

From the Trap of Truth to the Paradigm of Reality: Onopticon, Homovictimus, and the Ontopolitical Transformation of New Power

Hakki Tan

ORCID: [0009-0008-8582-3132](https://orcid.org/0009-0008-8582-3132)

“My paradigm is not a paradigm of truth; it is a paradigm of reality.”

Abstract

This article argues that contemporary debates on new power remain too often confined within an epistemological vocabulary of truth, representation, accuracy, bias, privacy, and data protection. Although these frameworks remain analytically important, they are insufficient for grasping the ontopolitical operation through which technical, institutional, and operational arrangements precondition the subject's possibilities of action, access, recognition, interpretation, circulation, and service provision. The article develops Hakki Tan's concept of the Onopticon as a regime of environmental structuring, operational recognition, and compulsory operational inclusion. The Onopticon includes surveillance, but cannot be reduced to it. It does not merely observe subjects; it prefigures the conditions under which they may become recognisable, verifiable, processable, governable, actionable, and eligible for access.

The structural subject-form produced by this regime is Homovictimus: not a passive victim expelled from the system, but a conditioned agent compelled to adapt to arrangements that remain outside their ownership and control. By engaging with Foucault, Deleuze, Zuboff, Bowker and Star, Eubanks, Rouvroy and Berns, Orenko Serra, and wider debates in critical data studies, the article situates the Onopticon within, and against, existing theories of surveillance, control, platform capitalism, algorithmic governmentality, biopolitics, and transhumanist governance. Through cases including Aadhaar, NHS-Palantir, AI-mediated synthetic answer systems, Netflix litigation, pandemic governance, transhumanist neurotechnologies, cellular modulation patents, and alternative protein technologies, the article shows how the problem of misrepresentation becomes a problem of reality imposition. Finally, the article treats the Right to Opacity not as a normative programme, a legal reform model, or a technological resistance strategy, but as a negative ontological threshold exposing the limits of the Onopticon's claim to total operational legibility.

Keywords: Onopticon, Homovictimus, ontopolitics, new power, algorithmic governmentality, a priori, hermeneutic a priori, Right to Opacity

1. Introduction: The Trap of Truth and the Paradigm of Reality

Contemporary debates on new power often begin with familiar questions. Does the algorithm work accurately? Is the dataset biased? Does the model represent social and physical reality adequately? Who has access to personal data? Who processes it, stores it, ranks it, sells it, or secures it?

These questions matter. Yet they remain insufficient. They continue to operate within what may be called the paradigm of Truth. That paradigm asks whether the system represents the world correctly. The more decisive problem today, however, precedes the question of correct representation. Systems do not merely misrepresent the world; they increasingly turn their incomplete representations into the operative reality through which subjects must live, move, ask, receive, work, heal, consume, and appear.

The question, then, is no longer simply: does the system know us correctly? The more fundamental question is: how does the system compel us to exist according to what it knows?

This is the passage from epistemology to ontopolitics. Epistemology asks whether knowledge is true. Ontopolitics asks which forms of existence are rendered possible, valid, recognisable, accessible, and processable. The shift is not rhetorical. It changes the object of critique. The issue is no longer simply whether the system lies, errs, hallucinates, distorts, excludes, or discriminates. The issue is how even erroneous, partial, and low-resolution models become binding environments.

The central claim of this article is that new power is not merely a set of apparatuses that observes, classifies, predicts, or disciplines. At a deeper level, it is a regime that prefigures the subject's encounter with the world. It determines what can be seen, which services can be reached, which forms of legibility will be accepted, which paths will remain open, which questions can be asked, which answers will appear plausible, and which forms of life can become operationally valid.

This article names that regime the Onopticon. The Onopticon is not a theory of surveillance. It contains surveillance, but exceeds it. Its primary function is not to see, but to render life processable. The subject-form produced within this regime is Homovictimus: a subject presumed

to be free, held responsible as an agent, and invited to choose, yet unable to govern the arrangements that condition action, recognition, access, interpretation, and social validity.

2. Method and Scope

This article is not a closed empirical study. It is a comparative theoretical intervention. Its aim is not to explain a single technological sector, but to conceptualise a recurring logic of power appearing across distinct domains. Digital identity, health data, AI-mediated search, platform entertainment, pandemic governance, transhumanist neurotechnologies, cellular modulation patents, alternative protein technologies, and automated welfare systems are therefore not treated as identical cases. They are read as threshold-fields in which the Onopticon appears with different densities, objects, speeds, and institutional forms.

A crucial qualification must be made at the outset. The Onopticon is not premised on the fantasy of a perfectly functioning system. Its violence often derives precisely from the fact that systems are incomplete, error-prone, patchworked, unstable, biased, bureaucratically inconsistent, and technically fragile. The claim is not that arrangements work flawlessly. The claim is that, even when they malfunction, subjects are compelled to adapt to the classifications, access conditions, and recognition thresholds produced by those arrangements. The Onopticon is therefore not a theory of technical perfection. It is a theory of imperfect but binding reality imposition.

Nor does this framework collapse all cases into a single technical plane. Netflix's attention economy, Aadhaar's biometric verification, NHS-Palantir's health-data integration, transhumanist neurotechnologies, and patents concerning cellular modulation do not operate at the same level. They differ in materiality, legal status, biological depth, institutional authority, and political consequence. The argument is not that these fields are identical. It is that they display a shared logic: the field of action ceases to appear as a natural or neutral space before the subject and becomes preconditioned by technical-legal, institutional, procedural, and operational arrangements.

The article also avoids the inflationary use of the concept. Not every technical system, database, platform, or algorithmic application is Onoptic. A field approaches an Onoptic logic when several conditions converge: exit becomes costly; alternatives are weakened or rendered

impractical; classification has real access effects; opacity is treated as risk; error cannot easily be corrected; and systemic blockage is returned to the subject as individual failure.

The purpose of the article is therefore not to produce an all-explaining theory. It is to name a threshold in the history of power: the point at which access, interpretation, recognition, responsiveness, and reality itself are bound to arrangements that the subject does not own, cannot fully inspect, and cannot meaningfully govern.

3. Theoretical Positioning: From Surveillance to Processability

The Onopticon does not reject existing theories of power. It clarifies the point at which they become insufficient.

Foucault's reading of the Panopticon showed how disciplinary power works through visibility. The subject internalises the possibility of being seen and regulates conduct accordingly. The Onopticon does not abolish this insight; it displaces its centre. The central issue is no longer merely that the subject may be seen. The deeper issue is that the subject must become processable, verifiable, classifiable, and operationally usable in order to pass through the world.

Deleuze's account of societies of control remains equally important. In control societies, enclosed institutions give way to continuous modulation, access codes, passwords, and dividual forms of subjectivity. The individual is decomposed into data fragments, profiles, scores, signals, and flows. Homovictimus extends this insight into an ontopolitical register. Homovictimus is not merely a dividualised subject. It is a subject compelled to access rights, services, care, visibility, interpretation, and circulation through the very fragments by which it is processed.

Zuboff's analysis of surveillance capitalism shows how human experience becomes behavioural surplus and is converted into prediction products. Yet the Onopticon emphasises an even more basic operation. Data does not merely create economic value. It organises the conditions of recognition, service, attention, access, and orientation. The question is not only who profits from behavioural data, but how behavioural data becomes part of the world in which subjects must act.

Bowker and Star's work on classification demonstrates that standards and categories do not merely describe reality; they help make certain things visible, actionable, and administratively

possible. The Onopticon builds on this insight but shifts the emphasis from classificatory order to lived constraint. Classification becomes ontopolitical when its categories determine whether a subject can access care, pass a border, receive a benefit, obtain credit, appear in a queue, reach an audience, or receive an answer.

Rouvroy and Berns' concept of algorithmic governmentality likewise comes close to the Onoptic threshold. Algorithmic governmentality operates through infra-individual data fragments, correlations, behavioural inference, and anticipatory modulation. The Onopticon incorporates this logic but insists on a further step. What begins as behavioural inference becomes reality imposition when the resulting patterns shape the practical world of credit, welfare, healthcare, border control, platform access, food systems, knowledge acquisition, bodily enhancement, and neurotechnological intervention.

Orengo Serra's work on corporate governance in transhumanism is especially significant here. It allows transhumanism to be understood not simply as a philosophical programme of human enhancement, but as a field of governance structured by Big Tech, neurotechnologies, biometric systems, AI platforms, data architectures, and state-corporate formations. From the standpoint of the Onopticon, transhumanism becomes a regional Onoptic formation: a domain in which the body, cognition, privacy, agency, citizenship, and modifiability of the human are reorganised through technical and corporate arrangements.

The distinctive contribution of the Onopticon is therefore this: it conceptualises new power not merely as surveillance, data extraction, modulation, classification, or algorithmic inference, but as the imposition of reality through operational recognition. This imposition need not operate smoothly. Wrong scores, failed matches, missing data, collapsed interfaces, bureaucratic inconsistencies, and algorithmic errors are not external to the regime. They are often among its most violent modalities, precisely because the subject must live inside the reality generated by error.

4. Defining the Onopticon: Access, Environmental Structuring, and Pre-Regulation

The term Onopticon is deliberately formed in relation to the Panopticon. The Panopticon suggests an architecture of seeing. The Onopticon names a regime that sees being, renders being processable, and determines the conditions under which being can count. The prefix onto- refers

to the ontological level, while opticon refers not only to sight, but also to selection, legibility, visibility, and processing. The Onopticon is therefore not simply an apparatus that sees. It is a regime that determines what may count as present, recognisable, actionable, and admissible within a given world.

The Onopticon may be defined as a regime of new power that reconfigures the subject as a recognisable, verifiable, processable, rankable, governable, and access-eligible being. Under the Panopticon, the subject regulates conduct because it may be seen. Under the Onopticon, the subject must regulate existence because it must be verified, matched, processed, routed, and rendered valid.

Its operative formula may be expressed as: *esse est verificari* - to be is to be verifiable. This is a deliberate echo of Berkeley's *esse est percipi*, yet it does not repeat Berkeleyan idealism. In Berkeley, being is tied to perception. Under the Onopticon, social validity is tied to verifiability, matchability, and operational processability. The formula should not be read as a claim that non-verified subjects cease to exist biologically or relationally. Rather, it names the narrowing of institutional, public, platform-mediated, and service-based existence when the subject cannot be verified.

The Onopticon operates through three interlinked levels. First, pre-processing: before a formal decision occurs, the person, file, patient, worker, consumer, user, applicant, or target is transformed into a system-compatible object. Second, environmental structuring: the world in which the subject acts is arranged in advance. The line of least resistance is made to coincide with compliance, legibility, and system compatibility. Third, pre-regulation: at its biological and technical limit, not only behaviour but responsiveness itself becomes susceptible to prior technical organisation.

This is where the Onopticon diverges most sharply from classical biopolitics. Foucauldian biopolitics concerns the governmental management of population life. The Onopticon, at its limit, concerns the organisation of the conditions under which a body, cell, patient, user, file, or system may respond at all.

Figure 1. The three operations of the Onopticon

Pre-processing	Environmental structuring	Pre-regulation
The subject is formatted as a processable object before formal decision.	The field of action is arranged so that compliance becomes the path of least resistance.	At the strongest threshold, response itself becomes technically conditionable.

5. Truth and Reality: Map, Terrain, and the Operative World

The paradigm of Truth asks: does the system represent the world accurately? The paradigm of Reality asks: by which mechanisms does the system turn its own representation into the world that must be lived?

The distinction can be clarified through the map and terrain problem. No model can reproduce the full complexity of the terrain. No platform, algorithm, interface, dataset, or ontology can represent the world in a one-to-one manner. That is true. Yet from the standpoint of the Onopticon, the decisive problem is not that the map is incomplete. The decisive problem is that the incomplete map becomes the only traversable environment.

A false classification is an epistemological problem. But when access to credit, welfare, healthcare, employment, border crossing, public visibility, or knowledge is conditioned by that false classification, the problem becomes ontopolitical. The question is no longer simply whether the subject has been wrongly represented. The question is why the subject must adapt to the practical reality created by the wrong representation.

Power no longer needs to make the map correspond to the terrain. It can compel the terrain, and the subject within it, to fit the map. Error does not remain merely false. It becomes operational.

For this reason, the Reality Paradigm intersects with, but cannot be reduced to, post-truth. Post-truth concerns the destabilisation of truth. The Reality Paradigm concerns the production of the conditions under which something can appear as real, selectable, actionable, accessible, or irrelevant. The problem is not only that people believe false things. It is that platforms, protocols, institutions, models, and procedural thresholds increasingly decide what can appear at all.

6. Homovictimus: Ontological Deprivation and Conditioned Agency

Homovictimus is not the passive victim of a system that excludes from outside. It is the subject deeply integrated into devices, accounts, biometric traces, data profiles, health records, payment systems, application forms, algorithmic rankings, administrative procedures, and platform protocols. Its vulnerability does not arise from simple exclusion. It arises from conditional inclusion.

Homovictimus can act. It can work, write, learn, apply, produce, organise, create, consume, contest, and use technology. Yet its action takes place within arrangements it does not own and cannot fully govern. Its agency is not annihilated. It is conditioned.

The more precise name for this condition is ontological deprivation. Ontological deprivation does not mean that the subject ceases to exist. It means that the subject is deprived of the conditions through which action, visibility, interpretation, representation, and opacity can be meaningfully held as its own.

Homovictimus has three principal features. First, its access is conditional. Participation in social life depends on accounts, verification systems, processable data, biometric matches, platform rules, or procedural compliance. Second, its knowledge is pre-formed. Its access to the world is mediated by search engines, recommendation systems, generative models, ranking systems, dashboards, and institutional interfaces. Third, its interpretation is subcontracted. The labour of comparing, contextualising, weighing, summarising, and judging is increasingly delegated to systems that select, order, condense, and present reality on the subject's behalf.

The psychopolitical dimension of Homovictimus is equally important. The subject does not only submit under coercion. It often invests affectively in the very arrangements that condition it. Convenience, speed, security, visibility, optimisation, personalised service, moral reassurance, and fear of exclusion bind the subject to the system. The Onopticon does not rule only through fear. It also rules through ease, comfort, recognition, and the desire not to be left outside.

Homovictimus is therefore not simply a human who has lost freedom. It is a more disturbing figure: a subject who appears free while the conditions of its freedom have been decided elsewhere.

7. The A Priori and the Hermeneutic A Priori

In Kant, the a priori names the necessary conditions within the subject that make experience possible. Time, space, and the categories structure the subject's relation to the world. Under the Onopticon, this structure is inverted. The world does not arrive as raw material before the subject. It arrives already filtered, ranked, formatted, moderated, secured, summarised, routed, and interpreted by technical, institutional, and operational arrangements.

This a priori is not Kantian in the strict transcendental sense. It is historical, technical, and mutable. It is closer to Foucault's historical a priori, though it also exceeds it. The issue is not only the discursive conditions under which statements become possible. The issue is the practical conditions under which access, recognition, verification, interpretation, and action become possible.

The a priori in this sense is the set of historical-technical conditions that prefigure what the subject can reach, see, ask, receive, compare, and do before the subject encounters the world as experience.

AI-mediated search and synthetic answer systems add a further layer: the hermeneutic a priori. If the a priori concerns access to the world, the hermeneutic a priori concerns how the accessible world is already made meaningful. In classical search, the user moved among sources, encountered contradictions, followed links, compared claims, and constructed interpretation through traversal. In synthetic answer systems, source selection, ranking, summarisation, contextualisation, safety modulation, tonal adjustment, and answer formation take place before the answer reaches the user.

The issue is therefore not merely whether AI systems answer correctly. The deeper issue is the displacement of interpretive labour. The subject no longer simply searches through a field of documents. It increasingly receives a pre-interpreted condensation of reality. Here Homovictimus becomes not only the subject who accesses services through systems, but the subject who receives interpreted reality through systems.

8. Threshold-Fields of the Onopticon

8.1. Aadhaar: Biometric Matching and the Operationalisation of Rights

Aadhaar demonstrates how rights may become dependent on verification. The issue is not simply biometric error. The issue is the attachment of access to food, welfare, pensions, and services to the successful operation of biometric and administrative matching.

A subject may remain a legal rights-holder while becoming unable to exercise those rights. The error is epistemological; the consequence is ontopolitical. The person does not cease to be a citizen, yet is practically distanced from the capacity to act as one.

Aadhaar therefore reveals one of the Onopticon's central operations: rights become protocol-dependent, citizenship becomes verification-dependent, and social existence becomes tied to operational recognition. Homovictimus is not the one simply excluded from welfare. It is the one compelled to become recognisable in the form the system can process.

8.2. NHS-Palantir: The Patient as Operational Node

The NHS-Palantir case reveals a more complex form of the Onopticon in health. Modern health systems have long translated patients into data through laboratory results, radiology images, prescriptions, discharge summaries, electronic records, and administrative coding. Yet integrated data platforms alter the scale and ontological status of this transformation.

The patient is no longer merely a fragmented clinical file. The patient becomes an operational node linked to capacity, flow, risk, priority, waiting lists, bed management, discharge planning, resource allocation, and institutional performance.

This exceeds the usual privacy question. Privacy asks who sees the data. The Onoptic question is sharper: within which architecture does the patient become real, processable, governable, and actionable?

Integrated systems may produce genuine benefits: better coordination, reduced delays, and more efficient resource allocation. Yet they also reconfigure the patient according to operational logics. Care becomes inseparable from flow. Clinical need becomes entangled with capacity management. The patient becomes legible through the system that organises care.

8.3. AI-Mediated Synthetic Answer: The Subcontracting of Interpretation

AI-mediated search systems do not simply accelerate information access. They transform the structure of interpretation. The user is no longer merely directed towards sources. Sources are selected, ranked, condensed, contextualised, and synthesised into an answer.

The location of epistemic labour changes. The user still asks, still judges, still may compare. But the material offered for judgement has already passed through an arrangement that determines what is likely to appear, what is emphasised, what is omitted, what is softened, what is framed as uncertain, and what is given the tone of reasonableness.

This is the hermeneutic face of the Onopticon. Interpretation is no longer simply performed by the subject after accessing sources. It is partially performed before the subject receives the world.

8.4. Platform Entertainment: Behavioural Data, Dark Design, and the Operationalised Viewer

The Onopticon does not operate only in state, border, welfare, or health systems. Entertainment platforms can also render attention, desire, habit, rhythm, and viewing time operational. The viewer is not merely a consumer of content. Viewing habits, pauses, continuations, device use, household profiles, children's profiles, and attention patterns become behavioural surfaces.

The 2026 lawsuit brought by the Texas Attorney General against Netflix is a contemporary example of this dispute. The complaint alleges that Netflix collected behavioural data from users, including children, without adequate knowledge or consent; associated such data with advertising technology and data brokers; and used dark design features such as autoplay to keep users watching. Netflix disputes the allegations. The case should therefore be treated not as a settled legal finding, but as a contested example that reveals the Onoptic logic of platform entertainment.

In this field, the subject is not coerced in the obvious manner. The system works through convenience, habit, enjoyment, and continuity. The viewer experiences freedom as choice, while the environment of attention is structured to prolong engagement. Homovictimus here is the

subject processed while entertained, watched while watching, and guided while believing itself to choose freely.

8.5. Pandemic Governance: Access Capture and Environmental Configuration

Pandemic governance made visible that the Onopticon is not reducible to surveillance. Digital health certificates, contact-tracing applications, border restrictions, risk classifications, biometric verification, and administrative access regimes reorganised the conditions under which life could circulate.

The centre of power was not a single institution. States, international organisations, financial actors, technology companies, health systems, and platform infrastructures formed a distributed legitimacy and coordination network. The crucial operation was not merely restriction, but compulsory integration into specific channels of recognition and access.

Three dynamics appeared clearly. First, pre-modelling: behaviour was not only recorded; the probable horizon of movement was organised in advance. Second, closure of alternatives: analogue routes weakened while digital verification became increasingly necessary. Third, vulnerability became operational input: fear, biological risk, public responsibility, and health anxiety were translated into governable categories. The restriction was visible. The imposition was deeper.

8.6. Transhumanist Governance: Big Tech, Neurotechnology, and the Enhanceable Human

Transhumanist governance is one of the Onopticon's significant regional formations. It operates through promises of enhancement, optimisation, cognitive extension, longevity, health, security, and improved human capacity. The question is not whether these promises are inherently false or illegitimate. The more fundamental question is: through which corporate, technical, legal, and institutional arrangements are body, cognition, privacy, agency, and citizenship reorganised?

Orengo Serra's work on corporate governance in transhumanism is important because it links this field to Big Tech, neurotechnologies, biometric systems, AI platforms, and state-corporate arrangements. From this perspective, transhumanism cannot be read merely as a speculative philosophy of future humanity. It must also be read as a field of governance.

The Onopticon does not condemn every neurotechnology or biomedical intervention as domination. The issue is not technology as such. The issue is the point at which the conditions of bodily recognition, cognitive enhancement, intervention, optimisation, classification, and modifiability become tied to arrangements that the subject does not govern. At that threshold, Homovictimus becomes not only patient, user, or citizen, but an enhanceable, monitorable, modifiable, and governable human form.

8.7. Biological Pre-Regulation: Patent, Cell Membrane, and the Threshold of Response

The most extreme threshold of the Onopticon appears where biological response becomes technically pre-organisable. This is not simply a question of population health or medical administration. It concerns the conditions under which living response itself may be technically designed.

U.S. Patent No. 10,765,878 B2, Compositions and Methods to Modulate Cell Activity, associated with Rockefeller University research, provides a paradigmatic boundary case. The patent describes methods and compositions for modulating cell activity through radiofrequency waves or magnetic fields. Its technical logic involves engineered cellular systems associated with ion channels, metal-binding proteins, and paramagnetic nanoparticles, such that external electromagnetic or magnetic fields may trigger cellular response. Within the patent, this approach is framed through Nanoparticle Induced Cellular Regulation (NICR).

The significance of this patent is not that it proves a completed political regime at the cellular level. A patent is not a social order. Nor should media sensationalism be mistaken for theory. Its significance is more precise: it demonstrates that biological responsiveness can be conceptualised as an engineered threshold. At this point, the membrane is no longer merely a biological boundary. It becomes a possible interface.

This is not yet the generalised social regulation of cellular life. It is a limit-case. A technical possibility becomes a regime of power only through investment, institutionalisation, regulation, market formation, medical adoption, public policy, and social acceptance. The patent therefore does not prove the completed biological Onopticon. It reveals its horizon of possibility.

8.8. Alternative Proteins: Molecular, Sensory, and Institutional Pre-Structuring

Alternative protein technologies are usually debated through environmental sustainability and market viability. The Onoptic question is different: through which property forms, patent regimes, regulatory thresholds, sensory norms, and institutional pathways is food being reorganised?

Plant-based analogues involve formulation, branding, shelf visibility, sensory imitation, and distribution. Cultivated meat involves cell lines, bioreactors, product dossiers, and high regulatory thresholds. Fermentation-based proteins involve molecular components, proprietary platforms, and supply-chain infrastructures. In each case, the consumer's apparently ethical choice is already shaped by patents, regulation, distribution, branding, sensory engineering, and capital concentration.

Here patent is not merely a legal protection. It is an ontopolitical mechanism. It transforms biological processes, formulations, cell lines, production platforms, and molecular components into ownable and governable objects. Competition does not begin only in the market. It begins at the threshold of what can be produced, scaled, authorised, sensed, recognised, and legitimised.

Homovictimus in this field does not name all consumers equally. It becomes most visible in professional-managerial forms of ethical consumption, where moral legitimacy is produced within a pre-structured field of choice. The subject chooses ethically, yet the field of ethical choice has already been formatted by property, regulation, capital, and sensory design.

9. The Six Operations of the Onopticon

The cases examined differ greatly. Biometric identity systems turn the body into a verification surface. Health-data platforms turn the patient into an operational node. AI interfaces prefigure interpretation. Entertainment platforms operationalise attention and habit. Transhumanist governance links bodily and cognitive enhancement to institutional-technical dependency. Pandemic governance reorganises circulation and access. Alternative protein technologies structure molecular, sensory, and regulatory fields. Yet across these differences a common Onoptic logic appears.

First, heterogeneous life processes are converted into processable units. The person becomes a profile; the patient becomes a pathway; the viewer becomes an engagement surface; the user

becomes a behavioural signal; the citizen becomes a verification event; the cell becomes a responsive interface.

Second, conditional inclusion is established. Subjects are not necessarily expelled. They are included in the form the system can recognise and process.

Third, power shifts from decision to decision horizon. Formal decisions may remain human, institutional, or legal. Yet the world placed before decision has already been ranked, sorted, risked, prioritised, hidden, or made actionable.

Fourth, responsibility is dispersed. Outcomes emerge through models, dashboards, workflows, interfaces, protocols, contractors, data pipelines, and procedural chains. Responsibility becomes difficult to locate precisely because it is everywhere distributed.

Fifth, legitimacy becomes procedural. Decisions appear rational because the system has already rendered some objects, subjects, risks, and pathways salient.

Sixth, at its strongest threshold, responsiveness itself becomes conditionable. Here the Onopticon surpasses both surveillance and algorithmic governmentality. The issue is no longer simply what is seen, inferred, or predicted. The issue is how the very conditions of response are organised in advance.

10. Autoimmunity and Algorithmic Feedback Blindness

The Onopticon does not only affect vulnerable subjects at the periphery. It also transforms the centre. As institutions gather more data, predict more behaviour, standardise more fields, and render more life-processes measurable, they come to believe that they know reality more fully. Yet this process often makes them increasingly dependent on what can be measured.

Algorithmic feedback blindness names the process through which systems begin to learn from their own prior reductions rather than from the world. The mechanism unfolds in three steps. First, complex behaviour is reduced to measurable indicators. Second, the system intervenes on the basis of those indicators, treating some groups as risky, some behaviours as deviant, some subjects as unreliable, and some options as inefficient. Third, the consequences of those interventions are fed back into the system as reality data.

The system appears to measure society, but increasingly measures the effects of its own interventions. This blindness is not merely technical. It narrows political judgement. The centre begins to treat what falls outside measurable indicators as noise, risk, anomaly, or inefficiency. The result is an impoverishment of the decision horizon.

This is the autoimmune character of the Noopticon. The mechanism built to control reality damages the capacity to perceive reality.

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

Against the Noopticon, the Right to Opacity is not a programme of reform. It is neither a legal blueprint nor a technological strategy of resistance. It is a negative ontological threshold.

This right differs from liberal privacy and from technical anonymity. Privacy asks that personal information be protected. Anonymity seeks concealment. Opacity names something more fundamental: the refusal of total readability, total predictability, total verifiability, and total processability.

Yet the Noopticon does not accept opacity neutrally. The unreadable subject is easily coded as risk, anomaly, fraud, inefficiency, threat, non-compliance, or failure. Opacity thus becomes less a safe zone than a site of conflict. It reveals the point at which the system's demand for legibility encounters the irreducible excess of the subject.

This does not render practices such as obfuscation, encryption, pseudonymity, open-source tools, decentralised networks, or data cooperatives irrelevant. But in this article they are not offered as a solution. At most, they indicate friction, leakage, interruption, and tactical cracks in the Noopticon's claim to totality. Tan's framework does not derive a politics of salvation from them. It uses them to diagnose the points at which imposed reality fails to close upon itself completely.

A further distinction is necessary. Forced visibility is domination. But forced opacity can also be erasure. Subjects without internet access, legal documentation, institutional recognition, or public visibility may experience opacity not as freedom, but as disappearance. The issue is therefore not the romanticisation of invisibility. The issue is the system's claim to decide, unilaterally, when subjects must be visible and when they may be ignored.

The Right to Opacity is therefore not the answer to the Noopticon. It is the sign of its limit.

12. Conclusion

The Onopticon is not a theory of surveillance. It contains surveillance, but exceeds it. The Onopticon is a new regime of power that determines, before the monitoring of behaviour, the field of reality within which the subject can act. For this reason, the central question for understanding contemporary new power is not whether the system represents us correctly. The more fundamental question is: by which mechanisms does the system turn its own incomplete representation into the only reality available to be lived?

Homovictimus is the necessary subject-form of this regime. It is not bare life simply excluded from the system. It is the subject kept inside, processed, verified, ranked, interpreted, guided, and made responsible within arrangements it does not control.

This article has proposed the Onopticon as a three-level conceptual framework: pre-processing, environmental structuring, and pre-regulation. Aadhaar shows the binding of rights to verification. NHS-Palantir shows the transformation of the patient into an operational node. AI-mediated synthetic answer systems show the subcontracting of interpretation. Netflix litigation shows behavioural data extraction and attention steering within platform entertainment. Orenego Serra's work on transhumanist governance shows how Big Tech, neurotechnologies, and state-corporate arrangements reorganise bodily and cognitive agency. Pandemic governance reveals access capture and environmental configuration. Patents concerning remote modulation of cellular activity reveal the horizon at which biological response becomes technically pre-organisable. Alternative protein technologies show molecular, sensory, and institutional pre-structuring.

The Onopticon is therefore not a problem of truth, but a regime of reality imposition. Its power does not depend on perfect functioning. It is powerful because even its failures, errors, gaps, and distortions may be imposed upon the subject as binding reality. Homovictimus is the name of the contemporary subject that continues to appear free within that imposed reality.

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.
- Berkeley, G. (1710). *A Treatise Concerning the Principles of Human Knowledge*.

- Bowker, G. C., & Star, S. L. (1999). *Sorting Things Out: Classification and Its Consequences*. MIT Press.
- Couldry, N., & Mejias, U. A. (2019). *The Costs of Connection: How Data Is Colonising Human Life and Appropriating It for Capitalism*. Stanford University Press.
- Deleuze, G. (1992). Postscript on the societies of control. *October*, 59, 3-7.
- Dixon, P. (2017). A failure to 'do no harm': India's Aadhaar biometric ID programme and its inability to protect privacy in relation to measures in Europe and the U.S. *Health and Technology*, 7, 539-567.
- Emirates News Agency. (2026, April 23). Under directives of UAE President and in world first: Mohammed bin Rashid reveals new UAE government framework to deploy Agentic AI across 50% of government sectors, operations within two years.
- Eubanks, V. (2018). *Automating Inequality: How High-Tech Tools Profile, Police, and Punish the Poor*. St. Martin's Press.
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Vintage.
- Foucault, M. (2008). *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978-1979*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Glissant, É. (1997). *Poetics of Relation*. University of Michigan Press.
- Han, B.-C. (2015). *The Burnout Society*. Stanford University Press.
- Orengo Serra, K. L. (2026). Gobernanza corporativa en el transhumanismo: Big Tech, neurotecnologías y desafíos CTS. *Trilogía Ciencia Tecnología Sociedad*, 18(38), e3724. <https://doi.org/10.22430/21457778.3724>
- 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.
- Rouvroy, A., & Berns, T. (2013). Algorithmic governmentality and prospects of emancipation. *Réseaux*, 177, 163-196.
- Srnicek, N. (2017). *Platform Capitalism*. Polity.
- Stanley, S. A., Gagner, J. E., Damanpour, S., Yoshida, M., Dordick, J. S., & Friedman, J. M. (2012). Radio-wave heating of iron oxide nanoparticles can regulate plasma glucose in mice. *Science*, 336(6081), 604-608. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1216753>
- Stanley, S. A., Sauer, J., Kane, R. S., Dordick, J. S., & Friedman, J. M. (2015). Remote regulation of glucose homeostasis in mice using genetically encoded nanoparticles. *Nature Medicine*, 21(1), 92-98. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nm.3730>
- Stanley, S., Friedman, J., Dordick, J. S., & Sauer, J. (2020). Compositions and methods to modulate cell activity (U.S. Patent No. 10,765,878 B2). U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. <https://patents.google.com/patent/US10765878B2/en>
- Sutherland, C. (2026, May 13). 'Netflix watches you': Lawsuit accuses streaming giant of spying on users. *TIME*.

- Tan, H. (2026a). Onopticon and Ontopolitical Mutation: From Burnout to Ontological Deprivation within the Reality Paradigm. Unpublished manuscript.
- Tan, H. (2026b). From Search to Synthetic Answer: The Onopticon, the Inversion of the Infrastructural A Priori, and Homovictimus. Unpublished manuscript.
- Tan, H. (2026c). From Fragmented Files to Operational Nodes: The NHS-Palantir Case and the Ontological Transformation of the Patient. Unpublished manuscript.
- Tan, H. (2026d). Down to the Cell Membrane: Onopticon, Homovictimus, and the Pre-Regulation of Life. Unpublished manuscript.
- Tan, H. (2026e). The Biopolitics of Artificial Meat and Food: Onopticon, Homovictimus, Patenting, and Regulatory Concentration in Alternative Protein Technologies. Unpublished manuscript.
- Tan, H. (2026f). The Double Face of International Governance: WHO, Pandemic Politics, and the Ontopolitics of Global Control. Unpublished manuscript.
- Texas Attorney General. (2026, May 11). Attorney General Ken Paxton sues Netflix for spying on Texas kids and consumers by illegally collecting users' data without their knowledge or consent.
- Zuboff, S. (2019). The Age of Surveillance Capitalism. PublicAffairs.