

Physis: A Theory of Power — 93 Falsifiable Hypotheses

Foundational Hypothesis Paper

The Core Falsifiable Claims of the Physis Framework

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 (revised May 2026)

Important Note

This preprint presents the 93 core falsifiable hypotheses of Physis: A Theory of Power (Öztürk, 2026). The full work — comprising 432 pages, 93 core hypotheses, and 633 mechanisms in total — is forthcoming as a published volume. The hypotheses presented here constitute the load-bearing structural skeleton of the framework. The remaining hypotheses (approximately 540) are secondary structures that extend, support, or complement this core. Detailed argumentation, mathematical models, formal definitions, and historical case studies are reserved for the book. This paper provides the testable claims of the framework, their falsification conditions, and their dependency architecture.

Note on this version: This is a major content revision (May 2026). The 93 hypotheses themselves are unchanged from the April 2026 version. Additions: Methodology Note, Position in Existing Literature, Conclusion, Limitations, References, Author Note (with AI disclosure), Related Resources, expanded Terminological Note. Standardized “Source hegemony” terminology (previously rendered as “Resource hegemony” in v1).

Abstract

This paper presents the 93 core falsifiable hypotheses underlying Physis: A Theory of Power (Öztürk, 2026), an independent theoretical framework for the structural analysis of power dynam-

ics. The framework proposes that power dynamics operate on two foundational strata: Physis — the biological default state of all living systems, including its dual mechanisms of destruction (aggression, dominance, competition) and balancing (empathy, fairness impulse, reciprocity); and Nomos — the uniquely human capacity for deliberate normative construction, arising from the convergence of memory and death-awareness in linear temporal consciousness, capable of both constructive and destructive operation. The framework's central claim is structural asymmetry: Physis's destructive mechanisms scale without friction while its balancing mechanisms cease to function as scale grows. This asymmetry is amplified and carried into Nomos, producing a continuous and structurally handicapped struggle. Three principles operate above all paradigm layers: the Continuity Principle (power conflict operates at every interaction, condition, and scale); the Singularization Principle (power conflict produces singularization as a structural outcome — a mathematical necessity wherever the mechanism operates, postponable but not preventable by Nomos); and the Endgame Principle (power conflict continues until a single will remains). The 93 hypotheses presented constitute the structural skeleton of the framework. Each hypothesis specifies three components: what it claims, the conditions under which it can be falsified, and which framework component collapses if falsification succeeds. This explicit articulation of falsification conditions distinguishes the framework from prevailing social theories, which typically leave such conditions implicit. The hypotheses are not presented as proven assertions but as attack points — empirically and logically testable claims that invite refutation, development, and refinement. The paper organizes hypotheses across nine sections plus a section on equality: Physis & Nomos foundations; power dynamics and singularization; leadership; managerial classes; corporate entities (the human-idea hybrid species and its survival logic); hegemony (its types, conditions for full breakdown, and structural fragility); freedom; justice; equality; and fraternity (including its founding-destructive paradox). The architecture of dependency between hypotheses is made explicit throughout: where one hypothesis falls, downstream consequences are identified. Keywords: power theory, hegemony, Physis, Nomos, falsifiability, structural asymmetry, corporate entity, fraternity, social theory, political philosophy, singularization, will to remain, mathematical necessity, structural analysis, corporate ontology

Methodology Note

The framework presented here emerges from a methodologically distinct research program. Rather than beginning with the canonical literature of Western political and social theory (Hobbes, Marx, Weber, Foucault, Bourdieu, Mills, and others) 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 Reign of the Aristocracy*, 2021–2024; *The Rise of the Bourgeoisie*, 2024–2025; both unpublished, with ongoing research on *The Reign of the Bourgeoisie*), which provided the empirical bedrock for 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 presented here specifies its own conditions for refutation — a feature uncommon in social-theoretical work, which typically leaves falsification conditions implicit or absent. The architecture of dependency between hypotheses is also explicit: where one hypothesis falls, downstream consequences are identified. 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 preprint. Hypothesis codes (PHY, NOM, VAR, TAN, GÜÇ, İLK, LİD, YÖN, TÜZ, HAY, HEG, MEŞ, ADL, EŞT, KAR, NÖR, SIN) are retained in their original Turkish abbreviations to preserve cross-reference consistency with the book’s full terminology system and the registered work (Öztürk, 2026, Registration No: 2026/17534). The use of original-language hypothesis codes in

academic work has precedent (DSM codes in psychiatry, original-German terms in Heideggerian scholarship); the practice protects the integrity of the citation network across translations.

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

A note on “source” (kaynak): in this framework, “source” carries a structural-ontological meaning — the underlying basis upon which a system depends for its existence (e.g., the lower class as the source of a social system). It is rendered as Source (capitalized in conceptual contexts) rather than “resource,” which would imply a fungible material input. The translation “Source hegemony” (rather than “Resource hegemony”) reflects this distinction.

Preamble: Architecture of Falsifiability

The 93 hypotheses that follow are the primary load-bearing claims of Physis theory. They are not proven assertions — they are attack points awaiting testing. The falsification conditions are not rhetorical gestures; they specify the precise empirical or logical conditions under which each hypothesis would be disconfirmed. The asymmetry of falsification weight is explicit: existential claims fall with a single counterexample (the discovery of a new species, a single documented case may be sufficient); structural tendency claims require systematic disconfirmation of the tendency itself (a single exception does not collapse the hypothesis; only the systematic non-operation of the tendency does). This difference arises from the nature of the hypotheses themselves: an existential claim (“unique to humans”) falls with a single counterexample; a structural tendency claim (“weakens as scale grows”) collapses only when the tendency is shown to systematically not operate. The language in each hypothesis’s falsification condition reflects this difference. Where a hypothesis falls, the downstream consequences are identified. The reader is thereby given not only the theory’s architecture but its pressure points. This is what distinguishes Physis from most social theory: the author specifies not only what the theory claims but exactly how it can be destroyed. The ordering follows the book’s flow. Each hypothesis is coded with a number; “Linked” indicates related hypotheses within the same section.

Section 1: Physis & Nomos

TAN-000 · Master Proposition (Öztürk, 2026)

Physis is the default — everything operates within it. Nomos is a capacity — it can be constructive or destructive. It arises within Physis. It emerges from the convergence of memory and death-awareness in linear temporal consciousness. Through this capacity, the human being can make

choices, build scale, and position “the self” in time. With these three capacities, humans construct systems encompassing billions of individuals. Physis’s balancing mechanism ceases to function at large scale, while its destructive mechanism continues to operate independently of scale. This asymmetry is carried into Nomos in amplified form. Nomos’s destructive dimension scales in the hands of those who benefit from imbalance. Its constructive dimension, requiring consciousness, is costly; requiring continuous awareness, it is fragile. This reality necessitates a continuous and handicapped struggle. **Falsification condition:** If any single component of this proposition — Physis’s default status, Nomos’s status as a neutral capacity, the existence of the asymmetry, the carrying-forward of the asymmetry — is refuted, the proposition weakens. However, for the proposition as a whole to fall, more than one component must fall simultaneously; the fall of a single component weakens but does not necessarily collapse the proposition. **If falsified:** Everything. This is the book’s master claim. All sections are unfoldings of this proposition. **Linked:** PHY-001, PHY-002, NOM-002, NOM-003, NOM-004, VAR-002, VAR-003

VAR-002 · Death-Awareness (Öztürk, 2026)

Death-awareness is unique to humans. The thought “I will die” — abstract, temporal, inevitable — is the trigger of the Nomos capacity. **Falsification condition:** If death-awareness at a human level is documented in another species — if the thought “I will die” is shown to be processed abstractly and temporally — the claim of human-uniqueness falls. Or if a species carrying death-awareness but showing no Nomos capacity is found, the trigger claim collapses. **If falsified:** The genesis chain breaks. Why Nomos exists only in humans cannot be explained. VAR-003 loses its foundation, and from there the cascade extends to NOM-002. **Linked:** VAR-003 (direct consequence)

VAR-003 · The Structure of Existential Consciousness (Öztürk, 2026)

Memory and death-awareness together generate linear temporal consciousness. In animals, time perception is cyclical and “now”-centered; in humans, it becomes linear as past-present-future-death. This synthesis generates the Nomos capacity. **Falsification condition:** If linear temporal consciousness is shown to arise independently of memory or death-awareness — for example, if a species with cyclical time perception is documented carrying linear temporal consciousness without death-awareness — the synthesis claim breaks. **If falsified:** NOM-002 loses its foundation. The

answer to the question “Why Nomos?” — “because linear temporal consciousness generates three capacities” — breaks. **Linked:** VAR-002 (precondition), NOM-002 (direct consequence)

PHY-001 · The Two Faces of Physis (Öztürk, 2026)

Physis is not one-dimensional. It carries both destructive mechanisms — aggression, dominance, competition — and balancing mechanisms — empathy, fairness impulse, reciprocity. Both precede Nomos. **Falsification condition:** If the reciprocity and fairness-response reflexes observed in primates are shown to not be part of Physis — to be entirely learned, cultural behaviors — this hypothesis collapses. Or the reverse: if destructive mechanisms are also shown to be cultural and Physis is shown to be neutral. **If falsified:** The asymmetry argument loses its foundation. If Physis is one-dimensional, one cannot say “the balancing mechanism ceases to function at scale” — because there is no balancing mechanism. PHY-002 falls. **Linked:** PHY-002 (direct consequence)

PHY-002 · Structural Asymmetry (Öztürk, 2026)

Physis’s balancing mechanism operates in close-range environments — in face-to-face relations, within familiar groups. The human cannot feel empathy toward thousands, cannot establish reciprocity with millions — when scale grows, the mechanism ceases to function. The destructive mechanism, however, continues to operate independently of scale. **Falsification condition:** If, above the Dunbar threshold, without corporate entity intervention and without deliberate Nomos construction, an egalitarian structure can be permanently sustained — that is, if empathy and reciprocity are shown to operate automatically at large scale as well — this hypothesis collapses. **If falsified:** The core of the “handicapped struggle” argument is broken. Without asymmetry, why Nomos is fragile cannot be explained. NOM-004 falls. **Linked:** PHY-001 (precondition), NOM-004 (direct consequence)

NOM-002 · The Three Capacities of Nomos (Öztürk, 2026)

Linear temporal consciousness generates three capacities: choice — the ability to act contrary to what Physis dictates; scale — the ability to construct systems extending beyond individual lifespans; temporal symbolic selfhood — the ability to position “the self” in time. **Falsification condition:**

If these three capacities are shown to arise without linear temporal consciousness — for example, if choice and scale capacities are observed in a species with cyclical time perception — the genesis mechanism breaks. Or if the three are shown to have independent sources rather than emerging from a single synthesis, the unified-genesis claim falls. **If falsified:** The genesis mechanism of the master proposition breaks. What Nomos “is” remains undefined. NOM-003 and NOM-004 lose their foundations. **Linked:** VAR-003 (precondition), NOM-003 (consequence), NOM-004 (indirect)

NOM-003 · The Dark Side of Nomos (Öztürk, 2026)

The capacity for choice is morally neutral. The capacity for conscious choice is also the capacity for conscious destruction. The direction of Nomos is not guaranteed. **Falsification condition:** If Nomos capacity is shown to be systematically biased toward the constructive direction — that is, if it is empirically established that humans, when making conscious choices, predominantly choose cooperation, justice, and balance, with destructive choices being exceptional — the neutrality claim falls. **If falsified:** The book’s argument for “why Nomos does not guarantee resistance” breaks. The hegemony mechanism weakens — because if Nomos is systematically constructive, its instrumentalization becomes an exceptional malfunction rather than a structural tendency. **Linked:** NOM-002 (precondition), NOM-004 (consequence)

NOM-004 · Fragility Asymmetry (Öztürk, 2026)

Physis’s structural asymmetry is carried into Nomos in amplified form. Three reasons: first, if the impulse can be suppressed, deliberate construction is far more easily bypassed; second, the instrument that should ensure balance is in the hands of those who benefit from imbalance; third, as scale grows, class conflicts and inter-corporate-entity dynamics enter the equation. **Falsification condition:** If Nomos capacity is shown to permanently balance Physis at large scale — that is, if it is established that Nomos does not weaken as scale grows but rather strengthens through institutional mechanisms, and that this strength is sustainable — this hypothesis collapses. **If falsified:** The final clause of the master proposition falls. The “continuous and handicapped struggle” argument loses its foundation. If the struggle is not handicapped, the book’s central tension — the structural disadvantage of Nomos — disappears. **Linked:** PHY-002 (precondition), NOM-002

(precondition), NOM-003 (precondition)

TÜZ-001 · Origin and Nature of the Corporate Entity (Öztürk, 2026)

The corporate entity is a hybrid species born from the symbiosis of human and idea. It does not carry Nomos capacity — because Nomos capacity requires the simultaneous presence of three conditions: death-awareness, the survival formula of “with others,” and the structural fact that the source of death is not the others themselves. The corporate entity fails to meet two of these conditions: it survives through the disappearance of others, and the source of its death is not entropy but the others. It operates as pure Physis. However, it is not entirely closed to Nomos — Nomos can enter the corporate entity only through the human. The corporate entity is immortal, tireless, and without conscience; Nomos can only be dictated to it by the individual, by force, and temporarily.

Falsification condition: If corporate entities are shown to be capable of choosing cooperation, reciprocity, and long-term balance structurally — without individual human intervention — the “pure Physis” claim falls. Or if the source-of-death structure is shown to not determine Nomos capacity — that is, if the survival-with-rivals formula can also generate Nomos — the three-condition argument collapses. **If falsified:** The entire argument of Section 5 collapses. If the corporate entity is not “pure Physis,” the concrete manifestation of the book’s scale argument — that as Nomos expands, Physis also scales — breaks. **Linked:** NOM-002 (context), NOM-004 (context)

TÜZ-003 · The Ontological Paradox (Öztürk, 2026)

The human survives with others; the corporate entity through the absence of others. The human can transition between two modes — can choose Nomos; the corporate entity is locked into one mode — pure Physis. This opposition pushes the corporate entity toward singularity: not as a containable tendency as in the individual, but as an existential necessity. As Nomos expands, the corporate entity — its manifestation — also expands; but because the corporate entity operates as pure Physis, as Nomos expands, Physis also scales. **Falsification condition:** If corporate entities are shown to be capable of choosing permanent symbiosis rather than competition — that is, not locked into a single mode — the paradox collapses. Or if corporate entities are shown to not gravitate toward singularity — if permanent plurality and balance in the market are shown to be sustained through the corporate entities’ own dynamics — the “existential necessity” claim falls. **If falsified:** The

human-corporate entity opposition falls. The bridge between the singularity argument (Section 2) and the hegemony mechanism (Section 6) is severed. **Linked:** TÜZ-001 (precondition), PHY-002 (context)

Section 2: Power Dynamics

TAN-082 · Definition of Singularity (Öztürk, 2026)

Singularity is the ultimate point toward which power conflict is directed — the dominance of a single will. Singularity is not a separate impulse or tendency. It has no biological basis. It is the structural consequence of power conflict — a mathematical result. **Falsification condition:** If power conflict is shown to not gravitate toward singularity — that is, if power accumulation is shown to hit a natural ceiling and permanent plurality is sustained through the dynamics of power conflict itself — this definition falls. Or if singularity is shown to be not structural but a contingent, exceptional outcome dependent on specific conditions. **If falsified:** The answer to the book’s “where is this going” question is lost. İLK-012, İLK-013, SIN-002, and the Section 6 full hegemonic breakdown argument lose their foundations. **Linked:** İLK-012 (operational principle), SIN-002 (paradox)

GÜÇ-002 · The Physis Basis of Power Conflict (Öztürk, 2026)

Power conflict is the fundamental dynamic of Physis and operates independently of existential consciousness. The same mechanism in the chimpanzee, the wolf, the human. Existential consciousness does not create power conflict; it opens Nomos instruments to it and provides the means of scaling. **Falsification condition:** If power conflict is shown to be observed only in species carrying existential consciousness — that is, if chimpanzee alpha struggle is shown to not be a real power conflict but only resource competition — the Physis-basis claim falls. **If falsified:** The Section 1–2 bridge breaks. The link between “Physis as default” and “power conflict” falls. If power conflict belongs to Nomos, the entire framework changes. **Linked:** PHY-001 (precondition), NOM-002 (context)

İLK-003 · The Continuity Principle (Öztürk, 2026)

Power conflict continues at every interaction, condition, and scale. The dynamic operating between two individuals also operates between two companies, between two states. What changes is scale, instrument, and time — the mechanism is identical. **Falsification condition:** If a particular scale — for example, the international system — is shown to operate through an entirely different mechanism; that is, if power conflict between individuals and dynamics between states are shown to be structurally different (not by analogy but in actual difference) — the continuity claim falls. **If falsified:** The theory's scale generalization breaks. The arguments for the corporate entity (Section 5), hegemony (Section 6), and the international system (Sections 7, 8) lose their foundations — because the carrying of micro dynamics to the macro level becomes unjustified. **Linked:** GÜÇ-002 (precondition)

İLK-012 · The Singularization Principle (Öztürk, 2026)

Power moves toward singularity. Each gain prepares the ground for the next — control expands, resources accumulate, the exit of rivals comes under control. It is a diminishing mathematics. The Will to Be draws the individual into conflict — this is biological; the mechanics of conflict push the system toward a single will — this is structural. **Falsification condition:** If power accumulation is shown to produce self-limiting mechanisms — that is, if as power grows, counter-powers automatically strengthen as well, and balance is shown to be structurally preserved — the gravitation-toward-singularity claim collapses. **If falsified:** TAN-082 and SIN-002 fall. The arguments for full hegemonic breakdown (Section 6) and “why return is difficult” (Section 7) lose their foundations. **Linked:** TAN-082 (definition), İLK-013 (continuation)

İLK-013 · The Endgame Principle (Öztürk, 2026)

Power conflict continues until a single will remains. From the moment two wills exist, the potential is present, and it disappears only when a single will remains. **Falsification condition:** If power conflict is shown to be capable of reaching a permanent equilibrium point — if mutual deterrence or institutional balances are shown to permanently freeze conflict — the “until a single will remains” claim falls. **If falsified:** The “continuous struggle” claim falls. If power conflict can reach a per-

manent equilibrium, the continuity of struggle is not guaranteed — the book’s “struggle continues” argument becomes unnecessary. **Linked:** İLK-012 (precondition), TAN-082 (context)

SIN-002 · The Singularity Paradox (Öztürk, 2026)

Full singularity collapses the system’s survival formula. Unopposed power cannot be tested, the legitimacy test does not function, if there is no alternative there is no adaptation. Power, upon reaching its ultimate goal, destroys itself. Singularity is both the point toward which power conflict is directed and the system’s point of fragility. **Falsification condition:** If full singularity is shown to be sustainable — that is, if systems dominated by a single will are shown to be capable of self-reproduction and remaining resistant to entropy — the paradox collapses. **If falsified:** The Section 6 full hegemonic breakdown (fragility paradox) falls; the Section 7 freedom argument weakens. The formula “most powerful = most fragile” loses its foundation. **Linked:** TAN-082 (precondition), İLK-012 (precondition), İLK-013 (context)

Section 3: Leadership

LİD-001 · The Leader-Based Paradigm Hypothesis (Öztürk, 2026)

Homo sapiens exists within a leader-based paradigm. This is not a preference but the structural consequence of the survival formula. Surviving as a group requires cooperation; cooperation requires coordination; coordination requires a decision-making mechanism. As scale grows, consensus becomes more difficult — the pressures of speed, coordination, and crisis management make the leadership structure advantageous. **Falsification condition:** If large-scale human communities — of thousands — are documented as having existed sustainably across generations without leadership and without hierarchy, the necessity claim falls. Or if consensus mechanisms are shown to operate permanently with scale. **If falsified:** The fundamental claim of Section 3 falls. If leadership is not necessary, the arguments for managerial classes (Section 4), the corporate entity (Section 5), and hegemony (Section 6) lose their foundations. **Linked:** GÜÇ-002 (precondition)

LİD-013 · Leadership and Brotherhood Spike Instrumentalization (Öztürk, 2026)

The leader does not replace the spike — they attempt to instrumentalize it. They want the results of the spike, and reject its essence — the forgetting of the suffering of freedom and justice, the inability of people to feel hegemony as it spreads. But they do not want one critical thing belonging to fraternity: equality. **Falsification condition:** If leaders are shown to not instrumentalize the spike — if they systematically govern while preserving genuine fraternity — the instrumentalization claim falls. Or if the spike is shown to be uninstrumentalizable — to automatically collapse when manipulated. **If falsified:** The hegemony-fraternity bridge falls. The argument for consent manufacturing collapses — the structural tension between leadership and fraternity remains undefined. **Linked:** PHY-001 (context), NOM-003 (context)

LİD-018 · The Lower-Class Paradox (Öztürk, 2026)

The lower class carries, transmits, and normalizes Physis criteria. Paradox: the lower class is the only class capable of using Nomos capacity without instrumentalizing it. But when it comes to leaders, the lower class also evaluates the leader's effectiveness through the Physis framework — conquest, power, expansion are read as success. The potential for hegemony is born from this paradox. **Falsification condition:** If the lower class is shown to systematically evaluate leaders through the Nomos framework — to consistently apply criteria of justice, equality, and social benefit — the Physis-normalization claim falls. **If falsified:** The question of “why hegemony is possible” remains unanswered. If the lower class does not normalize Physis, the hegemony mechanism does not operate. **Linked:** NOM-003 (context), NOM-004 (context)

PHY-004 · The Crossing of the Nomos Boundary (Öztürk, 2026)

If a candidate bypasses Nomos — crosses the boundary — Nomos no longer functions. From that point forward, Physis is the only rule of the game for every leader and every candidate. The boundary, once crossed, has been crossed for everyone; the difference between a once-crossed boundary and a never-crossed boundary is great. When this threshold is exceeded, the hegemonic tendency automatically begins to absorb freedoms without limit. When the boundary is crossed, the leader who chooses Physis becomes the leader; for others, persisting in Nomos in a deadly

conflict is suicide — taking an equivalent position becomes inevitable. **Falsification condition:** If the Nomos boundary is shown to be re-establishable after being crossed — if return is shown to be structurally possible and to have occurred repeatedly in history — the irreversibility claim falls. **If falsified:** The mechanism of approach toward singularity weakens. If the irreversibility of crossing the Nomos boundary falls, the argument for “why degeneration is inevitable” breaks. **Linked:** PHY-001 (precondition), NOM-003 (context)

Section 4: Managerial Classes

YÖN-001 · The Universality of the Three Classes (Öztürk, 2026)

The three classes — the governing, the governed, and those who want to govern — are necessarily present in every system; the fourth class (the implementing/bureaucracy) emerges as scale grows. When hierarchy forms, a decision-maker necessarily appears; if there is a decision-maker, there are also those subject to the decision; the dynamics of power conflict and the singularity tendency dictate the leader-candidate — those who want to govern. **Falsification condition:** If a large-scale social structure is documented as functioning permanently without classes — that is, if the governing-governed distinction is shown to be not necessary but contingent upon conditions — the universality claim falls. **If falsified:** The class concepts used throughout Sections 3–9 lose their foundations. The backbone of the book’s second half — class analysis — breaks. **Linked:** LİD-001 (precondition)

YÖN-002 · Upper-Middle Class Structural Identity (Öztürk, 2026)

The distinction between upper class and middle class is not structural but positional — they carry the same motivations, the same reflexes, the same singularity tendency. The success of the middle class does not change the structure, only the actors. **Falsification condition:** If the middle class is shown to systematically behave differently upon attaining power — to make structural changes, to break the singularity tendency — the identity claim falls. If revolutions are documented as producing permanent structural transformation. **If falsified:** The argument that “revolution does not change the structure” loses its foundation. The book’s pessimist realism breaks — if the middle class is genuinely different, change is possible. **Linked:** GÜÇ-002 (context)

YÖN-003 · The Structural Necessity of the Lower Class (Öztürk, 2026)

Without the governed, there is no governing — this is a structural necessity. The lower class is the source of the pool of will, the producer of economic resources, the human source. **Falsification condition:** If the governing class is shown to be capable of constructing a permanently sustainable structure without dependence on the lower class — for example, through full automation — the necessity claim falls. **If falsified:** The foundation of the legitimacy test is severed. Source hegemony (Section 6) loses its foundation. Hegemony analysis loses its lower-class dimension. **Linked:** LID-001 (context), YÖN-001 (precondition)

YÖN-006 · The Organization Paradox (Öztürk, 2026)

An organized lower class is no longer the lower class. Everything that generates leadership and hierarchy automatically creates a tendency toward middle-class formation. This does not mean that the lower class is passive; the capacity for legitimacy testing, the capacity to create the middle class, and the capacity to be the determining factor continue. **Falsification condition:** If an organized lower class is shown to permanently preserve its lower-class identity and motivations despite the leadership structure — that is, if organization is shown to not automatically produce class change — the paradox collapses. If Michels’s “iron law of oligarchy” is shown to be systematically violated. **If falsified:** The class-based answer to “why hegemony cannot be broken” falls. The lower class can become an independent actor → the book’s pessimist realism becomes ungrounded. **Linked:** LID-001 (context), İLK-012 (context)

VAR-010 · Class Differentiation of Existential Forms (Öztürk, 2026)

The meaning of existence differentiates by class: status-based for the upper and middle class, biological for the lower class, functional for bureaucracy. This difference excludes the lower class from being a natural actor in power conflict. **Falsification condition:** If the lower class is also shown to experience status-based existence — that is, if existential forms are shown to be independent of class — the differentiation claim falls. Or if all classes are shown to act with the same existential motivations. **If falsified:** The ontological foundation of the actor-source distinction collapses. All classes become equal actors → class analysis becomes unnecessary. **Linked:** PHY-001

(context), GÜÇ-002 (context)

TAN-025 · Fusion (Öztürk, 2026)

The integration of upper class and bureaucracy. Two forms: full fusion (party-state) and permeable fusion (revolving door). Its structural consequence: the system's source shifts from the lower class to the upper class. **Falsification condition:** If upper-class–bureaucracy integration is shown to not systematically lead to source displacement — that is, if fusion is shown to not change the position of the source — this hypothesis falls. Or if fusion is shown to be not structural but a rare, condition-dependent political event. **If falsified:** The mechanism of Section 6's full hegemonic breakdown falls. The class-based consequence of singularity cannot be explained. The convergence argument loses its foundation. **Linked:** YÖN-001 (context), İLK-012 (context)

Section 5: Corporate Entities

TÜZ-005 · The Structural Parasitism Tendency (Öztürk, 2026)

Symbiosis carries a structural parasitism tendency. The indicator of degeneration is the direction of benefit — not a frame of good or evil. When benefit begins to shift from the source to other classes, systemic degeneration begins. The threshold of parasitism is clear: when status exists for status's sake, and the corporate entity for the corporate entity's sake — that is, when it detaches from the reality of being an instrument of human survival — symbiosis transforms into parasitism. **Falsification condition:** If human–corporate entity symbiosis is shown to permanently produce mutual benefit — that is, if the parasitism tendency is shown to be not structural but contingent upon managerial failure — this hypothesis falls. **If falsified:** The bridge between Section 1's TÜZ-003 (paradox) and Section 6's hegemony breaks. Why the corporate entity inevitably harms its source cannot be explained. **Linked:** TÜZ-001 (precondition), TÜZ-003 (precondition)

VAR-013 · The Hybrid Threat Framework (Öztürk, 2026)

The corporate entity is a legally alive, ontologically hybrid species — a human–idea symbiosis. This hybrid species is defined by three fundamental properties: rational decision-making (emotionless, benefit-centered), will capacity arising from scale, and potential immortality. The corporate

entity is exempt from human limitations: it does not die, does not tire, does not feel guilt, is not constrained by emotional bonds. It can sustain its strategy across generations. **Falsification condition:** If the classification of corporate entities as a “species” is shown to be ontologically invalid — that is, if the corporate entity is shown to be merely a legal fiction without independent actor status — this hypothesis falls. **If falsified:** The ontological foundation of Section 5 collapses. If the corporate entity is not a “species,” the “human vs. corporate entity” conflict and the singularity-tendency claim cannot be constructed. **Linked:** TÜZ-001 (precondition)

HAY-008 · Opposing Survival Formulas (Öztürk, 2026)

The human survives with others; the corporate entity through the death of others. The human’s formula requires cooperation and solidarity; the corporate entity’s formula requires the disappearance of competitors. “Others” includes both rival corporate entities and humans — for the corporate entity, other corporate entities exist as pure threats at the point of existence. **Falsification condition:** If the survival formula of corporate entities is shown to operate through ecosystem logic rather than competition — that is, if the existence of rivals is shown to be necessary for the corporate entity’s survival — the opposition claim falls. **If falsified:** The link between TÜZ-003 and İLK-012 breaks. Why the corporate entity gravitates toward singularity cannot be explained. The transition from symbiosis to parasitism ceases to be a structural necessity. **Linked:** TÜZ-003 (precondition), VAR-013 (context)

GÜÇ-027 · The Takeover by the Capital-Centered Entity (Öztürk, 2026)

When a capital-centered corporate entity takes control of a will-centered structure, it assumes societal governance but its source remains the upper class. The direction of benefit does not change; the base is not seen as a source. Even if the lower class of the structure it has appropriated is visible, since it is not the real source of will, its survival is not of terminal importance for the existence of the structure. **Falsification condition:** If capital-centered corporate entities, upon assuming societal governance, are shown to shift benefit distribution in favor of the lower class — that is, if takeover is shown to not automatically operate against the source — this hypothesis falls. **If falsified:** The question “what happens when the capital-centered structure assumes societal governance” remains unanswered. The Section 6 hegemonic-takeover mechanism and the Section 8 international power

analysis are affected. **Linked:** TAN-025 (precondition), HAY-008 (context)

PHY-006 · Corporate Physis Hegemony (Advanced-Physis) (Öztürk, 2026)

Although the corporate entity was created by Nomos, it has been captured by Physis. Corporate entities behave like Physis: they prioritize their own survival at the expense of others, are zero-sum, and carry the singularity tendency. This occurs in two phases: in the first phase, humans govern corporate entities — Nomos can manifest itself to the extent permitted by competitive pressure; in the second phase, corporate entities govern corporate entities and the human moves away from the equation — a Physis-Physis reality forms. **Falsification condition:** If corporate entities are shown to structurally — not merely under individual leader pressure but through their own dynamics — transcend Physis and operate permanently within the Nomos framework, the “captured” claim falls. **If falsified:** The institutional evidence of Section 1’s Physis-Nomos asymmetry collapses. The corporate entity remains a “neutral instrument” — the book’s pessimist realism becomes ungrounded at the corporate entity dimension. **Linked:** PHY-001 (precondition), PHY-002 (precondition), VAR-013 (context)

NOM-009 · Nomos Simulacrum and the Continuity of Hegemony (Öztürk, 2026)

Corporate entities can prioritize Nomos ideals — freedom, justice, fraternity — but this is not the norm. Their existence and survival dictate different strategies: market dominance, economic success, hegemony. Corporate entities benefit humanity — technological progress, medical discoveries, infrastructure development — but these benefits are by-products, not the corporate entity’s purpose. “Less bad” is possible, but it requires continuous resistance. **Falsification condition:** If corporate entities are shown to systematically and permanently apply Nomos ideals — not merely as a marketing strategy but as a structural preference — the “not the norm” claim falls. **If falsified:** The instrumentalization of Nomos at the institutional level remains without evidence. The consent-manufacturing mechanism of hegemony falls at the corporate entity level. **Linked:** NOM-003 (precondition), LID-013 (context)

Section 6: Hegemony

HEG-001 · The Three Distinctions of Hegemony (Öztürk, 2026)

Hegemony differentiates along three axes: genuine/manipulative, internal/external orientation, and source types. Physis theory diverges from the standard hegemony approach at three points: it sees no essential difference between domination and hegemony; hegemony is not specific to a particular class; hegemony operates at every scale. This three-fold distinction makes the analysis of hegemony possible. **Falsification condition:** If hegemony is shown to not differentiate along these three axes — that is, if hegemony must be analyzed as one-dimensional or along entirely different axes — this framework falls. **If falsified:** The analytical framework of Section 6 breaks. The types of hegemony, class dynamics, and full breakdown analysis remain without a framework. **Linked:** PHY-002 (context), İLK-012 (context)

PHY-008 · The Motivation to Remain (Öztürk, 2026)

The fundamental motivation of power conflict is “to remain” — preserving one’s current power position. This is the core of Physis. The Will to Be draws into power conflict; the Will to Remain establishes hegemony. “Remaining” manifests differently for each actor: biological remaining for the individual, status remaining for the leader, institutional remaining for the corporate entity. **Falsification condition:** If power-holders’ motivation is shown to be systematically different from “remaining” — for example, if power-holders are shown to predominantly relinquish power voluntarily, or if power accumulation is shown to operate through dynamics independent of “remaining” — this hypothesis falls. **If falsified:** The motivation of hegemony remains undefined. The question “why power is not surrendered” remains unanswered. **Linked:** GÜÇ-002 (precondition)

GÜÇ-035 · The Structural Growth Tendency of Power Accumulation (Öztürk, 2026)

Power accumulation forms a self-feeding cycle — power generates more power. This is a structural tendency, not an individual preference. **Falsification condition:** If power accumulation is shown to naturally limit itself — that is, if as power grows, automatic counter-mechanisms are shown to engage and accumulation halts — the structural-growth claim falls. **If falsified:** The link between İLK-012 (singularization) and Section 6 weakens. The mechanism of hegemony accumulation

cannot be explained. **Linked:** İLK-012 (precondition), PHY-002 (context)

HEG-002 · Transformation from Symbiosis to Parasitism (Öztürk, 2026)

Hegemony carries a structural parasitism tendency. When status exists for status's sake, and hegemony for hegemony's sake — when it detaches from the reality of being an instrument of the human survival formula — symbiosis transforms into parasitism. **Falsification condition:** If hegemony is shown to be permanently sustainable in its symbiotic phase — that is, if the transition to parasitism is shown to be not structural but a preventable managerial error — the transformation claim falls. **If falsified:** The mechanism for why hegemony degenerates falls. The bridge between Section 1's TÜZ-003 and Section 5's TÜZ-005 with Section 6 breaks. **Linked:** TÜZ-005 (precondition), TÜZ-003 (context)

PHY-007 · Physis-Nomos Dialectic and Hegemony (Öztürk, 2026)

Power conflict on the Physis ground gravitates toward singularity; the human provides balance through Nomos capacity. In this dialectic, hegemony targets the legitimacy test — while instrumentalizing Nomos mechanisms, it tries to prevent the engagement of Physis-derived balancing impulses. Freedom and justice are resistance principles born against hegemony's attempt to erase human existence. **Falsification condition:** If hegemony is shown to operate independently of the Physis-Nomos dialectic — that is, if hegemony must be explained through an entirely different mechanism — this hypothesis falls. **If falsified:** The extension of Section 1's Physis-Nomos framework to Section 6 is severed. Hegemony cannot be integrated with Physis theory — it remains an independent concept. **Linked:** PHY-001 (precondition), NOM-004 (precondition)

NOM-010 · The Indestructibility of Nomos Ideals (Öztürk, 2026)

Freedom and justice are resistance principles born against hegemony's attempt to erase human existence; they can be instrumentalized but cannot be destroyed. **Falsification condition:** If, under sufficiently long and intense hegemony, demands for freedom and justice are shown to have completely faded — to have not arisen across generations — the indestructibility claim falls. **If falsified:** The “handicapped but continuing struggle” argument falls. Hegemony becomes abso-

lute and irreversible — pessimist realism turns to nihilism. **Linked:** NOM-003 (precondition), NOM-004 (context)

NOM-012 · The Genesis of Resistance Principles (Öztürk, 2026)

Hegemony spreads along two axes: it targets individual existence → the demand for freedom is born; it imposes the justice of the powerful → the demand for justice is born. Freedom and justice are resistance principles born against these two axes of hegemony. **Falsification condition:** If demands for freedom and justice are shown to arise independently of the existence of hegemony — that is, if these demands are shown to form even without hegemony — the causal link falls. **If falsified:** The precondition for Section 7 (Freedom) and Section 8 (Justice) breaks. Why freedom and justice arise cannot be explained. **Linked:** NOM-010 (precondition), PHY-001 (context)

PHY-009 · The Function of Fraternity (Öztürk, 2026)

Fraternity is in a different category — not a resistance principle but fusion. At the moment of the spike, neither force nor resistance operates; but the structural effect of the spike — its amplifying function — multiplies the Physis-Nomos asymmetry at the collective level. It plants both the seed of hegemony and can shatter it. **Falsification condition:** If fraternity is shown to systematically operate in a single direction — only constructively or only destructively — the separate-category claim falls. Or if the dynamics of force or resistance are shown to operate at the moment of the spike. **If falsified:** The Section 9 (Fraternity) argument changes at its root. If fraternity is unidirectional (only good), it conflicts with the Physis framework. **Linked:** PHY-001 (precondition)

HEG-003 · The Source Hegemony of the Lower Class (Öztürk, 2026)

The lower class possesses a hegemonic capacity: source hegemony. The existence of the system depends on the lower class — without the source, the system, the bureaucracy, and the governing class cannot exist. “If I am not, neither are you” — this is the only hegemony of reality that the lower class can legitimately use. **Falsification condition:** If the lower class is shown to carry no hegemonic capacity — that is, if the “source” position is shown to produce no bargaining power — this hypothesis falls. **If falsified:** The lower class becomes entirely powerless. The legitimacy test

becomes dysfunctional. **Linked:** YÖN-003 (precondition)

HEG-004 · The Displacement of Source Hegemony (Öztürk, 2026)

When fusion occurs, the source position shifts to the upper class; the system converges toward the capital-centered structure. The lower class ceases to be the source, becomes an instrument — loses its only hegemonic capacity. **Falsification condition:** If even after fusion the lower class is shown to retain its source position — that is, if the source is shown to be structurally non-displaceable — the displacement claim falls. **If falsified:** One of the fundamental mechanisms of full hegemonic breakdown falls. How the lower class loses its power cannot be explained. **Linked:** HEG-003 (precondition), TAN-025 (precondition)

YÖN-058 · Bureaucracy as Hegemony Target (Öztürk, 2026)

Whoever dominates the bureaucracy reaches the system and becomes the system itself. The bureaucracy is in direct interaction with the upper class in decision-making — this facilitates synchronization. **Falsification condition:** If seizing the bureaucracy is shown to not provide dominance over the system — that is, if the bureaucracy is shown to not function as a power-transfer mechanism — this hypothesis falls. **If falsified:** The operational counterpart of the fusion mechanism in Section 6 falls. The question of how “integration with the system” occurs remains unanswered. **Linked:** TAN-025 (precondition)

YÖN-066 · Fusion and “Too Big to Fail” (Öztürk, 2026)

When fusion with the bureaucracy occurs, the “too big to fail” scenario emerges. The lower class is communicated the propaganda “if I exist, you exist; if I do not, you do not”; after fusion occurs, this becomes almost a reality. The boundary between consent and necessity becomes blurred. **Falsification condition:** If after fusion the “too big to fail” scenario is shown to not arise — that is, if fusion is shown to not structurally produce this outcome — this hypothesis falls. **If falsified:** The answer to the “how” question of full hegemonic breakdown falls. Full breakdown cannot be explained. **Linked:** YÖN-058 (precondition), HEG-004 (context)

MEŞ-012 · Hegemony Quality and the Legitimacy Test (Öztürk, 2026)

Rationality is not the type of hegemony — it is the legitimacy test itself. Genuine and manipulative is the essential distinction of hegemony. The legitimacy test is two-stage: the instrument test (“is there a sword at hand?”) and the will test (“is there intent to lower the sword?”). **Falsification condition:** If the genuine/manipulative distinction in hegemony is shown to be impossible — that is, if all hegemony is shown to be inevitably manipulative or this distinction is shown to be meaningless — this hypothesis falls. **If falsified:** Whether hegemony is genuine or manipulative cannot be tested. The sword-witness model collapses. **Linked:** PHY-007 (context)

GÜÇ-033 · The System’s Authoritarian Tendency (Öztürk, 2026)

The asymmetry in hegemony distribution makes the system’s authoritarian tendency structural. This tendency is not a design flaw or moral failure but the inevitable consequence of power dynamics. Nomos limits this tendency but cannot eliminate it — because the same dynamics also erode Nomos. Mechanism: the upper class’s advantage in hegemony types, the singularity and fusion tendencies, the existential weakness of the middle class, the bureaucracy’s status as a target, the atomized structure of the lower class. **Falsification condition:** If authoritarianism is shown to be not structural but contingent and preventable — that is, if it is shown to be permanently prevented through proper institutional design — the structural-tendency claim falls. **If falsified:** Section 6’s main conclusion loses its foundation. Authoritarianism becomes “accidental” rather than “structural.” **Linked:** PHY-002 (precondition), İLK-012 (precondition), HEG-014 (precondition)

HEG-014 · Types of Upper Class Hegemony (Öztürk, 2026)

The upper class possesses five types of hegemony: institutional, informational, relational, ideological, coercive. This is a structural advantage. After fusion, if source hegemony also shifts, it possesses all six types. **Falsification condition:** If the upper class is shown to not possess these five types — that is, if some types are shown to belong to other classes or the types are shown to be unclassifiable in this manner — this hypothesis falls. **If falsified:** The precondition for GÜÇ-033 falls. Why the upper class possesses a structural advantage cannot be explained. **Linked:** GÜÇ-035 (context), İLK-012 (context)

HEG-015 · The Lower Class's Hegemony of Reality (Öztürk, 2026)

For the lower class and the bureaucracy, hegemonic claim and function are identical. They cannot be substituted. There is no such thing as “another lower class” — their hegemony is the hegemony of reality. The claim “without the source, no system” is an ontological necessity. **Falsification condition:** If the lower class is shown to be substitutable — that is, if through full automation or artificial source production, the ontological necessity of the lower class is shown to disappear — the “hegemony of reality” claim falls. **If falsified:** The ontological justification for HEG-003 falls. Why the lower class's hegemony is “real” cannot be explained. **Linked:** HEG-003 (precondition), YÖN-003 (context)

HEG-022 · Liberalism and Atomization (Öztürk, 2026)

Liberalism is a negative ideology: it does not produce collective identity; it atomizes. Other ideologies use fraternity; liberalism obstructs fraternity. When fraternity is obstructed, neither new hegemony can be established nor existing hegemony destroyed — the existing structure remains in place. **Falsification condition:** If liberalism is shown to be capable of producing collective identity — that is, if it is shown to construct a different “we” rather than atomizing — the negative-ideology claim falls. **If falsified:** The negative test of the fraternity concept falls. The mechanism for why liberalism preserves the existing structure cannot be explained. **Linked:** PHY-009 (context)

HEG-023 · Capitalism: The Invisible Ideology (Öztürk, 2026)

Capitalism is the only ideology that claims not to be an ideology; it is presented as the economic translation of Physis. Questioning “what is natural” appears meaningless. Market competition is power conflict; companies are corporate entities; profit maximization is “remaining”; “if you work, you earn” means the powerful win. **Falsification condition:** If the claim that capitalism is “not an ideology” is shown to be ineffective — that is, if people are shown to clearly see capitalism as an ideology and question it — the invisibility claim falls. **If falsified:** The book's modern world analysis loses its foundation. The contemporary evidence for Physis's “default” status falls. **Linked:** PHY-002 (context)

HEG-026 · The Conditions for Full Hegemonic Breakdown (Öztürk, 2026)

Full hegemonic breakdown requires the accumulation of five conditions: fusion with the system, displacement of source hegemony, dysfunction of the legitimacy test, ideological singularity, and concentration of hegemony types. **Falsification condition:** If full breakdown is shown to occur independently of these five conditions — that is, if different conditions are shown to produce full breakdown — the condition list falls. Or if these conditions are documented as having come together without full breakdown occurring. **If falsified:** Section 6’s greatest original contribution falls. The “full hegemonic breakdown” claim remains without evidence. **Linked:** SIN-002 (context), TAN-025 (context)

HEG-027 · The Position of Classes in Full Breakdown (Öztürk, 2026)

In full breakdown, the upper class is identified with the system; the middle class has been liquidated or rendered dysfunctional — though it can re-form from within the upper class; the bureaucracy is the upper class’s hegemonic instrument; the lower class is tightly controlled. **Falsification condition:** If in full-breakdown situations classes are shown to not be positioned in this manner — that is, if the middle class is shown to not be liquidated or the bureaucracy is shown to remain independent — this hypothesis falls. **If falsified:** The operational detail of HEG-026 falls. The concrete appearance of full breakdown remains undefined. **Linked:** HEG-026 (precondition), YÖN-001 (context)

HEG-028 · The Fragility Paradox (Öztürk, 2026)

Full hegemonic breakdown is both hegemony’s most monopolized and most fragile state. Parasitism can strengthen authority in the short term; but the unhappiness of the lower class — which is the source — rots the system’s core. The proposition “if there is a system, there is collective survival” loses its validity for the lower class. **Falsification condition:** If systems in a state of full breakdown are shown to be sustainably maintained — that is, if fragility is shown to be unreal or compensable indefinitely — the paradox collapses. **If falsified:** The link with SIN-002 breaks. The argument “most powerful = most fragile” falls. **Linked:** SIN-002 (precondition), HEG-026 (precondition)

GÜÇ-037 · Asymmetry from Singularity to Plurality (Öztürk, 2026)

From plurality, singularity can be constructed — the process is structurally supported. From singularity, the construction of plurality requires destructive transformation. Distributing power requires all power centers to relinquish their power through collective will — this rarely occurs. **Falsification condition:** If the transition from singularity to plurality is shown to be systematically achievable through peaceful and structural means — without destructive events — the asymmetry claim falls. **If falsified:** The mechanism of the book’s pessimist realism falls. “Singularity can easily be exited” → the “struggle continues” argument becomes unnecessary. **Linked:** SIN-002 (precondition), İLK-013 (context)

HEG-054 · The Balance Between Consent Loss and Fusion Capacity (Öztürk, 2026)

As the upper class reaches toward singularity, Nomos ideals are damaged. But consent loss is compensated by the capacity brought by fusion with the system. **Falsification condition:** If consent loss is shown to be uncompensable by fusion capacity — that is, if strong evidence is shown that consent loss always collapses the system — the balance claim falls. **If falsified:** The mechanism for why Nomos is not sufficient falls. The question “why Nomos is insufficient” goes unanswered at the Section 6 level. **Linked:** NOM-004 (precondition), PHY-002 (context)

YÖN-057 · Class Hegemony Motivations (Öztürk, 2026)

For the upper class: to remain; for the middle class: to be (becoming); for the lower class: literal survival. **Falsification condition:** If the motivations of the classes are shown to not differentiate in this manner — that is, if all classes are shown to act with the same motivation — the differentiation falls. **If falsified:** The class-based operational extension of PHY-008 disappears. **Linked:** PHY-008 (precondition), HEG-003 (context)

Section 7: Freedom

TAN-053 · The Individual-Group Tension (Öztürk, 2026)

In any place where two human beings exist, fully equal freedom is impossible. Interaction necessitates the sharing of will. This tension is independent of conflict — even if two people are entirely

good-intentioned and harmonious, there is a coordination cost. **Falsification condition:** If two individuals are shown to be capable of permanently sustaining fully equal freedom — that is, if interaction is shown to not require the sharing of will — the impossibility claim falls. **If falsified:** The foundation of Section 7’s paradox argument falls. HAY-009 and GÜÇ-042 lose their foundations. **Linked:** VAR-002 (context)

PHY-010 · The Demand for Freedom is Physis (Öztürk, 2026)

The demand for freedom is not Nomos but a biological reality encoded in the limbic system. Whether much or little, suppressed or unsuppressed, Physis imposes this tension as reality. Suppressed discomfort does not disappear; when triggered, it surfaces. The demand for freedom cannot be destroyed. **Falsification condition:** If the demand for freedom is shown to be entirely cultural — learned, conditioned — and to have no biological basis, the Physis-origin claim falls. Or if under sufficient conditioning the demand for freedom is documented as having permanently faded. **If falsified:** Section 7’s founding hypothesis falls. The grounding of freedom in Physis — the book’s original contribution — breaks. **Linked:** PHY-001 (precondition)

HAY-009 · The Group Participation Paradox (Öztürk, 2026)

The individual cannot survive in the long term alone — they are dependent on the group. But joining the group means loss of freedom. Paradox: joining steals, not joining steals more. In group participation, the loss of freedom is certain, while the gain in return is uncertain — group participation is a gamble. **Falsification condition:** If the individual is shown to be capable of sustaining long-term survival and well-being without group participation — that is, if dependence on the group is shown to be not biological but contingent upon conditions — the paradox collapses. **If falsified:** The individual-level concretization of the “handicapped struggle” argument falls. The individual-group tension remains theoretical. **Linked:** TAN-053 (precondition)

GÜÇ-042 · The Structural Advantage of Individual Prioritization (Öztürk, 2026)

Individual prioritization provides a structural advantage in power conflict. The individualist binary works; the collectivist spectrum works. The party that operates as a binary makes faster deci-

sions. The individualist's advantage comes from closing off Nomos capacity — from not being constrained by morality, ethics, justice, written rules; the collectivist's handicap comes from keeping this capacity open. **Falsification condition:** If the collectivist strategy is shown to be systematically advantageous in power conflict — that is, if cooperation and moral limits are shown to prevail over the individualist strategy in the long term — the structural-advantage claim falls. **If falsified:** The individual-level evidence of Section 1's NOM-004 falls. The question “is morality a handicap?” remains unanswered. **Linked:** NOM-004 (precondition)

HEG-055 · Hegemony for the Lower Class = Loss of Freedom (Öztürk, 2026)

The more hegemony, the less freedom. Hegemony is the sovereign's pursuit of forming a single will by absorbing other wills; this disregards the individual and collective will of the lower class. In full hegemonic breakdown, the individual is ontologically erased. **Falsification condition:** If hegemony is shown to systematically increase freedom — that is, if strong hegemony is shown to provide greater freedom to individuals — the inverse-relation claim falls. **If falsified:** The Section 6–7 bridge breaks. The mechanism of hegemony's effect on individual existence remains undefined. **Linked:** HEG-026 (context)

PHY-012 · Physis is Default, Nomos Requires Deliberate Effort (Öztürk, 2026)

Physis is the default; Nomos requires deliberate effort. The corporate entity is immortal, tireless, without conscience; Nomos can only be dictated to it by the individual, by force, and temporarily. Balance does not arise spontaneously, is not preserved, does not continue. When effort relaxes, the system automatically reverts to Physis. **Falsification condition:** If Nomos mechanisms are shown to be self-sustaining once established — that is, if balance is shown to be preserved even without deliberate effort — the “default” claim falls. **If falsified:** The “struggle continues” argument loses its foundation. The question “why is the struggle continuous?” remains unanswered. **Linked:** PHY-001 (precondition), NOM-004 (precondition)

MEŞ-013 · The Deceptiveness of Subjective Perception (Öztürk, 2026)

Under manipulative hegemony, the individual can experience another's will as their own. The answer “yes” can come from four different sources: the hegemony of reality, manipulative hegemony, legitimate exchange, surrender. **Falsification condition:** If individuals are shown to always be able to distinguish their own will from imposed will even under manipulative hegemony, the deceptiveness claim falls. **If falsified:** The distinction “feeling free ≠ being free” cannot be made. The measurement of freedom loses its foundation. **Linked:** PHY-007 (context)

MEŞ-015 · The Target Drift of the Legitimacy Test (Öztürk, 2026)

The legitimacy test always operates — but its target can drift. If the real decision-maker is elsewhere — corporate entity, system, invisible power centers — the legitimacy test tests the wrong target. The real upper class escapes accountability. **Falsification condition:** If the legitimacy test is shown to always find the correct target — that is, if the people are shown to correctly identify the real decision-makers — the target-drift claim falls. **If falsified:** Why the legitimacy test is insufficient in the modern world cannot be explained. **Linked:** MEŞ-012 (context)

PHY-013 · The Sovereign's Motivation is to Remain, Not Freedom (Öztürk, 2026)

From the sovereign's perspective, hegemony may appear as an increase in freedom, but the fundamental motivation is “to remain.” As power increases, the number and weight of components increase, the room for maneuver narrows, predictability increases. **Falsification condition:** If the primary motivation of sovereigns is shown to be freedom — that is, if power accumulation is shown to be undertaken for the purpose of increasing individual freedom — this hypothesis falls. **If falsified:** The freedom dimension of the “remaining” motivation falls. The mechanism for why the sovereign is also not free cannot be explained. **Linked:** PHY-008 (precondition)

GÜÇ-045 · The Dysfunction of Separation of Powers Against the Corporate Entity (Öztürk, 2026)

The “spreading over time” function of the separation-of-powers mechanism has lost its function due to the unlimited lifespan of corporate entities. It can obstruct the individual dictator; it can-

not obstruct institutional singularity. Moreover, instead of keeping the bureaucracy outside power conflict, it positions it as an actor — this makes possible the alternative form of singularity (bureaucratic hegemony). **Falsification condition:** If separation of powers is shown to be effective even against corporate entities — that is, if institutional singularity is shown to be permanently obstructed by separation of powers — the dysfunction claim falls. **If falsified:** How the corporate entity transcends Nomos mechanisms cannot be explained. The question “why separation of powers is insufficient” remains unanswered. **Linked:** TÜZ-001 (precondition), TÜZ-003 (context)

GÜÇ-046 · Pure Pysis in the International System (Öztürk, 2026)

The critical difference of the international system: all actors are corporate entities. The corporate entity operates as pure Pysis — Nomos can only enter the corporate entity through the individual, and at the international level this intermediary is absent. Result: the international system is the arena where Pysis operates in its purest form. **Falsification condition:** If international actors are shown to carry Nomos capacity — that is, if international organizations are shown to be capable of structurally making moral decisions without individual human intervention — the “pure Pysis” claim falls. **If falsified:** The mechanism for the book’s extension to the international system falls. “Why international law does not work” goes unanswered. **Linked:** TÜZ-001 (precondition)

PHY-014 · Freedom Cannot Be Left to Pysis (Öztürk, 2026)

The demand for freedom is Pysis, but its sustainability requires Nomos. If left to Pysis, it results in singularization — it does not bring real freedom even for the sovereign. The ideal of freedom destroys itself within Pysis dynamics. **Falsification condition:** If freedom is shown to be sustainably protectable without Nomos — through Pysis dynamics alone — the Nomos-necessity claim falls. **If falsified:** The bridge between PHY-010 and PHY-012 breaks. The formula “demand through Pysis + sustainability through Nomos” collapses. **Linked:** PHY-010 (precondition), PHY-012 (context)

NOM-014 · Equality is Entirely Nomos (Öztürk, 2026)

Equality is a concept with no counterpart in Physis. Nature does not produce equality. The “inequity aversion” observed in animals is not a demand for equality but an impulse for justice. Equality is entirely Nomos — a human-made, deliberately constructed ideal. This abstractness makes equality the most fragile and most manipulable concept. **Falsification condition:** If equality is shown to have a natural counterpart in Physis — that is, if equality is shown to be not learned but biologically encoded — the “entirely Nomos” claim falls. **If falsified:** Why equality is fragile cannot be explained. The Section 7–8 bridge breaks. **Linked:** NOM-003 (context), NOM-004 (context)

Section 8: Justice

TAN-066 · Organic and Instrumental Justice (Öztürk, 2026)

Justice operates in two forms: organic justice (Physis + Nomos, the search for balance) and instrumental justice (pure Physis disguised as Nomos, power consolidation). Instrumental justice is Physis wearing a Nomos mask. The difference is not in the source but in the function — the same mechanism (law, institution, rule) can be either organic or instrumental. **Falsification condition:** If justice is shown to always be organic — that is, if instrumentalization is shown to be not structural but an exceptional degeneration — the two-mode claim falls. Or if justice is shown to always be instrumental — if organic justice is shown to be an illusion. **If falsified:** The justice dimension of the hegemony-quality distinction falls. ADL-012 loses its foundation. **Linked:** PHY-001 (context), PHY-007 (context)

NÖR-024 · The Dual Layer of the Suffering of Injustice (Öztürk, 2026)

The suffering of injustice operates in two layers: individual (“it was done to me”) and group-level (“it was done to another but I also feel it”). Through mirror neurons and empathy circuits, another’s injustice is simulated — the calculation “what was done to them might be done to me tomorrow” operates unconsciously. This dual structure distinguishes justice from freedom — freedom protects individual existence, justice protects group existence. **Falsification condition:** If the suffering of injustice is shown to be only individual — that is, if the injustice of others is shown to produce no biological response — the dual-layer claim falls. **If falsified:** The dual individual/group structure of

justice falls. The freedom-justice distinction loses its foundation. **Linked:** PHY-001 (precondition)

PHY-015 · The Demand for Justice is Physis (Öztürk, 2026)

The search for balance — the origin of justice — already exists in Physis. The fairness response, empathy, the retribution impulse, mercy are impulsive, automatic. The stabilization mechanism in Physis was already operating; when scale grew and conscious choice came into play, it defined itself in the Nomos framework. Justice was not invented — it was defined when the human became able to define it conceptually. **Falsification condition:** If the demand for justice is shown to be entirely cultural — learned, conditioned — and to have no biological basis, the Physis-origin claim falls. **If falsified:** Section 8's founding hypothesis falls. The justice counterpart of PHY-010's "freedom is Physis" disappears. **Linked:** PHY-001 (precondition)

PHY-016 · Physis's Scale Asymmetry (Öztürk, 2026)

Physis's balancing mechanism (fairness, empathy, retribution) operates in face-to-face relations — the expectation of repeat encounter makes fairness operative; the wrongdoer can be excluded. When scale grows and relations become anonymous, this expectation disappears, and the mechanism ceases to function. Its destructive mechanism continues to operate independently of scale. **Falsification condition:** If the mechanisms of fairness and empathy are shown to operate automatically at large scale as well — that is, if the justice impulse is shown to be preserved even in anonymous relations — the asymmetry falls. **If falsified:** The justice-level concretization of Section 1's PHY-002 falls. The justice-based answer to "why is Nomos necessary?" disappears. **Linked:** PHY-002 (precondition)

VAR-022 · Group Death-Awareness and the Genesis of Justice (Öztürk, 2026)

While individual death-awareness gives birth to Nomos, group death-awareness ("if the group ceases to exist, my survival formula collapses") triggers the search for justice. The bond is indirect — the individual can switch to another group — and so the suffering of freedom is sharper, while the suffering of injustice is more widespread but less acute. **Falsification condition:** If the search for justice is shown to arise independently of group death-awareness — that is, if the de-

mand for justice is shown to arise even when the group is not under threat — the trigger claim falls. **If falsified:** The Section 8 extension of Section 1’s existence chain breaks. The parallelism individual death → Nomos / group death → justice is broken. **Linked:** VAR-002 (precondition), VAR-003 (precondition)

ADL-001 · The Reference Necessity of Justice (Öztürk, 2026)

The perception of injustice can only arise when comparison exists. Freedom does not require a reference (“do I have will?”); justice requires a reference (“is it fair?”). **Falsification condition:** If injustice is shown to be felt without a reference — that is, without comparison, as an absolute experience — the reference-necessity claim falls. **If falsified:** The Section 7–8 distinction loses its foundation. The mechanism for the freedom-justice difference cannot be explained. **Linked:** PHY-010 (context)

NOM-017 · Nomos Capacities Do Not Guarantee Balance (Öztürk, 2026)

The difference of Nomos lies not in dynamics but in capacities: choice, scale, codification. However, these capacities do not guarantee balance — choice can also choose imbalance, scale can also scale inequality, codification can also codify injustice. **Falsification condition:** If Nomos capacities are shown to systematically operate toward balance — that is, if the capacity for choice is shown to naturally tend toward fair choices — the no-guarantee claim falls. **If falsified:** The answer to the paradox “if Nomos exists, why is there no justice?” disappears. **Linked:** NOM-003 (precondition), NOM-004 (precondition)

PHY-018 · Nomos-Physis Balancing Asymmetry (Öztürk, 2026)

In Physis, both the hegemonic tendency and the balancing resistance operate automatically beyond the control of power-holders — the alpha cannot stop them. In Nomos, the hegemonic tendency operates automatically, but the balancing mechanism is dependent on the control of power-holders. This asymmetry makes Nomos structurally more fragile. **Falsification condition:** If the Nomos balancing mechanism is shown to operate independently of power-holders — structurally and automatically — the dependency claim falls. **If falsified:** The justice-level counterpart of Section 1’s

asymmetry argument falls. The justice dimension of the “struggle continues” argument disappears.

Linked: PHY-002 (precondition), NOM-004 (precondition)

ADL-008 · The Prerequisite Function of Equality (Öztürk, 2026)

Without the assumption of equality, freedom becomes the freedom of the powerful, justice becomes the justice of the powerful, right becomes the right of the powerful. Equality is the prerequisite that prevents the instrumentalization of Nomos’s other structures — without an axiom, no theorem can be constructed. However, equality is not justice itself; the axiom does not guarantee the theorem — equality is a prerequisite, not a solution. **Falsification condition:** If freedom and justice are shown to operate universally even without equality — that is, if “the freedom of all” can be discussed even without the assumption of equality — the prerequisite claim falls. **If falsified:** The mechanism of the equality → freedom → justice chain collapses. The operational consequence of NOM-014 falls.

Linked: NOM-014 (precondition)

ADL-012 · The Inter-Level Difference in Instrumentalization (Öztürk, 2026)

In relations where status and the corporate entity are not active, the rate of justice instrumentalization is low; in relations where they are active, it is systematically instrumentalized. The distinction is simple: when status and the corporate entity enter, justice becomes instrumentalized. The within-lower-class relation is the only “non-instrumentalized” cell — there is no struggle for status-based existence, and inequity aversion functions at small scale. **Falsification condition:** If justice is shown to be systematically instrumentalized even at the everyday level — that is, even without status and the corporate entity, justice is shown to transform into a tool of power — the inter-level-difference claim falls. **If falsified:** Section 8’s most practical implication falls. “Where does justice operate, where does it not?” goes unanswered. **Linked:** TÜZ-001 (context), TAN-066 (precondition)

GÜÇ-060 · The Braking Function of Source Hegemony (Öztürk, 2026)

The upper class’s dependence on the source makes the operation of everyday justice necessary. If “justice” is still being discussed in the system, this is evidence of source hegemony. The source’s

reaction to injustice — even if weak — functions as a brake in the system. Not separation of powers but this sensitivity is the real braking mechanism. **Falsification condition:** If justice is shown to operate independently of source hegemony — that is, even without any bargaining power on the part of the lower class — the braking-function claim falls. **If falsified:** The justice-level counterpart of HEG-003 falls. “Why is justice still discussed?” goes unanswered. **Linked:** HEG-003 (precondition)

Section on Equality

PHY-019 · The Counterpart of Equality in Physis (Öztürk, 2026)

Physis does not produce permanent equality — the strong eat the weak, the fast outpace the slow, the large devour the small. In Physis, there is not even temporary equality — only a unity that emerges at the moment of the spike: hierarchy requires a difference between “selves,” status requires comparison — when there is no “self,” both become meaningless and the distinction itself disappears. When the spike ends, the unity is lost, but a trace remains, and this trace is encoded as equality in Nomos and transformed into a norm. **Falsification condition:** If equality is shown to be sustained outside the spike — permanently, through Physis dynamics — the founding claim falls. **If falsified:** The founding hypothesis of the section on equality falls. The foundation of the claim “equality is entirely a product of Nomos” disappears. **Linked:** PHY-009 (context)

EŞT-006 · The Causality Fallacy (Öztürk, 2026)

The individual tends to attribute the success created by the brotherhood spike to equality. Equality was not the cause of success — it was the by-product of fraternity. What created success was the spike’s coordination capacity and power of solidarity — equality was the visible sign of that power. The sign was confused with the cause. **Falsification condition:** If equality is shown to independently produce success — independent of the brotherhood spike — the causality-fallacy claim falls. That is, if equality is genuinely an independent cause. **If falsified:** The most original contribution of the section on equality falls. The mechanism of the illusion “if we install equality, the problem is solved” cannot be explained. **Linked:** PHY-009 (context), PHY-019 (precondition)

EŞT-007 · The Protective Shield Function (Öztürk, 2026)

The norm of equality is a necessary prerequisite for freedom and justice to remain functional. Without equality, freedom becomes the freedom of the powerful, and justice the justice of the powerful. Equality is not an independent value but a shield required for the protection of other values — it is in a central position because it is the prerequisite for freedom and justice, not because it is a value in itself. **Falsification condition:** If freedom and justice are shown to operate universally even without equality — even against the powerful — the shield-function claim falls. **If falsified:** The bridge between Sections 7 and 8 and the section on equality breaks. The question “why should equality exist?” cannot be answered structurally. **Linked:** ADL-008 (precondition), NOM-014 (context)

EŞT-009 · Fragility and Vulnerability to Manipulation (Öztürk, 2026)

Equality, having no permanent counterpart in Physis, is the most fragile and most manipulable concept. Freedom and justice arise in absence — negative, producing suffering (a reaction exists); equality arises in presence — positive, the by-product of “we” in the spike. Outside the spike, the absence of equality is not felt — this asymmetry makes the manipulation of equality invisible. **Falsification condition:** If the absence of equality is shown to produce biological suffering — even outside the spike — the no-reaction claim falls. **If falsified:** Why equality is the most easily bypassed concept cannot be explained. **Linked:** NOM-004 (context), PHY-019 (precondition)

Section 9: Fraternity

PHY-021 · The Two-Table Difference — Map of the Intertwining of Physis and Nomos (Öztürk, 2026)

The difference between the Physis ranking and the real power ranking arises from the three elements that make the human human: death-awareness, temporal consciousness, and the capacity for choice. The spiritual dimension, at the bottom of the Physis ranking, rises to the top through the influence of Nomos — it is the strongest manifestation of Nomos within Physis, but at the same time the most fragile: powerful as long as questioning is closed, collapsing when it is opened. **Falsification condition:** If the two rankings are shown to not differ — that is, if the influence of Physis and

Nomos is shown to not change the order of fraternity dimensions — the “map” claim falls. Or if the difference in ordering is shown to derive from factors other than death-awareness, temporal consciousness, and the capacity for choice. **If falsified:** Section 9’s most original contribution falls. The concrete map of the intertwining of Physis and Nomos disappears. **Linked:** VAR-003 (precondition)

KAR-005 · The Emergency Nature of Fraternity (Öztürk, 2026)

Fraternity is an emergency mechanism — a social adrenaline surge. The spike is physiologically unsustainable for three reasons: the super-organism is an emergency state; the cortisol/oxytocin/adrenaline spike is metabolically unsustainable; the suppression of the prefrontal cortex is not normal functioning. Freedom and justice are baseline (chronic, continuous); fraternity is spike (momentary, exceptional). **Falsification condition:** If fraternity is shown to be sustainable as a baseline — chronic, continuous — the emergency-state claim falls. Or if freedom and justice are shown to also carry spike characteristics. **If falsified:** The mechanism for the structural difference between fraternity and freedom and justice falls. **Linked:** PHY-001 (precondition)

KAR-006 · Fraternity Has No Nomos (Öztürk, 2026)

Unlike freedom and justice, fraternity has no internal mechanism for transition to Nomos. In freedom, the suffering of will transforms into the capacity for choice; in justice, anger transforms into institution; in fraternity, the bond does not transform — it remains a bond. However, Nomos is not entirely closed to fraternity — it enters from outside: through awareness of freedom, justice, and equality. **Falsification condition:** If fraternity is shown to be transformable into Nomos — that is, if the fraternal bond is shown to be institutionalizable while preserving its essence — the “no Nomos” claim falls. **If falsified:** The argument that fraternity remains in Physis falls. The clearest evidence for the “Physis as default” argument disappears. **Linked:** NOM-002 (context)

KAR-007 · Fraternity is Fusion (Öztürk, 2026)

Fraternity is a momentary fusion in which “selves” dissolve into a super-organism. At the moment of the spike, neither force nor resistance operates — both require “the self.” Whether the group

formed by the spike will establish hegemony or shatter it is determined by the dynamics before and after the spike. The asymmetry is not in fraternity itself but in the Physis-Nomos balance: Physis is default, Nomos requires effort — because fraternity is collective, it multiplies this asymmetry. Because Physis’s destructive mechanism continues to operate independently of scale, the result emerges as asymmetric in practice. **Falsification condition:** If individuals are shown to not experience the dissolution of “the self” at the moment of fusion — if individual consciousness and will are shown to be preserved — the fusion mechanism falls. **If falsified:** The collective-level counterpart of Section 1’s PHY-002 falls. The mechanism for why the spike produces both founding and destructive results disappears. **Linked:** PHY-002 (precondition)

KAR-008 · The Nomos Paradox (Öztürk, 2026)

Genuine Nomos produces weak fraternity; Nomos simulacrum produces strong fraternity. The spiritual and political dimensions — the strongest fraternity — are Nomos simulacra: questioning is closed, hegemony is high. The philosophical dimension — the only genuine Nomos — produces the weakest fraternity. Nomos is powerful only when it is simulacrum — behaving like Physis, closing off questioning; when it is genuine Nomos, it weakens. **Falsification condition:** If genuine Nomos is shown to be capable of producing strong fraternity — that is, if intense collective bonding can be established even when questioning is open — the paradox collapses. **If falsified:** The fraternity dimension of Nomos’s fragility falls. The most striking evidence of the “Nomos paradox” argument disappears. **Linked:** NOM-003 (precondition), NOM-004 (precondition)

KAR-009 · The “Self”-Dissolution Mechanism (Öztürk, 2026)

At the moment of the spike, when altruism reaches its maximum, “the self” dissolves. This dissolution simultaneously eliminates three forms of suffering: freedom (tension requires two parties), justice (the calculation of proportion requires “the self”), equality (hierarchy requires a difference between “selves”). **Falsification condition:** If “the self” is shown to not dissolve at the moment of the spike — that is, if individual consciousness is shown to be preserved and the collective state is shown to operate compatibly with individual will — the dissolution mechanism falls. **If falsified:** The defining characteristic of the spike mechanism falls. Without “self”-dissolution, the spike, equality, and functional freedom/justice cannot be explained. **Linked:** PHY-001 (precondition),

VAR-003 (context)

KAR-010 · Physis's Trap — The Fraternity-Freedom Exclusivity (Öztürk, 2026)

Fraternity and freedom structurally exclude each other. In the fraternity spike, there is no will (the individual is voluntary); in hegemony, there is no will (another by force). The result is the same: the absence of will. This is why the sovereign wants to trigger fraternity again and again — fraternity is in structural harmony with leadership and hegemony, while in structural conflict with freedom. **Falsification condition:** If fraternity and freedom are shown to be sustainable together — simultaneously — the exclusivity claim falls. **If falsified:** The book's final argument falls. The deepest manifestation of Physis's internal contradiction disappears. **Linked:** PHY-010 (context), PHY-001 (precondition)

KAR-011 · The Founding-Destructive Paradox of Fraternity (Öztürk, 2026)

Fraternity establishes hegemony — but hegemony kills fraternity. Founding: fraternity creates the group → the group wins the power conflict → hegemony is established. Destructive: hegemony requires hierarchy → hierarchy disrupts the perception of equality → fraternity dies. **Falsification condition:** If the hegemony established by fraternity is shown to not kill fraternity — that is, if hegemony and fraternity are shown to be sustainable together — the paradox collapses. **If falsified:** The fraternity-level counterpart of Section 1's TÜZ-003 falls. "Every successful fraternity prepares its own death" — the cycle's inevitability is broken. **Linked:** TÜZ-003 (context), İLK-012 (context)

KAR-018 · Fraternity-Hierarchy Mutual Exclusivity (Öztürk, 2026)

Fraternity and hierarchy cannot coexist. Fraternity requires the perception of equality; hierarchy disrupts the perception of equality. At the moment of the spike, fraternity exists, hierarchy is suspended; after the spike, fraternity weakens, hierarchy begins to appear. But fraternity gives birth to leadership, and leadership creates hierarchy. Fraternity gives birth to its own murderer. **Falsification condition:** If fraternity and hierarchy are shown to be capable of coexisting — without disrupting each other — the exclusivity claim falls. Or if fraternity is shown to not give birth to

leadership. **If falsified:** The structural foundation of KAR-011 falls. The mechanism for why the paradox is inevitable disappears. **Linked:** PHY-002 (context), KAR-011 (consequence)

Conclusion

The 93 hypotheses presented constitute the falsifiable structural skeleton of Physis: A Theory of Power (Öztürk, 2026). They are organized through an explicit dependency architecture: foundational claims about Physis-Nomos asymmetry (Section 1) ground the analysis of power-conflict mechanics (Section 2), which in turn grounds the analysis of leadership (Section 3), managerial classes (Section 4), corporate entities (Section 5), hegemony (Section 6), and the resistance principles of freedom (Section 7), justice (Section 8), and equality, with fraternity (Section 9) understood as a fusion mechanism distinct from these resistance principles. The framework's central claim is that power conflict produces singularization as a structural outcome wherever the mechanism operates — a mathematical necessity, postponable but not preventable by Nomos. This claim, together with the asymmetry between Physis's destructive mechanisms (which scale without friction) and its balancing mechanisms (which cease to function at scale), produces the framework's diagnosis: a continuous and structurally handicapped struggle in which the constructive direction of Nomos requires unceasing effort against trajectories that operate of their own accord. The framework is offered not as a closed system but as a pressure point. Each hypothesis specifies its own falsification conditions; each falsification, if successful, specifies which downstream components collapse. The reader is given the architecture and the attack points simultaneously. This is what distinguishes Physis from most social theory: the author specifies not only what the theory claims but exactly how it can be destroyed. The hypotheses are presented in their definitive form. Detailed argumentation, mathematical models, formal definitions, historical case studies, and sustained engagement with the canonical political-theoretical literature (Marx, Weber, Foucault, Bourdieu, Mills, Wallerstein, Mann) are reserved for the forthcoming book. The Nomos Paradigm Series of analytical articles (Öztürk, 2026, ongoing) applies these hypotheses to historical and contemporary phenomena. Open questions remain. The empirical operationalization of falsification conditions for structural-tendency claims requires further work. The cross-cultural generality of the framework — particularly outside European and Anglo-American historical material — requires testing.

The relation between the framework and emerging traditions in complexity science, evolutionary game theory, and computational social science remains to be developed. The implications of the framework for the AI/AGI transition, addressed structurally in the Nomos Paradigm Series, require further philosophical and technical development. The framework’s contribution, if it is a contribution, is to specify the mechanics of power conflict with sufficient precision that the conditions of refutation become explicit. Whether the framework survives that test is for further research and debate to determine.

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, class dynamics, and corporate-entity transformations that ground the structural claims 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 paper 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 corporate entity as ontological hybrid species, the structural inevitability of the singularization ten-

dency, and the fragility paradox of full hegemonic breakdown — are positioned at a high level of structural abstraction. Their operationalization for specific empirical research requires further development. The framework provides falsification conditions in principle; their implementation in concrete research designs is a task for subsequent work. 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.

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). *The Game We Cannot Quit: How Paradigms Are Born, How They Die*. Nomos Paradigm Series, Article 1. SSRN Working Paper.

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 Reign of the Aristocracy*. Multi-volume historical research.

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

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, and others) is reserved for the forthcoming book. References to these traditions in the present paper 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 hypothesis architecture and dependency network, and the 93 core hypotheses themselves — 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 presented here. Correspondence regarding this framework may be directed through the author’s web hub: evrenozturk.carrd.co.

Related Resources

Forthcoming book: Öztürk, E. (2026). *Physis: A Theory of Power*.

Series articles: Öztürk, E. (2026). *Nomos Paradigm Series*. Independent publication on Medium. <https://medium.com/@evroztrk>

Web: <https://evrenozturk.carrd.co>

Registration, Copyright, and Attribution

The hypotheses presented in this preprint are 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 work and the *Physis* theory itself rests upon the author’s multi-volume historical research conducted between 2020–2025. This research — comprising *The Reign of the Aristocracy* (2021–2024) and *The Rise of the Bourgeoisie* (2024–2025) — is unpublished but constitutes the empirical foundation for the structural observations presented here. Research for *The Reign of the Bourgeoisie* is ongoing. The full work comprises 432 pages, 93 core falsifiable hypotheses, and 633 core mechanisms in total. The theoretical ecosystem of which

this preprint constitutes the structural skeleton 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

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.

© 2026 Evren Öztürk. All rights reserved.