

The Reality Paradigm and the Limit of Philosophy of Religion: The Killing of God, Onopticon and Homovictimus

Hakkı Tan

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0008-8582-3132>

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

Abstract

This article develops Hakkı Tan's Reality Paradigm as a theoretical diagnosis of the contemporary occupation of reality after the killing of God. It does not offer a Nietzschean philosophy, nor does it seek to reconstruct Nietzsche's own project of value-creation. Rather, it takes Nietzsche's announcement that "God is dead" as a correct historical-ontological diagnosis and radicalizes it in a different direction: God's death is not treated as a passive disappearance, but as a killing that opens the domain once governed by transcendence, truth, nature, human experience and moral order to occupation by technical-administrative systems. The article argues that the contemporary problem is not simply surveillance, control, ideological distortion or digital capitalism. It is the infrastructural imposition of the field within which subjects encounter the world, become legible, access institutions, contest decisions and remain socially viable. Onopticon names this regime of imposed reality. Homovictimus names the subject produced within it: not the human being in relation to truth as such, but the Onoptic subject who is held responsible as an agent while being deprived of the infrastructural conditions of agency. The article distinguishes historical religious, imperial, ideological and propagandistic reality regimes from the contemporary Onoptic regime. Earlier regimes also organized time, body, law, property, ritual, record, exclusion and social belonging; however, their infrastructural violence was generally tied to the formation, reproduction and governance of society. Onopticon marks a rupture insofar as it does not merely govern society; it operationally consumes the conditions through which society can produce subjectivity, contestation, opacity, reciprocity and alternative realities. The article further develops the concepts of infrastructural a priori, ontological deprivation, operational epistemic sovereignty, infrastructural justice, opacity and the Onoptic threshold. It concludes that the Reality Paradigm is not a reform programme or a policy solution, but a diagnostic anatomy of the contemporary imposition of reality.

Keywords: Reality Paradigm; Onopticon; Homovictimus; infrastructural a priori; ontological deprivation; operational epistemic sovereignty; opacity; infrastructural justice; philosophy of religion; technical-administrative power.

1. Introduction: The Killing of God and the Occupation of Reality

The point of departure of this article is the claim that Nietzsche's announcement that "God is dead" functions, within the Reality Paradigm, not as a philosophical lineage to be followed but as a historical-ontological diagnosis. Nietzsche is not treated here as the source of a doctrine of perspectivism, a programme of value-creation, or a systematic philosophical allegiance. What matters is more direct and more severe: God is dead; more precisely, God has been killed.

The killing of God is not merely the decline of a theological belief. It names the removal of the transcendent centre that had guaranteed reality, truth, nature, moral order and the conditions of human experience. Once this centre is killed, the domain it had governed does not remain empty. It becomes available for occupation. The decisive question is therefore not how human beings create values after God, but which infrastructures, institutions, technical systems and operational ontologies occupy the field of reality opened by this killing.

The Reality Paradigm begins at this point. It asks who now determines the field within which human beings encounter the world, become recognizable, move, work, speak, appeal, refuse and remain socially viable. Onopticon is the name of this regime. It is not simply a new form of surveillance. It is not merely a continuation of disciplinary power, control society or data extraction. It is a regime in which the conditions of

encounter with reality are pre-structured through infrastructures of recognition, access, eligibility, risk, ranking, identity and contestability.

Homovictimus is the subject produced within this regime. Homovictimus is not the human being as such, nor the religious subject in relation to truth, nor the believer in relation to God. Homovictimus is the Onoptic subject who is held responsible as an agent while being deprived of the infrastructural conditions required for agency. He is compelled to appear, to be processed, to become legible, to be classified and to remain accountable within a reality field he did not constitute and often cannot contest.

This article does not attempt to write a comprehensive history of philosophy of religion. It does not offer an encyclopaedic treatment of Plato, Augustine, Maimonides, Kierkegaard, Levinas or other canonical figures. These figures appear only as boundary markers. The central issue is not the history of religious thought as such, but the limit at which religious, metaphysical, ideological and propagandistic reality regimes differ from the contemporary Onoptic imposition of reality.

The argument proceeds in six movements. First, it defines the Reality Paradigm, Onopticon and Homovictimus. Second, it develops the concepts of ontological deprivation and operational epistemic sovereignty. Third, it distinguishes historical reality regimes from Onoptic reality imposition. Fourth, it clarifies the relation between truth, subjectivity and the Onoptic threshold. Fifth, it situates the paradigm in relation to Foucault, Deleuze, Agamben and Glissant as boundary figures rather than theoretical ancestors. Finally, it establishes the diagnostic rather than reformist character of the paradigm.

2. Theoretical Framework: Reality Paradigm, Onopticon and Homovictimus

The Reality Paradigm begins before the classical question of truth. It does not first ask whether a proposition corresponds to reality, whether a belief is justified, or whether a representation is accurate. It asks under what imposed conditions the human being encounters reality at all. Reality is not treated as a neutral background upon which power later acts. It is treated as a field of encounter that can be structured, restricted, operationalized and imposed.

Onopticon names the contemporary regime in which this field of encounter is imposed through technical, administrative, institutional and operational infrastructures. Panopticon concerns visibility. Control society concerns modulation. Surveillance capitalism concerns extraction, prediction and behavioural surplus. Onopticon concerns imposed reality: the pre-structuring of the field within which visibility, action, refusal, movement, recognition and appeal become possible or impossible.

This shift changes the level of analysis. The question is no longer simply who watches the subject, who modulates conduct, or who extracts value from behaviour. The Onoptic question is: who imposes the reality in which the subject can appear at all? In this sense, Onopticon is not an instrument inside reality; it is a regime that formats the conditions of access to reality.

Homovictimus is the subject of this regime. Homovictimus is the infrastructurally deprived subject of Onopticon. He is not simply a victim. He is the subject who is treated as responsible while being deprived of the conditions under which responsibility could be meaningfully exercised. He is asked to choose, comply, optimize, prove, adapt, appeal and manage risk, while the field of choice, recognition and appeal has already been narrowed by opaque infrastructures.

This definition must be kept precise. Homovictimus is not a general type of human being produced by every relation to truth. A relation to truth, in any context, does not make the human being Homovictimus; on the contrary, it can constitute the human being as a subject. A person may become a subject by responding to God, truth, conscience, moral demand or ultimate meaning. Homovictimus names something else: the subject

produced when the field of truth and reality is infrastructuralized, operationalized and attached to regimes of compulsory recognition, classification and weak contestability.

Historical religious, mythical and propagandistic reality regimes may function as analogues, precursors or boundary cases. Yet Homovictimus belongs specifically to the Reality Paradigm. He is the subject of Onoptic reality imposition, not the name of the religious subject as such.

3. Ontological Deprivation: The Closure of the Lifeworld

Ontological deprivation is not merely the loss of rights, services or access. More fundamentally, it is the infrastructural narrowing of the subject's capacity to constitute, interpret and sustain a lifeworld. Human beings never encounter the world in a completely unmediated way. Yet under the Onoptic regime, mediation no longer remains an open horizon of interpretation and experience. It becomes attached to compulsory technical-administrative passages.

The loss of Homovictimus is therefore not only the closure of an account, the rejection of an application, or the reduction of visibility. What is lost is the authority of the subject to make sense of his own world. Onopticon does not abolish human intentionality; it forces it to pass through profiles, scores, risks, interfaces, protocols and classifications. The lifeworld does not simply disappear. It is displaced from the subject's own horizon of meaning into an operational field of reality.

Ontological deprivation therefore names the loss of one's own possible field of being. A person may still appear to choose while the option-field has already been narrowed. A person may still be formally recognized while being recognized only as a score, profile, eligibility status, risk class or operational object. A person may still be allowed to speak while the conditions under which speech becomes visible, processable or contestable are already determined elsewhere.

This is why ontological deprivation is deeper than exhaustion, alienation or exclusion. Exhaustion concerns depleted energy. Alienation concerns estrangement from one's activity, product or social world. Exclusion concerns being kept outside. Ontological deprivation concerns being forced inside a reality architecture that deprives the subject of the conditions through which a world can be meaningfully encountered, contested and re-opened.

4. Operational Epistemic Sovereignty

Onopticon does not only impose reality; it also imposes what counts as knowledge. Profile, score, risk category, behavioural trace, health status, identity verification and algorithmic classification can acquire stronger epistemic authority than the subject's own account. The subject may speak, but the system knows him in the form in which it processes him. This knowledge is not merely representational. It is operational: it opens, closes, ranks, delays, suspends or erases access.

This condition can be called operational epistemic sovereignty. Operational epistemic sovereignty is the power of infrastructure to determine what counts as knowledge about the human being. In this regime, knowledge gains operational force before its truth is contested. A risk score can close a door before its validity is examined. A profile can enter the institutional field of decision before the person's self-description is heard. A behavioural trace can be treated as stronger evidence than intention, testimony or context.

One of the domains occupied after the killing of God is therefore epistemic. Onopticon is not God. Yet it occupies, through technical-administrative knowledge production, the domain of seeing, knowing and judging that had once been associated with divine authority. Reality imposition cannot be separated from epistemic sovereignty: whoever determines what counts as knowledge often determines how a subject appears within reality.

This point is decisive for the Reality Paradigm. The problem is not simply that systems make errors. The deeper problem is that systems acquire the authority to define error, relevance, risk, identity and credibility in advance. The subject does not merely confront a false representation. He confronts an operational truth that acts before it is understood, contested or reversed.

5. Scope and Violence: From Partial Reality Regimes to Onoptic Reality Imposition

Religions, mythologies, empires, ideologies and propaganda apparatuses have always constructed fields of reality. The Reality Paradigm does not claim that reality is imposed for the first time in the contemporary age. Its claim is more precise: earlier reality regimes were often partial, regional, symbolic, institutional or representational, whereas the contemporary Onoptic regime imposes the conditions of encounter with reality in an infrastructural, operational, compulsory and nearly continuous manner.

The issue, therefore, is not that reality imposition did not exist before and exists now. The issue is that the level, material carrier, scope and contestability of reality imposition have changed. The world may appear to turn as it always has. Human beings are still born, work, love, believe, fear and die. Yet the interfaces, access channels, forms of recognition, risk categories, visibility orders, movement permissions, account statuses, financial scores, health classifications, platform records and appeal mechanisms through which they encounter the world have acquired a material density that differs from earlier religious or propagandistic regimes. The rupture is not an apocalyptic announcement. It is the technical-administrative closure of the conditions that precede experience.

At this point, it must be clearly acknowledged that historical religious-imperial regimes also constructed infrastructural realities. The medieval Church, Islamic empires, religious calendars, population records, marriage, death, inheritance, excommunication, communal belonging and juridical orders did not merely produce meaning. They organized time, body, lineage, property, legitimacy and access.

Yet this infrastructurality, however violent, was often tied to the problem of forming, governing and reproducing society. Such regimes could produce domination, exploitation, exclusion and coercion. Nevertheless, in order to sustain their own power, they could not consume society entirely. They depended on taxation, soldiers, labour, loyalty, production, community, legitimacy and continuity. Onopticon breaks at this point. It is not the pathology of governing society; it is a reality imposition that destroys the conditions of society's possibility. It does not merely govern society. It operationally consumes the conditions of subjectivity, contestation, opacity, reciprocity and alternative world-production.

This difference can be stated across six levels. First, earlier religious and propagandistic regimes did not merely organize meaning, belief, loyalty and legitimacy; they also organized time, space, body, record, law, property, marriage, death and exclusion. To describe them as purely representational regimes would be mistaken. Yet their infrastructural violence generally operated within the necessity of forming and reproducing society. Onopticon does not merely interpret the world and does not merely govern society. It establishes the conditions of access to the world and then turns those conditions against society itself. Earlier regimes said: this is reality. The Onoptic regime says: you can encounter reality only through the interface, protocol, score, account, access condition and recognition system that I establish. Earlier regimes disciplined society; Onopticon uproots society's capacity to produce subjects.

Second, earlier regimes were often internally plural and externally limited. Church, state, family, guild, tribe, school, army, party and media could construct different reality fields. These fields overlapped, conflicted and constrained one another. Onoptic violence lies in infrastructural articulation: identity verification, platform accounts, financial access, health data, movement records, communication networks, search engines, security scoring and administrative decisions can become linked into a single operational architecture.

Third, remaining outside earlier reality regimes was often dangerous but sometimes possible. It could mean exile, heresy, exclusion or death. Yet the imposition was usually tied to a determinate community, empire, doctrine, territory or apparatus. In the Onoptic regime, remaining outside can amount to social, economic and institutional non-existence. To be without account, identity, score, verification, registration or platform access is not simply to choose an alternative life. It is to be deprived of access.

Fourth, earlier regimes shaped subjects through persuasion, fear, ritual, sermon, law, schooling, propaganda and violence. Onopticon does not abolish these instruments; it adds a preconditional architecture. The subject is not only persuaded or threatened. The field of options, search results, application forms, visibility rankings, risk thresholds and appeal channels is already structured in advance. Onoptic violence often does not shout. The door is closed, and the architect of the door remains unseen.

Fifth, earlier reality regimes often operated through representation and meaning, even when they had material consequences. The designation of someone as heretic, traitor, sinner or enemy could have severe effects. Yet contemporary technical-administrative classification connects naming directly to access, movement, finance, visibility, health, labour and appeal. The category does not merely produce meaning; it produces operations. A profile is not only representation. It is operational reality attached to decision infrastructure.

Sixth, earlier regimes were slower, more territorially limited and materially discontinuous. The Onoptic regime is real-time, continuously updated, data-fed and embedded in ordinary life. This is not merely a difference of speed. When speed, scope and operational capacity converge, they produce a difference of level. A rumour and a risk score, a sermon and automatic account closure, a propaganda poster and search-engine ranking, a religious category and a technical-administrative classification that cuts off credit, health or migration access do not operate at the same level.

The Reality Paradigm therefore does not deny earlier reality regimes. Religious regimes constructed reality through sacred order, calendar, law, record and community. Propagandistic regimes did so through representation and mobilization; ideological regimes through class, nation, race or history; bureaucratic regimes through record and classification.

Yet Onopticon breaks from these partial regimes. The human being's encounter with reality is no longer pre-structured merely at the level of meaning, representation, belief, law or institutional record. It is pre-structured at the level of infrastructural access, operational recognition, real-time classification and technical-administrative contestability. Historical religious-imperial regimes governed by forming society; the Onoptic regime governs by consuming the fields of encounter that make society possible.

6. The Blind Spot of Classical Philosophy of Religion

Classical philosophy of religion has largely been organized around questions concerning the existence of God, divine attributes, evil, miracles, revelation, religious experience and the relation between faith and reason. These questions remain significant. Yet from the standpoint of the Reality Paradigm, they are incomplete. They often presuppose the field in which human beings encounter God, truth, sin, salvation, nature, death and moral order, without asking how that field is constituted.

The point can be made through familiar examples. The cosmological argument asks whether the existence or causal order of the world requires a first cause or necessary ground; it rarely asks how the field of causal encounter is institutionally, technically or symbolically pre-structured for the subject who inhabits it. The problem of evil asks how suffering can be reconciled with divine goodness and power; it does not usually ask how suffering becomes visible, classifiable, administrable or contestable within a given reality architecture. Accounts of religious experience ask whether such experience is veridical, transformative or epistemically justified; they less often ask which infrastructures permit, rank, suppress, circulate or invalidate the appearance

of that experience. The Reality Paradigm does not replace these questions. It exposes their prior condition: the reality field in which they can be posed, recognized and contested.

The Reality Paradigm introduces a different question: is religion only a system of beliefs about God, or can it function as an architecture of encounter with reality? When religion produces categories such as sin, purification, obedience, heresy, salvation, sacredness, impurity, belief, unbelief, election, damnation or forgiveness, it does not merely produce ideas. It also structures how human beings experience themselves and the world.

Religion can therefore be read in three ways. First, religion can open reality by placing human beings within a wider field of meaning in the face of death, nihilism, suffering and brute force. Second, religion can close reality by binding human beings to compulsory recognition through categories of guilt, obedience, heresy or exclusion. Third, religion can resist imposed reality by preserving irreducible domains of opacity, conscience, mystical experience, prophetic justice and ethical responsibility.

The task is not to reduce religion to Onopticon. The task is to identify the threshold at which a truth relation becomes attached to infrastructures of compulsory recognition, operational classification and weak contestability. Religion does not become Onoptic because it makes truth claims. It approaches the Onoptic threshold when truth claims are bound to infrastructures that determine access, legibility and appeal in advance.

7. Boundary Figures: Conceptual Intensification Rather Than Historical Coverage

This article does not present a catalogue of philosophers. Its aim is not to cover the history of philosophy of religion but to clarify the boundary points at which the Reality Paradigm touches and departs from certain classical figures. Five figures are sufficient for this purpose: Plato, Augustine, Maimonides, Kierkegaard and Levinas.

Plato matters because he draws a powerful distinction between appearance and reality. The allegory of the cave already indicates that the world encountered by human beings is mediated. Yet the mediation at stake in Plato is philosophical and ontological. In Onopticon, mediation is technical-administrative and operational. Plato opens the possibility of ascent toward truth; Onopticon can close the field of access. Plato is therefore not a precursor of Onopticon but a boundary figure that clarifies the difference between philosophical mediation and infrastructural imposition.

Augustine matters because he develops interiority under the gaze of God. Confession constitutes the subject within categories of sin, grace, fallenness and salvation. Yet Augustinian interiority and Onoptic compulsory legibility are not the same. In Augustine, the subject opens himself before God. In Onopticon, the subject is made processable before the system. The difference is between theological interiority and technical-administrative legibility.

Maimonides matters because negative theology protects God from conceptual capture. To speak positively of God risks reducing God to human categories. This offers an important analogy for the Reality Paradigm: God cannot be exhausted by concepts; the human being cannot be exhausted by operations. Yet the difference must remain clear. Maimonides defends theological and conceptual opacity; the Reality Paradigm defends infrastructural opacity.

Kierkegaard matters because he defends the singular individual against the system. Faith cannot be reduced to objective proof, social profile or systematic category. In this respect, Kierkegaard offers an existential ground close to the refusal of Homovictimus: I am not a model, not a profile, not fuel for decision infrastructure. Yet Kierkegaard's concern is the Hegelian system and the tension between ethics and faith, not technical-administrative infrastructure. He is therefore a boundary figure, not a direct ancestor.

Levinas matters because the face of the Other precedes classification. The Other is not first a risk, target, profile, deviation or data object, but an ethical demand. This provides one of the strongest ethical resources against Onoptic classification. Yet Levinas establishes ethical priority, whereas the Reality Paradigm analyses how contemporary infrastructures suppress the conditions under which such ethical priority can be encountered.

These figures are not included to produce historical completeness. They mark points at which religious and philosophical thought shows the difference between truth, mediation, opacity and ethical relation on the one hand, and Onoptic reality imposition on the other.

8. Truth Relation, Recognition and the Onoptic Threshold

The distinction established in Section 2 has direct consequences for philosophy of religion. A relation to truth, in any context, does not produce Homovictimus; on the contrary, it can constitute the human being as a subject. Responsibility before God, revelation, morality, conscience or ultimate meaning may constitute the person as one who responds, takes a position, decides and creates meaning.

The problem begins when a truth relation is attached to an infrastructurally imposed regime that makes the subject processable, classifiable, access-dependent and weakly contestable.

This distinction is decisive for the relation between the Reality Paradigm and philosophy of religion. Religious reality regimes may place the human being within categories of sin, salvation, obedience, heresy, purification or sacred order. Such categories can construct fields of reality. Yet not every field of reality produces Homovictimus. Homovictimus emerges only when compulsory recognition, operational classification, infrastructural access-dependence, foreclosure of possibilities and weak contestability converge.

For this reason, this article does not produce a separate figure called "religious Homovictimus." Such a figure would overextend the concept and weaken the specificity of the Reality Paradigm. Historical religious reality regimes may display certain pre-forms or boundary analogies of Onoptic imposition. The concept becomes applicable only when truth is transformed into an infrastructural, operational and contestation-closing regime of reality imposition.

9. Opacity, Contestability and Infrastructural Justice

Infrastructural justice asks whether the conditions under which rights, access, recognition and appeal become possible are themselves just. A person may formally possess rights while the channel of application is closed, the decision logic inaccessible, the appeal process ineffective, or the classification irreversible. In such cases, a right remains a textual promise.

The normative core of infrastructural justice consists of three principles: opacity, contestability and reversibility.

Opacity means that the human being must not be rendered completely processable, modelable, predictable or operationalizable by any system. The human being exceeds what the system knows and processes. In the context of philosophy of religion, this principle indicates that the relation to truth cannot be reduced to a technical-administrative demand for transparency. This does not mean that every subject in a truth relation is Homovictimus. It means that truth relations must not be converted into regimes of total legibility.

Contestability means that classifications, risk assignments, access decisions and visibility orders must remain open to challenge. In religious contexts, this concerns interpretation, conscience and internal difference. The focus, however, is not the mere existence of religious truth claims, but whether such claims are attached to infrastructures that classify, restrict access and weaken objection. Opacity must not become a pretext for harm, domination or unaccountable power. The tension must be preserved.

Reversibility means that erroneous or unjust classifications must not become permanent destiny. Risk, ineligibility, untrustworthiness, access denial and operational invisibility become unjust when they are made irreversible. Religious categories approach the Onoptic level only when they become attached to technical-administrative architectures of recognition, access and appeal.

These principles do not function as policy proposals. They are diagnostic thresholds. They identify where the Onoptic imposition of reality intensifies. Infrastructural justice does not begin by asking how a system can be improved; it asks whether the field in which improvement, appeal and right can be claimed has already been imposed.

10. Paradigmatic Clarification: Changing the Level of Analysis

The Reality Paradigm is not a new footnote to existing theoretical traditions. Foucault, Deleuze, Agamben and Glissant are important for this discussion, but the Reality Paradigm does not continue on their level. It changes the level of analysis. It does not situate power primarily at the level of knowledge, discourse, modulation, exception or cultural opacity. It situates power at the level of the infrastructural imposition of the conditions of encounter.

Foucault shows how populations, bodies and conduct are governed through discipline, biopower, governmentality and security dispositifs. The Reality Paradigm does not repeat this line. It treats reality not as a background upon which power operates, but as a field of encounter technically and administratively constructed by power.

Deleuze reveals modulation, code, flow and continuously shifting thresholds in control societies. Onopticon asks about the world within which such modulation operates: which interface, option-field, visibility order and appeal channel is presented to the subject as reality?

Agamben offers the figure of homo sacer: excluded, placed in the zone of exception, and reduced to bare life. Homovictimus differs sharply. He is not simply excluded. He is forcibly included. His tragedy is not non-recognition but compulsory recognition. Homo sacer is the exception of bare life; Homovictimus is the compulsory legibility of processed life.

Glissant's right to opacity resists the Western demand to understand, translate and consume the other within its own categories. The Reality Paradigm shifts this insight into the technical-administrative register. The issue is no longer only the right not to be culturally understood or reduced, but the right not to be infrastructurally processed, modelled, classified and operationalized.

Foucault, Deleuze, Agamben and Glissant are therefore not ancestors but boundary stones. The Reality Paradigm passes by them, learns from them, and establishes its own plane of attack: the infrastructural imposition of reality.

11. Material Conditions of the Paradigmatic Rupture

The claim of rupture must not remain a merely definitional assertion. Nor should it be reduced to apocalyptic rhetoric. The argument is not that everything has changed and catastrophe is near. The stronger claim is that reality regimes that existed historically in partial forms have acquired, within contemporary technical-administrative infrastructures, a new density: they become encompassing, operation-producing and capable of binding contestation to their own conditions.

This rupture appears through five conditions.

First, the transcendent guarantee of reality has been killed. In the Nietzschean sense, God's death is not the quiet fading of a common centre of truth. It is the removal of that centre by human and modern forms of power. The resulting void is not merely filled; it is occupied.

Second, access has become infrastructural. Citizenship, health, labour, finance, mobility, communication, education and public visibility are increasingly attached to technical-administrative gateways. The human being encounters the world not directly, but through protocols of access.

Third, decision has shifted into the pre-decisional field. Rejection, acceptance, risk, eligibility, priority, visibility and appeal are often structured before the moment of decision. Power does not only decide; it constructs the field within which decisions become possible.

Fourth, identity and risk have become operational. A person is no longer recognized only by name, body or legal status. He is recognized through score, profile, past data, behavioural trace, account reliability, health status, location history and platform record.

Fifth, contestation has become dependent on infrastructure. When a person seeks to challenge a decision, he is often confined to the channels provided by the very architecture that produced the decision. The right to appeal may formally remain, while contestability is materially weakened.

Homovictimus is the subject of these five conditions. The concept does not name the human being in relation to God, truth or religious responsibility. It names the subject compulsorily recognized, processed, classified and rendered weakly contestable within Onoptic reality imposition.

The paradigmatic rupture is the convergence of these five conditions. Onopticon is not a technology. It is the regime-name of this convergence.

12. The Theoretical Status of the Manifesto

The Homovictimus Manifesto is not the proof of the theory. It is the performative text in which the diagnostic urgency of the theory becomes audible. Manifesto, theory and case are not identical, but neither are they fully separable. The manifesto speaks; theory clarifies; case analysis tests.

The central question is this: if Homovictimus is infrastructurally deprived, how can he speak? The answer is that Homovictimus is not a figure of absolute silence. His deprivation does not mean that speech is impossible; it means that the conditions under which speech becomes recognizable are already structured by the system. The manifesto opens a crack within this structured field of speech.

The manifesto should therefore not be read as the external theorist speaking on behalf of a victim. It should be read as situated naming from the position of Homovictimus. This is not pure, unmediated or romantic speech. Such purity does not exist. The voice emerges from within the imposed infrastructure. That is why it is political.

13. Method: Tracing Rather Than Measuring

The method of the Reality Paradigm is not to produce reform, design solutions or formulate policy. It is diagnostic. Its task is to make visible where, through which infrastructures, under which conditions of recognition and through what closures of contestability, a field of reality is imposed. The aim is not to repair the system but to expose how the system imposes itself as reality.

Ontological deprivation cannot be measured as a simple variable. To reduce it to a survey item would kill the concept. Yet this does not make it unresearchable. Research must trace its indicators and effects rather than measure it directly.

The method must therefore be double-layered. The first layer consists of empirical indicators: rejection rates, appeal durations, reversal rates, lack of explanation, account closure timelines, income loss, access loss, absence of alternative channels and persistence of classification errors. The second layer consists of

interpretive indicators: the subject's forced self-translation, loss of language, inability to plan, expectation that objection will not be heard, and self-reconfiguration according to systemic categories.

Quantitative methods show the forms of closure. Qualitative methods open the experience of closure. Theoretical interpretation connects both under the concept of ontological deprivation. The method of the Reality Paradigm is therefore tracing: following where and how infrastructure closes the subject's possible field of being.

14. Vertical, Horizontal and Hybrid Onoptization

The distinction between vertical and horizontal infrastructural power does not refer to fixed types of actors. It refers to functional positions. Vertical power operates near state sovereignty, security, policing, military decision, migration, borders and administrative determination. Horizontal power operates through everyday life, search, visibility, attention, consumption, sociality, logistics and platform dependency.

Contemporary Onopticon often functions in hybrid forms. Three intermediate forms can be distinguished.

The first is the verticalization of the horizontal. A commercial platform may acquire sovereign functions when it shares data, infrastructure or analytics with policing, intelligence, public administration or border regimes. It may remain a market actor while performing an infrastructural function of sovereignty.

The second is the horizontalization of the vertical. The state may transform the citizen into a user, public service into platform experience, and rights-claims into interface operations. The state no longer needs only to command. It can rank, filter, lower visibility or manage access like a platform.

The third is infrastructural articulation. Public institutions, private platforms and technical infrastructures may combine to produce a single field of reality. In this case, agency is not located in one institution. Reality is imposed by an architecture operating across institutions.

This hybridization shows why Onopticon cannot be reduced to one company, one state or one technology. Onopticon is not an actor. It is the regime that links actors into a reality-producing architecture.

15. Hardware Level: Boundary Architecture, Not Solutionism

The idea of hardware-level guarantees must not be understood as technical solutionism. Technical solutionism claims that political problems can be solved by technical tools. The hardware thesis of the Reality Paradigm functions instead as a diagnostic boundary concept: when no material limits are placed on what systems can do, rights can become merely textual promises.

Hardware is therefore not salvation but boundary architecture. The point is not to produce good power, but to diagnose the material conditions that make total visibility and total capture possible. Open standards, auditable architectures, local processing, data minimization, compartmentalized memory, capability-based access, cryptographic limits, independent auditability, public accountability and counter-infrastructures are not presented here as recipes. They indicate the material levels at which Onoptic capture must be analysed.

The question of who audits the hardware is unavoidable. The Reality Paradigm does not answer it by proposing an institutional model. It shows only this: if audit is entrusted to a single institution of trust, the auditor itself can become Onoptic.

16. Conceptual Economy

The Reality Paradigm risks producing too many concepts. This risk must be taken seriously. The conceptual architecture should therefore be organized around three core concepts and four secondary concepts.

The core concepts are Reality Paradigm, Onopticon and Homovictimus. Without them, the theory cannot be established.

The secondary concepts are infrastructural a priori, ontological deprivation, opacity and infrastructural justice. These deepen the core concepts but should not each carry the weight of an independent theory.

The structure is therefore layered. The Reality Paradigm formulates the question. Onopticon names the regime. Homovictimus names the subject. Infrastructural a priori names the condition. Ontological deprivation names the consequence. Opacity names the resistance threshold. Infrastructural justice names the normative horizon.

17. The Analysis of God-Like Imposition

It may not be ontologically possible to replace God. Yet it is entirely possible to occupy the domain once governed by God: to claim precedence over experience, to determine the conditions of encounter, and to occupy a regulatory position over human beings and nature. Onopticon is the name of this claim. It does not need to say "I am God." It assumes a divine-impositional function when it says: I come before experience; I am the condition of visibility; I determine access; I constitute risk; I assign the channel of appeal.

The Reality Paradigm diagnoses this function of divine imposition. The accusation is directed at systems that occupy the field opened by the killing of God and assume a regulatory position prior to experience. For this reason, the paradigm must also keep its own concepts contestable, revisable and reducible. A conceptual boundary is not a reality imposition; it is a way of limiting the violence of the concept itself.

A thought that begins with the killing of God cannot allow any infrastructure, system, concept or operational ontology to occupy the domain of God and impose itself as the absolute condition prior to experience.

18. Analysis of the Onoptic Threshold: The Platformization of Religious Practice

This article is not a case study. Nevertheless, it can indicate how the Reality Paradigm may be applied to philosophy of religion by offering a brief threshold analysis. The aim is not to propose a solution, but to diagnose the conditions under which Onoptization begins.

Consider a hypothetical contemporary case: a religious community or field of religious content increasingly exists through digital platforms. Sermons, lessons, announcements, donations, membership forms, archives, discussion channels and visibility mechanisms are transferred to platform infrastructure. The truth relation does not disappear. A person may still remain a subject in relation to faith, meaning, conscience and community. Yet the circulation conditions of that truth relation become attached to technical-administrative infrastructure.

The Onoptic threshold appears through three conditions.

First, compulsory recognition. A person must become recognizable through an account, identity, profile, verification procedure or platform history in order to relate to the community, access content, speak, donate, attend lessons or remain visible. This recognition is not the truth relation itself. It becomes the access condition of that relation.

Second, foreclosure of possibility. Account closure, reduced visibility, disappearance from ranking, exclusion from discussion channels, algorithmic suspicion or the loss of donation and communication tools may not destroy the religious truth relation itself, but it narrows its public and institutional circulation. The category does not merely produce meaning; it produces operations.

Third, weak contestability. If the person cannot understand why visibility was reduced, why an account was closed, why content became inaccessible or why he was categorized as risky, and if appeal is confined to a

closed platform form, automated response or vague community standard, then the truth relation has become attached to an Onoptic architecture of access.

In this example, the person is not Homovictimus because he is religious. Nor does religiosity itself produce Homovictimus. Homovictimus emerges when a religious relation is attached to infrastructural recognition, operational classification and weak contestability. The Reality Paradigm therefore does not explain religious truth. It diagnoses the conditions under which a religious truth relation becomes articulated with Onoptic reality imposition.

19. Before the Language of Solutions: The Attack Point of Diagnosis

The Reality Paradigm exposes the field that precedes the language of solutions. In the Onoptic regime, solution often remains inside the options supplied by the same infrastructure: better oversight, more transparency, more efficient appeal, more compliant ethical protocol. The paradigm does not simply multiply these options. It exposes how the option-field itself is constituted.

The task of the Reality Paradigm is therefore diagnostic. Rather than rushing to answer the question "What should be done?", it opens the question that must be asked first: within what field of reality can this question be posed, who can hear it, which appeal channel is open, and which possibilities have already been closed?

This is not a retreat. It is the attack point of the paradigm. Contemporary Onoptic regimes can reprocess even their own critique under the names of reform, improvement, compliance, transparency, oversight and ethical protocol. The Reality Paradigm attacks this closure not by offering solution packages, but by exposing the infrastructure that makes the language of solutions possible.

Infrastructural justice, opacity and boundary architecture are therefore not policy recipes. They are diagnostic concepts that indicate where Onoptic reality imposition intensifies. When a right is powerless before architecture, this must be diagnosed. The Reality Paradigm is not the treatment protocol of the system. It is the anatomy of the system's imposition as reality.

20. Conclusion

This article has developed the Reality Paradigm as a theoretical diagnosis of the occupation of reality after the killing of God. Its aim was not to rewrite the entire history of philosophy of religion. Rather, it clarified the similarity and rupture between religious, ideological and propagandistic reality regimes and contemporary Onoptic reality imposition.

The conclusion is direct. Religions, mythologies, ideologies and propaganda apparatuses have historically constructed fields of reality. Yet these regimes often operated through meaning, representation, ritual, law, record, loyalty and enemy production. Onopticon operates at the level of technical-administrative access to reality. The human being is no longer structured only by what he believes or how the world is interpreted. He is inserted into a field in which interface, account, score, risk category, access condition, visibility order and appeal channel are pre-established.

The central proposition of the Reality Paradigm is that reality does not come before power. This does not mean that all historical regimes are identical. Historical reality regimes existed, but the contemporary Onoptic regime transforms their partial and representational violence into infrastructural, operational and encompassing violence.

The Reality Paradigm takes Nietzsche's diagnosis that "God is dead" as correct and asks: who occupied the domain once governed by God after God was killed? Onopticon is the contemporary name of this occupation. As established above, Homovictimus names the Onoptic subject who remains treated as an agent while being deprived of the real conditions of agency.

This article is not a closure but a ground survey. What is completed here is not a system; what is opened is a regime of questions. Who constructs the field of reality? Which infrastructure becomes the gateway before experience? Which knowledge acquires operational force? Which objection is closed before it can appear? The Reality Paradigm continues to trace the anatomy of imposed reality without surrendering these questions to solution packages. The discussion does not end here. It begins again wherever Onopticon occupies a field of encounter.

References

Agamben, Giorgio. *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*.

Augustine. *Confessions; The City of God*.

Deleuze, Gilles. "Postscript on the Societies of Control."

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish; Security, Territory, Population; The Birth of Biopolitics*.

Glissant, Édouard. *Poetics of Relation*.

Han, Byung-Chul. *The Transparency Society*.

Kierkegaard, Søren. *Fear and Trembling*.

Levinas, Emmanuel. *Totality and Infinity*.

Maimonides. *The Guide for the Perplexed*.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. *The Gay Science*.

Plato. *Republic*.

Tan, Hakkı. *Reality Paradigm, Onopticon and Homovictimus: A Theoretical, Manifestal and Case-Based Inquiry into the Regime of Infrastructural Imposition*.