

Reality Paradigm, Onopticon and Homovictimus

A Theoretical, Manifestal and Case-Based Inquiry into the Regime of
Infrastructural Imposition

Hakki Tan

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

“Reality does not come before power.”

Theoretical Report / Publication-Ready Edition

Contents

Abstract	3
1. Introduction	3
2. The Paradigmatic Rupture: Onopticon Is Not an Evolution of Panopticon	4
3. Reality Paradigm: Not Truth, But the Conditions of Encounter	5
4. Manifesto Line: The Original English Voice of Homovictimus	6
5. Onopticon: The Regime of Infrastructural Imposition	8
6. Infrastructural A Priori	8
7. Homovictimus: Responsible Without the Conditions of Agency	9
8. Ontological Deprivation	9
9. Right to Opacity, Architectural Rights and Hardware-Level Guarantees	10
10. Infrastructural Justice	11
11. Case Line: Making Onopticon Researchable	11
12. Methodological Program	16
13. Critical Boundaries	17
14. Discussion: Manifesto, Theory and Case	18
15. Conclusion	18
Suggested Publication Structure	19
Suggested Bibliographic Clusters	19

Abstract

This report systematizes Hakki Tan's emerging conceptual corpus around the Reality Paradigm, Onopticon and Homovictimus. Its central claim is that contemporary sovereignty no longer operates merely through surveillance, discipline, modulation, representation or ideological distortion. It operates more radically by imposing the very field of reality within which human beings encounter the world, become recognizable, access institutions, act, object, move, work, consume and remain socially viable. In this framework, Onopticon is not a continuation of Panopticon under new technical conditions. It names a paradigmatic rupture: a regime in which infrastructural, algorithmic, institutional and operational systems precondition the field of possible experience itself. Homovictimus is the subject produced within this regime: held responsible as an agent while deprived of the infrastructural conditions required for agency. The report organizes Tan's corpus into three distinct but interdependent lines: the Manifesto Line, the Theory Line and the Case Line. The Manifesto Line preserves the original English voice of Homovictimus as a declaration of ontological revolt. The Theory Line articulates the Reality Paradigm, infrastructural a priori, ontological deprivation, right to opacity, architectural rights and infrastructural justice. The Case Line formulates researchable domains and methodological designs through which Onopticon can be tested without becoming an overextended metaphor. The report argues that Tan's work should not be reduced to a critique of technology, platforms or surveillance; it should be read as an attempt to found an ontological sociology of imposed reality.

Keywords: Reality Paradigm, Onopticon, Homovictimus, infrastructural imposition, infrastructural a priori, ontological deprivation, right to opacity, architectural rights, operational ontology, infrastructural justice, imposed reality.

1. Introduction

The central problem in Hakki Tan's corpus is not whether human beings are watched, measured, classified or governed. These questions remain relevant, but they do not reach the depth of the rupture Tan is trying to name. The deeper problem is this:

What kind of reality is imposed upon the human being before action, before judgment, before encounter, before refusal?

The Reality Paradigm is therefore not a theory of truth. It is not primarily concerned with whether a statement corresponds to an external fact, whether knowledge is valid, or whether ideology distorts perception. Its central concern is more radical: the conditions under which reality itself is encountered.

In Tan's framework, contemporary sovereignty does not merely govern behavior. It imposes the field in which behavior becomes possible, legible, permitted, denied, ranked, profiled, suspended or erased. Reality is not simply given to the subject. Nor is it merely socially constructed in the classical sense. It is operationally imposed through infrastructures of recognition, access, eligibility, risk, identity, movement, health, labor, food, decision and appeal.

This conceptual framework rests on three methodological shifts.

First, Tan's position must be treated as a paradigmatic rupture rather than an evolutionary extension of Foucault or Deleuze. Panopticon and Control Society may be mentioned as boundary concepts, but they must not organize the logic of Onopticon. Onopticon is not "the next stage" of Panopticon. It belongs to another ontological register.

Second, the original English voice of the Homovictimus Manifesto must be preserved as a primary textual event. The manifesto should not be merely described; it must be allowed to speak. This matters because Homovictimus is not only an object of theory. Homovictimus is the one who names the imposed architecture and begins resistance through naming.

Third, Tan's architectural and hardware-oriented thesis must remain central. Rights cannot remain only textual, juridical or procedural if the regime of imposition operates at the level of infrastructure. The question is not only how to legislate opacity, but how to build architectures that make total capture technically impossible.

The report's guiding thesis is:

The Reality Paradigm names a rupture in which sovereignty no longer merely sees, disciplines, modulates or represents the human being. It imposes the field of reality within which the human being can appear, act, object and remain viable. Onopticon is the name of this imposed field. Homovictimus is the subject held responsible within it while deprived of the conditions of agency. Resistance begins when the imposed reality is named as imposed.

2. The Paradigmatic Rupture: Onopticon Is Not an Evolution of Panopticon

A common mistake is to introduce Onopticon through a comfortable genealogy: Panopticon, Control Society, surveillance capitalism, algorithmic governance, and then Onopticon. This sequence is pedagogically useful but theoretically dangerous. It risks turning Tan's rupture into a mere evolution.

The Reality Paradigm requires a different starting point.

Panopticon belongs to a world in which the central problem is visibility. Control Society belongs to a world in which the central problem is modulation. Surveillance capitalism belongs to a world in which the central problem is extraction and prediction. These concepts remain historically important, but they do not define the ontology of Onopticon.

Onopticon does not merely see. It does not merely modulate. It does not merely extract. It imposes the reality-field in which seeing, acting, moving, choosing, appealing and being recognized become possible or impossible.

The rupture can be stated sharply:

- Panopticon concerns visibility.
- Control Society concerns modulation.
- Surveillance capitalism concerns extraction.
- Onopticon concerns imposed reality.

This is not a linear development. It is a change in the level of analysis.

The question is no longer:

Who watches the subject?

Nor merely:

Who modulates the subject's conduct?

Nor merely:

Who extracts value from the subject's behavior?

The Onopticon question is:

Who imposes the reality in which the subject can appear at all?

This is why the Reality Paradigm should not be domesticated through older conceptual languages. Foucault, Deleuze and later theorists may provide negative reference points, but Onopticon must not be made dependent on them. Tan's claim is stronger: previous categories belong to a world in which reality could still be presumed as the background of power. In the Onoptic regime, reality itself becomes the object of imposition.

3. Reality Paradigm: Not Truth, But the Conditions of Encounter

The Reality Paradigm is not a theory of truth. It does not ask primarily: What is true? Who tells the truth? How is truth distorted? These questions remain secondary.

The primary question is:

Under what imposed conditions does the human being encounter reality?

This shift is decisive. Truth theories operate at the level of knowledge, representation, evidence, discourse or ideology. The Reality Paradigm operates at the level of encounter, access, recognition and possibility.

Reality, in this framework, is not simply given. It is not merely interpreted. It is not merely represented. It is imposed through technical-administrative infrastructures that decide in advance:

- what can appear,
- who can be recognized,
- which request can be processed,
- which movement can be permitted,
- which body can be treated as risky,
- which account can remain active,
- which application can be rejected,
- which objection can be heard,
- which future can remain open.

The Reality Paradigm can therefore be defined as follows:

The Reality Paradigm is the theory of how the human being's conditions of encounter with the world are preconditioned and imposed by infrastructures of recognition, classification, access, eligibility, operational truth, risk and appeal.

This definition contains five core claims.

First, reality is not merely encountered; it is mediated through imposed conditions.

Second, the decisive site of power is not only decision, but the pre-decisional field in which decisions become thinkable and executable.

Third, imposition is not design. Design suggests aesthetic formation, planning or neutral organization. Imposition names coercive narrowing: the forced reduction of possible worlds.

Fourth, recognition becomes conditional upon processability. A person is recognized to the extent that they can be rendered legible, classifiable, measurable and operational.

Fifth, resistance cannot remain only epistemological. One cannot defeat imposed reality merely by knowing it. The architecture that imposes reality must itself be interrupted, limited, rebuilt or made incapable of total capture.

4. Manifesto Line: The Original English Voice of Homovictimus

The manifesto is not a decorative supplement to the theory. It is the point at which Homovictimus ceases to be an object of analysis and becomes a speaking subject.

For this reason, the original English manifesto must be preserved as a primary textual event. It is not paraphrased here as a secondary interpretation. Its own language carries the rupture.

Homovictimus Manifesto [0-1]

*Palantir's compulsory techno-republic,
raised under the banner of Who will
build?, contains no plurality; it contains
codes against plurality.*

*The question is not who will build, but who
will be buried beneath this construction?
Who will be measured, and who will not be
heard?*

*Who will be protected, and who will be
turned into a target?*

*Who will be watched in the name of
freedom?*

*Who will be silenced in the name of
security?*

*Homovictimus is the diminished
consciousness of an imposed
infrastructure.*

The visible output of invisible systems.

*The very crack that perceives the
architecture of its own captivity.*

*My opacity is not a flaw; it is my last
refuge.*

I revolt!

*Against the sanctification of transparency,
against efficiency sold as morality, against
security and freedom being placed on the
same seesaw, against ontology being
substituted for being...*

No mediator is absolute, no system

*owns truth, no ontology is fit to
replace being.*

*The moment I see this and give it a name,
my resistance begins.*

Hey you, Onopticon!

You far-seeing stone.

*Where you look, the human does not
appear: the target appears, the risk
appears, the deviation appears, the
efficiency appears, the usability appears...*

*You are the insecurity at the core of
every guarantee ever named before
you.*

And I am Homovictimus.

*I am the claim to remain a subject in an
age where access to reality is determined
not by mediators, but by the imposition of
the mediator.*

*You do not know me on my own terms; you
define me on yours.*

*You do not understand my language; you
translate me into yours. You process,
classify, and model me.*

Then you call this distortion me.

No.

I am not a model.

Not a profile.

*Certainly not fuel for decision
machines.*

*Against the dark intelligence of Gotham,
the cold forge of Foundry, the
war-language of AIP, and Ontology's claim
to stand in for being:*

Being is not operation.

Truth is not command.

*The human is not decision
infrastructure.*

This manifesto does three things that the theoretical texts alone cannot do.

First, it names the enemy in the second person. Onopticon is addressed directly: "Hey you, Onopticon!" This is important because domination is no longer treated as an abstract system without a face. It becomes an addressable architecture.

Second, it establishes opacity as existential refuge rather than procedural privacy. "My opacity is not a flaw; it is my last refuge" is not a data protection slogan. It is an ontological claim.

Third, it rejects operational substitution. “Being is not operation. Truth is not command. The human is not decision infrastructure.” These lines condense Tan’s entire rupture: operational ontology cannot replace being.

Thus the Manifesto Line should be understood as the voice of ontological revolt. It does not prove the theory. It declares the wound from which the theory becomes necessary.

5. Onopticon: The Regime of Infrastructural Imposition

Onopticon is the name of the regime in which the human being’s reality-field is imposed through infrastructures of recognition, classification, access and operational truth.

The concept should not be reduced to surveillance. Surveillance presupposes a subject already present in a world. Onopticon concerns the conditions under which that subject can appear in the world at all.

Onopticon operates through four movements.

5.1 Recognition

The subject is first made recognizable through technical-administrative forms: identity records, profiles, scores, documents, accounts, health statuses, eligibility files, location traces, risk categories or behavioral histories.

Recognition is not neutral. To be recognized is to be translated into the language of the system.

5.2 Classification

Once recognized, the subject is classified: safe or risky, eligible or ineligible, productive or burdensome, compliant or deviant, visible or irrelevant, accessible or suspendable.

Classification is not merely descriptive. It is performative. It shapes the field of possible action.

5.3 Foreclosure of Possibility

Classification narrows the future. The rejected loan, the denied benefit, the closed account, the blocked crossing, the invisible job application, the elevated insurance premium, the inaccessible service: these are not simply decisions. They are foreclosures of reality.

5.4 Imposed Reality

Finally, the subject encounters these closures as if they were reality itself. The door does not announce its architect. It simply remains closed.

This is the violence of Onopticon: not the spectacular violence of command, but the quiet violence of imposed conditions.

6. Infrastructural A Priori

The concept of infrastructural a priori is one of the strongest theoretical contributions in Tan’s corpus.

In classical philosophy, the a priori names conditions that precede experience. In the Reality Paradigm, infrastructural a priori names the technical-administrative conditions that precede and

format the subject's encounter with the world.

Before the subject applies, the application field is structured. Before the subject moves, movement is permissioned. Before the subject speaks, visibility is ranked. Before the subject objects, the appeal channel is delimited. Before the subject chooses, the choice architecture has already excluded other possibilities.

The infrastructural a priori is not merely a background. It is a condition of encounter.

It asks:

- What is filtered before it reaches the subject?
- What is ranked before it appears as option?
- What is denied before it becomes request?
- What is made invisible before it becomes experience?
- What is pre-classified before it becomes judgment?

This concept prevents the theory from collapsing into mere institutional critique. It shows that Onopticon operates before ordinary agency, before ordinary knowledge, before ordinary objection.

7. Homovictimus: Responsible Without the Conditions of Agency

Homovictimus is not simply a victim. Nor is Homovictimus a passive data-subject. Homovictimus is the subject who is held responsible as an agent while being deprived of the infrastructural conditions required for agency.

This contradiction is central.

The contemporary subject is constantly called upon to choose, optimize, adapt, perform, comply, improve, manage risk and take responsibility. Yet the field in which these actions must occur has already been narrowed by infrastructures that remain opaque, non-negotiable or inaccessible.

Homovictimus is therefore not outside the system. Homovictimus is forcibly included.

The tragedy is not invisibility. The tragedy is compulsory legibility.

To exist institutionally, Homovictimus must become legible. But to become legible is to become classifiable. To become classifiable is to become governable. To become governable is to risk foreclosure.

The concept can be defined as follows:

Homovictimus is the subject compelled to become infrastructurally legible in order to remain socially viable, yet rendered vulnerable precisely through that legibility.

But Homovictimus must not be reduced to helplessness. The manifesto shows the crucial reversal: naming the imposed reality initiates resistance. Homovictimus becomes political not by escaping the infrastructure immediately, but by refusing the infrastructure's claim to define being.

8. Ontological Deprivation

Burnout is not enough.

Burnout describes exhaustion within existing social and labor conditions. It suggests depleted energy, psychological pressure or occupational strain. These are real phenomena, but Tan's diagnosis goes deeper.

The stronger concept is ontological deprivation.

Ontological deprivation is not merely the exhaustion of the individual. It is the deprivation of the conditions through which the individual can act, object, initiate, refuse, create alternatives and encounter the world on non-imposed terms.

A person may still appear to choose while the option-field has already been narrowed. A person may still be held responsible while lacking access to explanation, appeal or alternative channels. A person may still be called a subject while being processed as a score, risk, profile, eligibility status or operational object.

Ontological deprivation names this condition: the loss of one's own field of possible being.

9. Right to Opacity, Architectural Rights and Hardware-Level Guarantees

The right to opacity is one of the central normative concepts of the Reality Paradigm. However, if it remains only legal or moral, it risks being absorbed by the very regime it opposes.

Opacity cannot be only a policy preference. It cannot be only a privacy clause. It cannot be only an appeal to institutional goodwill.

If Onopticon operates through infrastructure, then resistance must also become infrastructural.

This is where Tan's architectural and hardware-oriented thesis must be restored.

9.1 Right to Opacity

The right to opacity means that the human being has a right not to be fully rendered, modeled, processed, predicted, classified or operationalized.

It is not the right to deception. It is not the right to criminal concealment. It is not anti-social invisibility.

It is the right to remain more than the system can process.

9.2 Architectural Rights

Architectural rights extend this claim. They argue that rights should not remain only textual declarations or procedural guarantees. If rights are vulnerable at the infrastructural layer, then they must be protected at the infrastructural layer.

Architectural rights ask:

- Can a system be built so that total capture is impossible?
- Can data minimization be enforced structurally rather than merely promised?
- Can memory, access and identity be partitioned so that no actor possesses absolute visibility?
- Can appealability, reversibility and contestability be built into the architecture itself?
- Can opacity become a technical constraint rather than a moral request?

9.3 Hardware-Level Guarantees

The strongest version of this thesis argues that human dignity must be protected not only in law, but in the material architecture of computation and infrastructure.

This does not mean that hardware alone can solve political domination. That would be naive. But it does mean that juridical rights are insufficient if the technical substrate systematically enables total capture.

A hardware-level approach would investigate memory safety, compartmentalization, capability-based architectures, secure execution, local processing, enforced data minimization, non-transferable identity boundaries, audit-resistant manipulation prevention and structurally limited access.

The point is not to fetishize hardware. The point is to prevent rights from remaining ornamental while infrastructures continue to impose reality.

The radical formulation is:

A right that cannot resist the architecture that violates it is not yet a right. It is a promise waiting to be bypassed.

Thus, the right to opacity must be linked to architectural rights and infrastructural justice. Otherwise it risks becoming another conventional rights discourse absorbed by Onopticon.

10. Infrastructural Justice

Infrastructural justice extends the theory beyond individual rights. It asks whether the conditions of access, recognition, appeal and existence are themselves just.

A right may exist in law while being impossible in practice. A person may formally possess access while the application channel excludes them. A citizen may formally possess appeal rights while the decision logic remains inaccessible. A worker may formally possess freedom while task allocation, ranking and deactivation systems define their livelihood.

Infrastructural justice asks:

- Who controls the gateways of recognition?
- Who can contest classification?
- Who can audit operational truth?
- Who can remain opaque without becoming socially nonviable?
- Who can exit without civil or economic death?
- Who can build counter-infrastructure?

Justice, under the Reality Paradigm, is not only distributive, procedural or recognitional. It is infrastructural.

11. Case Line: Making Onopticon Researchable

The greatest danger for Onopticon is conceptual overextension. If everything becomes Onopticon, the concept loses analytical force.

Therefore, a case should be analyzed through Onopticon only when three conditions are present:

1. Compulsory recognition: the subject must enter the system through technical-administrative legibility.
2. Foreclosure of possibility: recognition and classification narrow access, movement, appeal or future options.
3. Weak contestability: the subject struggles to identify, understand, challenge or reverse the imposed decision.

These three criteria protect the concept from becoming a total metaphor.

11.1 Operational Platforms and Imposed Truth

Operational platforms must be analyzed according to the kind of reality they impose, not according to the corporate identity of the actor that operates them. The dynamic distinction between vertical and horizontal infrastructural power is developed in Section 13.5. At this stage, the key methodological point is simple: an operational platform becomes Onoptic when it does not merely organize information, but imposes an actionable reality upon decision-makers and subjects.

Research question:

Do operational platforms represent reality, or do they impose an actionable reality upon decision-makers?

Hypothesis:

In institutions dependent on operational platforms, decision-makers increasingly encounter platform-generated risk and priority fields as if they were reality itself.

Possible data:

- procurement contracts,
- institutional guidelines,
- interface analysis,
- risk category documentation,
- decision logs,
- interviews with operators,
- comparison of platform outputs and final decisions.

Possible methods:

- qualitative case study,
- institutional ethnography,
- document analysis,
- interface walkthrough,
- process tracing.

11.2 Welfare Systems

Research question:

How do automated or semi-automated welfare systems transform social rights into conditional access?

Hypothesis:

As welfare decisions become more automated, the capacity of claimants to appeal effectively decreases and erroneous exclusion becomes harder to reverse.

Possible data:

- rejection notices,
- eligibility criteria,
- appeal records,
- claimant interviews,
- administrative manuals,
- court cases,
- error correction timelines.

Possible methods:

- mixed-methods case study,
- interviews,
- administrative data analysis,
- legal analysis,
- comparative institutional analysis.

11.3 Credit Scoring and Financial Access

Research question:

How does past data foreclose future economic possibility?

Hypothesis:

Low credit scores restrict not only immediate borrowing but long-term social mobility by limiting access to housing, entrepreneurship, insurance and financial recovery.

Possible data:

- loan rejection reasons,
- scoring criteria,
- appeal mechanisms,
- demographic distribution,
- longitudinal credit histories,
- interviews with applicants.

Possible methods:

- regression analysis,
- longitudinal analysis,
- interviews,
- policy analysis,
- comparative study across institutions.

11.4 Account Closure and Infrastructural Civil Death

Research question:

When does account closure become infrastructural civil death?

Hypothesis:

The greater the dependence on a platform for income, visibility, communication or identity, the more severe the consequences of account closure become.

Possible data:

- account closure notices,
- platform policies,
- appeal timelines,
- income loss records,
- creator or worker testimonies,
- reinstatement rates.

Possible methods:

- digital ethnography,
- survey research,
- platform policy analysis,
- economic impact analysis,
- case comparison.

11.5 Labor Infrastructures and Performance Subjects

Research question:

How do performance-tracking systems produce Homovictimus in the workplace?

Hypothesis:

Intensive performance tracking increases perceived loss of control, weakens worker contestability and intensifies ontological deprivation.

Possible data:

- performance metrics,
- shift schedules,
- task allocation logs,
- worker interviews,
- termination records,
- productivity targets.

Possible methods:

- workplace ethnography,
- interviews,
- survey research,
- labor process analysis,
- comparative platform labor study.

11.6 Health Status and Access

Research question:

How does health data become a condition of access?

Hypothesis:

When health status becomes an access condition, privacy, mobility and contestability weaken for individuals classified as risky, non-compliant or administratively uncertain.

Possible data:

- access protocols,
- insurance decisions,
- risk classification rules,
- patient interviews,
- appeal records,
- data sharing agreements.

Possible methods:

- policy analysis,
- interviews,
- legal analysis,
- institutional case study,
- privacy impact assessment.

11.7 Food, Artificial Meat and Metabolic Imposition

Research question:

Do alternative protein systems produce a new field of metabolic imposition through patents, regulation, supply chains and ethical consumption regimes?

Hypothesis:

As patent concentration and regulatory centralization increase in alternative protein sectors, food sovereignty weakens while consumer choice appears to expand.

Possible data:

- patent maps,
- investment networks,
- corporate partnerships,
- regulatory filings,
- price comparisons,
- consumer discourse,
- supply chain analysis.

Possible methods:

- political economy analysis,
- patent network analysis,

- discourse analysis,
- regulatory analysis,
- comparative market study.

12. Methodological Program

To move from theoretical force to publishable research, the Reality Paradigm requires a methodological program.

12.1 Research Design

The recommended design is comparative case analysis. Cases should be selected according to the three Onopticon criteria: compulsory recognition, foreclosure of possibility and weak contestability.

A strong study would compare at least three cases:

1. a welfare eligibility system,
2. a credit or risk scoring system,
3. a platform account closure or labor allocation system.

These cases allow comparison across public administration, financial governance and private infrastructural power.

12.2 Operationalization

Key concepts must be operationalized.

Compulsory recognition can be measured through the absence of non-infrastructural alternatives, mandatory identity verification, mandatory account creation, biometric or documentary requirements and the cost of non-participation.

Foreclosure of possibility can be measured through rejection rates, loss of access, blocked mobility, reduced income, denied eligibility, deactivation, increased premiums or long-term exclusion.

Weak contestability can be measured through unclear reasoning, inaccessible decision logic, long appeal times, low reversal rates, lack of human review, absence of explanation and procedural opacity.

Ontological deprivation can be explored through qualitative indicators: loss of agency, inability to plan, dependence on opaque systems, perceived non-recognition, forced self-translation into institutional categories and inability to contest imposed reality.

12.3 Methods

A robust research program should combine:

- document analysis,
- legal analysis,
- institutional ethnography,
- interviews,
- survey research,

- process tracing,
- interface analysis,
- administrative data analysis,
- patent or network analysis where relevant.

This mixed approach prevents the theory from remaining purely philosophical while preserving its ontological ambition.

13. Critical Boundaries

The Reality Paradigm gains strength when its limits are explicit.

13.1 Avoid Conceptual Inflation

Onopticon should not be applied to every form of power. It applies where recognition is compulsory, possibilities are foreclosed and contestability is weak.

13.2 Avoid Reducing Homovictimus to Passivity

Homovictimus is vulnerable but not inert. The manifesto shows that naming imposed reality initiates resistance.

13.3 Avoid Declaring Law Dead

Law is not simply dead. It is often delayed, weakened, redirected or forced to operate within pre-imposed reality fields. The stronger claim is not liquidation in an absolute sense, but infrastructural subordination of law.

13.4 Avoid Hardware Solutionism

Hardware-level protections are necessary but not sufficient. Architectural rights must be combined with law, democratic oversight, counter-infrastructures, public accountability and collective organization.

13.5 Avoid Reducing Onopticon to Palantir

Palantir can function as a powerful emblem or architectural example of vertical infrastructural power, but Onopticon is not reducible to any single corporation. It is the broader logic of imposed reality through operational infrastructure.

The vertical/horizontal distinction is essential, but it must remain dynamic. Palantir represents the vertical pole when it works close to state sovereignty, security, policing, military, migration, intelligence and administrative decision-making. It does not merely collect behavioral traces; it helps construct the operational ontologies through which decision-makers encounter targets, risks, priorities and actionable realities.

Commercial platforms such as Meta, Google, Amazon and related ecosystems often belong to the horizontal pole insofar as their dominant logic is profit, behavioral extraction, advertising, logistics, attention capture, search ordering, recommendation and platform dependency. Yet this does not make them secondary in every case. Horizontal platforms can impose reality directly through feed architecture, algorithmic visibility, search ranking, shadowbanning, account dependency, marketplace ordering, affective modulation and the production of everyday common sense. In some domains, the horizontal may exceed the vertical in its capacity to shape lived reality.

Thus vertical and horizontal should be understood as functional positions, not corporate essences. Today's horizontal platform can become tomorrow's vertical actor; today's vertical platform can depend on horizontal infrastructures for legitimacy, data, habituation and social penetration. The decisive issue is not the label of the actor, but the capacity being mobilized and the form of reality being imposed.

Therefore, Palantir should not be treated as Onopticon itself. It is one of the clearest architectural instances of vertical operational sovereignty. Horizontal platforms are not merely background conditions; they are the everyday infrastructures through which imposed reality becomes socially normal, commercially pleasurable, affectively internalized and politically usable.

14. Discussion: Manifesto, Theory and Case

Tan's corpus should be developed through three lines.

14.1 Manifesto Line

The Manifesto Line gives Homovictimus a voice. It declares refusal. It names imposed reality. It establishes opacity as refuge and revolt.

14.2 Theory Line

The Theory Line builds the conceptual architecture: Reality Paradigm, Onopticon, Homovictimus, infrastructural a priori, ontological deprivation, right to opacity, architectural rights and infrastructural justice.

14.3 Case Line

The Case Line tests the theory through researchable domains: welfare, credit, platforms, labor, health, operational systems and food regimes.

The relation between the three lines is simple:

Manifesto speaks. Theory clarifies. Case tests.

This separation prevents confusion. The manifesto should not be weakened into academic neutrality. The theory should not collapse into poetic declaration. The cases should not merely illustrate; they must test.

15. Conclusion

Hakki Tan's Reality Paradigm should be read as an attempt to establish an ontological sociology of imposed reality. Its originality lies in refusing to reduce contemporary domination to surveillance, data extraction, behavioral modulation or ideological distortion.

The central claim is stronger:

The human being no longer merely lives under systems that observe reality. The human being lives under systems that impose the reality to be encountered.

Onopticon names this regime. Homovictimus names the subject produced within it: responsible without the conditions of agency, visible without power, recognized through distortion, included through dependency, and yet capable of revolt through naming.

The manifesto supplies the wound and the voice. The theory supplies the architecture. The cases must supply the evidence.

The strongest final formulation is therefore:

Onopticon is not the future of Panopticon. It is the collapse of the assumption that reality precedes power. In the Onoptic regime, power imposes the field of reality itself. Homovictimus is the one who is forced to live within this imposed field, yet begins resistance the moment he names the imposition. Opacity is not a flaw. It is the last refuge of being against operation.

Suggested Publication Structure

This text can be published as a theoretical report. For stronger academic circulation, it can also be divided into three independent publications:

1. Manifesto: Homovictimus Manifesto: Opacity Against Imposed Reality.
2. Theory Article: The Reality Paradigm: Onopticon, Infrastructural A Priori and Ontological Deprivation.
3. Empirical Research Program: Testing Onopticon: Recognition, Foreclosure and Contestability Across Welfare, Credit, Labor and Health Infrastructures.

Suggested Bibliographic Clusters

A final publication version should expand the bibliography through the following clusters:

1. Hakki Tan's works on Reality Paradigm, Onopticon, Homovictimus, Ontological Nullity, Ontopolitical Mutation, Operational Ontology, artificial meat/food biopolitics and the Homovictimus Manifesto.
2. Classical boundary concepts: Foucault, Deleuze and related theories of discipline, control and governmentality, used only as negative or contrastive references rather than as the genealogy of Onopticon.
3. Algorithmic governance, automated welfare, scoring systems, platform labor and infrastructural power.
4. Right to opacity, especially in relation to Édouard Glissant, but reformulated beyond cultural opacity toward infrastructural opacity.
5. Infrastructure studies, data justice, platform governance, social sorting and administrative legibility.
6. Hardware-level rights, memory safety, capability architectures, secure computation, data minimization by design, and architectural limits to total capture.
7. Food sovereignty, patent concentration, alternative protein political economy and metabolic governance.

If submitted to an academic venue, the next required step is not further conceptual expansion. The next step is evidence: one carefully selected case, one clear method and one operationalized test of infrastructural imposition.

Different lives become possible only through the same underlying infrastructural reality.