seeks to reorganize society by integrating labor, technology, production, and collective organization into a unified social project.

Japanese Buddhism approaches everyday life through practice.

Rather than redesigning society, it emphasizes the continuous cultivation of bodily responsiveness through ordinary activities.

Generative Topological Ontology introduces a fourth concept that encompasses and exceeds all three:

generation.

Generation is not reducible to design.

It is not reducible to construction.

Nor is it identical with practice.

Generation refers to the continual emergence of being through the reciprocal interaction of Pre-Humanity and Pre-Selfhood across multiple interfaces.

In this respect, design, construction, and practice become different modalities through which existential generation may occur, rather than independent or competing principles.

6.3 Conceptions of the Human Subject

The three traditions also differ in their understanding of the human subject.

Within the Bauhaus, the human being is primarily conceived as a subject inhabiting a rationally designed environment.

Within Russian Constructivism, the human being is understood as an active participant in constructing collective society.

Within Japanese Buddhism, the human being is regarded as a practitioner who continually transforms through lived experience.

Generative Topological Ontology departs from each of these perspectives.

The subject is not the point of departure.

Rather, the subject itself is generated.

The body responds to nature.

Nature responds to the body.

Others respond to the self.

The self responds to the world.

Within these reciprocal interactions, subjectivity continually emerges.

Consequently, human beings should not be understood as fixed entities but as continuously generated topological relations.

6.4 Conceptions of Art

The role assigned to art likewise differs among the three traditions.

For the Bauhaus, art organizes everyday environments through design.

For Russian Constructivism, art participates in the construction of society.

For Japanese Buddhism, artistic activity becomes inseparable from ordinary practice.

Generative Topological Ontology proposes a broader understanding.

Art is neither primarily an object nor an institution.

Art is an interface through which Pre-Humanity and Pre-Selfhood become connected, allowing new modes of being to emerge.

Through this definition, art is no longer positioned outside everyday life.

Instead, art becomes one of the fundamental structures through which everyday life continually generates existence.

6.5 Redefining Life as Art

The analyses developed throughout this study lead to the following definition:

Life as Art does not signify transforming everyday life into an artwork. Rather, it denotes the condition in which everyday life itself functions as an interface through which Pre-Humanity and Pre-Selfhood continually interact, thereby generating being, selfhood, and ontological self-verification.

This definition fundamentally reorients the meaning of Life as Art.

The concept no longer refers merely to a modern artistic ideal.

Instead, it becomes an ontological principle concerning the continual generation of existence.

Art does not beautify life.

Nor does it simply intervene in everyday existence.

Rather, art reveals, mediates, and continually renews the generative structure already inherent within everyday life.

6.6 Implications for Contemporary Society

The significance of this perspective becomes particularly evident within contemporary information society.

Artificial intelligence,

algorithmic evaluation,

digital platforms,

social media,

and institutional systems increasingly mediate human existence.

As a consequence, individuals often seek self-verification through external structures of evaluation.

Everyday life risks becoming organized primarily through informational systems.

Generative Topological Ontology argues that beneath these technological structures, another level of existence remains active.

The body continues to respond to nature.

Places continue to accumulate lived experience.

Temporal rhythms continue to shape human existence.

Encounters with others continue to generate unforeseen transformations.

These interactions cannot be fully replaced by information processing alone.

Consequently, Life as Art acquires renewed significance in the age of artificial intelligence.

It becomes the practice of restoring the generative relationship between human beings and the world within an increasingly information-saturated environment.

6.7 Summary

This chapter has compared the Bauhaus, Russian Constructivism, and Japanese Buddhism as three distinct ontological structures of everyday life.

The Bauhaus emphasizes design.

Russian Constructivism emphasizes construction.

Japanese Buddhism emphasizes practice.

Generative Topological Ontology introduces generation as the broader ontological principle capable of integrating these three perspectives.

Generation refers to the continual emergence of being through the reciprocal interaction of Pre-Humanity and Pre-Selfhood within everyday life.

Accordingly, Life as Art should no longer be understood simply as an artistic movement or cultural ideal.

Rather, it constitutes an ontological framework in which everyday life itself continually generates existence.

The following chapter develops this conclusion further by presenting a comprehensive ontology of Life as Art, synthesizing the comparative analyses into a unified philosophical framework.

Chapter 7

The Ontology of Life as Art

7.1 The Ontological Turn of Life as Art

Throughout this study, the Bauhaus, Russian Constructivism, and Japanese Buddhism have been examined not merely as historical movements but as distinct responses to a common ontological question concerning the relationship between everyday life and the generation of being.

Traditionally, Life as Art has been interpreted as the extension of artistic practice into everyday life.

Such an interpretation, however, continues to presuppose that art and life are fundamentally separate domains.

Generative Topological Ontology challenges this assumption.

Everyday life is not external to art.

Nor is art an aesthetic addition to life.

Instead, both constitute different expressions of the same ontological process through which Pre-Humanity and Pre-Selfhood continually interact across interfaces, giving rise to new modes of being.

Accordingly, Life as Art should no longer be understood as the fusion of two previously independent domains.

Rather, it denotes the ontological structure through which existence itself is continuously generated.

7.2 Everyday Life as the Interface of Existential Generation

Within Generative Topological Ontology, an interface is not merely a boundary separating independent entities.

It is the topological condition through which new forms of existence emerge.

Everyday life represents the highest concentration of such interfaces.

The body responds to nature.

The body responds to others.

The body responds to tools.

The body responds to place.

The body responds to temporality.

These interactions are not directed by a fully constituted subject.

Instead, subjectivity itself continually emerges through them.

Consequently, everyday life should not be understood simply as the environment within which human beings exist.

It is the interface through which human existence is continually generated.

7.3 Art as the Condition for the Generation of Being

This study does not define art primarily in terms of artworks, institutions, or aesthetic representation. Instead, art is understood as a condition that makes existential generation possible. Its significance lies not in the production of objects but in the creation of interfaces through which Pre-Humanity and Pre-Selfhood become connected.

From this perspective, the value of an artwork depends not upon its material permanence or institutional recognition but upon its capacity to generate new modes of existence. A tea house, a garden, a bonsai, a Web Installation, Distributed Autonomous Art, or Sayama Aesthetics School may all be interpreted as interfaces that continually generate new existential relationships.

The same perspective also clarifies practices such as Mitate, Shitate, and Osamari. Mitate generates a new relation by seeing or positioning something through another possible configuration. Shitate gives a concrete form to such a relation without reducing it to a fixed essence. Osamari names a provisional settling of relations among body, material, place, time, and nature. None of these practices closes generation; each creates a condition from which another response can emerge.

Art therefore becomes neither representation nor expression alone. It becomes the practical design of conditions through which being may continually emerge.

7.4 Everyday Life as Ontological Self-Verification

Modern societies frequently associate self-verification with external systems of evaluation.

Academic credentials,

professional qualifications,

economic success,

social reputation,

institutional authority,

and algorithmic ranking

often function as substitutes for existential certainty.

Generative Topological Ontology proposes a fundamentally different conception.

Ontological self-verification occurs whenever Pre-Humanity and Pre-Selfhood respond to one another within everyday life, allowing the self to become present to itself.

Such self-verification is never permanently achieved.

It is continually regenerated through everyday existence.

Consequently, everyday life should not be understood as the place where individuals prove themselves.

Rather, it is the topological field in which self-verification continuously occurs.

7.5 Life as Art in the Age of Artificial Intelligence

The rapid development of artificial intelligence has fundamentally transformed contemporary culture.

AI systems generate information,

produce images,

assist creative activity,

and increasingly participate in intellectual work.

At the same time, everyday life risks becoming increasingly mediated by informational systems rather than lived relationships.

Generative Topological Ontology does not oppose artificial intelligence.

Instead, it distinguishes between information generation and existential generation.

AI is capable of generating information.

Human beings generate existence through embodied interaction.

The bodily reciprocity between humans and Pre-Humanity, together with the continual emergence of Pre-Selfhood, cannot simply be reduced to computational processes.

Accordingly, Life as Art becomes increasingly significant in the age of artificial intelligence.

It provides an ontological framework through which human beings may continually regenerate their relationships with the body, nature, place, temporality, and others within technologically mediated environments.

7.6 Life as Art as Ontology

The principal achievement of this study is the reconstruction of Life as Art as an ontological rather than merely artistic concept.

Its central proposition may be expressed as follows:

Life as Art is the interface through which Pre-Humanity and Pre-Selfhood continually interact across the body, nature, others, place, and temporality, thereby generating being itself. Art is the practical condition that makes this continual generation possible.

In this formulation, Soku is not an assertion that life and art are simply identical. It names the generative immediacy through which their difference becomes a site of connection. Life remains life, and art remains art, yet their relation can produce a new topology of existence.

Through this definition, art is liberated from an exclusive dependence upon objects, institutions, or aesthetic categories. Everyday life itself becomes the continual practice of existential generation. Life is therefore not the object of art. Life itself constitutes ontology.

7.7 Summary

This chapter has reconstructed Life as Art as the central ontological concept of Generative Topological Ontology.

Rather than interpreting art as the production of aesthetic objects or participation in cultural institutions, this study has argued that art functions as an interface through which Pre-Humanity and Pre-Selfhood continually generate being, selfhood, and ontological self-verification.

This perspective extends beyond the modern ideal of integrating art and life.

It proposes a more fundamental philosophical claim:

Everyday life is itself the continuous generation of being.

Accordingly, Life as Art should not be understood as a cultural movement, an artistic doctrine, or a lifestyle.

It constitutes an ontology of existence, providing a unified theoretical framework that connects aesthetics, philosophy, interface theory, artificial intelligence, design, architecture, and religious thought through the common principle of existential generation.

The following Conclusion synthesizes these arguments and clarifies the broader philosophical significance of this ontological reconstruction of Life as Art.

Conclusion

This study has sought to reconstruct the concept of Life as Art not as a modern artistic ideal, but as an ontological principle grounded in Generative Topological Ontology (GTO).

To achieve this objective, the study examined the Bauhaus, Russian Constructivism, and Japanese Buddhism, not through historical genealogy or cultural influence, but as three distinct structural responses to a common ontological question:

How is being generated through everyday life?

The analyses demonstrated that the Bauhaus approaches everyday life through design, Russian Constructivism through construction, and Japanese Buddhism through practice.

Although these traditions emerged within different historical and cultural contexts, each recognizes that everyday life is not merely the background of artistic activity but the primary field in which human existence takes shape.

Building upon these observations, this study introduced generation as a broader ontological concept capable of integrating these three perspectives.

Generation refers to the continual emergence of being through the reciprocal interaction of Pre-Humanity and Pre-Selfhood across interfaces involving the body, nature, place, temporality, tools, and others.

Accordingly, everyday life should not be understood simply as the activity of an already existing subject.

Rather, everyday life itself constitutes the ontological interface through which subjectivity, meaning, value, and existence continually emerge.

From this perspective, Life as Art no longer signifies the aesthetic transformation of everyday life.

Instead, it denotes the continual generation of being through lived experience.

Art, therefore, is not fundamentally defined by the production of objects or participation in artistic institutions.

Its primary function is to establish, mediate, and sustain the interfaces through which existential generation becomes possible.

This redefinition liberates art from an exclusive dependence upon objects, museums, and institutional systems, while simultaneously restoring everyday life as the central field of artistic practice.

The implications of this ontology extend beyond aesthetics.

In the age of artificial intelligence, human experience is increasingly mediated by information systems, algorithmic evaluation, and digital environments.

Artificial intelligence can generate information, synthesize knowledge, and support creative production with unprecedented sophistication.

Nevertheless, the embodied reciprocity through which Pre-Humanity and Pre-Selfhood continually generate existence cannot be reduced to information processing alone.

Consequently, the significance of Life as Art becomes even greater under contemporary technological conditions.

Rather than opposing artificial intelligence, this ontology clarifies the distinctive mode through which human beings continue to generate existence within technologically mediated environments.

The theoretical significance of this study therefore lies not only in proposing a new interpretation of modern artistic movements.

More fundamentally, it presents an ontological framework capable of integrating aesthetics, philosophy, interface theory, design, architecture, religious thought, and artificial intelligence through the common principle of existential generation.

Within this framework, art is understood neither as representation nor as autonomous creation.

Instead, it becomes the practical establishment of conditions through which being continually emerges.

The principal contribution of this study may therefore be summarized in the following proposition:

Life as Art is not the ideal of making life artistic. It is the ontology according to which living itself continuously generates being through the reciprocal interaction of Pre-Humanity and Pre-Selfhood.

This proposition moves beyond the modern opposition between art and everyday life.

Rather than extending art into life, it understands everyday life itself as the primordial topological field in which existence is continuously generated.

In doing so, this study proposes Life as Art as a new ontological paradigm for the twenty-first century—one that redefines artistic practice not through objects, institutions, or representation, but through the continual generation of being itself.

References

Primary Works by the Author

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

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

Tanaka, Tomokazu (bigakusha-haha). 2026. Pre-Humanity and Pre-Selfhood: An Ontology of Self-Verification in Generative Topological Ontology. Research Memorandum, Version 0.9.

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

Tanaka, Tomokazu (bigakusha-haha). 2026. The Dynamics of Evaluation, Proof, and Value: Leverage Structures and Particular Contingency in Generative Topological Ontology. Research Memorandum, Version 1.0.

Tanaka, Tomokazu (bigakusha-haha). 2026. The Ontology of Life as Art: A Structural Comparison of the Bauhaus, Russian Constructivism, and Japanese Buddhism from the Perspective of Generative Topological Ontology. Research Memorandum, Version 1.0.

Bauhaus and Modern Design

Droste, Magdalena. 2006. Bauhaus, 1919–1933. Cologne: Taschen.

Gropius, Walter. 1965. The New Architecture and the Bauhaus. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Whitford, Frank. 1984. Bauhaus. London: Thames & Hudson.

Wingler, Hans M. 1978. The Bauhaus: Weimar, Dessau, Berlin, Chicago. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Russian Constructivism

Bowlt, John E. 1988. Russian Art of the Avant-Garde: Theory and Criticism, 1902–1934. London: Thames & Hudson.

Lodder, Christina. 1983. Russian Constructivism. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Tarabukin, Nikolai. 1923/1981. From the Easel to the Machine. In Russian Art of the Avant-Garde, edited by John E. Bowlt.

Japanese Buddhism and Japanese Aesthetics

Dōgen. Shōbōgenzō. Various editions.

Hisamatsu, Shin'ichi. 1971. Zen and the Fine Arts. Tokyo: Kodansha.

Izutsu, Toshihiko. 1982. Toward a Philosophy of Zen Buddhism. Tehran: Imperial Iranian Academy of Philosophy.

Kūkai. The Ten Stages of the Development of Mind (Jūjūshinron). Various editions.

Nishida, Kitarō. 1990. An Inquiry into the Good. Translated by Masao Abe and Christopher Ives. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Suzuki, D. T. 1959. Zen and Japanese Culture. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Philosophy and Ontology

Deleuze, Gilles. 1994. Difference and Repetition. New York: Columbia University Press.

Heidegger, Martin. 1962. Being and Time. Translated by John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson. Oxford: Blackwell.

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

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

Whitehead, Alfred North. 1978. Process and Reality. Corrected Edition. New York: Free Press.

Interface, Media, and Contemporary Theory

Bonsiepe, Gui. 1999. Interface: An Approach to Design. Maastricht: Jan van Eyck Akademie.

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

Norman, Donald A. 2013. The Design of Everyday Things. Revised and Expanded Edition. New York: Basic Books.

Artificial Intelligence

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

Russell, Stuart, and Peter Norvig. 2021. Artificial Intelligence: A Modern Approach. 4th ed. Hoboken, NJ: Pearson.

Topology, Systems, and Mathematics

Mac Lane, Saunders. 1998. Categories for the Working Mathematician. 2nd ed. New

York: Springer.

Munkres, James R. 2000. Topology. 2nd ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Thom, René. 1975. Structural Stability and Morphogenesis. Reading, MA: W. A. Benjamin.

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.