

The Onopticon

From Pre-Recognition to Imposed Reality — Feedback Decision Circuits and the Transformation of Modern Power, c. 1750–2026

Hakki Tan — ORCID: 0009-0008-8582-3132

ABSTRACT

Individual systems of record — census, health, education, law, payment, profile — are not Onopticons; each is an onoptic layer: a pre-recognition system capable of bearing, within a single domain, the profile of compulsory recognition, foreclosure of possibility, and weak contestability. The Onopticon is constituted where such layers are composed within an integrator position — a decision circuit that produces cross-domain outcomes about a subject and feeds those outcomes back into the layers themselves — or, in its terminal form, returns its category into irreversible material execution. When that circuit closes against effective contestation, it generates either trans-domain closure for the subject — narrowing across independent life-domains — or terminal closure where the circuit extinguishes the subject's capacity to encounter any subsequent domain, and structurally analogical exposure for the state; and the constitution of the circuit in a closed mode is not a law of nature but a cost asymmetry that operates wherever counter-pressure has not been engineered into the architecture. In this sense, the Onopticon is a regime of imposed reality: not because any layer coerces, but because the closed circuit renders the conditions of recognition, access, movement, action and contestation practically non-optional for the subject — the question of a viable outside answered in the negative. The environmental *a priori* names the extension of this circuit into the material world through networked objects and infrastructures: the gate of recognition disperses from the institution into the environment, and once feedback is established the object ceases to be a mere sensor and becomes an actuator of the decision horizon.

The framework adds to Mann's (1984) concept of infrastructural power a threshold (weak contestability), a level distinction (layer/composition), and a mechanism (the feedback circuit). The position is independent of its occupant — one of its most visible commercial occupants today is Palantir, its intra-state occupant the Chinese health-code architecture — and documented records of occupant substitution locate continuity in the function sequence rather than the institution. The theses are rendered testable through first-pass coding across a case record extending from colonial pre-form complexes (British India; French Africa) and parliamentary enclosure to the financial addressing complex, consumer credit scoring, and object-scale hinge cases; the separability evidence (credit scoring: the layer does not suffice for rupture; X-Road: composition does not suffice for a regime) supports the two wings of the composition thesis independently. The operational apparatus is presented in the Online Appendix (E0–E8); the study confines itself to diagnosis and analysis. The revised record identifies two rupture profiles: the Chinese health-code complex, in which mechanism and trans-domain civil effect are documented together, and the Maven Smart System, where a controlled state-commercial disclosure documents functions 8a–8e and, at the declared security-targeting unit, establishes terminal closure under subject-side non-contestability and scalable singular addressability. The date range in the title scopes the case record, not a causal lineage: what is claimed across it is structural homology and documented transfer, never unbroken continuity.

Keywords: Onopticon, onoptic layer, integrator position, feedback decision circuit, environmental a priori, closure asymmetry, sovereignty-critical layer, colonial pre-recognition, Homovictimus, infrastructural power.

1. INTRODUCTION: THE DISPLACEMENT OF THE QUESTION

The strongest everyday objection to the critique of infrastructural power runs as follows: social profiles, critical payment systems, and the registries of population, health, education and law record individuals in granular detail; yet to call each of them, one by one, a "surveillance regime" is forced. The health record is the condition of treatment, the civil registry of citizenship rights, and payment addressability the condition of participation in economic life — most are vital to the individual herself. Taken unit by unit, the objection is sound.

The founding move of this article is to absorb that objection: the objection is sound because the question is posed at the wrong unit. These systems are not Onopticons; they are onoptic layers — and the Onopticon is constituted not in the layer but where the layers are composed. The state, with information it records for its own public security and public services, supplies the ground on which the regime both forms and is applied to its own society — and, increasingly, to itself — whenever an integrator position with official access — or access traceable through documented shadow arrangements — to the totality of these layers is occupied. One of the most visible contemporary commercial occupants of that position is Palantir; but the analysis is addressed to the position, not the name: today it is called Palantir, tomorrow it will be called something else. Palantir enters this article as an occupant, and only as an occupant; the evidential weight of the rupture judgement rests where mechanism and effect are documented together (7.4), not on any name.

Stated at its plainest, before any apparatus: not every system of record is an Onopticon; a system may be an onoptic layer, operating within one domain; the Onopticon is constituted where layers produce decisions about the same subject and return those decisions into the subject's conditions of life; and where effective contestation and a viable outside remain, no Onopticon is constituted. The framework compresses to three pairs — not the layer but the composition; not visibility but feedback; not integration but uncontested closure.

A rule governs the reading of official self-documents throughout, and it is stated once here. A controlled institutional disclosure is asymmetrical evidence: it is strong primary evidence for the functions, capacities and institutional aims the operator expressly admits, and it is no evidence at all that undisclosed capacities, data flows, error rates or consequences are absent. In promotional or security-sensitive settings the public disclosure is therefore coded as an admitted operational floor, never an operational ceiling; the architecture visible in the public archive is the part the institution has judged legitimate, useful or safe to disclose, and the boundary of disclosure must not be mistaken for the boundary of operation. Undisclosed functions receive no positive code; they remain unknown: the rule blocks an inference of absence — it does not license an inference of presence. This rule sits within the five-step evidentiary hierarchy (E8) and applies uniformly — to Palantir's S-1, to the Abu Dhabi self-documents, to the Japanese statute, and to the Maven record below.

The question is thereby displaced: from *which system is the regime?* to *where is the regime constituted?* A second displacement is spatial: the site of constitution encompasses the composition points not only of institutional records but of the material environment the subject inhabits — the home, the vehicle, the meter, the road (Section 5). A third displacement is histor-

ical: the bond between layer, legal status, record and material enforcement is no invention of the digital age; its densest pre-forms are documented in imperial administration (7.1).

The genealogy in one sentence: the line that extends McLuhan's (1964) medium-proposition to the conditions of encounter passes through Kittler's (1985/1990) technical a priori; the contribution here is to bind that a priori to a regime test and to a level distinction (layer/composition). The principal interlocutors are named at the outset — Mann's infrastructural power, Kittler's technical a priori, the modulation line of Deleuze and of Rouvroy and Berns, the surveillant assemblage of Haggerty and Ericson, and Zuboff's surveillance capitalism — and the systematic comparison is given in Section 3. "The Reality Paradigm" is the proper name of the framework; its epistemic status is not a Kuhnian claim to community adoption but candidacy as a middle-range theory in Merton's sense. The conceptual chain may be summarised in a single table:

LEVEL	UNIT	QUESTION
Layer (onoptic layer)	Health, payment, education, law, profile, object	Is there recording and within-domain closure?
Position (integrator position)	The point of integration	Are data translated into a common ontology and matched to the subject?
Circuit (M3)	Feedback	Does the decision return to the domains of access, payment and movement?
Onopticon	$M3 \wedge K4=2 \wedge K3=2$, upon $K5=2$ (Section 3)	Does the circuit close — through independent-domain or terminal closure — without effective contestation or a viable outside?

The framework distinguishes four analytical levels — process (pre-recognition), unit (the onoptic layer), mechanism (the integrator position and its circuit), and regime (the Onopticon) — and licenses no movement between levels without explicit evidence: a layer does not establish a circuit; a circuit does not establish rupture; and rupture does not establish a universal historical condition without case-specific proof.¹ All criterion definitions, scales, decision rules, variables and the coding protocol are set out in the Online Appendix (E0-E8); the narrative is tied to these items by sparse markers only. All codings are first-pass codings by a single author; inter-coder reliability has not yet been measured, and the final threshold is independent double-coding on a sample not selected by the author.² A coding-unit rule applies to every case: each case judgement declares its unit — statutory text, implementation period, or local practice — and, in cases that are historical portfolios, unit selection proceeds by sampling independent of the coder, to forestall convenient-unit bias.³ The study confines itself to diagnosis and analysis; normative prescription lies outside its scope.

2. ONOPTIC LAYER VERSUS ONOPTICON: THE COMPOSITION THESIS

An onoptic layer is a pre-recognition system capable of bearing, within a single domain, the profile of the three core criteria: within-domain compulsory recognition (K1), within-domain foreclosure of possibility (K2; its kin in surveillance studies is social sorting — Lyon, 2003), and weak contestability (K3).⁴ K1 is coded with a mode tag, since a single score may conceal two distinct pathways of power: K1[A], access-conditional recognition — the subject must be translated in order to reach a service, a status, a market; and K1[C], compelled categorisation — the subject is converted into a category by the security or legal apparatus irrespective of her own approach. The modes may co-occur (K1[A/C]), and their distribution across cases is itself an object of analysis.⁵ A layer may cross the regime threshold; the historical record

shows as much: enclosure in the material domain, the news cartel in the symbolic, stay-behind in the security domain, Bretton Woods conditionality in the domain of economic policy are coded as single-domain regimes (7.2). The composition thesis bears not on those codings but on the rupture judgement: the closure that defines rupture cannot, by its logical structure, be a property of a layer. Rupture has two compositional forms, both emergent from composition rather than resident in any layer: in the first, it is trans-domain and recursive, exit from one gate opening onto another gate composed under the same logic; in the second, it is terminal, the inter-layer circuit returning its category into irreversible execution and removing the subject's capacity to encounter any further gate. Trans-domainness is a relation between layers; termination is the circuit's output crossing out of representation altogether — neither is available to a single layer. (The two are coded $K4=2[D]$ and $K4=2[T]$ in Section 3.) That an exit from one gate opens onto another gate of the same regime (recursion) is possible only where the gates have been composed under a single logic. Rupture is therefore an emergent property of composition, not of the layer; its operational content is fixed in Section 3: composition is the closing of an inter-layer circuit.

The thesis is supported from two directions by two independent cases. (i) The layer does not suffice for rupture: consumer credit scoring established mass-singular dynamic addressability ($K5=2$) decades before artificial intelligence (Lauer, 2017; Poon, 2007) — yet its closure remained domain-specific ($K4=1$). (ii) Composition does not suffice for a regime: Estonia's X-Road is the maximal case of layer-integration; but contestation is engraved into the architecture ($K3=0$), and it is not a regime. The formula: integration is the necessary condition of rupture; the sufficient condition is its articulation with weak contestability. The Mann threshold thus does its work: what constitutes a regime is neither technology nor integration, but integration whose channel of reverse penetration has been severed. The coding consequence is a level rule: at the layer level of analysis $K4$ is capped at 1; $K4=2$ may be awarded only at the composition level, and only upon documentation of circuit closure.⁶ The tautology risk of the rule is declared and bound to a falsification condition: should $K4=2$ be shown to arise without documented composition, the level rule and the composition thesis fall together.

With this thesis the cartographic mode of the a priori settles into an evolutionary line: static allotment map → contractual cartel map → static dossier → dynamic subject-file → real-time ontology → federated ontology → an environment that senses and enforces (Section 5). The a priori of the rupture phase is stored not in a single map but in layers, each held for legitimate — often vital — reasons: a distributed a priori; the regime is born not of the parts' existence but of their addressable composition. The more distributed, the more invisible: the hedge is seen, the score is sensed, the federated ontology — standing behind no single gate — is addressless.

3. THE INTEGRATOR POSITION: A FEEDBACK DECISION CIRCUIT

The integrator position is not the physical gathering of layer data in one centre. It is the dynamic operational position at which five powers concentrate across the layers of population, health, payment, movement, education, law, profile and security: (8a) access — official or documented-shadow connection to layer records; (8b) ontological translation — the carrying of records into a common data language; (8c) correlation — the matching of disparate records upon the same subject; (8d) cross-layer outcome production — a category of risk, eligibility, priority or targeting about the subject; (8e) feedback into action — the return of that category, as consequence, into the domains of payment, movement, health, security or legal access.⁷

The essence of the position is not place but circuit; onoptic power is born not in the individual links but in their closing upon the same subject so as to feed one another. The definition fore-closes an obvious defence at the outset — "there is no single central database, therefore no regime" — for the position can be constituted even across distributed infrastructures.

Two historical modes of composition are distinguished. Personal-administrative composition is the gathering of powers in a bureau and a person: local, discretionary, unscalable, thinly archived; the function adheres to the person, and substitution is fragile (its pure historical instance is the French *cercle commandant*; 7.1). Ontological composition is the gathering of powers in a common data language and circuit: substitutable, scalable, durable. Rupture is not the disappearance of personal-administrative composition — discretionary offices survive, and often operate inside the circuits themselves — but the shift of composition's centre of gravity to the ontological mode, which becomes scaling-dominant; hybrid configurations, in which discretion works within a circuit, are recorded as a coding note.⁸ The distinction also supplies the historical counter-ground of the substitution thesis below.

The position is graded (M0-M3):⁹ from bare interoperability, through translation-correlation, to cross-layer outcome production and the closed circuit. Integration may be established between layers while decision authority remains dispersed and contestation effective — in that case there is integration, but no Onoptic position. Two terms are therefore separated: the integrator position is a normatively neutral, degree-scaled position; the Onoptic position = integrator position (M3) $\wedge$ K3=2. Weak contestability is not part of the integrator position's definition — it is the condition that converts an integrator position into an Onoptic one; tautology is avoided, and the "non-onoptic position" remains empirically possible. The scale further converts the K4=2 judgement from a verdict on outcomes into a documentation of mechanism: the minimal requirement is documentation of functions 8d and 8e — of circuit closure. The limit of that requirement is recorded explicitly: **documentation of feedback establishes that the circuit is mechanically constituted; the circuit's scope, its continuity, and its counterfactual effect upon the subject must be documented separately.**¹⁰ The documentation requirement narrows the unlicensed leap from architecture to effect; it does not close it. And the rule for K4 is hardened accordingly: M3 attests that a circuit exists; **K4=2 additionally requires separate effect evidence, through one of two routes.** K4=2[D] requires documented narrowing of viable alternative lines in at least two independent life-domains — movement, payment/finance, health, education, legal status, housing, communication, energy — where independence means that the closure of one domain does not logically entail the closure of the other (the closure of payment entails the closure of rent-payment; that is one item of evidence, not two). K4=2[T] requires evidence that the direct output of the documented circuit irreversibly extinguishes the subject's practical capacity to encounter any subsequent domain — the full rule below. In either route, the circuit must be shown and its effect shown separately.¹¹ In short: the circuit must be shown, and its effect must be shown separately.

The position is not identical with any fixed institution; four occupancy types are distinguished: commercial (Palantir), intra-state (the Chinese health-code architecture), public-private consortium (the NHS-FDP articulation approximates this type), and distributed-composite occupancy — the form in which the position sits in no single actor, the functions closing across a contractual and access network between infrastructures; it is the architectural counterpart of shadow authority and disperses the address of contestation most radically. Where the occupant changes and the sequence access-translation-correlation-decision-feedback continues, what has changed is only the occupant; **the historical continuity of the position is to be**

sought not in the persistence of any firm or institution, but in the substitutability of the function sequence. Three substitution records stand: Maven (Google withdrew; the function continued under a different contractor), DCC→GDHCN (the institutional transfer of the certificate infrastructure; WHO, 2023), and SPFS/CIPS (those severed built the outside as a replica of the position) — the third the most instructive: even flight reproduces the position. The marginal-effect question is framed accordingly: the counterfactual unit is not the occupant but the position; the non-alteration of decision-horizon metrics after substitution is a double-valued finding — weakening the actor thesis, strengthening the position thesis.¹²

The genealogical debts are open: Deleuze's (1992) modulation, Rouvroy and Berns's (2013) algorithmic governmentality, and Farrell and Newman's (2019) network-topological analysis are direct antecedents. The contribution is not the circuit idea but its binding to the layer architecture, the degree scale, and a regime test external to K3.

Positioning against neighbouring frameworks. The comparison is compressed here; each line names what the neighbouring framework supplies and the operational addition made here.

FRAMEWORK	WHAT IT SUPPLIES	WHAT THE ONOPTICON ADDS
Mann (1984): infrastructural power	The capacity concept: penetrative, logistical state power	A threshold (weak contestability), the layer/composition distinction, and the temporal claim that penetration precedes the decision
Kittler (1985/1990): technical a priori	The material pre-structuring of experience by media	Extension from media to the whole field of encounter, bound to a regime test
Scott (1998): legibility	The state's production of legible, simplified social reality	The feedback wing and the closure test: legibility that returns as consequence, coded at a regime threshold
Haggerty and Ericson (2000): the surveillant assemblage	The convergence of discrete surveillance systems; the data double	The threshold the assemblage deliberately withholds: the circuit, the level rule, and the test for when convergence becomes regime
Bratton (2016): the Stack	The address layer; the architecture of planetary computation	An explicit operational regime test not developed in the same form; the pre-digital genealogy of addressability
Rouvroy and Berns (2013): algorithmic governmentality	The pre-emptive mode of government by data	Criteria, historical depth, and a test not confined to algorithmic systems
Easterling (2014): ex-trastatecraft	Infrastructure as a political actor independent of discourse	The threshold at which disposition becomes regime
Farrell and Newman (2019): weaponised interdependence	Panopticon and choke-point effects at the network core	The receiving-end formulation; pre-structuring rather than visibility
Zuboff (2019): surveillance capitalism	The extraction economy of behavioural surplus	The regime threshold; the state layers and material actuation less central to the market-centred account
Social-credit scholarship (Creemers, 2018; Liang et al., 2018)	The empirical record of state-led scoring and its fragmentation	The portfolio discipline and the circuit test that separate architecture from regime

Two rows mark the closest kin: Scott supplies the process, Haggerty and Ericson the convergence; the framework adds, in both cases, the closure test. The comparison also records a departure from the panoptic lineage: the object here is addressability, not visibility.

Falsification conditions: should substitution be shown systematically to interrupt the function sequence, the position thesis weakens and the judgement regresses to an actor case; should positions be documented as remaining systematically vacant despite available access, the attraction claim falls; should K4=2 be shown without documented circuit closure, the circuit definition falls; should an M3 circuit be documented in durable coexistence with engraved contestation (K3=0), the strong version of the asymmetry weakens — that no such case has yet been found in the record is registered as an open research question (7.5).

K4=2 has two evidentiary routes, and the distinction is load-bearing rather than permissive. K4=2's two evidentiary routes, named above at the criterion's definition, are governed as follows — neither one an exception to the other. K4=2[D] requires documented narrowing across at least two independent life-domains. K4=2[T], terminal closure, applies where the direct output of an M3 circuit extinguishes the subject's practical capacity to enter any subsequent domain at all. The terminal route does not count one consequence as several domains; it records the logical limit of the viable-outside test — the elimination of the subject's capacity to encounter any further gate. Its frame is strict and is not the military/civil boundary but the circuit itself: terminal closure is never inferred merely because an act is violent or lethal, and death produced outside a documented integrator circuit — in ordinary killing, in war unmediated by the circuit — falls outside it, because no integrator position is present. It is coded only where the outcome is generated through the documented feedback circuit, under K3=2 and upon scalable singular addressability (K5=2). The terminal route is case-neutral and domain-neutral: any documented M3 circuit — military, penal, medical or otherwise — qualifies under K4=2[T] only where its direct output is irreversible and extinguishes the subject's capacity to encounter any subsequent domain; a circuit whose output remains reversible or non-terminal does not satisfy K4=2[T] and must qualify, if at all, through the ordinary domain route. Terminal closure is the extreme form of a returned consequence, not a bypass of it: it entails the decisional grade (I2) and exceeds it. The canonical equation is unchanged; only the two empirical routes to K4=2 are named.

A clause on the subject of contestation is needed at the same point, because circuits that act upon a subject who is never their client expose an ambiguity the ordinary cases do not. K3 is assessed from the position of the classified subject — whether that subject can know the category, holds standing to challenge it, and can alter its consequence before feedback becomes irreversible — and not from the position of the institution's internal reviewers. In targeting and security circuits, internal verification, command approval, legal review or a human-in-the-loop regulate the circuit internally; they are not subject-side contestability, and cannot be presented as K3-E. This is not a widening of the criterion but a specification of whose contestation it measures.

The regime equation is therefore stated once, canonically: **Onopticon = M3 $\wedge$ K4=2 $\wedge$ K3=2, at a declared coding unit, upon population-scale addressability (K5=2). For K5, "population-scale" is relative to the declared subject population — the governed population in civil-administrative cases, and the operationally addressable target population within the relevant theatre or security carrier in targeting cases; it measures scalable singular addressability, not universal civilian enrolment. The declared population may not be narrowed at will: the carrier itself must be population-scale (as with a health-code platform, or an infrastructure able to scan an entire theatre), while the application may be narrow — this is the same threshold that separates rupture from enclave closure. Every judgement in the case record derives from this equation and none exceeds it; and the order of operations is fixed — the circuit is documented;**

either independent-domain narrowing ($K4=2[D]$) or terminal closure ($K4=2[T]$) is documented; the ineffectiveness of subject-side contestation is documented; the absence of a viable outside is shown; and only then is the composite named: "imposed reality" is the verdict issued at the end of the test, never a premise assumed at its beginning. $K5$ measures the addressability infrastructure, not the count of the targeted: Henan 2022 aims a narrow group through a population-scale carrier and codes $K5=2$; full closure without scalable addressability is not a regime but the enclave pattern (E0).

4. THE CLOSURE ASYMMETRY

"Power, by its nature, does not work with open institutions; but it works closely with open institutions" — in its raw form the proposition is essentialist, unfalsifiable, and refuted by the framework's own negative case: X-Road is proof that maximal layer-integration can be articulated openly and bidirectionally. The framework rescues the proposition's core as a selection asymmetry: closed articulation is systematically cheaper and higher-yielding than open articulation, and in the absence of counter-pressure it becomes the default attractor. Four documentable cost advantages: the externalisation of accountability (responsibility-diffusing shields: "the machine said so", "the law compels us", "terms of service"); ready-made templates of secrecy (trade secret, security exemption, arbitration chill — the legal infrastructure of closedness is already laid, that of openness must be built anew each time); the cheapness of shadow authority (a formal order leaves a trail and gives appeal an address; the public call and the shadow of sanction are deniable and addressless; Benkler, 2011); and the shifting of contestation costs onto the subject (for the legal-empirical record of automated exclusion and opacity, Eubanks, 2018; Pasquale, 2015). None of these advantages requires intent; each is simply cheaper. The counter-condition: the open mode is possible but not spontaneous — it is established and maintained only by counter-pressure engraved into the architecture (the X-Road access log; GDPR art. 22; the FCRA; the calendared sunset of the EU Digital COVID Certificate). Falsification: systematic documentation of integrator positions arising spontaneously open, absent engraved counter-pressure, would defeat the thesis. The asymmetry form is stronger than the essentialist form: closedness is not fate but an alterable cost structure. There is a directional corollary the record repeatedly shows but the thesis has not yet named: pre-recognition capacities mature where closed-mode articulation is cheapest — the sovereignty-critical and security domains, where the security exemption is standing, secrecy is the default and the cost of contestation to the subject is effectively infinite — and are then generalised into the civil domain carrying that already-decayed contestation architecture with them. Maven began as a military targeting programme and is narrated, at a single vendor conference, beside civilian deployments in health, mortgage and energy on the same platform; telematics, positioning and facial recognition descended into the civil environment from military origins; stay-behind networks seeped from military-intelligence infrastructure into civil political space. The military and civil circuits are not separate subjects but different feedback outputs of one infrastructure, and what assigns a subject to one output rather than another is itself a circuit product — the compelled categorisation of $K1[C]$. This is the historical motor of the closure asymmetry: the mode is engraved closed where it is cheapest to close, and it migrates closed. The Maven disclosure introduces a further form of the public/operational archive division: the architecture itself need no longer remain secret once it can be narrated as speed, decision advantage and protection of the warfighter. What stays operationally expensive to disclose is no longer the existence of the circuit but its subject-side record — the undisclosed feeds, the false correlations, the rejected alternatives, the civilian consequences,

the inaccessible grounds of classification. The public archive thus ceases to conceal the integrator's existence while continuing to conceal the subject's encounter with it: normalisation does not abolish secrecy but relocates it from capacity to consequence. The "admission" here is not a confession of wrongdoing; it is power affirming its own operation as success. The evidentiary status of the thesis is itself declared: what the record documents is a recurring inventory of institutional incentives favouring closed articulation; the systematic comparative cost accounting that would convert the asymmetry from a strong hypothesis into a finding belongs to the research programme — and the decisive observation, an M3 circuit in durable coexistence with effective contestation, remains the open question of 7.5.

The mechanism explains the most recurrent documentary finding of the case record: the division between public archive and operational archive — the suppression of the counter-archive at the founding (Young, 1801), the concealment of the operational archive in the expansion phase (cartel minutes; Gladio hidden from parliaments; TFTP), the trade-secret seal of the rupture phase — is the three-century observable consequence of the asymmetry (case table: Online Appendix). Gladio is the pure form: a structure operating inside open democratic institutions, hidden from them — a state apparatus unknown even to the prime minister (Andreotti's admission of 1990; European Parliament resolution, 1990). The apparent paradox of the rupture phase — maximal operational opacity conjoined with maximal doctrinal publicity (the Palantir S-1; Karp and Zamiska, 2025) — dissolves in the asymmetry's language: doctrine is cheap, because it borrows the position's legitimacy from open institutions; operation is dear, because it gives contestation an address.

5. THE OBJECT SCALE AND THE ENVIRONMENTAL A PRIORI

The Internet of Things is a necessary layer that renders visible the extension of the federated ontology into the material environment. Networked devices, vehicles of movement, and infrastructures of energy and logistics are not merely objects in use — they are object-scale pre-recognition layers, continuously generating data about a person's behaviour, location, rhythm, consumption and surroundings, and in some cases altering their own function in response. Layer discipline holds here too: none is, by itself, an Onopticon; a television's viewing data or a vehicle's movement record does not, on its own, produce trans-domain subject closure. But once such records become linkable with the layers of identity, payment, health, law and movement, the material base of the federated ontology widens: the subject becomes recognisable not only when applying to institutions but in every moment of dwelling, moving, consuming. The temporality and spatiality of pre-recognition change: in institutional layers translation was an act — the subject was translated at specific gates (registry office, bank, border); in object layers **the gate disperses into the environment and translation becomes a condition**. Two codable consequences follow:¹³ consent without act — consent shrinks to the moment of purchase; third parties (guests, passengers, passers-by) enter the layer without any consenting act — and contestation without object — one contests a decision; in continuous ambient recognition there is no contestable cut. Read through the K1 modes, this is the seepage of the compelled mode into access-conditional domains: the subject enters by the A-gate, and the profile widens thereafter in C-mode, without act.

What is decisive for rupture is not that objects are connected. It is that object records are matched to the person by the integrator position; translated within a common ontology into categories of risk, eligibility, priority or targeting; and returned as consequence into the subject's conditions of movement, payment, energy, health or access. Where that feedback is es-

established, the object is no longer a watching sensor; it becomes an actuator that materially executes the decision horizon: the car will not start, the lock will not open, the meter cuts off.¹⁴ The false positive here acquires material immediacy: there is not even a decision-moment to contest — the decision is lived as the behaviour of the thing. This is the imposed-reality register at its most literal — and its evidential status is marked at once: what the object record documents is the widening of the surface on which reality can be pre-structured, not its population-scale imposition (7.3); the register is borrowed from the regime level, not awarded to the layer. The resulting structure is the **environmental a priori** — not a third a priori but the material-environmental mode of the infrastructural a priori: the subject's field of encounter is constituted before experience also by the networked order of the dwelling, the equipment and the vehicles that generate data and can execute decisional consequences. The rupture phase does not transform the individual; it computes the individual's environment — the subject is not an object to be corrected but a parameter of the milieu — and the computed milieu here becomes material. The map-evolution reaches its last link: the a priori ceases to be representation and becomes an environment that senses and enforces — lived yet unnoticed, for it is no longer map but landscape.

Layer inflation is expressly foreclosed: not every sensor is a layer. An object attains layer status only under three criteria:¹⁵ subject-matchability, outward flow, and — as the strong form — remote actuation; the first two define a sensor layer, all three an actuator layer. K1 is coded by segment: the connected television at K1=0-1; regulatorily mandated telematics (eCall), smart-meter roll-outs and the de facto phone requirement of banking identification push their segments towards K1=2. Object ecosystems are the natural terrain of distributed-composite occupancy: the five functions typically disperse across actors — the device maker holds access, the platform translation, the data broker correlation and scoring, the insurer or lender feedback. Genealogy: Foucault's (2007) analysis of the milieu is the direct ancestor; Deleuze (1992), Gabrys (2016) and Sadowski (2020) are the contemporary veins; the contribution is the binding of that vein to the layer architecture, the object-layer threshold and the circuit test. The evidential status is measured: what is documented is not a population-scale closed object circuit but the separate closing of circuit fragments along distinct lines (7.3); the object layer is not a rupture case but the widening of the rupture surface. Falsification: should the systematic flow of object records into position ontologies prove undocumentable, the environmental a priori remains at the level of architectural potential.

6. SUBJECT AND STATE: FRAGMENTED CONSENT, INTEGRATED EXPOSURE; THE CORE-PERIPHERY AXIS

From Pre-Recognition to Imposed Reality

The subject-side thesis can now be stated in full — and at its proper level. The Onopticon is not a theory of reduced choice; it is a theory of pre-structured reality. What the regime names is not the narrowing of a menu of options within a given world, but the pre-conditioning of the infrastructural terms under which recognition, access, movement, action and contestation first become practically available to the subject. The modality of the claim is bounded three times, and the bounds are constitutive. First, the level: "pre-structured reality" is a regime-level characterisation, licensed only where the rupture conditions are met at a declared coding unit — a layer pre-structures a domain, not a reality; a circuit pre-structures mechanically; and documented effect (scope, continuity, counterfactual; E6-8e) is what carries imposition to its regime grade; the grading of imposition itself is fixed below. Second, the mode: imposition

is asymmetry, not essence — X-Road stands as proof that the same integrative capacity can hold the conditions of contestation open (Section 4), so that "imposed" names a cost-selected outcome, never a nature. Third, the evidence: within the present record the formulation is carried in full by two cases carrying the full regime equation through distinct evidentiary routes: the Chinese general pandemic regime, which documents mechanism and trans-domain civil effect together through $K4=2[D]$, and Maven, which documents the complete circuit through controlled institutional disclosure and satisfies the equation at its declared security-targeting unit through subject-side $K3=2$, terminal closure $K4=2[T]$ and $K5=2$. For architecture-level cases outside these declared units it remains, like the rupture judgement itself, a candidacy. It is this thesis that redeems the framework's proper name: the Reality Paradigm is so called because its object is the pre-structuring of the conditions of encounter, not the observation of conduct within them.

Homovictimus is redefined accordingly — and the redefinition resolves a tension the first-pass record had left standing. Not the passive victim; not simply the subject with narrowed agency: Homovictimus is the subject compelled to convert agency into tactics of survival within a field whose conditions have been pre-structured elsewhere — and then held responsible, in the language of free single acts, for the outcomes of those tactics. Both wings are constitutive. The tactical wing carries a genealogical debt to de Certeau (1984): the tactic is the art of the actor who operates on terrain owned by another — precisely the position of the subject inside a closed circuit. The responsabilisation wing retains the debt to, and difference from, Rose (1999): the difference is the material pre-narrowing of the field before the discourse. The threefold discipline of use (proper-individual / analogical-institution / analogical-state) stands unchanged.

The subject-side of the composition thesis is this: the subject enters each layer by a separate gate — as patient, taxpayer, user, debtor — and the consent given, or the compulsion borne, at each gate is directed at that domain. No single consent is directed at the composition of the layers; integrated exposure has no legal-phenomenological addressee, for composition is an operation that never once appeared before the subject. The formula: **fragmented consent, integrated exposure** — sharpened at the object scale by consent without act. This binds the rupture-form of weak contestability to a mechanism: there is no gate at which to contest, because the federated ontology stands behind no gate; contestation is dispersed across the layers, each of which may say "we merely recorded". The subject is held responsible, in the language of single acts, for the consequences of an integrated profile she produced by no single act.

The targeting circuit, where it exists, pre-structures both sides of the encounter, asymmetrically. The target is pre-recognised: constituted as an operational object without approach, knowledge or standing — and the very category "legitimate target" is itself a circuit output, a compelled categorisation ($K1[C]$) whose criteria the power sets, holds closed to challenge, and can redefine retroactively; enmity is not a natural fact given to the circuit but a product returned by it, the lethal cognate of the "in amity" evidentiary capture, in which the burden of proving one's exempt status rests on a subject whose proof is held by the classifying authority. The operator, meanwhile, is pre-optioned: the relevant detections, the target objects, the available courses of action, the appropriate means and the decision tempo have all been organised upstream by the integrator. The persistence of a human approval point therefore does not restore an unstructured field of judgement; the decision remains human in attribution while becoming infrastructural in constitution. This double structure is not confined to targeting — the loan officer, too, is pre-optioned — but targeting is where it is starkest, and where

the civil and the security subject are shown to be the same subject under two different assignments of the same infrastructure.

A qualification is necessary, and it sharpens rather than suspends the bounds above. Imposition should not be confined to the later moment at which a classification returns as an administrative consequence. Where the subject's data are made available for undisclosed analysis without consent, imposition begins at the level of pre-recognition itself: the subject is compelled into an ontology she neither sees, nor authors, nor contests, nor exits — the condition of analytical enclosure (E0). This is not yet, by itself, a regime-level Onopticon in the K4 sense; but it is already onoptic imposition at the level of the subject's analytic existence. The decision has not yet returned as consequence; the subject has already been rendered within a reality-form not of her making. Imposition is therefore graded, and the grades are load-bearing — indexed I1-I3, a derived index on the precedent of the Onoptic-position equation: it introduces no new criterion, but names configurations of the existing apparatus. **I1, analytic imposition** — non-consensual, unseen ontological inclusion; $I1 \equiv M2 \wedge$ the enclosure conditions (E0), so that consensual, logged, visible integration — X-Road — opens no grade. **I2, decisional imposition** — the category returned as consequence into a life-domain (8e; $\approx M3$). **I3, regime-level imposition** — an M3 circuit closed under weak contestability upon scalable singular addressability, through either $K4=2[D]$ (narrowing across at least two independent life-domains) or $K4=2[T]$ (terminal closure extinguishing the capacity to encounter any subsequent domain): $I3 \equiv M3 \wedge (K4=2[D] \vee K4=2[T]) \wedge K3=2$, on $K5=2$. The M-scale grades the same architecture from the side of the mechanism; the I-index reads it from the side of the subject. I1 does not establish I3 — the level rule stands — but I3 is never constituted without I1: every regime begins as an enclosure that nobody contested, because nobody could see it. The claim is bound, not bare: it is the imposition-graded restatement of the open question of 7.5, and should an M3 circuit be documented in durable coexistence with consensual, visible, effectively contestable inclusion, the sentence falls with it. The statutory record supplies a live statutory case, as reported at enactment (Jiji Press, 2026; full-text audit pending): the Japanese consent exemption licenses precisely I1, at population scale, including highly sensitive categories capable of C-mode use.

The state occupies a double position in this architecture. As feeder: it is the principal producer, licensor, standardiser, access-provider or enforcement-carrier of the layers — profile, broker and object layers are largely private productions, operating within state-set standards and under state-carried enforcement — and the ground of the position; in Mann's sense the capacity is normatively double-valued, and judgement attaches not to the form but to the articulation. As exposed: once the position is occupied, the data-supplying state no longer reads its own records; it feeds an ontology controlled elsewhere, and sees its own a priori only through the integrator's interface (the NHS record is the architectural document of this). A codable variable is proposed: integrator dependency. The carrier thesis is framed in its weakened-honest form: the most durable and most coercive closures are constituted by the state's official or shadow capacity; the shadow mode is categorically weaker than the official-authority thesis, and this is declared (7.5).

Between the conditional inclusion of the subject and the peripheral state's dependence on sovereignty-critical layers there is not identity but a structural analogy. A sovereignty-critical layer is pre-recognition infrastructure a state cannot in practice forgo if it is to sustain its sovereign functions: financial addressability, health certification, development finance, the security umbrella. The core state is producer or position-occupant of most such layers; the peripheral state is, most often, neither — it meets the needs theoretically indispensable to its sov-

ereignty by passing through positions occupied by others. The subject enters the layer in order to live; the peripheral state enters in order to sustain its sovereign functions; in both, the act of entry may generate a surface of exposure. But what is at issue for the state is not subjective experience; it is the structural position of **being held responsible for sovereign decisions and outcomes while the infrastructural conditions of its agency are pre-structured elsewhere**. The formula is derived at the analogical level: fragmented commitment, integrated exposure. This exposure has a documented dimension of historical constitution (7.1): a substantial portion of postcolonial states erected their sovereignty upon pre-recognition infrastructures inherited from colonial administration — cadastre, registry, legal codes, census categories — so that part of the periphery's present layer-exposure derives from the layers themselves having been produced elsewhere. The exposure, in other words, is often older than the state that bears it. The transformation remains conditional, coded by three conditions: the position of the sovereignty-critical layer is externally occupied; state-scale contestability is weak; the circuit can close upon that state's subjects or institutions. X-Road is the counter-evidence: a small, peripherally placed state can build its own open position — the asymmetry is not fate but cost. The scale-recursion record is a requirement of honesty: the periphery's exit from an external position most often erects a second position around a new centre (SPFS/CIPS); the fleeing state passes from one exposure to another — or into an imposing position over the smaller members of its own bloc. The closest kin is Farrell and Newman (2019): they analyse the capacity gained by the network core; the thesis here is the receiving-end formulation of the same structure. The difference from the dependency/world-systems vein (Wallerstein, 1974): the claim is not surplus transfer but **a priori dependency** — the pre-processing of the peripheral state's decision horizon, before its own decision, within externally occupied circuits.

7. THE CASE ARCHITECTURE

Cases are not of equal weight; the table below is the map of the section. The coding-unit rule (Section 1) governs every subsection.¹⁶

CATEGORY	FUNCTION IN THE ARGUMENT	CASES
Pre-form	Homologies and documented transfer links; no evidential burden	British India; French Africa (7.1)
Principal (single-domain)	The evidential burden of threshold-crossing within one domain	Enclosure; the Ring cartel; stay-behind; Bretton Woods (7.2)
Rupture	Carries the full regime equation through two distinct evidentiary routes	Chinese general regime — $K4=2[D]$; Maven Smart System — $K4=2[T]$ (7.4)
Hinge	The mechanism of transition	SWIFT/OFAC; credit scoring; the object hinges (7.3)
Comparative side-case	Tests a principal pattern in another domain; no continuity claim	COVAX (7.2)
Negative and pilot	Discriminant power	X-Road; Nobel; the WHO; the SMTP pair (7.5)
Boundary test	The framework's capacity for self-weakening	The WikiLeaks blockade; excommunication; the resistance record (7.5)

7.1 Pre-Form Complexes: British India and French Africa

Colonial administration is not the first form of the Onopticon; it is, however, the historical terrain on which the modern state's pre-recognition capacity densified under imperial conditions, and this article codes it as a pre-form complex. In British India, the Permanent Settlement of Bengal (1793), the cadastre, forest law, the census and the Criminal Tribes Act (1871) translated land, right, caste, tribe, crime and movement into categories legible to the state. In French Algeria and West Africa, the indigénat placed the colonial subject in a legal status separate from the citizen, while cercle administration united head tax, compulsory labour and administrative sanction along a single line of rule. In both, social reality was first rendered governable through record and legal status; but the centres of gravity differed — two emphases, not two pure types: the British complex worked through documentation, cadastre and classification; the French through exceptional law, administrative penalty and labour mobilisation (the British system also had its exceptional sanctions, the French its cadastre).

Methodological record — the coding unit. The British and French colonial complexes are not single coding units but historical portfolios of pre-form cases to be coded separately: two empires, dozens of colonies, more than a century, and heterogeneous legal instruments cannot be gathered into one K1-K5 row. The scores in this section are therefore statutory-architecture profiles: the coding unit is the statutory text itself (the chain is written into the text); implementation-level judgements — a particular forest-settlement file, the Criminal Tribes Act as applied in a particular province and period, the tax-prestation chain of a particular cercle — await unit-by-unit coding under coder-independent sampling.¹⁷ The distinction is the same as the architecture/effect discipline of the Palantir case: architecture is read from the document; implementation is documented separately.

The British complex (statutory-architecture profile). The judgement rests on a translation threshold that stands apart from historiographical dispute: the forest legislation's (1865; 1878; 1927) extinguishing of unrecorded customary rights by passing them through a procedure of inquiry and registration is the imperial repetition of parliamentary enclosure's operation — "the undocumented right is deemed not to exist" — and one link of this parallel is not homology but documented transfer: Guha (1963) shows at archival level that the Permanent Settlement was derived from the English ideology of "improvement" (the tie to 7.2). The thesis that the census constituted caste categories (Dirks, 2001) is contested and bears no weight in the judgement; what is uncontested is that the 1901 census (with Risley's ethnographic apparatus) rendered the population categorically legible, and that the category generated administrative consequence (Cohn, 1996; on classification infrastructures and their consequences generally, Bowker and Star, 1999; for the everyday power of the document regime, Raman, 2012; for the legal constitution, Singha, 1998). The Criminal Tribes Act is the nakedest form of the record: registration → category of hereditary criminality → movement pass → residence restriction — a paper-based, collective, static analogue proto-circuit: classification bound directly to the enforcement of movement. What is punished is not the act but the identity; the barest fusion of responsabilisation with the erasure of agency, and the historical outer anchor of Homovictimus — coded K1[C] in mode. That "denotified" communities remained stigmatised in category and police practice after the Act's repeal is the historical anchor of the infrastructural-persistence variable:¹⁸ the authority lapses, the category lives. Statutory-architecture profile (first pass): K1=2 [C-weighted] (extinction of the unrecorded right; registration-compulsory identity), K2=2, K3=2; K5=1 (the category collective, the record static); composition mode predominantly personal-administrative, document-heavy.

The French complex (statutory-architecture profile). The indigénat — by statute in Algeria in 1881, by decree-regime in West Africa from the early 1900s — is the power of administrative penalty without judicial process, and the purest historical form of the weak-contestability criterion: contestation is institutionally absent. A source-critical record is obligatory: Mann (2009) shows the indigénat to have been not a single coherent "code" but a heterogeneous, locally variable regime of sanctioning practices — the judgement therefore attaches not to a uniform code but to the form of unjudicialised administrative sanction itself, and the implementation-level variety is precisely the rationale of the portfolio rule. The decree of 25 May 1912, which wrote unilaterally the conditions of admission to citizenship, is the imperial-legal form of conditional inclusion: a promise of inclusion whose threshold the administration sets. The payability of the head tax in compulsory labour (the prestation regime) binds the fiscal record-layer directly to enforcement upon the body (Fall, 1993; for the structural bond of colonial finance and forced labour, van Waijenburg, 2018; for the documented extremity of violence, Daughton, 2021) — the administrative precursor, in the age of human labour, of material actuation; the parallel is drawn in homology status and with restraint, for the difference between the body compelled to labour and the vehicle disabled at a distance is constitutive not only analytically but morally. The scissors between the discourse of the mission civilisatrice and the practice of the indigénat (Conklin, 1997) is the imperial-scale record of the legitimisation-practice gap.¹⁹ And the cercle commandant is conceptually the most fertile figure: the gathering of tax, labour, penalty and movement in one office is cross-domain composition — but without common ontology, correlation technology or scalability; the composition closes in the bureau and the person, not in data. The cercle is the pure historical occupant of personal-administrative composition (Section 3): substitutable, yet with the function adhering to the person, the position's continuity fragile — the counter-ground of why ontological composition eases substitution. Statutory-architecture profile (first pass): K1=2 [C-weighted] (status law), K2=2, K3=2 (the pure form); K5=0-1; composition mode personal-administrative, enforcement-heavy.

Collective judgement and status. These portfolios do not warrant the verdict that particular colonial orders were Onopticons: records were largely paper-based, fragmentary and local; the population-scale dynamic profile, real-time correlation, and a feedback circuit spanning all domains of life did not exist. What did exist, at high intensity, was recognition through compelled categorisation, the advance closing of the decision horizon, and ineffective contestation. Colonial rule is therefore not the rupture phase itself but the historical pre-form of the bond between layer, legal status, record and material enforcement. The contemporary Onoptic circuit should be conceived as that pre-form endowed with digital, dynamic, cross-domain compositional capacity — a claim of structural homology, not institutional continuity; documented transfer is defended only along the Guha link and in the infrastructural inheritance of decolonisation (Section 6). The claim is thus more restrained than the generalisation of colonialism into a new analytic of data appropriation (Couldry and Mejias, 2019): what is defended is homology under portfolio coding, not a continuous colonial logic. Ethical-epistemic record: these complexes are not neutral administrative history but the densification, in state form, of racialised regimes of property and labour (Bhandar, 2018). Sampling note: the South African pass-laws regime is the strongest additional candidate of the pre-form category and is proposed for independent coding.²⁰

7.2 Single-Domain Regimes: Foundation and Expansion (1750-1990)

Four principal cases show that the regime threshold can be crossed at the layer level; none meets the rupture criteria — the domain closed was single. A terminological guard governs

the section: "regime" is here the genus — threshold-crossing closure within a declared scope; the Onopticon is its trans-domain, feedback-closed, scaled species, and no single-domain coding is a species claim. **Enclosure (1750-1830):** the parliamentary process recognised only the right translatable into document; unwritten customary use was legally deemed not to exist ($K1=2$ [A/C], $K2=2$, $K3=2$). The coding-unit declaration holds here also: the judgement attaches to the statutory architecture of the parliamentary procedure; the more than five thousand individual Acts are an implementation portfolio for which unit sampling is proposed.²¹ The regime judgement rests not on the immiseration thesis but on the translation threshold undisputed even by revisionist historiography (Neeson, 1993; Shaw-Taylor, 2001); the export of "improvement" ideology to Bengal is the framework's documented transfer link (Guha, 1963; 7.1). The outside was open-but-frictional (the Settlement Act); the making of the dispossessed villager, through vagrancy law, into the moral author of his own poverty is the first serial record of homovictimisation. **The Ring cartel (1870-1934):** the world's news field was closed ex ante into territories by the secret contract of 1870; the AP "outside" was built largely through intra-cartel negotiation (Silberstein-Loeb, 2014); the cartel's central bureau is the single-domain proto-integrator. **Stay-behind (1949-1990):** the evidence is held to the cautious core (Andreotti's admission; European Parliament resolution, 1990; national inquiries; Nuti, 2007); the purest form of weak contestability within institutional democracy — the subject of contestation structurally excluded from knowledge; the dossier static; mode $K1[C]$. **Bretton Woods (1944-):** "purely economic" conditionality rewrites the borrowing state's policy horizon before its decision (coding unit: the programme documents of the conditionality architecture; individual country programmes are an implementation portfolio). **COVAX (2020-) — comparative side-case.** COVAX is not a continuation of Bretton Woods and is coded in its own sentence, with its own evidential status: what it shares is the analogical state-scale pattern of responsabilisation — failure belonging to dose-sharing decisions and an unaltered patent-market architecture, responsibility written to the recipient in the language of "absorption capacity" — and a conditionality homology; no institutional continuity is claimed.

7.3 Hinge Cases: Completing Rupture Capacity on a Single Wing

The financial addressing complex (SWIFT, 1973-2025): institution-addressed foundation, switch capacity (2012; 2022), the shield of "the law compels us"; the OFAC designations of 2025 lowered the unit of address from institution to person (U.S. Department of the Treasury, 2025; supporting first-person testimony of lived effect: Le Monde, 2025); the closing of accounts even by banks under no legal obligation (de-risking; World Bank, 2015) is the multi-source anchor of the category's priority over reality; the outside is buildable-but-costly and, when built, is built as a replica of the position. **Credit scoring (1956/1989-):** mass-singular dynamic addressability established by mid-century; closure remained domain-specific; the FCRA channel present-but-weak — the farthest point a layer can reach alone; the archival ground of the dossier→score→ontology line is Lauer (2017); mode a hybrid $K1[A/C]$ — the file compiled independently of the subject's approach, access conditioned upon the file. **Object hinges:** (i) the vehicle-telematics→insurance line — that driving-behaviour data flowed through data brokers to insurers and generated premium and access consequences was documented in 2024 through journalism and litigation records: the mini-circuit object (8a) → translation-scoring (8b-8d) → insurance consequence (8e); trans-domain, and — the five functions dispersed across actors — the first concrete coding of distributed-composite occupancy; the termination of data-sharing programmes after exposure is the counter-pressure record that the circuit can be opened, and the case is coded double-use; (ii) starter-interrupt devices —

the vehicle rendered remotely unstartable upon missed payments in subprime auto credit: the documented joint of the credit layer with material actuation; (iii) the prepayment meter and "self-disconnection" — the cut-off appearing in the administrative record as customer choice: the pure object-scale form of homovictimisation — and, under the revised definition (Section 6), its cleanest laboratory: the survival tactic — rationing, self-disconnection — is recorded by the system in the language of choice, and the record then stands as the very document of the subject's responsibility. No object line yields rupture alone; together the three document the widening of the rupture surface — with the scope and continuity sub-dimensions²² marked line by line: the telematics line was interrupted, on the continuity dimension, by exposure; the starter-interrupt and meter lines are records of routine operation.

7.4 Rupture: The Integrator Position and Its Occupants (2003-2026)

The intra-state occupant — the Chinese health-code complex. The coding-unit rule applies symmetrically here: "the Chinese health code" is itself a portfolio — a national framework realised in provincial and municipal implementations on differing platforms — and is coded as two separate cases. **(a) The general pandemic regime (statutory-and-architecture unit; national framework with provincial implementations):** the strongest rupture case in the present record — the case in which, within that record, mechanism and effect are most fully documented together: the de facto closure of code-less public existence during the period is multi-sourced; the composition of payment, movement and health layers in a single QR status, and the status's return as consequence into the domains of access, documents circuit closure (M3); the K4=2 judgement satisfies the two-independent-domain rule with separate evidence in movement, payment and public access; scope (population scale) and continuity (routine operation through the period) are likewise documented. **(b) Henan 2022 (point case: a province, a month, an identified subject group):** the codes of bank depositors turned red on grounds external to health, without appeal, local officials later punished (Reuters, 2022) — the anchor of non-appealability (K3=2) and, more importantly, of the circuit's re-targetability: a health circuit re-aimed at a financial-protest group — a distinct observable property, kin to dormancy, entered in the catalogue.²³ The point case does not carry the general regime's scope; the general regime does not rest on the point case. The matched comparison stands: the same carrier is sub-threshold in the EU articulation (the Digital COVID Certificate: monopoly-free translation, judicial review and a sunset written into the regulation hold the circuit open; European Union, 2021) — the case-level proof of the carrier-constant/regime-variable thesis; the transfer of the certificate infrastructure to the WHO's global network (WHO, 2023) is at once a dormancy record and a record of the position's continuity.

The commercial occupant — Palantir. What is documented is architecture and intent (contracts, freedom-of-information records, the product language's own avowal, the S-1's aim of "becoming the default" for sectors, the self-doctrine; Palantir Technologies, 2020; Karp and Zamiska, 2025). The coding-unit rule is enforced without exception here: **K1-K5 are properties not of a firm but of a particular deployment's effects upon subjects.** Palantir's platform architecture carries the capacity to generate the K1-K5 profile; **the final K code is awarded only at the level of a specific deployment, period, institution and subject group.** Two deployment lines are accordingly coded apart, and they are not the same feedback instance. The ICE/Maven line is a security-targeting circuit: the target package is produced before the decision; the "human in the loop" decides, but the world in which she decides has been pre-narrowed (Amoore, 2013); the package's passage into operational enforcement is the documented record of feedback, and the nearest evidence of single-subject cross-domain closure lies — partially (K4=1-2 under the two-domain rule: the finance domain docu-

mented through the sanctions intersection, the movement domain partial) — at the intersection of the target-packaged subject with the financial addressing complex; mode K1[C]. The NHS-FDP line is largely a within-domain circuit: health data returning into health-internal flow priority (NHS England, 2023) — high in circuit degree yet single-domain, unusable as evidence of trans-domain closure (K4=2); the evidence it does carry is of the state's feeder-exposed position (Section 6); mode K1[A]. The collective judgement is framed accordingly: what Palantir evidences is not a cross-domain circuit closing upon a single subject but **the same function sequence recurring, as architecture, across institutions** — which weakens the single-circuit rupture claim and strengthens the position thesis: the portability of the function sequence from institution to institution is direct evidence of the position's independence from occupant and from any single deployment. What the record shows is a position that travels. The rupture judgement is a candidate at the level of architecture; **the circuit's scope, continuity and counterfactual effect upon subjects remain the open question** (the documentation limit of Section 3).

The consortium occupant — the Abu Dhabi TAMM complex (declared-architecture case). The case introduces a documentary type new to the record: architecture presented rather than pried open. Where the Palantir record was assembled from freedom-of-information releases and procurement files, here the state announces the position from its own official organ: a digital strategy investing at scale in an AI-enabled government (Abu Dhabi Government, 2025a); a common digital backbone with sovereign cloud, life-event monitoring, predictive decision processing and cross-entity service orchestration (Department of Government Enablement, 2025a); a platform executing on the user's behalf across more than 1,100 services, with an expanding composition spanning health, family, mobility, property, insurance and private-sector services (TAMM 4.0; Department of Government Enablement, 2025b; Abu Dhabi Government, 2025c); an API-First policy establishing public-private connection as default state policy (UAE Cabinet, 2025a); a Microsoft-G42 sovereign-cloud arrangement targeting full process automation (Abu Dhabi Government, 2025b); a regulatory-intelligence ecosystem binding legislation, judicial decisions, administrative process and field systems into an AI loop that monitors social effects and generates legislative updates (UAE Cabinet, 2025b); a federal programme to deploy agentic AI across half of government sectors within two years (UAE Cabinet, 2026); and institutional governance concentrated in a council spanning policy, regulation, investment and implementation (UAE President / Abu Dhabi Government, 2025). Every source is a self-document and is coded at intent status — the state-scale counterpart of the S-1, with the Ethical Charter supplying the doctrine layer (UAE Cabinet, 2024). The coding-unit rule and the five-step evidentiary hierarchy (E8) govern the judgement: steps one to three — strategy, platform, statute — are strongly present; steps four and five — the specific deployment upon a subject, and the contestation record — are absent. First-pass judgement: ontological composition strongly documented; the integrator position expressly designed and partly in operation, supplying the first full case of the public-private consortium occupancy type that the NHS-FDP articulation only approximated; a strong M3 candidate; trans-domain subject closure not shown; the ineffectiveness of contestation not established — **not an On-opticon; an advanced Onopticon-architecture candidate**. Three observations are entered. First, the declared architecture displaces, without refuting, the dual-archive thesis: the public/operational division no longer runs along the architecture/effect line but along the capacity-declaration/subject-level-consequence line — doctrine's cheapness extends here to the architecture itself, and what stays dear is, as ever, the layer that gives contestation an address. Second, the regulatory-intelligence ecosystem is the first documentable pathway for the open hypothesis of 7.5: where the normative layer becomes an output of the circuit (norm-

ative feedback, E0), the channel of contestation is rendered endogenous to what it would audit. Third, the contestation architecture is statutorily split: Federal Decree-Law 45/2021 supplies K3-F (arts. 13, 18: information rights, objection to automated decisions) while its art. 2 exemption withholds the channel precisely from the state segment in which the circuit lives — the statutory form of the K3 decay prediction: form granted where legitimacy is cheap, effect withheld where contestation is dear; article-level audit pending. The asymmetry prediction is accordingly pre-registered: absent counter-pressure engraved at the circuit's own segment, the position will consolidate in the closed mode — the framework's second prospective natural experiment, entered in the matrix with the date of this first pass.

The state-commercial occupant — the Maven Smart System and the public admission of the closed circuit. The evidentiary status of the Maven line changed with the March 2026 AIPCon 9 presentation by the Department's Chief Digital and Artificial Intelligence Officer. The record is not an independent audit and is read under the controlled-disclosure rule (Section 1): official and promotional, it is primary evidence for the functions its state operator and commercial occupant expressly admit, and the architecture it shows is an operational floor, not a ceiling. Within that floor, the demonstrated workflow supplies the five functions of the integrator position in sequence: heterogeneous sensor and operational feeds made accessible (8a); carried through an abstraction layer and shared ontology (8b); correlated into an operational object — in the demonstration, narrowed to a specific vehicle in a parking lot (8c); converted into courses of action and an assessment of the appropriate asset (8d); and returned into material execution through the same environment (8e), the operator's own words closing the loop — from identifying the target, to a course of action, to actioning it, "all within one system." The record establishes M3 at the declared security-targeting unit: not an architecture merely capable of closing, but the closed circuit publicly narrated and demonstrated by its state operator, and, by the March 2026 programme-of-record decision (as reported; primary-document confirmation pending), passing from pilot into permanent infrastructure.

Contestability is assessed from the position of the targeted subject (Section 3). Command approval, legal review and a human-in-the-loop may regulate the circuit internally; they do not supply the target with knowledge of the category, standing to challenge it, or a route capable of altering the consequence before feedback becomes irreversible. At the declared unit the subject is structurally excluded from all three conditions; K3=2 follows. The target is pre-recognised while the operator is pre-optioned: the target object, the relevant information, the available courses of action, the appropriate means and the decision tempo are constituted upstream, and the decision remains human in attribution while becoming infrastructural in constitution. The category "legitimate target" is itself a circuit output, closed to the subject's challenge and redefinable by the power that sets it — the lethal cognate of evidentiary capture.

The case also exposes the terminal route of closure ($K4=2[T]$). The output of the demonstrated circuit is not a security classification remaining within one administrative domain; it is the passage of the classified target into material execution, and where that execution extinguishes the subject's capacity to enter any subsequent domain, the viable-outside question receives its strongest possible negative answer. This is not one effect multiplied into several domains but the removal of the capacity to encounter any further domain — the logical limit of the test, generated through the documented circuit, under K3=2, upon the Department-scaled singular target-addressability that satisfies K5=2. The resulting configuration is **M3 $\wedge$ K4=2[T] $\wedge$ K3=2, upon K5=2: at this declared coding unit, Maven is an Onopticon** — not a sibling of the civil cases set outside the framework, but the security-domain instance of the same regime type, differing from the Chinese complex not in kind but in evidence profile:

its mechanism is more openly documented (narrated by its operator) and its subject-side effect less so (behind the fog of war and the controlled-disclosure boundary), where the Chinese case is documented at both ends by post-hoc civil record.

The occupant judgement remains distinct from the regime judgement. Palantir is not named the Onopticon; it occupies the commercial side of a state-commercial integrator position whose access, authority, data production and enforcement capacity remain state-carried. The regime is the closed Maven circuit; Palantir is one of its occupants — and the Google→Palantir substitution, with the further reported withdrawal of a follow-on contractor in 2026, records again that the withdrawal of one occupant does not interrupt the function sequence: the position expanded under the next. The case therefore strengthens both wings at once — the existence of a concrete regime and the independence of the position from any single occupant. The Maven line accordingly ceases to be coded as portable architecture only; it is coded as a rupture case, upon the controlled-disclosure floor, with the subject-side record marked as the zone the public archive withholds.

7.5 Discriminant Power and Boundary Tests

X-Road is doubly negative: the circuit does not close (no cross-domain outcome, no feedback) and contestation is engraved (e-Estonia, n.d.) — the independence of the two negatives yields a fertile open question: can an $M3 \wedge K3=0$ case be observed? If observed, it is settled that what blocks the regime is contestation, not the circuit; if none is found, the hypothesis that the closed circuit structurally erodes contestation gains strength. The SMTP-procedural-threshold pair is the double refusal of determinism: the same function can be organised without a regime; the regime logic can be built without technology. Nobel (a recognition infrastructure; the sealed-calendared archive type) and the WHO (a legitimacy node) are negative. Medieval excommunication (Vodola, 1986) is the pre-modern precursor of subject-scale multi-domain closure, but it could not scale — the pattern coded as enclave closure (E0) — rupture is the composite of mass singularisation, computational pre-processing and continuous updating; the Criminal Tribes Act (7.1) confirms the same refinement at imperial scale: the proto-circuit existed; dynamism and singularity did not. The WikiLeaks blockade (2010-13) is the boundary test of the carrier thesis: multi-firm simultaneous closure without official authority (Benkler, 2011) generates the shadow-authority mode and rewrites the thesis in weakened form; a layer reading is added — the blockade was the closure of a single layer, and that a crypto-outside could be built (composition-less closure failing, even under the densest shadow authority, to reach trans-domain recursion) supports the level rule from an independent direction. The resistance record: four forms are documented (infrastructural exit; physical counter-architecture; naming and testimony; producer dissent); the common pattern is that resistance wins partial results at the layer level and is displaced at the level of the position — a pattern the tactic formulation predicts rather than merely tolerates: tactics, operating on terrain owned by another, win locally and are displaced structurally (de Certeau, 1984); the resistance record is thereby converted from a standing anomaly of the "deprived subject" into direct evidence for the revised definition of Homovictimus (Section 6) — the exception is recorded as a matter of honesty: the telematics exposure did in fact open the circuit. The dual-archive case table is in the Online Appendix.

8. FINDINGS (FIRST-PASS CODING STATUS)

(1) Regime-type validity divides across two levels: the objection "one cannot call each of these systems an Onopticon" is absorbed as the framework's own prediction, and the risk of over-ex-

tension is structurally closed; K1's mode tags ([A]/[C]) prevent a single score from concealing distinct pathways of power. (2) Rupture is a composition event whose content is circuit closure; K4=2 has been converted from a verdict on outcomes into a documentation of mechanism, bounded by the scope-continuity-counterfactual rule; K4=2 now carries two evidentiary routes (Section 3) — K4=2[D], documented narrowing across at least two independent life-domains, and K4=2[T], terminal closure produced through the documented circuit, both under the same discipline; the two separability proofs support the two wings independently, and the level rule's tautology risk is bound to a falsification condition. (3) The position is a feedback decision circuit, independent of its occupant; its continuity lies in the substitutability of the function sequence. The strongest rupture case in the present record is the Chinese general pandemic regime — the case in which, within that record, mechanism and effect are most fully documented together; it is itself coded as a portfolio, with Henan 2022 held apart as the point case anchoring non-appealability and re-targetability; Palantir's cross-institutional evidence remains the recurring architecture of a function sequence — the portability that strengthens the position thesis and carries the Google→Palantir substitution record — but this no longer holds its rupture status at architecture level alone: at the declared security-targeting unit, the Maven circuit satisfies M3, subject-side K3=2, terminal closure K4=2[T] and K5=2, and is coded a rupture case upon the controlled-disclosure floor. Palantir is not thereby identified with the regime; the regime is the closed Maven circuit, and Palantir remains the commercial occupant of a state-commercial integrator position whose access, authority and enforcement remain state-carried. K codes are awarded at deployment level only. (4) Closedness is not nature but asymmetry; the dual archive is its three-century observable consequence; the opacity-publicity paradox is resolved. (5) The state's double position is unequal along the core-periphery axis; the peripheral state's exposure is bound to the subject analogy — structural analogy, not identity: the state's exposure is not subjective experience but the position of being held responsible for outcomes while the infrastructural conditions of agency are pre-structured elsewhere; the historical constitution of that exposure is documented in colonially inherited layers; the scale-recursion record is a requirement of honesty. (6) Fragmented consent, integrated exposure: the subject is held responsible, in the language of single acts, for the consequences of a profile she produced by no single act. Homovictimus is fixed in its two-winged form — the subject compelled to convert agency into survival tactics within a pre-structured field, and held responsible for their outcomes in the language of single acts; the imposed-reality formulation that grounds it is graded — analytic, decisional, regime — its regime grade effect-bound and carried in full, within the present record, by two rupture cases with distinct evidentiary profiles — the Chinese general regime, documenting mechanism and trans-domain civil effect together, and Maven, documenting the full circuit through controlled disclosure and satisfying the equation at its declared security-targeting unit via subject-side K3=2, terminal closure K4=2[T] and K5=2 — its analytic grade (I1) licensed at statutory level by the Japanese exemption of 2026. (7) The environmental a priori: the gate disperses into the environment and the rupture surface widens; documented mini-circuits show circuit fragments closing at object scale; the judgement is measured, and the telematics exposure's opening of the circuit records that counter-pressure can succeed at object scale; consent without act reads, in mode terms, as the seepage of the compelled mode into access-conditional domains. (8) The colonial complexes are pre-forms, not rupture — and not single coding units but historical portfolios: judgements here are at the level of statutory architecture, implementation-level coding awaiting coder-independent unit sampling. The translation threshold, the proto-circuit (the Criminal Tribes Act), pure weak contestability (the indigénat) and personal-administrative composition (the cercle) are documented at high intensity in the stat-

utory architecture; what defines rupture is this bond becoming digital, dynamic and ontologically composite — a claim of structural homology, not institutional continuity (7.1). (9) Integrator power culminates in workflow capture: the position does not merely integrate records but reorganises the anatomy of institutional decision — determining what becomes an object, which relations count as relevant, which options become actionable, which means appear appropriate and at what tempo judgement must occur. The human may remain the attributed author of the final act while the field of judgement has been constituted infrastructurally; the Maven record is the clearest first-pass demonstration — the target pre-recognised and the operator pre-optioned within a single circuit publicly narrated by its state operator. (10) Pre-recognition capacities mature in the domains where closed-mode articulation is cheapest — the sovereignty-critical and security domains — and generalise into the civil domain carrying their already-decayed contestation architecture with them; military and civil circuits are not separate subjects but different feedback outputs of one infrastructure, and the assignment of a subject to one output rather than another is itself a circuit product (K1[C]). This is the historical motor of the closure asymmetry, and it places the security-targeting case not outside the framework's civil concern but at the leading edge of it.

9. CONCLUSION

The thesis defended is this: **the Onopticon is the regime type constituted where the on-optic layers of modern pre-recognition — population, health, education, law, finance, movement, profile, security, and at object scale the material environment; layers of which the state is the principal producer, licenser, standardiser, access-provider or enforcement-carrier, though not the sole originator of each — close within a decision circuit that produces cross-domain outcomes about subject or state, feeds those outcomes back into the layers — or, in its terminal form, returns the category into irreversible material execution, extinguishing the subject's capacity to enter any subsequent domain — and is shielded from effective contestation.** Each layer, most of the time, carries legitimate and vital functions; judgement attaches not to the layer but to the closing of the circuit. The historical form of the thesis is this: **the history of modern power is not the unbroken history of a single apparatus; it is the history of the transformation of the bond between record, legal status, classification and material enforcement from personal-administrative forms towards ontological, substitutable, feedback-closed circuits** — continuity is to be sought not in the name of any institution but in the historical change of form of pre-recognition itself. The circuit is independent of its occupant, and the occupant of its name; the analysis has therefore been addressed to the function sequence. The constitution of the circuit in a closed mode is not nature but a cost asymmetry operating in the absence of engraved counter-pressure; its pull is unequally distributed — epistemic dependency for the core, and for the periphery the turning of the sovereignty-critical need itself into imposition and threat: a transformation conditional, coded, historically grounded in colonially inherited layers, and — as X-Road shows — cost rather than fate. And the circuit's surface is widening: the Onopticon is constituted at the composition points not only of the institutions that record the human being but **of the material environment the human being inhabits** — as the gate disperses into the environment, the a priori ceases to be representation and becomes the milieu itself. Stated at its proper level, the subject-side thesis follows: the Onopticon is a theory not of reduced choice but of pre-structured reality — and Homovictimus is the subject compelled to convert agency into survival tactics within that field, and held responsible for their outcomes in the language of single acts. Imposed reality begins

before the decision, at the moment the subject is compelled into an unseen ontology of recognition — that is its analytic grade (I1); it becomes decisional (I2) where the category returns as consequence, and regime-level (I3) only where closure under weak contestability is documented. The Onopticon is not tested by asking whether options are merely narrowed. The question the apparatus operationalises is whether recognition, access, movement, action and contestation become practically available only on terms pre-structured elsewhere — that is, whether a viable outside remains; and that question is answered not directly but through the criteria: circuit closure documented (M3), either narrowing shown separately across at least two independent life-domains ($K4=2[D]$) or terminal closure demonstrated where the circuit extinguishes the subject's capacity to encounter any subsequent domain ($K4=2[T]$), and contestation found ineffective from the position of the classified subject ($K3=2$). The Onopticon is therefore not merely an infrastructure of recognition; it is a regime of imposed reality wherever — and only wherever — the subject is compelled to live, move, act and contest within conditions composed elsewhere, closed across the domains of a life, and shielded from effective challenge. And the Maven record supplies the terminal form of that thesis: where the integrator not only pre-structures the recognition and the options of the encounter but returns its category into irreversible material execution, imposed reality no longer names the narrowing of a future within the world; it names the infrastructural termination of the subject's capacity to encounter a future world at all — the security-domain limit of a mechanism whose civil operation is the book's subject, not its exception.

Stronger claims have deliberately not been made: single systems — and single colonial orders — have not been declared regimes; weak contestability has not been folded into the integrator position's definition; feedback documentation has been confined to mechanical constitution, with Palantir's codes held at deployment level; the imposed-reality formulation has been graded — analytic, decisional, regime — with its regime grade bound to documented effect; and rupture has not been generalised into a universal historical condition. The auxiliary theses carry their own bounds — shadow authority, scale recursion, rupture-surface status, homology and portfolio status — each recorded where it arises. The framework is a middle-range theory candidate with a defined test protocol and a presented first-pass coding. The research programme: tracking of decision-horizon metrics across occupant-substitution quasi-experiments; coding of integrator dependency and the sovereignty-critical gradient on a state sample; comparative extension of engraved-counter-pressure cases; systematic search for an $M3 \wedge K3=0$ case; systematic search for further terminal-route cases — penal execution infrastructures, lethal border and threat systems, irreversible medical decision circuits — under the case-neutral rule ($K4=2[T]$); process-tracing of transfer chains (the improvement-ideology line included); coder-independent unit sampling of the colonial portfolios and the pass-laws regime; an inventory of object-data flow contracts; two derivative studies projected from the framework rather than folded into it — a matched empirical test of when integration becomes a regime (the certificate pair, X-Road, and credit scoring under differing contestation architectures) and a study of sovereignty-critical layers and a priori dependency on a state sample; and completion of the claim-source mapping through a second-pass documentary audit. The decision to remain within diagnosis stands.

Online Appendix statement. The Operational Coding Catalogue — E0: the concept set and rules of use, ordered across the framework's four analytical levels; E1: core criteria with the K1 mode tags ([A] access-conditional / [C] compelled) and the level rule; E2: the position scale and the Onoptic-position equation, with a coding note on hybrid configurations in which discretion operates inside circuits; E3: the object-layer threshold; E4: decision rules, including

the two evidentiary routes to $K4=2$ — independent-domain closure ($K4=2[D]$, separate evidence in at least two independent life-domains) and terminal closure ($K4=2[T]$, the circuit's direct output extinguishing the capacity to encounter any subsequent domain) — under their common requirements of documented circuit, effect, scope, continuity, counterfactual relevance, subject-side $K3=2$ and scalable singular addressability; E5: pre-screening and the subject test; E6: observable variables and the circuit signature, including the scope, continuity and counterfactual-effect sub-dimensions of 8e and the re-targetability sub-indicator; E7: state-dependency and position probes; E8: the coding protocol, the coding-unit rule, coder-independent unit sampling, reliability, sampling frames and the five-step evidentiary hierarchy — strategy/policy document, platform/implementation document, statute, specific deployment upon a subject, contestation or court record — which orders documentary types by what each can evidence — together with the dual-archive case table and the claim-source mapping table, seeded below in extract, is provided as the article's online supplement.

NOTES

1. Concept set and rules of use: Online Appendix, E0.
2. Coding-unit rule, coder-independent unit sampling and sampling frames: E8.
3. Coding-unit rule, coder-independent unit sampling and sampling frames: E8.
4. Criterion definitions and the level rule: Online Appendix, E1.
5. Mode-tag coding: E1.
6. Level rule and decision rules: E1, E4.
7. The five functions as observable variables: E6.
8. Hybrid-configuration coding note: E2.
9. Scale definition: E2.
10. Scope, continuity and counterfactual-effect sub-dimensions: E6-8e.
11. Hardened $K4$ rule: E1, E4.
12. Substitution probe: E7, probe 5.
13. Pre-screening indicators: E5.
14. Operational criterion for material actuation: E6-8e.
15. Object-layer threshold: E3.
16. Coding-unit rule, coder-independent unit sampling and sampling frames: E8.
17. Coding-unit rule, coder-independent unit sampling and sampling frames: E8.
18. Infrastructural persistence (dormancy): E6-7.
19. Legitimation-practice gap variable: E6-3.
20. Coding-unit rule, coder-independent unit sampling and sampling frames: E8.
21. Coding-unit rule, coder-independent unit sampling and sampling frames: E8.
22. Scope, continuity and counterfactual-effect sub-dimensions: E6-8e.
23. Re-targetability sub-indicator: E6.

REFERENCES

- Abu Dhabi Government (2025a) *Abu Dhabi Government launches Digital Strategy 2025–2027*. Abu Dhabi Media Office, 21 January. [Self-document/intent status.]
- Abu Dhabi Government (2025b) *Abu Dhabi Government accelerates digital strategy with landmark Microsoft, G42 partnership*. Abu Dhabi Media Office, 18 March. [Self-document/intent status; sovereign-cloud arrangement.]

- Abu Dhabi Government (2025c) *Innovative initiatives and projects unveiled at Abu Dhabi Government Pavilion on day 2 of GITEX Global 2025*. Abu Dhabi Media Office, 15 October. [Self-document/intent status.]
- Amoore, L. (2013) *The Politics of Possibility: Risk and Security Beyond Probability*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Benkler, Y. (2011) 'A free irresponsible press: WikiLeaks and the battle over the soul of the networked fourth estate', *Harvard Civil Rights–Civil Liberties Law Review*, 46(2), pp. 311–397.
- Bhandar, B. (2018) *Colonial Lives of Property: Law, Land, and Racial Regimes of Ownership*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Bowker, G. C. and Star, S. L. (1999) *Sorting Things Out: Classification and Its Consequences*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Bratton, B. H. (2016) *The Stack: On Software and Sovereignty*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Census of India, 1901 (1903) *Report* (H. H. Risley, Census Commissioner; ethnographic appendices). Calcutta: Government of India. [Primary document.]
- Cohn, B. S. (1996) *Colonialism and Its Forms of Knowledge: The British in India*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Conklin, A. L. (1997) *A Mission to Civilize: The Republican Idea of Empire in France and West Africa, 1895–1930*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Couldry, N. and Mejias, U. A. (2019) *The Costs of Connection: How Data Is Colonizing Human Life and Appropriating It for Capitalism*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Creemers, R. (2018) 'China's Social Credit System: an evolving practice of control'. SSRN working paper. [Working-paper status.]
- Criminal Tribes Act 1871 (Act XXVII of 1871), esp. the provisions on registration, passes and residence restriction. Government of India. [Primary document; section-level citation: verification pending, see Online Appendix.]
- Daughton, J. P. (2021) *In the Forest of No Joy: The Congo-Océan Railroad and the Tragedy of French Colonialism*. New York: W. W. Norton. [Documented-violence record; AEF context.]
- de Certeau, M. (1984) *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Trans. S. Rendall. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Décret du 25 mai 1912 fixant les conditions d'accession des indigènes de l'Afrique occidentale française à la qualité de citoyen français, *Journal officiel de la République française*. [Primary document.]
- Deleuze, G. (1992) 'Postscript on the societies of control', *October*, 59, pp. 3–7.
- Department of Government Enablement – Abu Dhabi (2025a) *Abu Dhabi Government Digital Strategy 2025–2027 accelerates AI-native government journey*. Abu Dhabi Media Office, 30 September. [Self-document/intent status; backbone, life-event monitoring, predictive decision processing.]
- Department of Government Enablement – Abu Dhabi (2025b) *Department of Government Enablement launches TAMM 4.0 during GITEX Global 2025*. Abu Dhabi Media Office, 14 October. [Self-document/intent status; AutoGov; execution on the user's behalf.]
- Dirks, N. B. (2001) *Castes of Mind: Colonialism and the Making of Modern India*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. [The constitutive-effect thesis is contested; cited with a dispute record.]
- Easterling, K. (2014) *Extrastatecraft: The Power of Infrastructure Space*. London: Verso.
- e-Estonia (n.d.) *X-Road® data exchange layer*. Institutional documentation, accessed 15 January 2026.
- European Parliament (1990) Resolution on the Gladio affair, 22 November 1990, *Official Journal of the European Communities*, C 324.
- European Union (2016) Regulation (EU) 2016/679 (General Data Protection Regulation), art. 22.
- European Union (2021) Regulation (EU) 2021/953 (EU Digital COVID Certificate).

- Eubanks, V. (2018) *Automating Inequality: How High-Tech Tools Profile, Police, and Punish the Poor*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Fair Credit Reporting Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1681 (1970).
- Fall, B. (1993) *Le travail forcé en Afrique-Occidentale française, 1900-1946*. Paris: Karthala.
- Farrell, H. and Newman, A. L. (2019) 'Weaponized interdependence: how global economic networks shape state coercion', *International Security*, 44(1), pp. 42-79.
- Foucault, M. (2007) *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1977-78*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gabrys, J. (2016) *Program Earth: Environmental Sensing Technology and the Making of a Computational Planet*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Guha, R. (1963) *A Rule of Property for Bengal: An Essay on the Idea of Permanent Settlement*. Paris and The Hague: Mouton.
- Haggerty, K. D. and Ericson, R. V. (2000) 'The surveillant assemblage', *British Journal of Sociology*, 51(4), pp. 605-622.
- Indian Forest Act 1865; Indian Forest Act 1878, esp. the forest-settlement inquiry provisions; Indian Forest Act 1927. Government of India. [Primary documents; section-level citation: verification pending, see Online Appendix.]
- Jiji Press (2026) 'Japan eases privacy rules to boost AI development', 10 July. [Enactment report; statute text and implementing guidelines pending — see claim-source matrix.]
- Karp, A. C. and Zamiska, N. W. (2025) *The Technological Republic*. New York: Crown Currency. [Statement-of-intent status.]
- Kittler, F. A. (1985/1990) *Discourse Networks 1800/1900*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Lauer, J. (2017) *Creditworthy: A History of Consumer Surveillance and Financial Identity in America*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Le Monde (2025) 'Nicolas Guillou, French ICC judge sanctioned by the US', 19 November. [Supporting first-person testimony; not primary evidence — the evidential burden rests on the Treasury record.]
- Liang, F., Das, V., Kostyuk, N. and Hussain, M. M. (2018) 'Constructing a data-driven society: China's Social Credit System as a state surveillance infrastructure', *Policy & Internet*, 10(4), pp. 415-453.
- Loi du 28 juin 1881 (Code de l'indigénat, Algeria), *Journal officiel de la République française*. [Primary document.]
- Lyon, D. (ed.) (2003) *Surveillance as Social Sorting: Privacy, Risk, and Digital Discrimination*. London: Routledge.
- Mann, G. (2009) 'What was the indigénat? The "empire of law" in French West Africa', *Journal of African History*, 50(3), pp. 331-353. [Revisionist-calibration status.]
- Mann, M. (1984) 'The autonomous power of the state: its origins, mechanisms and results', *European Journal of Sociology*, 25(2), pp. 185-213.
- McLuhan, M. (1964) *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Neeson, J. M. (1993) *Commoners: Common Right, Enclosure and Social Change in England, 1700-1820*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- NHS England (2023) *Federated Data Platform: contract award notice*. [Public procurement record.]
- Nuti, L. (2007) 'The Italian "stay-behind" network', *Journal of Strategic Studies*, 30(6), pp. 955-980.
- Chief Digital and Artificial Intelligence Office (2026) *AI Dominance: Projects and Programs*. U.S. Department of War. [Official programme description; Maven as tactical sensor-fusion platform, the wider programme joining data integration, battle management and kill-chain execution; controlled disclosure — admitted floor.]

- Palantir Technologies (2026a) *Multi-Domain AI: The Future of Command and Control | CDAO at AIPCon 9* [video]. 13 March. [Controlled primary self-document; state operator's public demonstration of the closed targeting circuit — admitted floor, not ceiling.]
- Palantir Technologies (2026b) *Q1 2026 Business Update*. [Investor record; Maven deployed across the Department; the Ontology positioned as infrastructure joining data, logic, action and security in real time.]
- Palantir Technologies (2020) *Form S-1 Registration Statement*. U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission. [Self-document/intent status.]
- Pasquale, F. (2015) *The Black Box Society: The Secret Algorithms That Control Money and Information*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Poon, M. (2007) 'Scorecards as devices for consumer credit: the case of Fair, Isaac & Company Incorporated', *Sociological Review*, 55(s2), pp. 284–306.
- Raman, B. (2012) *Document Raj: Writing and Scribes in Early Colonial South India*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Reuters (2022) 'China bank protest stopped by health codes turning red, depositors say', 14 June. [Multi-source press record; full-text verification logged in the claim-source mapping table.]
- Rose, N. (1999) *Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rouvroy, A. and Berns, T. (2013) 'Gouvernementalité algorithmique et perspectives d'émancipation', *Réseaux*, 177(1), pp. 163–196.
- Sadowski, J. (2020) *Too Smart: How Digital Capitalism Is Extracting Data, Controlling Our Lives, and Taking Over the World*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Scott, J. C. (1998) *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Shaw-Taylor, L. (2001) 'Parliamentary enclosure and the emergence of an English agricultural proletariat', *Journal of Economic History*, 61(3), pp. 640–662.
- Silberstein-Loeb, J. (2014) *The International Distribution of News: The Associated Press, Press Association, and Reuters, 1848–1947*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Singha, R. (1998) *A Despotism of Law: Crime and Justice in Early Colonial India*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- U.S. Department of the Treasury (2025) Sanctions designations relating to the International Criminal Court, 20 August. [OFAC/SDN record.]
- UAE Cabinet (2024) *Ethical Charter of Development and Use of Artificial Intelligence*. 10 June. [Doctrine-layer document; measurement pair, with the art. 2 exemption, for the legitimization-practice gap (E6-3).]
- UAE Cabinet (2025a) *UAE Cabinet approves National Cybersecurity Strategy, API-First Policy*. 3 February. [Primary policy record; composition as default.]
- UAE Cabinet (2025b) *UAE Cabinet approves launch of first integrated regulatory intelligence ecosystem in UAE Government*. 14 April. [Self-document/intent status; normative-feedback source.]
- UAE Cabinet (2026) *New UAE Government framework to deploy Agentic AI across 50% of government sectors and operations within two years*. 23 April. [Self-document/intent status; 8d–8e capacity programme.]
- UAE President / Abu Dhabi Government (2025) *Resolution reconstituting the Artificial Intelligence and Advanced Technology Council*. Abu Dhabi Media Office, 23 October. [Institutional-governance record.]
- United Arab Emirates (2021) Federal Decree-Law No. 45 of 2021 Concerning the Protection of Personal Data, *Official Gazette* No. 712, Supplement. [Primary statute; arts. 2, 13, 18, 21; article-level audit pending.]

- van Waijenburg, M. (2018) 'Financing the African colonial state: the revenue imperative and forced labor', *Journal of Economic History*, 78(1), pp. 40–80.
- Vodola, E. (1986) *Excommunication in the Middle Ages*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Wallerstein, I. (1974) *The Modern World-System I*. New York: Academic Press.
- WHO (2023) *WHO and European Commission launch the Global Digital Health Certification Network (GDHCN)*. [Documented transfer record.]
- World Bank (2015) *Withdrawal from Correspondent Banking: Where, Why, and What to Do About It*. Washington, DC: World Bank. [De-risking report.]
- Young, A. (1801) *An Inquiry into the Propriety of Applying Wastes to the Better Maintenance and Support of the Poor*. [Report withdrawn from publication by the Board of Agriculture.]
- Zuboff, S. (2019) *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism*. London: Profile Books.

This guide is appended for orientation only. The article's claims, criteria, coding rules, and evidentiary thresholds remain governed by the main text.

READER'S GUIDE TO THE ONOPTICON: HOW TO READ PRE-STRUCTURED REALITY, ONOPTIC LAYERS, AND FEEDBACK DECISION CIRCUITS

1. The Core Claim in One Sentence

The Onopticon names the regime type constituted where the domain-specific systems through which modern power pre-recognises persons — health, payment, law, education, movement, profile, security, and at object scale the material environment — are composed into a feedback decision circuit that produces cross-domain outcomes about a subject, returns those outcomes into the subject's life-domains — or, at the terminal limit, into irreversible execution — and is shielded from effective contestation; the theory is therefore not a theory of surveillance, and not a theory of reduced choice, but a theory of pre-structured reality — of the infrastructural terms under which recognition, access, movement, action and contestation first become practically available to the subject.

2. Why the Unit Matters

The most common misreading of frameworks of this kind is the inflation error: "every database is an Onopticon." The article is built to make that error impossible, and it begins by conceding the strongest everyday objection — the health record is the condition of treatment, the civil registry of citizenship, payment addressability of economic life; taken unit by unit, calling each a "surveillance regime" is forced. The article's founding move is to absorb the objection: it is sound because the question is posed at the wrong unit. Individual systems are onoptic layers — domain-specific pre-recognition systems, each capable of compulsory recognition, foreclosure of possibility and weak contestability *within a single field*, and most of them carrying legitimate, often vital, functions. The Onopticon is constituted not in any layer but where layers are composed: where an integrator position translates records into a common ontology, correlates them upon the same subject, produces cross-domain outcomes, and feeds those outcomes back into the layers — or, at the terminal limit, into irreversible execution. A reader who remembers one thing should remember this: the regime judgement is a judgement about composition, never about a system.

3. The Four-Level Architecture

LAYER → POSITION → CIRCUIT → ONOPTICON

LEVEL	WHAT IT IS	THE QUESTION IT ANSWERS
Onoptic layer	A domain-specific pre-recognition system: recording and within-domain closure (health, payment, law, education, profile, object).	Is the subject recorded, and is possibility fore-closed inside one domain?
Integrator position	The operational position where five powers may concentrate: access, ontological translation, correlation, cross-layer outcome production, feedback. Not necessarily an institution, firm or database — it can be constituted across distributed infrastructures.	Are records translated into a common ontology and matched to the same subject?

Feedback decision circuit	The point at which categories produced about the subject return as consequences into life-domains — payment, movement, health, legal access, security, energy — or into irreversible material execution.	Does the decision come back — does the category act?
Onopticon	The closed circuit under weak contestability: closure across independent life-domains ($K4=2[D]$) or terminal closure ($K4=2[T]$), at subject scale, upon scalable singular addressability.	Do effective contestation and a viable outside remain?

The framework licenses no movement between levels without explicit evidence: a layer does not establish a circuit; a circuit does not establish rupture; and rupture does not establish a universal historical condition without case-specific proof. This is the level rule, and it is the article's spine.

4. The Difference Between Surveillance and Onoptic Power

The panoptic tradition asks who is watched, by whom, and with what awareness. The Onopticon asks a prior question: under what conditions does the subject become recognisable, addressable, classifiable, movable, payable, contestable at all? The object of the theory is addressability, not visibility. What matters is not simply that the subject is seen, but that the terms of every future encounter — with the clinic, the bank, the border, the platform, the meter — are prepared before the subject arrives at them. This is why the article speaks of an a priori: the field of encounter is constituted before experience, first by institutional records, then, at object scale, by the networked environment itself, where the gate disperses from the registry office into the dwelling, the vehicle and the meter, and translation ceases to be an act the subject performs and becomes a condition the subject inhabits.

5. Fragmented Consent, Integrated Exposure

The subject enters each layer by a separate gate — as patient, taxpayer, debtor, user, citizen, traveller, student, worker — and the consent given, or the compulsion borne, at each gate is directed at that domain alone. No single consent is ever directed at the composition of the layers, because the composition never once appears before the subject as something to which consent could be given. Interrogated, each layer may answer truthfully: *we merely recorded*. The exposure, meanwhile, is produced elsewhere — at the point of composition, which has no legal-phenomenological addressee. This is the formula **fragmented consent, integrated exposure**, and it explains the rupture-form of weak contestability mechanically: there is no gate at which to contest, because the federated ontology stands behind no gate.

6. The Three Grades of Imposition (I1-I3)

The article grades imposition through a derived index that introduces no new criterion — it names configurations of the existing apparatus.

I1 — analytic imposition. The subject is included, without consent and without sight, in an ontology she neither authors, contests, nor exits: non-consensual, unseen ontological inclusion (the condition of analytical enclosure). Because I1 requires the enclosure conditions and not mere integration, consensual, logged, visible integration — Estonia's X-Road — opens no grade at all.

I2 — decisional imposition. A category returns as a consequence into a life-domain: payment, movement, health, law, education, housing, communication, energy, access. The decision has come back.

I3 — regime-level imposition. The circuit closes across at least two independent life-domains under weak contestability, upon population-scale, mass-singular addressability. Only here does the unqualified word "imposed" apply, and only with documented effect.

Two sentences carry the discipline. First: I1 does not establish I3 — the level rule remains intact; a population included in an unseen ontology is not yet a population enclosed in a regime. Second: I3 is never constituted without I1 — every regime begins as an enclosure that nobody contested, because nobody could see it. The second sentence is bound, not bare: should a closed circuit ever be documented arising from consensual, visible, effectively contestable inclusion, the sentence falls.

7. Homovictimus

Homovictimus is not the passive victim, and not simply the subject with narrowed agency. It is the subject compelled to convert agency into tactics of survival on terrain pre-structured elsewhere — and then held responsible, in the language of free single acts, for the outcomes of those tactics. The cleanest illustration in the case record is the prepayment meter: the household that rations itself into "self-disconnection" performs a survival tactic, the system records the cut-off as customer choice, and the record then stands as the very document of the subject's responsibility. The tactic is not the sign of freedom; it is the evidence of the field. Both wings of the definition are constitutive: remove the tactical wing and the concept collapses into passive victimhood, contradicted by the documented resistance record; remove the responsabilisation wing and it collapses into mere constraint.

8. The State and the Core-Periphery Axis

The state occupies a double position. As feeder, it is the principal producer, licensor, standardiser, access-provider or enforcement-carrier of the layers and the ground of the position. As exposed, once the position is occupied by another, the data-supplying state no longer reads its own records: it feeds an ontology controlled elsewhere and sees its own a priori through the integrator's interface. Between the subject and the peripheral state the article draws a structural analogy, never an identity: the subject experiences conditional inclusion; the peripheral state occupies the structural position of being held responsible for sovereign decisions and outcomes while the infrastructural conditions of its agency are pre-structured elsewhere — often in layers inherited from colonial administration, so that the exposure is older than the state that bears it. Two records keep the analogy honest: exit from an external position most often erects a second position around a new centre (scale recursion); and a small, peripherally placed state has built its own position open (X-Road) — the asymmetry is cost, not fate.

9. Case Map for Beginners

CASE	WHAT IT SHOWS	IS IT THE ONOPTICON?
Enclosure (1750–1830)	A layer can cross the regime threshold: the undocumented right deemed not to exist.	No — single-domain regime; one domain closed, not a life.
Consumer credit scoring	A layer can reach mass-singular dynamic addressability decades before AI and still remain domain-specific.	No — the layer does not suffice for rupture (first separability proof).
X-Road (Estonia)	Maximal integration can coexist with engraved, effective contestation.	No — the negative case; composition does not suffice for a regime (second separability proof).

Chinese general pandemic regime	Mechanism and effect documented together: circuit closure, two-domain narrowing, population scale, routine continuity.	The strongest rupture case in the present record.
Maven Smart System (7.4)	The operator-admitted closed targeting circuit: functions 8a–8e narrated and demonstrated by the state operator; the second empirical route to K4=2.	An Onopticon at the declared security-targeting unit — same regime type, terminal route (K4=2[T]), distinct evidence profile.
Palantir	A function sequence recurring, as architecture, across institutions — a position that travels.	Candidate at architecture level only; K codes are awarded per deployment, and effect remains the open question.
Object hinges (telematics; starter-interrupt; prepayment meters)	Circuit fragments closing at object scale; the decision lived as the behaviour of the thing.	No single line yields rupture; together they widen the rupture surface.
Japanese AI-data consent exemption (2026)	I1 licensed at population scale, including sensitive categories capable of C-mode use; the contestation window rendered unconstructible at inclusion.	No — analytic imposition is not regime-level imposition; an enabling event, not a circuit.

10. What This Article Does Not Claim

- That every database is an Onopticon.
- That every AI system is a regime.
- That every layer automatically produces rupture.
- That Palantir alone is the Onopticon: the analysis is addressed to the position, not the occupant.
- That every data-collection practice is regime-level imposition: most practice sits at layer level, and much of it never opens a grade.
- That resistance is impossible: four forms are documented, and one — the telematics exposure — did in fact open a circuit.
- That colonial administration was already the full digital Onopticon: the colonial complexes are pre-forms, coded as portfolios, related by structural homology and documented transfer, not institutional continuity.

11. What This Article Does Claim

- That the regime emerges where layers are composed, not in any layer.
- That the decisive mechanism is feedback: the return of the category as consequence.
- That contestability is the threshold: integration whose channel of reverse penetration has been severed is what constitutes a regime.
- That imposition may begin before any decision, at the level of unseen ontological inclusion (I1) — while full regime-level imposition (I3) requires either independent-domain closure (K4=2[D]) or terminal closure (K4=2[T]), together with weak contestability and scalable singular addressability.
- That closedness is not the nature of power but a cost asymmetry, alterable by counter-pressure engraved into the architecture.
- That the Reality Paradigm studies the pre-structuring of the conditions of encounter, not merely the observation of conduct within them.

12. Suggested Reading Path

Read the Abstract and Section 1 first, to see the founding move: the objection absorbed, the question displaced. Then Section 2, for the layer/composition distinction and the two separability proofs. Then Section 3, for the integrator position, the M-scale and the hardened K4 rule. Then Section 6, for the subject: pre-structured reality, the grades of imposition, Homovictimus, and the state analogy. Then Section 7, for the cases — reading 7.5 (the negative cases and boundary tests) is as important as reading 7.4 (rupture). Finish with the Findings and the Conclusion, and treat the Online Appendix (E0–E8) as the article's rulebook: every load-bearing term has a row there, with a definition and a rule of use.

13. Glossary

TERM	MEANING
Onopticon	The regime type constituted where onoptic layers close within a feedback decision circuit shielded from effective contestation. A regime judgement, never a property of a single system.
Onoptic layer	A domain-specific pre-recognition system capable of compulsory recognition, foreclosure of possibility and weak contestability within one field.
Pre-recognition	The prior translation of persons, objects, relations or territories into administratively actionable categories before a later decision.
Integrator position	The operational position coordinating access, translation, correlation, outcome production and feedback across layers; independent of its occupant.
Feedback decision circuit	The sequence in which a category produced through inter-layer composition is returned as consequence into a life-domain or into irreversible material execution.
Weak contestability	The absence or weakness of a timely, intelligible and effective route to challenge a category and its consequences; anchored by the formal/effective (K3-F/E) distinction.
Closure asymmetry	Absent engineered counter-pressure, closed articulation is systematically cheaper for power than open articulation; closedness is cost, not fate.
Environmental a priori	The material-environmental mode of infrastructural pre-recognition: the conditions of encounter pre-structured through networked objects and spaces.
Fragmented consent	Consent or compulsion encountered separately at each layer, each directed at one domain only.
Integrated exposure	The exposure produced by the unannounced composition of the layers, to which no single consent was ever directed.
Analytic imposition (I1)	Non-consensual, unseen ontological inclusion: the subject compelled into an ontology she neither sees, authors, contests, nor exits.
Decisional imposition (I2)	A category returned as consequence into a life-domain.
Regime-level imposition (I3)	Regime-level closure under weak contestability and scalable singular addressability, reached through either independent-domain closure ($K4=2[D]$) or terminal closure ($K4=2[T]$); the only grade the unqualified word "imposed" names.
Homovictimus	The subject compelled to convert agency into survival tactics within a pre-structured field, and held responsible for their outcomes in the language of free single acts.
Sovereignty-critical layer	Pre-recognition infrastructure a state cannot practically forgo if it is to sustain sovereign functions: financial addressability, health certification, development finance, the security umbrella.
Reality Paradigm	The framework's proper name: the study of how the conditions of encounter are pre-structured through technical, legal, administrative and material infrastructures.

14. Final Summary

The article's importance lies in a displacement. Theories of modern power have long asked what happens to the subject after the fact — who watches, who coerces, who excludes, and with what justification. The Onopticon asks what has already happened before the fact: how the conditions under which reality becomes accessible, navigable, contestable or closed to the subject are composed in advance, across layers no one of which is illegitimate, by a position no one of which is its permanent occupant, through a circuit that returns its categories as the texture of daily life. The decisive issue is no longer only surveillance, coercion or exclusion after the decision; it is the prior composition of the decision's world. And the framework insists, against its own temptation to generality, that this diagnosis be earned case by case: shown at a declared unit, graded, bounded by falsification conditions, and tested against the standing possibility — proven once already, in a small Baltic state — that the same integrative capacity can be built open.

ONLINE APPENDIX — E0: CONCEPT SET AND RULES OF USE

Boundary declaration. The concept set fixes the article's terms of analysis and their rules of use; operational variables, indicators, scales and thresholds are defined in the Coding Catalogue (E1–E8). The two instruments are complementary, not duplicates: a concept row states what a term means and how it may not be used; a catalogue entry states how it is measured. Entries are ordered across the framework's four analytical levels — process, unit, mechanism, regime — followed by subject- and state-side concepts and historical categories.

CONCEPT	DEFINITION	RULE OF USE
Reality Paradigm	The middle-range theoretical framework developed here for analysing how conditions of encounter are pre-structured through technical, legal, administrative and material infrastructures. The name registers the framework's object: the pre-structuring of the conditions of encounter — recognition, access, movement, action, contestation — rather than the observation of conduct within them.	The proper name of the framework, not a synonym for the Onopticon.
Pre-recognition	The prior translation of persons, objects, relations or territories into administratively actionable categories before a later decision is formally made.	The broadest process term in the framework. It may occur without producing an Onopticon.
Translation threshold	The point at which only what can be translated into the system's format is recognised, and the untranslatable is deemed not to exist.	The historiography-independent ground of the enclosure and colonial judgements; it does not depend on immiseration or constitutive-effect theses.
Onoptic layer	A domain-specific pre-recognition system capable of compulsory recognition, foreclosure of possibility and weak contestability within a single field.	A layer is not itself an Onopticon. Health, payment, education, law, profile and object systems may be layers.
K1[A]: access-conditional recognition	Recognition required in order to obtain a service, legal status, market access, mobility or another necessary good.	Used where the subject must enter a system in order to access a domain.
K1[C]: compelled categorisation	Recognition imposed by a legal, security or administrative apparatus regardless of voluntary approach by the subject.	Used where the subject is classified, monitored, restricted or targeted without seeking entry into the relevant system.
	The pre-conditioning, within a domain, of whether a practical option becomes	

Foreclosure of possibility	accessible to the subject before a decision is visibly or formally made. It appears empirically as the narrowing of viable options; narrowing is the criterion's measurement footprint, not its core.	Refers to K2 and remains domain-bounded: trans-domain closure is K4's object, never K2's. It is not identical with a later denial or sanction.
Weak contestability	The absence or weakness of a timely, intelligible and effective route through which a subject can challenge, correct or reverse a category and its consequences.	Refers to K3. It concerns the architecture of contestation, not the quantity of protest. On the precedent of the K1 mode tags, the score is anchored — not extended — by a formal/effective distinction: K3-F, a legal or procedural channel exists; K3-E, the subject can know the category, has standing to invoke the channel, and the channel's capacity to alter the consequence is documented — where any of the three fails, the channel is decorative. Anchors: K3=0, a channel both formal and effective (X-Road: the access log gives contestation material traction); K3=1, a formal channel that is costly, delayed, opaque or of limited effect (the FCRA line: present-but-weak); K3=2, no channel or a decorative one (the indigénat; Henan 2022; Gladio — the subject structurally excluded even from knowing the category). The closure asymmetry (Section 4) predicts the decay path: under cost pressure channels rot from E to F — form retained because legitimacy is cheap, effectiveness withheld because contestation is dear — so the empirical frequency of F-present/E-absent configurations is an independent test of the asymmetry thesis.
Composition	The relation through which distinct layers become connected under a shared operational logic.	Composition is necessary for rupture but does not by itself establish a regime.
Integrator position	The dynamic operational position through which access, translation, correlation, outcome production and feedback are coordinated across layers.	A position is not necessarily an institution, firm, database or state office.
Occupant	The firm, public agency, consortium or distributed network temporarily carrying the integrator position.	The occupant must be distinguished from the position. Palantir, for example, is an occupant in particular deployments, not the position itself.
Shadow authority	The prompting of closure by public officials through calls and the shadow of sanction, without formal legal order.	Categorically weaker than official authority; invoked only where documented (the WikiLeaks blockade). It bounds the carrier thesis; it does not replace it.
Feedback decision circuit	A sequence in which cross-domain categories are produced about a subject and returned as consequences into domains such as movement, payment, health, legal access, security or energy.	M3 establishes that such a circuit exists; it does not alone establish rupture.
Analytical enclosure	The condition of the data double at the moment of non-consensual correlation (8c): constituted inside an ontology it can neither see nor build, contest nor exit — by construction rather than by any further decision.	A mechanism-level concept, assigned to M2: it names the double's condition, never the subject's, and is never a regime judgement. The four properties — unseen, unbuilt, uncontestable, exitless — are constitutive of the double; the regime question remains whether the double's states return as consequences into the subject's life-domains (8e; K4). It introduces no additional criterion. The genealogical debt is to Haggerty and Ericson's data double; the addition is the enclosure framing and the level assignment. First statutory case: the Japanese consent

		exemption of 2026, which licenses correlation for AI development without any act of the subject. Its imposition-reading is I1, the analytic grade of imposition (Section 6).
Normative feedback	The configuration in which the circuit's output includes the normative layer itself: legislation, regulation and administrative rule are generated or updated by the same loop that monitors the effects of their application, so that law ceases to be only an input of the circuit and becomes its product.	An observation concept, not a criterion. Its K3 consequence is structural: where the channel of contestation is endogenous to the circuit it would audit, the channel's independence is architecturally eroded — the first documentable pathway for the open hypothesis of 7.5, that the closed circuit structurally erodes contestability. First declared case: the UAE regulatory-intelligence ecosystem (2025); operation-level documentation pending.
Onoptic position	The integrator position operating at closed-circuit degree under weak contestability: Onoptic position = integrator position (M3) $\wedge$ K3=2.	Weak contestability is not part of the integrator position's definition; it is the condition that converts an integrator position into an Onoptic one. The non-onoptic integrator position is empirically possible (X-Road). The equation is the framework's tautology guard.
Personal-administrative composition	The local concentration of heterogeneous powers in a person, bureau or discretionary office.	A historical pre-form. It is typically local, weakly archived and difficult to scale.
Ontological composition	The integration of heterogeneous records through a common data language, correlation mechanism and feedback circuit.	The scalable and substitutable form of composition characteristic of the rupture phase.
Rupture	The condition in which composition produces recursive, subject-scale and trans-domain closure under weak contestability, upon mass-singular, dynamic, population-scale addressability (K5=2).	Requires more than M3: K4=2 additionally requires separate effect evidence — narrowing of viable alternatives in at least two independent life-domains (K4=2[D]) or terminal closure (K4=2[T]); and without K5=2 there is no rupture — excommunication and the Criminal Tribes Act closed without scaling. K5 measures the addressability infrastructure, not the count of the targeted: a narrow group reached through a population-scale carrier codes K5=2 (Henan 2022); full closure without scalable addressability is enclave closure, not rupture.
Enclave closure	Full circuit closure upon a subject or group in the absence of population-scale, mass-singular addressability: multi-domain, recursive, weakly contestable — but unscaled.	A pre-form pattern, never a regime: medieval excommunication is its pure historical instance, the Criminal Tribes Act its imperial refinement. It resolves the status of configurations satisfying every condition except K5=2, and it introduces no additional criterion. Should enclave closure be shown to scale without a change in addressability infrastructure, the K5 threshold — and with it the framework's periodisation — would require revision.
Regime (genus)	The generic term for closure that has crossed the threshold profile within its declared scope; a genus of which single-domain regimes and the Onopticon are species.	"Regime" alone never means "Onopticon". A single-domain regime closes one domain and belongs to the genus; the Onopticon is the trans-domain, feedback-closed, scaled species, and the term is reserved for it.
Onopticon	The regime type constituted where onoptic layers close within a decision circuit that produces cross-domain outcomes about subject or state, feeds those outcomes	Canonical equation: Onopticon = M3 $\wedge$ K4=2 $\wedge$ K3=2, at a declared coding unit, upon K5=2. A regime judgement, never a property of a single layer, firm or state; awarded only where the rupture conditions — including K5=2 and the two-domain evidence rule — are met at a declared coding unit.

	back into the layers — or, in its terminal form, returns its category into irreversible material execution, extinguishing the subject's capacity to enter any subsequent domain — and is shielded from effective contestation.	
Pre-structured (imposed) reality	The regime-level condition in which the infrastructural terms under which recognition, access, movement, action and contestation become practically available to the subject are pre-conditioned by a closed circuit before the subject's act.	A characterisation of the Onopticon, never of a layer or of an integrator position as such. It introduces no additional criterion: it adds no empirical content beyond K1-K5, M3 and the effect sub-dimensions (E6-8e). Imposition is graded (Section 6) by the derived index I1-I3, which introduces no new criterion: I1, analytic — non-consensual, unseen ontological inclusion ($\equiv M2 \wedge$ the enclosure conditions; see Analytical enclosure); I2, decisional — the category returned as consequence (8e); I3, regime — an M3 circuit closed under weak contestability upon $K5=2$, through either $K4=2[D]$ or $K4=2[T]$, with documented effect ($I3 \equiv M3 \wedge (K4=2[D] \vee K4=2[T]) \wedge K3=2$, on $K5=2$). The unqualified term refers to I3, which may be asserted only where effect is documented; elsewhere the modality is "pre-structured" or a grade marker, and the status candidacy.
Viable outside	A practical route through which a subject can still live, move, transact, access rights or sustain a social existence beyond the circuit's closure.	"Outside" does not mean total exit from society; it means a materially viable alternative line.
Closure asymmetry	The proposition that, absent engineered counter-pressure, closed articulation tends to be less costly and more advantageous for power than open articulation.	Not an essentialist claim that power can never operate openly.
Contestation-window asymmetry	The structural non-simultaneity of contestability and consequence: at the moment of inclusion, contestation is possible but objectless; at the moment of circuit closure, the consequence is visible but contestation is shielded. The subject never encounters a moment at which the harm is both present and contestable.	The institutional-scale generalisation of contestation without object (E5) and the temporal face of the closure asymmetry (§4): the a priori can be stockpiled; contestation cannot. It does not by itself establish $K3=2$; it predicts where $K3-E$ will fail, and it converts "imposition begins at pre-recognition" into its calibrated form — what is imposed at inclusion is the analytic grade — the enclosure of the double — together with the advance cheapening of the regime's future closure; the regime grade is not. Its limit form is inclusion without event: where the consent requirement is removed, inclusion ceases to occur as an event for the subject — dated, addressed, recorded — so the window is not narrow but unconstructible; and with the consent record goes the standing-anchor of future contestation ($K3-E$), for an ontology without an act-genealogy leaves objection nothing to hold. It introduces no additional criterion. First statutory case: the 2026 Japanese revision, whose penalty regime prices only mass breaches (affecting more than 1,000 subjects), leaving the subject-scale window unpriced.
Statutory antedating	The legal conversion of de facto ante-actum inclusion into de jure priority: the statute does not create the earliness of the a priori — practice had already moved inclusion before the subject's act — but antedates it	The statutory counterpart of the architectural dispersal of the gate (Section 5): the act→condition transformation has two instruments, architectural and statutory, and the statutory one is the cheaper — its purchase is what the closure asymmetry predicts. It introduces no additional criterion. First statutory case: the Japanese consent exemption of 2026.

	in law, erasing the legal-risk cost of pre-actum inclusion and inverting the norm/exception polarity between consent and exemption.	
Counter-pressure	Institutional, legal, technical or procedural mechanisms that make access, explanation, correction, audit or appeal materially effective.	Examples include access logs, judicial review, correction rights, sunset clauses and enforceable transparency duties.
Environmental a priori	The material-environmental mode of the infrastructural a priori, in which the conditions of encounter are pre-structured through networked objects, infrastructures and spaces.	Not a third a priori; it is the environmental extension of infrastructural pre-recognition.
Sensor layer	An object-scale layer that is subject-matchable and transmits data beyond the immediate device or household.	A sensor layer does not itself establish material enforcement.
Actuator layer	An object-scale layer in which a category or decision is returned as a remotely mediated material consequence.	Examples include a vehicle that will not start, a lock that will not open, or a meter that disconnects.
Fragmented consent, integrated exposure	The condition in which consent or compulsion is encountered separately at each layer, while exposure is generated by their unannounced composition.	Applies primarily to individual subjects.
Fragmented commitment, integrated exposure	The state-scale analogue in which separate treaties, memberships, standards or dependencies combine into an exposure not assumed through any single commitment.	Applies to states only by structural analogy, never as a claim of identical experience.
Homovictimus	The subject compelled to convert agency into tactics of survival within a field whose infrastructural conditions have been pre-structured elsewhere, and held responsible, in the language of free single acts, for the outcomes of those tactics.	Both wings are constitutive: without the tactical wing the concept collapses into passive victimhood — contradicted by the resistance record (7.5); without the responsabilisation wing it collapses into mere constraint. Properly refers to human subjects; institutional and state uses are explicitly analogical.
Feeder-exposed state	A state that supplies data, legitimacy, standards or operational capacity to an integrator position while becoming dependent on that position's ontology or interface.	The state may simultaneously be a producer of layers and an object of exposure.
Sovereignty-	A layer a state cannot practically forgo if it is to sustain	Dependency on such a layer does not automatically establish exposure; three conditions must hold — the relevant position is ex-

critical layer	sovereign functions, such as financial addressability, health certification, development finance or a security umbrella.	ternally occupied, state-scale contestability is weak, and the circuit can close upon that state's subjects or institutions.
A priori dependency	The pre-processing of a peripheral state's decision horizon, before its own decision, within externally occupied circuits.	Distinguishes the periphery thesis from surplus-transfer claims of the dependency/world-systems vein; it is a claim about the horizon of decision, not the flow of value.
Scale recursion	The tendency of exit from an external position to erect a second position around a new centre.	A record of honesty, not of futility: it converts the exit narrative from liberation to change of position; it does not deny that positions can be built open (X-Road).
Colonial pre-form complex	A historical portfolio in which record, legal status, classification and material enforcement were densely linked without yet becoming a dynamic, population-scale, ontologically composed circuit.	A pre-form is not an early Onopticon. The relation is structural homology, not presumed institutional continuity.

This concept set distinguishes four analytical levels: process (pre-recognition), unit (onoptic layer), mechanism (integrator position and feedback circuit), and regime (Onopticon). The framework should not move from one level to another without explicit evidence. A layer does not establish a circuit; a circuit does not establish rupture; and rupture does not establish a universal historical condition without case-specific proof. The set is also register-stratified: the same conceptual family speaks in modalities calibrated to level and evidence — the translation threshold says "deemed not to exist" (domain-internal, read from the document); K2 says "pre-conditioned accessibility", measured through its narrowing footprint; K4 says "documented narrowing in at least two independent life-domains" (the evidence rule); and the regime characterisation says "pre-structured", grading "imposition" (I1 analytic → I2 decisional → I3 regime) and reserving the unqualified regime sense for documented effect. The gradient is not an inconsistency but a discipline: modality strengthens only as level rises and evidence accumulates.

ONLINE APPENDIX — SEED CLAIM-SOURCE MATRIX (EXTRACT)

The full claim-source mapping accompanies the coding catalogue; the extract below seeds it for the load-bearing judgements. Each row runs: claim → document → document type → coding criterion → score → uncertainty note. Items awaiting archival confirmation are flagged pending.

CLAIM	DOCUMENT	DOCUMENT TYPE	CRITERION	SCORE	UNCERTAINTY NOTE
Code-less public existence was de facto closed during the pandemic period (China, general regime)	Multi-source press and administrative records, 2020–22	Secondary, multi-source	K4=2 (two-domain rule: movement, payment, public access)	K4=2	Full-text audit of provincial variation pending
Depositors' health codes turned red on grounds external to health, without appeal (Henan, June 2022)	Reuters, 14 June 2022; subsequent disciplinary announcements	Multi-source press + administrative follow-up	K3=2; re-targetability (E6)	K3=2	Local disciplinary records pending
Target packages are produced prior to enforcement decisions (ICE/ICM deployment)	FOIA releases; procurement records	Disclosed primary-adjacent documents	8d–8e (mechanical circuit closure)	M3 at deployment level; K4=1–2	Counterfactual effect unmeasured; scope audit pending
Patient-flow prioritisation runs through the platform ontology (NHS-FDP)	Contract award notice (NHS England, 2023)	Public procurement record	M-degree; single-domain circuit	M2–M3, single-domain; not K4 evidence	Data-model ownership terms pending
Driving-behaviour data flowed via brokers to insurers with premium and access consequences	Journalism and litigation records, 2024	Secondary + court filings	8a–8e mini-circuit; distributed-composite occupancy	Object hinge; double-use (counter-pressure)	Broker-contract texts pending
A sanctioned individual's accounts were closed beyond legal obligation (OFAC/SWIFT line)	U.S. Treasury designation, 20 August 2025; Le Monde testimony	Primary (OFAC/SDN) + supporting testimony	K5 unit lowered to person; over-compliance (E6–6)	Hinge closure at subject scale	Bank-level closure records pending
Unwritten customary use was extinguished by documentary procedure (enclosure)	Statutory architecture of parliamentary enclosure; Young (1801)	Primary (statute) + historiography	Translation threshold; K1=2 [A/C]	K1=2	Implementation-portfolio sampling pending (E8)
The registration→pass→residence chain is written into statute (Criminal Tribes Act 1871)	Act XXVII of 1871	Primary (statute)	Proto-circuit; K5=1; K1[C]	Statutory-architecture profile	Section-level citation pending
	Loi du 28 juin 1881; AOF		K3=2 (pure form)		Local-practice unit sampling pending

Administrative penalty operated without judicial process (indigénat)	decree regime; Mann (2009)	Primary + revisionist calibration		Statutory-architecture profile	
Maximal integration coexists with engraved contestation (X-Road)	e-Estonia documentation, accessed 15 January 2026	Institutional documentation	K3=0; M-low (no 8d-8e)	Negative control	Independent audit reports to be added
The consent exemption licenses composition functions (8b-8c) — including sensitive categories capable of C-mode use — with penalty effectiveness thresholded at 1,000 subjects (Japan, 2026 revision)	Statute (2026 revision of the personal-data law); Diet enactment record and press report (Jiji Press), 10 July 2026; companion statute opening state-held data to certified operators	Primary (statute) + multi-source press	Counter-pressure de-engraving (§4 negative-exemplar); K3-F present / K3-E null at subject scale; analytical enclosure licensed at M2 (E0); I1 licensed at population scale (Section 6); inclusion without event and statutory antedating (E0); contestation-window asymmetry (E0); feeder-state opening (companion statute)	Statutory-architecture profile; enabling event, not a circuit	Regulations and guidelines pending (two-year window); certified-operator registry pending; open/closed articulation of exemption-formed pools pending — the natural experiment of the asymmetry thesis
An integrator position is expressly declared and partly operated at state scale (Abu Dhabi TAMM complex); the K3-F channel is statutorily withheld from the state segment (PDPL art. 2)	Official strategy, platform and cabinet records, 2025-26; Federal Decree-Law 45/2021 (arts. 2, 13, 18, 21)	Primary self-documents (intent status) + primary statute	Consortium occupancy (first full case); M3 candidacy at steps 1-3 of the evidentiary hierarchy (E8); normative feedback (E0); integrator dependency (sovereign cloud); pre-registered asymmetry prediction (dated first pass, 2026)	Declared-architecture profile; not an Onopticon — advanced architecture candidate	Steps 4-5 absent: no deployment-upon-subject or contestation record; PDPL article-level audit pending; agent-AI operation records pending
Multi-source sensor and operational feeds are translated through a shared ontology, correlated into a specific target, converted into courses of action and an asset recommendation, and returned into material execution (Maven Smart System); at the declared security-targeting unit, $M3 \wedge K4=2[T] \wedge K3=2$ upon $K5=2$	CDAO presentation at AIPCon 9 (13 March 2026); official CDAO programme description; Palantir Q1 2026 business update; programme-of-record decision (March 2026)	Controlled primary self-document + official institutional corroboration (admitted floor)	8a-8e; M3; K3=2 (subject-side); $K4=2[T]$ terminal closure; $K5=2$; occupant/regime distinction; military→civil generalisation axis	Onopticon at the declared security-targeting unit — same regime type, distinct evidence profile	Public disclosure establishes the admitted minimum; undisclosed feeds, error rates, actual review practice and subject-level incident records remain outside the public archive; the AIPCon 9 presentation (13 March 2026) is directly sourced; the programme-of-record decision (March 2026) and the 2026 follow-on-contractor withdrawal are as-reported and await primary-document

					confirmation; several throughput figures press-reported, primary-source pending
--	--	--	--	--	---