Contrast-Induced Topology: A Structural Framework for Emergence and Identity

André Hampshire
`andrehampshire@gmail.com`
No institutional affiliation

May 21, 2025

Contents

Introduction

What must happen for a structure to become perceptible? Classical topology begins with points, sets, and open neighborhoods. Physics often begins with fields, particles, and metrics. Yet none of these address a more primitive question: *what permits a structure to become perceptible in the first place?* This manuscript develops a theory in which **modulated contrast**, not pre-assumed geometry, becomes the generative foundation of spatial and structural reality.

Motivation

Across perception, physics, and epistemology, we frequently treat objects, shapes, and regions as ontologically primitive. We speak of particles as existing independently, of loops as inherent features of space, and of surfaces as continuous manifolds. But these assumptions obscure a more foundational condition: **no structure can be resolved without a differential modulation across an aperture of discernment**. Whether visually, acoustically, or materially, structure emerges through contrast—the variation of a field, its curvature, and its accumulation across finite regions.

This manuscript develops a complete ontological and topological framework grounded in this principle. It does not assume geometry. It does not assume particles. Instead, it defines the very conditions under which identity, multiplicity, enclosure, and topology first arise—from the *accumulation of contrast* over a finite perceptual window.

Overview

The theory begins with three ontological axioms:

1. **Contrast Primacy** — contrast is the foundational perceptual quantity;
2. **Threshold Resolution** — a structure only emerges if contrast exceeds a fixed resolution threshold;
3. **Ontological Locality** — emergence is locally gated within the observer's aperture.

From these, we construct a contrast-induced geometry in which space is defined not by coordinates but by the integrated gradient of a contrast field $C(x)$. This leads to the concept of the *shire*—the minimal unit of integrated contrast curvature necessary for structure to emerge. Through this, we define:

- Contrast-induced metric spaces,
- Contrast-resolved Betti numbers (including latent and resolved forms),
- Angular intensity as the modulator of dimensional individuation,
- And a rigorous distinction between wave-like continuity and particle-like discreteness, all derived structurally from contrast dynamics.

Later sections develop the transition from latent identity to resolved structure, formalize perceptual loops and triangulated relationships, and articulate a structural epistemology in which knowledge corresponds to threshold crossings in perceptual contrast.

Finally, we examine **perceptual collapse**—not as a quantum mystery but as a degeneracy of projected structure—and propose a higher-dimensional contrast manifold as the source of what appears as both particle and wave.

Contribution

This work proposes that:

- Topological features are *not absolute invariants*, but arise only when contrast structure crosses resolution thresholds;
- Classical distinctions such as wave versus particle, object versus field, are *emergent ontologies*, determined by the topological history of contrast curvature;
- Epistemic access, identity, and truth are all *contrast-relative*, and should be understood as structural, not semantic;
- The Betti numbers $\beta_0, \beta_1, \beta_2$ acquire a *dynamic role* in tracking structural evolution, not static classification.

Thus, *Contrast-Induced Topology* offers a new foundation for spatial, perceptual, and ontological theory—one that begins not from space, but from structure.

Chapter 1

Axioms and Foundations of Contrast Geometry

1.1 Introduction

This chapter establishes the primitive assumptions, mathematical structures, and perceptual principles that define the theory of contrast-induced emergence. In this framework, contrast is not a derivative quantity but the generative force from which structure, identity, and even topology arise.

We begin with three foundational axioms that describe the conditions for structural appearance, grounded in perceptual resolution. These axioms, together with a set of geometric assumptions, lay the foundation for a new ontological approach to space, identity, and measurement.

1.2 Ontological Axioms

Axiom 1.1 (Contrast Primacy)**.** Contrast is the primitive perceptual quantity. A structure can only emerge if modulated contrast is present in the observer's aperture window.

Axiom 1.2 (Threshold Resolution)**.** A structure is perceptible only if the integral of contrast over a neighborhood exceeds a resolution threshold ρ_0.

Axiom 1.3 (Ontological Locality)**.** Emergence is local: contrast must accumulate within a bounded neighborhood of the observer to resolve structure. No structure can emerge at infinity.

1.3 Perceptual Assumptions

Assumption 1.4 (Observer Aperture)**.** The observer perceives the world through a bounded open subset $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, termed the *aperture window*, representing the field of discernibility.

Assumption 1.5 (Smooth Contrast Field)**.** The contrast field $C : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ is at least continuously differentiable (C^1) on a domain $\Omega \supset A$, allowing well-defined gradients $\nabla C(x)$ and integrals over regions.

Assumption 1.6 (Resolution Threshold)**.** There exists a universal (or class-relative) contrast threshold $\rho_0 > 0$ that determines the minimal condition for structural emergence.

Assumption 1.7 (Objective Class Consistency)**.** There exists a class of observers, the *objective class*, who share the same aperture structure A and threshold ρ_0. Within this class, structural emergence is invariant under transformations that preserve contrast flow and threshold accumulation.

1.4 Foundational Definitions

Definition 1.8 (Perceptual Aperture)**.** Let $A \subset \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be the bounded open region across which an observer or detector can register contrast. This is the *aperture window*.

Definition 1.9 (Contrast Field as Structural Deformation)**.** Let $C : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ be a scalar field. The contrast field quantifies the degree to which the structure of space itself is modulated in the vicinity of x. Large values of $\|\nabla C(x)\|$ indicate spatial distortion or boundary transitions. Structure emerges where contrast curvature is sufficient to differentiate regions.

Corollary 1.10 (Curvature-Individuation Principle)**.** *A point $x_0 \in A$ is resolved as an individuated structure only if:*

$$\int_{B_\varepsilon(x_0)} \|\nabla C(x)\| \, dx \geq \rho_0.$$

Identity is not primitive—it is resolved through integrated curvature.

Definition 1.11 (Contrast-Induced Metric Space)**.** Given $C : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$, define the metric:

$$d_C(x, y) := \inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma_{x \to y}} \int_\gamma \|\nabla C(z)\| \, ds,$$

where $\Gamma_{x \to y}$ is the set of smooth paths from x to y. Then (Ω, d_C) is a contrast-induced metric space.

1.5 The Shire: Unit of Structural Emergence

Definition 1.12 (Structural Emergence)**.** A region $U \subset A$ exhibits emergence if:

$$\int_U \|\nabla C(x)\|\, dx \geq \rho_0.$$

A point x_0 is minimally resolved if there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that:

$$\int_{B_\varepsilon(x_0)} \|\nabla C(x)\|\, dx \geq \rho_0.$$

Definition 1.13 (One Shire)**.** A *shire* is the minimal unit of integrated contrast curvature required for structural individuation:

$$1 \text{ shire} := \rho_0.$$

A structure $U \subset A$ is ontologically distinct if and only if:

$$\int_U \|\nabla C(x)\|\, dx \geq 1 \text{ shire}.$$

Naming of the Shire

The term “shire” invokes a poetic and symbolic origin. In literature, a shire is a bounded and meaningful domain. In this framework, it is the birthplace of perceptual identity. The name also echoes the second syllable of the author’s surname, Hampshire—linking formal structure with personal and philosophical roots.

Chapter 2

From Structural Emergence to Discernible Form

2.1 Introduction

Having established the foundational ontology of contrast and thresholded emergence, we now examine the transformation by which a minimally resolved point becomes a discernible form. This chapter formalizes the evolution from the appearance of a single shire to the full individuation and enclosure of a structural particle.

We introduce the concept of structural inflation, develop the notion of angular intensity, and define the boundary conditions for perceptual identity.

2.2 Emergence-to-Discernment Transition

Theorem 2.1 (Emergence-to-Discernment Transition)**.** *Let $C : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ be a contrast field. Suppose an observer in aperture $A \subset \Omega$ detects a first emergence at point x_0 when:*

$$\int_{\gamma_0} \|\nabla C(x)\| \, dx = \rho_0 = 1 \text{ shire.}$$

Then:

1. *x_0 is ontologically real but topologically minimal: $\beta_0 = 1$, $\beta_1 = \beta_2 = 0$.*

2. *As contrast continues to accumulate, there exists a time $t^\dagger$ at which the contrast structure becomes enclosed:*

$$\beta_2 = 1.$$

3. The total integrated contrast from emergence to discernment is:

$$\int_{\gamma_{em}} \|\nabla C(x)\| \, dx = \rho_{structure} > \rho_0.$$

Definition 2.2 (Structural Envelope)**.** Let x_0 be a point of first emergence. As the contrast source evolves, its *structural envelope* is the region $U \subset \Omega$ over which contrast curvature accumulates from emergence to discernibility. The envelope contrast is:

$$\rho_{\text{structure}} := \int_U \|\nabla C(x)\| \, dx.$$

Definition 2.3 (Contrast-Normalized Geometry)**.** Let $\|\nabla C(x)\| = \kappa_0 > 0$ be constant over a region U. Then:

$$\rho_{\text{structure}} = \kappa_0 \cdot \mathrm{Vol}(U), \quad \text{so that} \quad \mathrm{Vol}(U) = \frac{\rho_{\text{structure}}}{\kappa_0}.$$

Proposition 2.4 (Scaling in Normalized Geometry)**.** *Let $B_R^n \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a ball of radius R over which $\|\nabla C(x)\| = \kappa_0$. Then:*

$$\rho_{structure}(R) = \kappa_0 \cdot \frac{\pi^{n/2}}{\Gamma(n/2+1)} R^n,$$

and

$$\rho_{structure}(2R) = 2^n \cdot \rho_{structure}(R).$$

2.3 Angular Intensity and Identity Closure

Definition 2.5 (Angular Intensity)**.** Let $C : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ be expressed in polar or spherical coordinates about x_0. The *angular intensity* is defined as:

$$I(r, \theta) := \frac{d^2 C}{d\theta^2}.$$

This quantity captures the second-order variation of contrast across angular directions, revealing curvature transitions and potential enclosure.

Theorem 2.6 (Completion of Identity via Intensity Collapse)**.** *Let x_0 be a resolved emergence point. If the angular intensity satisfies:*

$$I(r, \theta) \neq 0 \text{ for } r < r^\dagger, \quad \text{and} \quad I(r^\dagger, \theta) = 0 \ \forall \theta,$$

then $r = r^\dagger$ defines the boundary of a fully enclosed structure. The object is now a perceptual *identity:*

$$\beta_2 = 1.$$

2.4 Structural Inflation and Dimensional Emergence

Definition 2.7 (Structural Inflation)**.** Let x_0 be a resolved contrast point. *Structural inflation* is the process by which continued accumulation of contrast curvature across radial and angular directions expands the resolved region from a point to an enclosed volume. This continues until:

$$I(r^\dagger, \theta) = 0 \quad \forall\theta.$$

Definition 2.8 (Structural Particle)**.** A *structural particle* is a compact, enclosed contrast structure that emerges through:

1. Pointwise emergence: $\int_{B_\varepsilon(x_0)} \|\nabla C(x)\| \, dx = \rho_0$
2. Structural inflation over time
3. Angular intensity collapse: $I(r^\dagger, \theta) = 0$

At this moment, the form is enclosed and individuated: $\beta_2 = 1$.

Chapter 3

Topological Multiplicity and Relational Structure

3.1 Introduction

Following the emergence and individuation of structural particles, we now address the transition from singular identities to multiplicity and relation. This involves contrast bifurcation, angular divergence, and the formation of contrast-resolved loops.

The central topological quantity is the *first Betti number* β_1, which counts the number of topological loops. These loops are not assumed geometrically but emerge from persistent contrast pathways between enclosed identity units.

3.2 Bifurcation and Multiplicity

Theorem 3.1 (Pre-Resolution Bifurcation Constraint)**.** *Let x_0 be a point of initial contrast emergence and $r^\dagger$ the enclosure radius where $I(r^\dagger, \theta) = 0$. For a bifurcation to produce two side-by-side identity units, angular divergence must occur before $r^\dagger$:*

$$\exists\ r_b < r^\dagger,\ \theta_1 \neq \theta_2,\ \textit{such that}\ \left| \frac{d^2C}{d\theta^2}(\theta_1) - \frac{d^2C}{d\theta^2}(\theta_2) \right| \geq \delta.$$

Definition 3.2 (Contrast Bifurcation Threshold)**.** Let $\delta > 0$ be a fixed threshold. A contrast bifurcation occurs at radius r_b if:

$$|I(r_b, \theta_1) - I(r_b, \theta_2)| \geq \delta.$$

This condition must occur before identity enclosure ($r_b < r^\dagger$) for distinct structural units to resolve.

Definition 3.3 (Objective Class Resolution Condition)**.** Let two emergent structures be separated by distance d_{12} and located at distance d_{obs} from an observer in class $\mathcal{C}$ with threshold ρ_0. Then they are resolved as distinct if:

$$\int_{U_{12}} \|\nabla C(x)\| \, dx \geq \rho_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{d_{12}}{d_{\text{obs}}} \geq \alpha_{\rho_0}.$$

3.3 Betti Numbers from Contrast Structure

Definition 3.4 (Contrast-Resolved Betti Numbers)**.** Let $C : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ and resolution threshold ρ_0 be given. Then for each n, the n-th Betti number β_n counts the number of n-dimensional topological features (components, loops, volumes) that satisfy:

$$\int_U \|\nabla C(x)\| \, dx \geq \rho_0 \quad \text{and} \quad I(\theta)|_U \to 0 \text{ (for enclosure).}$$

If a feature is latent but unresolved, we write $\beta_n^* > \beta_n$.

Proposition 3.5 (Betti Numbers are Contrast-Relative)**.** *Contrast-resolved Betti numbers are not absolute invariants. They depend on:*

- *The contrast field $C(x)$*
- *The observer aperture A*
- *The threshold ρ_0*

Thus, $\beta_n(t)$ may vary with perceptual evolution.

Theorem 3.6 (Topological Individuation Requires Enclosure)**.** *Let latent contrast lobes U_i each accumulate sufficient contrast and collapse angular intensity. Then:*

$$\forall i, \quad \int_{U_i} \|\nabla C(x)\| \, dx \geq \rho_0, \quad I(\theta)|_{U_i} = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \beta_2(U_i) = 1 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \beta_0 = n.$$

3.4 Loops and Latent Relation

Definition 3.7 (Latent Contrast Loop)**.** Let U_1, U_2 be two enclosed identity units ($\beta_2 = 1$). Suppose:

- There exists a path γ from U_1 to U_2 with $\int_\gamma \|\nabla C(x)\| \, dx < \rho_0$,
- Their angular intensity derivatives are synchronized: $\frac{dI_1}{dt} \approx \frac{dI_2}{dt}$,

Then a latent contrast loop exists: $\beta_1^* = 1$.

Proposition 3.8 (Triangulated Latent Structure). *Let U_A, U_B, U_C be three identity units with synchronized intensity profiles and contrast paths between each pair satisfying:*

$$\int_{\gamma_{ij}} \|\nabla C(x)\|\, dx < \rho_0,$$

Then:

$$\beta_0 = 3, \quad \beta_1^* = 3, \quad \beta_2^* \geq 0.$$

If the interior triangle saturates in contrast:

$$\int_{T_{ABC}} \|\nabla C(x)\|\, dx \geq \rho_0, \quad \Rightarrow \quad \beta_2 = 1.$$

Principle 3.9 (Continuity Does Not Imply Unity). *A continuous structure with no internal contrast bifurcation satisfies:*

$$\beta_0^* = 1, \quad \beta_1^* = 0.$$

But contrast bifurcation within a continuous arc implies:

$$\beta_1^* = 1, \quad \beta_0^* \geq 2.$$

3.5 Waves vs. Contrast-Linked Multiplicity

Proposition 3.10 (Structural Divergence: Wave or Multiplicity). *Let a contrast structure emerge from a point and evolve over time.*

- *If new peaks appear near threshold spacing without enclosure: $\beta_0 = 1$, $\beta_1 = 1$, $\beta_2 = 0$ — a wave.*
- *If peaks bifurcate and individually enclose: $\beta_0 \geq 2$, $\beta_1 = 1$, $\beta_2 \geq 2$ — a particle composite.*

Theorem 3.11 (Topological Signature Theorem). *Let β_0^*, β_2^* denote perceived multiplicity and enclosure.*

- $\beta_0^* = 1$, $\beta_2^* = 1$ *indicates a single enclosed particle.*
- $\beta_0^* > 1$, $\beta_2^* = 0$ *indicates a projected wave.*

Chapter 4

Epistemology and Perception

4.1 Introduction

In classical epistemology, knowledge is treated as justified belief. In this framework, however, structure is not believed — it is resolved. Epistemic access arises not from propositional inference but from modulated contrast crossing a threshold within a bounded aperture.

This chapter develops a structural epistemology rooted in perceptual constraints. Here, the conditions for appearance, individuation, and falsehood are formalized through resolution dynamics, not mental states.

4.2 Foundational Epistemic Axioms

Axiom 4.1 (Epistemic Primacy of Contrast)**.** A structure is knowable only if modulated contrast exceeds a resolution threshold within the observer's aperture:

$$\int_U \|\nabla C(x)\|\, dx \geq \rho_0.$$

Axiom 4.2 (Perception is Structurally Gated)**.** Perceptual access is bounded and aperture-relative. No observer perceives totality. Knowledge of $x \in \Omega$ is only possible if $x \in A$ and $C(x)$ varies sufficiently over A.

Axiom 4.3 (Identity Emerges, It Is Not Presumed)**.** Objects are not postulated but resolved via sufficient contrast modulation. There is no object $o \in \Omega$ unless:

$$\exists U_o \subset A : \quad \int_{U_o} \|\nabla C(x)\|\, dx \geq \rho_0.$$

4.3 Definitions and Epistemic Events

Definition 4.4 (Knowledge as Resolution Event)**.** A subject knows a structure S if there exists $U \supset S$ such that:

$$\int_U \|\nabla C(x)\|\, dx \geq \rho_0 \quad \text{and} \quad I(r^\dagger, \theta) = 0 \ \forall\theta.$$

Definition 4.5 (Epistemic Event)**.** An *epistemic event* is a local change in Betti numbers induced by thresholded contrast:

$$\beta_n(t) \to \beta_n(t + \delta t).$$

Examples include:

- A form appearing from fog
- A sound emerging from background noise
- A touch resolving a latent surface

Definition 4.6 (False Perception)**.** A structure is perceived falsely if contrast satisfies emergence but fails enclosure:

$$\int_U \|\nabla C(x)\|\, dx \geq \rho_0, \quad \text{but} \quad I(r, \theta) \not\to 0.$$

4.4 Contrast-Relative Truth and Structural Objectivity

Theorem 4.7 (Contrast-Relativity of Truth)**.** *Let two observers O_1, O_2 have different thresholds $\rho_0^{(1)} \neq \rho_0^{(2)}$. Then structural emergence may occur for O_1 but not for O_2. Therefore:*

$$\textit{Truth is contrast-relative:} \quad \rho_0^{(1)} \neq \rho_0^{(2)} \Rightarrow \textit{Perception is observer-dependent.}$$

Corollary 4.8. *Truth is not what exists independent of perception, but what is resolved under thresholded contrast within a given aperture.*

Theorem 4.9 (No Knowledge Without Contrast Differentiation)**.** *If $\nabla C(x) = 0$ for all $x \in U$, then for any aperture $A \subset U$:*

$$\int_A \|\nabla C(x)\|\, dx = 0 < \rho_0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \textit{No discernible structure.}$$

4.5 Contrast-Based Reformulation of Epistemic Terms

Classical Term	Contrast Framework
Justified belief	Thresholded contrast resolution
Truth	Structurally enclosed contrast
Certainty	Supersaturated emergence ($\gg \rho_0$)
Objectivity	Invariance under contrast-preserving transforms
Falsehood	Sub-threshold contrast misinterpreted as identity
Sensation	Modulated contrast gradient

4.6 Intensity Typology and Structural Roles

Definition 4.10 (Spatial Intensity)**.**

$$I_{\text{spatial}}(x) := \|\nabla C(x)\| \quad \text{(governs where structure emerges).}$$

Definition 4.11 (Temporal Intensity)**.**

$$I_{\text{temporal}}(x,t) := \left|\frac{\partial C}{\partial t}(x,t)\right| \quad \text{(governs when events occur).}$$

Definition 4.12 (Angular Intensity)**.**

$$I_\theta(r,\theta) := \left|\frac{d^2 C}{d\theta^2}\right| \quad \text{(governs closure and individuation).}$$

Principle 4.13 (Perceptual Event Criterion)**.** *A perceptual event occurs when:*

$$\int_{t_1}^{t_2} \int_A \left|\frac{\partial C}{\partial t}(x,t)\right| dx dt \geq \rho_0.$$

4.7 Terminological Distinction: Intensity vs. Curvature Intensity

We distinguish:

- **Intensity**: First-order contrast rate (e.g., $\|\nabla C(x)\|$, $\left|\frac{\partial C}{\partial t}\right|$) — governs emergence.
- **Curvature Intensity**: Second-order contrast curvature (e.g., $\left|\frac{d^2 C}{d\theta^2}\right|$) — governs individuation and closure.

Angular curvature intensity vanishes at the boundary of form:

$$I_\theta(r^\dagger, \theta) = 0 \Rightarrow \text{Enclosure complete.}$$

4.8 Epistemological Scope and Limits

This framework is not a theory of belief or cognition. It is a theory of structural discernibility. It reframes appearance as a physically conditioned threshold crossing, governed by contrast rather than thought.

Principle 4.14 (Structural Epistemology)**.** *A thing exists — to an observer — if and only if its contrast curvature exceeds threshold across a perceptual aperture. Appearance is structural, not semantic. Collapse is projective, not mental.*

Chapter 5

Appearance, Collapse, and Higher Contrast Manifolds

5.1 Introduction

Wave–particle duality is traditionally viewed as a fundamental and irreconcilable aspect of quantum behavior. In this framework, we reinterpret the duality as a projection effect: a structural degeneracy that arises when a higher-dimensional contrast structure is perceived through a lower-dimensional aperture.

Collapse is not a change in the system's ontology — it is a loss of perceptual access to the full contrast topology.

5.2 Degeneracy of Appearance Under Projection

Principle 5.1 (Collapse as Contrast Degeneracy). *Let $C(x)$ be a contrast field over $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and let $P : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^m$ be a projection with $m < n$. The image $P(supp(C))$ may collapse extended contrast structures into degenerate, point-like appearances.*

Collapse is not physical — it is perceptual. The structure remains whole in n dimensions, but appears discrete in m.

Example 5.2 (The Pulse in Line-of-Sight View). A transverse contrast pulse propagating along the z-axis appears as a point to an observer who perceives only in z. The structure — though extended in y — is projected into a single peak of modulated contrast. Wave and particle become phenomenologically degenerate under projection.

Example 5.3 (The Ant on the Line). Consider an ant limited to a 1D line. Whether a particle or a curved wave passes by, the ant perceives only local peaks. Dimensional restriction compresses ontologically distinct structures into identical sensory data.

5.3 Perceptual Frame Expansion and Structure Recovery

When the observer's perceptual aperture expands (e.g., from 1D to 2D), latent structure becomes resolved:

- Angular intensity can now be detected
- Contrast curvature across width and height becomes visible
- Enclosure and structural identity emerge

Thus, what was once a "particle" becomes recognizable as a wave. Appearance is conditional on perceptual access.

5.4 The Contrast Manifold

Definition 5.4 (Contrast Manifold)**.** Let $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a higher-dimensional space in which contrast fields are defined. Observable structures are projections $\pi(\Sigma) \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ of coherent substructures $\Sigma \subset \mathcal{C}$.

$$\text{Particle or wave } = \pi(\Sigma) \text{ under restricted dimensional access.}$$

Principle 5.5 (Projection Limitation)**.** *Let $\pi_\rho(\Sigma)$ denote the projection of Σ into $\mathbb{R}^3$ under contrast resolution ρ_0. Then:*

$$\pi_\rho(\Sigma) \neq \emptyset \quad \textit{only when} \quad \int_{\Omega(x)} \|\nabla C\| \, dV > \rho_0.$$

Thus, access to higher-dimensional structures occurs only under high contrast gradients, localized geometries, or precision instruments — as in quantum systems.

5.5 Fragmentation and Inferred Wholeness

Theorem 5.6 (Fragmented Projection Indicates Higher Unity)**.** *Let $\{C_i\}_{i=1}^k \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ be spatially disjoint contrast components that:*

- *Exhibit synchronized contrast behavior*
- *Are not topologically enclosed*

Then there exists a contrast manifold $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{R}^n$*,* $n > 3$ *such that:*

$$\pi(\Sigma) = \bigcup_i C_i, \quad \textit{and} \quad \Sigma \textit{ is connected or enclosed.}$$

5.6 Waves as Resolved Strings

Let $\gamma : [0, 1] \to \mathcal{C}$ be a continuous contrast path (a string).

- If $\pi \circ \gamma$ appears as a bounded, unresolved peak $\to$ **Particle**
- If $\pi \circ \gamma$ exhibits periodic or extended contrast $\to$ **Wave**

Principle 5.7 (Resolution Principle)**.** *The string* γ *is ontological. Whether it appears as a wave or a particle is determined by:*

$$\int_\gamma \|\nabla C\| \, ds \geq \rho_0 \quad \textit{(resolved)} \quad \textit{vs.} \quad < \rho_0 \quad \textit{(unresolved).}$$

Waves and particles are not different substances — they are different perceptual access levels to the same contrast structure.

5.7 Topological Signature Revisited

Theorem 5.8 (Wave vs. Particle Signature)**.** *Let* $I(t, \theta)$ *denote angular intensity.*

- ***Structural particle****:*

$$\frac{dI}{dt} > 0, \quad \exists t^\dagger : I(t^\dagger, \theta) = 0 \ \forall \theta \quad \Rightarrow \beta_2 = 1.$$

- ***Structural wave****:*

$$\frac{dI}{dt} \approx 0, \quad I(t, \theta) \not\to 0 \ \textit{as} \ t \to \infty \quad \Rightarrow \beta_2 = 0.$$

5.8 Conclusion: Projection and Being

Wave–particle duality is not a paradox — it is a perceptual bifurcation. Collapse is not a rupture in ontology, but a reduction in access. What appears discontinuous may be part of a larger, continuous contrast topology.

Principle 5.9 (Ontological Coherence, Projective Appearance)**.** *The world is structurally coherent. Contrast fields live in higher dimensions. What we see depends on how — and how much — we perceive.*