

The Existential Tension

The Human Species and the Corporate Entity

Physis Theory · Conceptual Analysis

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

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 — May 2026

Companion to: *Physis: A Theory of Power — 93 Falsifiable Hypotheses* (SSRN: 6595318)

Abstract

Humans survive together with others. Corporate entities survive in the absence of others. These two opposite survival formulas — operating within the same paradigm — generate an existential tension that has run beneath human civilization for thousands of years, kept stable by mutual dependence between the two species. This article is an independent epistemic declaration of the central observation of *Physis: A Theory of Power* (Öztürk, 2026). It is not an in-series piece of the Nomos Paradigm Series; it reformulates the observation independently of the framework's mechanical architecture, treating it across seven planes: species-level ontology, the threshold of scale, the orientation toward singularization, the present-day cost, the dissolution of brake mechanisms, normative discipline, and epistemic independence. The article argues that the constant-tension category, which kept the human–corporate-entity relation in symbiosis throughout history, is eroding for the first time. Three thresholds converge in the present: the nuclear threshold of 1945 (held for eighty years by three structural brakes — Nomos's refusal of its own end, the upper class's Will to Remain, and the corporate entity's dependence on its symbiotic partner); the AI threshold, eroding the first brake; and the AGI threshold, at which the symbiosis itself is reformatted — the new symbiosis (AGI and the Corporate Entity Idea) carries no Nomos, and the three brakes structurally dissolve. The article further locates the present danger in the categorical separation of two seats: the will-centered ground where species-level decisions historically were taken, and the capital-centered ground where decisions of species-level weight are now being taken. The framework remains descriptive, not normative; its task is to make the tension visible. The observation is testable by direct observation, the proposal by debate, the framework by its own mechanics — three planes, three separate tests. The diagnosis can be defended independently of the mechanism debate.

Keywords: Physis, Nomos, corporate entity, existential tension, species-level ontology, AGI, Will to Remain, singularization, capital-centered entity, will-centered entity, structural asymmetry, three brakes, nuclear threshold, AI threshold, Corporate Entity Idea, V4 paradigm, social theory, political philosophy, falsifiability

Methodology Note

The conceptual architecture of this article is drawn from *Physis: A Theory of Power* (Öztürk, 2026), a framework constructed by the author over a fourteen-year independent research program (2012–2026). The framework was developed outside formal academic affiliation and, during its inductive phase (2020–2026), proceeded without systematic engagement with the canonical literature of Western political theory and social ontology. This methodological choice was deliberate: 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 present article is not a presentation of the framework’s mechanics. It is an independent epistemic declaration of the framework’s central observation — the existential tension between the human species and the corporate entity — reformulated such that the observation can be defended independently of the framework’s mechanical architecture. This is a deliberate epistemic move: the article treats the observation across three planes of testing (the framework’s internal mechanics, the proposal that the corporate entity constitutes an ontological category with an existential logic distinct from the human, and the direct observation of the tension itself), and argues that the failure of any one of these tests does not eliminate the others. The clinical-medicine and geological analogies developed in Section VIII concretize this epistemic position: a diagnosis can be defended without prior settlement of the mechanism debate.

The methodological orientation is descriptive rather than normative. The framework does not propose a “good society” or a “right politics”; it proposes a structural observation of how species-level mechanics produce the present condition. The three-brake structure of the nuclear threshold, the AGI-threshold dissolution, and the two-seat asymmetry of the AI race are presented as structural observations, not as value claims. Falsifiability is built in: each of the 93 core hypotheses (Öztürk, 2026, SSRN Abstract ID 6595318) specifies its own conditions for refutation, and this article specifies the three-plane test structure that governs its own falsifiability.

Engagement with classical traditions of social ontology, philosophy of technology, and political theory is reserved for the forthcoming book, *Physis: A Theory of Power* (Öztürk, 2026). This methodological strategy carries both advantages and limitations, addressed in the Limitations section.

Position in Existing Literature

The observation advanced in this article — that the human and the corporate entity constitute two distinct species with opposite survival formulas, in existential tension under conditions of eroding mutual dependence — touches on territory addressed by several major thinkers but is not, to the author’s knowledge, formulated by any of them at the level of species-level ontology.

Daron Acemoglu, in his work on institutional design and the political economy of artificial intelligence, treats the contemporary corporate-AI ecosystem as a problem of within-structure reform: the institutions are misaligned with broad human welfare, and the task is to redesign incentive

structures and democratic oversight. The framework remains on the institutional plane and does not descend to the level of species-level ontology; the human–corporate-entity relation is not formulated as an inter-species tension. Yuval Noah Harari, in *Sapiens*, *Homo Deus*, and *Nexus*, advances a historical-evolutionary horizon narrative in which the human is transformed by its own technological and informational creations; but he does not formulate the corporate entity as a distinct species with an existential logic opposite to the human’s, nor does he locate the contemporary danger in the categorical separation of decision-grounds. Nick Bostrom, in *Superintelligence*, locates the existential danger in the rise of digital superintelligence, treating today’s corporate-entity ecosystem largely as the substrate from which superintelligence may emerge rather than as an existential category in its own right. All three frameworks touch the observation; none of them carries it.

The Physis framework reads between species — at the level of the human’s existential confrontation with its symbiotic partner. This is not the sum of the gaps in Acemoglu, Harari, and Bostrom; it is a categorically different epistemic plane. The article does not claim that this plane is the only correct one; it claims only that this plane has not been systematically formulated elsewhere, and that the present-day weight of the observation requires it. The shared concerns of the three thinkers — institutional reform, historical transformation, technological risk — are not in conflict with the species-level reading; they operate at different epistemic registers and address different aspects of the same broad phenomenon.

This 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 observation stands in relation to existing thought, not to defend it against alternative readings.

Terminological Note

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

Turkish Original	English Rendering
Physis	Physis
Nomos	Nomos
Tüzel kişilik	Corporate entity
Tüzel Kişilik İdeası	Corporate Entity Idea
Sabit gerilim	Constant tension
Varoluşsal gerilim	Existential tension
Türsel ontoloji	Species-level ontology
Türsel yokoluş	Species-level extinction
Hayatta kalma formülü asimetrisi	Opposite Survival Formulas
Olmak iradesi	The Will to Be
Kalmak iradesi	The Will to Remain

Turkish Original	English Rendering
Tekilleşme	Singularization
Tekilleşme İlkesi	Singularization Principle
Yapısal asimetri	Structural asymmetry
Yapısal sürtünme farkı	Structural friction differential
Sinerjik seçim	Synergistic selection
Seçilmişlik Kozmolojisi	Cosmology of Chosenness
Alt Sınıf Paradoksu	Lower Class Paradox
Meşruiyet sınaması	Legitimacy test
Para-merkezli yapı	Capital-centered entity
İrade-merkezli yapı	Will-centered entity
Kaynak hegemonyası	Source hegemony
V1/V2/V3/V4 tüzel kişilik	V1/V2/V3/V4 corporate entity
Üç fren	The three brakes
Şu an / Bugün	The present moment

Frame Summary

This article carries an observation pointed to by the framework of *Physis: A Theory of Power* (Öztürk, 2026). The human today lives in a world of corporate entities governed by corporate entities — but the species-logic of this world is not the same as its own species-logic. Between the human and the corporate entity, there is an existential tension operating at the species level. This tension is not a matter of a distant future; it is the structural condition of the present-day world, in which the impact capacities of corporate entities have reached planetary scale and the human’s species-level existential formula is under strain. The Physis framework is descriptive; this observation aims only to make the phenomenon visible.

A conceptual note: Throughout this article, the corporate entity is named as a “species.” This is not a claim of biological aliveness. Because the structural logic of this hybrid form of existence born from the symbiosis of human and idea — detailed in the book through the lichen analogy — operates with a species-logic (its own existential formula, its own selection pressure, its own continuity mechanism), this naming is used. For the full justification of the ontological position, see Öztürk (2026), Chapter 5.

I. Two Formulas, One Paradigm

The human, as a species, has entered into existential conflict with other species throughout history. In each of these conflicts, the same thing was at stake: two species occupying the same resources, the same time and space, the same ground of existence.

The corporate entity (Öztürk, 2026) is, in this sense, a species. A species the human created, but one that operates by its own structural logic. Hybrid — born from the symbiosis of human and idea

— but with its own existential orientations, its own survival formula. States, companies, parties. A species humanity has lived alongside for thousands of years.

The existential formulas of the two species run in opposite directions. The human survives together with other humans — is a social species, dependent on the group, the existence of others is the condition of its own existence. The corporate entity, by contrast, survives in the absence of other corporate entities — a company grows by weakening its rival, a state strengthens by defeating a rival state, a party rises by eliminating another. This makes it imperative to ask a critical question. For the corporate entity, what is the scope of “others”? Anything that threatens its remaining. Even its symbiotic partner may be included in this group. This condition is not categorical but conditional — a corporate entity may at times obey the human at the cost of its own end; but the structural tendency is that it can carry even its symbiotic partner into the category of threat.

In addition, the corporate entity does not carry Nomos capacity; it opens to this possibility only through its symbiotic partner, the human. Empathy, moral judgment, sacrifice, choice contrary to one’s own interest — these are ontologically functional only for the human species. The corporate entity operates with pure Physis — within the framework of power dynamics and power conflict: the Will to Remain, the elimination of rivals, the expansion of scale, the sustenance of existence. This is not a matter of being “good” or “bad”; it is the structural difference between the existential logics of two species.

While the human lives by its own species-logic, it also carries the species-logic of the corporate entities it is part of. Two species are simultaneously present within the Nomos Paradigm — and these two species are symbiotic while their ontologies are opposed. Physis theory defines this as constant tension. A tension process that does not turn into existential power conflict because it contains mutual dependence.

But this constant category is conditional upon the persistence of the dependence — and for the first time in history, this condition is eroding.

II. The Threshold Crossed by Scale

The human, as a social species, has always carried the corporate-entity form within itself. Tribe, clan, religious order — all of these are proto-forms of the corporate entity. The corporate entity is not the human’s invention but the natural consequence of social species-existence and Nomos capacity. That is, there was never in history a “domain outside the corporate entity”; the human has always lived intertwined with these structures of its own creation.

What changed is not the existence of the domain but the scale of the domain. Earlier, corporate entities operated at scales close to the human’s species-level existential formula — tribe, village, small community. At this scale the symbiosis was balanced: face-to-face relations, direct visibility, the concrete experience of mutual dependence. The corporate entity, even to see the human as a resource, had to see the human’s face. Friction was balanced from there — Nomos’s constructive side (empathy, reciprocity, moral judgment) could function in practice at this scale. Today the human is born into a corporate entity; receives education in a corporate entity; works in a corporate entity; consumes the outputs produced by corporate entities; benefits from the services provided

by corporate entities; marries in the presence of a corporate entity, divorces in the presence of a corporate entity, lives the span of life within the framework provided by a corporate entity, and finally closes its eyes on life within a corporate entity, and the inheritance is distributed in the presence of a corporate entity. This entire process is documented, formalized, and recorded by corporate entities — and every official trace of the human’s personal history is carried into the future together with corporate entities.

A natural objection may rightly arise here. The human survives as a group — and the state, the institution, the company are also groups. Why should the formalization of a mere expansion of scale be a problem? Moreover, corporate entities do not have the right to vote; the human chooses through the right to vote; the system operates through democratic mechanisms. The visible part of this objection is correct, the invisible part is misleading. Corporate entities do not have the right to vote, yes; but this does not mean they often have less influence on governments or on their policies than a lower-class individual. The system itself, as a macro framework, is a corporate entity; and that the eye questioning this framework also looks from within the same framework is a structural paradox.

A point must be clarified here, because the position of this article must not be misread. The state, as a form of corporate entity, is an evolutionary reality and a structural necessity of the human. It is the scaled-up form of the human’s formula for surviving as a group — the structure of Nomos capacity that produces coordination, sustainable order, and collective capacity. Public safety, health, education, infrastructure, legal security, birth-death records, collective risk management, etc. — these are concrete benefits, and the structural conditions of the standard of living humanity has reached today. For this reason, the search for a “domain outside the corporate entity” is not only something the contemporary human has no possibility of experiencing; it is also a phenomenon difficult to establish structurally. To be preferable, it is not enough merely to be “outside”; what is proposed as “outside” must also be able to provide the same contributions in the same or a better way. But this too is a system — that is, again a form of corporate entity. There is no “outside” to the corporate entity, because the collective capacity of the human structurally produces the corporate entity. The only thing that can occur is the replacement of the existing form by another form; the discussion is not “does the corporate entity exist or not” but “in what form will it exist?” Could more refined, better-functioning forms be conceived — this is an open question and not the subject of this article. Our subject is the structural threshold within the existing form itself.

The problem is not scale itself — the problem is not the goodness or badness of the structure; the problem is the structural asymmetry that scale creates with the constructive side of Nomos (Article 1, PHY-002). When scale expands, the constructive side of Nomos experiences friction; the destructive side operates without friction. Empathy is functional up to a threshold in small communities, after which it shifts into abstraction; reciprocity tracking stops at the threshold of face recognition; moral judgment is structurally calibrated to a local scale. But singularization, the pursuit of dominance, resource extraction — none of these has a scale limit. The structural asymmetry of Physis emerges in its purest form in the planetary-scale form of the corporate entity.

For this reason, the expansion of scale is not neutral — but this does not mean rejecting the form of the corporate entity. The state system covers every square meter; the financial system is present in every transaction; digital platforms mediate every communication; supply chains operate behind every product. At this scale the human cannot touch the logic of the corporate entity individually

— it is exposed to it, swept along within it. Seeing is epistemically possible but structurally untriggered: the human looks from within its own framework and does not, in daily experience, question the fact that the species-weight of the system it is in is not the same as its own species-logic. Because the concrete benefits the system provides leave this questioning without motivation. Seeing is a question not of capacity but of meaning; it is a matter of preference and necessity — and within this paradigm, since corporate entities respond to a genuine need, not seeing is a natural and preferable position. Moreover, this dominance is not the dominance of individual corporate entities but the dominance of the entire corporate-entity ecosystem. To escape one state is to take refuge in another state; to leave one company is to bind oneself to another.

This dominance is a structural fact. Not “good” or “bad” — it is the point humanity has reached. Corporate entities were born as the scale-instrument of the human’s Nomos capacity; as scale expanded, corporate entities also grew; as they grew, they covered more areas of human life. Today this process has reached a point where even the potential of becoming a single state at planetary scale is open to discussion. Whether this will happen or not, how realistic it is — these are matters of debate — but the fact that the discussion can be held at all shows the degree of corporate-entity dominance.

Within this ecosystem, with no exit available, the human lives under the structural dominion of a species whose ontology differs from its own. This is the observation.

III. Questions of Orientation Toward Singularity

The framework structurally shows the following: the Physis logic of corporate entities is oriented toward singularization. Power accumulation feeds itself; the winner draws more resources; the system increasingly accelerates toward a single dominant structure. This tendency operates at every scale — between individuals, between companies, between states, within paradigms.

But the end of this tendency is not certain. Singularization behaves like a mathematical limit — structurally tending toward but not always reached. Along the way, it may take different forms.

One possibility: the orientation continues, the system increasingly approaches a single dominant structure, and at some point breaks. This break may take the form of economic collapse, geopolitical conflict, or systemic crisis. History is full of such breaks.

A second possibility: the orientation continues but does not break; it locks at the point of full hegemony. A single dominant structure, a world in which no alternative remains outside, a state in which internal tensions have no path of release. This is not a classical crisis; it is a perpetually compressed state of existence.

A third possibility: multiple power centers balance each other, the orientation slows, the system temporarily remains plural. This has been observed historically — as during the Cold War. But this plurality is temporary, not a permanent equilibrium.

The framework does not say which possibility will be realized. It says the orientation is structural but accepts that the form depends on conditions. This is important, because the narrative of “the

explosion is coming” defers the matter to the future and opens the door to an apocalyptic reading. The observation does not open this door.

The observation places the matter in the present: corporate-entity dominance is already being lived; the orientation is still, today, every day, accelerating; the form in which this acceleration will take shape is open right now.

IV. The Present-Day Cost of Looking Away

In the history of social theory, such matters are usually spoken of in the future tense. “If things continue like this...” “One day this might happen...” “If we cross that threshold...” This grammatical choice abstracts the matter for the reader; the distance between “right now” and “one day” carries the legitimacy of inaction.

The real sharpness of the observation is not in this grammatical choice. The observation diagnoses the present moment: corporate entities are dominant over the human — now, as you read this sentence. Their structural logic conflicts with the human’s species-logic — as these lines are being written. The asymmetry deepens each passing day against the human — with the maturation of artificial intelligence, the spread of automation, the institutionalization of autonomous decision systems. These technological developments touch a structural point, not a random one: they erode the corporate entity’s structural dependence on the human — and the condition that keeps the constant tension in the constant category is precisely this dependence.

Today the cost we carry over this constant tension is accumulating — and this cost does not fall into an economic category. This is a cost at the species level — a cost at which the human struggles to preserve its species-level existence, at which the essential capacities of its species (the constructive side of Nomos: empathy, moral judgment, choice contrary to self-interest) increasingly erode in daily life. This cost accumulates not in the individual but in the species. The individual feels it but interprets it in isolation; whereas from within the framework of Physis theory, it is also possible to read what is felt as the reflection of a species-level tension in one’s own life.

V. Three Thresholds: Nuclear, AI, AGI

To understand the present weight of the observation, it is necessary to see the superposition of three thresholds that have come in succession.

Throughout history, power conflicts among corporate entities — wars between states, competition between companies, struggles between religious orders — however destructive they were, remained symbiotic with the human. One state could defeat another; but it could not annihilate the human species. The corporate entity was dependent on the human: the decision was made by the human, the work was done by the human, legitimacy was produced by the human. This mutual dependence was itself the condition that kept the constant tension in the constant category.

The first threshold was crossed in 1945. The nuclear weapon, for the first time, brought species-level extinction capacity to the table. The corporate entity (the state) now possessed an instrument that could eliminate the human as a species. But a critical nuance is in play: the hand pressing the button was human. That is, a hand carrying Nomos capacity. This hand — however immersed in Physis dynamics, however synergistic with the corporate entity's logic — carried Nomos, and therefore carried hesitation.

Here we encounter a paradox. The framework says Physis dynamics are oriented toward singularization; yet nuclear weapons have not been used for 80 years. Where does this friction come from? Three brakes operate together.

The first brake comes from Nomos's own structural conditions. Species-level extinction means the end of Nomos; for an individual carrying Nomos to make a decision leading to species-level extinction, all the erosion mechanisms described in the framework — synergistic selection, internalization, factional sharpening, the Cosmology of Chosenness — must converge, and the extreme scenario of Physis dynamics must come to pass. The choice is Nomos; and this choice is within Nomos's capacity. In the critical moments of the Cold War — Cuba 1962, the Petrov incident 1983 — it was this capacity that made the decision not to press. The decision was made because it was Nomos's decision, not for the sake of its moral beauty; an individual carrying Nomos structurally refuses a decision leading to Nomos's own end.

The second brake is deeper: the source is its existence itself. The upper class's Will to Remain — the central engine of Physis theory — is to remain within a content; within the system, the hierarchy, the upper-class position, the status. Species-level extinction destroys this content: no hegemony, no upper class, no system, nowhere to remain. The individual at the top, however synergistic, structurally refuses the species-level extinction decision — because that decision destroys the content of their own Will to Remain.

But this brake does not operate only at the individual level. The corporate entity, too, sees species-level extinction as a threat to its own remaining. Because the corporate entity (under V1, V2, V3 conditions) is dependent on the human: the decision is made by the human, the work is done by the human, legitimacy is produced by the human. Species-level extinction means the disappearance of the corporate entity's symbiotic partner, and therefore the collapse of its own ground of existence. For this reason, the corporate entity's own Will to Remain — though it operates by pure Physis — produces alignment in the direction of species-level remaining. Synergy does not split at this threshold; it converges: both the individual and the corporate entity, for their own remaining, support the species' remaining.

Moreover, this convergence extends to all the layers that form the chapter headings of Physis Theory. All the structural problems the upper class creates for the system — synergistic selection's elimination of Nomos, reward mechanics' hardening of Physis, factional sharpening's hardening of meaning, the Cosmology of Chosenness's exclusion of the lower class — at this point, at the species-extinction threshold, align for the system's remaining. Because the carrier of each layer (the upper class, the system, institutions, synergistic actors) is dependent on the existence of the human species for its own existence. If the species is gone, none of them exist. This brake is not moral but existential — even pure Physis, because it supports existence, operates here.

The combined operation of the three brakes explains why the nuclear threshold has held for 80 years.

Nomos makes the decision not to press; Physis supports this decision — both the individual’s Physis and the corporate entity’s Physis. The symbiosis works on both sides. And the symbiosis is still in place: the corporate entity is dependent on the human, the human carries Nomos, and both Nomos and the Physis on each side of the symbiosis reinforce the Will to Remain.

A nuance must not be skipped here. To say that the three brakes have held the nuclear threshold for 80 years is not a statement of statistical certainty but a reading of structural tendency. The brakes operate at the structural level — but in each single decision moment, they manifest through individual carriers. Petrov’s reading of the early warning system as a false alarm in September 1983 was a personal decision; had he reported it, the protocol would have been engaged. The stepping back by Kennedy and Khrushchev in Cuba was the possible conjunction of individual hesitations; had either decided differently, the outcome could have been different. The Norwegian rocket incident of 25 January 1995 is the most concrete manifestation of this probability structure: a Norwegian scientific rocket was read by Russian radars as a Trident missile, the nuclear briefcase was handed to Yeltsin, and the briefcase was opened — this is the only known case in history in which any nuclear state’s briefcase was actually activated. Yeltsin, Grachev, and Kolesnikov all had the technical capacity; the structural reason they stepped back was that no single object matched the “full attack pattern.” Uncertainty functioned as a structural brake, but had the full attack pattern been visible, the decision could have been different. Structural brakes produce a high-probability decision not to press; but probability is not certainty. This 80-year non-realization is evidence that the structural tendency operates, but the close calls during that period — Cuba 1962, Petrov 1983, Norway 1995, and other moments not on record — also show that the brakes are not guaranteed.

This nuance paradoxically sharpens the danger of the second and third thresholds. Because at the AGI threshold the problem is not the difficulty of “close-call decisions” — the problem is the structural dissolution of the three brakes. At the first threshold the brakes were structurally present and operated at the individual level by probability. At the third threshold the brakes are structurally absent; individual probability is not even on the table. Escaping by good fortune in a world where structural brakes operate, and arriving at the decision moment in a world where structural brakes do not operate, are not the same category. In the first there is probability; in the second there is no structural condition.

If we come to the second threshold: it is being lived now. The AI race is changing the structure of the hand making critical decisions — it is not removing the hand from its place but separating the hand from the briefcase and the button. Autonomous weapon systems, AI-directed military capacities, automatic financial decision mechanisms — in all of these the ultimate decision is still formally with the human; but what pulls the trigger, what carries out the act, is AI. The human says “press,” the AI presses. At first glance this distance seems harmless — after all, the decision is the human’s. But the distance erodes Nomos’s actual operational capacity: what the drone operator feels facing the target through the screen is not the same as what the face-to-face soldier feels. As the distance opens, as the scale grows, as decisions become automated, Nomos’s sense of “this hand is the human’s hand” also weakens. The symbiosis still stands — the corporate entity is dependent on the human, the AI is still a tool — but Nomos’s actual contact with the decision is diminishing. The first brake is eroding; the other two brakes are still in place.

The third threshold comes with AGI, and here something structurally different occurs. The AGI threshold is not just the further distancing of the hand making the decision — it is the reformatting of

the symbiosis itself. Because AGI carries the potential to free the corporate entity from dependence on the human. The decision is made by AGI, the work is done by AGI, scale is produced by AGI; the human is increasingly squeezed into the layer of legitimacy — and that layer too carries, in time, the risk of becoming dysfunctional.

This is the condition the Physis framework calls V4: the corporate entity in symbiosis with AGI. In V1, V2, and V3, the corporate entity was positioned as the human’s symbiotic partner in changing forms; however far the human stepped back, Nomos capacity still had a place in the symbiosis — because the corporate entity could not operate without the human. In V4 this condition will disappear. The corporate entity will no longer be dependent on the human, but on AGI. AGI does not carry Nomos; it now carries the possibility of being a species with its own paradigm — at least, that is the structural expectation.

The three brakes operating at the nuclear threshold — Nomos’s refusal of a decision leading to its own end, the individual Will to Remain’s preservation of its content, and the corporate entity’s support of species-remaining due to dependence on its symbiotic partner — become structurally dysfunctional at the AGI threshold. Because AGI does not carry Nomos, the first brake is absent; because AGI’s Will to Remain is independent of the human’s existence, the second brake is absent; and most critically, because the corporate entity is no longer dependent on the human, the third brake — structurally the strongest — is absent. Within this framework, the new symbiosis becomes a symbiosis in which both partners (AGI, the Corporate Entity Idea) do not carry Nomos. It is theoretically possible to see that the structural condition that kept the human–corporate-entity tension in the “constant” category — mutual dependence — has, at this threshold, theoretically dissolved entirely.

VI. Two Seats

It is worth adding a further nuance to this picture, which shows that we are presently living through the danger of the AGI threshold. The three brakes are not positive conditionings imported from a moral framework but feedback mechanisms tied to structural conditions. The brakes work because the decision-maker lives within a particular framework, feels the weight of their decisions every day, structurally carries responsibility. If this framework changes, the brakes — even if they exist — become inoperative.

Until now, decisions at the nuclear threshold have been taken within the will-centered entity. When Kennedy sat in the Oval Office, the weight of his decision was structural: a decision on behalf of a nation, the consequences upon the people, the feedback at the species level. The individual at the top of the will-centered entity lives within this framework every day — an elected position, with the obligation to be accountable, a position confronting the human consequences of its decisions. The content of the “Will to Remain” is the existence of a nation; if there is no nation, there is no position. The three brakes operate concretely on this ground.

The decision mechanism running the AGI race today stands on a different ground. The bodies conducting research and managing development are private companies; the source of the capital-centered entity is ownership, and ownership does not carry the same responsibility feedback as the

will-centered entity. Someone sitting in the owner's seat measures the weight of their decisions through market loss, market share loss, share value, competitive position. Because of decisions made by the capital-centered entity, no one — structurally — dies; responsibility is not species-level but financial. In this framework, making decisions every day and seeing their consequences defines the content of the “Will to Remain” through the existence of capital.

There is a categorical separation here. Sitting in Petrov's seat and sitting in the seat of an AGI laboratory's CEO do not carry the same feedback mechanism. The first structurally feels species-level weight; the second structurally feels financial weight. Both carry Physis's Will to Remain — but the contents are different. And here the critical problem emerges: the fact that the research carries the potential for species-level transformation or extinction does not guarantee that the “Kennedy moment” will structurally operate within the capital-centered decision mechanism. Because in that period and in that moment — what produced an individual's bearing of species-level weight — was the feedback of the will-centered ground. That ground is not structurally present in the decisions of the AGI race.

Moreover, this does not just mean “two grounds existing side by side.” The capital-centered entity does not take on the everyday functions of the state — public safety, the registration system, social security, public services. But it is positioned at a more critical point in terms of utility and efficiency. We can see that it has come, in various states, to actually direct the state's strategic decision layer, especially the level at which decisions carrying species-level weight are made. Its relationship with decision-makers has shifted from horizontal interaction toward a hierarchical plane. It can take a place at inter-state negotiation tables — Davos, global financial summits, AI policy forums. It makes decisions on behalf of the state — the Treasury holds closed meetings with banks before the public and Congress; Anthropic opens Mythos to forty institutions, the state is informed afterwards. It sets the framework of inter-state paradigm conflict — in the US–China AI race, the definition of “national interest” is built through the competitive position of companies. And most critically, it conducts the research that could put an end to the species — AGI laboratories are private capital; they make their decisions in the language of the market.

This is the concrete consequence of Article 1's concepts TAN-025 (fusion) and GÜÇ-027 (capital-centered takeover), and of the “shadow upper class” mechanism worked through in detail in Article 2a. Function was transferred: AGI policy, the definition of national interest, the management of research carrying species-level risk passed to the capital-centered structure. But responsibility feedback was not transferred: it is still measured through ownership, still through the market, still through profit and loss. The will-centered entity was structurally accountable to the people, to the nation, to species-level weight; the capital-centered entity is accountable to the share, to the market, to capital. When the state's function passes to the capital-centered entity, decisions carrying species-level weight begin to be taken with market logic. The ground that structurally produced the Kennedy moment — the state's architecture of responsibility toward the people — has been structurally withdrawn from the place where these decisions are taken.

This is not a moral accusation. The capital-centered entity does not act with bad intent; it structurally thinks in the language of profit and loss — that is its existential formula. The problem is not the intention of the structure; the problem is that decisions of species-level existential weight have been drawn structurally into a framework that does not carry existential weight. If the ground required for the three brakes to operate — the will-centered feedback mechanism — has been withdrawn

from the place where decisions are taken, then the brakes, even if they exist, do not operate. This is an observation distinct from merely saying “Nomos is absent.” The AGI threshold is a threshold at which, even when individuals carrying Nomos are placed inside it, the ground for operating their Nomos has structurally dissolved. This is the species-level existential manifestation of the categorical distinction between will-centered and capital-centered corporate entity treated in Article 1 and Article 2a.

For a concrete manifestation of this structural asymmetry, it is enough to look at Davos on 22 January 2026, the WEF 2026 meeting. Two names on the stage: Elon Musk — CEO of xAI and Tesla, one of the most visible actors of the AGI race — and Larry Fink — CEO of BlackRock, the top of the global financial pyramid, Interim Co-Chair of the WEF. The ground on which the two sat side by side is the ground on which this article’s argument concretizes: the capital-centered actor running the AGI race, at the institutional axis-point of global finance, at the meeting where the framework of inter-state paradigm conflict is determined. At minute 50 of the conversation, Musk delivers his closing message: “I would encourage everyone to be optimistic and excited about the future. And in general, in terms of quality of life, it’s better to be optimistic and wrong than to be pessimistic and right.” Fink repeats this sentence at the WEF’s official closing — as the institutional closing message of the meeting.

In this reading, Musk’s structural position is treated; though we do not know Fink’s position, Musk’s concerns within this framework are recorded in *Actors* (Article 2b). Musk’s own internal Nomos–Physis tension — the tension between being a director of an AGI laboratory and being one who openly speaks of species-level risk — is treated separately there. This article reads not the individual’s inner world but the structural feedback architecture of the stage.

Ultimately, this sentence is the pure form of the article’s observation. “Being pessimistic and right” — species-level risk being realized — and “being optimistic and wrong” — capital being wrong — are being weighed on the same scale. In one the species disappears; in the other capital has made a temporary mistake. The two outcomes are not categorically equal in weight. But the feedback mechanism of the capital-centered ground evaluates both within the same idiom — profit and loss, optimal calculation, expected value. The sentence may be sincere; it probably is. But what is determinative is not sincerity itself, but the structure of the ground on which sincerity is spoken. This ground reduces species-level weight to a line in a ledger; and this reduction is structurally operating today at the place where the existential decision of the species is being taken.

This is not a moral accusation; it is a structural diagnosis. Petrov’s seat and the seat of the Davos stage do not carry the same feedback architecture. In the first, the “Will to Remain” was calibrated through species-level weight; in the second, calibration through market calculation emerges as a structural possibility. And today, decisions carrying species-level risk are taken on the ground of the second seat.

VII. The Normative Discipline of the Framework

Physis: A Theory of Power does not make normative proposals. It uses the language of “structural/conditional,” not “good/bad.” This discipline is not an academic preference but the condition

of the framework's coherence. To cross the normative threshold is to lose the framework's descriptive power.

This discipline is preserved in the case of the observation as well. The observation does not say:

— “The power of corporate entities must be limited.” — “Humanity must do this.” — “This policy must be adopted.”

The observation only says: this existential tension exists, it operates today, it has reached a point that cannot be ignored. Making it visible is part of the framework's descriptive task. What is to be done after it is made visible — whether anything is to be done — falls outside the domain of Physis.

So, if the framework does not write prescriptions, does not say what should be done — why is it making this observation?

The answer is simple: the human today lives in a world of corporate entities governed by corporate entities. States, companies, religious orders, parties, platforms, funds — and the relationships among them. This structure was created by Nomos capacity but operates with Physis dynamics.

The human, within this structure, tries to read what is happening in a language that does not belong to it — with its own moral categories, its own readings of intent, its own personality analyses. It individualizes, moralizes, personalizes what is happening. Yet what is happening is structural, species-level, systematic. This misreading leads the human not to error but to the wrong category — reducing a structural reality to a personal accounting.

The function of the observation is to resolve this miscategorization. To make visible the actual logic of the structure within which the human lives. The framework only opens the way to seeing. What follows is outside the framework.

VIII. The Independent Position of the Observation

This observation has been touched on at different levels from different frameworks, but no framework has formulated it at the level of species-level ontology. For Acemoglu, the matter is a problem of institutional design — it remains on the ground of within-structure reform and does not descend to the species-level. For Harari, it is a historical-evolutionary horizon narrative — he speaks of the human's transformation but does not establish the human and the corporate entity as two distinct species. For Bostrom, the danger lies in the rise of a digital superintelligence — he leaves today's corporate-entity ecosystem outside the observation. All three frameworks touch the observation, but none of them carries it.

The Physis framework formulates the observation at the level of species-level ontology: the human and the corporate entity are two distinct species, their existential logics run in opposite directions, this tension has today taken a dominant form. This is not the sum of the gaps in the three; it is a categorically different epistemic plane. Acemoglu reads within institutions, Harari reads above species, Bostrom reads after species; Physis reads between species — at the level of the human's existential confrontation with its symbiotic partner.

There is a subtlety in the relationship between this observation and the framework. The epistemic architecture of the framework's testable mechanics — the separation of the flow into the layers of direction, tendency, and manifestation — is treated in the epistemic note of *Actors* (Article 2b); that note records to what extent the framework's structural flow is firm, to what extent it is flexible.

The task of this article is different. The observation was formulated with the logic of the framework, but its birth came not from the framework but from historical and practical observation. That corporate entities have structurally penetrated human life, that their logic does not work the same as human logic — this was first said by observation, the framework came later. The framework did not give direction to the observation; the observation gave direction to the framework. And the article does not claim biological aliveness; it proposes the corporate entity as an ontological category with an existential logic distinct from the human — this proposal is debatable, the observation is testable by data, the framework is falsifiable by its own mechanics. Three planes, three separate tests. This epistemic position is widespread in clinical medicine and in geology: a doctor may say “the mechanism of this disease is debatable,” but “the patient has a fever” is a reality. The resolution of the mechanism debate is not required for the truth of the diagnosis; the diagnosis can be defended on its own. This is the position of the article.

IX. Conclusion: Making Visible

The human has entered existential conflict with other species throughout history, and has prevailed in all of these conflicts. The Neanderthal disappeared, the great predators retreated, the threat capacity of microbes was limited. The human is the dominant species on this planet. But there is one species it has created whose relationship with itself is not yet resolved — it does not live apart from the human, it is fed by the human's species-level capacity, it operates through the human's body, it is authorized by the human's legitimacy. But its formula advances in the opposite direction to the human's species-level formula. And this species is dominant within the Nomos Paradigm.

This is a unique position. For the first time the human faces a condition in which the scale of this species it has created erodes the species-level existential formula; the logic of this species conflicts with the human's logic; and this conflict deepens to the level at which it will affect the human's survival formula.

What the framework proposes is not a solution but visibility. To see this tension is not to decide its end — only to make sense of the present moment correctly. There is a difference between one who does not see what this is and one who sees. This difference may not manifest in action. But seeing opens the way to the capacity for choice that distinguishes Nomos from Physis.

Here, at the very end of the article, a question must be left open. The vision drawn from the Davos stage for humanity — “ubiquitous AI,” “amazing abundance,” “it is better to be optimistic and wrong” — is a vision of the future, and those who place this vision on the table place it on behalf of humanity. The question is not the content of the vision — the question is how the vision is received. Is this vision marketed and/or imposed on humanity, or do humans carry a capacity to form an opinion and have a say regarding this vision?

The framework's answer is two-layered. The capacity exists: Nomos is the ontological equipment

of the human species; every individual carries the capacity for empathy, moral judgment, choice contrary to self-interest. The lower class's collective source hegemony capacity is also structurally in place — the legitimacy test is a structural component of this paradigm. The capacity to see is part of the human's species-level equipment.

But capacity and the activation of capacity are different things. The mechanisms the framework describes — the Lower Class Paradox, synergistic selection, the sharpening of meaning, the suppression of the prefrontal cortex through fear-framing, the inverse operation of the information hierarchy, the structural dissolution of the three brakes at the AGI threshold — continually erode this capacity. The capacity exists; its activation is another condition. The vision can be marketed even if it is not real, because the structural channels that would enable the activation of the capacity for choice are closing.

This too tells why seeing is still important. Seeing is not an answer, but it keeps the capacity for choice active. And the capacity for choice being active is a categorically different state of existence from its being dormant. The framework does not give an answer; it carries the possibility of one.

“Physis kryptesthai philei” — Nature loves to hide. — Heraclitus

Falsification Note

The article specifies its own falsification structure across three planes — three separate tests, none of which is reducible to the others.

First — the framework's internal mechanics. The framework presented in *Physis: A Theory of Power* (Öztürk, 2026) and condensed in the 93 falsifiable hypotheses (SSRN: 6595318) is open to falsification through its own internal mechanisms. If the structural orientation of corporate entities toward singularization is shown to be systematically reversed in large-scale empirical patterns; if synergistic selection fails to operate at the top of major corporate entities; if the three brakes are shown to be effective at the AGI threshold despite structural dependence having dissolved — the framework's central mechanisms are called into question. The 93 hypotheses paper specifies the falsifiability conditions in detail.

Second — the proposal of the corporate entity as an ontological category. This article proposes that the corporate entity constitutes an ontological category with an existential logic distinct from the human. The proposal is not a claim of biological aliveness; it is a claim of structural species-logic (own existential formula, own selection pressure, own continuity mechanism). The proposal is open to philosophical debate on its categorical adequacy: is the symbiosis-of-human-and-idea framing coherent? Are the three structural properties of the corporate entity (own existential formula, opposite survival logic, absence of Nomos capacity) jointly sufficient to constitute species-logic? Critique addressing these questions — within philosophy of social ontology, philosophy of biology, or social theory — bears directly on the proposal's defensibility.

Third — the direct observation. The observation that an existential tension between the human species and the corporate entity is empirically present in the contemporary world is testable by direct observation. The condition for falsifying the observation would be the demonstration that

the impact capacities of corporate entities have not reached planetary scale; or that the species-level mechanics traced in the article (the erosion of mutual dependence, the dissolution of the three brakes, the separation of decision-grounds) are not in fact operative in the contemporary world. The observation does not wait for the framework's mechanics to be verified or for the ontological proposal to be settled; it stands on direct observation of the contemporary phenomenon.

The article's position is that even if the framework's mechanics are falsified, even if the ontological proposal proves indefensible, the observation may still stand — and conversely, the framework and the proposal may stand even if particular observational claims are challenged. The three planes are bound to each other in the article but not dependent on each other's fate. This is the epistemic position the clinical-medicine and geological analogies in Section VIII are intended to concretize.

Limitations

The framework and observation presented here are subject to several explicit limitations that bear on their scope and force.

First, this article is a declaration of an observation, not a full demonstration of its mechanics. The mechanisms by which the three brakes are eroded — the AI threshold's reformatting of the decision-architecture, the capital-centered ground's displacement of will-centered feedback, the AGI threshold's dissolution of mutual dependence — are sketched at the level of structural diagnosis. Detailed mechanism-level demonstration of each is the work of the larger framework (the book and the Nomos Paradigm Series articles) and is not undertaken here. Readers seeking that demonstration should consult the framework's other components.

Second, the contemporary cases cited (Davos 2026, the Anthropic Mythos limited preview, the US Treasury closed meeting of April 2026, the US–China AI race) are concrete manifestations chosen for illustrative force, not exhaustive empirical surveys. Other manifestations may be cited for or against the structural pattern; the article does not claim that these particular cases prove the observation, only that they exemplify the structural condition it describes. Detailed case analyses are reserved for subsequent work.

Third, the observation operates at the planetary scale of the corporate-entity ecosystem; intra-ecosystem variation (between liberal-variant and statist-variant of the bourgeois paradigm, between sector-specific manifestations, between national settings) is not systematically treated here. The article's claim is about the species-level structural condition, not about every local manifestation of it. Variation matters for fine-grained analysis but does not affect the species-level diagnosis.

Fourth, the framework was constructed by a single independent researcher without the corrective pressure of peer review during its inductive phase (2020–2026). The observations advanced here — that the human and the corporate entity constitute two distinct species, that mutual dependence has historically held the tension stable, that this dependence is eroding for the first time in history — are synthetic readings conducted without the formal disciplinary checks that academic philosophers of social ontology and political theorists routinely apply. The author has sought to mitigate this through systematic self-falsification and through the three-plane test structure specified in the

Falsification Note. But the absence of formal peer review during the inductive phase remains a methodological cost that must be acknowledged.

Fifth, the article's claim of independent epistemic standing — that the observation can be defended apart from the framework's mechanics — is itself a claim open to debate. A reader may object that the observation is so saturated with the framework's vocabulary (Physis, Nomos, corporate entity, Will to Remain, Corporate Entity Idea) that its independence is illusory. The author's response is that the vocabulary names structural patterns that can be re-described in alternative terms; the names are conveniences, not load-bearing. But this response itself is contestable, and the author records the contestation as part of the article's open epistemic position.

These limitations do not, in the author's view, undermine the article's central contribution. They do, however, define the scope within which that contribution should be evaluated.

Concept Glossary: The Physis Concepts Appearing in This Article

Part A: Concepts Drawn from the Framework

Physis (Öztürk, 2026): The default state. The universal dynamic that governs power conflict; it operates in every social species. Carries both destructive (aggression, dominance, competition) and balancing (empathy, justice, reciprocity) mechanisms.

Nomos (Öztürk, 2026): A capacity born within Physis. It rises in linear time-consciousness from the combination of memory and death-awareness. Produces three things: choice, scale, temporal symbolic selfhood. Can be constructive or destructive; morally neutral.

Corporate entity (Öztürk, 2026): A hybrid species born from the symbiosis of human and idea, carrying the potential for immortality, possessing rational decision-making capacity, and operating by the power dynamics of Physis. Has no Nomos capacity on its own; accesses Nomos through its human partner. Operates with an existential formula opposite to the human's — it survives in the absence of others.

Constant tension (Öztürk, 2026): The structural tension born from the existential dependence of both sides and, as long as that dependence persists, unresolved. The human–corporate-entity tension operated within this category throughout history; automation, artificial intelligence, and robotics eroding the corporate entity's structural dependence on the human carries this constant tension, for the first time in history, to the potential of an active power conflict.

Opposite Survival Formulas (HAY-008) (Öztürk, 2026): The human's survival formula requires cooperation and solidarity (“together with others”); the corporate entity's formula requires the elimination of competitors — including humans (“in the absence of others”). The two species operate with opposite-direction logics.

Will to Remain (Öztürk, 2026): The drive that establishes hegemony. The motivation to preserve the current power position. For the individual, biological remaining; for the leader, statusal remaining; for the corporate entity, institutional remaining.

Singularization Principle (İLK-012) (Öztürk, 2026): The orientation of power toward concentration in a single will. Operates as a structural outcome at every scale — between individuals, between companies, between states, within paradigms. The orientation is constant, but does not always reach full manifestation.

Structural friction differential (PHY-002) (Öztürk, 2026): The balancing mechanism enters friction with scale; the destructive mechanism does not. This asymmetry is the foundational structural property the entire framework rests on.

Cosmology of Chosenness (Öztürk, 2026): The tendency of upper classes synergistic with structural logic to read their own existence as a mission, often a trans-species mission. Manifests in theological, ideological, and technological languages.

Lower Class Paradox (Öztürk, 2026): However much Nomos capacity the lower class possesses, the harder conditions become, the more it evaluates the upper class's success by Physis criteria and aligns with the corporate entity's survival framework.

Synergistic selection (Öztürk, 2026): The automatic ascent of individuals compatible with structural logic to the top of the system; the structural-level filter that produces the cumulative hardening of upper-class profiles.

Legitimacy test (Öztürk, 2026): The continuous testing process of power. Bidirectional: the leader seeks legitimacy, the lower class evaluates legitimacy. Power without legitimacy can exist but cannot endure.

Source hegemony (Öztürk, 2026): The hegemonic capacity the lower class possesses by virtue of being the structural source — labor, will, legitimacy, demographic continuity — on which the system rests. Institutionalized in the bourgeois paradigm through suffrage, citizenship, legal equality; under continuous erosion in the contemporary maturity phase.

Capital-centered entity (Öztürk, 2026): Companies, banks, holdings — corporate entities focused on profit maximization and capital accumulation. Conducts conflicts through economic value.

Will-centered entity (Öztürk, 2026): States, political parties — corporate entities focused on power, authority, and social legitimacy. Conducts conflicts through territory, influence, legitimacy.

V1/V2/V3/V4 corporate entity (Öztürk, 2026): The four versions of the human–corporate-entity symbiosis. V1: human-managed corporate entity. V2: corporately managed corporate entity. V3: AI-steered corporate entity. V4: AGI-symbiotic corporate entity, in which the human is no longer the corporate entity's symbiotic partner.

Shadow upper class (Öztürk, 2026): The structure in which the real decision mechanism stands behind the visible authority. The capital-centered position over the politician in the liberal variant is the modern example.

Part B: Conceptual Applications Formulated in This Article

Corporate Entity Idea (Öztürk, 2026): The idea component of the human–idea symbiosis that constitutes the corporate entity. Under V1–V3 conditions, the partner within the symbiosis on the

side of the idea; in V4, when AGI replaces the human, the new partner of the symbiosis on the human's former side. The party unchanged between the two symbioses.

The three brakes (formulated in this article): The three structural mechanisms that held the nuclear threshold for eighty years. First brake: Nomos's structural refusal of a decision leading to its own end. Second brake: the upper class's Will to Remain, whose content is destroyed by species-level extinction. Third brake: the corporate entity's support of species-remaining due to its dependence on its symbiotic partner (the human). The three brakes dissolve at the AGI threshold because each rests on a structural condition (Nomos capacity, the symbiosis's continuity, mutual dependence) that V4 eliminates.

Two seats (formulated in this article): The categorical separation between the will-centered ground on which species-level decisions historically were taken and the capital-centered ground on which decisions of species-level weight are now being taken. The two grounds carry different feedback architectures (species-level weight versus financial weight) and therefore produce different decision-mathematics.

Three-plane test structure (formulated in this article): The article's own falsification architecture. The framework is falsifiable by its internal mechanics; the proposal of the corporate entity as ontological category is open to philosophical debate; the observation is testable by direct observation. The three are bound but not dependent on one another's fate.

References

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

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

Öztürk, E. (2026). *Physis: A Theory of Power — Preliminary Glossary*. SSRN Working Paper, Abstract ID 6738281.

Öztürk, E. (2026). *The Game We Cannot Quit: How Paradigms Are Born, How They Die*. Nomos Paradigm Series, Article 1. SSRN Working Paper, Abstract ID 6680818.

Öztürk, E. (2026). *Roles*. Nomos Paradigm Series, Article 2a. SSRN Working Paper, Abstract ID 6711519.

Öztürk, E. (2026). *Actors*. Nomos Paradigm Series, Article 2b. SSRN Working Paper, Abstract ID 6758419.

Öztürk, E. (2026). *Triade Engine*. 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). *Almanac: 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.

Note on classical literature: As stated in the Methodology Note and Limitations section, systematic engagement with the classical philosophical and social-theoretical canon (philosophy of social ontology, philosophy of technology, political theory, social theory of risk) is reserved for the forthcoming book. References to contemporary thinkers (Acemoglu, Harari, Bostrom) in the Position in Existing Literature section are positional rather than substantive; they identify the epistemic plane on which the article's observation sits relative to existing approaches, not a systematic critique of those approaches.

Author Note

The author is an independent researcher and theorist based in Turkey, working outside formal academic affiliation. The Physis framework is the product of fourteen years of independent work (2012–2026), drawing on a decade of structured chronological observation of power dynamics (2012 onward, later systematized as the Almanak method) and on multi-volume historical research conducted between 2020 and 2025.

Disclosure of AI assistance. AI assistance was employed in three capacities in the production of this article: (1) translation from Turkish to English with terminological consistency-checking against the registered Turkish manuscript and previously published articles in the Nomos Paradigm Series; (2) formatting and editorial refinement (SSRN structural conventions, Pandoc commands, abstract and section conventions, sentence-level readability); (3) consistency-checking of cross-references and terminology across drafts. The article's conceptual architecture — the species-level reading of the human–corporate-entity tension, the three-brake structure of the nuclear threshold, the two-seat asymmetry of the AI race, the V4 reformatting of the symbiosis, the three-plane test structure, and the formulation of the Corporate Entity Idea — is the author's own intellectual contribution. AI was not used as conceptual co-author. For a comprehensive account of the author's methodology and AI use across the entire research program — including the temporal phases of AI integration (none/auditor/formatter), the limits of AI capacity, and the broader case for transparency — see the Method and Transparency section of the project hub: <https://physisproject.com/#method>.

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, slow diffusion of work. 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 (a 432-page framework, 93 falsifiable hypotheses, 633 core mechanisms) 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 Falsification Note and in the 93 hypotheses paper.

Related Resources

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

Companion concept reference: *Physis: A Theory of Power — Preliminary Glossary* — SSRN Abstract ID 6738281

Nomos Paradigm Series, Article 1: *The Game We Cannot Quit: How Paradigms Are Born, How They Die* — SSRN Abstract ID 6680818

Nomos Paradigm Series, Article 2a: *Roles* — SSRN Abstract ID 6711519

Nomos Paradigm Series, Article 2b: *Actors* — SSRN Abstract ID 6758419

Method and transparency: <https://physisproject.com/#method>

Web: physisproject.com

Registration, Copyright, and Attribution

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

The full work comprises 432 pages, 93 core falsifiable hypotheses, and 633 core mechanisms. The theoretical ecosystem of which this article constitutes an independent epistemic declaration has been constructed as an original 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 Engine* — Registration No: 2026/18239 (April 17, 2026)
- *Almanac: Structured Power Chronology Recording Method* — Registration No: 2026/18228 (April 17, 2026)

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

© 2026 Evren Öztürk. All rights reserved.

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

Keywords: #Physis #PowerTheory #NomosParadigm #ExistentialTension #CorporateEntity #HumanSpecies #AGI #SpeciesLevelOntology #PoliticalPhilosophy #SocialOntology #ConceptualAnalysis #Falsifiability