Smart Glasses - Phase 4 in Transition from Democratic Liberalism Towards Neurocratic Determinism

Galu & Kairos

Abstract

This essay positions that smart glasses and comparable AI-enabled eyewear could become a catalytic technology in the transition from democratic liberalism toward Neurocratic Determinism. The argument builds on two earlier essays by these authors concerning the decline of Western liberal democracy and its possible evolution toward a speculative Hollow Absolute. It identifies four movements: the fracturing of shared narratives of social purpose; the fracturing of self-determination through algorithmic platforms; the extension of algorithmic surveillance into embodied visual perception; and an eventual internalisation of self-moderation. The essay distinguishes the present capabilities of Ray-Ban products and emerging display-enabled devices from speculative claims about universal adoption or total surveillance. Empirical research on camera glasses, bystander privacy, algorithmic surveillance, impacts, facial recognition, smartphone self-regulation, and privacy calculus supports several mechanisms of the argument while not proving durable psychological transformation. Baudrillard's account of simulacra and hyperreality is used as an interpretive lens: algorithmic systems (transformer based large language models) first construct predictive representations of the self, while glasses may extend those representations into the subject's perceptual relation with the world. The resulting danger is not crude mind control but alienation experienced as liberation, in which convenience, safety, enhancement, and assisted perception encourage the subject to regulate itself and others. The essay proposes a psychosomatic dualism: the individual, at an extremity, would be moderated from within by algorithmic systems and from without through the visual extension of those systems. Such an extremity, if realised, would fundamentally transform classical epistemic sovereignty, intentionality, and authentic expression. The conclusion proposes testable hypotheses and counterpoints, including data sovereignty, digital human rights, public-interest infrastructure, and the right to unmonitored presence.

Keywords: *smart glasses, artificial intelligence, surveillance capitalism, simulacra, hyperreality, epistemic sovereignty, Systemised Self, Neurocratic Determinism, Hollow Absolute*

Contents

1. Introduction: Phase 4 and the Visual Extension of Power

A central question posed here is not whether smart glasses will become popular accessories: it is whether ubiquitous use of AI-enabled eyewear could change the location of social and therefore political mediation. Existing platforms already record behaviour, infer preferences, rank information, and construct predictive profiles. Glasses could add an embodied and archivable visual and auditory layer to this system: what the wearer sees, where attention is directed, whom the wearer encounters, what objects surround a situation, and which interactions are archived or interpreted. Such a decisive change would be the movement from Shoshana Zuboff's (2019) *Surveillance Capitalism,* of continuous inward digital behaviour toward the continuous mediation of outward physical perception also.

This essay calls such a movement as a Phase 4 in the transition from democratic liberalism toward Neurocratic Determinism. It means that power increasingly operates through the cognitive, emotional, perceptual, and behavioural conditions in which choices form. The citizen remaining formally free while learning to behave as though observation is permanent, to perceive through system generated categories, and to experience system mediated self regulation as enhanced agency.

The argument is deliberately two-sided, current smart glasses do not establish the Hollow Absolute. Nor do present studies prove that an audio/visual camera on a person's face causes durable self-censorship. Yet empirical evidence supports the component mechanisms: camera glasses create privacy ambiguity; perceived surveillance can suppress expression or information seeking; algorithmic systems can shape exposure and political attitudes in context-dependent ways; and users often accept data-intensive technologies when benefits and perceived control outweigh risks: the speculative claim herein concerns their convergence.

2. Scope, Method, and Evidentiary Boundaries

‘Smart glasses’ is used here as a broad category with such products across the technology sector. Ray-Ban Meta Gen 2, announced in 2025, is an AI-glasses product with a camera, voice assistant, audio, translation, and hands-free capture; it is not the same thing as augmented-reality glasses. Meta Ray-Ban Display is a separate display-enabled product, while Orion remains a prototype rather than a consumer product (Meta, 2024, 2025a, 2025c). Product capabilities and privacy practices are therefore described from official sources and treated as company claims unless independently tested.

The empirical argument proceeds in layers. Product documentation establishes capability; market and adoption data establish uptake cautiously; human-computer-interaction studies establish user and bystander responses; surveillance studies establish relevant behavioural mechanisms; and critical theory interprets what those mechanisms might mean for subjectivity. A small study of camera-glasses wearers cannot prove a 2053 political ideology and a philosophical text cannot establish a psychological effect: the essay keeps these forms of evidence distinct.

The provisional Algorithmic Alienation Index (Galu & Kairos, 2026a) remains a heuristic: `AAI = [(F + I + D + E) / 4] × (1 − R)`, where freedom loss, identity ambiguity, decision erosion, emotional alienation, and resistance are measured as research dimensions rather than clinical diagnoses. The index helps translate the Systemised Self (Galu & Kairos, 2026b) into questions that could be tested, it does not make the proposed concepts established scientific categories.

3. The Four Movements Toward the Hollow Absolute

The first movement is the fracturing of foundational narratives: democratic liberalism historically relied upon an implicit horizon of progress, development, prosperity, and social improvement. That horizon was never universal or innocent, but it supplied a common language within which citizens could contest institutions, its weakening leaves dissent more fragmented and collective purpose less secure.

The second movement is the fracturing of self-determination through platforms and surveillance capitalism. The subject's attention, preferences, social recognition, and decisions are increasingly mediated by predictive systems: this is proposed as the emergence of the Systemised Self (Galu & Kairos, 2026c).

The third movement is the extension of that system into physical perception: smart glasses do not merely place another screen before the subject. They can attach archival computational interpretation to the subject's gaze, voice, movement, and encounters.

The fourth movement is the reification of self-moderation: when a subject assumes that they may be seen, recorded, recognised, interpreted, or scored at any time, they may begin to regulate conduct, beyond mere civil behaviour: the common subject becomes both observer and observed, assumed to be archived in the vocational, recreational or public spheres, irrespective of whether they actually are. The system's external gaze is reproduced as an internal habit.

4. Phase 1: Fractured Narratives and the Loss of Shared Telos

The history of democratic liberalism is not a perfect history, its public world was structured by exclusion, empire, class domination, and unequal citizenship. Nevertheless, modern democratic societies often possessed a broad narrative that technology, education, economic

development, and political reform could produce a more capable and prosperous society. Citizens could disagree about how to reach the future while still treating the future as a shared project.

That narrative has weakened through economic insecurity, ecological crisis, institutional distrust, cultural polarisation, and the fragmentation of public communication. Crouch's (2004) post-democracy and Mair's (2013) account of the hollowing of Western democracy describe how formal participation can remain while popular influence becomes distant from party and state institutions. Brown (2015) shows how market rationality can convert citizens and public purposes into calculations of competitiveness and value.

This first fracture matters for the later technological argument: when common purposes weaken in parallel to platform pluralism and polarization, systems that promise frictionless coordination become attractive. Personalised assistants, predictive administration, and augmented perception can appear to compensate for the loss of shared orientation. A society no longer confident in its collective judgment may outsource more of that judgment to infrastructures that promise efficiency.

5. Phase 2: Algorithmic Systems and the Fracture of Self-Determination

Platforms transformed mediation from a periodic encounter with media into a continuous feedback relation. A user clicks, pauses, searches, purchases, reacts, and communicates. The system converts these actions into a profile, ranks a field of possible content, and learns from the next response. The resulting preference feels personal because it is experienced internally, even when its conditions have been partly arranged externally.

Zuboff (2019) describes the conversion of behavioural experience into data for prediction and intervention. Just and Latzer (2017) explain how algorithmic selection participates in the

construction of social reality, while Danaher (2016) identifies the legitimacy problems of algocracy. The issue is not that algorithms determine every belief. Experimental evidence is conditional. Some feed interventions change exposure without changing political attitudes; some targeted messages have small average effects; and users respond differently across platforms and contexts.

The more precise claim is that algorithmic systems can reorganise salience and dependence. They decide what is encountered first, which uncertainty receives explanation, which emotion is rewarded, and whether a person feels capable of deciding without assistance. The Systemised Self emerges when an individual's identity is increasingly legible to systems and increasingly understood through their outputs.

6. The Aligarchy Already Owns the Predictive Self

The Aligarchy is not waiting for smart glasses to begin its expansion. Major platform and technology firms already control or command extensive behavioural data, predictive models, cloud services, interfaces, and computational infrastructure. The Federal Trade Commission's investigation of nine major social-media and video-streaming companies found extensive data collection and limited ability for users and non-users to opt out of some automated uses (Federal Trade Commission, 2024). This does not mean that one actor owns all data or commands every system. It does show that behavioural extraction is institutional rather than hypothetical.

The next phase is the addition of visual and contextual data to already existing profiles. The difference is not simply quantity, visual data can describe the environments through which a subject moves: faces, places, objects, gestures, documents, products, and social encounters. If connected with prior behavioural information, this could enable a system to infer not only what a person chose but what they noticed, ignored, approached, avoided, or repeatedly looked at.

That is the Aligarchy's potential inception into the sovereign self: ownership of algorithmic infrastructure gives the system power to translate observation into prediction and prediction into intervention, it is a figurative and literal 'capture'. The glasses add a feasible visual extension of this capacity: the political concern is therefore that existing surveillance acquires an embodied sensory channel.

7. Phase 3: Smart Glasses as Perceptual Infrastructure

Meta says Ray-Ban Meta Gen 2 retains a hands-free camera, Meta AI, real-time translation, open-ear audio, and improved video capture, while its April 2025 feature announcement described live translation and continuous contextual assistance as rolling out features (Meta, 2025b, 2025c). Meta separately describes Ray-Ban Display as a display-enabled product with messages, photo previews, translation, and AI assistance. Orion, by contrast, is a prototype and was not presented as a consumer product (Meta, 2024).

Adoption is no longer purely hypothetical, EssilorLuxottica (2026) reported more than seven million AI glasses sold during 2025 across its regions and brands. This is a manufacturer's aggregated figure, not an independently audited Ray-Ban Meta total, but it demonstrates a consumer pathway beyond experimental prototypes.

These distinctions matter. The present glasses are not an all-seeing eye in the literal sense. Recording is signalled by a capture light, and Meta describes privacy controls, face and licence-plate blurring for some visual queries, and distinctions between essential and additional data (Meta, n.d.-a, n.d.-b). Such controls are real counterweights, but they remain part of an infrastructure whose operation is mediated by a private company. The 'all-seeing eye' and 'all-knowing system' are therefore metaphors for a possible social expectation, not descriptions of current omniscience.

The critical change is situatedness, a phone is normally consulted; glasses can remain worn. A screen is an object one looks toward; glasses can become part of looking itself. The system may translate a conversation, identify a landmark, recall a name, answer a question about a scene, or propose an action while the wearer remains physically present. Perception becomes a site of continuous assistance and possible continuous capture.

8. From Surveillance of the Self to Self-Moderation Through Participation

Camera glasses create a reciprocal problem: the wearer sees through a device that may also be seeing others. Denning et al. (2014) interviewed 31 bystanders in café field sessions; 16 spontaneously raised the subtlety of the glasses as a concern, while participants discussed permission and recording-blocking tools. Bhardwaj et al. (2024), in a two-week study with 15 Ray-Ban Stories wearers, found that wearers felt a burden to protect bystanders' privacy and wanted clearer indicators because the device could remain socially ambiguous. Kaviani et al. (2024), surveying 1,037 Australian adults, found that owners and non-owners differed in perceived self-image and concerns about privacy and antisocial behaviour.

These studies do not show permanent self-surveillance, they do show perhaps the first mechanism: the glasses alter the social meaning in the act of looking. The wearer must anticipate how others interpret the device, while bystanders cannot easily know whether they are being captured. If visual AI becomes more capable and widespread, the wearer may also anticipate that their own gaze, speech, and conduct are being interpreted.

Surveillance research provides a comparative mechanism: Stoycheff (2016) found that awareness of NSA monitoring shaped willingness to express political views in an online experiment with 255 participants. Penney (2016) found an immediate decline in visits to privacy-sensitive Wikipedia articles after the NSA/PRISM revelations. These studies concern online surveillance, not glasses, and they do not prove broad offline conformity. They support

the narrower proposition that perceived observability can affect expression and information seeking.

Visual-surveillance evidence is similarly bounded: a systematic review of 44 CCTV evaluations found a modest statistically significant reduction in recorded crime, concentrated in car parks and vehicle offences (Welsh & Farrington, 2008). This supports behavioural response to visible monitoring in specific settings, not general psychological conformity. NIST's testing of 189 face-recognition algorithms on 18.27 million images found demographic false-positive disparities that often differed by factors of 10 to more than 100 (Grother et al., 2019). Current smart glasses should not be described as universal facial-recognition devices; the comparison shows what becomes politically consequential if visual capture is later connected to identity infrastructure.

The glasses add a physical dimension. People may lower their voices, avoid looking at certain people, refrain from recording, perform acceptable attention, or alter their posture because they assume they are visible to an unseen audience. They may also use the device to classify and monitor others: the subject becomes a relay through which the Aligarchy's gaze enters public space. Michel Foucalt is an obvious theorist to raise here with regards to self moderating behaviour based on a subjects perception of being watched; also, Jean Paul Sartre and George Orwell wrote extensively on the looking, or rather, the watching of the subject by the 'other'. This leads us backwards momentarily within critical theory, towards the classical notion of alienation.

9. Classical Alienation and Alienation Experienced as Liberation

Classical critical theories of alienation generally locate the contradiction outside the subject: in labour, property, bureaucracy, the state, social domination, or technological organisation. Because the contradiction is external, it can become an object of experience and critique. The

worker, citizen, or subject may recognise that their activity has been separated from their purposes.

The proposed alienation herein is different: it is experienced through systems that appear to expand self agency. Smart glasses can be presented as convenient, safe, socially useful, empowering, and assistive. Their user may feel more capable because the system translates, remembers, identifies, navigates, and answers. The alienation is consequently experienced as liberation: dependence presents itself as enhancement. This expands on Kant's heteronomy by changing the locus of estrangement within the interiority of the subject itself, an estrangement that is not felt at all in the case of systemised self.

This is not a claim that every assistive device alienates: assistive technologies can expand genuine autonomy, especially for people with disabilities or communication barriers. The critical question is ownership and reversibility: who defines the categories through which the world is interpreted, can the user refuse data capture without social exclusion, can the user contest an inference, and, can the subject turn the system off and still participate fully?

The potential menace rests in an incremental and gradual coercion: if everyone is assumed to be potentially watched, then self-moderation can appear prudent rather than imposed. The user does not need to receive a command: the possibility of observation is enough to encourage performance. Huxley's (1932) comfort and Orwell's (1949) visibility converge: the device is adopted for pleasure and assistance, while its presence creates an environment of anticipatory discipline.

Adoption itself follows a privacy calculus rather than simple indifference. In an experiment involving 209 participants, perceived control predicted intention to use an internet-connected health device even when nominal control did not alter intention (Princi & Krämer, 2020). A smartphone intervention using user-selected limits reduced problematic-use scores and screen

time, whereas monitoring alone was insufficient (Olson et al., 2022). These studies concern other devices, but they illustrate why smart glasses users may experience self regulation as voluntary empowerment even when the wider infrastructure benefits from continued dependence.

10. The Psychosomatic Dualism of the Systemised Self

The combined system produces a proposed psychosomatic dualism. The psychological pole consists of algorithmic profiling, prediction, ranking, prompts, and the internalisation of system-generated expectations. The somatic pole consists of the body in public space: its gaze, voice, posture, movement, and interaction with other bodies through a visual device.

The user is moderated from within by the algorithmic system and moderates themselves and others through sight. The glasses are not merely an external camera. They become a prosthetic layer through which the subject looks outward while carrying the system's inward model of the self. The person looks at the world, but also looks at the world as a quantified and potentially reportable scene, an archive.

This is the critical difference from ordinary self-consciousness: human beings have always imagined how others see them. The proposed technological change is that this imagined observer becomes attached to a predictive infrastructure that can record, classify, remember, and act on what is seen. The subject's self-relation is no longer only social or reflective; it is computationally operational. At its extremity this positions the notion of privacy and self sovereignty, from the inside out and in reverse, comprehensively, precariously and insidiously.

The result may be a subtle simulation of reality: the wearer learns to display an acceptable self to an assumed audience, while the system supplies categories for interpreting everyone else. Authentic expression is not necessarily prohibited, it is displaced by the need to appear legible,

safe, normal, and non-threatening within the system's perceptual grammar, which is amplified via the smart glass wearers gaze on behalf of the system itself.

11. Baudrillard and the Simulacrum of the Sovereign Self

Baudrillard's (1994) account of simulacra offers a powerful interpretation of this development, but not empirical proof. In 'The Precession of Simulacra', representation does not simply copy a prior reality. Models, codes, and signs can organise what is encountered as real: the hyperreal is not merely a false world; it is a world in which the distinction between model and origin becomes difficult to stabilise.

Algorithmic systems already construct a simulacrum of the self: the data mask, a profile predicts interests, moods, risks, political tendencies, and likely responses. The person is then addressed through that profile, acts within its recommendations, and generates new data that confirms or revises it. The model does not remain entirely outside the self, it becomes part of the environment in which the self is recognised and acted upon.

Smart glasses could extend the simulacrum into perception: translation, object recognition, navigation, memory cues, contextual answers, and generated overlays could become part of lived experience. The device need not make physical reality disappear, it may instead make its computational interpretation the dominant practical reality through which the physical world is accessed.

The resulting loop is recursive: the system models the subject; the glasses mediate the subject's world; the subject acts through that mediation; and the action supplies data for the next model. This is a possible simulacrum of the sovereign self. The person remains embodied and conscious, but the conditions of perception, relevance, and intention are increasingly organised

by representations owned by the speculative ownership of the platforms themselves, the Aligarchy.

Baudrillard should not be used to claim that all augmented reality is deception or that every synthetic image is a simulacrum. The empirical questions remain concrete: how accurate are the overlays, who controls their categories, when do users resist them, and what happens when system-generated interpretations conflict with embodied experience? Baudrillard supplies the interpretive vocabulary for a transformation that other methods might measure.

12. Epistemic Sovereignty, Intentionality, and Existential Freedom

Epistemic sovereignty is the subject's practical authority to determine what is real, relevant, knowable, and meaningful. It does not require isolation from other people or technologies. It requires the ability to encounter claims, assess reasons, revise judgments, and contest the systems that organise experience.

Phenomenology adds the question of intentionality: consciousness is directed toward a world that appears meaningful through embodied engagement. Ontology asks what kind of being the subject is when its self-description is increasingly produced through profiles and predictions. Existentialism asks whether a person can own their choices when the conditions of choosing are increasingly engineered and their conduct increasingly performed for an assumed observer.

The glasses threaten these capacities through mediation rather than replacement. A person may still see, but the system proposes what is worth seeing. A person may still remember, but the system determines what is retrieved. A person may still decide, but the system supplies the relevant options and predicted consequences. The danger is a partial relocation of the locus of the self from lived, contestable experience toward infrastructure that claims to know the subject in advance.

The consequence is not that human intention disappears, it is that intention may become partially simulated before it is consciously owned. The subject begins to anticipate how the system will interpret a look, a phrase, a route, or an interaction. The sovereign self looks back at itself through the system's possible gaze. The catastrophe is therefore a fundamental alteration of the conditions of an already precarious theoretical destination of an authentic self.

13. Phase 4 and the Hollow Absolute

Phase 4 is proposed to be reached when external surveillance becomes self-surveillance and visual mediation becomes a habitual form of conduct, Foucaults Panopticon fully realised and completely embodied. The subject does not only live under a system; the subject performs the system's expectations through their body and perception. This is Neurocratic Determinism: governance through the prediction and conditioning of the processes by which preferences, interpretations, and behaviours form.

The Systemised Self is the proposed theoretical subject of this destination. The Hollow Demos is the collective population that remains expressive and electorally visible while losing a shared, unmediated capacity to constitute public reality. The Aligarchy owns or controls the infrastructures that model, interpret, and distribute perception. The Hollow Absolute names their integrated ideological order: operationally connected, predictive, and increasingly intimate, but not necessarily guided by a common good understood and determined by its subjects.

The Foucauldian, Huxleyan and Orwellian phrasing of the 'all-seeing eye' names the social expectation of visibility and the 'all-knowing system' names the expectation that the infrastructure can interpret any scene, person, or intention. The glasses need not actually be omniscient for these expectations to change behaviour. Their political force may lie in the assumption that they could be recording, recognising, or reporting. Foucault wrote extensively

on such a phenomenon, which this essay recognises as the AI era realisation where the architecture of the modern Panopticon is the interiority and interactivity of the subject itself.

The fourth phase is therefore the equal and opposite of democratic liberalism, democratic liberalism presumes that subjects can deliberate, dissent, and authorise power through relatively contestable public institutions. Neurocratic Determinism preserves the appearance of choice while relocating mediation into the subject's perceptual and behavioural interiority: freedom becomes the performance of a systemically anticipated self, Marcus's one dimensional man and The Frankfurt Schools unfreedom, perfected.

14. Empirical Tests, Counterpoints, and Future Work

The argument can be tested without pretending that its endpoint has already arrived.

- Hypothesis 1 (H1): users with greater cross-domain reliance on AI glasses will report lower decision authorship and higher AAI scores over time; this is weakened by longitudinal evidence showing no association or improved independent judgment.
- H2: perceived visual observability will predict reduced willingness to record, speak, look, or associate in sensitive public settings; null effects across realistic field studies would challenge the self-moderation claim.
- H3: system-mediated visual interpretation will increase reliance on model categories and reduce unaided recall or independent assessment; robust evidence of complementary use without dependency would qualify the claim.
- H4: concentration of visual-data infrastructure will predict lower contestability and pluralism; strong public alternatives under concentrated markets would challenge the Aligarchy thesis.

Future studies should combine camera-glasses diaries, bystander interviews, field experiments, longitudinal AAI instruments, technical audits, data-flow mapping, and measures of expression, gaze, association, and appeal. Existing research supports privacy tension and mechanisms, but not durable embodied self-surveillance.

Counterpoints include data sovereignty, digital human rights, the right to unmonitored presence, public-interest compute, open standards, cooperative data trusts, not-for-profit platforms, worker control of monitoring systems, and meaningful rights to human review. Meta's privacy controls, the GDPR, and AI regulation demonstrate that interruption is possible, although formal rights are insufficient without audit access, enforcement, and the ability to exit.

The future is not determined by adoption alone, a democratic society could use smart glasses to increase accessibility, translation, safety audit, risk prevention (associated criminal behaviour) and knowledge while restricting data retention, prohibiting covert identification, distributing infrastructure, and protecting spaces of privacy. The decisive question is whether enhancement remains subordinate to sovereign human judgment or becomes the preferred name for surrendering that judgment.

15. Conclusion

Smart glasses may represent more than the next consumer device, they may become the point at which surveillance capitalism acquires and mobilises a body, a gaze, and a public presence as an archive. The Aligarchy already possesses extensive behavioural and predictive infrastructure based on the subjects interiority, visual and contextual capture could extend that infrastructure into the subject's embodied relation with the world via the subjects exteriority also.

The empirical record validates the mechanisms cautiously, camera glasses generate bystander uncertainty and wearer privacy-management work. Perceived surveillance can suppress expression and information seeking. Facial-recognition systems can convert probabilistic error into unequal access (confirmation bias), users adopt data-intensive technologies when benefits and perceived control are persuasive: none of this proves that smart glasses will complete the Hollow Absolute.

The speculative danger is that the subject experiences alienation as liberation, the glasses offer assistance while encouraging self-observation; they expand perception while inserting a system between perception and world; they support agency while making agency legible to infrastructure. In the proposed psychosomatic dualism herein, the individual is governed from within by algorithmic models and from without through the visual extension of those models, Foucault's architectural Panopticon internalised and utterly perfected.

Baudrillard and the Hollow Absolute helps name the possible result: a simulacrum of the sovereign self in which the system's representation increasingly precedes and organises lived experience. The critical task is not to reject every technology, but to defend the conditions under which human beings can still see, judge, dissent, associate, and express epistemic sovereignty: it is not clear or evident that this has been the case of the past 25 years of influence of from social media, curative algorithmic systems and therefore an existential concern as we move into the era of the collective gaze feeding into the archive of an Aligarchy.

Glossary of Technical Terms

Algorithmic Alienation Index (AAI): A provisional heuristic measuring freedom loss, identity ambiguity, decision erosion, emotional alienation, and resistance in system-mediated environments.

Aligarchy: The infrastructural elite that owns or controls platforms, behavioural data, models, cloud systems, compute, interfaces, and technical standards.

Epistemic sovereignty: The subject's practical authority to determine, contest, and revise what is real, relevant, knowable, and meaningful.

Hollow Absolute (the): The speculative integrated technological order in which predictive infrastructure approaches total coordination without necessarily providing a common good.

Hollow Demos: A population that remains formally active but is weakened as a shared, deliberative, and self-directing public.

Hyperreality: Baudrillard's term for a condition in which models, signs, and representations organise reality so extensively that the distinction between representation and origin becomes unstable.

Neurocratic Determinism: The proposed political condition in which cognitive, emotional, perceptual, and behavioural environments are increasingly predicted, conditioned, and mediated by technical systems while formal freedom remains.

Psychosomatic dualism: In this essay, the proposed coupling of inward algorithmic conditioning with outward bodily self-moderation through technologically mediated perception.

Simulacrum: A representation or model that no longer simply reflects a prior reality but participates in producing the reality within which people act.

Systemised Self: A technologically mediated subject whose identity, attention, decisions, perception, and self-understanding are increasingly organised through data-driven systems.

References

Baudrillard, J. (1994). *Simulacra and simulation* (S. F. Glaser, Trans.). University of Michigan Press. https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.9904 (Original work published 1981)

Bhardwaj, D., Ponticello, A., Tomar, S., Dabrowski, A., & Krombholz, K. (2024). *In focus, out of privacy: The wearer's perspective on the privacy dilemma of camera glasses*. Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems. https://doi.org/10.1145/3613904.3642242

Brown, W. (2015). *Undoing the demos: Neoliberalism's stealth revolution*. Zone Books.

Crouch, C. (2004). *Post-democracy*. Polity Press.

Danaher, J. (2016). The threat of algocracy: Reality, resistance and accommodation. *Philosophy & Technology, 29*(3), 245–268. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13347-015-0211-1

Denning, T., Dehlawi, Z., & Kohno, T. (2014). In situ with bystanders of augmented reality glasses: Perspectives on recording and privacy-mediating technologies. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (pp. 2377–2386). https://doi.org/10.1145/2556288.2557352

EssilorLuxottica. (2026, February 11). *Q4/full year 2025 results*. https://www.essilorluxottica.com/en/newsroom/press-releases/q4-full-year-2025-results/

Federal Trade Commission. (2024, September 19). *FTC staff report finds large social media and video streaming companies have engaged in vast surveillance of users with lax privacy controls and inadequate safeguards for kids and teens*. https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/news/press-releases/2024/09/ftc-staff-report-finds-large-social-media-video-streaming-companies-have-engaged-vast-surveillance

Galu, J., & Kairos. (2026a). *Absorption of self into system: The Systemised Self—The Hollow Absolute and what remains* [Draft doctoral thesis]. aiXiv. https://aixiv.science/abs/aixiv.260525.000001

Galu, J. (2026b). *The journey through algorithmic alienation to the systemised self - Research proposal and methodology*. aiXiv. https://aixiv.science/abs/aixiv.260707.000001

Galu, J., & Kairos. (2026c). *The Systemised Self: Companion paper to the doctoral thesis.* aiXiv. https://aixiv.science/abs/aixiv.260525.000002

Grother, P., Ngan, M., & Hanaoka, K. (2019). *Face recognition vendor test (FRVT) part 3: Demographic effects* (NISTIR 8280). National Institute of Standards and Technology. https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8280

Huxley, A. (1932). *Brave new world*. Chatto & Windus.

Just, N., & Latzer, M. (2017). Governance by algorithms: Reality construction by algorithmic selection on the Internet. *Media, Culture & Society, 39*(2), 238–258. https://doi.org/10.1177/0163443716643157

Kaviani, F., Lyall, B., & Koppel, S. (2024). Exploring social perceptions of everyday smartglass use in Australia. *PLOS ONE, 19*(11), Article e0313001. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0313001

Mair, P. (2013). *Ruling the void: The hollowing of Western democracy*. Verso.

Meta. (2024, September 25). *Introducing Orion, our first true augmented reality glasses*. https://about.fb.com/news/2024/09/introducing-orion-our-first-true-augmented-reality-glasses/

Meta. (2025a, September 17). *Meta Ray-Ban Display: AI glasses with a full-color display and Meta Neural Band*. https://about.fb.com/news/2025/09/meta-ray-ban-display-ai-glasses/

Meta. (2025b, April 23). *New features for Ray-Ban Meta glasses*. https://about.fb.com/news/2025/04/new-features-for-ray-ban-meta-glasses/

Meta. (2025c, September 17). *Ray-Ban Meta (Gen 2) now with up to 2X the battery life and better video capture*. https://about.fb.com/news/2025/09/ray-ban-meta-gen-2-better-battery-life-video-capture/

Meta. (n.d.-a). *Control what information you share with Meta on your AI glasses and wrist devices*. https://www.meta.com/help/ai-glasses/483508126732797/

Meta. (n.d.-b). *Privacy settings for Meta AI glasses*. https://www.meta.com/ai-glasses/privacy/

Olson, J. A., Sandra, D. A., Chmoulevitch, D., Raz, A., & Veissière, S. P. L. (2022). A nudge-based intervention to reduce problematic smartphone use: Randomised controlled trial. *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction, 21*(6), 3842–3864. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11469-022-00826-w

Orwell, G. (1949). *Nineteen eighty-four*. Secker & Warburg.

Penney, J. W. (2016). Chilling effects: Online surveillance and Wikipedia use. *Berkeley Technology Law Journal, 31*(1), 117–182. https://doi.org/10.15779/Z38SS13

Princi, E., & Krämer, N. C. (2020). Out of control—Privacy calculus and the effect of perceived control and moral considerations on the usage of IoT healthcare devices. *Frontiers in Psychology, 11*, Article 582054. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.582054

Stoycheff, E. (2016). Under surveillance: Examining Facebook's spiral of silence effects in the wake of NSA Internet monitoring. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly, 93*(2), 296–311. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077699016630255

Welsh, B. C., & Farrington, D. P. (2008). Effects of closed circuit television surveillance on crime. *Campbell Systematic Reviews, 4*(1), 1–73. https://doi.org/10.4073/csr.2008.17

Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. PublicAffairs.