

THEFT AS SERVICE

An Onoptic Indictment of Imposed Reality

"To own nothing is to be nowhere."

Hakki Tan

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

Reality Paradigm | Onopticon | Homovictimus

2025

Keywords: Onopticon; Homovictimus; imposed reality; ontological theft; mandatory inclusion; threshold dispossession; sovereignty of permission; infrastructural a priori; right to opacity; architectural rights; subscription economy; surveillance capitalism.

READING NOTE

This text does not treat Ida Auken's WEF-linked 2030 scenario as an official policy document.

It reads it as a symptom.

Its object is not the private intention of an author.

Its object is the public function of a discourse.

The question is not merely what the author meant.

The question is what kind of future is normalised when such a text circulates within a global governance environment.

What loss is renamed progress?

What surrender is renamed convenience?

What dispossession is renamed access?

What dependency is renamed sustainability?

What disappearance is renamed freedom?

This is not a philological reading.

It is a structural and symptomatic reading.

For future scenarios are never innocent.

Utopias also produce obedience.

Thought experiments also discipline the horizon of the present.

CONCEPTUAL AND OPERATIONAL NOTE: ONOPTICON, HOMOVICTIMUS AND THE REALITY PARADIGM

This manifesto is not merely a political refusal.

It is a diagnosis grounded in Hakkı Tan's Reality Paradigm.

For that reason, the concepts must be disciplined.

Onopticon is not every form of surveillance.

Homovictim is not every victim.

Dispossession is not merely poverty.

Opacity is not secrecy.

The Reality Paradigm is not a theory of truth.

Its primary question is more basic:

Under what conditions does the human being encounter the world?

This question precedes the question of truth.

For what a person can call true, what they can choose, what they can contest, what they can access, and what kind of future they can imagine are often determined before they ever arrive at the world.

They are shaped by technical, administrative and infrastructural conditions already in place.

Therefore, the question of Onopticon is not:

Who is watching whom?

Who is collecting which data?

Who is predicting whose behaviour?

These questions matter.

But they are not enough.

The question of Onopticon is:

Who, under what conditions, may access which reality?

More sharply still:

Through which technical-administrative threshold must a person pass before being recognised as human?

Onopticon is the pre-processing and imposition of the human being's field of encounter with the world.

It operates through four movements.

The first movement is **recognition**.

The human being is made recognisable to the system: through identity records, accounts, documents, profiles, scores, health status, location traces, risk categories, payment histories, behavioural data, application forms and verification mechanisms.

But this recognition is not innocent.

The system recognises the human being only in its own language.

The person becomes visible not as a whole being, but as a format the system can process.

The second movement is **classification**.

The recognised person is classified.

Safe or risky.

Eligible or ineligible.

Efficient or burdensome.

Normal or deviant.

Compliant or problematic.

Visible or irrelevant.

Permitted or suspendable.

This classification does not merely describe reality.

It produces reality.

For the category into which the system places you determines which door opens, which door closes, which option appears, and which future is erased before you have even imagined it.

The third movement is **foreclosure of possibility**.

Classification narrows the future.

A refused loan.

A closed account.

An invisible job application.

A raised insurance premium.

A blocked appeal channel.

A restricted movement.

A suspended service.

A body marked as risky.

A patient assigned low priority.

A citizen placed in a queue.

These are not merely decisions.

They are closures of reality.

The fourth movement is **imposed reality**.

At the end of the process, the human being begins to live these closures as if they were reality itself.

The door does not tell you who closed it.

It simply does not open.

You do not know why your application disappeared.

You simply receive no answer.

You do not understand the logic by which your account was suspended.

You simply find yourself outside.

You do not see how your field of options was narrowed.

You simply mistake the menu placed before you for life.

This is the violence of Onopticon.

It narrows without commanding.

It closes without prohibiting.

It includes without freeing.

It does not need to make the decision.

It constructs the horizon in which any decision becomes possible.

It does not remove the human being from the world.

It includes the human being only in the form that can be processed.

Onopticon is therefore not merely a surveillance regime.

It is a regime of imposed reality, operating through **mandatory recognition, classification, foreclosure of possibility, and weak contestability**.

A situation becomes Onoptic when three conditions appear together.

First: Mandatory Recognition.

A person cannot be recognised, served, heard, employed, moved, treated, housed, verified or socially sustained without entering the system.

Second: Foreclosure of Possibility.

Once inside the system, the person is deprived of certain options, movements, rights, forms of access or futures through recognition and classification.

Third: Weak Contestability.

The person cannot see the logic by which they were classified, cannot contest it meaningfully, cannot reverse it, cannot obtain an explanation, and cannot move through an alternative channel.

When these three conditions converge, the issue is no longer merely bureaucracy, technology, software, the market or public administration.

The issue is Onopticon.

For here power does not merely decide.

It prepares the world in which decision will occur.

Sovereignty has migrated from the moment of decision to the horizon of decision.

Classical sovereignty asks:

Who decides?

Onoptic sovereignty asks:

What reality has been placed before the one who decides?

The judge may still be human.

The doctor may still be human.

The clerk may still be human.

The commander may still be human.

But the world presented to that human has already been processed.

Risk has already been ranked.

Priority has already been assigned.

Suspicion has already been generated.

Eligibility has already been calculated.

Possibility has already been narrowed.

That is why saying “the human remains in the loop” is not enough.

The human may remain in the loop.

But if the world of the loop has already been designed by the machine, the human decides only inside an imposed reality.

The problem is not simply that the machine pulls the trigger.

The problem is that the human can think only within a world already prepared by the machine.

Onopticon therefore need not replace decision.

It does something deeper.

It processes the reality in which decision takes place.

THE OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF HOMOVICTIMUS

Homovictimus is not merely the injured human being.

Homovictimus is not the passive mass.

Homovictimus is not the consumer with false consciousness.

Homovictimus is not the pitiful subject on whose behalf others speak.

Homovictimus is the structural human type produced by the Onoptic regime.

Its definition is this:

Homovictimus is the human being compelled to become infrastructurally recognisable in order to remain socially viable, yet rendered classifiable, manageable, suspendable, foreclosable and fragile precisely through that recognition.

At the centre of this definition lies a contradiction.

Homovictimus is still expected to behave as an agent.

To choose.

To adapt.

To improve.

To manage risk.

To remain productive.

To protect accounts.

To apply.

To appeal.

Yet the field in which all this must occur has already been narrowed.

The application space has been pre-structured.

Movement has been tied to permission.

Visibility has been ranked.

Risk has been assigned.

Appeal channels have been restricted.

The architecture of choice has been prepared in advance.

The tragedy of Homovictimus is therefore not invisibility.

It is **compulsory readability**.

To live within institutions, one must be readable.

To be readable, one must be classifiable.

To be classifiable, one must be translated into the language of the system.

And once translated into the language of the system, one loses the excess of one's being.

Homovictimus is not the person excluded from the system.

Homovictimus is the person included only in a processable form.

Not expelled.

Admitted.

But not as oneself.

Only as the system can process.

The freedom of Homovictimus is not denied.

It is tied to access permission.

The voice of Homovictimus is not silenced.

It is converted into an application form.

The existence of Homovictimus is not destroyed.

It is converted into a profile.

The life of Homovictimus is not taken away.

It is tethered to thresholds.

Energy threshold.

Health threshold.

Identity threshold.

Payment threshold.

Location threshold.

Risk threshold.

Account threshold.

Eligibility threshold.

The person who cannot pass these thresholds still exists in theory.

But their social viability is weakened in practice.

The hardest definition is this:

Homovictimus is the human being forced to be recognised in order to exist, forced to be processed in order to be recognised, forced to be classified in order to be processed, and deprived of possibility through that very classification.

Yet Homovictimus is not hopeless.

Homovictimus becomes political at the moment it names its captivity not as personal failure, but as imposed reality.

Resistance does not begin by instantly escaping the infrastructure.

Resistance begins by refusing the infrastructure's claim that "this is reality".

When Homovictimus names Onopticon, it ceases to be merely a victim.

It becomes the witness.

INTRODUCTION: THE FAIRY TALE IS OVER

“Welcome to 2030. I own nothing, have no privacy, and life has never been better.” [1]

False.

This sentence is not a vision of the future.

It is one of the smoothest, most poisonous and most dangerous forms through which contemporary power seeks to acquit itself.

For what is promised here is not freedom.

What is promised is surrender.

But surrender is packaged so elegantly that the surrendered subject will call it liberation.

This text is not the trial of one person’s private intention.

The question is not what Ida Auken felt, intended or imagined.

The question is harder:

Within what field of power does this future narrative circulate?

What world does it normalise?

What loss does it call progress?

What submission does it call convenience?

What theft does it sell as service?

A text acquires function beyond the author’s intention.

This indictment is therefore not an indictment of intention.

It is an indictment of function.

The WEF 2030 scenario is an Onoptic pre-framing disguised as a future story.

It does not occupy land first.

It occupies the field of reality.

It targets not only the home, but decision, privacy, access, labour, dissent and the conditions under which a human being encounters the world.

The logic of sovereignty revealed in this narrative is Onopticon.

Onopticon is not merely the system that watches.

Onopticon is the architecture that pre-processes and imposes the conditions under which the human being may encounter the world.

For that reason, the “happy person” of the 2030 scenario is not a free person.

It is Homovictimus.

Not as an insult.

Not as pity.

Not as a psychological diagnosis.

But as a structural position.

Homovictimus is the person still expected to behave as an agent after the infrastructural conditions of agency have been taken away.

The person who mistakes captivity for access.

Dependency for convenience.

Exposure for safety.

Dispossession for lightness.

Processability for happiness.

This manifesto is written not to pity that person, but to expose the architecture that produces them.

The fairy tale is over.

Reality will now speak.

THE FUNCTION OF THE MANIFESTO: THERE IS A THIEF IN THE HOUSE

When you see a thief entering a house, you first shout:

“There is a thief.”

You do not begin by shouting the technical protocol of capture.

Strategy begins only after the alarm.

An unnamed thief walks through the house as a guest.

To debate the capture protocol while the thief is still inside may serve the thief more than the household.

First, the theft must be named.

First, the household must be awakened.

First, the intrusion must cease to look like hospitality.

This manifesto is not a technical solution list.

It is not a legislative draft.

It is not a reform programme.

It is the alarm that points to the thief inside the house.

For the first success of Onopticon is that the thief no longer appears as a thief.

The thief no longer arrives by breaking the door.

It arrives as service.

As sustainability.

As convenience.

As access.

As personalisation.

As security.

As clean energy.

As smart city.

As future vision.

And while you applaud it, the deed of the house changes hands.

What is stolen here is not merely property.

What is stolen is the human being's right to take place in the world.

What is stolen is the right to remain opaque.

What is stolen is the right to encounter reality on one's own terms.

What is stolen is the right to contest.

What is stolen is the right to a future whose possibilities have not already been closed.

Therefore we first shout:

There is a thief.

But we shout knowing this:

Onopticon is not absolute.

It is an architecture that seeks to become absolute.

Its strength lies in invisibility.

In normalisation.

In being mistaken for service.

Once named, it weakens.

Once exposed, it cracks.

Once the alarm is raised, it is forced to defend itself.

The thief's strength does not mean the thief is invincible.

The thief's greatest advantage is that the household mistakes it for a guest.

The alarm does not capture the thief at once.

But it stops the thief being treated as a guest.

The alarm does not guarantee awakening.

But it ends the innocence of sleep.

Homovictimus may hear the alarm and still remain asleep.

It may still mistake the thief for a guest.

It may even try to silence the alarm.

For Onopticon processes not only the external world, but the comfort of perception itself.

Yet the function of the alarm is not to guarantee awakening.

Its function is to end the innocence of sleep.

Once "there is a thief" has been spoken, the issue is no longer simply ignorance.

The issue is where one stands after hearing it.

I. THE OLD WORLD DID NOT DECAY; IT WAS MADE TO DECAY

The WEF text lists the crises of the old world.

Traffic.

Air pollution.

Concrete expansion.

Unemployment.

Consumer excess.

Ecological devastation.

Social unrest.

Meaningless work.

They are right.

These things existed.

But the real question is:

Who produced them?

Society?

Humanity?

The ordinary consumer?

No.

These crises were not produced merely by isolated companies.

They were produced by a historical regime: fossil capital, growth ideology, urban rent, financial expansion, engineered consumption, planned obsolescence, energy dependency and state-market coordination. [15] [16]

This regime first polluted the world.

Then it presented that pollution as the shared sin of humanity.

It first converted cities into congestion, labour into exhaustion, desire into consumption, nature into resource, and the human being into user.

Then it pointed at the ruins and said:

“Humanity cannot continue like this.”

Then it offered, as solution, a deeper form of domination.

The sentence “the old world decayed” is therefore incomplete.

The old world did not decay.

It was made to decay.

This is one of the oldest operations of modern power, and it still works.

Those who call us the authors of the ruins are often the architects of the ruins.

Remember:

The same hand burns, then extinguishes, then calls itself heroic.

But “the same hand” is not a single company, a single person or a single institution.

It is the governing logic of power and capital that produces crisis and returns as salvation.

What now appears as solution is often that same logic reconstituting itself as green, smart, sustainable, inclusive and technological.

The crisis is not only the collapse of the old world.

The crisis is that the agent of collapse appears as the owner of the solution.

That is why the WEF scenario is not innocent.

Its solution is a new architecture of sovereignty built upon the ruins of the old world.

Disaster capitalism teaches us that moments of catastrophe can be used to accelerate transformations that would otherwise meet resistance. [15]

Fossil capital teaches us that climate crisis is not the equal product of abstract “humanity”, but the historical outcome of specific relations of energy, labour, production and capital. [16]

Climate Leviathan reminds us that global responses to climate crisis may themselves generate new forms of governance and domination. [17]

This manifesto says precisely that:

The crisis is real.

But the reality of the crisis does not legitimise the seizure of the human being’s field of reality.

Crisis: the collapse of the old world.

Culprit: vague “humanity”, meaning you.

Owner of the solution: the historical logic that produced the crisis.

Result: the transfer of property, privacy, decision, labour and dissent into infrastructure.

The reality of climate crisis does not legitimise ontological liquidation.

The reality of consumer excess does not justify dispossession.

The dirtiness of the unmonitored old world does not make the monitored new world free.

To be forced to choose between a dirty world and a sterile cage is not freedom.

It is the architecture of the false dilemma.

The false dilemma is this:

Either the pollution, congestion, waste and fossil wreckage of the old world.

Or the sterile city managed by sensors, platforms, data flows, algorithmic optimisation and permanent readability.

No.

We reject this dilemma.

There is a third possibility:

Neither dirty world nor sterile cage.

Neither fossil chaos nor algorithmic enclosure.

Neither old ruin nor new domination.

A sustainable city without surveillance is possible.

A technological city that respects opacity is possible.

An efficient city that does not reduce the human being to a processable object is possible.

A clean world that does not tie freedom to infrastructural permission is possible.

The smart city discourse often presents a political choice as a technical necessity: either the slow, dirty and inefficient old city, or the sensorised, platformed, data-optimised smart city. [19] [20]

This is the classic trick of technological solutionism.

The political is technicalised.

The architecture of power is presented as service.

Alternatives are made invisible.

The dissenter is made to look as though they oppose clean air, efficiency, safety or sustainability.

Marcuse's closed universe of the one-dimensional man returns here: the human being is made unable to think beyond the options placed before them. [18]

The false dilemma is not merely a logical error.

It is a technique of foreclosing possibility.

It gives you two options.

It owns both.

One is the ruin.

The other is the cage.

Then it says:

"Choose freely."

We refuse the choice.

Freedom is not choosing between ruin and cage.

Freedom is exposing the hand that built the dilemma.

The old world was made to decay; then the owners of decay presented themselves as cleaners.

That is where the false dilemma begins:

Either drown in the world they polluted, or live in the sterile cage they manage.

We reject that dilemma.

Freedom is not the choice between the dirty world and the sterile cage.

Freedom is the right to ask again under what conditions reality itself is to be built.

II. ONOPTICON: NOT SURVEILLANCE, BUT THE PRE-PROCESSING AND IMPOSITION OF THE HORIZON OF REALITY

The Panopticon watches. [4]

Control society modulates behaviour. [5]

Surveillance capitalism predicts. [6]

Onopticon goes deeper.

It builds the field of demand before you ask.

It ties the routes of movement to permission before you move.

It narrows the channel of contestation before you object.

It prepares the field of options before you believe you have chosen.

The violence of Onopticon is not that it slams the door in your face.

Its violence is that it determines the door, the key, the threshold, the access condition and the appeal channel before you ever arrive.

The door does not announce itself as closed.

It simply does not open.

The question of Onopticon is not “who watches whom?”

Its question is:

Who, under what conditions, may access which reality?

Onopticon’s power begins here.

It does not always make the decision.

It does not need to.

It does something more effective:

It prepares the world in which the decision will be made.

The judge decides, but the file has already been ordered.

The doctor decides, but the risk field has already been processed.

The citizen applies, but the application space has already been narrowed.

The person chooses, but the horizon of choice has already been closed.

The WEF narrative no longer says:

“You must do this.”

It says:

“We have made it easier for you.”

But the question is:

What has been made easier?

Your life?

Or your dependency?

The answer is clear.

What has been made easier is not freedom.

It is processability.

The human being is allowed to live only insofar as it can be processed.

The four movements of Onopticon are at work here.

First, you are compelled to become recognisable.

Then you are classified.

Then your possibilities are narrowed.

Then you begin to mistake that narrowed field for reality.

Power no longer needs to command.

It merely offers you a processed world.

And within that world, you believe you are choosing.

That is the lie of Onopticon.

III. ONTOLOGICAL THEFT: LIFE SOLD BACK AS SERVICE

The WEF 2030 narrative presents the transformation of products into services as freedom. [1]

This is not merely an economic shift.

It is the polite name for ontological theft.

Ontological theft is the removal of the human being's conditions of existence and the resale of those same conditions as services.

Your right to shelter is taken, then returned as accommodation service.

Your capacity for movement is taken, then returned as mobility service.

Your object is taken, then returned as access.

Your privacy is taken, then returned as security.

Your field of choice is taken, then returned as personalised recommendation.

Your community is taken, then returned as network service.

Your relation to nature is taken, then returned as green experience.

In this context, "service" is not innocent.

Service is the subscription model of a reality already taken from you.

A condition of existence is first separated from you.

Then it is offered back as more efficient, cleaner, smarter, greener, more sustainable and more accessible.

But it is no longer yours.

It has been allocated to you.

Allocated life is not free life.

Allocated life is life whose thread is held elsewhere.

The new domination need not destroy the human being.

It gives life.

But it allocates life.

It gives movement.

But movement by permission.

It gives options.

But options already processed.

It gives happiness.

But happiness made operational.

It gives a world.

But a world it has built.

Ontological theft is the name of what has been taken.

Mandatory Inclusion is the name of the infrastructure through which you must pass in order to access what was taken.

First, the condition of existence is severed.

Then access to that condition is allocated as service.

Thus the human being becomes dependent upon the very system that removed what it now rents back.

Ontological theft is theft.

Mandatory Inclusion is the thief renting you what it stole.

IV. THE LIQUIDATION OF PROPERTY: NOT SERVICE, BUT MANDATORY INCLUSION

The narrator of the WEF scenario owns neither home, nor car, nor appliances, nor everyday objects. [1]

Very well.

But did these things disappear?

Homes still exist.

Vehicles still exist.

Servers still exist.

Data centres still exist.

Platforms still exist.

Algorithms still exist.

Energy infrastructures still exist.

Food chains still exist.

What disappears is not property in general.

What disappears is your capacity to live outside infrastructure.

When you own nothing, you must connect to a system every time you wish to use anything.

For movement: a platform.

For shelter: an allocation mechanism.

For food: a logistics chain.

For communication: an account.

For identity: a verification infrastructure.

For movement: a permission architecture.

This is not freedom.

This is Mandatory Inclusion.

Mandatory Inclusion is not the free participation of the human being in the system.

It is the condition in which life, work, movement, shelter and recognition outside the system have been rendered practically unviable.

You are inside because the outside has been stripped of viability.

They call this participation.

We call it infrastructural enclosure.

The system does not need to throw you out.

It does something deeper:

It keeps you inside, but only in the form it can process.

You do not join the system.

You remain inside because the system has left no life outside.

Yet Onopticon does not always make exit absolutely impossible.

It acts more cunningly.

It does not prohibit exit.

It makes exit expensive.

It makes exit lonely.

It makes exit risky.

It makes exit administratively invisible.

It brings exit close to civil death.

Classical sovereignty bans exit.

Onoptic sovereignty leaves exit formally possible while making its cost existential.

The true name of the “free” world promised by WEF is this:

PERMANENT ACCESS IN EXCHANGE FOR PERMANENT SURRENDER.

When the market price of something disappears, the cost does not vanish.

It is charged elsewhere.

From your privacy.

From your data.

From your dependency.

From your right to contest.

From your opacity.

From your reality.

V. THE SUBSCRIPTION REGIME: PROPERTY CONVERTED INTO CONTINUOUS PERMISSION

Dispossession is not merely a promise of the future.

It is already an economic architecture.

Products become services.

Purchase becomes access.

Perpetual licence becomes subscription.

Object becomes usage right.

Usage right becomes continuous verification.

And eventually the human being no longer lives through what it owns, but through what remains actively subscribed.

The point is not that subscription as such is always the issue.

One may subscribe to certain services.

In some cases, subscription lowers initial cost, provides maintenance, enables updates, and may be practical.

The rupture begins elsewhere:

When the option to purchase is removed, access ceases to be a choice and becomes compulsory inclusion.

The question is no longer:

Shall I buy it or rent it?

The question becomes:

Rent it or do without.

At that moment, market choice ends.

Infrastructural blackmail begins.

The critic will say:

The option to purchase has not disappeared everywhere.

Hybrid models still exist.

Some products can still be bought.

Some services still offer subscription and perpetual licence side by side.

Correct.

But this is not evidence of the regime's absence.

It is often the transitional form of the regime.

Onopticon rarely begins with prohibition.

It begins with habituation.

First, subscription is made convenient.

Then purchase is pushed into the background.

Then user behaviour is tested.

Then purchase is made technically, economically and culturally irrational.

The option remains on paper.

Reality flows into subscription.

The hybrid model is often not free choice.

It is the threshold strategy of dispossession.

The process has four stages.

Habituation.

The user is psychologically prepared to live without ownership. Low initial cost, free trials, easy access, cloud synchronisation and cross-device convenience make the access model attractive.

Approach.

The purchase option is not removed, but displaced from the centre. Interface, advertising, updates, support, development and innovation move towards subscription. Purchase remains, but it no longer leads.

Testing.

Resistance is measured. Which markets react? Who cancels? Who stays? Which features can be made subscription-only before users submit? Which price point is accepted? Which level of dependency prevents exit?

De facto commencement.

The purchase option may not be legally or technically abolished, but it becomes practically meaningless. It exists, but it no longer lives. On paper it is an option. In reality it is a dead end.

This is threshold dispossession.

Dispossession does not always arrive at once.

It arrives threshold by threshold.

The user becomes accustomed at each stage.

One day purchase appears old, nostalgic, unsupported, incompatible, expensive, irrational and unnecessary.

Then the company says:

“The market chose this.”

No.

The market did not choose.

The architecture of choice was rebuilt.

The subscription regime does not begin by banning purchase.

It ages purchase.

It isolates purchase.

It deprives purchase of support.

It makes purchase appear irrational.

Then it presents the death of property as consumer preference.

In software, this transformation has already occurred. Tools that were once purchased through perpetual licences have become monthly or yearly services. Adobe's move into Creative Cloud and Autodesk's transition away from perpetual licences are symbolic cases of this shift. [7] [8]

But the issue is not limited to software.

Design, engineering, media production, data management, cloud services, fleet management, aviation maintenance, lighting infrastructure, automotive software and hardware-feature locking have all drawn tools of production and use away from object, licence, archive and ownerly control into account, platform, contract, maintenance service, performance fee and subscription architecture. [9] [10] [11] [12] [13] [14]

This is not merely a change in pricing.

It is an ontological relocation of tools.

When you purchase a piece of software, you establish a relatively direct bond of use. You may remain on an older version. You may open your files. You may work without internet. The relation to the seller weakens. The tool becomes part of your working world.

Under subscription, the tool is no longer yours.

It becomes a door that asks for permission again and again.

Is payment valid?

Is the account active?

Is the licence server reachable?

Have the terms changed?

Is the data provider connected?

Is the device still authorised?

Is the user still eligible?

Subscription is not merely a payment method.

It is a continuously verified relation of existence.

Property is a transfer.

Subscription is a permission architecture.

Property relates you to an object.

Subscription relates you to infrastructure.

As your relation to the object weakens, your dependency on infrastructure deepens.

That is why the phrase “do not own, access” is not liberating.

Access can always be cut.

Access can be priced.

Access can be conditioned.

Access can be profiled.

Access can be suspended.

Access can be algorithmically narrowed.

Access can be redefined through a change in terms.

When an object is yours, the relation retains some material continuity.

When you access a service, your relation persists by someone else’s permission.

The true name of the subscription economy is therefore:

the sovereignty of permission.

Rolls-Royce’s TotalCare model in aviation turns the engine from a sold object into a relationship of performance, maintenance and risk management. The engine is not merely metal. It is a continuously monitored infrastructural node whose performance is tied to service contract. [11]

Michelin Fleet Solutions converts tyres from purchased objects into fleet, kilometre, maintenance and service relations. The tyre is no longer merely rubber under a vehicle; it is a measured, monitored, externally managed and usage-priced element of service. [12]

Signify / Philips's Light-as-a-Service model at Schiphol Airport sells not the light fitting, but the light. The airport accesses illumination; ownership remains with the producer. This is one of the clearest examples of the "not product, but outcome" logic. [13]

BMW's Functions on Demand and heated seat subscription controversy reveals another threshold. The hardware may physically exist inside the car, yet its functions can be opened or closed through software and subscription gates. Some applications provoked backlash and retreat. But failure does not make the experiment irrelevant. Onopticon advances not only through success, but through testing. A model is tried, resistance is measured, the terrain is mapped, and the same logic returns in another form. [14]

The common structure is this:

The object recedes.

The service advances.

Ownership remains with the producer.

The user receives outcome, access, performance or function.

The subscription regime is therefore not merely a digital software question.

Industrial objects, fleets, engines, tyres, lighting, cars, printers, wearables and home devices are all being drawn towards the same threshold.

Subscription is not yet the general norm for all hardware.

But it is entering from strategic edges.

Onopticon does not seize every object at once.

It first seizes the layers that make the object function: permission, data, maintenance, update, performance and connection.

A device may sit in your house, on your desk, on your wrist, in your pocket.

Yet it may not be under your control.

It is meaningful only so long as subscription remains active.

When payment stops, the account closes, the licence fails or the server disappears, the object inside your home may become inert.

This is not merely the death of the object.

It is the death of control.

The thing in your home may not be yours.

The software on your computer may not be yours.

The device on your wrist may not be yours.

The archive you thought you had may not be yours.

The tool with which you work may have been merely allocated to you for as long as you pay.

This is allocated life.

The disappearance of the second-hand market is crucial here. If a product is never sold, it has no second life. There is nothing to transfer. Nothing to resell. Nothing to store. Nothing to inherit. No older version to preserve.

The object no longer circulates among people.

It lives on the permission line between company and user.

The subscription model kills the second life of the object.

The object no longer gains social duration.

It hangs in the company's server, contract, licence and payment system.

Vendor lock-in is not merely economic.

It is Onoptic.

The system accumulates the user's history, data, habits, file formats, archives and workflows, and thereby punishes exit.

Exit is not banned.

It is made expensive.

It is made exhausting.

It carries the risk of data loss.

It demands relearning.

It produces professional exclusion.

The user believes they freely choose to stay.

In reality, the cost of leaving has been made more frightening than the cost of remaining.

Subscription fatigue is not merely financial stress.

It is the recognition that one's life has been divided into rents.

Software rent.

Music rent.

Film rent.

Cloud rent.

Data rent.

Attention rent.

Hardware rent.

Mobility rent.

Food rent.

Tool rent.

Identity verification rent.

The human being eventually feels not that they live, but that they remain attached.

Subscription fatigue is ontological fatigue.

The human being becomes tired when life is lived through the sum of things one does not own.

Subscription is therefore dangerous not only because it can be expensive.

It is dangerous because it converts life into continuous permission.

What you buy establishes a bond between you and the object.

What you subscribe to establishes a constantly renewed line of obedience between you and the company.

This is the economy of Onopticon:

It takes the object.

It sells access.

It charges permission every month.

VI. OWNERSHIP IS NOT FETISH; IT IS ONTOLOGICAL CONTROL

What is defended here is not unlimited property hunger.

It is not capitalist accumulation.

It is the human being's condition of taking place in the world.

A house, as speculative asset, can be an instrument of domination.

But a house as a place where one can close a door, leave traces and sustain continuity is a condition of existence.

An object, as capital accumulation, can be fetish.

But an object as skill, memory, independence and practical power is a bond with reality.

A vehicle, as status symbol, can be alienation.

But a vehicle as the capacity to move according to one's own rhythm is a bond with the world.

The issue is not worship of property.

The issue is ontological control.

Ontological control is the capacity to sustain continuity over a place, object, tool, body, data, time and labour; to leave a trace; to use without requiring someone else's immediate permission; to form a bond with one's own reality.

A house is not merely a housing unit.

A room is not merely square footage.

A table is not merely a surface.

A book is not merely content.

A kitchen tool is not merely function.

A key is not merely metal.

These are nails driven into the world by human existence.

A cake machine does not merely make cake. It carries a family evening, a child's memory, the smell of a home, the transfer of a skill. It may be delivered to the door in minutes. But what arrives is only the tool. What disappears is the time-soaked culture of production within the home.

The WEF narrative sees function in the object.

We see trace.

Without trace, there is no continuity.

Without continuity, there is no belonging.

Without belonging, the subject cannot take place in the world.

A circular economy may, in principle, reduce waste.

But if it dissolves every object into anonymous service circulation and severs the human being's memory bond with things, it is not ecological virtue.

It is ontological damage.

"I own nothing" is not a sentence of freedom.

It is the erasure of human traces from the world.

The person who owns nothing is not merely poor.

They are nowhere.

VII. INFRASTRUCTURAL A PRIORI: THE WORLD BUILT BEFORE ENCOUNTER

The deepest operation of Onopticon begins not at the moment of decision, but before decision.

This is the infrastructural a priori.

In classical philosophy, the a priori names conditions that precede experience.

In the Reality Paradigm, infrastructural a priori names the technical-administrative conditions established before the human being encounters the world.

Before a person applies, the application space has been structured.

Before a person moves, movement has been tied to permission.

Before a person speaks, visibility has been ranked.

Before a person appeals, the appeal channel has been narrowed.

Before a person chooses, the architecture of options has already excluded certain possibilities.

Onopticon therefore does not merely say "no".

It does something deeper.

It defines what counts as application.

What appears as option.

What can be demanded.

What counts as risk.

What is recognised as human need.

What can be contested.

The human being believes it encounters the world.

In fact, it encounters a world already processed.

Reality is no longer simply the field of life.

It becomes a field of encounter formatted in advance by infrastructure.

VIII. ALGORITHMIC CONVENIENCE: THE SOFTEST FORM OF POSSIBILITY FORECLOSURE

In the WEF narrative, algorithmic selection is presented as convenience: the algorithm knows the person's taste better than the person does. [1]

This is one of Onopticon's clearest confessions.

The algorithm does not prohibit.

It does not shout.

It does not command.

It arranges the field of options.

It does not tell the person what to choose.

It decides which world will appear as available.

You still believe you choose.

But what you choose belongs to a pre-processed field of possibility.

This is possibility foreclosure.

Possibility foreclosure is not the direct banning of a future.

It is more intimate.

Some possibilities never appear.

Some paths never become options.

Some desires are filtered before formation.

Some encounters never occur.

Some futures are closed before they can be thought.

You are “free” inside the options shown to you.

But you cannot see how the option field was built.

That is the intelligence of Onopticon.

It does not show you chains.

It shows you a menu.

To choose from a menu is not freedom if whoever prepared the menu also prepared the world.

Algorithmic convenience does not free the human being from the burden of choice.

It separates the human being from the conditions under which choice becomes possible.

IX. THE TRAGEDY OF THE PERSON WHO SAYS “I HOPE”

In the WEF narrative, even the loss of privacy appears as a calm, almost fatalistic admission: the person knows they are recorded, yet merely hopes the system will not use that knowledge against them. [1]

This sentence collapses the whole narrative from within.

Here the human being is no longer a rights-bearing subject.

No longer inviolable.

No longer sovereign over an inner space.

They are a data being hoping for the benevolence of the system.

“I hope they will not use it against me.”

This is not the sentence of a citizen.

It is the sentence of the processed human.

It is not the speech of consent.

It is the speech of dependence.

Privacy is not the hiding of something shameful.

Privacy is the protection of the human being's unfinished state.

A person cannot remain human in a world where every thought, desire, fear, disappointment, mistake and dream becomes record.

For the human being is not only what they do.

The human being is also what they do not do, what they abandon, what they think but do not say, what they desire but restrain, what they attempt but do not complete.

If this space disappears, the self disappears.

Opacity is not a defect.

Opacity is the last refuge of being.

The regime normalised by the WEF narrative assumes that this refuge can be abolished.

The human being does not vanish.

Something worse happens.

The human being loses its excess.

The part the system cannot process.

Its inner darkness.

Its silence.

Its right to close the door.

And this is called safe life.

X. THE LIQUIDATION OF OPACITY: THE DESTRUCTION OF THE HUMAN EXCESS

Privacy is often trapped in a legal vocabulary, as though the matter were merely the protection of personal data.

As though the inner life of the human being were a category to be managed by forms.

No.

The problem is deeper.

The problem is the assumption that the human being can be fully modelled, predicted, classified and processed.

Opacity is not the darkness of the human being before the system.

Opacity is the last proof that the human being exceeds the system.

A person fully known is no longer a person.

They have become a profile.

A person fully predicted is no longer a subject.

They have become a behavioural model.

A person fully processed is no longer a citizen.

They have become an operational object.

The liquidation of opacity is therefore not merely a loss of privacy.

It is the destruction of the excess of being.

The human being is not human to the extent that the system understands them.

The human being is human to the extent that the system cannot.

What Onopticon cannot tolerate is this:

The excess of the human.

The remainder.

The darkness that does not fit the model.

The deviation that cannot be predicted.

The existence that cannot be processed.

The liquidation of opacity attacks that part of the human being which is larger than the system.

The absence of a right not to be processed is the technique of that attack.

First, human excess is named as defect.

Then it is converted into category.

Then into model.

Then into risk.

Then into management.

Then it is sold back to the human being as identity.

XI. OPACITY, ARCHITECTURAL RIGHTS AND HARDWARE-LEVEL GUARANTEES

The right to opacity is not merely privacy.

It is the right not to be reduced to a fully processable, modelled, predictable, classifiable and operational object.

Opacity is not the right to deceive.

Not the right to conceal crime.

Not the right to evade social responsibility.

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

But if this right remains only in legal language, it is weak.

For Onopticon does not need to abolish law directly.

It makes law dependent on infrastructure.

The right remains on paper.

The architecture empties it.

Therefore a right must be built not merely as text, but as architecture.

Architectural rights ask:

Can a system be built so that total capture is technically impossible?

Can data minimisation be a structural necessity rather than a promise?

Can identity, memory, access and transaction spaces be separated so that no actor possesses total visibility?

Can contestability, reversibility and explanation be part of the architecture rather than a benevolent add-on?

Can opacity become a technical limit rather than a moral request?

The issue is not hardware fetishism.

The issue is this:

If violation operates at the infrastructural level, the right must be able to resist at the infrastructural level.

A right that can resist the architecture that violates it is real.

A right that architecture can bypass at any moment is merely a deferred promise.

A right that cannot resist the architecture that violates it is not yet a right.

It is a sentence waiting to be bypassed.

XII. THE END OF WORK? NO: THE EXTINGUISHING OF PRODUCTIVE POWER

The robots took your job.

Your free time increased.

You will be creative.

No.

The human being is not merely an organism with spare time.

The human being produces.

Repairs.

Builds.

Shapes.

Tries.

Breaks.

Makes again.

These activities are not merely economic.

They are bodily ways of encountering reality.

In the WEF narrative, the human being is gradually removed from production. “Creative time” is offered, but the material bond with labour is weakened. “Time to think” is given, but thought’s power to intervene in reality has already been tied to infrastructure.

We do not defend exploitative labour.

But the liberation described in the WEF text is not the emancipation of labour from exploitation.

It is the separation of productive power from the human being.

The end of work may be liberation.

The end of productive power is ontological impoverishment.

The person who cannot touch the world cannot change the world.

The person who cannot change the world consumes the reality supplied to them.

Onopticon may not force the human being to work.

It may reduce the human being into an organism that receives services.

This is not freedom.

It is the extinguishing of productive power.

Free time becomes not liberated time, but emptied time.

XIII. ONTOLOGICAL DEPRIVATION

Fatigue is not enough.

Burnout is not enough.

Alienation is not enough.

In the age of Onopticon, the human being is not merely tired.

The human being is deprived of its field of possibility.

Ontological deprivation is the removal of the capacity to act, contest, initiate, refuse, create alternatives and encounter the world under non-imposed conditions.

A person may still appear to choose.

But the field of choice may already be closed.

A person may still be held responsible.

But explanation, contestation and alternative channels may have been removed.

A person may still be called a subject.

But the system may process them as score, risk, profile, eligibility state or operational object.

This is ontological deprivation:

the loss of one's possible field of existence.

The suffering of Homovictimus is therefore not merely psychological.

It is the loss of possibility.

Not only the inability to direct one's life.

But the fact that the directions of life were narrowed before they arrived.

XIV. WHEN NATURE BECOMES SERVICE, IT CEASES TO BE NATURE

In the WEF text, nature too is drawn into the logic of service.

Lived nature is replaced by managed nature.

Soil by landscape.

Season by planning.

Encounter by experience.

To protect nature is one thing.

To convert nature into a system-managed wellness service is another.

Nature is not merely green space.

Not merely protected area.

Not merely plant aesthetics inside the city.

Not merely a service that calms the human psyche.

Nature is the field where the human being meets limits, learns waiting, encounters season, tests labour, feels attachment to soil and lives rhythms not fully governed by system.

Onopticon does not need to destroy resistance.

It converts resistance into experience.

Experience into hobby.

Hobby into service.

Service into data flow.

Cycling is not resistance in itself.

Cooking is not resistance in itself.

Growing plants is not resistance in itself.

They become resistant only when tied to a power of life not dependent upon infrastructure.

Otherwise they become rituals of recovery within the system.

Onopticon does not give nature back.

It allocates a simulation of nature as a tolerated wellness experience inside the system.

When lived nature is lost and managed scenery accepted, nature is not saved.

The human being is domesticated.

XV. THOSE OUTSIDE THE CITY: YOU DID NOT LOSE THEM; THEY LEFT YOU

The WEF narrative presents those outside the city as people who could not adapt, found technology too much, or felt useless within the system. [1]

It places them among the lost.

Wrong.

Those who do not enter the system are not necessarily the maladapted.

They may be the ones who saw that what you call progress is regression.

They may be the ones who understood that what you call freedom is a chain.

You did not lose them.

They left you.

Self-sufficient communities must not be romanticised. Every outside is not automatically free. Poverty, fragility, isolation and hardship are real.

But this is also true:

To know whether a regime is free, one must not look only at what it offers inside.

One must look at the cost of exit.

If leaving the system means losing shelter, food, health, communication, identity and recognition, the system is not service.

It is infrastructural enclosure.

Any order that makes exit resemble death is not free, no matter how comfortable it is inside.

Onopticon does not need to destroy the outside.

It need only make the outside expensive.

Nostalgic.

Fragile.

Marginal.

Harmlessly categorised as “alternative living”.

The outside remains.

But it loses historical force.

XVI. ONOPTIC MORALITY: THE SUBTLE MECHANISM THAT PARALYSES DISSENT

The WEF text grounds itself in moral language:

We are saving the planet.

Ending traffic.

Reducing waste.

Cleaning the air.

Lowering energy costs.

Freeing people from work.

Providing access for all.

Thus dissent becomes almost impossible.

The dissenter is immediately placed in a hostile position.

They defend pollution.

They want the old growth model.

They hate ecology.

They fear technology.

They are paranoid.

Maladjusted.

Reactionary.

This is the pre-paralysis of dissent.

The system first captures the moral high ground.

Then it presents its solution as the only reasonable path.

Then it codes anyone who objects as an obstacle to humanity's salvation.

Our objection is not to technology.

Our objection is not to ecological solutions.

Our objection is not to sustainability.

Our objection is to this:

The same logic that produced the crises of the old world now seeks, in the name of solution, to seize the human being's field of reality.

We are not against clean energy.

We are against infrastructural dependency built under the sign of clean energy.

We are not against intelligent transport.

We are against movement rights being tied to platform permission.

We are not against reducing waste.

We are against the destruction of the memory bond between human beings and objects.

We are not against technological ease.

We are against ease replacing freedom.

We are not against comfort.

We are against comfortable surrender.

The trick of Onoptic morality is this:

It first identifies itself with the good of humanity.

Then it presents objection to itself as objection to humanity.

In this trap, power does not only build systems.

It builds the moral ground from which resistance appears immoral.

Onopticon is therefore not merely technical.

It is moral enclosure.

XVII. HOMOVICTIMUS: NOT FALSE CONSCIOUSNESS, BUT THE SEIZURE OF THE CONDITIONS OF AGENCY

The human being in the WEF narrative is not chained.

Not explicitly forced.

They are offered service.

Convenience.

Clean air.

Rapid transport.

Algorithmic choice.

Free time.

And yet it is here that a new human type emerges:

Homovictimus.

Homovictimus is the person who mistakes the system that wounds them for the source of comfort.

Dependency as access.

Obedience as adaptation.

Dispossession as lightness.

Surveillance as personalisation.

Algorithmic direction as convenience.

The loss of opacity as safety.

The pre-processing and imposition of reality as happiness.

Let us repeat:

Homovictimus is not a psychological insult.

It does not mean “they are not really happy, but we know better”.

Homovictimus is the structural position in which even happiness is conditioned by infrastructure.

More precisely:

Homovictimus is the human being compelled to become infrastructurally recognisable in order to remain socially viable, yet rendered classifiable, manageable, suspendable, foreclosable and fragile precisely through that recognition.

A person may genuinely feel happy.

But if that happiness is produced within an infrastructure that punishes exit, destroys opacity, requires processability, converts control into allocation, and paralyses contestation, then happiness is not proof of freedom.

It is operational happiness.

Operational happiness is not happiness born from the human being’s own reality.

It is happiness measurable, manageable and sustainable by the system.

Homovictimus is not passive.

It is more dangerous than that.

It is the human being still expected to be responsible, while the infrastructural conditions of responsibility have been removed.

"You chose," it is told.

But the system built the options.

"You participated," it is told.

But the outside was made unviable.

"You are happy," it is told.

But happiness was serviced.

"You are free," it is told.

But freedom depends on access permission.

The tragedy of Homovictimus is not suffering.

The tragedy is mistaking suffering for comfort.

But the deeper tragedy is this:

The tragedy of Homovictimus is not invisibility.

It is compulsory readability.

To exist, it must be recognised.

To be recognised, it must be processed.

To be processed, it must be classified.

And through classification, it loses its field of possibility.

Resistance does not begin by pitying Homovictimus.

It begins by naming the architecture that produces it.

Once Homovictimus names Onopticon, it ceases to be merely victim.

It becomes witness.

XVIII. THE ABSENCE OF THE RIGHT NOT TO BE PROCESSED

Onopticon does not kill the human being.

It processes them.

Defines them.

Classifies them.

Verifies them.

Scores them.

Risk-ranks them.

Predicts them.

Converts them into a behavioural object.

Then it gives that processed object back to the human being and says:

“This is you.”

No.

I am not your model.

I am not your profile.

I am not your risk score.

I am not your access level.

I am not your behavioural prediction.

This is where Onopticon transforms the human being.

Every service becomes an occasion for profiling.

Every access becomes a ritual of verification.

Every movement becomes a behavioural trace.

Every preference becomes prediction material.

Every need becomes a classification gate.

Every person, at every moment, in every system, is compelled to be readable.

Readability is not freedom.

Sometimes readability is capturability.

Sometimes transparency is surrender.

Sometimes convenience is the invisibility of the chain.

The absence of the right not to be processed is the operational form of the liquidation of opacity.

Human excess is first pathologised.

Then categorised.

Then modelled.

Then risk-ranked.

Then managed.

Then sold back as identity.

XIX. INFRASTRUCTURAL INJUSTICE: RIGHTS ARE LOST IN THE ARCHITECTURE OF THE DOOR

A right may exist on paper.

But if the door through which it must pass has been narrowed by infrastructure, the right is decoration.

Can you apply?

Can you appeal?

Can you see the logic of the decision?

Can the system explain the category into which it placed you?

Can you leave and still live?

In the age of Onopticon, justice is not lost only in court.

It is lost in the architecture of the door.

For what admits, excludes, ranks, reveals, hides, marks as risky and cuts off access is no longer merely law.

It is infrastructure.

Who can be recognised?

Who counts as processable?

Who is seen as risky?

Who is delayed?

Who is erased?

Who can appeal?

Who receives an explanation?

Who can leave the system and still survive?

These are not technical questions.

They are questions of sovereignty.

Infrastructural justice asks:

Who can remain opaque without social death?

Who can contest classification?

Who can audit operational truth?

Who can build counter-infrastructure?

Who can contest not only the outcome of a decision, but the pre-constructed space in which the decision became possible?

If the key to the door is not with the human being, freedom is only a button on an interface.

The human being does not lose freedom when arriving at the door.

Freedom was lost when the door was built.

XX. CONCEPTUAL LIMIT: ONOPTICON IS NOT EVERYTHING

Onopticon is a powerful concept.

It must therefore be used carefully.

Not every surveillance practice is Onopticon.

Not every algorithm is Onopticon.

Not every platform is Onopticon.

Not every subscription is Onopticon.

Not every bureaucracy is Onopticon.

A situation becomes Onoptic not because it uses technology.

It becomes Onoptic when mandatory recognition, foreclosure of possibility and weak contestability operate together.

This boundary matters.

If the concept explains everything, it explains nothing sharply.

Onopticon must not be a metaphor.

It must be a criterion-based diagnosis.

This manifesto shouts.

But what it shouts is not vague.

It shouts that the conditions under which the human being encounters the world are being built so as to force the human being into a processable form before being recognised as human.

The name of that arrangement is Onopticon.

The human type it produces is Homovictimus.

Its deepest result is ontological deprivation.

The last refuge against it is opacity.

And its central question remains:

Who, under what conditions, may access which reality?

XXI. REALITY CANNOT BE DELEGATED

The WEF promise is this:

Do not own; access.

Do not decide; let the algorithm decide.

Do not remain private; trust.

Do not produce; receive service.

Do not object; the system already wants your good.

We refuse.

Reality cannot be delegated.

Reality is the sum of the human being's direct and indirect contacts with the world: through objects, body, place, labour, language, privacy, mistakes, dissent and opacity.

Reality is not only the question of what is true in the external world.

The more basic question is:

Under what conditions can the human being encounter the world?

If the conditions of encounter are pre-processed and imposed by infrastructure, you are not living freely.

You are consuming a prepared reality.

The response to the 2030 scenario cannot therefore be simple technology rejection.

We do not reject technology.

We reject technology when it closes the field of reality.

We do not reject service.

We reject service when it becomes compulsory inclusion.

We do not reject ecology.

We reject dispossession in the name of ecology.

We do not reject intelligent systems.

We reject the reduction of the human being to a stupid user.

We do not reject comfort.

We reject comfort replacing freedom.

We do not reject the future.

We reject the future being written in advance by power.

Reality is not a service that power may process and impose for us.

Reality is the human being's right to say:

I am here.

FINAL WORD: REFUSING 2030 BEFORE IT ARRIVES

The WEF 2030 fairy tale is the utopia of power, not of society.

In that city, the human being does not dwell; it is allocated.

It does not choose; it is guided.

It does not remain private; it is recorded.

It does not own; it accesses.

It does not object; it adapts.

It does not produce; it receives service.

It does not encounter the world; it moves through a pre-processed and imposed field of reality.

Power desires the following human being:

Dispossessed but connected.

Privacyless but calm.

Processable but happy.

Participatory but obedient.

Included in the system but no longer a subject.

We reject this human being.

The person who owns nothing is nowhere.

The person who is nowhere is not a subject.

The person who is not a subject is not the author of their own life, no matter how happy they appear.

We cannot be free in a world that is not ours.

Choosing between options that are not ours is not choice.

A happiness that is not ours is not happiness.

The promise of Onopticon is not life.

It is pre-processed and imposed reality.

We reject that reality.

We reject not only dispossession, but the theft of the human being's right to take place in the world.

We reject not only surveillance, but the liquidation of opaque existence.

We reject not only algorithms, but the foreclosure of the horizon of possibility.

We reject not only service, but the reduction of life to allocated access.

We reject not only subscription, but the conversion of existence into continuous permission.

We reject not only the future, but the future written in advance by power.

We do not wait for 2030.

WE REFUSE NOW.

REFERENCES AND SOURCE MAP

A. Primary Text and WEF Context

[1] Ida Auken / World Economic Forum. "Welcome to 2030. I own nothing, have no privacy, and life has never been better." Medium, World Economic Forum, 12 November 2016.

Use: The primary scenario criticised by this manifesto; dispossession, loss of privacy, service logic, algorithmic convenience and those outside the city.

Access: <https://medium.com/world-economic-forum/welcome-to-2030-i-own-nothing-have-no-privacy-and-life-has-never-been-better-ee2eed62f710>

[2] World Economic Forum. "Annual Meeting of the Global Future Councils 2016 / Live blog: World Economic Forum meeting in Dubai."

Use: Context for future scenarios and thought experiments circulated within the WEF environment.

Access: <https://www.weforum.org/meetings/annual-meeting-of-global-future-councils-2016/stream/live-blog-world-economic-forum-meeting-in-dubai/>

[3] World Economic Forum. "Leadership and Governance."

Use: Institutional context of the WEF as a global governance, corporate and policy environment.

Access: <https://www.weforum.org/about/leadership-and-governance/>

B. Theoretical Background

[4] Michel Foucault. Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison. 1975 / English translation 1977.

Use: Panopticon, discipline, surveillance and the production of subjects.

Access: <https://monoskop.org/images/4/43/>

[Foucault_Michel_Discipline_and_Punish_The_Birth_of_the_Prison_1977_1995.pdf](#)

[5] Gilles Deleuze. "Postscript on the Societies of Control." 1990.

Use: The transition from disciplinary societies to control societies; modulation and continuous control.

Access: <https://deleuze.cla.purdue.edu/resource/gilles-deleuze-postscript-on-societies-of-control/>

[6] Shoshana Zuboff. The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power. 2019.

Use: Surveillance capitalism, behavioural extraction, prediction markets and behavioural modification.

Access: <https://www.hbs.edu/faculty/Pages/item.aspx?num=56791>

C. Subscription Regime and the Transformation of Property into Access

[7] Wired. "Unhappy Customers Want to Parachute From Adobe's Creative Cloud." 2013.

Use: Adobe Creative Suite / Creative Cloud transition; the shift from perpetual licence to subscription and user backlash.

Access: <https://www.wired.com/2013/05/adobe-creative-cloud-petition/>

[8] Autodesk. "Autodesk Details Next Phase of Subscription Transition." Official investor announcement, 3 September 2015.

Use: Autodesk's transition from perpetual licences to subscription.

Access: <https://investors.autodesk.com/news-releases/news-release-details/autodesk-details-next-phase-subscription-transition>

[9] WHOOP. "Membership Options."

Use: Wearable hardware embedded within membership/subscription relations.

Access: <https://www.whoop.com/us/en/membership/>

[10] HP. “HP All-In Plan Terms of Service.”

Use: Printer, ink and service tied into a subscription contract, including cancellation and return terms.

Access: <https://www.hp.com/us-en/all-in-plan/terms.html>

[11] Rolls-Royce. “TotalCare.”

Use: Aircraft engines configured as service, performance and risk-management relationships rather than merely sold objects.

Access: <https://www.rolls-royce.com/products-and-services/civil-aerospace/services/totalcare.aspx>

[12] Michelin. “Michelin Fleet Solutions.”

Use: Tyres converted from products into fleet, maintenance, mileage and service relationships.

Access: <https://business.michelinman.com/freight-transportation/freight-transportation-services/michelin-fleet-solutions>

[13] Signify / Philips. “Philips provides Light as a Service to Schiphol Airport.” 2015.

Use: The sale of light as service rather than fittings as objects; retention of ownership by the producer.

Access: <https://www.signify.com/global/our-company/news/press-release-archive/2015/20150416-philips-provides-light-as-a-service-to-schiphol-airport>

[14] Wired. “BMW’s Heated-Seats-as-a-Service Model Has Drivers Seeking Hacks.” 2022.

Use: Automotive hardware functions controlled through software and subscription gates; user backlash.

Access: <https://www.wired.com/story/bmw-heated-seats-as-a-service-model-has-drivers-seeking-hacks/>

D. Political Economy, Crisis and Smart City Critique

[15] Naomi Klein. The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism. 2007.

Use: Crises used to accelerate and impose market-centred transformations that would otherwise face resistance.

Access: <https://naomiklein.org/the-shock-doctrine/>

[16] Andreas Malm. Fossil Capital: The Rise of Steam Power and the Roots of Global Warming. 2016.

Use: Climate crisis as rooted not in abstract humanity, but in fossil-fuelled relations of capital, labour and production.

Access: <https://www.versobooks.com/en-gb/products/135-fossil-capital>

[17] Geoff Mann & Joel Wainwright. Climate Leviathan: A Political Theory of Our Planetary Future. 2018.

Use: The risk that global sovereign responses to climate crisis generate new forms of domination.

Access: <https://www.versobooks.com/en-gb/products/520-climate-leviathan>

[18] Herbert Marcuse. One-Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society. 1964.

Use: The closed universe of technical rationality and the narrowing of possible alternatives.

Access: <https://www.marxists.org/ebooks/marcuse/one-dimensional-man.pdf>

[19] Evgeny Morozov & Francesca Bria. Rethinking the Smart City: Democratizing Urban Technology. Rosa Luxemburg Stiftung, 2018.

Use: Critique of smart city solutionism, data sovereignty and democratic control of urban technology.

Access: <https://rosalux.nyc/rethinking-the-smart-city/>

[20] Robert G. Hollands. "Will the real smart city please stand up? Intelligent, progressive or entrepreneurial?" City, 12(3), 303-320, 2008.

Use: The ideological function of the smart city label: what it reveals and what it conceals.

Access: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13604810802479126>

E. Hakkı Tan's Reality Paradigm, Onopticon and Homovictimus

[21] Hakkı Tan. Reality Paradigm, Onopticon and Homovictimus: A Theoretical, Manifestal and Case-Based Inquiry into the Regime of Infrastructural Imposition. Theoretical Report / Publication-Ready Edition. 2025.

Use: Reality Paradigm as a theory of encounter rather than truth; Onopticon as recognition, classification, foreclosure of possibility and imposed reality; Homovictimus as compulsory readability and infrastructural fragility; infrastructural a priori, ontological deprivation, right to opacity, architectural rights and infrastructural justice.

[22] Hakkı Tan. Onopticon: Sovereignty as Environmental Structuring. 2025.

Use: Onopticon as the pre-processing of vital thresholds beyond surveillance; sovereignty migrating from decision to the horizon of decision; Homovictimus as the human being whose biological continuity, institutional recognition and horizon of action are bound to technical thresholds.

F. Conceptual Note

This manifesto does not merely summarise the sources above.

It reads the WEF 2030 scenario through Foucault's Panopticon, Deleuze's control society, Zuboff's surveillance capitalism, Klein's disaster capitalism, Malm's fossil capital, Mann and Wainwright's climate sovereignty, Marcuse's one-dimensional society, Morozov and Bria's smart city critique, Hollands's ideological analysis of the smart city, contemporary subscription economies and Hakkı Tan's Reality Paradigm.

The core claim is this:

The issue is not merely surveillance.

Not merely subscription.

Not merely the transfer of property.

Not merely climate crisis.

Not merely the smart city.

The issue is the pre-processing and imposition of the conditions under which the human being encounters the world.

The name of that function is Onopticon.

The human type it produces is Homovictimus.

G. Editorial Note on the Primary Text

The primary text criticised in this manifesto is Ida Auken's "Welcome to 2030. I own nothing, have no privacy, and life has never been better", first circulated in November 2016 in connection with the World Economic Forum's Annual Meeting of the Global Future Councils.

The Medium version published by the World Economic Forum states that the piece was “Originally published at www.weforum.org”. The original WEF Agenda URL now returns a 404 error, and no public explanation for its removal was found in the sources consulted.

The text therefore no longer appears to be accessible through its original WEF Agenda page, but remains accessible through the World Economic Forum’s Medium publication, secondary reproductions and archives.

This note does not prove a hidden plan.

It establishes the documentary status of the object being criticised: a WEF-linked future scenario that entered public circulation, shaped debate, and then disappeared from its original WEF URL while remaining available elsewhere.

That disappearance is not the argument of this manifesto.

The argument is the text itself.

And the text is clear enough:

products become services;

ownership becomes access;

privacy becomes hope;

choice becomes algorithmic delegation;

work becomes serviced creativity;

outsiders become those “lost on the way”;

and crisis becomes the justification for a new reality regime.

That regime is named here as Onopticon.

Hakki Tan

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

Reality Paradigm | Onopticon | Homovictimus

2025