

The Occupation of the Horizon of Decision: The Onopticon, Homovictimus and the Ontopolitical Re-reading of Philosophy

Hakkı Tan's Reality Paradigm from Ancient Philosophy to Infrastructural Imposition

Hakki Tan

ORCID: [0009-0008-8582-3132](https://orcid.org/0009-0008-8582-3132)

“My paradigm is not a paradigm of the Truth; it is a paradigm of Reality.”

Abstract

This article develops Hakkı Tan's concepts of the **Onopticon** and **Homovictimus** as the basis for an ontopolitical re-reading of the history of philosophy. It argues that contemporary power can no longer be adequately understood through surveillance, discipline, control, behavioural extraction, algorithmic governmentality or juridical sovereignty alone. The decisive transformation lies at a prior level: the technical pre-processing of the horizon within which subjects encounter reality, access institutions, become recognisable, contest decisions and remain socially viable. The Onopticon names this regime of infrastructural and environmental imposition. It does not merely observe, modulate or predict subjects; it structures and imposes the field in which they can appear as processable beings. Homovictimus names the anthropological form produced by this regime: the subject of compulsory inclusion, rendered governable, classifiable and accountable while being deprived of the infrastructural conditions required for intact agency. The article distinguishes the Onopticon from neighbouring theories, including the Panopticon, societies of control, surveillance capitalism, algorithmic governmentality, the Noosphere, actor-network theory, media ecology, Gestell, decisionism and biopolitics. It then develops an empirical anatomy of onoptic power through biological, cognitive, punitive, civil, administrative, military and environmental cases, including NICR, Palantir, ICE, NHS data infrastructures, AI-state models, Maven/AIP, BFIId, consumer LiDAR and Pegasus. Finally, it rereads Plato, Descartes, Kant, Hegel, Husserl, Heidegger, Schmitt, Marx, Simondon, Stiegler and Foucault through the question of how the field of encounter is constituted before truth, agency, recognition or decision can appear. The article is not a completed doctrine or policy programme. It is a paradigm-construction article: a testable conceptual framework for analysing infrastructural and environmental imposition as a distinct form of contemporary power.

Keywords: Onopticon; Homovictimus; Reality Paradigm; infrastructural imposition; environmental structuring and imposition; compulsory inclusion; operational recognition; decision horizon; BFId; Palantir; Gestell; algorithmic governmentality; philosophy of technology; political ontology.

1. Introduction: from surveillance to pre-processed life

Much contemporary critical theory still speaks in the languages of surveillance, discipline, control, data extraction and algorithmic governance. These languages remain indispensable. Yet they no longer exhaust the form of power that increasingly defines the present. The most decisive operation is not always that the subject is watched, corrected, predicted, ranked or nudged. It is that the field in which the subject can appear, act, access, object, move, receive care, become a target or enter a decision has already been technically pre-processed.

The central question is therefore not simply: who watches, who controls, who extracts behavioural data, or who decides? The prior question is:

Through what infrastructural and environmental conditions is a subject made perceptible, recognisable, referenceable, processable and attachable to decision before explicit recognition, consent, refusal or exclusion occurs?

This article names that regime the **Onopticon**. The Onopticon is not a digital Panopticon. It is not a general metaphor for surveillance. It is not simply platform capitalism, algorithmic governance, biopolitics, security infrastructure or artificial intelligence. It is a regime in which power does not merely operate upon a subject already situated in a world. It structures and imposes the world of possible encounter itself. It does not need to exclude the subject in the classical sense. It includes the subject compulsorily, but only in a form that can be processed.

This is the crucial anthropological point. The subject of the Onopticon is **Homovictimus**: not merely the victim, the surveilled citizen, the exploited worker, the bare life, the consumer, the data subject or the dividual. Homovictimus is the subject of compulsory inclusion: the actor who remains responsible as if agency were intact, while the infrastructural conditions of agency are pre-processed, narrowed or transferred into technical gateways.

The thesis developed here is deliberately double. On the one hand, the Onopticon must be distinguished sharply from neighbouring concepts. Its originality does not lie in claiming that nobody before Tan saw technical mediation, surveillance, algorithmic prediction or environmental shaping. Its originality lies in the articulation of two elements that, in the neighbouring literature, remain dispersed rather than central: **infrastructural/environmental imposition** and **compulsory inclusion**. On the other hand, the Onopticon must not become a totalising concept that names everything. It requires criteria. A case becomes strongly onoptic only when a technical or environmental gateway pre-processes the field of encounter, compels inclusion in

a processable form, narrows the horizon of action or contestation, and weakens the subject's capacity to refuse or appeal.

The article proceeds in ten steps. It first clarifies the conceptual kernel of the Onopticon and distinguishes it from neighbouring theories. It then defines sovereignty as environmental structuring and imposition, develops an empirical anatomy of onoptic power through heterogeneous technical cases, and defines Homovictimus as the anthropological product of these operations. The later sections examine war and targeting through Maven/AIP, reread philosophy from Plato to Foucault through the problem of the pre-processed horizon, and address theoretical self-location. The article concludes that the Onopticon names a regime in which reality no longer precedes power as a neutral field; power helps impose the field within which reality becomes encounterable.

2. Conceptual kernel: infrastructural/environmental imposition and compulsory inclusion

Two concepts distinguish the Onopticon from neighbouring theories: **infrastructural/environmental imposition** and **compulsory inclusion**.

2.1 Infrastructural and environmental imposition

Infrastructural imposition is the compulsory structuring of environments, devices and institutional gateways in ways that make subjects, objects, actions and spaces datafiable, referenceable, accessible, governable or attachable to decision before meaningful consent, refusal or contestation can occur. Environmental structuring and imposition is not neutral design. It is the arrangement of physical, digital, biological, institutional or electromagnetic surroundings so that certain forms of perception, recognition, access, movement or decision become technically possible in advance and are then imposed as the field of practical reality.

This distinction matters because the Onopticon does not merely study data once data already exists. It asks how bodies, devices, actions, spaces and lives are made capable of being transformed into data: referenceable, visible, ranked, attached to institutional processing or brought into operational command.

Thus, the Onopticon is not reducible to algorithmic decision-making. The algorithm may be downstream. The prior operation is the production of processability: the transformation of a person, body, action, device or environment into something technically available for classification, extraction, recognition, intervention or administrative action.

2.2 Compulsory inclusion

The second distinction is compulsory inclusion. Modern critical theory often understands domination through exclusion, repression, discipline or extraction. The Onop-

tion does not primarily exclude. It includes, but it includes only by translating the subject into a processable form.

The tragedy of Homovictimus is therefore not invisibility but compulsory legibility. To receive care, cross a border, use a platform, obtain credit, appear in a system, appeal a decision, work, communicate or even inhabit a wireless environment, the subject must enter technical and institutional gateways. Yet to enter them, the subject must become readable, classifiable and actionable within a system's terms.

The Onopticon therefore imposes a paradoxical condition:

the subject must become processable in order to remain socially viable, yet this processability narrows the very agency for which the subject remains responsible.

This is why Homovictimus is not simply a victim. Homovictimus is the subject who is compulsorily included into the infrastructures that pre-process the conditions of agency.

3. Neighbouring theories: what the Onopticon is not

The Onopticon does not arise from an empty theoretical field. It stands next to several powerful traditions. The point is not that these theories are obsolete. The point is that none of them makes infrastructural/environmental imposition and compulsory inclusion the central analytic pair.

3.1 Foucault: the Panopticon sees; the Onopticon imposes the field of encounter

Foucault's analysis of the Panopticon remains decisive for understanding visibility, discipline, normalisation and self-regulation (Foucault 1977). Biopower further shows how modern power administers life at the level of population, health, productivity and security. Yet the Onopticon asks a prior question. It does not primarily ask who sees whom, nor even how life is administered. It asks who structures and imposes the field in which the subject becomes visible, accessible, classifiable and governable in the first place.

The Panopticon presupposes a subject placed in an institutional space and made visible. The Onopticon concerns the technical and environmental production of the space of appearance itself. Panoptic power sees. Onoptic power structures the field in which seeing, recognition, movement and decision become possible.

3.2 Deleuze: control modulates; the Onopticon builds the gates

Deleuze's societies of control describe continuous modulation, codes, access and individualisation (Deleuze 1992). This is a crucial diagnosis of post-disciplinary power. Yet control presupposes modifiable flows. The Onopticon asks how the gates through which those flows must pass are built, owned, standardised and imposed. Control modulates; the Onopticon constructs compulsory gateways.

The distinction is sharp: in Deleuze, the subject is continuously coded and modulated; in the Onopticon, the field of possible access is technically pre-structured before the subject can enter modulation.

3.3 Zuboff: surveillance capitalism extracts; the Onopticon binds thresholds of life

Zuboff's surveillance capitalism illuminates behavioural surplus, prediction products and markets for behavioural modification (Zuboff 2019). Yet the Onopticon is not centred only on market extraction. It includes market systems, but also health, border control, military targeting, cellular regulation, public administration and environmental sensing. Its concern is not only the monetisation of behavioural data, but the infrastructural binding of life-thresholds: care, movement, recognition, targeting, eligibility, visibility and appeal.

Surveillance capitalism extracts behavioural surplus. The Onopticon binds the conditions under which the subject can become processable at all.

3.4 Rouvroy and Berns: algorithmic governmentality predicts; the Onopticon imposes conditions of inclusion

Rouvroy and Berns define algorithmic governmentality as a data-driven rationality that aggregates, analyses and models data in order to anticipate and affect possible behaviours (Rouvroy and Berns 2013). Their work is one of the closest neighbouring frameworks. It bypasses the reflexive subject and works through infra-individual data and supra-individual patterns.

The distinction is temporal and material. Algorithmic governmentality explains how behaviours may be governed once datafication and profiling are underway. Tan's concept of infrastructural imposition asks a prior question: through what material, technical and environmental conditions does a body, device, action or environment become datafiable, referenceable or processable in the first place?

Algorithmic governmentality predicts and pre-empts. The Onopticon imposes the conditions under which a subject must become processable in order to be included.

3.5 Amoore: probability politics constructs risk; the Onopticon constructs the decision horizon

Amoore's work on risk, security and possibility shows how data practices govern uncertain futures and make some possible futures actionable (Amoore 2013, 2020). This is indispensable for understanding contemporary security reasoning. Yet the Onopticon is broader than a politics of probability. It asks not only how risk is calculated, but how the world placed before the decision-maker is pre-processed: which entities appear, which signals matter, which cases are prioritised, which bodies become actionable and which environments become sensing fields.

Amoore analyses the risk horizon. The Onopticon analyses the technical construction and imposition of the decision horizon itself.

3.6 Pasquinelli and Joler: the Nooscope maps machine representation; the Onopticon maps operational imposition

Pasquinelli and Joler's Nooscope maps machine learning as an instrument of knowledge extraction and highlights how statistical models compress, distort and mediate the world (Pasquinelli and Joler 2021). This is close to the Onopticon insofar as both reject the fantasy of neutral machine vision.

Yet the Nooscope is primarily concerned with representation, modelling and the epistemic limits of machine learning. The Onopticon asks how representation becomes operationally attached to access, care, policing, border control, targeting and biological responsiveness. The key problem is not only that the machine sees through a model; it is that the model becomes a gate.

3.7 Parisi: algorithmic reason thinks computation; the Onopticon thinks the sovereign threshold

Parisi's account of algorithmic reason refuses the reduction of computation to mechanical determinism and shows how algorithmic processes generate new forms of abstraction beyond direct human control (Parisi 2013). This is essential for avoiding a crude view of algorithms as simple deterministic tools.

The Onopticon is not primarily an ontology of computation. It is an analysis of the point at which computation, infrastructure and institutional power become compulsory gateways of life, recognition and decision. Parisi interrogates algorithmic thought; the Onopticon interrogates the sovereign threshold at which algorithmic-technical environments become imposed conditions of social reality.

3.8 Agamben: exception includes by excluding; the Onopticon includes by processing

Agamben's Homo Sacer, state of exception, camp and dispositif are crucial for thinking the capture of life by sovereignty (Agamben 1998, 2009). The proximity to the Onopticon is obvious: both concern life's prior capture. Yet the mechanism differs. Agamben's sovereign exception includes life by excluding it from juridical protection. The Onopticon includes life by making it processable within technical and institutional gateways.

The camp is not the Onopticon's model. The normalised gateway is. Homovictimus is therefore not Homo Sacer. Homo Sacer is exposed as bare life; Homovictimus is compelled to remain operationally legible in order to live, move, receive care or appear as administratively real.

3.9 Latour: networks explain mediation; the Onopticon explains coercive gateways

Latour's actor-network theory shows that non-human actors, instruments, documents, devices and inscriptions participate in the construction of the social (Latour 2005). A Latourian analysis can certainly register asymmetry and coercion. The Onopticon's difference is not that Latour cannot see technical mediation. Rather, it is that the Onopticon centres the moment when networks become compulsory gateways with sovereign effects.

Latour explains association and mediation. The Onopticon explains when mediation becomes imposed access architecture.

3.10 McLuhan and Ballard: media environments transform perception; the Onopticon binds access and life

McLuhan's claim that the medium is the message remains important for understanding how media reshape perception, social organisation and sensory experience (McLuhan 1964). Ballard's fictional worlds grasp the psychopathology of technical environments with extraordinary force. Yet the Onopticon is neither a media ecology nor a theory of technical psychopathology. It concerns the moment when technical environments condition recognition, movement, care, appeal, targeting and survival.

The medium shapes perception. The Onopticon structures and imposes the life-gate.

4. Sovereignty as environmental structuring and imposition

The most concise formula of the Onopticon is this:

sovereignty is no longer located only in the decision, but in the technical construction of the horizon in which decisions become possible.

Classical sovereignty focuses on command, law, prohibition, territorial control, exception or decision. The Onopticon relocates sovereignty into the pre-decisional environment. The decisive question is not only who decides, but who structures the world presented to decision.

For a patient, this environment may consist of records, risk scores, triage systems, service access and clinical pathways. For a migrant, it may consist of case-management platforms, address data, network analysis, biometric systems and enforcement prioritisation. For a citizen, it may consist of AI-enabled service triage and eligibility systems. For a military operator, it may consist of target maps, anomaly detection, sensor fusion and operational priority. For a body, it may consist of biological thresholds pre-regulated by technical signals. For a person moving through a wireless environment, it may consist of radio-frequency patterns that become referenceable.

The subject may still appear to decide. Yet the world in which the decision occurs has already been configured. The claim is therefore not that machines replace all human judgement. The stronger claim is:

human beings may still decide, but they decide within a reality that has already been technically pre-processed.

This is why environmental structuring must be understood as environmental imposition. A designed environment can be negotiated, ignored or refused. An imposed environment becomes the unavoidable field of encounter.

5. Criteria: when is a case onoptic?

To avoid conceptual inflation, the Onopticon requires operational criteria. A case is strongly onoptic when the following conditions are present:

1. **Technical or environmental gateway:** access to life, recognition, mobility, care, work, visibility, appeal or decision is mediated through a technical environment or gateway.
2. **Pre-processing:** before the subject or decision-maker reaches the relevant field, the world is sorted, filtered, risked, rendered perceptible, made referenceable or otherwise prepared.
3. **Compulsory inclusion:** the subject is not simply excluded, but is required to enter the system in a processable form in order to remain socially, biologically or institutionally viable.
4. **Horizon restriction:** possible movement, appeal, care, action, targeting, recognition or refusal is narrowed in advance.
5. **Weak contestability:** the subject cannot meaningfully know, refuse, contest or reverse the structuring operation before its effects are imposed.

These criteria do not turn the Onopticon into a checklist detached from philosophy. They protect the concept from becoming a slogan. Not every sensor is an Onopticon. Not every algorithmic system is onoptic. Not every platform is an onoptic regime. The Onopticon appears where processability becomes a condition of inclusion and where the horizon of encounter is technically imposed.

6. Empirical anatomy: heterogeneous material processes, one sovereign operation

One criticism of the Onopticon is that it draws together processes that are materially very different: cellular regulation, data platforms, immigration enforcement, health infrastructures, AI-state systems, wireless sensing and spyware. The criticism is useful, but misdirected. The Onopticon does not claim that these are the same technical object. It claims that different material domains can instantiate the same sovereign operation: the technical pre-processing of the threshold through which life, decision, access, recognition or action must pass.

The unity is not a unity of content. It is a unity of mechanism: technical gateway, pre-processing, compulsory inclusion, horizon restriction and weak contestability. The heterogeneity of the cases is therefore not a weakness. It is precisely what shows that the Onopticon is not a theory of one platform, one device or one surveillance apparatus, but a broader theory of power.

6.1 Biological face: NICR and the pre-regulation of life

In Tan's work on NICR, the relevant issue is not merely biotechnology or therapeutic intervention. The point is that biological responsiveness can be technically prepared in advance. If cellular activity is made responsive to external triggers through engineered channels or nanoparticles, then the body's future field of responsiveness is not simply treated after the fact; it is pre-structured.

The patient is not excluded. The patient is included in treatment, but through a technical gateway that reconfigures biological responsiveness. This is the biological face of compulsory inclusion. Life continues, but it continues through a pre-regulated threshold.

6.2 Cognitive face: Palantir and the pre-processing of the decision horizon

Palantir should not be reduced to a software vendor or data platform. Its onoptic significance lies in the production of operational ontologies: data become objects, objects become relations, relations become priorities, and priorities shape intervention. The state may formally retain the decision, but the field presented to decision has been pre-processed.

The formula is:

the decision remains public, while the decision horizon is technically prepared by a private platform.

This does not mean Palantir is identical with the Onopticon. Rather, it exemplifies one cognitive face of onoptic power: the transformation of data integration into operational reality.

6.3 Punitive face: ICE and pre-judicial attention architecture

The punitive face of the Onopticon appears where enforcement systems produce visibility, priority and operational attention before juridical judgement. ICE-related data infrastructures and case-management systems show how individuals may be placed into enforcement horizons through aggregation, prioritisation and cross-referencing before any final legal determination.

The machine may not issue the sentence. But it can structure which persons become visible, which files move forward, which relations appear suspicious, and which bodies are placed within the reach of enforcement. Legitimacy is thus partially produced before adjudication.

6.4 Civil face: NHS and compulsory inclusion into care infrastructure

The civil face is the most subtle because it appears under the signs of modernisation, efficiency, coordination and care. The NHS Federated Data Platform and related debates around public health data infrastructures show how care can become tied to large-scale operational integration. The patient is not punished. The patient is included. Yet inclusion into care may require entry into data infrastructures whose logic governs pathways, flows, capacity and decision support.

The onoptic issue is not that data integration is always illegitimate. It is that the life-gate of care may become inseparable from technical infrastructures that the subject cannot meaningfully refuse while remaining within the system of care.

6.5 Administrative face: the AI-state and processing infrastructure

In AI-state models, sovereignty appears not primarily as command but as administrative pre-processing. Applications, eligibility, urgency, service routing, risk and prioritisation are technically ordered before the citizen experiences a decision. The state does not disappear. It becomes an infrastructure of processing.

The neoliberal subject is still imagined as choosing. The onoptic subject is routed.

6.6 Military face: Maven/AIP and pre-processed war

Military AI systems such as Maven and AIP raise the problem of pre-processed targeting. The most important issue is not only whether a human remains ‘in the loop’. The issue is what world is shown to that human: which image matters, which object is labelled, which pattern is anomalous, which cluster is operationally relevant and which target appears actionable.

Human-in-the-loop becomes weak if the loop itself has already been pre-structured. The military face of the Onopticon is therefore not merely automation. It is the pre-processing of threat perception.

6.7 Environmental-wireless face: BFId and WiFi as recognition infrastructure

BFId, a WiFi-based identity inference attack using Beamforming Feedback Information, gives the Onopticon a micro-physical environmental case. Todt, Morsbach and Strufe (2025) show that BFI-based sensing can infer identity within a closed reference set using recordings from 197 individuals. BFId does not demonstrate universal open-set identification of any unknown person. Its significance is more precise: under certain radio and reference conditions, the body can become a referenceable radio-frequency pattern without the person carrying a device.

This is an important onoptic threshold. The WiFi environment is no longer merely a communications medium. It becomes a field in which recognisability can be produced. The subject need not actively provide data. The body's presence within an electromagnetic environment can become technically processable.

BFId therefore answers the charge of empirical abstraction. It shows, materially, how environmental imposition can occur below the level of platform interaction or administrative decision: signal, body, feedback, classification. The environment itself becomes a recognition gateway.

6.8 Perceptual face: consumer LiDAR and non-line-of-sight imaging

Consumer LiDAR shows a different threshold: the weakening of hiddenness. Soma-sundaram et al. (2026) demonstrate non-line-of-sight capabilities using smartphone-grade LiDAR, including reconstruction and tracking of hidden objects. The onoptic significance is not identity recognition. It is the infrastructural production of perceptibility. The distinction between visible and non-visible is technically weakened.

Here the gateway is perceptual. The hidden is not yet a target, risk or subject. But it has entered a technical field of possible processing.

6.9 Device-internal face: Pegasus and zero-click operational access

Pegasus shows device-internal infrastructural imposition. A phone can become a sensor, archive, microphone, camera, location trace and testimony repository. Citizen Lab's FORCEDENTRY report and subsequent technical analyses show how zero-click intrusion can compromise a device without requiring visible user action (Marczak et al. 2021; Beer and Groß 2021).

Pegasus matters because it collapses behavioural blame. The target need not click. The device itself becomes the operational field. This is not merely surveillance from outside. It is the transformation of the subject's own digital intermediary into an imposed infrastructure of access.

7. Homovictimus: the subject of compulsory inclusion

The empirical faces of the Onopticon produce different intensities of the same anthropological form. Homovictimus is not a single sociological group. It is a structural position generated whenever subjects are held responsible as agents while the conditions of agency are technically pre-processed.

There are multiple modalities:

- **Biological Homovictimus:** the body whose responsiveness is tied to technical regulation.
- **Cognitive Homovictimus:** the subject whose operational reality is pre-structured by platform ontologies.
- **Punitive Homovictimus:** the migrant or suspect placed within an enforcement horizon before final judgement.
- **Civil Homovictimus:** the patient or citizen included into care or service only through processable infrastructure.

- **Administrative Homovictimus:** the citizen routed through algorithmic eligibility and priority systems.
- **Military Homovictimus:** the target or operator situated in pre-processed threat space.
- **Environmental Homovictimus:** the body rendered referenceable by the surrounding technical environment.

These are not identical experiences. A patient, a platform worker, a migrant, a target and a wireless body are not the same. Yet they share a structural condition: their viable presence depends on technical processability. The concept therefore does not erase differences. It identifies the common form of compulsory inclusion that can be specified by domain, intensity and consequence.

8. Re-reading philosophy: from truth to the pre-processed horizon

The Onopticon is not external to philosophy. It reopens philosophy's central questions: appearance, certainty, experience, recognition, world, technology, sovereignty, labour and mediation.

8.1 Plato: from illusion to the architecture of appearance

Plato's cave stages the difference between shadow and truth. The problem is illusion. The philosopher leaves the cave and sees the sun. In the Onopticon, the problem is not only that shadows are mistaken for truth. The problem is that the field of appearance - the wall, the chains, the light, the direction of visibility, the path of exit - has itself been technically arranged. The question is no longer only 'what is true?' but 'who structures the space in which something can appear as true, visible or actionable?'

8.2 Descartes: from cogito to gateway subject

Descartes grounds certainty in the thinking subject. Yet in an onoptic regime, inner certainty does not guarantee institutional appearance. The subject must be verified, referenced, authenticated, routed and recognised. The cogito secures internal certainty; the Onopticon controls external access.

8.3 Kant: not continuity but rupture - transcendental a priori and infrastructural a priori

Kant asks how experience is possible. The a priori forms and categories are universal and necessary conditions of possible experience. They are not technical devices, platforms, databases or historical infrastructures. To equate Kant's a priori with technical infrastructure would be a category mistake.

The Onopticon does not claim such equivalence. The relationship is not continuity but rupture. Kant's subject constitutes the phenomenal world through transcendental conditions. Homovictimus finds the social field of encounter technically pre-

structured before access. The move from Kant to Tan is therefore not a smooth transition, but an ontopolitical displacement of the question of conditions.

Kant asks:

What are the transcendental conditions under which experience is possible?

The Onopticon asks:

What are the infrastructural conditions under which access to a field of experience, recognition, decision and contestation becomes possible or impossible?

This distinction preserves Kant while radicalising the contemporary question. The infrastructural a priori is not a transcendental form. It is a historically built, technically imposed and institutionally consequential gateway that can become practically necessary in specific domains. Its necessity is not metaphysical. It is operational. It does not make all experience possible. It makes particular forms of social, institutional, biological or political encounter possible or impossible.

The rupture is therefore decisive: the modern subject who constitutes experience is replaced, in the onoptic regime, by a subject whose access to the field of experience is already technically filtered.

8.4 Hegel: from recognition to operational recognition as misrecognition

Hegel's recognition is not merely interpersonal approval. It belongs to the development of self-consciousness and to the institutions of objective spirit: family, civil society, law and the state. Recognition is bound to freedom.

Operational recognition is not the continuation of Hegelian recognition. It is its pathological inversion. The system 'recognises' the subject only by translating it into risk, profile, eligibility, target, patient, account, applicant, migrant or user. This is not recognition in the Hegelian sense. It is technical misrecognition: inclusion by reduction.

Thus, operational recognition should not be presented as Hegel's fulfilment. It is the collapse of recognition into processability. Hegelian recognition opens the subject towards freedom; onoptic recognition binds the subject to a gateway.

8.5 Husserl: not processed intentionality, but pre-structured givenness

Husserlian intentionality is the structure by which consciousness is always consciousness of something. It cannot be technically 'processed' from the outside without losing its meaning. The Onopticon should not claim to process intentionality itself. Its claim is different: it pre-structures the field of givenness toward which intentionality is directed.

The issue is not that consciousness is technically manufactured. It is that the world given to consciousness - interfaces, rankings, options, routes, risks, objects and signals - has already been arranged. Husserl asks how the world is given to consciousness. The Onopticon asks how the field of givenness is technically prepared before it appears.

Lebenswelt is therefore not abolished. It is technically saturated. The task is not to replace phenomenology, but to ask what happens when the life-world is increasingly mediated by pre-processed environments.

8.6 Heidegger: from Gestell to onoptic imposition

Heidegger's Gestell is indispensable here. Modern technology is not merely a tool; it reveals the world as standing-reserve, Bestand (Heidegger 1977). This is a direct ancestor of onoptic thinking. Yet the Onopticon adds a political and infrastructural concreteness that Heidegger leaves underdeveloped.

Gestell reveals beings as calculable resources. The Onopticon binds these resources to gateways of access, care, targeting, recognition and decision. Heidegger asks how technology reveals being. The Onopticon asks how technical infrastructures impose the field in which beings become processable and attachable to decision.

8.7 Schmitt: from decision to the construction of the decision horizon

Schmitt defines the sovereign as the one who decides on the exception (Schmitt 2005). The Onopticon does not deny this. It asks what comes before the decision. Who constructs the field in which exception, risk, threat, target, priority and emergency become visible as objects of decision?

Schmitt's sovereign closes the door. The Onopticon determines where the door is, who can approach it and how bodies are recognised by it. Sovereignty migrates from decision to the construction of the decision horizon.

8.8 Marx: from dead labour to infrastructural gateways

Marx is indispensable because infrastructures are owned, funded, operated, patented and embedded in relations of accumulation. Machine systems are forms of dead labour dominating living labour (Marx 1976). The Onopticon extends this insight beyond the factory. Dead labour now appears in data centres, platforms, risk engines, administrative systems, health infrastructures, military AI and technical environments.

Homovictimus is therefore not only ontopolitically deprived. It is also infrastructurally proletarianised. The question becomes: who owns the conditions of access, recognition and decision?

8.9 Simondon and Stiegler: technology is not the enemy; compulsory gateways are

Simondon prevents the Onopticon from becoming crude technophobia. Technical objects have their own modes of individuation and can participate in human becoming (Simondon 2017). Stiegler likewise understands technics as *pharmakon*: both poison and remedy (Stiegler 1998).

The Onopticon does not claim that technology as such is domination. It claims that technics become onoptic when technical mediation becomes compulsory inclusion, environmental imposition and gateway sovereignty. The issue is not co-existence with technology. The issue is when co-existence becomes non-negotiable processability.

8.10 Foucault revisited: the threshold beyond visibility

Foucault remains necessary, but not sufficient. The Panopticon sees. Biopower administers life. The Onopticon pre-processes the conditions under which life becomes accessible, visible, governable and attachable to decision.

This is why the Onopticon is not the future of the Panopticon. It is the point at which the assumption that reality precedes power collapses.

9. Theoretical self-location: paradigm construction, not final doctrine

This article does not stand outside the Onopticon. It does not claim a miraculous position of pure exteriority. It speaks from within the technical, institutional and conceptual pressures it analyses. Its act of naming is not salvation. It is a conceptual interruption.

Nor is the article a programme of reform. It does not ask what should be encrypted, banned, audited or regulated. Such questions are legitimate, but they belong to a different inquiry. The present task is diagnostic and paradigmatic: to name the regime under which such questions themselves become possible or impossible.

The Onopticon is therefore not a completed doctrine. It is a developing research paradigm. New cases may confirm it, complicate it, extend it or falsify parts of it. Its value lies in its capacity to be tested against emerging technical formations.

The strongest formulation is:

the Onopticon is a paradigm for testing how infrastructural/environmental imposition and compulsory inclusion operate across heterogeneous technical domains.

Naming the regime does not overthrow it. But it interrupts its preferred disguises: modernisation, efficiency, safety, coordination, smartness, optimisation, care and innovation. The name Onopticon marks the point at which these languages no longer suffice.

10. Conclusion: a new regime requires a new name

The present regime is not merely updated surveillance society, expanded surveillance capitalism or the digitalisation of the security state. These are components. They are not the name of the regime.

The name is the Onopticon.

The Onopticon is the regime in which power pre-processes the thresholds of life, recognition, access, care, movement, targeting and decision. It does not always seize the decision directly. It does something more fundamental: it structures and imposes the horizon in which decisions become possible.

Its subject is Homovictimus.

Homovictimus is not the sovereign modern subject. It is not simply bare life, disciplined body, dividual, consumer or data subject. It is the actor compulsorily included in processable form, held responsible as if agency were intact while the conditions of agency are technically pre-structured.

The task of this article has been to construct a paradigm, not to complete a system. The Onopticon is not a total concept that explains everything. It is a testable name for a specific operation: infrastructural/environmental imposition through compulsory inclusion.

The final thesis is therefore as follows:

the Onopticon is not the future of the Panopticon. It is the collapse of the assumption that reality precedes power as a neutral field. In the onoptic regime, power helps impose the field of reality within which the subject can appear, act, access, be recognised and contest. Homovictimus is the human being who must live inside that imposed field.

References

- Agamben, G. (1998) *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Translated by D. Heller-Roazen. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Agamben, G. (2009) *What Is an Apparatus? and Other Essays*. Translated by D. Kishik and S. Pedatella. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Amoore, L. (2013) *The Politics of Possibility: Risk and Security Beyond Probability*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Amoore, L. (2020) *Cloud Ethics: Algorithms and the Attributes of Ourselves and Others*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Amnesty International (2021) *Forensic Methodology Report: How to Catch NSO Group's Pegasus*. Available at: <https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/research/2021/07/forensic-methodology-report-how-to-catch-nso-groups-pegasus/>.

Beer, I. and Groß, S. (2021) 'A deep dive into an NSO zero-click iMessage exploit: Remote code execution', *Google Project Zero*, 15 December. Available at: <https://projectzero.google/2021/12/a-deep-dive-into-nso-zero-click.html>.

Deleuze, G. (1992) 'Postscript on the societies of control', *October*, 59, pp. 3-7.

Foucault, M. (1977) *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Translated by A. Sheridan. New York: Pantheon.

Heidegger, M. (1977) 'The question concerning technology', in *The Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays*. Translated by W. Lovitt. New York: Harper & Row, pp. 3-35.

Hegel, G. W. F. (1977) *Phenomenology of Spirit*. Translated by A. V. Miller. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Husserl, E. (1970) *The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology*. Translated by D. Carr. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

Kant, I. (1998) *Critique of Pure Reason*. Translated and edited by P. Guyer and A. W. Wood. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Karlsruhe Institute of Technology (2025) 'The spy who came in from the WiFi: Beware of radio waves that reveal your identity'. Press release, 13 October. Available at: <https://www.eurekalert.org/news-releases/1101595>.

Knight, E. (2020) 'Palantir's ICM in America's post-9/11 security technology complex', *Surveillance & Society*, 18(2), pp. 231-246.

Latour, B. (2005) *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Marczak, B., Scott-Railton, J., Berdan, K., Razzak, B. A. and Deibert, R. (2021) 'FORCE-ENTRY: NSO Group iMessage zero-click exploit captured in the wild', *Citizen Lab*, 13 September. Available at: <https://citizenlab.ca/research/forcedentry-nso-group-imessage-exploit-captured-in-the-wild/>.

Marx, K. (1976) *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy, Volume I*. Translated by B. Fowkes. London: Penguin.

McLuhan, M. (1964) *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Mijente, National Immigration Project and Immigrant Defense Project (2018) *Who's Behind ICE? The Tech and Data Companies Fuelling Deportations*. Available at: https://mijente.net/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/WHO%E2%80%99S-BEHIND-ICE_-The-Tech-and-Data-Companies-Fueling-Deportations-_v1.pdf.

NHS England (2023) 'Federated Data Platform and Associated Services: Contract explainer'. Available at: <https://www.england.nhs.uk/digitaltechnology/nhs-federated-data-platform/security-privacy/contract-explainer/>.

Palantir Technologies (2024) 'Palantir expands Maven Smart System AI/ML capabilities to military services'. Press release, 20 September. Available at: <https://investors.palantir.com/news-details/2024/Palantir-Expands-Maven-Smart-System-AI/ML-Capabilities-to-Military-Services/>.

Parisi, L. (2013) *Contagious Architecture: Computation, Aesthetics, and Space*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Pasquinelli, M. and Joler, V. (2021) 'The Nooscope manifested: AI as instrument of knowledge extractivism', *Interface Critique*, 3, pp. 37-68. <https://doi.org/10.11588/ic.2021.3.81326>.

Reuters (2026) 'Pentagon to adopt Palantir AI as core US military system, memo says', 8 April. Available at: <https://www.reuters.com/technology/pentagon-adopt-palantir-ai-as-core-us-military-system-memo-says-2026-03-20/>.

Rouvroy, A. (2013) 'The end(s) of critique: data behaviourism versus due process', in M. Hildebrandt and K. de Vries (eds) *Privacy, Due Process and the Computational Turn: The Philosophy of Law Meets the Philosophy of Technology*. London: Routledge, pp. 143-167.

Rouvroy, A. (2020) 'Algorithmic governmentality and the death of politics', *Green European Journal*, 27 March. Available at: <https://www.greeneuropeanjournal.eu/algorithmic-governmentality-and-the-death-of-politics/>.

Rouvroy, A. and Berns, T. (2013) 'Algorithmic governmentality and prospects of emancipation: Disparateness as a precondition for individuation through relationships?', *Réseaux*, 177(1), pp. 163-196. <https://doi.org/10.3917/res.177.0163>.

Schmitt, C. (2005) *Political Theology: Four Chapters on the Concept of Sovereignty*. Translated by G. Schwab. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Simondon, G. (2017) *On the Mode of Existence of Technical Objects*. Translated by C. Malaspina and J. Rogove. Minneapolis: Univocal.

Somasundaram, S., Young, A., Dave, A., Pediredla, A. and Raskar, R. (2026) 'Imaging hidden objects with consumer LiDAR via motion-induced sampling', *Nature*, 653, pp. 693-699. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-026-10502-x>.

Stiegler, B. (1998) *Technics and Time, 1: The Fault of Epimetheus*. Translated by R. Beardsworth and G. Collins. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Tan, H. (2026a) *Reality Paradigm, Onopticon and Homovictimus: A Theoretical, Manifestal and Case-Based Inquiry into the Regime of Infrastructural Imposition*. ResearchGate preprint. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.15728.42241>.

Tan, H. (2026b) *Down to the Cell Membrane: Onopticon, Homovictimus, and the Pre-Regulation of Life: Sovereignty as Environmental Structuring from the State to Cellular Responsiveness*. SSRN preprint. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.6659878>.

Tan, H. (2026c) *The Infrastructural Structuring of the Environment: BFId, Consumer LiDAR, Pegasus, Rouvroy and Onoptic Thresholds in the Compulsory Inclusion of Homovictimus*. Unpublished manuscript prepared for peer review.

- Todt, J., Morsbach, F. and Strufe, T. (2025) 'BFId: Identity inference attacks utilizing Beamforming Feedback Information', in *Proceedings of the 2025 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security (CCS '25)*. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3719027.3765062>.
- Zuboff, S. (2019) *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power*. New York: PublicAffairs.