

The Reality Paradigm: Onopticon and Imposed Reality

A Theoretical Manifesto-Article on Homovictimus, Kratoptic Violence and Fragoptic Attrition

Hakki Tan

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

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

— **Hakki Tan**

Abstract

This article develops the **Reality Paradigm** as a theoretical intervention into contemporary debates on power, subjectivity and infrastructural governance. It argues that twenty-first-century power cannot be adequately understood solely through surveillance, discipline, ideology, data extraction or juridical sovereignty. More fundamentally, contemporary power operates by imposing the material, technical and administrative conditions under which subjects encounter the world. The central concept of the article is the **Onopticon**. Unlike the Panopticon, the Onopticon should not be understood as a digitalised continuation of surveillance. It designates a paradigmatic shift through which the subject is rendered recognisable, classifiable, accessible, liable to rejection and governable before action takes place.

The article positions the Onopticon as the primary ontological regime of imposed reality. **Homovictimus** names the subject of this regime: a subject held responsible as an agent while being deprived of the infrastructural conditions necessary for meaningful agency. **Kratopticon** and **Fragopticon** are not treated as independent regimes equivalent to the Onopticon, but as secondary modalities of the Onoptic field. Kratopticon refers to the violent modality through which human beings are transformed into operational targets, security objects or detainable bodies. Fragoptic refers to the attritional modality through which decision-making and action are weakened by uncertainty, weak contestability and temporally dispersed pressure.

The article does not present a policy programme or reform proposal. Instead, it offers a conceptual architecture for analysing imposed reality. The **Right to Opacity** is therefore not advanced as a solution, but as an ontological-political threshold against the absolutisation of readability, classification and operational reduction. The article concludes by arguing that the Reality Paradigm should be understood not as a total theory of power, but as an analytical framework for studying the infrastructural production of reality and the conditions under which subjects become visible, vulnerable, targetable and contestable.

Keywords: Reality Paradigm; Onopticon; Homovictimus; counter-agency; Kratopticon; Fragoptic; Homo Sacer; Homo Fragilis; Right to Opacity; imposed reality; infrastructural a priori; ontological deprivation; 9/11; post-9/11 security infrastructure; Guantánamo; Patriot Act; Afghanistan; Iraq; drone warfare; targeted killing; Yugoslavia; dissolution of Yugoslavia; re-territorialisation of Yugoslavia; Bosnia; Serbia; Croatia; Kosovo; Dayton Settlement; ethnic cleansing; forced displacement; war crimes procedures; SWIFT restrictions; platform labour; Uber; Airbnb.

1. Introduction: Reality Does Not Precede Power

Contemporary power can no longer be adequately analysed by asking only who watches, who punishes, who produces ideology or who controls discourse. These questions remain important, but they do not reach the deeper problem addressed in this article: **under what imposed conditions is the subject made to encounter reality at all?**

The Reality Paradigm is not a theory of truth. It does not primarily ask what is true, false or misrepresented. Its question is prior to this:

Under what material, technical, administrative, financial and algorithmic conditions do truth, conduct, movement, objection and subjectivity become possible?

The opening proposition of this article is therefore the following: **my paradigm is not a paradigm of the Truth; it is a paradigm of Reality.** Truth refers here to problems of correctness, representation and contestation. Reality, by contrast, refers to the material-technical field into which the subject is inserted before it can act, raise objections, move, claim, refuse or appear.

This distinction is crucial. The Reality Paradigm does not remain within the opposition between truth and falsehood. It addresses the prior field in which truth, falsehood, agency, objection and subjectivity become possible. In this sense, reality is not a neutral world simply awaiting interpretation. It is operationally imposed through infrastructures of recognition, access, eligibility, risk, identity, movement, labour, finance, application, objection and visibility. The subject does not encounter the world directly; it encounters the world through pre-structured technical and administrative passages.

The central claim of this article is therefore:

Contemporary power does not merely represent, manipulate or conceal reality; it constructs and imposes the field within which reality becomes encounterable.

The key concept through which this claim is developed is the **Onopticon**. The Onopticon is not the updated, digital or algorithmic version of the Panopticon. The Panopticon concerns visibility, discipline and the correction of conduct. The Onopticon concerns the prior structuring of the field in which conduct can occur at all. Whereas the Panopticon renders the subject visible, the Onopticon constructs the reality in which the subject may appear, move, apply, be rejected, be ranked, be rendered eligible or become contestable.

The Onopticon therefore does not ask:

Who watches the subject?

It asks instead:

Who imposes the reality within which the subject can appear?

The article places the Onopticon at the centre of its theoretical architecture. **Kratopticon**, **Fragopticon**, **Homovictimus**, **Homo Fragilis**, the **Right to Opacity** and **counter-agency** are not presented as independent theories of equal weight. They are supporting concepts that unfold different dimensions of the Onoptic field: its subject-form, its violent modality, its attritional modality and its limit condition. The founding claim remains singular: **the Onopticon names the contemporary imposition of reality by power.**

Accordingly, Kratopticon and Fragopticon are treated as subordinate modalities of the Onoptic regime. Kratopticon refers to the violent transformation of human beings into operational targets

within a field of Onoptic classification and risk. Fragopticon refers to the weakening of decision-making and action within the same imposed field through uncertainty, weak contestability and temporally dispersed attrition.

The article should therefore be read not as a threefold typology of power, but as a theoretical programme centred on the Onoptic production of imposed reality.

2. Methodological Orientation: A Theoretical Manifesto-Article

This article is not designed as a quantitative empirical study. It is a work of conceptual theory-building. The empirical examples used throughout the article are not treated as direct causal proof, but as **analytical case indicators** through which the conceptual architecture becomes visible.

The aim is not to offer a completed empirical theory, but to construct a framework capable of analysing contemporary power as the infrastructural imposition of reality. For this reason, the article does not follow the conventional sequence of hypothesis, test and result. Instead, it proceeds through conceptual clarification, theoretical differentiation, analytical case indicators and the articulation of conditions under which the framework may later be operationalised.

The methodological orientation rests on four moves.

First, it distinguishes the Onopticon from the Panopticon, societies of control and surveillance capitalism. The Onopticon is not treated as the continuation of these models, but as a different ontological level of power.

Second, it identifies the Onopticon as the founding concept. The other concepts used in the article clarify the subjective, violent, attritional and threshold dimensions of the Onoptic field.

Third, it uses cases such as Guantánamo, post-9/11 security infrastructures, the dissolution of Yugoslavia, platform labour, financial networks and algorithmic management as analytical indicators of how imposed reality operates.

Fourth, it proposes criteria of analytical distinguishability: **compulsory recognition, foreclosure of possibility** and **weak contestability**. These criteria are intended to distinguish Onoptic processes from other forms of power.

This article does not claim to explain all forms of domination. It focuses specifically on three modalities: the infrastructural imposition of the field of encounter; the technical-organisational production of the body as an object of violence; and the attritional weakening of decision-making and action through uncertainty.

Nor does the article offer a solution, reform package or policy programme. The function of the Reality Paradigm is diagnostic. It aims to name the imposed reality that otherwise appears natural. In this sense, terms such as the Right to Opacity, counter-agency and infrastructural justice are not presented as institutional programmes, but as analytical limit-concepts against the absolutisation of the Onoptic field.

3. Conceptual Map

Given the conceptual density of the article, it is useful to clarify from the outset how each concept functions within the argument. The following table does not introduce separate theories, but locates each term within the Onoptic architecture of imposed reality.

Concept	Function in the Article
Reality Paradigm	Analyses the imposed conditions under which reality becomes encounterable.
Onopticon	Names the infrastructural imposition of reality before action takes place.
Infrastructural a priori	Names the technical-administrative conditions that precede and structure the subject's encounter with the world.
Homovictimus	Names the subject held responsible while deprived of the infrastructural conditions of agency.
Counter-agency	Refers to the fragile capacity to expose or interrupt imposed reality.
Ontological deprivation	Names the loss of one's own field of possible existence under imposed reality.
Kratopticon	Names the violent modality of the Onoptic field; it turns bodies into operational targets.
Fragopticon	Names the attritional modality of the Onoptic field; it weakens decision-making and contestation.
Right to Opacity	Functions as a limit-principle against absolute readability and operational reduction.

This conceptual map should be read hierarchically rather than horizontally. The **Onopticon** is the founding concept of the article. The remaining concepts clarify its infrastructural condition, subject-form, fragile counter-agency, existential consequence, violent modality, attritional modality and limit condition.

4. Beyond the Panopticon: Onopticon as the Infrastructural Imposition of Reality

It would be theoretically insufficient to present the Onopticon as a more advanced, digital or algorithmic Panopticon. Yet it would be equally mistaken to reduce Foucault's Panopticon to a simple model of retrospective watching.

Foucault's analysis of the Panopticon concerns visibility, discipline, automatic power and the normative production of subjects (Foucault, 1977). Deleuze's account of societies of control emphasises modulation beyond enclosed disciplinary institutions (Deleuze, 1992). Zuboff's theory of surveillance capitalism analyses behavioural data extraction, prediction and behavioural modification (Zuboff, 2019). These approaches are indispensable, but they do not fully account for the ontological level at which the Onopticon operates.

Concept	Central Question	Governing Logic
Panopticon	Who is seen and disciplined?	Visibility, norm and subject production
Societies of Control	Who is modulated?	Continuous control
Surveillance Capitalism	From whom is behavioural data extracted?	Prediction and behavioural modification

Concept	Central Question	Governing Logic
Onopticon	Within what imposed reality can the subject appear?	Imposed reality
<i>The Onopticon does not simply see.</i> <i>It does not simply modulate.</i> <i>It does not simply extract data.</i>		

It imposes the field within which the subject can be seen, ranked, processed, rejected, accessed, profiled and rendered socially viable.

Its fundamental question is therefore:

Who imposes the conditions under which the subject can appear in the world?

This marks the conceptual threshold of the article. The Onopticon names power operating not after experience, but within the conditions of experience itself.

This does not entail a rejection of Foucault. On the contrary, the argument extends the Foucauldian analysis of disciplinary production into a new material-technical register. The Panopticon produces the subject within visibility. The Onopticon constructs the reality within which the subject can become visible, processable, rejectable or excluded. It is therefore not the mere evolution of the Panopticon, but an ontological displacement of Panoptic visibility into the infrastructural conditions under which visibility, recognition and contestability become possible.

5. Theoretical Location: Boundary Concepts and Points of Differentiation

The Reality Paradigm does not reject existing critical literature. Nor does it claim to emerge from nowhere. Foucault, Deleuze, Zuboff, Agamben, Mbembe, Scott and the literature on hybrid warfare function here as boundary points rather than as a linear genealogy.

Literature	Explanatory Strength	Added Dimension of the Reality Paradigm
Foucault / Panopticon	Discipline, visibility and subject production	Imposition of the pre-experiential field of encounter
Deleuze / Control	Continuous modulation	The imposed reality upon which modulation operates
Zuboff / Surveillance Capitalism	Data extraction and behavioural prediction	Construction of the field of possibility before behaviour
Scott / Legibility	State simplification of society	Recognition, eligibility and contestability infrastructures prior to experience
Agamben / Homo Sacer	Exception and bare life	Operational transformation of bare life into targetable object
Mbembe / Necropolitics	Politics of death	Technical-bureaucratic organisation of killing and detention
Hoffman / Hybrid Warfare	Grey-zone tools and hybrid conflict	Attritional weakening of decision-making capacity
Infrastructure Studies	Invisibility and constitutive force of infrastructure	Infrastructure as condition of encounter

Foucault shows how disciplinary power produces the subject; the Onopticon analyses how the field in which the subject encounters the world is technically and administratively imposed. Deleuze analyses modulation; the Onopticon asks about the reality upon which modulation operates. Zuboff analyses behavioural extraction and prediction; the Onopticon examines the structuring of the field of possible behaviour before behaviour takes place.

Scott's account of legibility shows how the state simplifies society in order to render it administratively manageable (Scott, 1998). The Reality Paradigm extends this line of thought. The problem is not only that society is made legible, but that the subject's conditions of application, mobility, contestation, risk, access and social viability are pre-structured by technical-administrative infrastructures. Mann's theory of infrastructural power is also relevant, since it concerns the state's capacity to penetrate society (Mann, 1984). Star's ethnography of infrastructure further demonstrates how infrastructures often remain invisible, embedded and noticed only in moments of breakdown (Star, 1999). The Reality Paradigm adds that infrastructure is not merely background; it becomes the condition of encounter itself.

DeNardis's work on internet governance is significant for showing that technical infrastructures are not neutral carriers. Protocols, domain names, network architectures and standards become sites of political struggle (DeNardis, 2014). This is essential for understanding the digital dimension of the Onopticon: power operates not only at the level of content, discourse or data, but also through the infrastructural layer that makes access, visibility, connection and circulation possible.

Agamben analyses the juridical production of bare life outside the protection of law (Agamben, 1998). Kratopticon asks how this bare life is transformed into an operational object through databases, transfer chains, camp architecture, interrogation protocols, security classification and targeting technologies. Mbembe's concept of necropolitics remains indispensable for understanding the politics of death and exposure to death (Mbembe, 2003). Kratopticon extends this discussion into the technical-bureaucratic organisation of targeting and detention.

Finally, the literature on hybrid warfare often focuses on tools: disinformation, cyber-operations, proxy actors and grey-zone tactics (Hoffman, 2007). Fragopticon shifts attention from tools to the subject-form produced by such conditions: the fragile subject whose capacity to decide, object and act is weakened through uncertainty.

6. The Reality Paradigm: Not Truth, but Conditions of Encounter

The Reality Paradigm is not a paradigm of truth. It is not primarily concerned with truth-value, representation or ideological distortion.

Its central question is:

Under what imposed conditions does the human being encounter reality?

This marks a decisive shift. Theories of truth often operate at the level of knowledge, representation, discourse, evidence or ideology. The Reality Paradigm operates at the level of encounter, access, recognition, eligibility and possibility.

From this perspective, reality is not simply given. Nor is it merely interpreted or represented. It is imposed through technical-administrative infrastructures.

These infrastructures determine in advance:

- what may become visible;

- who may be recognised;
- which application may be processed;
- which movement may be permitted;
- which body may be coded as risky;
- which account may remain active;
- which objection may be heard;
- which future may remain open.

The Reality Paradigm can therefore be defined as follows:

The Reality Paradigm is a theoretical framework for analysing how the conditions under which human beings encounter the world are pre-structured and imposed by infrastructures of recognition, classification, access, eligibility, risk, operational validity and contestation.

This definition implies five claims.

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

Second, power operates not only at the moment of decision, but prior to decision.

Third, imposition is not neutral design; it is the coercive narrowing of possible worlds.

Fourth, recognition is tied to processability.

Fifth, resistance cannot be merely epistemological; it must address the architecture that imposes reality.

This does not mean that truth and reality are absolutely separable. They are not. Truth is always entangled with regimes of reality. The point is more precise: the Reality Paradigm gives analytical priority to the material-technical field that determines the conditions under which truth can become accessible, contestable or meaningful.

7. Onopticon: The Regime of Infrastructural Imposition

7.1 Definition

The Onopticon names the primary ontological regime in which the human field of reality is imposed through infrastructures of recognition, classification, access and operational validity.

The concept must not be confused with surveillance. Surveillance observes a subject already situated in the world. The Onopticon determines the conditions under which the subject can appear in the world.

Its basic formula is:

recognise first, classify next, foreclose possibility, and then present this foreclosure as reality.

A structure may be called Onoptic only when three conditions are present.

First, there must be **compulsory recognition**: the subject is forced to enter a technical-administrative field of readability.

Second, there must be **foreclosure of possibility**: recognition and classification narrow access, movement, objection or future options.

Third, there must be **weak contestability**: the subject struggles to understand, challenge or reverse the imposed decision.

These criteria prevent the Onopticon from becoming a loose metaphor for any form of infrastructure.

7.2 The Four Movements of the Onopticon

The Onopticon operates through four movements.

First, the subject is recognised through technical-administrative forms: identity records, profiles, scores, documents, accounts, health statuses, eligibility files, location traces, risk categories and behavioural histories. Recognition is not neutral. To be recognised is to be translated into the language of the system.

Second, the recognised subject is classified: safe or risky, eligible or ineligible, productive or burdensome, compliant or deviant, visible or irrelevant, accessible or suspendable. Classification does not merely describe; it shapes future possibility.

Third, classification forecloses possibility. A rejected loan, suspended account, invisible job application, increased insurance premium, blocked border crossing or inaccessible appeal channel is not merely an isolated decision. It is a closure of reality.

Fourth, the subject experiences this closure as reality itself. The gate does not explain its architecture; it simply remains closed.

The violence of the Onopticon lies here. It is not spectacular violence issuing commands. It is quiet violence imposing conditions.

7.3 Financial Onopticon

The political weaponisation of financial networks is central to the Onopticon. Global payment systems, sanctions regimes, credit-rating mechanisms, risk scores and debt infrastructures may determine in advance what economic actions can be performed. Farrell and Newman's concept of weaponised interdependence is particularly relevant here, since it shows how global networks can become instruments of coercion (Farrell & Newman, 2019).

SWIFT restrictions, credit scores, risk profiles and algorithmic financial decisions are not merely economic mechanisms. They pre-structure the economic reality within which individual and collective actors can move.

8. The Infrastructural A Priori

One of the central concepts of the Reality Paradigm is the **infrastructural a priori**.

In classical philosophy, the a priori refers to conditions that precede experience. In the Reality Paradigm, the infrastructural a priori refers to the technical-administrative conditions that precede and structure the subject's encounter with the world.

Before the subject applies, the application field is already structured.
Before the subject moves, mobility has already been permitted.
Before the subject speaks, visibility has already been ranked.

Before the subject objects, the appeal channel has already been narrowed. Before the subject chooses, the architecture of choice has already excluded certain possibilities.

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

It asks:

- what is filtered before reaching the subject?
- what is ranked before appearing as an option?
- what is rejected before becoming a claim?
- what is made invisible before becoming experience?
- what is classified before judgement?

This concept lifts the Onopticon beyond a simple institutional critique. It shows that the Onopticon operates prior to ordinary action, knowledge and objection.

9. Homovictimus: The Responsible Subject Deprived of the Conditions of Agency

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

This contradiction is central.

The contemporary subject is constantly called upon to choose, adapt, manage risk, perform, optimise the self and assume responsibility. Yet the field in which these actions are to be performed is already narrowed by opaque, non-negotiable and inaccessible infrastructures.

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

The tragedy is not invisibility, but compulsory readability.

To exist institutionally, Homovictimus must become readable. Yet to be readable is to be classifiable. To be classifiable is to be governable. To be governable is to risk the foreclosure of possibility.

Homovictimus can therefore be defined as:

the subject compelled to become infrastructurally readable in order to remain socially viable, but rendered vulnerable precisely through that readability.

Yet Homovictimus is not a figure of absolute helplessness. Its politicisation does not imply the return of a fully sovereign subject endowed with pure free will. What appears here is a fragile and infrastructurally conditioned form of **counter-agency**.

Counter-agency does not restore the sovereign liberal subject. It names a situated and infrastructurally constrained capacity to expose, interrupt or contest imposed reality. It is not an escape from the Onoptic field. It is the capacity to reveal the imposed character of reality itself. It may appear as objection, refusal, naming, interruption, the revelation of arbitrary classification, or the insistence that a given reality is not natural but constructed.

Counter-agency is not a solution. It is not a reform programme. It is not a redemptive politics. It is a fragile act of exposure that interrupts the absolutisation of the Onoptic field.

Homovictimus is not fully free; but neither is it fully passive. Politicisation begins when imposed reality is revealed as imposed.

10. Ontological Deprivation

Exhaustion is not a sufficient concept.

Exhaustion names fatigue, psychological pressure and affective depletion under contemporary conditions of labour and life. These are real phenomena, but the Reality Paradigm diagnoses a deeper condition: **ontological deprivation**.

Ontological deprivation does not mean that the individual is merely tired. It means that the individual is deprived of the capacity to act, object, initiate, refuse, construct alternatives and encounter the world under conditions not already imposed.

A person may still appear to choose, but the field of choice has already been narrowed. A person may still be held responsible, but may lack access to explanation, objection or alternative channels.

A person may still be called a subject, but may be processed as a score, risk, profile, eligibility status or operational object.

Ontological deprivation is the loss of one's own field of possible existence.

It is therefore the basic existential consequence experienced by Homovictimus. The sequence is as follows: the Onopticon imposes the field of encounter; the infrastructural a priori structures possibility before action; compulsory readability binds the subject to the system; Homovictimus is held responsible within this binding; ontological deprivation emerges as the loss of the subject's own field of possible existence.

11. Kratopticon: The Violent Modality of the Onoptic Field

11.1 Definition

Kratopticon is not an independent theory of sovereignty separate from the Onoptic field. It names the violent modality through which human beings are transformed, within Onoptic classification and risk production, into operational targets, security objects or detainable bodies.

Kratopticon refers to the technical, logistical, military and bureaucratic production of the body as targetable once it has been removed from the field of legal protection.

Where Agamben asks who is placed outside the law, Kratopticon asks:

Through which technical mechanisms is the body placed in the zone of exception made trackable, transferable, detainable or destroyable?

Kratopticon therefore analyses not only violence, but the organisational technology of violence.

Its sharpest formulation is:

Kratopticon is the process through which Homo Sacer is transformed into an operational target.

11.2 Homo Sacer

The subject of Kratopticon is Homo Sacer: the exposed, targetable body deprived of legal protection.

Yet in this article Homo Sacer is not only a juridical figure. It is also a technical object of targeting. Once the body is coded within Onoptic classification as risk, deviation, threat or security object, it can be transferred, detained, interrogated or destroyed within the Kratoptic modality.

11.3 Guantánamo as Kratoptic Case

Guantánamo is not only a juridical space of exception. It is also an architecture of detention through which sovereign violence is technically, logistically and bureaucratically organised.

Here, the body is:

- tracked through global intelligence networks;
- recorded biometrically;
- transported through military logistics;
- held outside ordinary legal protection;
- continuously managed as a security object.

Guantánamo is therefore a concentrated instance of Kratopticon. Agamben's theory of exception is crucial for understanding it. Yet Guantánamo is not merely juridical exclusion. It is a composition of detention, interrogation, transfer, recording and security classification. Kratopticon thus extends Agamben's analysis of bare life into the military-bureaucratic organisation of targetability (Agamben, 1998; Mbembe, 2003).

Kratoptic violence appears not only in the decision to kill or detain, but in the organisational combination of databases, transfer chains, camp space, interrogation protocols, security classification and juridical indeterminacy. It conceptualises sovereign violence not as a single decision, but as a technical-bureaucratic process that renders the body targetable and governable.

12. Fragopticon: The Attritional Modality of the Onoptic Field

12.1 Definition

Fragopticon is not an independent concept of hybrid warfare. It names the attritional modality through which foreclosure of possibility is produced not by sudden prohibition, but through weak contestability, diffuse responsibility and temporally dispersed pressure.

Fragopticon weakens collective and individual decision-making capacity through uncertainty, low-intensity pressure and prolonged attrition.

Its formula is:

$$\text{uncertainty} + \text{low-intensity pressure} + \text{time} = \text{strategic paralysis}.$$

The object of Fragopticon is not merely the capacity of an adversary. Its deeper target is the very condition of decision-making.

12.2 Mechanisms

Fragopticon operates through three mechanisms.

First, **threshold manipulation**. The actor calculates the threshold at which the other side will respond and keeps pressure below that point.

Second, **diffusion of responsibility**. Agency, intention and the chain of action are made ambiguous, making response difficult.

Third, **temporal attrition**. Crisis is sustained not through a single decisive blow, but through prolonged uncertainty and low-intensity pressure.

12.3 Homo Fragilis

The subject of Fragopticon is Homo Fragilis.

This is the fragile subject whose decision-making capacity has been weakened by permanent crisis, informational fragmentation, legal ambiguity and low-intensity threat.

Homo Fragilis is not directly eliminated. It is made unable to decide. It is not forced into submission through a single act, but held at the threshold of response. It does not necessarily lose the right to object; it loses the ability to locate the addressee of objection.

12.4 Capital's Fragopticon

Fragopticon does not operate only in interstate hybrid conflict. It can also be observed in the governance practices of platform capital. However, this does not require attributing a unified and fully conscious strategic will to corporations. Fragopticon may function not as a centrally designed plan, but as a set of dispersed practices that exploit regulatory gaps, distribute responsibility, force law to follow after the fact, and convert uncertainty into structural advantage.

Platform capitalism operates not only through data extraction and market mediation, but also through regimes in which rules are constantly altered, responsibility is diffused and the legal field is forced to catch up retrospectively (Srnicek, 2017).

Platforms such as Uber and Airbnb:

- create facts on the ground;
- force legal regulation to follow belatedly;
- continuously alter rules;
- distribute responsibility;
- leave users and workers within a field of uncertainty.

For workers, this produces:

- algorithmic wage volatility;
- the risk of account deactivation;
- constant performance pressure;
- income uncertainty.

For cities, it produces:

- pressure on housing markets;
- regulatory delay;
- legal ambiguity.

Capital's Fragopticon therefore operates less through open prohibition than through complication, delay and attrition. It need not be designed from a single centre. Its effect lies in the transformation of uncertainty into a managerial advantage.

12.5 Platform Labour as Sub-Case

Platform labour is one of the clearest everyday examples of Fragopticon. The literature on the gig economy shows that platform workers are governed by algorithmic management, variable income and uncertain work security (Woodcock & Graham, 2020). Research on algorithmic management further demonstrates that workplace control is increasingly exercised through ranking, scoring, automated task allocation and opaque performance metrics rather than through human supervision alone (Kellogg, Valentine, & Christin, 2020; Rosenblat, 2018).

The platform worker is not directly prohibited from working. Instead, the worker is compelled to operate under changing algorithmic rules, income volatility and uncertain performance criteria.

This regime functions through:

- algorithmic wage fluctuations;
- risk of account deactivation;
- constantly shifting performance criteria;
- invisible rating systems;
- unpredictable labour intensity.

In the case of platform labour, Fragopticon stretches the three criteria of the Onopticon across time. Compulsory recognition is established through the worker's profile, rating, location data and performance history. Foreclosure of possibility occurs through income volatility, opaque work allocation and the threat of account deactivation. Weak contestability is produced by the opacity of algorithmic decisions, the absence of accountable interlocutors and uncertain appeal mechanisms. The worker is not directly banned; rather, the ground of action is continuously destabilised.

13. The Right to Opacity: Not a Solution, but a Threshold

13.1 The Right to Opacity

Drawing on Édouard Glissant's thought of opacity, this article proposes a limit-concept against the reduction of the subject to a fully explainable, classifiable and governable object (Glissant, 1997).

This must be stated clearly: the **Right to Opacity is not a solution. It is not a reform programme. It is not a policy package.**

The Right to Opacity is an ontological-political threshold against the claim of absolute readability.

It is:

- not a positive programme;
- a negative limit-principle;
- a line of resistance against technical absolutism.

Its function is not to propose a romantic escape from systems. In modern society, subjects often cannot entirely exit infrastructures of identity, record, document, border, account, access and transaction. The issue is not identification as such. The issue is the absolutisation of identification.

The Right to Opacity therefore does not defend the idea that the subject should never be identified. It refuses the transformation of identification into an unlimited, irreversible and uncontestable condition.

The human being cannot be reduced without remainder to a calculable data object.

13.2 Counter-Agency and the Opacity Threshold

Counter-agency is not the practical solution of the Right to Opacity. It is the gesture through which the apparent totality of the Onoptic field is exposed and interrupted. This gesture may be juridical, political, technical or symbolic; the article does not systematise these into a reform programme.

What matters is that the subject is not rendered entirely passive. The counter-agency of Homovictimus is not full freedom. It is the capacity to interrupt the naturalisation of imposed reality.

Counter-agency says:

The reality imposed upon me is not reality itself; it is a constructed, classified and infrastructurally imposed field.

The function of the Right to Opacity is therefore not to solve, but to draw a limit. It stands against the Onoptic claim that everything can be read, classified, governed and operationalised.

Analytically, the Right to Opacity marks the point at which compulsory recognition, foreclosure of possibility and weak contestability cease to be administrative procedures and become ontological domination.

Opacity is not a defect. It is the final refuge of being against operation.

14. Transitions Between Modalities

The three modalities are not separate regimes.

- The Onopticon constructs the material-technical field of possibility.
- Kratopticon renders the body that falls outside this field targetable.
- Fragopticon weakens the ground of action and decision through uncertainty.

Onopticon, Kratopticon and Fragopticon must therefore be understood not as three equivalent regimes, but as infrastructural, violent and attritional modalities of the Onoptic field of imposed reality. The Onopticon is the primary ontological ground. Kratopticon is the violent modality through which the human becomes targetable. Fragopticon is the attritional modality through which decision-making and contestation are weakened.

14.1 9/11 as Transitional Case

The post-9/11 period provides a powerful example of transition between modalities. In the first phase, the attacks produced a Fragoptic field of uncertainty by generating the perception of a networked and asymmetric threat outside the logic of conventional interstate war. Threat was no longer attached to a stable front or an openly identifiable state, but appeared as something that could emerge anywhere. This uncertainty increased social fragility and intensified demands for security.

In the second phase, this uncertainty legitimised a Kratoptic shift. The interventions in Afghanistan and Iraq, Guantánamo, extraordinary detention regimes, targeted killing and drone warfare all

demonstrate the transformation of bodies removed from legal protection into objects managed through military, logistical and technical apparatuses.

In the third phase, the crisis was stabilised into durable Onoptic security infrastructures. The Patriot Act, biometric passports, airport security protocols, mass data collection and risk-based border controls show how security, initially framed as exceptional, became embedded within the infrastructure of everyday mobility. Post-9/11 security was not merely a set of emergency measures. It reconstructed the field of movement, border control and risk governance (Amoore, 2013; Lyon, 2015; Salter, 2003).

9/11 should therefore be read not only as an attack, but as a historical threshold in which Fragoptic uncertainty, Kratoptic violence and Onoptic security infrastructure became sequentially articulated.

14.2 The Dissolution and Re-Territorialisation of Yugoslavia

The dissolution of Yugoslavia can be read, within the Reality Paradigm, not merely as the collapse of a state, but as the fragmentation of a shared political reality, the transformation of bodies into targetable and displaceable categories, and the subsequent construction of new borders, citizenship regimes, recognition structures and international governance architectures.

This case is significant because it shows that the Onopticon is not confined to digital, financial or algorithmic infrastructures. It may also operate at territorial, legal and geopolitical levels.

This reading does not reduce Yugoslavia's dissolution to a single cause or to the action of a single external actor. Its purpose is to show how, during the dissolution process, a shared political reality was fragmented, bodies were transformed into targetable categories, and new recognition-border-citizenship infrastructures were constructed after war.

Nor does this section claim to explain all causes of Yugoslavia's dissolution. It provides an analytical reading of dissolution, violence and reconstruction through Onoptic, Kratoptic and Fragoptic modalities.

The first phase may be described as **Fragoptic fragmentation**. The weakening of Yugoslavia's federal political reality, economic crisis, the intensification of ethno-nationalist discourse, media propaganda, the recirculation of historical trauma, the ambiguous position of paramilitary actors and international diplomatic hesitation all weakened the shared ground of decision and belonging. Fragoptic did not simply eliminate collective decision-making capacity. It fragmented trust, representation and the idea of a common future through prolonged uncertainty. The old political reality did not disappear in a single moment; it dissolved through an architecture of uncertainty (Woodward, 1995; Gagnon, 2004).

In the second phase, this fragmentation became **Kratoptic violence**. As the shared field of reality broke down, the body appeared no longer simply as citizen, but as ethnic category, security threat, displaceable population or military target. Sieges, detention practices, ethnic cleansing, paramilitary violence, forced displacement, international military intervention and war crimes procedures made the Kratoptic plane visible. The issue was not only violence in the abstract, but the transformation of bodies into targetable, transferable, detainable or displaceable objects through military, bureaucratic, legal and international apparatuses (Campbell, 1998).

The third phase involved **Onoptic reconstruction**. After dissolution, reality was reconstructed through new borders, state recognitions, citizenship regimes, passports, refugee statuses, international protection mechanisms, the Dayton settlement, the status of Kosovo and Euro-Atlantic

integration processes. The collapse of the old political reality did not produce a simple void. It generated another reality architecture determining movement, belonging, recognition, sovereignty and contestation. This architecture determined who would belong to which state, who would be recognised as refugee or displaced person, which borders would count, which political units would gain international legitimacy and which objections could be processed (Hayden, 1999; Chandler, 2000).

Yugoslavia can therefore be read as a historical transition in which Fragoptic fragmentation passed into Kratoptic violence and then into an Onoptic architecture of borders, recognition and citizenship. Dissolution here is not understood as a simple externally imposed operation, but as a multi-layered transformation at the intersection of internal ethno-political conflict, the erosion of federal legitimacy, economic crisis, international recognition politics, military intervention and post-war institutional reconstruction.

The case expands the claim of the Reality Paradigm: power imposes encounterable reality not only through platforms, financial networks or security algorithms, but also through maps, borders, statuses, passports, international agreements, refugee regimes and mechanisms of recognition.

15. Sociological Inequalities

The Onopticon, Kratopticon and Fragopticon do not operate equally upon everyone.

A refugee, platform worker, indebted student, political dissident and elite investor are not exposed to the same infrastructural regime with the same intensity.

For migrants, the Onopticon may operate as biometric border control. For the poor, it may operate as credit or risk scoring. For platform workers, it may operate as algorithmic management. For political dissidents, it may operate as security risk classification.

Such differentiated exposure means that the same infrastructure produces different consequences across social positions. A biometric border regime may function as expedited mobility for a tourist while becoming a mechanism of suspicion, waiting and exclusion for a refugee. Likewise, a credit scoring system may facilitate financial access for an investor while narrowing the economic reality of an indebted or precarious individual.

The architecture of reality is therefore not separate from social inequality. Class, migration status, race, gender, ethnicity and political position shape the intensity with which subjects become readable, scoreable, targetable or fragile. The literature on data justice has similarly shown that data systems are not merely technical but are entangled with global and social inequalities (Taylor, 2017).

16. Limits of the Model and Analytical Distinguishability

This article does not claim to provide a closed mega-theory of all power relations. The Reality Paradigm is intended to analyse specific transitions between material-technical infrastructures, technicalised sovereign violence and fragmented regimes of uncertainty.

The model does not claim to explain by itself:

- everyday micro-power relations;
- face-to-face domination;

- cultural hegemony;
- all forms of patriarchal power;
- the full complexity of ideological consent.

It focuses on three axes:

1. the infrastructural construction of the subject's field of possibility;
2. the technical-organisational production of the body as an object of violence;
3. the attritional weakening of collective and individual decision-making through uncertainty.

The model is therefore a conceptual map for analysing specific historical concentrations of power, not a theory of power in its entirety.

The framework can be made analytically researchable through three criteria: **compulsory recognition, foreclosure of possibility** and **weak contestability**. A case should be treated as Onoptic only if the subject is forced into a particular infrastructure, if that infrastructure narrows access, movement or future options, and if the subject struggles to understand, contest or reverse this narrowing. If one of these conditions is absent, the case should be analysed not as Onopticon, but as another form of power.

The Reality Paradigm should therefore not be understood as an unfalsifiable theory of everything, but as a diagnostic framework applicable under specific analytical conditions.

17. Conclusion

This article has reconceptualised contemporary power through the Onoptic ground of imposed reality. The Onopticon is not simply the future of the Panopticon. It names the collapse of the assumption that reality precedes power. In the Onoptic regime, power does not merely observe reality; it imposes the field within which reality is encountered.

The founding concept of the article is the Onopticon. The other concepts clarify its subject-form, violent modality, attritional modality and limit condition.

The argument may be summarised as follows.

The **Onopticon** is the primary ontological ground: it imposes the reality within which the subject encounters the world through infrastructures of recognition, classification, access, eligibility, risk and contestation.

Homovictimus is the subject of this ground: responsible but deprived of the conditions of agency; rendered visible but not recognised on its own terms; included but made dependent.

Counter-agency is not a recipe for emancipation. It is a fragile capacity to expose the naturalisation of imposed reality.

Kratopticon is the violent modality of the Onoptic field: it transforms the human into an operational target, security object or detainable body.

Fragopticon is the attritional modality of the Onoptic field: it weakens decision-making and contestation through uncertainty, diffusion of responsibility and temporally dispersed pressure.

*The **Right to Opacity** is the limit-principle against the absolutisation of this field.*

The Onopticon shows what the subject can do; Kratopticon shows which body can be targeted; Fragopticon shows which decisions are delayed, suspended or paralysed within uncertainty. Taken together, these concepts allow contemporary power to be understood not merely as repression, surveillance or ideology, but as the material-technical production of reality.

This article does not offer a solution or reform programme. The aim of the Reality Paradigm is not to improve imposed reality, but to show that it is imposed. An unnamed imposition appears as reality itself. A named imposition becomes visible as a form of power.

Opacity is not a defect. It is the final refuge of being against operation.

The next step is not to multiply concepts, but to test the framework through carefully selected cases, explicit methods and operationalised criteria.

References

- Agamben, G. (1998). *Homo sacer: Sovereign power and bare life*. Stanford University Press.
- Amoore, L. (2013). *The politics of possibility: Risk and security beyond probability*. Duke University Press.
- Campbell, D. (1998). *National deconstruction: Violence, identity, and justice in Bosnia*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Chandler, D. (2000). *Bosnia: Faking democracy after Dayton*. Pluto Press.
- Deleuze, G. (1992). Postscript on the societies of control. *October*, 59, 3–7.
- DeNardis, L. (2014). *The global war for internet governance*. Yale University Press.
- Farrell, H., & Newman, A. L. (2019). Weaponized interdependence: How global economic networks shape state coercion. *International Security*, 44(1), 42–79.
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. Pantheon Books.
- Gagnon, V. P. (2004). *The myth of ethnic war: Serbia and Croatia in the 1990s*. Cornell University Press.
- Glissant, É. (1997). *Poetics of relation*. University of Michigan Press.
- Hayden, R. M. (1999). *Blueprints for a house divided: The constitutional logic of the Yugoslav conflicts*. University of Michigan Press.
- Hoffman, F. G. (2007). *Conflict in the 21st century: The rise of hybrid wars*. Potomac Institute for Policy Studies.
- Kellogg, K. C., Valentine, M. A., & Christin, A. (2020). Algorithms at work: The new contested terrain of control. *Academy of Management Annals*, 14(1), 366–410.
- Lyon, D. (2015). *Surveillance after Snowden*. Polity.
- Mann, M. (1984). The autonomous power of the state: Its origins, mechanisms and results. *European Journal of Sociology*, 25(2), 185–213.
- Maurer, T. (2018). *Cyber mercenaries: The state, hackers, and power*. Cambridge University Press.

- Mbembe, A. (2003). Necropolitics. *Public Culture*, 15(1), 11–40.
- Pasquale, F. (2015). *The black box society: The secret algorithms that control money and information*. Harvard University Press.
- Rosenblat, A. (2018). *Uberland: How algorithms are rewriting the rules of work*. University of California Press.
- Salter, M. B. (2003). *Rights of passage: The passport in international relations*. Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Scott, J. C. (1998). *Seeing like a state: How certain schemes to improve the human condition have failed*. Yale University Press.
- Srnicek, N. (2017). *Platform capitalism*. Polity.
- Star, S. L. (1999). The ethnography of infrastructure. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 43(3), 377–391.
- Taylor, L. (2017). What is data justice? The case for connecting digital rights and freedoms globally. *Big Data & Society*, 4(2), 1–14.
- Woodcock, J., & Graham, M. (2020). *The gig economy: A critical introduction*. Polity.
- Woodward, S. L. (1995). *Balkan tragedy: Chaos and dissolution after the Cold War*. Brookings Institution.
- Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism*. PublicAffairs.