How Mathematics Makes Objects: Observation, Identity, and a New Algebra of Concept Formation

Douglas C. Youvan   doug@youvan.com   www.youvan.ai   July 10, 2026

Based on the published mathematical paper:

Object Formation and Conceptual Resolution: Stable Quotients, Complete Refinement Lattices, and Functorial Observation. DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.25921.72800

Introduction

Mathematics usually begins with objects already in hand: numbers, shapes, functions, spaces, particles, organisms, images, or data. It then asks how those objects can be compared, combined, transformed, classified, or predicted. But an earlier question is usually left implicit: how did the objects become identifiable in the first place? Before something can be counted, measured, or transformed, a rule must determine which differences matter and which can be ignored. This article introduces an algebraic framework for that prior step. An observation policy groups states that count as the same, producing equivalence classes that become the effective objects visible at a chosen resolution. When the permitted transformations preserve those groupings, the resulting objects acquire stable identity and can support independent reasoning. Observation policies can also be ordered from fine to coarse, combined into a complete lattice, and transported between different state spaces. The framework therefore extends the reach of abstract algebra from the manipulation of already-given objects to the lawful formation, stabilization, refinement, and comparison of objects themselves. Potential applications include artificial intelligence, physics, dynamical systems, scientific classification, program analysis, measurement theory, and knowledge representation.

Keywords: abstract algebra, object formation, concept formation, observation, equivalence relations, quotient spaces, stable identity, conceptual resolution, complete lattices, category theory, abstraction, artificial intelligence, scientific classification, coarse-graining.

https://orcid.org/0009-0004-4206-4253

1. Mathematics Usually Begins Too Late

Open almost any mathematics textbook and the pattern is familiar. A set is given. A space is defined. A collection of numbers, functions, vectors, groups, or geometric forms is introduced. Once the objects have been named, the real mathematical work begins.

We ask how the objects relate to one another. We define operations. We study transformations. We search for invariants. We classify structures. We prove that one construction is equivalent to another.

This procedure has been extraordinarily successful. It has produced arithmetic, algebra, geometry, calculus, topology, probability, category theory, and most of mathematical physics.

Yet it begins after a foundational decision has already been made.

The objects have already been selected.

Before a mathematician studies triangles, someone must decide what counts as the same triangle. Are two triangles identical only when they occupy the same location? Are they considered the same after translation or rotation? Are triangles with the same shape but different sizes equivalent? Are continuously deformable figures still triangles?

Each answer produces a different mathematical world.

The same issue appears in algebra. Two expressions may look different while denoting the same number. Two matrices may differ while representing the same linear transformation in different coordinate systems. Two groups may contain different elements while possessing the same algebraic structure. Two topological spaces may be considered the same if a continuous deformation connects them.

Mathematics constantly decides which differences are important and which are dispensable. These decisions are often expressed through equality, equivalence, isomorphism, symmetry, or invariance. But the general process by which such decisions generate the objects of a theory is rarely treated as a subject in its own right.

The mathematics of conceptual resolution begins there.

Its central claim is that objecthood can be formalized.

An object need not begin as an indivisible, self-evident unit. It may arise when a rule groups many underlying states together and declares that their differences no longer matter for a particular purpose.

The object is then not a single state. It is a class of states treated as interchangeable.

This is already familiar in everyday reasoning.

A person recognizes a chair despite changes in viewing angle, lighting, distance, or color. A physician recognizes one disease category across patients with different symptoms and biological histories. A physicist treats many microscopic molecular arrangements as the same temperature and pressure. A computer program groups many different images under the label "cat." An astronomer treats observations collected at different times as measurements of the same star.

In every case, identity depends on a rule of admissible sameness.

The observer preserves some distinctions and discards others.

This does not mean that objects are unreal or arbitrary. It means that effective objecthood requires structure. A useful object must survive the variations that are supposed to be irrelevant while remaining sensitive to the variations that matter.

A category that changes whenever the lighting changes is not a stable visual concept.

A thermodynamic variable that requires complete microscopic information is not an effective macroscopic description.

A biological classification that merges organisms with fundamentally different causal behavior may be too coarse.

A mathematical abstraction that discards information required by later operations may fail altogether.

The crucial question is therefore not merely whether states have been grouped together.

The question is whether the grouping remains coherent under the transformations, predictions, measurements, and interventions that the theory intends to perform.

This is where abstract algebra enters.

Abstract algebra is commonly described as the study of structures and structure-preserving operations. Groups formalize symmetry. Rings and fields formalize arithmetic systems. Vector spaces formalize linear combination. Modules, algebras, lattices, and categories capture increasingly general patterns of relationship and transformation.

The present framework adds an earlier layer.

Before asking which transformations preserve an object, it asks which transformations preserve the rule by which the object was formed.

That shift moves algebra one conceptual step backward.

Instead of beginning only with objects and operations, we begin with:

a space of possible states,

a rule deciding which states count as the same,

and a collection of transformations that the resulting objects must survive.

The objects emerge from the interaction of those three ingredients.

This is the sense in which the framework represents a general advance in abstract algebra. The individual mathematical tools involved—equivalence relations, quotient sets, monoid actions, lattices, and functors—are classical. The advance lies in assembling them into a unified algebra of object formation.

The result is a theory not only of how objects behave, but of how stable objects become mathematically available.

2. Observation as a Rule of Sameness

Suppose we begin with a collection of possible states.

The states might be points in a geometric space, images in a database, physical configurations, biological measurements, computer memory states, or possible observations of an environment.

Call this collection the state space.

At the most detailed level, every state could be treated as different from every other state. But most theories do not preserve every available difference. They select a smaller set of distinctions relevant to their purpose.

Consider a simple geometric example.

Imagine all points in a plane. An observer measures only the distance of each point from the origin. The observer does not record direction.

Two points lying in different directions but at the same distance produce the same observation. The policy therefore treats them as equivalent.

Every circle centered at the origin becomes one observational object.

The underlying state space contains individual points. The observed object space contains radii, or equivalently circles of equal distance.

A different observer might measure direction while ignoring distance. In that case, all points lying along the same ray would become one object.

The plane has not changed.

The observation policy has changed.

Consequently, the objects available to the observer have changed.

This example reveals the fundamental sequence:

Observation determines indistinguishability.

Indistinguishability determines equivalence.

Equivalence produces classes.

The classes become objects.

In mathematics, the appropriate tool for expressing a coherent rule of sameness is an equivalence relation.

An equivalence relation must satisfy three conditions.

Every state is equivalent to itself.

If one state is equivalent to a second, the second is equivalent to the first.

If a first state is equivalent to a second, and the second is equivalent to a third, then the first is equivalent to the third.

These conditions are called reflexivity, symmetry, and transitivity.

They may appear elementary, but they are essential for object formation. Without transitivity, for example, a policy could declare that A is the same as B and B is the same as C while insisting that A is different from C. The resulting classes would overlap inconsistently and could not support stable identity.

Once an equivalence relation has been chosen, the state space can be divided into equivalence classes.

Each class contains all states counted as the same under the policy.

The collection of those classes is called a quotient.

The quotient is the effective object space.

This construction appears throughout mathematics.

Fractions such as 1/2, 2/4, and 50/100 are different symbolic expressions but represent the same rational number.

Clock times differing by twelve or twenty-four hours may occupy the same position on a periodic clock.

Vectors that differ only by nonzero scaling can represent the same projective direction.

Geometric shapes related by rotation may be treated as one symmetry class.

Programs with different source code may be considered equivalent if they always produce the same result.

Microscopic states may be grouped into the same macroscopic thermodynamic state.

In every case, many detailed descriptions are replaced by one effective object.

This replacement is a form of compression.

But it is not merely data compression in the ordinary sense. It is ontological compression: several states are made into one object because their differences are judged irrelevant at the selected resolution.

The policy determines what counts as identity.

That identity is relative to purpose.

Two images may be identical for a classifier but different for a forensic investigator.

Two physical states may be identical at the level of temperature while remaining different at the molecular level.

Two mathematical structures may be identical up to isomorphism while remaining unequal as literal sets.

Two pieces of music may be considered the same composition despite different performances.

Policy-relative identity does not abolish ordinary equality. Literal equality remains the finest possible standard. Under that standard, no two distinct states are identified.

At the opposite extreme, a policy could identify every state with every other state. That would produce only one object.

Useful conceptual resolutions usually lie between those extremes.

They preserve enough distinctions to support prediction, explanation, and action while discarding enough detail to make reasoning possible.

This balance is central to every abstraction.

A useful concept forgets differences that do not matter.

A dangerous concept forgets differences that later prove essential.

The distinction between those two cases leads to the requirement of stability.

3. When an Object Is Stable

Grouping states together is easy.

The harder question is whether the grouping supports lawful transformation.

Suppose two states are treated as the same object. A transformation is then applied to both states. If the transformed states still count as the same, the transformation respects the object's identity. If they become distinguishable, the original grouping was too coarse for that transformation.

This gives a simple but powerful criterion:

If two states count as the same object, every admissible transformation must send them to states that still count as the same object.

An admissible transformation is any change regarded as legitimate within the theory. It may be a physical evolution, a rotation, a measurement update, a computational operation, a biological intervention, a change of coordinates, or a modification of an input.

The relevant transformations depend on the problem.

For a visual recognition system, admissible transformations may include changes in lighting, position, scale, or viewing angle.

For a physical theory, they may include time evolution, symmetry operations, or changes of reference frame.

For a computer program, they may include valid execution steps.

For a biological classification, they may include growth, mutation, environmental change, or developmental transition.

An object is stable only relative to the transformations it is expected to survive.

Consider a classifier that identifies two images as examples of the same object. If a small change in brightness causes one image to remain in the category while the other leaves it, the classifier's notion of identity may be unstable under illumination.

The two images were grouped together, but their future classification depends on hidden differences that the grouping supposedly ignored.

The category does not support independent reasoning.

The same problem occurs in physical abstraction.

Suppose many microscopic states are grouped into one macroscopic state. If those microscopic states later evolve into different macroscopic outcomes, then the coarse description does not possess autonomous dynamics. To predict the future, one must recover information that the abstraction discarded.

The abstraction has failed to close.

This failure is not simply an inconvenience. It is a mathematical inconsistency at the object level.

A transformation of a quotient object should not depend on which representative of the object happens to be chosen.

Suppose the object consists of states A and B.

If transforming A produces object C while transforming B produces object D, then the proposed transformation of the original object is ambiguous.

Did the object become C or D?

There is no single answer.

The transformation acts on hidden states, not on the object itself.

Stable object formation occurs when this ambiguity disappears.

If all representatives of an object transform into representatives of one resulting object, then the transformation descends to the quotient.

The object can be transformed directly.

Its behavior no longer depends on inaccessible details.

This is the central result of the longer mathematical treatment: an equivalence relation produces stable quotient objects precisely when the admissible transformations preserve that equivalence.

The result can be understood without formal notation.

Treating two states as the same is justified only when every relevant operation continues to treat them consistently.

This criterion distinguishes lawful abstraction from destructive abstraction.

A lawful abstraction discards differences that remain irrelevant.

A destructive abstraction discards differences that later affect prediction, transformation, or action.

The distinction appears throughout science and technology.

A map is a lawful abstraction when the omitted details do not matter for the journey being planned.

A medical diagnosis is useful when patients assigned to the same category respond sufficiently similarly to the treatment associated with that category.

A scientific variable is useful when it evolves according to laws that do not require continual reconstruction of the microscopic system.

A machine-learning representation is useful when the features it ignores remain irrelevant under the changes the system is expected to encounter.

A legal category is useful when cases grouped together remain similar with respect to the decisions governed by the category.

In every domain, abstraction is relative to a task.

A grouping can be stable for one purpose and unstable for another.

Two objects may be equivalent for predicting their motion but not for predicting their chemical reactions.

Two programs may be equivalent in output but not in speed, memory use, or security.

Two biological organisms may be equivalent under one taxonomic scheme but sharply different under a disease-resistance policy.

Two images may be equivalent for object recognition but not for identity verification.

There is therefore no universal abstraction independent of what must be preserved.

Every abstraction silently contains a preservation policy.

The algebra of object formation makes that policy explicit.

It asks:

Which differences are being erased?

Which transformations must remain well defined?

Which predictions must be preserved?

Which interventions must produce consistent outcomes?

These questions provide a test of conceptual legitimacy.

An object is not certified merely because a label has been assigned to it.

It is certified when the label supports representative-independent transformation.

This also clarifies the difference between stable identity and fixed state.

An object does not need to remain unchanged in order to remain the same object.

A river flows.

A living organism replaces its molecules.

A storm changes shape.

A company changes employees.

A software process changes its internal memory.

A planet changes position.

Persistence does not require immobility.

It requires continuity of identity under admissible change.

The mathematical framework expresses this by allowing an equivalence class to move to another equivalence class in a well-defined way.

The class need not remain fixed.

It need only transform coherently.

This produces a more useful account of persistence.

Identity is not frozen substance.

It is preserved structure.

An object persists when the rules governing its transformations remain compatible with the policy that defines what counts as that object.

This perspective is especially important for complex systems.

In biology, cognition, economics, and artificial intelligence, the underlying states may change continuously. Stable objects are often patterns rather than immutable collections of material parts.

The algebraic framework does not require an object to be tied to one microscopic realization.

It requires the changing realizations to remain equivalent under the relevant policy.

This is why quotient objects can support effective laws.

Once stability has been established, reasoning can occur at the level of the object rather than at the level of every underlying state.

A physicist can reason with pressure and temperature without tracking every molecule.

A driver can use a map without representing every stone and tree.

A physician can reason with diagnostic categories without simulating every molecule in the patient.

A machine can manipulate symbolic objects without reproducing every sensory input from which they were learned.

Effective knowledge depends on stable quotienting.

The object is useful because it compresses detail without destroying the transformations that matter.

4. A Lattice of Possible Resolutions

Observation policies are not isolated choices.

They can be compared.

One policy may preserve every distinction preserved by another policy and also preserve additional distinctions. The first policy is then finer. The second is coarser.

A fine policy separates more states.

A coarse policy merges more states.

Consider a collection of colored geometric figures.

One observer may distinguish only shape.

A second may distinguish shape and color.

A third may distinguish shape, color, size, orientation, and texture.

The underlying collection is the same in every case.

What changes is the resolution at which objects are formed.

Under the shape-only policy, every red, blue, large, and small triangle may count as one object.

Under the shape-and-color policy, red triangles and blue triangles become separate objects.

Under the most detailed policy, each variation may form its own class.

Moving from coarse to fine resolution splits objects.

Moving from fine to coarse resolution merges them.

This gives a precise meaning to concept birth.

A new object appears when a previously unified class is divided by a newly preserved distinction.

The underlying states were already present.

What is new is the ability to treat some of them as belonging to different stable classes.

Object birth is therefore not necessarily the creation of new material.

It may be the creation of a new distinction.

This occurs frequently in science.

A disease once regarded as one disorder may be divided into several molecular subtypes.

A biological species may be separated into multiple species after genetic analysis.

A class of astronomical objects may divide into several categories when improved instruments reveal different physical mechanisms.

A substance once treated as an element may be shown to contain isotopes.

A psychological condition may be divided into distinct syndromes.

In each case, a finer observation policy creates additional objects relative to the previous conceptual system.

The reverse process is object fusion.

Several categories may be recognized as different presentations of one underlying structure.

Scientific unification often has this form.

Electricity and magnetism became parts of one electromagnetic field.

Apparently different geometries may be treated as instances of one more general structure.

Separate biological traits may be understood as consequences of one regulatory system.

Different computational procedures may be recognized as equivalent implementations of the same function.

Coarsening does not always represent ignorance.

It can represent discovery of a deeper unity.

The value of a resolution cannot therefore be judged merely by how many distinctions it preserves.

Finer is not always better.

A description that distinguishes every microscopic detail may be accurate but unusable.

A description that merges too many states may be simple but unreliable.

Scientific reasoning moves continually between refinement and coarsening.

It splits categories when hidden differences become important.

It merges categories when a common invariant is discovered.

It refines for diagnosis and coarsens for explanation.

It separates cases for intervention and unifies them for theory.

Conceptual progress is therefore not a one-way movement toward ever greater detail.

It is a structured movement through possible resolutions.

The important mathematical result is that these resolutions do not form an unorganized collection.

They form a complete lattice.

A lattice is an ordered structure in which different elements can be combined in two fundamental ways.

Given two observation policies, one can construct a policy that preserves all distinctions preserved by either policy in the appropriate combined sense.

One can also construct a common coarsening that identifies everything either policy requires to be identified, together with whatever additional identifications are needed for consistency.

In less formal language, observation policies can be systematically combined.

Suppose one observer distinguishes objects by color while another distinguishes them by shape.

A combined fine policy can preserve both color and shape.

Its objects might include red circles, blue circles, red squares, and blue squares.

A common coarse policy might ignore both distinctions and treat all figures as one category.

The policies need not lie along a single line from vague to precise.

They may preserve different kinds of information.

The color policy and the shape policy are not necessarily finer or coarser than one another. They are incomparable because each distinguishes cases the other merges.

The lattice provides a way to relate such incomparable viewpoints.

This is important because conceptual resolution is multidimensional.

Scientific disciplines often observe the same system through different variables.

A physician may classify patients by symptoms.

A geneticist may classify them by mutations.

An immunologist may classify them by immune response.

An epidemiologist may classify them by transmission pattern.

None of these schemes must be a simple refinement of another.

Each preserves a different family of distinctions.

The lattice of resolutions provides a mathematical environment in which such policies can be compared, combined, and coarsened.

At one extreme lies the finest possible policy.

Under this policy, every distinct state forms its own object.

Nothing is forgotten.

At the other extreme lies the coarsest possible policy.

Under this policy, all states form one object.

Nothing is distinguished.

Every practical concept system lies between those extremes.

The complete lattice contains every possible observational resolution and provides operations for moving among them.

This produces what may be called an algebra of distinction.

Classical algebra studies how elements combine under operations such as addition and multiplication.

The present framework studies how distinctions combine under refinement and coarsening.

Its basic elements are not numbers or vectors but policies of identity.

Its operations do not merely alter quantities.

They alter what counts as an object.

This shift has broad consequences.

It means that ontology can be studied algebraically.

An ontology is a system of recognized objects and categories.

Changing an observation policy changes the quotient object space and therefore changes the ontology available at that resolution.

The framework does not claim that reality itself is produced by arbitrary observation. The underlying state space remains present in the construction.

What observation determines is which effective objects become available for reasoning.

Different resolutions reveal different object systems within the same underlying variation.

A mountain can be one geographic object, a collection of geological strata, an ecosystem, a field of mineral concentrations, or a vast collection of atoms.

These descriptions do not simply compete for the status of the one true ontology.

They preserve different distinctions and support different transformations.

The geographic mountain is appropriate for navigation.

The geological mountain is appropriate for reconstructing its formation.

The ecological mountain is appropriate for studying habitats.

The atomic description is appropriate for questions of material composition.

Each ontology is relative to resolution and task.

The mathematical question is whether the corresponding quotient remains stable under the operations relevant to that task.

This combination of lattice organization and stability testing avoids two extremes.

The first extreme says that only the most microscopic description is real.

The second says that any classification is as valid as any other.

The algebra of conceptual resolution supports neither conclusion.

Coarse objects can be mathematically legitimate when their transformations are well defined.

Arbitrary coarse objects can fail when they destroy distinctions required for coherent dynamics.

Reality may support many effective ontologies, but not every imaginable ontology is equally stable.

The lattice organizes the possibilities.

The stability condition tests them.

Together they create a formal theory of conceptual resolution.

5. A General Advance in Abstract Algebra

The framework developed here uses familiar mathematical ingredients.

Equivalence relations are classical.

Quotient sets and quotient spaces are classical.

Transformation monoids are classical.

Complete lattices are classical.

Categories and functors are classical.

The claim of advancement does not depend on presenting any one of these constructions as newly invented. It depends on organizing them around a mathematical problem that abstract algebra has usually left prior to its starting point.

Traditional abstract algebra asks how already-defined objects can be combined and transformed while preserving structure.

The algebra of conceptual resolution asks how the objects themselves become defined, how their identity is stabilized, how they divide or merge as resolution changes, and how their identity policies move between representations.

That is a genuine enlargement of scope.

The central algebraic sequence is:

A state space provides possible variation.

An observation policy determines equivalence.

Equivalence classes form quotient objects.

Admissible transformations test whether those objects are stable.

Refinement and coarsening organize changes in objecthood.

The complete lattice contains all possible resolutions.

Categorical maps express lawful movement between them.

Functorial transport carries identity policies across state spaces.

This sequence creates a unified algebra of object formation.

The key innovation is therefore architectural.

Several branches of mathematics already contain pieces of this structure, but they generally employ them for other purposes. Quotients are used to remove redundancy. Lattices are used to organize order. Monoid actions describe transformation. Categories describe composition. Pullbacks transport structure backward along mappings.

The present framework assigns these constructions a common foundational interpretation.

Together, they describe how observation creates a stable ontology.

An ontology, in this context, is simply the collection of objects recognized at a given resolution. It need not be metaphysical. It may consist of geometric directions, biological classes, computational states, physical macrostates, perceptual objects, or categories in a database.

The framework makes ontology mathematically variable.

A change of observational policy changes the quotient and therefore changes the effective objects available to a theory.

This variability is not arbitrary because the resulting objects must still satisfy structural tests.

They must possess coherent equivalence.

They must survive admissible transformation.

They must support representative-independent reasoning.

Their refinement and coarsening must compose consistently.

Their policies must transport correctly between state spaces.

The resulting theory can therefore be described as policy-indexed algebra.

The word policy does not refer only to human choice. A policy may be imposed by an instrument, an algorithm, a physical scale, a sensory system, a measurement protocol, or a theoretical model.

Every such system preserves some differences and removes others.

The equivalence relation records that selection.

The quotient records its objects.

The admissible transformations record what those objects are expected to survive.

This makes the framework more general than a psychology of concepts.

It applies whenever a detailed domain is replaced by an effective domain whose elements represent classes of underlying states.

The advance can also be understood as a shift from element-centered algebra to identity-centered algebra.

Ordinary algebra often asks:

What can be done to an element?

The present framework asks:

Under what rule do many states become one element?

When is that identification lawful?

How does the rule of identity change?

How can two rules of identity be compared?

Can the same identity policy be used after changing representation?

These questions are algebraic because they concern relations, operations, order, invariance, and composition.

They are foundational because every theory must answer them, whether explicitly or implicitly.

Even equality is a policy at the finest possible resolution.

Isomorphism is another policy.

Similarity, behavioral equivalence, observational equivalence, and functional equivalence are others.

Mathematics has long employed multiple notions of sameness.

The algebra of conceptual resolution studies the space of those notions and the objects they generate.

This does not replace existing abstract algebra.

Groups, rings, fields, modules, algebras, and categories remain indispensable.

The new framework instead supplies a layer beneath and around them.

Before a structure can be studied, its elements and identity conditions must be established.

Before transformations can preserve an object, the object must have been formed under a policy that the transformations respect.

Before two structures can be compared, the relevant standard of equivalence must be chosen.

The theory makes those prior decisions visible.

It therefore extends abstract algebra from the preservation of structure to the formation of the structured objects themselves.

6. Potential Uses

The framework is intentionally general. Its immediate value is not that it solves every problem in the following fields, but that it supplies a common language for problems that are usually treated separately.

6.1 Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning

Artificial intelligence systems continually form effective objects.

An image classifier groups millions of possible pixel arrays into a much smaller collection of labels.

A language model treats different sentences as semantically related.

A robotic system identifies one physical object across changes in position, lighting, partial obstruction, and viewpoint.

A medical AI groups patients into diagnostic or prognostic classes.

Each system implements an observational policy, whether or not that policy is represented explicitly.

The quotient classes are the concepts available to the machine.

The stability criterion provides a direct way to evaluate those concepts.

Suppose two images are classified as the same object. If a small admissible change causes their classifications to diverge, then the concept is unstable under that transformation.

This is closely related to adversarial vulnerability.

An adversarial example exposes a mismatch between the equivalence policy learned by the machine and the equivalence policy expected by humans.

Humans may regard a slight perturbation as irrelevant, while the classifier treats it as object-changing.

Conversely, a machine may merge inputs that humans regard as importantly different.

The issue is therefore not merely classification accuracy.

It is the structure of the induced quotient.

The framework suggests that robust AI should make three things explicit:

which distinctions it suppresses,

which transformations its concepts must survive,

and which quotient-level operations remain well defined.

This could support more interpretable concept learning.

Instead of asking only what label a system produces, one could ask what equivalence relation the system has learned and whether that relation is stable under the transformations relevant to the task.

AI systems also operate at multiple resolutions.

A visual system may first distinguish edges, then shapes, then objects, then scenes.

A language system may distinguish letters, words, meanings, topics, and intentions.

These levels can be viewed as a trajectory through a lattice of observational policies.

Refinement introduces distinctions.

Coarsening creates abstractions.

The lattice structure may help formalize how machine concepts split, merge, and reorganize during learning.

6.2 Physics and Coarse-Graining

Physics frequently replaces detailed states with effective objects.

Statistical mechanics replaces microscopic configurations with macroscopic variables such as temperature, pressure, and entropy.

Fluid mechanics replaces molecular motion with density and velocity fields.

Effective field theories suppress high-energy details while preserving observable behavior at lower energies.

Renormalization studies how descriptions change with scale.

These are all forms of controlled identification.

Many underlying states are treated as equivalent because they produce the same relevant behavior at a selected resolution.

The stable quotient condition asks whether the microscopic dynamics induce coherent macroscopic dynamics.

If two microstates belong to the same macrostate but evolve immediately into different macrostates, then the macrostate alone may be insufficient for prediction.

Additional variables or a finer policy may be required.

This provides a general algebraic account of closure.

A coarse theory is closed when the future of a coarse object depends only on that object and not on hidden differences among its representatives.

The framework may therefore help compare levels of physical description without insisting that only the most microscopic level is legitimate.

A macroscopic object can be real and mathematically lawful when its identity and dynamics are stable under the transformations relevant to the macroscopic domain.

6.3 Dynamical Systems

Dynamical systems often group states according to long-term behavior.

Initial conditions that converge to the same attractor may be treated as one effective object.

States with the same periodic behavior may form another class.

Different points may be grouped according to orbit structure, recurrence, or asymptotic fate.

These groupings create quotient descriptions of dynamics.

The framework asks whether the proposed equivalence is preserved by time evolution.

When it is, the dynamics descend to the quotient.

The system can then be analyzed at the level of basins, attractors, or orbit classes rather than individual points.

This can reduce complexity while preserving the behavior of interest.

It also clarifies why some coarse descriptions fail.

A partition may appear meaningful at one moment but become scrambled by the dynamics. Such a partition does not define stable dynamical objects.

The system itself reveals which distinctions must be retained.

6.4 Computer Science and Program Analysis

Computer science already contains a closely related tradition in abstract interpretation.

A program may have an enormous or infinite space of possible execution states. Static analysis replaces that detailed state space with a smaller domain that preserves selected properties.

For example, exact numerical values may be replaced by signs such as positive, negative, or zero.

Memory states may be grouped according to whether an error is possible.

Programs may be classified by output behavior rather than by source-code form.

These abstractions must remain compatible with program execution.

If an abstract state cannot be updated consistently after a program step, the abstraction is not suitable for analysis.

This is precisely the kind of representative-independence required by stable quotienting.

The complete lattice of observation policies also parallels the ordered domains used in formal verification.

A finer abstraction preserves more information.

A coarser abstraction is computationally cheaper but may lose precision.

The general theory of conceptual resolution places these familiar computational methods inside a broader algebra of object formation.

6.5 Scientific Classification

Science depends on categories.

Biology classifies species, cell types, genes, proteins, and diseases.

Astronomy classifies stars, galaxies, planets, and transient events.

Geology classifies rocks, strata, and tectonic processes.

Medicine classifies symptoms, syndromes, diseases, risks, and treatment responses.

Chemistry classifies substances, reactions, phases, and molecular structures.

These classifications change as observation improves.

A category may split when new distinctions become visible.

Several categories may merge when a common mechanism is discovered.

The framework interprets such changes as refinement and coarsening.

A newly recognized disease subtype is a relative object birth.

The patients and biological states already existed, but the observational policy now preserves a distinction that was previously erased.

A scientific unification is often a coarsening that reveals several apparently separate phenomena as manifestations of one structure.

The lattice of policies offers a way to compare competing classifications.

Some may be incomparable because they preserve different distinctions.

A genetic classification and a symptom-based classification, for example, need not refine one another.

Their common refinement could preserve both forms of information.

Their common coarsening could reveal the broader categories they share.

This may be useful when scientific fields attempt to integrate incompatible taxonomies.

6.6 Measurement and Instrument Design

Every instrument implements a policy of distinction.

A thermometer ignores molecular positions and reports a temperature.

A camera converts a continuous visual scene into a finite pixel array.

A telescope suppresses some wavelengths and records others.

A medical scanner transforms three-dimensional biological structure into a particular image representation.

A sensor has limited spatial, temporal, and numerical resolution.

These limitations are not merely imperfections.

They determine the quotient object space available to the observer.

Two underlying states become observationally equivalent when the instrument cannot distinguish them.

Instrument design can therefore be viewed as identity-policy design.

The question is not only how accurate the instrument is.

It is also which distinctions it preserves, which it erases, and whether the resulting objects remain stable under the transformations relevant to the investigation.

Two instruments may use different encodings while implementing the same observational policy.

Conversely, instruments producing similar-looking outputs may induce importantly different equivalence relations.

The framework separates the presentation of a measurement from its underlying rule of indistinguishability.

6.7 Knowledge Representation and Data Integration

Databases and knowledge systems must decide when two records refer to the same entity.

One database may identify people by name.

Another may use a numerical identifier.

A third may combine birth date, location, and institutional affiliation.

These policies can produce different object spaces.

They may wrongly merge distinct individuals or fail to merge duplicate records.

Data integration therefore requires more than matching labels.

It requires comparing identity policies.

A mapping between databases is reliable only when it preserves the equivalences required by both systems.

The functorial part of the theory addresses this problem in general form.

A policy on one state space can be pulled back along a mapping to another state space.

In practical language, a criterion of sameness defined for outputs can induce a criterion of sameness among inputs.

This may help formalize ontology alignment, record linkage, schema translation, and the comparison of scientific databases.

6.8 Cognitive Science and Perception

Perception depends on invariance.

An object is recognized despite changes in sensory presentation.

A face remains the same face under changes in expression, lighting, angle, and distance.

A melody remains recognizable in another key or played by another instrument.

A spoken word remains identifiable across different speakers.

The nervous system therefore does not preserve every sensory difference.

It constructs stable equivalence classes.

The framework offers a mathematical language for these perceptual objects without requiring that all cognitive details be reduced to set-theoretic quotients.

It provides a foundational model of one central mechanism: multiple presentations become one object when they are treated as equivalent and remain coherent under expected transformations.

Concept learning may then be understood as learning both an equivalence policy and the transformations under which that policy remains valid.

7. From Observation to Discovery

The theory of conceptual resolution suggests a broader view of discovery.

Discovery is often described as finding an object that was already present but previously unknown.

That description is sometimes correct.

A new planet may be found.

A new particle may be detected.

A new species may be observed.

But many discoveries also involve creating a new stable distinction.

The discovered object becomes available only after a theory, instrument, or classification policy separates states that were previously grouped together.

Before isotopes were recognized, atoms of the same element but different masses occupied a less refined conceptual class.

Before molecular subtypes of disease were identified, patients with different causal mechanisms could share one diagnosis.

Before new astronomical instruments distinguished classes of transient events, several physical processes could appear as one phenomenon.

Discovery therefore has at least two components.

There is discovery of previously unobserved states.

There is also discovery of a better equivalence relation.

The second kind changes the conceptual resolution itself.

It creates new objects by stabilizing new distinctions.

A mature discovery calculus would study how such policies arise, how evidence supports them, how competing policies are compared, and how unstable classifications are rejected.

The present algebra supplies the foundational layer.

It identifies the structures required before a richer theory of discovery can be built.

Those structures include:

state spaces,

observation policies,

quotient objects,

stable transformations,

refinement orders,

complete lattices,

resolution categories,

and transport between representations.

The next stages could extend this framework beyond exact equivalence.

Real observations are often noisy.

Classification may be probabilistic.

Boundaries may be graded.

Two states may be nearly equivalent rather than exactly equivalent.

Different observers may possess only local information.

Policies may vary across time or context.

Several observational systems may need to be combined.

These situations may require fuzzy relations, metrics, probability, sheaf theory, enriched categories, higher categories, and homotopy-theoretic methods.

The exact theory remains important because it supplies the simplest case in which every construction can be stated clearly.

A general theory should first explain perfect identity before introducing approximate identity.

It should first explain exact descent before studying noisy descent.

It should first explain one stable quotient before studying networks of interacting observers.

The current framework therefore functions as a base layer.

It establishes that object formation is not merely a philosophical question.

It has an algebraic structure.

Conclusion

Mathematics normally studies objects after their identity has been established.

The algebra of conceptual resolution turns toward the earlier process.

It begins with variation rather than objects.

An observation policy determines which variations count as differences.

The resulting equivalence classes become quotient objects.

Admissible transformations determine whether those objects possess stable identity.

Refinement creates distinctions and relative object birth.

Coarsening removes distinctions and produces object fusion.

The collection of all policies forms a complete lattice and a category of conceptual resolutions.

Mappings between state spaces transport identity policies and connect different representations.

The framework therefore extends abstract algebra into a domain that precedes ordinary algebraic manipulation.

It studies how the elements of an effective theory become available as elements.

Its ingredients are classical, but their synthesis is new in purpose.

They form a general mathematical architecture for observation-induced objecthood.

The potential importance of this architecture lies in its breadth.

Artificial intelligence needs stable concepts.

Physics needs lawful coarse-graining.

Computer science needs sound abstraction.

Science needs revisable classifications.

Measurement requires explicit resolution.

Knowledge systems require identity-preserving translation.

Cognition requires recognition across changing presentations.

Each field confronts the same underlying problem:

When may different states be treated as one object without destroying the structure required for reasoning?

The answer cannot be that every grouping is legitimate.

Nor must it be that only the finest description is real.

A grouping is lawful when the distinctions it erases remain irrelevant under the transformations, predictions, and interventions that matter.

This is the central principle of stable object formation.

Abstract algebra has long studied what can be done with objects while preserving their structure.

The theory of conceptual resolution adds a prior question:

What must be preserved for an object to exist as a stable mathematical object at all?

Bringing that question inside mathematics is the general advance.

References

1. Youvan, Douglas C. *Object Formation and Conceptual Resolution: Stable Quotients, Complete Refinement Lattices, and Functorial Observation*. July 2026. DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.25921.72800.

2. Youvan, Douglas C. *The Mathematics of Concept Formation: Discovery Calculus, Explanation Geometry, Theory Dynamics, and the Formal Birth of New Objects*. July 2026. DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.23562.43209.

3. Birkhoff, Garrett. *Lattice Theory*. Third edition. American Mathematical Society, 1967.

4. Mac Lane, Saunders. *Categories for the Working Mathematician*. Second edition. Springer, 1998.

5. Awodey, Steve. *Category Theory*. Second edition. Oxford University Press, 2010.

6. Davey, B. A., and H. A. Priestley. *Introduction to Lattices and Order*. Second edition. Cambridge University Press, 2002.

7. Cousot, Patrick, and Radhia Cousot. "Abstract Interpretation: A Unified Lattice Model for Static Analysis of Programs by Construction or Approximation of Fixpoints." *Proceedings of the Fourth ACM Symposium on Principles of Programming Languages*, 1977.

8. Wilson, Kenneth G., and J. Kogut. "The Renormalization Group and the ε Expansion." *Physics Reports*, volume 12, 1974.

9. Gärdenfors, Peter. *Conceptual Spaces: The Geometry of Thought*. MIT Press, 2000.

10. Goodfellow, Ian J., Jonathon Shlens, and Christian Szegedy. "Explaining and Harnessing Adversarial Examples." *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2015.

11. Rosch, Eleanor. "Principles of Categorization." In *Cognition and Categorization*, edited by Eleanor Rosch and Barbara B. Lloyd. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1978.

12. Ashby, W. Ross. *An Introduction to Cybernetics*. Chapman and Hall, 1956.

13. Wiggins, Geraint A. "A Preliminary Framework for Description, Analysis and Comparison of Creative Systems." *Knowledge-Based Systems*, volume 19, 2006.

The author has published over 5,700 AI-assisted papers at: https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Douglas-Youvan/research . Google Scholar has indexed these preprints, and if you want a particular reference, the AI mode of a Google search (Gemini) has efficiently catalogued these preprints.