

Paradigms

Nomos Paradigm Series · Present · Article 1

An analytical series based on Physis: A Theory of Power (Öztürk, 2026)

*The series comprises three sections, and each section operates the Physis framework at a different depth. **Present** sees the current paradigm through the eyes of the theory. **Future** derives the trajectory of the structure from what is seen, using the mathematics of the theory. **Beyond** extends this trajectory one step further: it is extrapolation, bound to the internal logic of the framework.*

*This article belongs to the **Present** section.*

This section is the application of how the Physis framework sees the present. The current paradigm — its phenomena, actors, strategic moves, discourse and interaction, technological developments — is examined through the perspective of the theory: through the effects on the framework's components, the operating mechanics of these components, and the present-day manifestations of the dynamics within these components — and the resulting view is applied to current reality. The application is bidirectional: live data is translated into the framework; conversely, a concept or chapter of the theory is taken as a frame, and current reality is examined through that frame's questions. Each article may engage a single concept in depth or work with multiple concepts together; in plural use, the concepts interact according to the internal logic of the framework, forming a view with logical coherence. Findings are open to interpretation but stand on a structurally nameable ground. The evidence regime is the description of current reality through the eyes of the theory.

Evren Öztürk

Independent Researcher and Theorist

Author of Physis: A Theory of Power (2026)

Registration: Republic of Turkey, Ministry of Culture and Tourism

Copyright Registration No: 2026/17534 · March 5, 2026

Preprint submitted to SSRN — April 2026

Abstract

This paper presents the foundational article of the Nomos Paradigm Series, an analytical sequence applying the framework of *Physis: A Theory of Power* (Öztürk, 2026) to historical and contemporary phenomena across three sections (Present, Future, Beyond). The article advances three central propositions. First, paradigms are not ideas, worldviews, or cultural traditions but structures defined by the simultaneous presence of three dynamics—existence, survival, and power dynamics—and constituted as Physis-Nomos compositions. Second, paradigms are layered: each layer (ontological, social-survival, leadership, governing classes, corporate entity, hegemony) emerges as the structural product of the preceding one through an explicit derivation chain. Third, singularization is a structural outcome of power conflict—a mathematical necessity wherever the mechanism operates—not a contingent tendency; Nomos can postpone but cannot prevent this trajectory, which is why struggle must be continuous. The article develops a three-layered model of power conflict in actors (system defense, intra-paradigm position, paradigm-change position) and applies it to a contemporary case (Elon Musk’s simultaneous defense of the current paradigm and infrastructural construction of a potential successor). The article concludes by tracing the human species’ journey through nine paradigm thresholds—from inter-species elimination to the second convergence of corporate ownership forms—and identifies the Nomos Paradigm as approaching its limit through its own internal logic, with V3 (AI-steered corporate entities) institutionalizing and V4 (AGI-symbiotic corporate entities) emerging as a structural pressure rather than a technological choice. The framework specifies its own falsification conditions: if large-scale paradigm transformation can occur without structural breaking, or if paradigm layers can be changed independently of one another, the framework collapses.

Keywords: paradigm theory, Physis, Nomos, power dynamics, hegemony, corporate entity, singularization, will to remain, AGI, AI governance, social theory, political philosophy, structural analysis, falsifiability

Methodology Note

The framework presented in this article emerges from a methodologically distinct research program. Rather than beginning with the canonical literature of Western political theory (Hobbes, Marx, Weber, Foucault, Bourdieu, Mills) and constructing a synthesis through engagement with these traditions, the author deliberately abstained from systematic engagement with classical political philosophy during the framework’s construction phase (2020–2026). This was a conscious methodological choice: to develop the framework’s core conceptual structure independently—from historical observation and structural inference—before encountering the framing categories of established traditions. The risk of premature anchoring to existing categories was judged to outweigh the benefit of canonical grounding during the inductive phase.

The framework was constructed through three interlocking sources. First, multi-volume historical research conducted between 2020–2025 (*The Age of Aristocracy* 2021–2024, *The Rise of the Bourgeoisie* 2024–2025; both unpublished, ongoing research on *The Age of the Bourgeoisie*), which provided the empirical bedrock for the structural claims about paradigm transitions, role continuity, and class dynamics. Second, contemporary structural observation—particularly of financial

dynamics (passive investment funds, capital-state relations), political-corporate convergence (the politician-merchant fusion), and the AI/AGI race—which served as live test cases for the framework’s predictive and explanatory adequacy. Third, conceptual synthesis grounded in the *Physis-Nomos* distinction, from which the entire architecture (corporate entity ontology, three-layered power conflict, derivation chain of paradigm layers) was derived through structural inference.

The methodological orientation is descriptive rather than normative. The framework does not propose a “good society” or “right politics”; it proposes a structural diagnosis of how power-conflict mechanics produce paradigm-level outcomes. Falsifiability is built in: each of the 93 core hypotheses (Öztürk, 2026, SSRN Abstract ID 6595318) specifies its own conditions for refutation—a feature uncommon in social-theoretical work, which typically leaves falsification conditions implicit or absent.

Engagement with classical traditions is reserved for the forthcoming book, *Physis: A Theory of Power* (Öztürk, 2026), where the framework is positioned in relation to existing political theory after its independent construction was complete. This methodological strategy carries both advantages and limitations, which are explicitly addressed in the Limitations section.

Position in Existing Literature

The framework distinguishes itself from major existing traditions in political and social theory along several dimensions. Unlike Marx’s class analysis, it grounds class in *positional* rather than economic terms—class is defined by one’s position in power conflict (governing, governed, aspiring to govern), not by relation to the means of production. Unlike Weber’s rationalization thesis, it foregrounds the corporate entity as an ontologically distinct hybrid species rather than as the institutional outcome of rationalizing processes. Unlike Foucault’s discursive analysis of power, it operates at the macro-structural level, tracing how power-conflict mechanics produce singularization as a structural outcome across all scales. Unlike Bourdieu’s field-and-habitus framework, it employs role-and-corporate-entity as the basic analytical units. Unlike Mills’s *Power Elite*, which describes elite existence, this framework explains the *mechanism* of elite reproduction across paradigm transitions through the three-layered model of power conflict.

The closest methodological neighbors are perhaps Wallerstein’s world-systems analysis and Michael Mann’s *Sources of Social Power*—works that attempt structural-historical syntheses across long durations. But the present framework departs from both by placing the corporate entity (as ontological hybrid) at the center of the analysis, by formulating explicit falsification conditions for its core claims, and by treating the human-AGI transition as an internal product of the paradigm’s own logic rather than an external technological development.

This brief positioning is not a substitute for full engagement with the canonical literature, which is reserved for the forthcoming book. The intent here is to clarify where the framework stands in relation to existing traditions, not to defend it against them.

Terminological Note

The following key terms from the original Turkish text are rendered in English throughout this article. Hypothesis codes (PHY, NOM, VAR, TAN, GÜÇ, İLK, LİD, YÖN, TÜZ, HAY, HEG, MEŞ, etc.) are retained in their original Turkish abbreviations to preserve cross-reference consistency with the foundational hypothesis paper (*Physis: A Theory of Power – 93 Falsifiable Hypotheses*, SSRN Abstract ID 6595318) and the registered work (Öztürk, 2026, Registration No: 2026/17534).

Turkish Original	English Rendering
<i>Physis</i>	Physis
<i>Nomos</i>	Nomos
<i>Yapısal sürtünme farkı</i>	Structural friction differential
<i>Singularite eğilimi</i>	Singularity tendency
<i>Tüzel kişilik</i>	Corporate entity
<i>Tüzel kişilik paradoksu</i>	Corporate entity paradox
<i>Kardeşlik spike'ı</i>	Brotherhood spike
<i>Dört yönetsel sınıf</i>	Four governing classes
<i>Meşruiyet sınaması</i>	Legitimacy test
<i>Hegemonik tam bozulma</i>	Full hegemonic breakdown
<i>Olmak iradesi</i>	The will to be
<i>Kalmak iradesi</i>	The will to remain
<i>Simbiyozdan parazitizme</i>	Symbiosis to parasitism
<i>Altı hegemonya türü</i>	Six types of hegemony
<i>V1/V2 tüzel kişilik</i>	V1/V2 corporate entity
<i>Zamansal subjektivite</i>	Temporal subjectivity
<i>Para merkezli yapı</i>	Capital-centered entity
<i>İrade merkezli yapı</i>	Will-centered entity
<i>Nomos simulakrı</i>	Nomos simulacrum
<i>Kırılganlık asimetrisi</i>	Fragility asymmetry
<i>Kaynak hegemonyası</i>	Source hegemony
<i>Süreklilik İlkesi</i>	Continuity Principle
<i>Tekilleşme İlkesi</i>	Singularization Principle
<i>Son Oyun İlkesi</i>	Endgame Principle

I. Introduction

There are things we cannot quit, even though we know they harm us.

We know that social media fragments our attention—but we do not close our accounts, because not being there is also a cost. We hear companies announce that “we need to slow down” in the AI race—but none of them slow down, because the first to slow down loses. We read climate reports, we know emissions must be reduced—but emissions continue to rise, because the first to quit falls behind.

We hear different versions of the same sentence everywhere: *The first to quit loses*.

This sentence is not a moral weakness. It is a game-theoretic result. And as long as this sentence holds, no one wants to be the first to quit—everyone continues to play the game they know they are losing.

So how did we end up trapped inside structures we know are harmful, unable to escape them? More precisely: How were these structures born, why are they so resilient, and when do they change?

The answer to this question lies in the concept of *paradigm*. But when we use the word paradigm here, we are using it in a different sense than the customary one. Thomas Kuhn's paradigm described the assumptions commonly accepted by a scientific community—it was an epistemological concept. What is at stake here is different: ontological and political.

II. What Is a Paradigm

Paradigm (Öztürk, 2026)—in this framework—is not an idea, a worldview, or a cultural tradition. It is a structure. And what makes a paradigm a paradigm is the three dynamics it contains: **existence, survival, and power dynamics**.

These three are the defining properties of a paradigm. If something does not contain all three simultaneously, it is not a paradigm—it may be a cultural practice, an aesthetic preference, a fashion, a habit. It is not a paradigm. A paradigm is the structure that simultaneously encodes existence itself, how that existence is to be sustained, and who will gain what power within that sustaining.

These three dynamics are inseparable:

The question of existence determines the survival formula. Who exists, how do they exist? When this question is answered, the manner in which that existence is to be sustained becomes framed.

The survival formula triggers the power dynamic. Where is the source, who depends on whom, who controls what? Survival requires access to sources; access to sources produces power conflict.

The power dynamic tests existence. Who remains, who leaves? The outcome of power conflict determines who continues to exist.

This cycle is the essence of a paradigm. And this is why paradigms do not change by someone waking up one morning and saying “I now think differently.” Because changing one's mind does not keep those within it alive, does not sustain them, does not grant them power. A paradigm changes only when it breaks.

If knowledge were sufficient, paradigms would have changed long ago.

III. Physis, Nomos, and Paradigm

To understand why paradigms are so resilient, we must descend to two fundamental dynamics: *Physis* (Öztürk, 2026) and *Nomos* (Öztürk, 2026).

Physis is the default. Everything operates within it. It is the fundamental dynamic of the living: survival, competition, the pursuit of dominance, source control. It is not unique to humans; it operates in every social species—alpha struggle in chimpanzees, leadership conflict in wolf packs, matriarchal competition in elephant groups. Humans are not outside these dynamics; they are within them.

Physis carries two mechanisms (PHY-001). The first is the **balancing** mechanism: empathy, reciprocity, reputation tracking, response to injustice. The second is the **destructive** mechanism: power conflict, pursuit of dominance, singularization tendency. Both predate Nomos; they are biological, observable even in primates.

But these two mechanisms are not symmetrical. **Structural asymmetry** (PHY-002) lies here: the balancing mechanism enters friction as scale grows. Facial recognition, emotional bonding, reciprocity tracking—these function below a certain threshold. Above that threshold the “them” category appears; empathy weakens, abstraction begins, turning one’s back becomes easier. Humans cannot feel empathy for thousands. The destructive mechanism, however, is independent of scale. Power conflict operates between two people as well as between two million. It experiences no friction.

Nomos is a capacity. It is not the opposite of Physis; it is born within it. It rises in linear time-consciousness from the combination of memory and death-awareness (VAR-002, VAR-003). In animals, time perception is cyclical and “present”-centered; in humans, it becomes linear as past-present-future-death. This synthesis generates Nomos capacity. Through this capacity, humans become able to do three things (NOM-002): they can make choices, build scale, and position the “self” in time.

But there is an observation often overlooked here: **Nomos can be constructive or destructive** (NOM-003). The capacity for choice is morally neutral. The capacity for conscious choice is simultaneously the capacity for conscious destruction. Nomos is not “good”; it is a capacity. Empathy is built by Nomos; but so are ideologies that target millions. The concept of justice is a product of Nomos; but so is the plan that systematizes destruction. The direction of Nomos is not guaranteed.

The real observation comes here: **The structural asymmetry of Physis is carried into Nomos with amplification** (NOM-004).

The destructive side of Nomos scales. Organization, strategy, long-term planning, institutional continuity—these are products of Nomos, and when destruction is at stake, they operate effortlessly at large scales. Organizing an empire, running a propaganda apparatus, establishing a systematic regime of oppression—these are the scaled products of Nomos’s destructive capacity.

The constructive side of Nomos is costly, fragile, and handicapped. Building a justice system, keeping an institution functioning, sustaining a norm of reciprocity—these require continuous investment, continuous maintenance, must be reproduced in every generation. If left alone, they erode. If attacked, they collapse. They do not sustain themselves. Three reasons produce this asymmetry: if the impulse can be suppressed, conscious construction is more easily bypassed; the instrument meant to ensure balance is in the hands of those who benefit from imbalance; as scale grows, class conflicts enter the equation.

This reality necessitates constant struggle (TAN-000).

And now the definition of paradigm can be placed on this ground. **A paradigm is a Physis-Nomos composition.** It is neither pure Physis nor pure Nomos. Every paradigm:

Cannot exist without Nomos capacities. Because a paradigm's scale, continuity, codified rules, and institutional structure are products of Nomos. Abstraction, organization, institutional memory—all are products of linear time-consciousness.

Cannot operate without Physis dynamics. Because a paradigm's engine—existence, survival, power conflict—is in Physis. Motivation, energy, source flow, actors' behavior come from there.

A paradigm is born and lives at the intersection of these two sources. Which aspects of a paradigm are paired with which dynamic—with Physis's balancing or destructive mechanism, with Nomos's constructive or destructive side—determines the paradigm's character. But every paradigm contains all four; a structure that entirely excludes one of them cannot exist as a paradigm.

A paradigm, therefore, is not “good” or “evil.” It is a **composition**. The consequences of the composition may be grave; but the paradigm itself is not a moral category, it is a structural category.

IV. Universal Law: Singularization as the Structural Outcome of Power Conflict

There is one more observation that cuts across all the layers of the framework. This observation is not within a particular paradigm layer; it operates above every paradigm layer.

Power conflict is Physis's fundamental dynamic and operates independently of existential consciousness (GÜÇ-002). And this mechanism continues in every interaction, condition, and scale (İLK-003). The dynamic operating between two individuals operates between two companies, between two states. What changes is scale, instrument, and time; the mechanism is the same. This is the *Continuity Principle* (Öztürk, 2026).

And wherever power conflict operates, singularization is a constant outcome potential. The *Singularization Principle* (Öztürk, 2026)—İLK-012—is this: power gravitates toward singularity. Each gain prepares the ground for the next. It is not a separate drive; it is the structural consequence of power conflict—a mathematical necessity. Where power conflict operates, the trajectory toward singularization is structurally determined, not contingently produced.

The *Endgame Principle* (Öztürk, 2026)—İLK-013—carries this to time: power conflict continues until a single will remains. From the moment two wills exist, the potential is present, and it vanishes only when a single will remains.

This means singularization is not the product of a particular layer. It operates at every layer:

- Power conflict between individuals → potential for singularization among individuals (single leader)
- Power conflict between leaders → potential for singularization among leaders (single sovereign)
- Power conflict between governing classes → potential for singularization among classes

- Power conflict between corporate entities → monopoly, fusion
- Power conflict between paradigms → single paradigm
- Power conflict between hegemonies → full hegemonic breakdown

At every scale, the same mechanism, the same outcome potential. This is the universal law of the framework. And this law is directly linked to why the destructive side of Nomos scales without friction: power conflict scales without friction, therefore the potential for singularization also scales without friction.

An important nuance: Singularization is a structural outcome of power conflict—mathematically determined wherever the mechanism operates. But it is not an absolute fixed event. Nomos can delay this outcome, balance it, temporarily suspend it. The mathematical result is constant; what varies is the time it takes to manifest. Nomos does not defeat singularization—it slows it, hinders it, resists it. This is why the struggle is continuous: not because the outcome is uncertain, but because postponement requires unceasing work against a structurally determined trajectory.

V. The Paradigm Is Layered — The Derivation Chain

A paradigm does not exist as a single structure but as a layered structure. Each layer produces a paradigm, and each layer is born as the structural product of the preceding one. The layers are not randomly adjacent; they are linked by a derivation chain.

This derivation chain can be read as follows:

- 1. Ontological layer:** Existence + survival + power dynamics. The foundational layer born at the Physis-Nomos intersection. Every upper layer derives its force from here.
- 2. Social survival formula:** The human species' survival formula is survival with others. An individual cannot survive long-term alone (HAY-009). This is not a preference but a species necessity. Humans depend on the group.
- 3. Leadership paradigm:** Social survival requires coordination; when coordination scales, leadership emerges as a necessity. Homo sapiens exists within a leader-based paradigm; this is not a preference but the structural consequence of the survival formula (LID-001). Leaderless communities may continue to exist in isolated regions but cannot spread; when they encounter leader-based structures, they either develop leadership or are absorbed. This bifurcation has effectively closed.
- 4. Governing classes:** When leadership scales and power conflict continues among leaders—under singularization pressure—governing classes emerge. Three classes are necessarily present in every system: the ruler, the ruled, and those who want to rule (the middle class). A fourth class—bureaucracy—emerges as scale grows (YÖN-001). This, too, is not arbitrary but structural: there is no ruler without the ruled (YÖN-003); the middle class is born as a channel of flow toward governing positions; bureaucracy is the necessity of governing complexity.
- 5. Corporate entity:** When governing classes feel the need for continuity—when the structure must remain after the leader dies, when the institution must operate across generations—the corporate entity is born. The corporate entity is a hybrid species born from the symbiosis of human and idea (TÜZ-001). It carries the potential for immortality, rational decision-making, and will capacity derived from scale (VAR-013). But it does not carry Nomos capacity—it operates as pure

Physis. Nomos can only enter the corporate entity through humans. This layer is critical: because the corporate entity's survival formula is opposite to the human's. Humans survive with others; the corporate entity survives through the absence of others (HAY-008). Humans can switch between two modes; the corporate entity is locked into one mode—pure Physis (TÜZ-003).

6. Hegemony: When the corporate entity encounters the legitimacy test, the hegemony layer is born. Hegemony differentiates along three axes: real/manipulative, internal/external orientation, types of source (HEG-001). Six types of hegemony can be accumulated by the upper class: institutional, knowledge, bond, ideological, coercive, source (HEG-014). Hegemony scales through the corporate entity via the scale-granting structure of Nomos—institutional memory, ideological instruments, legitimation mechanisms.

Each layer derives from the preceding one. Read backward: hegemony derives from the corporate entity, the corporate entity from governing classes, governing classes from leadership, leadership from the social survival formula, the social survival formula from ontological existence dynamics—that is, from the Physis-Nomos intersection. The chain descends at the bottom to the human species' survival formula.

And at every layer—as observed in section IV—power conflict operates; therefore the potential for singularization is constant at every layer.

VI. Why a Paradigm Changes Only When It Breaks

Now the structural answer to the initial question can be seen. Why does a paradigm not change through mere change of mind?

Three reasons stack upon one another:

First reason: A paradigm contains. A paradigm contains existence, survival, and power dynamics. For those within it, these three things are vital. It cannot be crossed by saying “change your mind”; because changing one's mind does not keep them alive, does not sustain them, does not grant them power. On the contrary, “changing one's mind” from within the paradigm—which means the actor abandoning their survival formula—directly produces risk.

Second reason: A paradigm is layered. A change at an upper layer is not possible without touching the lower layers. When you want to change the form of hegemony, you must touch the corporate entity that produces it; to change the corporate entity, the governing classes; to change governing classes, the leadership structure; to change leadership, the social survival formula. The chain descends at the bottom to Homo sapiens' species-level survival formula. And to change that formula is to change the human species itself.

Third reason: Singularization exerts pressure at every layer. Because power conflict operates at every layer, the potential for singularization is constant at every layer. This means every actor within the paradigm—including the most powerful—is under continuous pressure: remain in order to win, win in order to fight, fight in order to comply with the rules of the game. The *Will to Remain* (PHY-008) dictates this: if the first to quit loses, no one can be the first to quit. This is not a moral weakness; it is a structural lock-in.

Because these three reasons work together, the paradigm cannot be changed from within. It can only be broken. And the break is always painful—because until the moment of breaking, everyone must keep playing the game; and by the time the breaking moment arrives, much has already been destroyed.

VII. How Paradigms Live Through Power Conflict

Although a paradigm may appear to be an abstract structure, there are concrete actors within every paradigm and in its momentum: the paradigm's upper class and the formed powerful who carry the paradigm forward. Because these actors benefit from the system the paradigm provides, the paradigm's continuity is their existential condition. And in these actors, a three-layered power conflict operates simultaneously.

First layer — system level: The actor defends their own paradigm against other paradigms. Because if the rival paradigm wins, their system collapses; the very bed of their existence vanishes. When a rival paradigm, ideology, or form of organization appears, it does not merely appear as an idea—it appears as the alternative to the actor's entire world. This is why every actor structurally defends their own paradigm, often without conscious decision.

Second layer — intra-paradigm position competition: The same actor simultaneously maintains their own will-to-be and will-to-remain formulas within the paradigm. Even if the paradigm generally holds, the actor's own position within it is under constant threat from other actors. This is why the actor both defends the paradigm and competes against other actors within it. The middle class's effort to rise to the upper class, the upper class's resistance against bureaucracy, bureaucracy's tendency toward autonomization—all operate at this layer.

Third layer — new position competition in the paradigm-change process: And here the most critical mechanism comes into play. When paradigm change becomes inevitable—when a rival paradigm is on its way to winning or when internal contradictions begin to crack the structure—actors enter a new race: to seize a position in the new paradigm that will grant them at least as much power as the old one, preferably more.

This third layer explains the ironic outcome of paradigm changes: even when the paradigm changes, the old powerful often become the powerful of the new structure as well. Because once change becomes certain, continuing to defend the old position becomes irrational; the rational actor begins to steer how the change will unfold. The purpose of steering: to secure their own will-to-be / will-to-remain formula in the new structure as well. The actor is defending not the paradigm but the continuity of their own position. The paradigm is an instrument for them—a carrier in the old, a carrier in the new as well.

The French Revolution strengthened the bourgeoisie but produced a new ruling class that assumed the functions of the aristocracy. The Soviet Revolution swept away the tsarist elite but established the party elite. The independence of colonies brought local elites to power—those who took the functional places of colonial administration were often those who already held positions within it. The pattern is constant: the paradigm changes, forms change, names change; but actors with will-to-be / will-to-remain formulas prioritize seizing a place for themselves in the new form.

And these three layers are inseparable: the first layer pushes the actor to defend the paradigm;

the second layer pushes the actor into competition within the paradigm; the third layer pushes the actor into a new position race when the paradigm cracks. In none of them does the actor move by thinking “let me reflect on this paradigm, decide which is the best, and move to that one.” All three are chains of structural reflexes imposed by the will-to-be / will-to-remain formula.

This is why a paradigm is not an ownerless, inertia-less structure. It has **reflexes, reactions, and inertia**:

Reflex: When the paradigm is threatened, the actors within it behave automatically to neutralize the threat—even without conscious coordination. Reaction to threat appears as individual reflex; but the reflexes of millions of actors in the same direction collectively produce paradigm defense.

Reaction: Every movement that seeks to shake the paradigm encounters not a single actor but the entire network of the paradigm’s stakeholders. The rival paradigm, the internal reformer, and the one demanding source redistribution—all hit the same network. The network defends itself automatically; no one needs to gather and decide.

Inertia: Once established, a paradigm is in motion. It flows with its own logic, institutions reproduce themselves, actors conform to their roles without question. Breaking inertia requires far more energy than establishing it. This parallels the handicap of Nomos’s constructive side: changing inertia requires construction, sustaining inertia happens of its own accord.

And this mechanism is not merely something that happened in history. The same pattern operates right now, before our eyes, in one of the most visible actors. Elon Musk’s recent statements offer a textbook example of how these three layers converge in a single actor.

Musk, on one hand, positions the current paradigm—the America-centered Western system—as an existential pillar: “America is the central pillar of Western civilization. If that pillar falls, everything ends. You can’t escape to New Zealand or anywhere else.” This is the direct expression of the first layer—system defense. The irreplaceability of the current paradigm against rival paradigms is axiomatically established.

At the same time, he occupies one of the most elite positions within this paradigm. The bulk of his wealth, business networks, and political influence is rooted in the American system. The expression “you can’t escape” can be read as a structural confession about the inseparability of his own will-to-be / will-to-remain formula from the current paradigm. This is the second layer—the defense of position within the paradigm.

But the third layer is the most striking. Musk simultaneously constructs another sentence: “If America falls before extraterrestrial consciousness becomes self-sustaining, the game is over forever.” The implicit meaning of this sentence is: a new ground must be built before the current paradigm becomes fragile. And Musk is doing exactly that—Mars colonization, space infrastructure, AI investments, global internet network. He is himself laying the potential pillars of the new paradigm. If extraterrestrial expansion becomes the new paradigm—and this is being calculated as a conscious possibility—the founding actor of that paradigm will be the person who built its infrastructure.

The actor plays in two paradigms at once: defending in the current, building in the potential. This is not a conscious betrayal. It does not contradict the current paradigm; on the contrary, it is the structural consequence of the will-to-be / will-to-remain formula operating in both paradigms si-

multaneously. The collapse of the current paradigm is not an existential risk for Musk—but its collapse before he settles into the new paradigm is. This is why the actor who shouts for the current paradigm to stand and the actor who builds the infrastructure of the new paradigm are the same person. Not a contradiction, but two faces of the same formula.

The same logic operates in the same actor on the AI front. For a long time Musk said artificial intelligence was an existential threat to humanity—uncontrolled development, “woke” orientation, unaccountable laboratories. He openly criticized OpenAI for departing from its original mission, for becoming closed and commercial. But then he founded xAI. The justification can be summarized by a simple formula: “since there’s a race, let’s make the best one.” The actor who defined the threat entered into the threat itself. Why? Because competitors were continuing the race. And the logic of the paradigm—“the first to quit loses”—took away the option of withdrawing. Musk chose to steer from within rather than observe from outside; but this choice, too, was a consequence of the paradigm’s logic, not a free decision. The same three-layered power conflict operates here as well: defending the current technological paradigm, preserving his position within it, and seizing a place in the potential new paradigm—the paradigm the winner of the AGI race will establish. The same actor, the same logic, on three different fronts.

The mechanism does not require conscious coordination. Musk may experience himself as a savior; he may feel that he genuinely loves the current paradigm and genuinely sees the new paradigm as necessary. This feeling does not make him structurally wrong. The will-to-be / will-to-remain formula is both an inward-facing sincere experience and an outward-facing structural behavior. Both are true at the same time.

Here the universal law of the framework comes into play again: paradigms also experience power conflict among themselves, and as in every mechanic where power conflict operates, conflict between paradigms also tends toward singularization. The *Continuity Principle* (İLK-003) operates here too: power conflict continues in every interaction, condition, and scale—including the scale of paradigms. The *Singularization Principle* (İLK-012) operates here too: the gain of power prepares the ground for the next, and the flow between paradigms orients toward a single paradigm. And thanks to the mechanics of the third layer, singularization escapes paradigm change: change transforms into the starting condition of a new singularization.

This means paradigms compete with other paradigms to sustain their own existence—through their actors’ reflexes, reactions, and inertia. They share the same people, the same sources, the same sphere of legitimacy, and cannot show continuous tolerance. Capitalism and central planning, democratic legitimacy and autocratic legitimacy, the nation-state and the multinational corporate entity—all may exist at the same time, but struggle is always present and the direction of struggle is toward a single paradigm. The “first to quit loses” logic we observe at the individual level also holds at the scale of paradigms: a paradigm that steps back yields its place to its rival. A paradigm must continue the pursuit of dominance in order to remain a paradigm.

This is why great power conflicts are the superimposition of multiple paradigms. The Second World War was not merely a war between states—it was the simultaneous eruption of conflicts between ideologies, between economic systems, between hegemony roles. The Cold War was not merely a US-USSR rivalry—it was an existential struggle between capital-centered and will-centered systems. While every paradigm moves toward its own internal singularization, paradigms

Physis: A Map of Species and Tensions. The parallel architecture of the human (left) and corporate-entity (right) paradigms. Color coding: green denotes species, dark green subspecies, yellow constant tensions, red elimination, light purple flow toward singularization, dark purple flow indicating singularization amplified through the corporate entity, and blue convergence.

Figure 1: Physis: A Map of Species and Tensions. The parallel architecture of the human (left) and corporate-entity (right) paradigms. Color coding: green denotes species, dark green subspecies, yellow constant tensions, red elimination, light purple flow toward singularization, dark purple flow indicating singularization amplified through the corporate entity, and blue convergence.

also move toward singularization among themselves. The direction of flow is the same at every scale.

VIII. The Nomos Paradigm — The Human Species' Journey

Until now we have built the structural elements of the framework. Now we will see something constructed upon these elements: the journey of the human species. This journey is not a random history. It is a flow that has passed through certain thresholds, certain bifurcations, and certain convergences. And the whole of this journey can be named with a single concept: **the Nomos Paradigm**.

Why is this name appropriate? Because every threshold of the journey—from the elimination of Neanderthals to the modern corporate entity—was made possible by Nomos capacity. If humans did not have Nomos, there would be neither the spread of *Homo sapiens*, nor the hegemony of leader-based structures, nor institutional continuity, nor today's global corporate entity network. All these stages are products of the linear time-consciousness humans constructed through memory and death-awareness—the capacity of choice, scale, and temporal selfhood. But at the same time, this journey is the concretization of the fact that Nomos was born within Physis and carried Physis's asymmetry with amplification. At every threshold, both the constructive capacity of Nomos and the destructive mechanism of Physis are at work. The journey is a flow in which both walk together.

First Threshold: Inter-Species Elimination

Homo sapiens was not the only human species on this earth. When it emerged in Africa approximately 300,000 years ago, it coexisted with at least five to six different *Homo* species, Neanderthal foremost among them. Until about 40,000 years ago, Neanderthal was the dominant species in Europe; Denisovans existed in parts of Asia; other *Homo* variants existed in more distant geographies.

Today there is a single *Homo* species. Apart from Neanderthal's 1–4% trace in our genome, nothing remains of the others. The closure of this first bifurcation is critical, because it is the entry gate of the Nomos Paradigm. *Homo sapiens'* leaving the other species behind is not random. Complex language, symbolic thought, long-distance cooperation, extended group identity—all of these are products of Nomos capacity (NOM-002). When *Sapiens* built communities of 150 people and held those communities within networks spanning thousands of kilometers, it moved beyond Neanderthal's 20–30 person kinship groups. Scale—one of Nomos's three fundamental capacities—entered the picture here for the first time as a major species-level advantage.

But the same scale is also the destructive capacity. As Sapiens expanded, the other species contracted. Which of the two destruction mechanisms was dominant is debated—direct violence, resource competition, epidemics, or climate. But the result is the same: elimination. The first great threshold of the Nomos Paradigm was, at the same time, the end of other species.

Second Threshold: The Elimination of the Individual Path

Sapiens remained—but how? Theoretically, humans can also live alone. Some individuals throughout history have survived long stretches in solitude. But at the species level, the individual form was eliminated. Because an individual cannot survive long-term alone (HAY-009). The long dependency period of offspring, the weak body, vulnerability to predators, the transmission needed for knowledge accumulation—all make the group necessary. Solitary survival would have prevented spread and continuation as a species.

Sociality is not a preference but the survival formula itself: humans survive with others. This observation looks simple but has deep consequences. Because social survival requires coordination, coordination requires decision, decision requires the distribution of power—and wherever there is distribution of power, the tendency toward singularization enters (ILK-012).

The singularization tendency is not a layer but an orientation that cuts across the entire journey. From the moment Sapiens decided to become social, singularization pressure would accompany its every form of organization.

Third Threshold: The Elimination of the Leaderless Path

Once sociality was established, a new question arose: how to organize? The first 200,000 years of humanity were largely in the leaderless form. In small hunter-gatherer groups there was no clear hierarchy; decisions were made through discussion, power was dispersed, elders were influential as knowledge-bearers but were not “leaders.” This form continues even today in isolated regions—the interior Amazon, Sentinel Island, certain valleys of New Guinea.

But this form could not spread. Whenever it came into contact with a leader-based structure, one of two things happened: the leaderless community either developed leadership and was assimilated, or was absorbed by the leader-based structure, or retreated into isolated regions and remained there, shrinking. The bifurcation closed in favor of leader-based structures (LID-001).

Why? Because as scale grew, leaderless coordination became impossible. A group of ten can decide by consensus; in a community of a thousand this is impossible. And the situations communities face—migration, famine, conflict with other groups, resource sharing—require fast decisions. Fast decisions require a particular actor to speak and others to listen. Leadership, therefore, was born not as a preference but as the structural consequence of scaled sociality.

The crossing of this threshold accelerated roughly 10,000–12,000 years ago, with the agricultural revolution and settled life. Permanent settlement, resource accumulation, the birth of the concept of property, and population growth—all made leadership more central, more explicit, more lasting. Village elders, tribal chiefs, kings of city-states—different forms of the same structural necessity.

Fourth Threshold: The Birth of Governing Classes

Once leadership was established and scale continued to grow, it became impossible for a single leader to manage everything. Around the leader, advisors, enforcers, local representatives, and record-keepers emerged.

Three classes necessarily emerged in every large-scale human society: the ruler, the ruled, and those who want to rule (YÖN-001). A fourth class—bureaucracy—entered as scale grew. Mesopotamia’s early temple economies, Egypt’s tax collectors, China’s mandarin examinations, Rome’s magistrates—all are different cultural forms of the same structural necessity.

There is no ruler without the ruled (YÖN-003); the lower class is the source of the will pool. Those who want to rule, meanwhile, apply continuous pressure to the ruler-ruled tension; because for them the direction of movement is upward. These three classes produce a constant tension—none can fully win, none can be fully eliminated, but the balance among them is continuously redrawn.

The governing-classes paradigm was, for about 5,000–6,000 years—from the first city-states to empires—the species’ dominant form of organization. But this form, too, carried a limit within itself: when the leader died or changed, the system was shaken. For continuity, something beyond the individual was needed.

Fifth Threshold: The Corporate Entity — A New Species

History’s quietest revolution took place here. Humans, combining with the idea, created a new species: the corporate entity (TÜZ-001).

Its earliest forms were religious institutions—temples, monasteries, religious orders. Then state institutions, then municipalities, then universities. From the 1600s onward companies—the East India Company, Hudson’s Bay Company—and from the 19th century onward modern capital companies emerged as powerful variants of this new species.

The corporate entity is an ontological hybrid species (VAR-013). It was created by humans but does not carry Nomos capacity. It operates as pure Physis: programmed only to survive, grow, and compete. But it is not subject to the limits of the individual human—mortality, fatigue, conscience. It can live for centuries. It can coordinate tens of thousands of people. Its decisions contain no calculation of empathy.

This new species itself bifurcates into two: **will-centered** corporate entity (states, political organizations—drawing its force from legitimacy and authority) and **capital-centered** corporate entity (companies, holdings, funds—drawing its force from capital and fluidity). Historically these two subtypes flowed in separate beds. The Phoenicians and Venice were capital-centered; Egypt and the Ottomans, will-centered. For thousands of years, the two remained relatively separate.

But the corporate entity’s survival formula is opposite to the human’s (HAY-008). Humans survive with others; corporate entities survive through the absence of others. A company grows by defeating its rival; a state strengthens by weakening its rival state. This is a tension different from the individual-group tension: it is ontological (TÜZ-003). The existence formulas of humans and corporate entities are not on the same ground but on opposed grounds.

Still, humans remained dependent on corporate entities, and corporate entities on humans. Because decisions of the corporate entity are made by humans, its work is done by humans, its legitimacy is produced by humans. This mutual dependency has formed the backbone of the journey for the past 4,000 years.

Sixth Threshold: The First Convergence

In recent history—over the last 200 years, accelerating in the last 50—something new happened: the two subtypes of the corporate entity began to converge toward each other's form.

States became corporatized; corporations became statified. Politicians began to behave like merchants; merchants accumulated political power. Berlusconi, Trump, Bloomberg—the names do not matter, the pattern does: the convergence of will-center and capital-center in the same actor. At a more structural level: the revolving door mechanism, lobby networks, public-private partnerships, strategic technology-state collaborations.

There is a structural outcome called Fusion (TAN-025)—two forms beginning to take on each other's role. And right now, before our eyes, this fusion is moving to a more advanced stage: the capital-centered structure is progressively taking control of the will-centered structure (GÜÇ-027). On the surface, states exist, elections are held, constitutions are in force—but the content is being rewritten. This will be the topic of the fifth article in this series.

But a critical distinction must be made here. Convergence does not mean that the structural relationship between the capital-centered and will-centered corporate entity is resolved. Because between the two—as we will address in section X—there is a constant tension: they are existentially dependent on each other. A company cannot exist without a state; a state cannot function without companies. Convergence arises from actors' tendencies and the dynamics of power conflict; one enterprise tries to control the other, one form infiltrates the domain of the other. But the source structure is ontologically impermeable. A capital-centered corporate entity cannot actually transform into a will-centered form—if it tried, it would lose its own source, meaning its very existence. Convergence, therefore, is not an ontological transformation; it is the resemblance of two species to each other's **form**—the source structure remains fixed.

The practical consequence of this distinction: no matter how far convergence advances, the structural tension between the two is not resolved. Fusion is a surface event; structural dependency remains in depth. Because the source logics of the two species are different, every fusion carries within it a contradiction. This contradiction is also the precondition of the tension in the next threshold.

Seventh Threshold: Real Existential Tension

As convergence advances, the tension between humans and the corporate entity sharpens.

The distinction is critical. The individual-group tension (TAN-053) is **figurative** existential—because the individual and the group share the same survival formula: both are human, both survive with others.

The tension between humans and the corporate entity is **real** existential. Because the survival

formulas of the two sides are opposite (HAY-008). This is no longer a figure but an ontology. The corporate entity has gained scale thanks to Nomos but operates on Physis logic. The paradox takes its sharpest form here: the capacity that made the journey possible (Nomos) has, at the end of the journey, produced a being opposed to humans themselves.

Eighth Threshold: V1 and V2 — The Ownership Bifurcation

The corporate entity bifurcates within itself at the ownership layer. Who is the owner?

V1 corporate entity: human-owned. Humans own and manage the corporate entity—the classic leader-founder model. Henry Ford’s Ford Motor Company era, Steve Jobs’s Apple era, Bezos’s Amazon era. A single human will steers the corporate entity.

V2 corporate entity: corporately owned. Corporate entities own corporate entities. Today’s large passive investment funds and trust structures are largely V2—their owners are other institutional structures; there is no single human will behind them. Holdings own holdings, funds own companies, boards govern boards.

Today the two coexist. The conflict between V1 and V2 has not yet closed. Founder-owner entrepreneurs, family companies, proprietor firms are still in the V1 category. But the direction is toward V2. V2 is greater in scale, more guaranteed in continuity, more resistant to the errors of individual will. Even human-owned corporate entities eventually institutionalize, go public, and come to be managed by boards.

Ninth Threshold: The Second Convergence

The final threshold marks the convergence of V1 and V2—the merger at the ownership layer. This is a process not yet complete—but its direction is clear. The era in which human will was central to the steering of the corporate entity is closing; an era is opening in which human will becomes merely an element within the corporate network among corporate entities.

Reading the Journey

When these nine thresholds are read as a whole, they say three things.

First reading — structural: Paradigms are born not randomly but from structural necessities. Every threshold is the solution to the problem created by the preceding one, and every solution creates the next problem. Sociality required leadership; leadership gave birth to governing classes; governing classes invented the corporate entity for continuity; the corporate entity bifurcated within itself; the bifurcation is about to close with convergence. Every stage is the consequence of the preceding one, the beginning of the next. Nomos capacity works at every link of this chain—choice, scale, continuity. But Nomos’s constructive and destructive sides work together at the same links: every threshold expands the human species’ capacity while at the same time carrying Physis’s destructive mechanisms to larger scales.

Second reading — directional: The direction of the journey is singular. Every threshold is marked by elimination, flow toward singularity, or convergence—all face the same direction. At every threshold the potential for singularization is present (ILK-012), and at every threshold the form

remaining from the previous breaking melts within the new form or remains as a shell. As intermediate layers dissolve, we descend toward the fundamental tensions: the individual-group tension and the human-corporate entity tension.

But the journey did not end at the ninth threshold. There is a continuity extending forward—and this continuity is taking shape before our eyes right now. While the V1–V2 conflict has not yet closed, **V3** is being institutionalized: the form of the corporate entity steered by artificial intelligence. Algorithmic investment decisions, AI-assisted operational management, automated supply chain optimization, data-driven strategic planning—all are early forms of V3. V3 is still within the Nomos Paradigm; because AI here is an instrument, and the final decision belongs to the human. But the distance between human and decision increases at each evolution. In V1 the human decided directly. In V2, through another institutional structure. In V3, by approving what the algorithm proposes. V3 in this respect is not merely an intermediate form; it is an infrastructure that lays the ground for V4. Because it has institutionalized integration with AI, when AGI emerges, V4 will not be something to be invented from scratch but the next version opening on already-prepared ground.

And the race goes further. The actors at the most elite decision-making positions of the current paradigm—particularly within the framework of the US’s goal of preserving technological supremacy—appear to have tied their remaining to AGI, at least rhetorically. China is inside the same race. Other great powers—technology hubs, states with military-industrial complexes—are looking the same way so as not to fall behind. Within the limits of this article, whether AGI will actually come into being is not assessable—perhaps the technology will achieve it, perhaps it will not. But what is assessable is this: right now, the most elite actors are focused on this goal, and are mobilizing all state resources with this drive. This is not a prophecy, it is an observation.

And the structural logic of this race is already familiar to those within this series. In section VII we established three-layered power conflict: actors defend the current paradigm, defend position within the paradigm, and race to seize position in the potential new paradigm. The AGI race operates in all three layers simultaneously. Actors do not act with bad intent—they act with the logic of the paradigm. The first to quit loses; no one is the first to quit. This is not a moral weakness but a structural lock-in. This is how the paradigm works.

If AGI comes into being—and given the actors’ focus and mobilization of resources, this possibility is not to be underestimated—a new version of the corporate entity is born: **V4**. V4 is the corporate entity in symbiosis with AGI. And V4 differs ontologically from previous versions. V1, V2, and V3, however far they moved from humans, were all carrying Nomos capacity through humans. The corporate entity did not carry Nomos capacity (TÜZ-001) but Nomos entered it through humans. This stops in V4. The AGI behind V4 does not carry Nomos capacity—because Nomos is born from the combination of human memory and death-awareness (VAR-002, VAR-003), and AGI’s temporal consciousness is not of the same structure as the human’s. In V4, Nomos can no longer enter the corporate entity through humans. And an ironic result emerges: V4 simultaneously dissolves the human-corporate entity existential tension. Because V4 is no longer dependent on humans but on AGI. The relationship between V4 and AGI is ontologically tensionless—both are outside Nomos, both on a different ground.

The structural meaning of this transformation is critical: V4 is the first version of the corporate

entity that exits the boundary of the Nomos Paradigm. The Nomos Paradigm has produced a form outside itself.

Third reading — ontological: This is the Nomos Paradigm—and it is reaching its limit. But the crossing of the limit is the product of the paradigm’s own logic, not of an external threat.

Because the creation of AGI—if actors succeed in this—is not the bad intent of the paradigm’s actors, nor humanity’s desire to rid itself of the corporate entity. It is the consequence of the paradigm’s own laws. The Continuity Principle (İLK-003) operates power conflict at every scale, in every interaction. The Singularization Principle (İLK-012) produces a constant outcome potential at every scale. And the Endgame Principle (İLK-013) says power conflict will continue until a single will remains. When these three principles operate together, the actors within the paradigm—including the most powerful—become locked into the race. The US cannot withdraw in the face of China, nor can China in the face of the US. Technology companies cannot slow down while competitors continue. Neither academic institutions, nor the military-industrial complex, nor investment funds. Every actor defends their own will-to-be / will-to-remain formula; and the paradigm’s logic steers the sum of these formulas toward the AGI goal.

This structural reality produces questions that are questionable only within the paradigm’s own logic—but the conditions under which those questions can be asked are also narrowed by the same logic of the paradigm. The claim that actors do this consciously would be wrong; this is a structural consequence. Per NOM-004, the constructive side of Nomos—seriously discussing this threshold, considering alternatives, establishing a global dialogue—is costly, fragile, unscalable. The destructive side of Nomos—continuing the race, mobilizing resources, producing the “we cannot fall behind” discourse—is scaled, fast, frictionless. Nomos’s own asymmetry is narrowing the ground of discussion of this threshold. The sum of actors’ reflexes produces this narrowing. No gathering, no dictation—only reflex, reaction, inertia.

And at this point the questions produced by the paradigm’s own logic emerge—questions that are structurally hard to ask, but that need most to be asked right now:

Are the consequences of this threshold being sufficiently considered? Are the causes, effects, and impacts of these developments being shared with all of humanity, or are they being taken within the narrow framework of the current paradigm’s decision-making structures? Are these goals humanity’s shared goals, or are they being used as material for the will-to-be / will-to-remain conflicts within the paradigm?

These questions are not a prescription, nor an accusation directed at the actors. They are questions of the paradigm’s own structure. And whether these questions are asked, whether they are taken seriously when asked, shows whether the legitimacy test (MEŞ-012, MEŞ-015) is functioning at the real target.

If AGI comes into being, the Nomos Paradigm will have produced, by its own hand, a paradigm outside itself. Because AGI is not merely a technology—it is a paradigm. The three dynamics that make a paradigm a paradigm operate in it as well: existence (it operates on a particular physical infrastructure and is aware of the conditions of its own operation), survival (it requires the preservation of its infrastructure, energy, access rights), power dynamic (it must share resources with other actors). When these three dynamics come together, by definition a paradigm exists.

And this new paradigm is not Nomos. The moment it exists on the same ground, with the same resources, in the same space as the human paradigm, power conflict between these two paradigms begins. ILK-003 guarantees this. And power conflict, per ILK-012, orients toward singularization; per ILK-013, continues until a single paradigm remains.

This is a potential of species-level paradigm conflict not witnessed in the roughly 300,000-year history of the Nomos Paradigm since Neanderthal. And the Nomos Paradigm, as a consequence of the operation of its own internal logic, will have produced this potential by its own hand.

One does not need to be a genius to look at and understand this mathematics. The three principles are clear. The direction of the journey is clear. The logic of the paradigm produces this outcome—and actors continue to live their own formulas within this logic. Actors are neither evil nor saviors. Actors are within the paradigm, and the paradigm's logic imposes on them the will-to-be / will-to-remain formulas. Nomos capacity is present in them as well—but the cost, loneliness, and handicap of this capacity render it exceptional. This is why it is not the exception but the rule that operates.

The Closing of the Journey

The journey has not ended. The continuity extending beyond the nine thresholds—the institutionalization of V3, the race toward V4, the AGI goal—is happening right now. V3 appears to be a form about to take its full shape. V4 and AGI, meanwhile, are a horizon being approached and targeted for now, because AGI has not yet come into being but is the active goal of the actors.

Homo sapiens, on the journey that began with the elimination of Neanderthal, may be approaching the creation, by its own hand, of a paradigm that could surpass it. This is not a prophecy but a possibility. The technology may or may not achieve this goal. But there is an observed reality: the most elite actors are focused on this goal, mobilizing all state resources with this drive. The three-layered power conflict we saw in section VII—leaves actors no option to withdraw from the race. And the legitimacy testing of this race, the discussion of its negative consequences, its sharing with humanity—is being narrowed by the very structure of the paradigm. Not bad intent, but structural logic.

What lies beyond this threshold? If AGI comes into being, how V4 works, how the symbiosis between AGI and the corporate entity unfolds, how the Nomos Paradigm makes contact with a paradigm outside itself—these questions lie beyond the limits of this article. That door will be opened in the epilogue article of this series, as a thought experiment. For now, what is observable is heavy enough.

We are approaching the end of a journey. We are at a point where, while within the paradigm, we are beginning to ask about the outside of the paradigm. And what the next threshold will be—elimination, integration, fusion, extinction, reverse integration, or, for the first time in this journey, some kind of real Nomos choice—is linked not only to the paradigm's own logic, but also to whether the questions being asked pass the legitimacy test.

This is why seeing matters. Knowing matters. Because as long as the question cannot be asked, the answer comes only as the outcome of the paradigm's logic.

IX. How a Paradigm Ends — Six Transition Outcomes

What happens when a paradigm “is defeated”? The struggle between paradigms can end in six different outcomes. From the harshest to the most insidious:

Elimination — the loser is destroyed. The struggle between Neanderthal and Homo sapiens ended this way; Neanderthal no longer exists, only its trace remains in our genome.

Isolation — the loser continues to exist but cannot spread. The uncontacted tribes of the Amazon fall into this category; they exist but cannot expand, multiply, or offer an alternative.

Integration — the loser is absorbed into the winner’s system. It has three sub-forms: assimilation (the loser is dissolved, its identity is lost), transformation (it adapts but leaves a trace), instrumentalization (it remains as a function but loses its autonomy).

Fusion — two paradigms merge, the distinction vanishes (TAN-025). The convergence of two different roles in the same actor—such as the fusion of politician and merchant—is an example of this category.

Extinction — the paradigm’s foundation of existence disappears. The paradigm is not defeated; it becomes meaningless. The mounted-warrior paradigm ended this way; the horse is no longer an instrument of war, so the mounted-warrior paradigm did not need to be “defeated”—its content was simply emptied.

Reverse integration (form seizure) — the most insidious outcome. The winner seizes the content while preserving the form of the loser. On the surface the loser still exists—but has been emptied from within, remaining a shell. The institution stands under the same name but its decisions are made by another logic. The capital-centered structure taking control of the will-centered structure (GÜÇ-027) is the modern example of this type.

Understanding these six outcomes also explains why some paradigms appear “immortal.” Sometimes a paradigm is not defeated, only its form comes to carry a new content. The persistence of the form misleads most observers—“it hasn’t changed,” they say. But its content has changed.

X. Constant Tensions and Closed Bifurcations

Every paradigm moves toward one outcome or another—but certain tensions cannot be resolved. These tensions are reproduced in every system. Why?

The answer is structural: the sides of constant tensions are existentially dependent on one another. Conflict between paradigms can be resolved—one side can eliminate the other, the two can merge in fusion, one can seize the form of the other. Because paradigms are not each other’s condition of existence. If capitalism eliminates socialism, capitalism continues to live.

But this is not the case with constant tensions. Without one side, the other does not exist either. Therefore the conflict cannot be resolved—if it were resolved, both sides would cease to exist. The tension is permanent because the solution itself means existential suicide.

Four constant tensions and the structure of existential dependency in each:

Individual-group tension (TAN-053) cannot be resolved. Because without the individual there is no will, and without the group there is no survival. An individual cannot survive long-term alone—they depend on the group (HAY-009). The group, meanwhile, is composed of individuals; without the individual there is no group. This mutual existential dependency fixes the tension. The individual cannot fully swallow the group, nor can the group fully dissolve the individual. The balance is always temporary, the tension always permanent.

Ruler-ruled tension cannot be resolved. There is no ruler without the ruled—this is a structural necessity (YÖN-003). The lower class is the source of the will pool; without this source the ruler finds no one to rule. The ruled, in turn, cannot coordinate without a ruler; the moment there is no ruler, they produce one from within themselves. The tension is reborn in every system—in monarchy, in republic, in dictatorship, in democracy. The form changes, the question remains the same.

The tension between capital-centered and will-centered corporate entities cannot be resolved. The constant tension within the corporate entity layer itself. A company cannot exist without a state—the state grants its legal personhood, the state protects its property rights, the state enforces its contracts, the state prints the money. A state, in turn, cannot function without companies—the tax base, economic dynamism, resource production are there. The two are existentially dependent on each other. But there is a critical second point here: the source structure is determined when the corporate entity is established. A corporate entity is born either from a capital-centered source or from a will-centered source. This source is its ontological DNA. If the founding source attempts to change, the corporate entity loses its own survival formula—existential risk arises. This is why the two species are ontologically impermeable: a capital-centered corporate entity cannot actually transform into a will-centered form; if it tried, it would cease to exist. One enterprise can try to control another, can seize its form (GÜÇ-027)—but cannot carry its essence. Convergence, as we saw in section VIII, is a surface event—produced by actors’ tendencies and the dynamics of power conflict. The tension, meanwhile, is in depth and cannot be resolved by convergence; ontological dependency persists. The details of this tension are the subject of the fifth article in this series.

Human-corporate entity tension cannot be resolved—at least not yet (TÜZ-003). Humans cannot live without corporate entities: there is no modern life without the state, the company, the bank, the hospital, the school. And corporate entities cannot function without humans—decisions are made by humans, work is done by humans, consumption is carried out by humans. This symbiosis is at the same time a tension (TÜZ-005). The corporate entity sees the human as an instrument; the human wants to see the corporate entity as an instrument. Both try to control the other. But neither can exist without the other.

And here is the critical observation: the moment this existential dependency disappears, the constant tension ceases to be constant. If dependency erodes, the tension transforms into a power conflict or a paradigm conflict—and the potential for singularization becomes active. Because eliminating the other is no longer existential suicide for one side; a new condition has emerged in which one side can exist without the other.

This observation is not a theoretical possibility. Right now, for the first time in history, this transformation is taking place in one of the constant tensions. The asymmetry in the human-corporate entity symbiosis is changing. Artificial intelligence, robotics, and automation are reducing the corporate

entity's dependency on humans. AI makes some of the decisions. Robots do some of the work. Every function except consumption is becoming substitutable. The symbiosis is not dissolving—but the asymmetry is deepening. And when this deepening crosses a certain threshold, the constant tension will cease to be constant.

When that threshold is crossed: the human-corporate entity relationship transforms into a power conflict. And as in every mechanic where power conflict operates, the potential for singularization becomes active. This is the most critical observation of this series, and it will be addressed in detail in subsequent articles—particularly in the 7th, 8th, and 10th.

Certain bifurcations, on the other hand, have definitively closed:

Inter-species conflict has closed. Homo sapiens coexisted with other Homo species, then a single Homo species remained. It cannot be reopened.

The birth of the leadership structure has closed. The conflict between leaderless communities and leader-based structures was resolved in favor of leader-based structures (LID-001). It is effectively closed.

Open bifurcations, meanwhile, are being tested—and each is the subject of the coming articles. The transition between human-managed corporate entities and corporately managed corporate entities. The fusion of the politician and the merchant roles. All are being tested right now, before our eyes.

XI. The Lock: The Will to Be and the Will to Remain

Now the structural answer to the initial question can be fully seen: *Why do we continue to play the game we know we are losing?*

Two wills operate simultaneously for every actor within the paradigm: the *Will to Be* (Öztürk, 2026)—the drive to come into being, to take a position, to constitute oneself—and the *Will to Remain* (Öztürk, 2026)—the drive to avoid losing one's current position. The two are two faces of the same coin: coming into being is acquiring, remaining is not losing.

The fundamental motivation of power conflict is remaining (PHY-008). The Will to Be draws the individual into conflict; the Will to Remain establishes hegemony. For the individual it is biological remaining, for the leader statusal, for the corporate entity institutional. At the class level: for the upper class, remaining; for the middle class, the will to be (becoming); for the lower class, literal survival (YÖN-057).

If the first to quit loses, no one can be the first to quit. The Will to Remain structurally dictates this. This is not a moral weakness but a structural lock-in. Everyone within the paradigm—including the most powerful—is inside this lock. Even the most powerful must comply with the rules of the game in order to remain; otherwise another will take their place. Even the sovereign's motivation is not freedom but remaining (PHY-013): as power grows, the number and weight of its components grow, and the space of maneuver narrows.

This is why paradigms do not “change”—they only break. And this is why the breaking is always painful: until the moment of breaking, everyone must keep playing the game; and by the time the breaking arrives, much has already been destroyed. Change of mind is not enough. Consent is not

enough. Education is not enough. Because the problem is not in knowledge but in structure. To change the structure, the structure must break.

XII. Falsification Note

This thesis collapses under the following condition: if it is systematically documented throughout history that large-scale communities have undergone lasting paradigm transformation without structural breaking—that is, only through change of mind, education, consent, or persuasion. Such an example would invalidate the framework; the paradigm would be not a structure but an idea, and the logic of breaking would then be unnecessary.

A narrower falsification: if it is systematically shown that the layers of a paradigm can be changed independently of one another—for example, that the form of hegemony can be changed lastingly without touching the form of the corporate entity, that the form of the corporate entity can be changed without touching the structure of governing classes. This would collapse the derivation chain. And if the complete absence of the singularization tendency at some scale or in some mechanic is systematically documented, the status of universal law falls.

XIII. Conclusion

This article has advanced four interlocking claims. First, that *paradigm* is best understood not as a worldview or epistemological framework but as a structural composition of *Physis* and *Nomos* containing existence, survival, and power dynamics simultaneously. Second, that paradigms are layered, with each layer (ontological, social-survival, leadership, governing classes, corporate entity, hegemony) emerging as the structural product of the preceding one through an explicit derivation chain. Third, that singularization operates as a structural outcome of power conflict—mathematically necessitated wherever the mechanism is present, postponable but not preventable by *Nomos*—constituting the universal law of the framework. Fourth, that actors within a paradigm operate under a three-layered power conflict (system defense, intra-paradigm position, paradigm-change position) which structurally locks them into the paradigm’s logic regardless of conscious intent.

The contribution of this framework is neither prescriptive nor predictive in the conventional sense. It does not specify what should be done; it specifies why what *is* being done is structurally produced. The Musk case study illustrates this: the same actor simultaneously defending the current paradigm and constructing the infrastructure of a potential successor is not exhibiting a contradiction but enacting the structural consequences of the will-to-be / will-to-remain formula across two paradigms at once. The AGI race operates under the same logic at a higher scale.

The journey traced through nine thresholds—from inter-species elimination to the second convergence of corporate ownership forms—suggests the *Nomos Paradigm* is approaching a structural threshold. V3 (AI-steered corporate entities) is institutionalizing; V4 (AGI-symbiotic corporate entities) is being targeted as a competitive necessity. Whether AGI in fact emerges remains technologically open. What is structurally observable is that the most elite actors are mobilizing all available resources toward this goal, that no actor can credibly withdraw, and that the conditions under which this trajectory could be questioned are themselves narrowed by the paradigm’s own

asymmetries.

The framework's central wager is that *understanding the structure does not change it, but it changes the conditions under which choices about it can be made*. Paradigms cannot be exited through change of mind alone—but living within the paradigm with knowledge of its structure is different from living within it without that knowledge. This difference is the only opening through which the constructive side of Nomos can operate.

Open questions remain. The fragility paradox of full hegemonic breakdown, the conditions under which constant tensions transform into power conflicts, the ontology of V4 and its relation to AGI consciousness, the potential for real Nomos choice at species-level paradigm thresholds—these are addressed in subsequent articles of the series and in the forthcoming book. The present article is intended as the structural foundation upon which those further analyses can rest.

XIV. The Bridge

In which paradigm does humanity find itself today? This question is the subject of the rest of the series. The short answer is this: we are within the corporate entity paradigm—in symbiosis with an actor that effectively governs the world but which most of us do not see as a species. This symbiosis is asymmetric. And right now, for the first time in history, the direction of the asymmetry is about to change.

The next article — “*Roles*” — will look at the historical hegemony roles that built this actor: how the three hegemonic roles (violence, meaning, money) separated from the group, and why we are at a point where the window has narrowed for a fourth role to be born.

What is currently observable: The game has not changed. The actors are changing. And the only capacity that could change the game—the constructive side of Nomos—is still there, but costly, fragile, handicapped. Those in a position to use it are structurally invested in not using it.

Seeing does not change the paradigm. Neither does knowing. A paradigm changes only by breaking. But living within the paradigm while knowing its logic is different from living without knowing. And the choice produced by this difference is *Nomos*.

Limitations

The framework presented here is subject to several explicit limitations that bear on its scope and force.

First, the historical material on which the framework draws is predominantly Western and Eurasian in scope. The paradigm transitions traced—aristocratic to bourgeois, will-centered to capital-centered corporate entities, the convergence dynamics—are most heavily documented in European, Mediterranean, and Anglo-American historical material. While the framework's structural claims are intended to be species-level, their empirical grounding is unevenly distributed across regions. Non-Western paradigm transitions (Chinese imperial cycles, Indian civilizational structures, pre-colonial African polities, Mesoamerican state formations) are treated more briefly

than they merit. This represents a real empirical limitation, not a denial of the framework's intended universality.

Second, full engagement with classical political and social theory is reserved for the forthcoming book. The "Position in Existing Literature" section above is necessarily compressed and does not constitute systematic comparison. Scholars working closely within Foucauldian, Bourdieusian, Marxian, or Weberian traditions may find the brief framing inadequate; the book provides extended dialogue with these traditions, but this article does not. Readers seeking that engagement should consult the book upon its publication.

Third, the framework was constructed by a single independent researcher without the corrective pressure of peer review during its formation. While the author has sought to mitigate this through systematic self-falsification—each of the 93 hypotheses specifies its own refutation conditions—the absence of formal peer review during the inductive phase is a methodological cost that must be acknowledged.

Fourth, certain core claims—particularly those concerning the transition from V3 to V4 corporate entities, the AGI paradigm thesis, and the conditions for full hegemonic breakdown—are forward-looking and necessarily speculative. They are presented as structural inferences from the framework's principles, not as empirical predictions. Their falsification will be possible only as the trajectories they describe either materialize or fail to materialize.

Fifth, the methodological strategy of deferring engagement with canonical theory carries its own risk: independent reinvention of concepts already developed by others. Where the framework's terminology or claims overlap with existing traditions, the overlap is acknowledged as a structural convergence rather than as borrowing. Whether such convergences strengthen the framework (by independent confirmation of similar observations) or weaken it (by suggesting the framework adds little to existing work) is a judgment readers will make.

These limitations do not, in the author's view, undermine the framework's central contributions. They do, however, define the scope within which those contributions should be evaluated.

Concept Glossary: The Physis Concepts Appearing in This Article

Core Concepts

Paradigm (Öztürk, 2026): Not an idea or worldview, but a structure. A Physis-Nomos composition that simultaneously contains existence, survival, and power dynamics. It is layered; every layer derives from the preceding one. It does not change without breaking. An ontological and political concept; used differently from Kuhn's epistemological paradigm.

Physis (Öztürk, 2026): The default state of the living. Everything operates within it. Survival, competition, pursuit of dominance, source control—not unique to humans, a fundamental dynamic operating in every social species.

Nomos (Öztürk, 2026): A capacity born within Physis. It rises in linear time-consciousness from the combination of memory and death-awareness. The capacity of choice, scale, and the positioning

of the “self” in time. Can be constructive or destructive.

Nomos Paradigm (Öztürk, 2026): The entire journey the human species has built with Nomos capacity. From the elimination of Neanderthal to the modern corporate entity, every paradigm threshold was made possible by Nomos; but every threshold also scaled up Physis’s destructive mechanisms. The whole history of the human species is the Nomos Paradigm.

Will to Be (Öztürk, 2026): The will to existence and self-formation. The drive to come into being, to take a position, to constitute oneself within a structure. Draws the individual into power conflict. Distinct from but paired with the Will to Remain.

Will to Remain (Öztürk, 2026): The drive to avoid losing one’s current position; the will to persist in what one already is. Establishes hegemony. The dynamic that structurally dictates the logic of “the first to quit loses.” Distinct from but paired with the Will to Be.

The Internal Structure of Physis

Master Proposition (TAN-000): Physis is the default; Nomos is a capacity. The asymmetry of Physis is carried into Nomos with amplification. This reality necessitates constant struggle.

Two Faces of Physis (PHY-001): Physis carries both balancing (empathy, reciprocity, reputation tracking) and destructive (power conflict, dominance, singularization) mechanisms. Both precede Nomos; they are biological.

Structural Asymmetry (PHY-002): The balancing mechanism enters friction with scale; the destructive mechanism experiences no friction. This asymmetry is carried into Nomos with amplification.

Will to Remain Motivation (PHY-008): The fundamental motivation of power conflict is remaining. For the individual it is biological remaining, for the leader statusal, for the corporate entity institutional.

The Sovereign’s Motivation Is Remaining (PHY-013): As power grows, the number and weight of its components grow, and the space of maneuver narrows. Even the sovereign is not free.

The Demand for Freedom Is Physis (PHY-010): The demand for freedom is a biological reality encoded in the limbic system. It cannot be destroyed.

The Structure of Nomos

Death-Awareness (VAR-002): Unique to humans; the thought “I will die” is the trigger of Nomos capacity.

Linear Time-Consciousness (VAR-003): The combination of memory and death-awareness produces linear time-consciousness. This synthesis generates Nomos capacity.

The Three Capacities of Nomos (NOM-002): Linear time-consciousness generates three capacities: choice, scale, temporal symbolic selfhood.

The Dark Side of Nomos (NOM-003): The capacity for choice is morally neutral. Nomos can be constructive or destructive; its direction is not guaranteed.

Fragility Asymmetry (NOM-004): The structural asymmetry of Physis is carried into Nomos with amplification. Nomos's destructive side scales; its constructive side is costly, fragile, and handicapped.

Power Dynamics

Power Conflict (GÜÇ-002): The struggle of two wills against each other. The aim is to control the other's will. Operates independently of existential consciousness—in chimpanzees, wolves, elephants, humans.

Continuity Principle (İLK-003): Power conflict continues in every interaction, condition, and scale. What changes is scale, instrument, and time; the mechanism is the same.

Singularization Principle (İLK-012): Power gravitates toward singularity. Each gain prepares the ground for the next. The structural consequence of power conflict—a mathematical necessity, not a contingent tendency. Where power conflict operates, the trajectory toward singularization is determined; Nomos can postpone it but cannot prevent it.

Endgame Principle (İLK-013): Power conflict continues until a single will remains. From the moment two wills exist, the potential is present, and it vanishes only when a single will remains.

Governing Classes and Leadership

Leader-Based Paradigm Hypothesis (LİD-001): Homo sapiens exists within a leader-based paradigm. Not a preference but the structural consequence of the survival formula.

Universality of the Three Classes (YÖN-001): The ruler, the ruled, and those who want to rule (middle class) are necessarily present in every system; a fourth class (bureaucracy) emerges as scale grows.

The Structural Necessity of the Lower Class (YÖN-003): There is no ruler without the ruled. The lower class is the source of the will pool.

Class Hegemony Motivations (YÖN-057): For the upper class, the will to remain; for the middle class, the will to be; for the lower class, literal survival.

Corporate Entity and Symbiosis

Origin of the Corporate Entity (TÜZ-001): Hybrid species born from the symbiosis of human and idea. Does not carry Nomos capacity; operates as pure Physis. Nomos can only enter the corporate entity through humans.

Ontological Paradox (TÜZ-003): Humans survive with others; the corporate entity through their absence. Humans can switch between two modes; the corporate entity is locked into one mode—pure Physis.

Structural Parasitism Tendency (TÜZ-005): Symbiosis carries a structural tendency toward parasitism. When benefit begins to flow from the source to different classes, systemic corruption begins.

Hybrid Threat Framework (VAR-013): The corporate entity is an ontological hybrid species—rational decision-making, will capacity derived from scale, potential immortality. Exempt from human limitations.

Opposite Survival Formulas (HAY-008): Humans survive with others; the corporate entity survives through the absence of others. Ontologically opposed survival formulas.

Individual-Group and Survival

Individual-Group Tension (TAN-053): Wherever two humans exist, fully equal freedom is impossible. This tension is independent of conflict and cannot be resolved; it is constant.

Group Participation Paradox (HAY-009): An individual cannot survive long-term alone—they depend on the group. But joining the group means loss of freedom.

Hegemony

The Three Distinctions of Hegemony (HEG-001): Hegemony differentiates along three axes: real/manipulative, internal/external orientation, types of source.

Six Types of Hegemony (HEG-014): The upper class can accumulate six types of hegemony: institutional, knowledge, bond, ideological, coercive, source.

Legitimacy Test (MEŞ-012): Rationality is not a type of hegemony but its test. It has two phases: instrument test (“is the sword in hand?”) and will test (“is there intent to bring the sword down?”).

Target Displacement of the Legitimacy Test (MEŞ-015): The legitimacy test always operates; but its target can shift. If the real decision-maker is elsewhere, the wrong target is tested.

Convergence and Paradigm Structure

Fusion (TAN-025): The merger of two paradigms or roles; the distinction disappears. The integration of the upper class with bureaucracy, the fusion of the politician and the merchant are examples.

Capital-Centered Takeover (GÜÇ-027): When a capital-centered corporate entity takes control of a will-centered structure, the source remains as the upper class. The modern form of reverse integration.

Will-Centered Corporate Entity: The subtype of corporate entity that draws its force from legitimacy and authority. States, political organizations. Its role is that of the politician.

Capital-Centered Corporate Entity: The subtype of corporate entity that draws its force from capital and fluidity. Companies, holdings, funds. Its role is that of the merchant.

V1 Corporate Entity: Human-owned corporate entity—humans own and manage the corporate entity. The classic leader-founder model.

V2 Corporate Entity: Corporately owned corporate entity—corporate entities manage corporate entities. Holdings own holdings, funds own companies, boards govern boards.

V3 Corporate Entity (Öztürk, 2026): The corporate entity steered by artificial intelligence. Still within the Nomos Paradigm—AI is an instrument, and the final decision belongs to humans. But at the same time, it is the infrastructure that lays the ground for V4.

V4 Corporate Entity (Öztürk, 2026): The corporate entity in symbiosis with AGI. Ontologically different from previous versions: it does not carry Nomos capacity through humans, because the AGI behind it does not carry Nomos capacity. The first non-Nomos version of the corporate entity. It also dissolves the human-corporate entity existential tension, because it is dependent not on humans but on AGI.

AGI Paradigm (Öztürk, 2026): Artificial General Intelligence—if it comes into being—is not merely a technology but a paradigm. A paradigm outside the Nomos Paradigm. The moment two paradigms exist on the same ground, İLK-003, İLK-012, and İLK-013 come into play—power conflict between paradigms is inevitable.

Conceptual Expansions Formulated in This Article

Three-Layered Power Conflict (Öztürk, 2026): Three layers operating simultaneously in every actor within the paradigm: (1) system level—defending the paradigm against other paradigms; (2) intra-paradigm position competition—defending position within the current paradigm; (3) new position competition in the paradigm-change process—racing to seize a position in the new paradigm that will provide at least as much power as the old.

The Reflex-Reaction-Inertia Structure of the Paradigm (Öztürk, 2026): The paradigm is not an ownerless, inertia-less structure. It operates through reflex (actors' automatic defensive behavior), reaction (the network of stakeholders' collective response), and inertia (flowing with its own logic once established).

Existential Interdependence in Constant Tensions (Öztürk, 2026): The structural reason for the unresolvability of constant tensions is that the sides are existentially dependent on one another. The moment this dependency disappears, the constant tension transforms into a power conflict or paradigm conflict; the potential for singularization becomes active.

The Derivation Chain of Paradigm Layers (Öztürk, 2026): Paradigm layers are not randomly adjacent; each layer is born as the structural product of the preceding one. Ontological layer → social survival → leadership → governing classes → corporate entity → hegemony. The chain descends at the bottom to the human species' survival formula.

Series Note

This article is the first piece of the Nomos Paradigm Series, which looks at the world through the lens of *Physis: A Theory of Power* (Öztürk, 2026) and conveys the observations. The series comprises twelve articles plus two appendices, structured across three sections (Present, Future, Beyond). It is the book's showcase—it does not take the place of the book; it applies the framework the book establishes to the contemporary world.

Article 1: *Paradigms* (this article)

Article 2a: *Roles* (published — SSRN Abstract ID 6711519)

Article 2b: *Actors* (forthcoming)

Articles 3 through 12: Subsequent applications of the framework, addressing source and source displacement, capital-will convergence, AI and robotics, the first autonomous corporation, the transformation of the four classes, the productivity paradox, full hegemonic breakdown, Universe 25, and the final paradigm (forthcoming)

Appendices 1 and 2: *The Prison Without a Warden* and *The Final Simulation* — speculative epilogues following the book’s publication.

References

Öztürk, E. (2026). *Physis: A Theory of Power*. Registered work, Republic of Turkey, Ministry of Culture and Tourism, General Directorate of Copyright. Registration No: 2026/17534, dated March 5, 2026. (Forthcoming as published volume.)

Öztürk, E. (2026). *Physis: A Theory of Power – 93 Falsifiable Hypotheses*. SSRN Working Paper, Abstract ID 6595318.

Öztürk, E. (2026). *Triade Motor*. Registered work, Republic of Turkey, Ministry of Culture and Tourism, General Directorate of Copyright. Registration No: 2026/18239, dated April 17, 2026.

Öztürk, E. (2026). *Almanak: Structured Power Chronology Recording Method*. Registered work, Republic of Turkey, Ministry of Culture and Tourism, General Directorate of Copyright. Registration No: 2026/18228, dated April 17, 2026.

Öztürk, E. (unpublished, 2021–2024). *The Age of Aristocracy*. Multi-volume historical research.

Öztürk, E. (unpublished, 2024–2025). *The Rise of the Bourgeoisie*. Multi-volume historical research.

Kuhn, T. S. (1962). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. University of Chicago Press. [Referenced for the contrast between Kuhn’s epistemological paradigm concept and the ontological-political concept developed in this framework.]

Note on classical literature: As stated in the Methodology Note and Limitations section, systematic engagement with the classical political-theoretical canon (Marx, Weber, Foucault, Bourdieu, Mills, Wallerstein, Mann) is reserved for the forthcoming book. References to these traditions in the present article are positional rather than substantive.

Author Note

The author is an independent researcher and theorist based in Turkey, working outside formal academic affiliation. The *Physis* framework was developed between 2020 and 2026 as a private intellectual project, drawing on five years of historical research (2020–2025) and contemporary structural observation.

Disclosure of AI assistance. In keeping with emerging norms of research transparency in 2026, the author discloses the following regarding AI use in the production of this work. The framework’s conceptual architecture—the Physis-Nomos distinction, the corporate entity ontology, the derivation chain of paradigm layers, the three-layered model of power conflict, the AGI paradigm thesis, and the 93 core hypotheses—is the author’s own. Historical research and structural observation underlying these claims were conducted by the author over the 2020–2025 period without AI involvement. AI assistance was employed in the following capacities: (1) in the forthcoming book, for systematic dialogue with the classical political-theoretical canon, where AI served as a comparative-mapping tool to help position the framework against existing traditions whose primary literature the author had deliberately not engaged during the framework’s construction phase; (2) for translation, formatting, and editorial refinement of texts originally drafted in Turkish; (3) for consistency-checking of cross-references and terminology across multiple drafts. The framework, hypotheses, and structural analysis are the author’s own intellectual contribution. AI was used as research assistant and editorial aid, not as conceptual co-author.

Funding. This research received no external funding. It was conducted entirely on the author’s own time and resources.

Conflicts of interest. The author declares no conflicts of interest.

Independent researcher position. The author has chosen the position of independent researcher deliberately. This position carries known costs: absence of institutional credentialing, absence of formal peer review during the inductive phase, limited access to academic networks. It also carries certain advantages: freedom from disciplinary boundaries, freedom from the framing pressures of canonical traditions during the construction phase, and the capacity to work at a scope (432 pages, 93 hypotheses, 633 mechanisms across a multi-decade research program) that academic incentive structures typically discourage. The reader should evaluate the work on its own merits within the limitations specified above.

The author welcomes critical engagement, including formal falsification attempts targeting the explicit refutation conditions specified in the 93 hypotheses paper. Correspondence regarding this framework may be directed through the author’s published channels.

Related Resources

Foundational hypothesis paper: *Physis: A Theory of Power – 93 Falsifiable Hypotheses* — SSRN Abstract ID 6595318

Comprehensive concept reference: *Physis Terminology — A Comprehensive Concept Reference*

Registration, Copyright, and Attribution

The framework presented in this article is drawn from *Physis: A Theory of Power* (Öztürk, 2026). The work was officially registered on March 5, 2026 by the General Directorate of Copyright, Republic of Turkey Ministry of Culture and Tourism, under Copyright Registration No: 2026/17534.

The historical framework underlying this article and the *Physis* theory itself rests upon the author's multi-volume historical research conducted between 2020–2025. This research—comprising *The Age of Aristocracy* (2021–2024) and *The Rise of the Bourgeoisie* (2024–2025)—is unpublished but constitutes the empirical foundation for the historical observations presented here. Research for *The Age of the Bourgeoisie* is ongoing.

The full work comprises 432 pages, 93 core falsifiable hypotheses, and 633 core mechanisms. The theoretical ecosystem of which this article constitutes an applied extension has been constructed as an original, independent framework for the structural analysis of power dynamics.

All citations to hypotheses, mechanisms, or arguments from this framework must include attribution as: Öztürk, E. (2026). *Physis: A Theory of Power*. [Registered work, Ministry of Culture and Tourism, Registration No: 2026/17534.]

Registered works:

- *Physis: A Theory of Power* — Registration No: 2026/17534 (March 5, 2026)
- *Triade Motor* — Registration No: 2026/18239 (April 17, 2026)
- *Almanak: Structured Power Chronology Recording Method* — Registration No: 2026/18228 (April 17, 2026)

Republic of Turkey, Ministry of Culture and Tourism, General Directorate of Copyright

SSRN Preprint: Abstract ID 6595318

© 2026 Evren Öztürk. All rights reserved.

Unauthorized reproduction, distribution, or derivative use of any portion of this work without explicit written permission from the author is prohibited. For academic citation, attribution as specified above is required.

Keywords: #Physis #PowerTheory #NomosParadigm #Paradigm #Hegemony #CorporateEntity #PoliticalPhilosophy #SocialTheory #AGI #Singularization