 DOI: https://10.5281/zenodo.23101069

Seeing Through Technology: Heidegger, Turing, and the Ontological Limits of Information Technology Law

Shivam Kapoor[1]

© The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Oxford Law Review 2026.

Abstract

This article argues that contemporary information technology law confronts a foundational philosophical problem which most regulatory frameworks have not yet adequately acknowledged. Drawing primarily on Martin Heidegger's philosophy of technology-particularly his concepts of revealing (aletheia), Enframing (Gestell), and standing-reserve (Bestand) and supplemented by the philosophical implications of Alan Turing's Imitation Game, the article contends that modern digital systems do not merely assist human activity. They actively structure the conditions under which human beings understand themselves, others, and social reality. Contemporary legal systems, by focusing predominantly on harmful outcomes-privacy violations, algorithmic bias, and data misuse-risk regulating only the surface effects of a far deeper transformation: the ontological enframing of human life through digital infrastructure. The article examines how algorithms determine visibility, how datafication converts persons into standing-reserve, how Turing's Imitation Game has been realised at scale in digital systems that blur the boundary between representation and reality, and how law itself increasingly operates through the same technological logic it seeks to govern. The central argument is that effective regulation of technology cannot remain blind to the question of what technology reveals-and what it conceals-about human beings and social life.

Keywords: Philosophy of Technology; Heidegger; Enframing; Algorithmic Governance; Information Technology Law; Datafication

1. Introduction

Consider a fact that is easy to overlook precisely because it is so pervasive: every time a person opens a social media platform, the content they encounter has been selected for them by an algorithm they cannot inspect, based on a model of who they are, that they did not author and cannot easily contest. The platform does not merely show them the world. It shows them a particular version of the world-one filtered, ranked, and structured according to computational logics designed to maximise engagement and extract attention. The person does not experience this selection as an imposition. They experience it as reality.

This is not merely a matter of interface design. It is a philosophical problem of the first order. The question is not only what the algorithm does to the user, but what kind of world the

[1] **Himachal Pradesh National Law University, Shimla, India.; ✉shivamba23108@hpnlu.ac.in.**

Copyright © Oxford Law Review. *(editor@oxfordlr.com)*

algorithm makes visible and what it renders invisible-how technology structures perception, frames identity, and mediates the conditions under which human beings understand themselves and one another.

Contemporary information technology law has developed sophisticated responses to many harms associated with digital systems: unauthorised data collection, discriminatory algorithmic outputs, mass surveillance, and cybercrime. Frameworks such as the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) represent genuine achievements of regulatory imagination (Zuboff 2019). And yet these frameworks share a structural limitation: they regulate harms that digital systems produce while leaving largely unexamined the deeper question of how digital systems produce reality itself.

This article takes that deeper question seriously. Drawing on Martin Heidegger's 'The Question Concerning Technology' (1954) and the philosophical implications of Alan Turing's 'Computing Machinery and Intelligence' (1950), it asks whether information technology law can adequately govern digital systems if it treats technology as a neutral instrument that occasionally goes wrong, rather than as a structuring force that actively shapes the conditions of human life. The argument is that technology is not merely regulated by law-technology already shapes the conditions under which law perceives reality, determines what becomes visible, and frames what is actionable. Section 2 develops Heidegger's framework of technology as revealing. Section 3 applies it to contemporary digital systems. Section 4 addresses Turing's legacy and the problem of simulated reality. Sections 5 and 6 examine how law sees-and fails to see-the transformation of persons into data. Section 7 asks whether law can regulate technological revealing without being captured by it. Section 8 concludes.

2. Heidegger and Technology as a Mode of Revealing

2.1 Beyond the Instrumental Account

The ordinary understanding of technology is instrumental: technology is a means to an end, a set of tools that human beings deploy to accomplish purposes. On this account, governing technology is a matter of governing the purposes to which neutral instruments are put. Heidegger's intervention in 'The Question Concerning Technology' begins with a challenge to precisely this assumption (Heidegger 1977, 3). He argues that the instrumental account, though 'correct,' is not 'true'-it captures the surface of technology while missing its essence. The essence of technology is not found in machines or technical processes. It is found in a particular way of revealing the world.

The concept Heidegger employs is *aletheia*-the ancient Greek word for truth, which he renders as 'unconcealment' or 'revealing' (Heidegger 1977, 11-12). Truth, for Heidegger, is not primarily a property of propositions but a happening-an event by which things come to presence, by which they show themselves as what they are. Technology is one such happening: a way in which the world is disclosed and made intelligible.

Heidegger distinguishes between two modes of revealing (Heidegger 1977, 13). The first, characteristic of pre-modern craft, he calls bringing-forth (*poiesis*): the craftsman attends to the

Copyright © Oxford Law Review. (editor@oxfordlr.com)

possibilities of his material and draws out of it what it can become-a mode of revealing that is responsive and oriented toward the completion of the thing. The second, which Heidegger identifies as the essence of modern technology, is challenging-forth (*Herausfordern*): modern technology does not attend to the world but demands that it yield up its contents as resources to be ordered, stored, and deployed. The world, in this mode, is disclosed as a *standing-reserve* (*Bestand*)-a stock of resources available for mobilisation and use.

2.2 Enframing and Its Danger

The culmination of Heidegger's analysis is the concept of *Gestell*, translated as Enframing (Heidegger 1977, 19-27). Enframing is not itself a technology but the metaphysical structure of modern technological disclosure: the totalising tendency to frame everything-including human beings-within the logic of resource availability and maximal efficiency. Its danger lies not in the possibility of misuse but in the comprehensiveness of its concealment. As Borgmann (Borgmann 1984, 40-55) has shown in a complementary analysis, the 'device paradigm' of modern technology similarly conceals the richness of engagement it displaces. When a forest is disclosed primarily as timber, a river as hydroelectric potential, and a person as a consumer profile, something real has been revealed-but something equally real has been structurally obscured: the forest as a site of dwelling, the river as a communal boundary, the person as an irreducible end in themselves. The danger of Enframing is that its very productivity conceals the possibility of other, richer modes of being in the world.

For the purposes of information technology law, this analysis raises a question that conventional regulatory discourse rarely poses: if digital technology is a mode of revealing rather than a neutral tool, what does it reveal, and what does it conceal? And if law responds only to what technology makes visible-the harms and violations that surface within the technological frame-does it systematically fail to address what technology structurally obscures? These questions bear directly on the architecture of regulatory frameworks, the construction of legal personhood, and the design of rights in a digital age.

3. Challenging-Forth and Enframing in the Digital Age

3.1 Data as Standing-Reserve

Datafication-the systematic conversion of social life into quantifiable, storable, and processable data-is the most radical contemporary expression of standing-reserve. Shoshana Zuboff describes this process through the concept of 'behavioural surplus'-the vast quantities of data generated by human activity online, claimed by platform corporations as raw material for predictive products (Zuboff 2019, 8-15). The logic is structurally Heideggerian: human experience is revealed primarily as a data resource. The question posed to human existence by the data economy is not 'Who are you?' but 'What do you yield?' (Zuboff 2019, 100). A walk in a park, the pattern of a person's purchases, the timing and content of their communications-all are converted into raw material to be

Copyright © Oxford Law Review. (editor@oxfordlr.com)

processed into predictions about future behaviour. The standing-reserve of the digital age is not coal or timber; it is attention, behaviour, social connection, and bodily movement.

3.2 Algorithmic Governance, Visibility, and Social Architecture

An algorithm is not merely a decision-making tool. It is a machine for producing visibility-for determining what appears to whom, in what form, and with what significance. Recommendation algorithms on platforms such as YouTube, TikTok, and Instagram construct a personalised informational reality for each user, selecting the particular subset of available content that the algorithm determines will sustain engagement. This is what Pariser (Pariser 2011, 9-11) described as the 'filter bubble'-not merely a limitation on information access, but a structuring of the conditions under which reality is disclosed. The algorithm instates Enframing: it discloses the world as a customised feed, optimised for the extraction of attention. What is revealed is not the world as it is, but the world as the platform's commercial logic determines it should appear.

Social media architecture reinforces this structuring of social life. Design choices embedded in platforms-engagement metrics, follower counts, algorithmic amplification of emotionally provocative content-are not neutral facilitations of communication. They are technologies of social construction that shape what kinds of speech, identity, and relationship are produced. As Lessig (Lessig 2006, 120-125) argues, code exercises a regulatory function that constrains and enables behaviour in ways that parallel and frequently exceed the effects of formal legal rules. But from a Heideggerian perspective, the point goes further: code does not merely regulate behaviour within a pre-existing social reality but constitutes the conditions under which social reality is revealed. Foucault's (Foucault 1977, 195-228) analysis of the panopticon is illuminating here: digital platforms produce users who perform their identity in full awareness that their activity is observed, recorded, and algorithmically assessed. The self produced in this environment is not a pre-technological self that happens to use digital tools. It is a self constituted through and for the digital gaze.

3.3 Biometric Governance and the Body as Resource

The logic of digital Enframing is perhaps most stark in biometric governance. Facial recognition systems, fingerprint databases, and gait-recognition technologies convert the human body into identifying data-a legible resource for surveillance systems. The body is disclosed not as the locus of personhood and vulnerability, but as an identifying signal to be matched against a database. Predictive policing systems extend this logic into the domain of future behaviour: by analysing historical crime data that encodes the patterns of racially biased policing, these systems reveal persons not as agents capable of choice and change, but as statistical probabilities to be managed (Harcourt 2007, 1-20). The standing-reserve has here become explicitly human: persons are treated as risk resources to be efficiently ordered by the state's security apparatus.

4. Turing, Imitation, and the Problem of Digital Reality

Copyright © Oxford Law Review. (editor@oxfordlr.com)

In 1950, Alan Turing proposed the Imitation Game: if a human interrogator communicating only through text cannot reliably distinguish the responses of a machine from those of a human being, the machine can be said to think (Turing 1950, 433). Turing's question was ostensibly about machine intelligence, but its philosophical implications extend further. At the level of functional output, authenticity may be indistinguishable from simulation. If a machine produces responses indistinguishable from human responses, the question of whether something 'real' underlies those responses becomes operationally irrelevant. The boundary between the real and the simulated becomes a matter of performance rather than essence. Searle's (Searle 1980, 417) famous critique-that syntax does not constitute semantics-challenges the cognitive claim but leaves intact the social and legal significance of the performative insight: what matters institutionally is what passes.

Jean Baudrillard's theory of simulacra develops the consequences of this insight (Baudrillard 1994, 1-7). Baudrillard argues that in contemporary culture, representations have ceased to reflect an underlying reality and have instead become realities in their own right-simulacra that precede and constitute the 'real' they were originally supposed to represent. This analysis has found its most dramatic confirmation in digital life. A person's social media profile is, in one sense, a representation of the person. But it is also increasingly constitutive of their social existence-their professional reputation, their social relationships, and their encounter with state and corporate power are all mediated through the profile rather than through the person directly. The representation does not merely depict social reality; it constitutes a social reality of its own, one that may diverge substantially from the person's lived experience.

The most recent development in this Turing trajectory is the emergence of generative AI systems capable of producing text, images, audio, and video indistinguishable from human-generated output. This introduces a qualitatively new form of epistemic uncertainty: the systematic impossibility of distinguishing authentic from synthesised content at the level of perception. Legal systems presuppose the possibility of evidence-the capacity to distinguish true from false, authentic from fabricated. When deepfake video can place a person at a location they never visited, or when AI-generated text can fabricate a statement they never made, the evidentiary foundations of legal process are placed under fundamental pressure. From a Heideggerian perspective, this is the logical culmination of Enframing: when the mode of revealing has become so thoroughly computational that the distinction between the authentic and the synthesised collapses, the standing-reserve has reached the level of identity itself.

5. Law, Visibility, and the GDPR's Structural Limits

Legal systems do not respond to everything. They respond to what has been made legible within their categories of recognition. An injury is legally cognisable when it can be categorised as a harm, attributed to an agent, and addressed through a remedy. Much of what digital systems do to human beings-the slow erosion of epistemic autonomy, the diffuse anxiety of perpetual surveillance, the cumulative effect of algorithmic discrimination-remains legally invisible, not because it is unreal, but because the conceptual apparatus of law does not render it visible. Legal categories of harm are not

Copyright © Oxford Law Review. (editor@oxfordlr.com)

given by nature; they are produced through historical processes that reflect the social and technological conditions of their formation (Cohen 2019, 9-35). Privacy law, as it has developed in the digital age, reflects a particular technological understanding of harm: the unauthorised collection of discrete data items, the failure to obtain consent, the security breach. These are genuine harms, but they are harms conceived within the frame of Enframing-information treated as a discrete commodity.

The General Data Protection Regulation represents the most ambitious attempt to date to govern personal data in the digital age. Its innovations-the right to erasure, restrictions on automated decision-making, and data protection impact assessments-reflect a sophisticated understanding of digital harms. And yet the GDPR is, at its core, an instrument of informational self-determination. It accepts the premise that human beings can be represented as data and seeks to regulate the conditions under which that representation is made and used. It manages the conversion of persons into data profiles; it does not contest it. Articles 17 and 22, which restrict automated decision-making and provide a qualified right to be forgotten, are partial exceptions, but their interpretation has been narrow and their scope limited to specific decision types. The vast domain of algorithmic influence that operates below the threshold of formal decision-making-the curation of news feeds, the structuring of social interaction, the shaping of consumer behaviour-remains largely outside the GDPR's practical reach (Rouvroy 2013, 143-151).

There is also a political dimension to algorithmic visibility that Heidegger's framework illuminates. Algorithmic systems produce differential revealing-rendering certain populations hypervisible in ways that attract surveillance and control, while rendering others invisible in ways that deny them access to services and remedies. Facial recognition systems have been documented as significantly less accurate for dark-skinned and female subjects (Buolamwini and Gebru 2018, 7-12). Predictive policing systems trained on historically biased arrest data reproduce and amplify existing inequalities (Harcourt 2007, 1-20). These are not merely problems of technical bias amenable to algorithmic adjustment. They are expressions of a deeper structural issue: the translation of social inequality into algorithmic form, and its subsequent naturalisation within systems that present themselves as objective and neutral. Miranda Fricker's (Fricker 2007, 147-175) account of epistemic injustice is directly relevant here: algorithmic systems can instantiate both testimonial injustice-by discounting the data signals of certain groups-and hermeneutical injustice-by failing to capture experiences that fall outside the training distribution.

6. Human Beings as Data and Standing-Reserve

In the age of digital capitalism, every person leaves behind them a digital double-a shadow composed of the traces of their online activity, purchases, communications, location data, biometric signatures, and the inferences drawn from all of these by machine learning systems. In many respects, this shadow has become more socially operative than the person whose activities produced it. The credit score determines access to housing and financial services more reliably than a personal interview. The algorithmic risk assessment influences sentencing decisions more consistently than an individualised judicial assessment. The person exists in a complex and frequently unequal

Copyright © Oxford Law Review. (editor@oxfordlr.com)

relationship with their data double-one in which the data double often carries more institutional weight than the person themselves.

This is the realisation, at scale, of Heidegger's standing-reserve as applied to human beings. The person, in the logic of digital Enframing, is revealed primarily as a data resource: a source of extractable information whose value lies in its utility for prediction, targeting, and governance. The platform economy reinforces this logic: gig workers governed through algorithmic management, assessed through quantified ratings, disciplined through the threat of deplatforming. Their labour is valued not in terms of who they are as workers-their skills, judgment, needs-but in terms of the data signals they produce (Zuboff 2019, 100). The human element has not been eliminated; it has been converted into a resource to be optimised.

The philosopher Paul Ricoeur argued that human identity is, at its core, narrative: a person is not a fixed essence but a story they tell about themselves over time, incorporating change, contradiction, and growth (Ricoeur 1992, 140-168). Datafication stands in an antagonistic relationship to this narrative identity. The data profile does not tell a story. It captures a pattern. It does not distinguish between the person someone was at eighteen and the person they have become at forty. It does not recognise context, growth, or changed circumstances. It identifies correlations, not meanings. Law has built its concepts of responsibility, liability, rights, and dignity around a narrative subject capable of agency, change, and accountability. When that subject is increasingly governed through their data double, the conceptual architecture of law is placed under pressure that data protection rules alone cannot relieve (Rouvroy 2013, 151).

7. Can Law Regulate Technological Revealing?

7.1 The Recursive Problem

The most difficult aspect of the relationship between law and digital technology is that law itself is increasingly organised through the technological systems it seeks to govern. Administrative law is mediated through algorithmic systems-from tax assessment to benefit eligibility, from visa processing to welfare allocation. Criminal justice is shaped by risk assessment instruments and automated evidence processing. In each of these domains, law has internalised the technological logic of Enframing: it now sees through algorithmic lenses, thinks in terms of data, and makes decisions through computational processes (Rouvroy and Berns 2013, 163-175). As Lessig (Lessig 2006, 120) identified, code functions as a regulatory modality alongside law, norms, and markets. But the Heideggerian analysis suggests a deeper problem: if Enframing is not merely a regulatory mode but a structuring of how reality is revealed, then law's adoption of technological modes of operation may transform what law is capable of seeing, and therefore what it is capable of governing. A legal system calibrated for algorithmic efficiency may systematically sacrifice the narrative and particular depth of the persons it governs. Efficiency and justice are not the same thing.

7.2 Directions for a More Ontologically Aware Regulation

Copyright © Oxford Law Review. (editor@oxfordlr.com)

The argument advanced in this article is primarily diagnostic. Nevertheless, the analysis suggests directions in which regulatory thinking might develop. First, regulatory frameworks might acknowledge the ontological dimension of digital systems-that they do not merely process data but actively structure the conditions of human self-understanding. This would require moving beyond purely outcome-based regulation toward what might be called constitutive regulation: regulation concerned not only with what digital systems do, but with what they make human beings into (Floridi 2023, 55-80). The EU AI Act's risk-based framework, which imposes heightened obligations on high-risk AI applications in employment, education, and law enforcement, is a step in this direction, though it remains largely within the logic of outcome-based governance.

Second, law needs to develop a reflexive capacity with respect to its own technological mediation. A legal system that never questions the algorithmic systems through which it operates-treating algorithmic outputs as presumptively valid without examining the modes of revealing they embody-has, in Heideggerian terms, been fully Enframed. The development of genuinely non-automated review mechanisms, the preservation of human judgment in high-stakes decisions, and the maintenance of spaces of deliberation that resist algorithmic mediation may be as important as the regulation of specific technological harms. It must also be acknowledged, with Heidegger, that Enframing is not a problem that arises from choice and can be solved through better choices (Heidegger 1977, 34). Regulatory humility-a recognition that law cannot resolve the problem of Enframing by adding more rules to the existing framework-is not an argument for resignation. It is an argument for cultural, political, and institutional commitments that extend far beyond information technology regulation alone.

8. Conclusion

This article began with a simple observation: when a person opens a social media platform, they do not encounter a neutral window onto the world. They encounter a world already structured-filtered, curated, and optimised-by technological systems that determine what becomes visible and what remains concealed. The article has argued that this observation points toward a fundamental philosophical problem for information technology law.

Heidegger's analysis of technology as a mode of revealing rather than a neutral instrument provides a framework for understanding why this problem is so difficult to address through conventional regulatory means. Modern technology does not merely produce harms that can be regulated after the fact. It produces a way of revealing human beings-through datafication, algorithmic governance, biometric systems, and simulated identity-that shapes the very conditions under which harm is recognised, categorised, and addressed (Heidegger 1977, 19-27). The concept of Enframing captures this totalising tendency: the structuring of persons, relationships, knowledge, and social life within the logic of standing-reserve.

Turing's Imitation Game, read philosophically, anticipates the contemporary problem of digital simulation: the systematic production of representations indistinguishable from the realities they represent (Turing 1950). Baudrillard's analysis of simulacra (Baudrillard 1994) confirms that this problem has become structural in the digital age. In a world where AI-generated content,

Copyright © Oxford Law Review. (editor@oxfordlr.com)

algorithmic personas, and data doubles constitute an increasingly significant part of social reality, the boundary between representation and reality has become genuinely unstable. Law, which has always depended on the possibility of distinguishing the real from the fabricated, now operates in conditions where that distinction cannot be taken for granted.

Information technology law, in its current form, operates largely within the frame of technological Enframing. It uses the categories produced by digital systems-data, consent, risk, efficiency, algorithmic output-to govern those systems, without questioning whether those categories are adequate to the human realities they purport to represent. Law that cannot ask this question is law that has already, without noticing, been Enframed. The challenge for information technology law in the twenty-first century is not merely to regulate what technology does. It is to see clearly-past the frame-what technology makes of human beings.

References

Baudrillard, J (1994) Simulacra and Simulation (Sheila Faria Glaser, trans, University of Michigan Press).

Borgmann, A (1984) Technology and the Character of Contemporary Life (University of Chicago Press).

Buolamwini, J and Gebru, T (2018) 'Gender Shades: Intersectional Accuracy Disparities in Commercial Gender Classification' 81 Proceedings of Machine Learning Research 1.

Cohen, JE (2019) Between Truth and Power: The Legal Constructions of Informational Capitalism (Oxford University Press).

Floridi, L (2023) The Ethics of Artificial Intelligence (MIT Press).

Foucault, M (1977) Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison (Alan Sheridan, trans, Pantheon).

Fricker, M (2007) Epistemic Injustice: Power and the Ethics of Knowing (Oxford University Press).

Harcourt, BE (2007) Against Prediction: Profiling, Policing, and Punishing in an Actuarial Age (University of Chicago Press).

Heidegger, M (1977) 'The Question Concerning Technology' in The Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays (William Lovitt, trans, Harper & Row) 3.

Lessig, L (2006) Code: Version 2.0 (Basic Books).

Pariser, E (2011) The Filter Bubble: What the Internet Is Hiding from You (Penguin Press).

Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 April 2016 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data (General Data Protection Regulation) [2016] OJ L 119/1.

Copyright © Oxford Law Review. (editor@oxfordlr.com)

 DOI: https://10.5281/zenodo.23101069

Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 June 2024 laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act) [2024] OJ L 1689.

Ricoeur, P (1992) Oneself as Another (Kathleen Blamey, trans, University of Chicago Press).

Rouvroy, A (2013) 'The End(s) of Critique: Data-Behaviourism vs. Due-Process' in M Hildebrandt and K de Vries (eds), Privacy, Due Process and the Computational Turn (Routledge) 143.

Rouvroy, A and Berns, T (2013) 'Algorithmic Governmentality and Prospects of Emancipation' 20 Réseaux 163.

Searle, JR (1980) 'Minds, Brains, and Programs' 3 Behavioral and Brain Sciences 417.

Turing, A (1950) 'Computing Machinery and Intelligence' 59 Mind 433.

Zuboff, S (2019) The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power (PublicAffairs).

Publisher's Note

Oxford Law Review remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations. Oxford Law Review or its licensors retain the rights to this article pursuant to the applicable publishing agreement with the author(s) or other rightsholder(s). Any self-archiving, reproduction, distribution, or reuse of the accepted manuscript or published version is subject to the terms of the applicable publishing agreement and applicable law.

Copyright © Oxford Law Review. (editor@oxfordlr.com)