

Before Truth, Reality: Operation Condor and the Crude Fermentation of Onoptic Logic

An Ontopolitical Analysis of Power through Hakki Tan's Reality Paradigm

Hakki Tan

ORCID: 0009-0008-8582-3132

"My paradigm is not a paradigm of truth; it is a paradigm of reality."

Article Type: Research Article | Field: Political Theory, Latin American Studies, Human Rights, Theory of Power

Abstract

This article reinterprets Operation Condor through Hakki Tan's Reality Paradigm. I argue that Operation Condor was not the Onopticon itself. Rather, it was one of the crude, predigital periods of state-terrorist fermentation in Onoptic logic. In Condor, power still depended upon the classical friend-enemy distinction, the labelling of dissidents as "subversives", and targeted political elimination. By contrast, the contemporary Onopticon operates the same logic of infrastructural imposition without necessarily depending upon prior enemy-designation. It embeds this logic within everyday, diffuse, and globalised forms of governance.

The Reality Paradigm is not a narrow theory of surveillance, platforms, or digital control. Rather, it is an ontopolitical theory of power that diagnoses a deeper rupture: power no longer merely suppresses truth; it imposes the very field of reality in which truth may appear. The Onopticon therefore operates not primarily at the level of surveillance, discipline, modulation, representation, or ideological distortion, but at the level of the enforced construction of the field within which human beings encounter the world, become recognisable, access institutions, contest decisions, and remain socially liveable.

Operation Condor is historically significant in this respect. South American dictatorships did not merely physically eliminate dissidents. They first transformed political subjects into operational targets within a transnational intelligence infrastructure. The article examines both the continuity and the rupture between Condor's crude, bloody, enemy-dependent form of imposition and the contemporary Onopticon's infrastructural enclosure, which may operate through enemy-production but is not limited to it. The article further argues that archives, algorithms, and regimes of controlled disclosure may become instruments of the enforcement of reality not only through concealment, but also through asymmetrical conditions of disclosure, circulation, ownership, standardisation, and access.

Keywords: Reality Paradigm, Onopticon, Homovictimus, Operation Condor, ontopolitical power, infrastructural imposition, crude fermentation, controlled disclosure, counter-reality, Global South, ontological rupture.

1. Introduction

Modern theories of power have often been organised around truth, ideology, surveillance, discipline, and control. They explain how power distorts truth, renders the subject visible, or directs behaviour. Yet they frequently leave a more fundamental question in the background. How does power construct and impose the field of reality before truth can appear at all?

Hakki Tan's Reality Paradigm begins from precisely this question. The issue is not merely that human beings are observed, measured, or deprived of options. The deeper issue is the field of reality within which the subject can act, be recognised, contest decisions, and remain liveable. The Reality Paradigm therefore asks a prior question. Under what technical, administrative, legal, intelligence-based, economic, and infrastructural conditions can a subject turn towards truth in the first place?

This article historicises that theoretical framework through Operation Condor, the transnational state-terror network that operated across South America in the 1970s. This historicisation, however, is not a simple search for continuity. Condor is not treated as identical with the contemporary Onopticon. Rather, I read it as a crude, bloody, targeted, and enemy-dependent fermentation period of Onoptic reason.

In this article, the concept of “crude fermentation” refers to the historical pre-form of Onoptic logic before it became a digital, everyday, and globalised infrastructural regime. It names the stage in which this logic operated through enemy construction, secret archives, intelligence coordination, naked state violence, and enforced disappearance. In other words, crude fermentation is the harder, bloodier, and more visible historical pre-phase of today’s Onoptic enforcement of reality.

This distinction is crucial. In Condor, power had to label the dissident as an “enemy” before eliminating them. The contemporary Onopticon moves further: it can enclose human beings within infrastructures of access, visibility, classification, scoring, permission, denial, and managed contestability without necessarily declaring them enemies. Not that the Onopticon no longer produces enemies. Rather, prior enemy-designation ceases to be the necessary threshold for the operation of power. The Onopticon may operate through enemy-production, but it can also operate through ordinary classification, scoring, access control, and infrastructural dependency.

This reading does not invalidate Marxist, dependency-theoretical, or traditional imperialism-based analyses of Operation Condor. Such approaches remain indispensable for explaining Condor’s class function, geopolitical role, anti-communist orientation, and place within dependent capitalist state formations. The question of this article, however, is different. It asks not only in whose interests Condor operated, but through what infrastructural procedures dissidents were transformed from human beings, citizens, or political subjects into targets. The Reality Paradigm does not replace economic or geopolitical explanations of power; it diagnoses the field of reality that must be constructed for those explanations to become operational. In this sense, the ontopolitical reading offered here does not displace class or imperialism analysis; rather, it renders visible the operational and ontopolitical ground that such analyses often presuppose.

Theoretical position note: The concepts of the Reality Paradigm, the Onopticon, the infrastructural a priori, and Homovictimus¹ used in this article are core concepts of the ontopolitical theory of power developed by Hakki Tan. This article subjects that conceptual set to a historical-genealogical analysis through the case of Operation Condor. Its aim is therefore not to import these concepts from an external framework, but to put them to work in relation to transnational state terror, enforced disappearance, and infrastructural imposition.

¹ From homo (human) + victimus, a non-standard Latinate formation used here to mean “one who is made a victim”.

The central thesis of the article is therefore straightforward. Operation Condor was one of the crude and bloody fermentation periods of Onoptic logic. The Onopticon is the everyday, infrastructural, and globalised form of the same logic. It operates without necessarily depending upon prior enemy-designation.

2. The Reality Paradigm as a Theory of Power and Infrastructural Imposition

The Reality Paradigm argues that power operates not only upon truth, but also upon the ontological conditions under which truth can appear. In this sense, the Onopticon is not a mere digital update of the classical Panopticon or of surveillance capitalism. The Onopticon is not a theory of cables, networks, or platforms. It is, more fundamentally, a theory of power.

The Panopticon concerns the rendering visible and disciplining of the subject. Surveillance capitalism concerns the extraction, prediction, and monetisation of behavioural data. The Onopticon operates at a prior level: it determines within which reality the subject will appear, how they will be recognised, what options they will encounter, what possibilities of contestation they will have, and under what conditions they may remain liveable.

At this point, the Reality Paradigm enters into contact with Foucault's analyses of discipline and biopolitics, and with Agamben's discussions of the state of exception and bare life; yet it is not identical with either. Foucault shows how modern power disciplines bodies and manages populations. Agamben emphasises how sovereignty reduces human beings to bare life through juridical exception. The Reality Paradigm turns towards a more infrastructural question that operates before and beneath both lines of analysis: through what mechanisms is the field of reality established in which a human being can appear as body, population, citizen, risk, agent, or victim? The Onopticon therefore diagnoses not only power that disciplines, makes live, lets die, or places life under exception, but power that imposes the very field in which all these operations become possible.

At the centre of this theory lies the concept of the infrastructural *a priori*. In the Kantian tradition, the *a priori* refers to the formative conditions that precede experience. In the Reality Paradigm, however, these conditions are no longer located inside the subject, but in infrastructures placed before the subject. Human beings do not encounter the world directly; they encounter a field of reality already processed by administrative, legal, intelligence-based, economic, and digital infrastructures. The condition of experience thus shifts from the internal cognitive structure of the subject to external infrastructural architectures.

Put simply, the subject no longer encounters the world first, but an already established field of processing that stands in for the world. This field determines in advance what is possible, what is visible, what is acceptable, what counts as risky, and what may be excluded.

At this point, the language of "regulation" becomes insufficient. What is at stake is not neutral organisation, but the coercive construction of reality. Imposition is therefore a key term. Power does not merely reduce options; it constructs the field within which options are encountered. It does not merely monitor behaviour; it pre-processes the plane of reality on which behaviour becomes possible. It does not merely classify the subject; it makes recognisability dependent upon classifiability.

This approach is completed by the concept of Homovictimus. Homovictimus is not a passive victim, but a subject held fully responsible as an agent by the system while being deprived of the infrastructural and epistemic conditions required for agency. The person appears to have chosen, yet the field of choice has already been narrowed. The person appears not to have objected, yet the channel of objection has already been closed. The person appears to have made a mistake, yet the decision environment has already been constructed by others.

Homovictimus therefore reveals one of the sharpest contradictions of modern power: the human being continues to be held responsible as an agent, while the conditions of agency are taken away. Homovictimus is not a person rendered passive because they are a victim; rather, they are a person whose conditions of agency are removed precisely at the moment they are treated as an agent.

This distinction is crucial for the historical reading developed below. Homovictimus does not deny the real political agency of Condor's victims. Trade unionists, revolutionaries, left-wing politicians, students, journalists, militants, and activists were often subjects engaged in political struggle through their own historical will. The ontopolitical violence of Condor did not consist in inventing agency where none existed. It consisted in converting existing political agency into operational targetability by stripping it of its legal, public, and contestable conditions.

3. Operation Condor: Transnational Infrastructural Coordination

Operation Condor was a secret transnational repression network established by right-wing military dictatorships in South America during the 1970s. The security services of Chile, Argentina, Uruguay, Paraguay, Bolivia, and Brazil stood at the centre of this structure. A CIA summary published by the United States Department of State on 24 March 1977 described Operation Condor as a cooperative effort among these countries' security services to combat "terrorism and subversion". The same document indicated that what had initially been envisaged as information exchange later involved discussions of assassination operations abroad (U.S. Department of State, 1977).

The October 1975 invitation issued by DINA chief Manuel Contreras was decisive for Condor's formal establishment. According to the document published by the National Security Archive, Contreras invited secret police chiefs from Paraguay, Argentina, Uruguay, Brazil, and Bolivia to a five-day meeting in Santiago at the end of November. The invitation stated that the meeting would create the basis for "coordinated actions"; its attachments included an agenda, a structural chart for intelligence sharing and operational coordination, and codes for encrypted communication (DINA/Contreras, 1975).

This point is theoretically significant. Condor was not merely a loose political alliance or a form of military solidarity. It was an infrastructure of archives, codes, communication, coordination, targeting, and transnational operations. According to CELS, drawing on trial materials, Condor's first phase involved the creation of a centralised database on guerrilla movements, left-wing parties, trade unionists, religious groups, liberal politicians, and others considered enemies by the regimes. Its second phase targeted regional political enemies. Its third phase involved operations to track and eliminate individuals across the Americas and Europe (CELS, n.d.).

Lessa and Balardini's theory of transnational repression shows that Condor did not emerge all at once, but gradually fermented. Their Transnational Human Rights Victims (THRV) dataset identifies 805 victims of transnational repression in South America between 1969 and 1981. According to their periodisation, regional repression took the form of more isolated actions between 1969 and 1973, moved towards initial cooperation between 1974 and 1975, and reached its highest intensity during the Condor period between 1976 and 1978 (Lessa & Balardini, 2024). This historical evolution makes it possible to read Condor not as the Onoptic logic itself, but as its predigital and crude fermentation period.

We should not understand the relationship between Condor and the United States through a simple, linear command-and-control model. We must instead situate it within Cold War counterinsurgency doctrines, continental security institutions, training networks, and intelligence cooperation. McSherry argues that it is insufficient to view Condor either solely as an initiative of Latin American states or solely as an instrument of Washington. Instead, it should be analysed as a historical-structural system of state terror in which a US-supported security architecture intersected with regional military elites organised around the doctrine of the "internal enemy" (McSherry, 2019). The focus of this article, however, is not primarily the role of the United States, but the way in which this system transformed the dissident into a target within an operational reality.

The historical significance of Condor therefore lies not only in its violence. Condor created a synchronised operational reality infrastructure that exceeded the territorial limits of the nation-state. Where a dissident was located, under what name they lived, with which organisation they were associated, which country they had entered, and under which status they would be targeted were all processed within this infrastructure.

3.1. The Administrative Grammar of Targeting

A closer reading of Condor's documents shows that reality-imposition was not only a matter of violence, but also of administrative grammar. The language of "coordination", "subversion", "information exchange", "special teams", "encrypted communication", and "sanctions" did not merely describe repression; it made repression administratively thinkable and operationally executable.

The DINA invitation did not simply call a meeting. It proposed a structure through which intelligence could be shared, targets could be rendered legible across borders, and action could be synchronised. The inclusion of encrypted communication codes is particularly significant. Encryption here was not only a security measure; it was part of the infrastructure through which clandestine cooperation could acquire continuity, repeatability, and operational discipline.

Likewise, Scherrer's cable did not merely report possible assassinations abroad; it revealed a phase structure in which information, classification, mobility, and elimination were connected within a single operational sequence. The archive therefore shows that Condor's violence depended upon a prior bureaucratic conversion: political subjects had to be translated into files, codes, routes, risks, and actionable targets.

This administrative grammar is central to the ontopolitical argument of the article. Condor did not only kill dissidents; it first produced a reality in which dissidents could be processed as transnationally actionable objects. The file, the code, the route, the status, and the category preceded the disappearance. They did not replace violence; they made violence executable.

4. An Onoptic Reading of Condor: The Erasure of Reality before Truth

The violence of Operation Condor was not merely physical. Before victims were physically eliminated, they were placed within specific categories: “subversive”, “terrorist”, “extremist”, “Marxist”, “enemy”. These categories were often not juridical statuses produced through legal judgement. They were instruments through which security services produced operational reality.

When a victim of Condor crossed from one country to another, they did not thereby reach freedom. Rather, they moved to another node of the same operational reality network. Exile was no longer a safe distance. The border was no longer a protective line. Passport, address, organisational affiliation, family ties, and political history became operational data carried after the person.

This was the crude and predigital form of Onoptic logic. Power was not primarily concerned with whether the individual spoke the truth; it destroyed the person’s capacity to appear on the scene of truth, and dismantled the legal and spatial infrastructure through which their existence could be proved. When a person is turned into a target without trial, the question is no longer simply whether the state is lying. The more fundamental question is: through what infrastructural operation has this person been transformed from human being, citizen, or accused subject into a target?

The Reality Paradigm operates precisely here. It argues that power does not merely distort truth; it imposes the conditions of reality in which truth can appear. In Condor, this imposition operated through files, codes, borders, clandestine centres, false documents, communication networks, and illegal transfers.

FBI agent Robert Scherrer’s “*Chilbom*” cable of 28 September 1976 reported that, in Condor’s third and most secret phase, special teams could travel to non-member countries and conduct operations against targets, including assassination (FBI/Scherrer, 1976). This document makes clear that Condor was not simply an apparatus of information exchange, but an infrastructure of transnational targeting and elimination.

For this reason, Condor’s violence was directed not only against the victim’s body. It also destroyed the plane of reality within which the victim could appear as human. The dissident was first stripped of political subjecthood, then transformed into a security object, and finally constituted as an operational target. Physical elimination was the final stage of an ontopolitical elimination that had already taken place.

Here, elimination does not refer only to the destruction of the body, but to the disabling of the conditions of record, law, place, and testimony through which a person could be recognised as human. Condor’s killing therefore produced not only death, but also the fragmentation of the provable conditions of existence.

5. Homovictimus and Absolute Enclosure: The Case of Juan Pablo Recagno Ibarburu

Condor provides one of the historical laboratories of the absolute enclosure of Homovictimus. In the eyes of the state, the victim was an excessive agent: dangerous, organised, and a transnational threat. Yet before the law, the same person was deprived of the conditions of agency: there was no court, no defence, no open accusation, no reliable record, and no body.

One example that concretises this abstract mechanism is the Uruguayan Juan Pablo Recagno Ibarburu. According to CELS’s account of the Condor trial, twenty-seven Uruguayan citizens were disappeared in Buenos Aires between August and October 1976; Juan Pablo Recagno Ibarburu was abducted on 2 October 1976 as part of this group. CELS states that Recagno was a ceramicist and an illustrator/cartoonist who worked for *Joker*

magazine (CELS, n.d.).

According to the victim record of Argentina's Public Prosecutor's Office for Plan Condor, Recagno Ibarburu remains disappeared. The record states that his family's attempts to locate him were unsuccessful, and that official reports during habeas corpus proceedings concealed the fact of his detention (Ministerio Público Fiscal Argentina, n.d.).

The case of Recagno shows that enforced disappearance is not only a physical crime. The person is removed not only from life, but also from the field of provable existence. The family is left with uncertainty, society with silence, the law with no file, and the state with denial. The person is punished as though they were a full-fledged agent, yet the field of reality in which they could speak as an agent is taken away.

This is the historical-hard form of Homovictimus: the human being coded by the system as a dangerous agent, while being deprived entirely of the legal, epistemic, and infrastructural conditions of agency. Homovictimus is therefore not merely a suffering person; it is the person deprived of defence, objection, recognition, and provability at the very moment they are treated as an agent.

The concept must therefore be distinguished from passivity. Homovictimus does not name a person without agency. It names the condition in which real historical agency is captured, recoded, and stripped of the institutional conditions through which it could remain politically contestable. The revolutionary, trade unionist, journalist, militant, student, or dissident does not become Homovictimus because they lacked agency; they become Homovictimus when their agency is converted into evidence of targetability and then deprived of any legal or public form of defence.

6. From Crude Fermentation to Ontological Rupture: Condor and the Onopticon

It would be mistaken to identify Operation Condor directly with the contemporary Onopticon. Condor was a secret, military-intelligence, bloody, and exceptional network of state terror. The Onopticon, by contrast, is a contemporary, everyday, diffuse, infrastructural, and often normalised regime of reality-imposition.

Yet this difference does not erase the genealogical relation between them. Condor is a crude fermentation period of Onoptic logic. The relation between the two regimes must be understood through both continuity and rupture.

The continuity defended here is neither technological nor linear. This article does not assume a simple evolutionary line from Condor to the digital Onopticon. The continuity lies not in the technical movement from telegram to cloud, or from secret file to algorithm. It lies in the operational logic by which the subject is first transformed into a processable category. That category then determines conditions of movement, visibility, defence, access, and liveability. Condor was the analog and bloody pre-form of this logic; the contemporary Onopticon is its digital, diffuse, and everyday form.

The limit of Condor: Condor had to mark a body as an enemy before eliminating it. Categories such as "Marxist", "subversive", "terrorist", and "extremist" were political-ontological thresholds that made violence possible. Here, power still relied upon the classical friend-enemy distinction. Violence was targeted, exceptional, naked, and often concentrated in clandestine centres.

Lessa and Balardini's periodisation reinforces this distinction. Condor represents the phase in which transnational repression reached its highest degree of cooperative intensity between 1976 and 1978. Yet that intensity remained dependent upon the politically enemy-coded subject. Condor's infrastructure first marked the dissident as "subversive"; it then connected this marking to intelligence exchange, cross-border tracking, abduction, and enforced disappearance (Lessa & Balardini, 2024).

The Onoptic rupture: The contemporary Onopticon operates the logic of imposition without necessarily requiring the declaration of an enemy. Contemporary security regimes still produce enemies. Categories such as terrorist suspect, irregular migrant, radicalisation risk, criminal profile, and predictive-policing target show that

enemy-production continues within digital governance. The claim is more precise. The Onopticon is not dependent upon prior enemy-designation as the necessary threshold of power. It can operate through enemy-production, but it can also operate through ordinary classification, scoring, access control, bureaucratic invisibility, and infrastructural dependency.

The rupture is therefore this: in Condor, one had to be enemy-coded in order to become a target. In the Onopticon, one may be rendered governable, vulnerable, or disposable simply by being made readable, calculable, classifiable, and processable. Condor organised the lethal exception; the Onopticon conditions the infrastructure of liveability.

Put differently, Condor eliminates the enemy; the Onopticon determines the conditions of liveability without necessarily declaring an enemy. In Condor, violence is concentrated in the moment of exception; in the Onopticon, imposition is embedded in the ordinary infrastructure of everyday life.

However, to emphasise Condor's infrastructural power is not to present it as a flawless or entirely closed system. Like every enforcement of reality, Condor produced frictions, delays, excess records, testimonies, family searches, human rights struggles, and archival residues. These cracks did not, however, dissolve the reality imposed by the system. Rather, they created limited openings within the imposed field of reality through which evidence, memory, and demands for accountability could later emerge.

This point requires a stronger account of resistance. Human rights movements, most notably the Mothers of Plaza de Mayo, did not simply occupy minor cracks within the imposed reality of disappearance. By repeating names, displaying photographs, occupying public space, and refusing the state's denial of the disappeared, they produced counter-realities that disrupted the state's attempt to transform absence into non-existence (Bouvard, 1994; Taylor, 1997). Such resistance did not abolish the imposed reality of Condor, but it prevented that reality from becoming the only reality. It forced disappearance back into visibility, memory, testimony, and eventually legal contestation.

Condor's lack of perfection therefore does not weaken its status as an Onoptic pre-form; on the contrary, it shows that enforced reality is never absolute closure, but a continuously contested enclosure. Power imposes reality, but this imposed reality remains a field of struggle.

This leads to the radical point of the theory. The Onopticon is not merely a system that observes human beings. It is an architecture of power that constructs and imposes the field within which the human being can appear as human. The Onopticon is therefore not the technological future of the Panopticon, but the collapse of the assumption that reality precedes power.

7. Archive, Algorithm, and Controlled Disclosure

The archival legacy of Condor is important not only for documenting past human rights violations through contemporary digital tools, but also for understanding how the enforcement of reality operates. In their study of the Plancondor.org experience, Smart, Lessa, Barbano, and Risso show that OCR, natural language processing, metadata categorisation, and data visualisation create new possibilities for documenting past human rights violations. These tools also produce risks related to algorithmic opacity, politics of representation, and data selection (Smart et al., 2026).

This ambivalence is crucial from the standpoint of the Reality Paradigm. Technology is neither inherently emancipatory nor inherently oppressive. What matters is which field of reality a technology imposes, upon whom, with what possibilities of contestation, and within which regime of opacity.

However, digital archives and algorithmic tools of documentation cannot be treated merely as technical capacities. Which institutions finance these tools, within which data architectures they operate, upon which server and platform infrastructures they depend, who can access them, and under which legal regimes they function are all decisive questions. The emancipatory or oppressive effects of archival technologies therefore

depend not only upon the software used, but also upon the relations of capital, state power, institutions, and platforms that make that software possible. From the standpoint of the Reality Paradigm, this is crucial: infrastructure is not merely technical. It is a political-economic imposition of reality operating through ownership, access, financing, protocols, and distributions of authority.

This political-economic dimension must also be considered alongside centre–periphery inequality. During the Condor period, the repressive infrastructures of South America developed not solely through the will of local military regimes, but in entanglement with Cold War security doctrines, training networks, intelligence cooperation, and counterinsurgency architectures centred in the Global North. Today, a significant portion of digital Onoptic infrastructures similarly operates through corporations, cloud systems, data protocols, platform standards, and financial networks centred in the Global North. This continuity does not identify Condor with the contemporary Onopticon; rather, it shows that the construction of the field does not operate independently of geopolitical inequality. Subjects in the Global South are often forced to live not only within the reality fields constructed by their own states, but also within infrastructures designed, owned, or standardised elsewhere.

The archive is not a pure repository of truth standing outside the Onoptic regime. Power produces reality not only by concealing, but also by delaying, cooling, decontextualising, and, when the time comes, disclosing under controlled conditions. The circulation of Condor’s documents years after the events should therefore not be read simply as the triumph of truth. It must also be understood as the transformation of crime into historical distance, expert language, file order, and manageable memory.

This issue is not limited to past archives; contemporary diplomatic leaks also generate similar struggles over reality. The Intercept’s 2023 report on the Pakistan “cypher” can be read as a contemporary example of this problem. The report shows how diplomatic tension between the United States and Pakistan, connected to Imran Khan’s foreign policy position in the context of the Russia–Ukraine war, became an internal political struggle over legitimacy through a leaked diplomatic document (Grim & Hussain, 2023). This case cannot be identified with Condor. It is used here only as a limited comparison concerning document circulation, diplomatic pressure, delayed or leaked disclosure, and the production of political reality.

The lesson of the cypher case is not that truth is simply liberated once a secret document is disclosed. The stronger conclusion is that an Onoptic regime operates not only through concealment, but also through the management of a document’s status, timing of circulation, legitimacy, and political effect. Disclosure may strengthen truth; it may also turn truth into contested, delayed, cooled, or neutralised information.

For this reason, counter-archives must not merely collect documents; they must also interrogate the regime of reality within which documents are rendered visible. The power of the Onopticon lies not in completely destroying truth, but in determining when, where, how, and at what level of political inefficacy truth may appear. The Onopticon is not absolute; nevertheless, it is reality as imposition. This imposition operates at times through concealment, at times through delay, and at times through controlled openness.

8. Conclusion

The Reality Paradigm is not a simple critique of technology. It is an ontopolitical theory of power that diagnoses how modern power constructs, narrows, and imposes the field of reality before truth can appear.

Operation Condor is one of the starkest historical cases through which this diagnosis can be read. In Condor, power did not merely repress or kill the dissident. It first placed the dissident within an operational field of reality: “subversive”, “risk”, “target”, “disappearing body”. This classification acquired material infrastructure through archives, intelligence files, borders, encrypted communication codes, joint operational mechanisms, and clandestine detention centres.

Yet Condor is not the contemporary Onopticon itself. It is a crude, bloody, enemy-dependent fermentation period of Onoptic logic. The more radical aspect of the contemporary Onopticon is not that it never produces enemies, but that it can operate without depending upon prior enemy-designation. It is no longer always

necessary to declare someone an enemy in order to render them vulnerable; it may be sufficient to make them readable, processable, classifiable, and contestable only within managed limits.

The relationship between Condor and the Onopticon is therefore not one of simple historical continuity. Condor was a form of transnational state terror directed at the enemy-coded body. The Onopticon is a more diffuse form of power that conditions the infrastructural reality of human life without requiring enemy-designation as its necessary threshold. The difference is not quantitative, but ontological.

The human subject therefore does not disappear into structure. Condor's victims were not passive products of state classification. Many were real political agents engaged in organised struggle. The violence of Condor consisted precisely in transforming such agency into targetability while depriving it of legal defence, public recognition, and contestable form. Likewise, resistance did not merely occupy residual cracks in the system. Movements such as the Mothers of Plaza de Mayo generated counter-realities by making absence visible, naming the disappeared, and forcing denial into the public field of memory and testimony.

The discussion of archives and disclosure sharpens this conclusion. Modern power does not only conceal; it also produces reality by disclosing. The circulation of a document does not mean the automatic liberation of truth. What matters is the time, context, regime of legitimacy, and political level of effectiveness within which the document becomes visible. Onoptic imposition is therefore not only a regime of invisibility; it is also a regime of controlled visibility.

This imposition operates not only through the internal security apparatuses of national states, but also through infrastructures whose ownership, standards, and access are distributed unequally on a global scale. During the Condor period, security architectures were entangled with Global North-centred counterinsurgency and intelligence arrangements. Today, digital Onoptic infrastructures are shaped to a significant degree by Global North-centred platforms, cloud systems, data standards, and financial networks. This shows that reality-imposition is not only a national problem, but also a geopolitical and political-economic one.

The article's relationship to alternative theories of power becomes clear at this point. Marxist, dependency-theoretical, and imperialism-based analyses remain indispensable for explaining Condor's class, geopolitical, and anti-communist context. The Reality Paradigm, however, reveals a more fundamental level that such explanations often leave in the background: the level at which power constructs, narrows, and disables the field of reality in which the victim could appear as human before being transformed into a target.

The clearest conclusion is this: modern power does not merely suppress truth; it constructs, narrows, and, when necessary, destroys the reality in which human beings might seek truth. Operation Condor was the crude and bloody historical fermentation of this process. The Onopticon is the same logic in its globalised and infrastructural form: no longer necessarily dependent upon the declaration of an enemy, yet still capable of producing enemies whenever such production serves the architecture of imposition.

References

- Agamben, G. (1998). *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Stanford University Press.
- Agamben, G. (2005). *State of Exception*. University of Chicago Press.
- Bouvard, M. G. (1994). *Revolutionizing Motherhood: The Mothers of the Plaza de Mayo*. Scholarly Resources.
- CELS. (n.d.). Operation Condor: A Criminal Conspiracy to Forcibly Disappear People.
- DINA / Contreras, M. (1975). Invitation from DINA Director Manuel Contreras to Paraguayans to Attend First Meeting of Operation Condor with Attached Agenda and Encrypted Communication Codes. National Security Archive.
- Dinges, J. (2004). *The Condor Years: How Pinochet and His Allies Brought Terrorism to Three Continents*. The New Press.
- FBI / Scherrer, R. (1976). "Chilbom" Cable. National Security Archive.
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1978). *The History of Sexuality, Volume 1: An Introduction*. Pantheon Books.

- Grim, R., & Hussain, M. (2023, August 9). Secret Pakistan Cable Documents U.S. Pressure to Remove Imran Khan. *The Intercept*.
- Lessa, F. (2022). *The Condor Trials: Transnational Repression and Human Rights in South America*. Yale University Press.
- Lessa, F., & Balardini, L. (2024). No safe haven: Operation Condor and transnational repression in South America. *International Studies Quarterly*, 68(2), sqae035.
- McSherry, J. P. (2019). Operation Condor as an international system of state violence and terror: A historical-structural analysis. In P. Policzer (Ed.), *The Politics of Violence in Latin America* (pp. 53–86). University of Calgary Press.
- Ministerio Público Fiscal Argentina. (n.d.). Juan Pablo Recagno Ibarburu | Plan Condor.
- National Security Archive. (n.d.). Chile and Operation Condor.
- National Security Archive. (2016). Operation Condor Verdict: Guilty!
- Plan Cóndor Project. (n.d.). The Foundation of Operation Condor.
- Reuters. (2024, June 3). Pakistan's Imran Khan Acquitted of Leaking State Secrets Charges, but to Stay in Jail.
- Smart, S., Lessa, F., Barbano, R., & Risso, M. (2026). Archives and algorithms: The Plancondor.org experience and the human rights potential of new technologies. *International Journal of Transitional Justice*, ijaf023.
- Taylor, D. (1997). *Disappearing Acts: Spectacles of Gender and Nationalism in Argentina's "Dirty War"*. Duke University Press.
- U.S. Department of State, Office of the Historian. (1976). Foreign Relations of the United States: Operation Condor Document, October 1976.
- U.S. Department of State, Office of the Historian. (1977). Foreign Relations of the United States: Operation Condor Telegram, March 24, 1977.
- Voice of America. (2023, August 9). Purported Text of Secret Cable Shows U.S. Ire at Imran Khan.

Ethical Statement

This study is not based on fieldwork involving human participants and therefore does not require ethical approval. The historical materials used in the article are drawn from publicly available archival, judicial, human rights, journalistic, and academic sources.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The author declares that there is no conflict of interest in relation to this article.

Funding Statement

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency, public, commercial, or not-for-profit.