

Comprehensive Research Report on Hakki Tan's Theory of "Onopticon and Homovictimus": The Digital Leviathan, Algorithmic Governmentality, and the Anatomy of Ontological Mutiny

INTRODUCTION: The New Ontological Regime of the Digital Age

The first quarter of the twenty-first century marks a radical phase in which information and communication technologies have shed their purely instrumental functions and transformed into a structural and foundational ground for human existence. In this context, the works introduced to the literature by Hakki Tan in 2026, titled "Onopticon and Homovictimus: The Ontological Regime of the Digital Leviathan and the Operationalization of Algorithmic Governmentality" and "ONOPTIC EXECUTION: The Liquidation of Law in the Age of the Prosthetic Individual and the Sociology of Homovictimus," create an unprecedented paradigm shift at the intersection of the philosophy of technology, digital sociology, and modern legal theory.¹ These works reject shallow approaches that view digitalization merely as a privacy violation or a data security issue; instead, they read the phenomenon directly through the liquidation of human agency, free will, and legal subjectivity—that is, as a massive "ontological crisis."¹

This comprehensive research report deeply analyzes what these works convey, the power of their interdisciplinary and manifesto-like methodology, how they diverge from other studies in contemporary surveillance literature (especially the Foucault and Zuboff schools), and what kind of theoretical blindness would exist in the fields of political sociology and technology law if these texts had never been written. The report integrates not only theoretical speculations but also highly concrete legal and hardware developments—such as the Spanish Supreme Court's BOSCO ruling⁵, the precedent-setting case law of the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU)⁶, and CHERIoT-based microchip architectures⁷—into Tan's philosophical framework to detail the "Architectural Rights Doctrine" that can be developed against algorithmic domination.¹

SECTION 1: What Does the Work Explain? The Death of

the Panopticon and the Birth of the Onopticon

The central argument of Hakkı Tan's work is that the classical "Panopticon" model, rooted in Jeremy Bentham and utilized by Michel Foucault to explain modern disciplinary societies, is inadequate to grasp the complexity and violence of today's digital ecosystem.¹ The work begins by declaring the death of the Panopticon and asserts that power has constructed an entirely new ontological regime: the *Onopticon*.¹

1.1. The Transition from Disciplinary Surveillance to Temporal Foreclosure

The Panopticon was an architecture of spatial confinement featuring a central observation tower, where prisoners in cells corrected their own behavior through self-control due to the mere possibility of being "watched."¹ In Foucault's model, visibility was a trap, and power disciplined the body in enclosed spaces like schools, factories, and prisons.² Although Gilles Deleuze argued in the late twentieth century that "societies of control" had replaced disciplinary societies, Tan's theory takes this observation a step further into algorithmic absoluteness.²

Derived from the combination of the Greek words "on" (being) and "optikon" (seeing/observing), the Onopticon goes beyond observation; it reconstructs existence by translating it into data.¹ While the Panopticon monitors the past and the present, the Onopticon calculates, reserves, and forecloses the future with statistical probabilities before it even happens.¹ Power is no longer an "observing eye" but a "recognizing and calculating apparatus."¹

This new architecture of power derives its ideological legitimacy from what Evgeny Morozov critiques as "technological solutionism"—the fallacy that complex social, political, and moral problems can be seamlessly resolved through simple algorithmic applications.¹ The primary goal of the Onopticon is to encode human unpredictability and uncertainty as a "flaw" and to trap the future within the datasets of the present by eliminating this uncertainty.¹

Panopticon (Classical Surveillance)	Onopticon (Algorithmic Governmentality)
Operational Logic	Observing, recording, disciplining through visibility.
Perception of Time	Recording past actions and controlling the

	present.
Impact on the Subject	The individual corrects their behavior (self-control) conscious of being watched.
Type of Confinement	Spatial confinement (prison, asylum, factory).

1.2. The Pre-recognition Regime and the Foreclosure of the Future

The operation of the Onopticon rests on two main pillars. The first is the "Pre-recognition Regime."¹ In this regime, even while an individual is merely contemplating or initiating an action, they are already categorized by the system across vast data pools as a consumer, a potential criminal, or a high-risk borrower.¹ As Shoshana Zuboff explains with the concept of "behavioral surplus," human experience serves as raw material that is unilaterally claimed and transformed into behavioral data.¹

The second and most destructive pillar is the "Foreclosure of the Future."¹ Algorithmic systems do not wait for an event to occur; they intervene in the present based on statistical probabilities and cancel out alternative future scenarios.¹ The individual experiences profound epistemological closure, forced to surrender the right to be the sole author of their own life to algorithmic black boxes whose operations are kept secret.¹

1.3. Algorithmic Injustice and the "Digital Jim Crow"

One of the most concrete, institutional, and devastating manifestations of the foreclosure of the future is the "predictive policing" applications adopted by law enforcement agencies worldwide.¹ Marketed on the premise of preemptively predicting where crimes will be committed, these algorithms, as analyzed deeply by Fara Sheila Rodriguez (2025), mostly encode and automate the historical biases and racist profiling practices of law enforcement, thereby initiating a new era of "Digital Jim Crow."¹ As emphasized in the works of Virginia Eubanks, these high-tech tools automate structural inequality by criminalizing poverty and marginalizing minority communities.¹

The work proves with striking data that these systems are not only a moral failure but an empirical and mathematical disaster. In studies analyzing over 23,000 predictions made by the Geolitica (formerly PredPol) software in the city of Plainfield, the system's success rate in predicting robberies and aggravated assaults was found to be an unbelievable 0.6%, and its

success rate for burglaries remained at a mere 0.1%.¹ Furthermore, in simulations of the same system in Indianapolis, it was predicted that the Latine population would be subjected to "200% to 400% more police patrols" compared to the white population.¹⁰ Using these statistics, Hakkı Tan definitively asserts that these systems "do not deliver justice; on the contrary, they are an automation mechanism that launders systemic prejudice."¹

SECTION 2: The Liquidation of Law and Administrative Suspension

One of the greatest theoretical leaps of the work is its collision of the philosophical dimensions of technological domination with modern legal theory. The phenomenon of "Algorithmic Governmentality," inheriting the conceptual legacy of Foucault, Stiegler, and Rouvroy, refers to the process by which the social world is governed not through politics, constitutional law, or social norms, but through the automated processing of massive amounts of data.¹

2.1. Data-Behaviourism and the Cancellation of Will

Modern law is built upon centuries of evolution resting on the assumptions of free will, intent (*mens rea*), and human agency.² However, the regime of "data-behaviourism" pointed out by Antoinette Rouvroy completely excludes the psychological motivations behind human actions, causal links, the individual's intent, or verbal defense.² Instead, it establishes a new regime of truth focused solely on superficial correlations among massive datasets.² The rights-bearing "legal subject" of classical law is liquidated and replaced by a statistical body, and the pursuit of justice is transformed into a cold calculation focused on minimizing risk before the action even occurs.²

2.2. Digital Civil Death

In this new regime, the traditional concept of crime and punishment disappears.² The prison, the primary method of punishment in the Panopticon era (the physical confinement of the body), is replaced by an automated, preemptive, and exclusionary mechanism termed "Administrative Suspension."²

The administrative suspension process operates without the need for traditional due process, human assessment, or the right to defense. It takes the form of an individual's digital account being closed, financial credibility being zeroed out, an Uber driver's license being algorithmically revoked, or visa access being instantly blocked.² When the algorithm detects a suspicious data flow or a correlation that violates community guidelines, it does not seek "causality"; it directly cuts access.² Hakkı Tan describes this situation as the digital age adaptation of the Ancient Roman concept of "Civil Death": The individual is physically alive and breathing, but socially, economically, and ontologically "unplugged" and exiled outside the

system.¹

SECTION 3: The Prosthetic Individual and "Homovictimus" as a New Sociological Figure

The flawless operation of the Onopticon and the delegation of law to algorithmic automation bracket the concept of "society," the fundamental unit of sociology, replacing it with the figure of the "Prosthetic Individual," fully integrated into the network.² Individuals voluntarily offer the data they produce in their daily lives to the system through the engineering of consent.¹

This situation, conceptualized by Byung-Chul Han as "psychopolitics," is the most refined self-exploitation technique of neoliberalism.¹ When individuals delegate their memories, navigational skills, social orientations, and core decision-making mechanisms entirely to artificial intelligence, they fall victim to what Bernard Stiegler defines as "cognitive proletarianization."¹ This means the systematic loss of the critical knowledge of life (*savoir-vivre*) regarding how humans should live and act autonomously.¹

3.1. The Ontological Tragedy from Homo Sacer to Homovictimus

At the center of all these transformations emerges an entirely new sociological and political figure that shatters the Enlightenment ideal of the rational and autonomous individual: *Homovictimus*.¹ This concept¹, a portmanteau of *homo* (human) and *victima* (victim), carries both a parallel and a radical contrast to Giorgio Agamben's famous figure of *Homo Sacer*.¹

Agamben's *Homo Sacer*, brought from Roman law to the present day, represents the "bare life" stripped of all civil rights, who can be killed but not sacrificed, pushed outside the camp and the law.¹ *Homovictimus*, unlike *Homo Sacer*, has not been pushed outside the system; on the contrary, they are absolutely integrated into the digital ecosystem.² They are a hyper-visible data carcass, completely stripped of their political agency, rendered "undefined" not by remaining outside the system, but within its flawless operation.¹ *Homovictimus* is the data victim of the modern age, crushed under the weight of their own digital shadow.¹

3.2. Ontological Violence and Algorithmic Guilt

Homovictimus can be declared "guilty" or "risky" based solely on statistical inferences drawn from their digital footprints.¹ This situation creates direct ontological violence. The work proves that this ontological violence is not merely an abstract concept but has reached an industrial scale, particularly around technology-facilitated gender-based violence (TFGBV).¹

According to UN Women and independent reports, an explosion of 550% occurred in deepfake videos between 2019 and 2023.¹ While 98% of these videos consist of non-consensual

pornographic content, 99% explicitly target women.¹ The production of millions of sexualized images in just a few days via AI tools like "Grok" is the most concrete indicator of how women's bodily integrity is brutally violated algorithmically and the ontological violence Homovictimism is subjected to.¹

SECTION 4: The Operational Architecture of the Digital Leviathan: State and Market Models

Inspired by Thomas Hobbes's concept of absolute sovereignty, Hakkı Tan names how the Onopticon regime is applied on a global scale the "Digital Leviathan."¹ As Luciano Floridi discusses in the context of "digital sovereignty," power is being centralized through technological infrastructures and machine learning in a way unseen in history.¹ The Digital Leviathan operates primarily through two fundamental operational models globally ¹:

4.1. The State-Centric Model

In this model, the state reduces the citizen's ontological status to a biometric code or a behavioral social score.¹ The citizen possesses as many rights as the profile they have in the state's database.

- **India's Aadhaar System:** Pioneered this model by linking fundamental rights and access to public services to massive biometric databases.¹
- **Kenya's Maisha Namba Project:** Although 91% of its population already possessed a valid ID, this \$15 billion digital ID project, implemented for political rent-seeking and external donor interests, is openly criticized by civil society as a practice of "digital colonialism."¹
- **China's Social Credit System:** This system, which enforces behavioral compliance through regional databases, reached its pinnacle in April 2026 by legislating the "Credit Repair Management Measures" to manage penalties against "dishonest" entities.¹ This state-centric Leviathan condemns those left outside the digital registry or whose scores drop to "bare life," transforming them into modern Homo Sacers.¹

4.2. The Market-Centric Model

Operating under surveillance capitalism, the market-centric Leviathan transforms the illusion of freedom into an engine of continuous data extraction.¹

- **Palantir and the Privatization of Intelligence:** Tech monopolies effectively privatize state surveillance by providing state security apparatuses with "predictive risk scores" derived from massive data correlations.¹ Although companies like Palantir are not all-seeing eyes, they power the Onopticon by generating probabilistic and partial predictions from limited data ecologies.¹²
- **Meta and Intent Prediction Models:** Social media algorithms (such as Meta's intent

prediction models) weaponize individuals' psychological vulnerabilities, trapping them in hyper-personalized echo chambers. In doing so, behavioral modification is achieved, and engagement on the platform is maximized.¹

Digital Leviathan Model	Driving Force and Primary Goal	Management Technique	Typical Examples
State-Centric	Political obedience, national security, social control.	Imposition of biometric ID, social scoring, exclusion from public services.	Aadhaar (India), Maisha Namba (Kenya), Social Credit System (China).
Market-Centric	Production of behavioral surplus, profit maximization.	Echo chambers, intent prediction, attention engineering, privatization of surveillance.	Palantir (Risk scoring), Meta (Intent prediction algorithms).

SECTION 5: How Does It Explain, and Does It Succeed?

Methodological Framework and Rhetorical Power

The answer to the question "How does this article convey its message, and does it truly succeed in doing so?" is hidden in the interdisciplinary cross-reading strategy Hakkı Tan adopted while writing the piece and the striking, manifesto-like language he used.¹ The work is not merely a computer science paper, a dry legal analysis, or a pessimistic philosophical text; it is a hybrid manifesto that melts all of these in the same pot.

5.1. Grounding Theory in Empirical Cases

The article consistently supports even its most abstract ontological claims (e.g., "foreclosure of the future") with empirical data (the 0.6% PredPol failure in Plainfield), economic critiques (the rent-seeking in Kenya's \$15 billion project), and hardware engineering reports (the CHERIoT architecture).¹ It also broadens the issue to a political economy dimension by redefining crime not as an anomaly, but as a "structural dependency" for elite integration, referencing criminological frameworks like the "Peace Environment Theory."¹⁴

5.2. The "Manifesto of Homovictimus" and Rhetorical Shock

Where the text's narrative power peaks is in the heavy references to his 2026 preprint work titled "The Manifesto of Homovictimus (An Ontological Tragedy)."¹ Here, Tan sets aside academic coldness and constructs an almost literary language of tragedy.¹³ In the manifesto, the modern victim cries out in their own words:

*"I am Homovictimus! The orphan child of the fell Onopticon, The wretched subject of this digital age! No mere flesh under the watchman's gaze am I, nay; I am a phantom built of ciphers, an unfinished construction! My will is shackled within a cold digital womb, And my future held ransom in a dungeon of algorithms..."*¹³

This poetic and existential cry succeeds in making the reader mentally and emotionally feel that the situation is not merely an issue of "data privacy," but an all-out assault on human dignity. The author invites the reader not only to understand but, as seen in the later sections of the manifesto, to "pour venom in the sacred well of numbers," to turn the machine's sweet dream into a nightmare, and to be a "Glitch" (Error) that tears the face of the system against the tyranny of perfection.¹³ Consequently, the work does not just explain its point; it awakens the reader from epistemological numbness and invites them to an ontological mutiny.¹³

SECTION 6: Unique Position in the Literature: What Differentiates It From Its Peers?

There is a vast global literature on digital surveillance, big data, and AI ethics. However, Hakki Tan's theory, which forms the backbone of this report, transcends the dead ends of traditional schools of thought and demonstrates a radical break from its peers across three fundamental axes:

6.1. Overcoming the Panopticon and Surveillance Capitalism

The vast majority of existing academic works still try to read technological domination through Foucault's spatial disciplinary concept (Panopticon) or remain confined to Shoshana Zuboff's concept of "Surveillance Capitalism," which focuses on corporate profit motives.² Yet Tan proves that the issue is not merely economic data exploitation or visual surveillance (correcting oneself out of fear of being watched). The Onopticon concept demonstrates that power does not settle for watching the human being; instead, it takes decisions on their behalf, destroying time and existence through predictability (Ontological Rupture), thereby opening an entirely new analytical window in the literature.¹

6.2. The Philosophical Synthesis of Legal Resistance and Jurisprudence

Many critical theories end by making a diagnosis and painting a bleak picture. Hakkı Tan's work, however, centers the massive legal victories sprouting in Europe under the concept of "Negentropic Resistance" in his philosophical argument.¹ The work places the existential war waged by the law against algorithms on highly concrete ground through the following landmark rulings:

The Historic BOSCO Ruling of the Spanish Supreme Court (September 2025): The relentless legal struggle waged by the Civio Foundation against the Spanish government for 7 full years (2018-2025)⁵ is one of the greatest steps taken in the name of algorithmic transparency in the literature.⁵ The Spanish government refused for years to disclose the source code of the "BOSCO" algorithm, which automatically determined the energy subsidy (social voucher) given to poor citizens and unjustly rejected many eligible applicants.⁵ Power evaded transparency by claiming that disclosing the code would violate "intellectual property" rights, threaten "national security," and open the door to cyberattacks (e.g., the risk of cryptocurrency mining on government servers).⁵

However, in the ruling delivered by the Spanish Supreme Court on September 11, 2025 (and detailed by Civio on November 17, 2025), the government's arguments were demolished.⁵ The Court ruled that knowing the operation of algorithms that determine public rights is not a technical detail but an inseparable "constitutional right" within a "digital democracy."⁵ It emphasized that the guises of national security and intellectual property cannot be used as automatic shields to prevent transparency; on the contrary, opening the code to external scrutiny (open-source independent audit) would increase the system's security.⁵ This ruling is the most magnificent practical victory of the principles of "human oversight" and accountability that Tan proposed against the Onopticon.¹

The CK v Dun & Bradstreet Ruling (C-203/22) by the CJEU: Another example of the courts' tendency to smash black boxes is the CJEU ruling from February 2025.¹ A consumer named CK was deemed a "high credit risk" and rejected for a monthly 10.3 Euro mobile subscription contract by the automated credit scoring algorithm of Dun & Bradstreet (D&B).²⁰ CK requested "meaningful information about the logic involved" behind the decision under the GDPR, and the company refused to provide information, stating that this algorithm was a "trade secret."²⁰ In this case carried from Austrian courts to the CJEU, the Court ruled that companies' trade secret arguments cannot negate the data subject's "right to explanation" under GDPR Article 15(1)(h).¹

By synthesizing these court decisions with the EU AI Act—which bans social scoring and purely profiling-based predictive policing and mandates the "Stop Button" (Human Oversight) through Article 14¹—Hakkı Tan elevates his work from mere doom-mongering into a legal manifesto of resistance.¹

6.3. The Integration of Philosophy and Hardware Engineering: The

Architectural Rights Doctrine

The unique element that solidifies the work's unmatched position in the literature is that it does not leave the protection of human rights solely to the mercy of laws or software. Knowing that software will always fall victim to corporate lobbies, national security exemptions, and inevitable code vulnerabilities, Tan proposes the "Architectural Rights Doctrine."¹ According to this doctrine, human dignity, the right to opacity, and data inviolability must be coded directly into the physical hardware of technology, that is, into silicon.¹

This theoretical proposition is transformed into a concrete hardware reality by the UK-based SCl Semiconductor's ICENI microcontrollers and the CHERIoT (Capability Hardware Enhanced RISC Instructions for IoT) architecture.¹ Memory safety vulnerabilities (buffer overflows, unauthorized data usage, etc.) encountered in traditional software development processes (especially in C/C++ languages) account for more than 70% of global cybersecurity vulnerabilities.¹ The CHERIoT technology and the CHERIoT-Ibex core developed in partnership with Microsoft/Google prevent these software vulnerabilities at the hardware architecture level through "hardware-enforced memory safety" and "fine-grained compartmentalization."¹

Layer of Defense	Traditional Approach (Weak)	Architectural Rights Doctrine (CHERIOT / ICENI Model)
Security Framework	Software-based patches, legal GDPR compliance texts.	Capability-based security embedded in hardware. ²⁷
Isolation Method	Isolation at the operating system level (Vulnerable to backdoors and leaks).	"Fine-grained compartmentalization" at the silicon level (Hardware isolation of network stacks and cryptographic keys). ²⁶
Impact on Security Vulnerabilities	Buffer overflows and memory leaks crash the entire system.	70% of memory safety errors are prevented by design; the attack's blast radius is physically constrained by hardware. ¹

Tan pairs the "Right to Opacity" formulated by Éric Sadin—the right of an individual to refuse to be absolutely calculable and retain a zone of darkness for themselves—with the hardware security barriers of CHERIoT.¹ Melting the pursuit of fundamental rights in legal philosophy in

the same pot with a microcontroller innovation at the Instruction Set Architecture (ISA) level makes this work a visionary masterpiece not only in its own field but in the history of interdisciplinary science.¹

SECTION 7: Ontological Mutiny and Practical Necessity: What Would Be Missing If This Article Were Not Written?

Answering "What would be missing in the literature or intellectual arena if this text had not been written?" is a critical test for understanding the magnitude of the epistemological shock the work creates. Undoubtedly, if this work had not been authored, critiques of digital domination would continue to exist; however, the scope would remain much shallower, diagnoses would be incorrect, and resistance strategies would be incomplete. The fundamental pillars that would be missing are:

1. Diagnostic Error and Conceptual Blindness (The Ghost of the Panopticon): If Tan had not constructed the "Onopticon" concept, the academic world would continue to cling to the "Panopticon" metaphor, even though the capacity of surveillance apparatuses has shifted from mere observation to preemptive prediction and foreclosing the future.¹ The reality of the "foreclosure" of the future by algorithms would be missed, and the issue would be mistaken for merely a "privacy" debate. Just as curing a disease relies on the correct diagnosis, fighting authoritarian digitalization requires an accurate vocabulary. Tan has created this vocabulary.

2. The Namelessness of the Victim (The Absence of Homovictimus): Throughout human history, oppression has always been visible through concrete perpetrators, bloody wars, or iron bars. However, there was no sociological term to describe the "silent and bloodless destruction" experienced by the modern individual who cannot rent a house because their credit score dropped, is eliminated from a job application by AI, or is declared a criminal in facial recognition systems with false data. Without the conceptualization of "Homovictimus," this integrated victim—whose perpetrator is an algorithm—would remain nameless, and the tragedy experienced would be brushed off as a "software bug" rather than a sociological reality.¹

3. The Absence of Active Resistance and Ontological Mutiny: If the article had not been written, proposed solutions against AI would remain limited to the weak, non-binding "ethical AI" guidelines written by civil society organizations.¹ The work brings the concepts of "ontological mutiny" and "sensorial apostasy" developed against colonialism by Nigerian writer Bayo Akomolafe into the context of digital resistance, transforming despair into radical action.¹⁶

The concept of "Negentropy," nourished by Bernard Stiegler's philosophy of technology, presents the unpredictability, chaos, and "friction" in human nature as a legitimate sabotage

tool against the flawless automation of algorithms.¹ If this work did not exist, "data poisoning/noisy upscaling" tools like Nightshade and Glaze (v2.1), developed by artists against AIs that scrape their art without permission, would merely be seen as technical software patches; it would not be understood that these are "an ontological defense against an ontological attack."¹ Likewise, the massive constitutional implication (decentralized justice) of blockchain-based platforms like Kleros (Version 2.0 Beta on Arbitrum One) stripping algorithmic monopolies of judicial power and transferring it to randomly selected, economically incentivized "human juries" could not be placed on such a powerful theoretical foundation.¹

4. Peace Environment Theory and Structural Criminology: Finally, Tan's definition of crime—within the context of his own "Peace Environment Theory"—not as a deviant anomaly, but as a structural dependency for the systemic integration of elites¹⁴, provides an invaluable political economy perspective explaining why digital violence (e.g., turning a blind eye to deepfake violence) cannot be stopped.

CONCLUSION: Hopeful Pessimism and the Courage to Be a "Glitch"

Hakkı Tan's work shatters the ostentatious rhetoric of progress in the digital age, revealing with unmatched analytical depth how technology is being transformed into an "Onoptic" existential trap at the hands of state and corporate monopolies. The data-behaviourism that strips individuals of their free will, the administrative suspension mechanisms that turn the law into execution without trial, and the hyper-visible Homovictim figure victimized inside the system constitute the anatomy of the structural violence of the digital ecosystem.¹

However, despite this terrifying picture, the work is not a document of surrender. Inspired by Byung-Chul Han's philosophy, the posture of "hopeful pessimism"¹ clearly exposes the system's vulnerability: The Onopticon is addicted to flawless data and frictionless computation.¹

Civio forcing the source code of the BOSCO algorithm to be opened to the public in Spain⁵, the CJEU piercing the guise of trade secrets to confirm the individual's right to demand an explanation⁶, artists sabotaging algorithmic exploitation via data poisoning with Glaze and Nightshade¹, and SCI Semiconductor engraving human rights directly onto silicon hardware with the ICENI architecture¹; all of these are lines of negentropic resistance collapsing this massive machine from the inside.

In the final analysis, the work invites us not to weep over an inevitable extinction, but to defend human dignity. Against the machine's tyranny of flawlessness and absolute predictability, humanity's greatest weapon is to defend the right to remain unpredictable and to show the courage to become an uncorrectable, sacred "Glitch" (Error) that disrupts the flawless

operation of the system.¹ Had this article not existed, humanity would continue to sleepwalk toward its own ontological tragedy, lulled by the lullabies of technological determinism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY (Works by Hakkı Tan)

The foundational works by author Hakkı Tan, which form the main theoretical framework and concepts analyzed in the report, are listed below:

- **Tan, H. (2026).** *Onopticon and Homovictimus: The Ontological Regime of the Digital Leviathan and the Operationalization of Algorithmic Governmentality.* ¹
- **Tan, H. (2026).** *ONOPTIC EXECUTION: The Liquidation of Law in the Age of the Prosthetic Individual and the Sociology of Homovictimus.* (Preprint). ²
- **Tan, H. (2026).** *THE MANIFESTO OF HOMOVICTIMUS (An Ontological Tragedy).* (Preprint). ¹³
- **Tan, H. (2026).** *The Political Economy of Ontological Crime and the Peace Environment Theory: A Comparative Analysis of Management Technologies (2024-2026).* (Preprint). ¹⁴
- **Tan, H. (2026).** *The Death of the Human Onoptic Record: Beyond the Threshold.* (Preprint). ¹⁴
- **Tan, H. (2026).** *Digital Guantanamo: The Ontological Regime of the Onopticon - A Near-Future Theoretical Intervention via Palantir Technology.* ¹⁵
- **Tan, H. (2026).** *NEURO-POLITICAL ENCLOSURE AND THE POSSIBILITY OF 'COUNTER-PRUNING': The Subject as a "Reverse Signifier" and the Energetic Cost of Agency.* ¹⁵
- **Tan, H. (2026).** *THE PARENTHESIS OF SOCIETY AND ONTOLOGICAL DESTRUCTION: Simulated Consent, Co-opted Resistance, and Political Epoche as a "Crisis Reflex".* ¹⁵
- **Tan, H. (2026).** *Nature's Health Is Human Health: A Critical Analysis of WHO's Hypocrisy in the Ecological Crisis.* ¹⁵