

Necrotechnology, Stiegler and the Digital

Bert Olivier

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3138-1948>

University of the Free State, South Africa

OlivierG1@ufs.ac.za

Abstract

This article is an attempt to understand the relationship between what has manifested itself globally since at least 2020, namely, what we may call – adapting Achille Mbembe’s concept of “necropolitics” (the politics of death) – “necrotechnology” (the technology of death), on the one hand, and digital technology, which the French philosopher Bernard Stiegler links with a new kind of “barbarism”, on the other. Examples are provided of “necrotechnology” in action, which S. D. Wells terms the “weapons of mass destruction” (WMD), that have been used against human beings for decades, and the group behind this sustained attempt at committing democide is identified. Setting aside the inarguable issue of the moral reprehensibility of the democidal project (on Kantian grounds, involving ethics), the question of an appropriate response to the latter is raised, and, because advanced digital technology is indispensable for actualising the project’s aims, an answer is formulated in terms of Stiegler’s philosophy of technology. Specific attention is given to Stiegler’s claim, that we live in an age of “disruption”, where the chief source of disruption is digital technology, which he further links to the claim that we live in “an epoch without epoch”, that is, where the characteristic mode of functioning of digital technology is such that it systematically prevents an “epoch” from forming because no cultural integration and consolidation of “retentions” and “protentions” are allowed to take place. Surprising as it may seem, the “solution” Stiegler offers is indissolubly linked with the human capacity for *thinking*, which enables us to grasp the impoverishing exclusiveness of digital technology, to the detriment of utilising other kinds of technology. However, Stiegler’s work enables people to practise a Heideggerian “Yes and No” approach to digital technology: by all means use it for innocuous purposes, but do not allow it to use (or abuse) you.

Keywords: Bernard Stiegler; democide; digital; Michel Foucault; Martin Heidegger; Achille Mbembe; necrotechnology; weapons of mass destruction; thinking



Phronimon

Volume 26 | 2025 | #20219 | 27 pages

<https://doi.org/10.25159/2413-3086/20219>

ISSN 2413-3086 (Online), ISSN 1516-4018 (Print)

© The Author(s) 2025



Published by Unisa Press. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>)

Introduction: “Necrotechnology”

We live at a time when the most far-reaching changes in technology, and concomitantly, in the social and political relationships between human beings – which have fundamentally been maintained for centuries – are taking place. It is impossible to capture the sheer magnitude of these developments in a mere article, but I can try to sketch its contours. Provisionally one might say that, as is well-known in the light of the work of several thinkers, including Michel Foucault, Jacques Derrida and Bernard Stiegler (on whose relevant contribution to this issue I will concentrate here), that the use of technical devices by human beings (re-)configure their subjectivity in a complex manner.

One demonstration of this insight is encountered in Derrida’s (1981, 61–172) complex deconstruction of Plato’s critique of writing as a *pharmakon* – poison and cure simultaneously. In brief, while Plato, through the use of Egyptian mythology, warns against writing as a *mnemonic*, insofar as its multivocality and undecidability makes of it an inferior substitute for the putative immediacy, decidability and univocality of speech as organ of truth, Derrida deftly, and at length, teases out the paradox at the heart of Plato’s logocentric and phonocentric bias. It amounts to the demonstration that speech, no less than writing, is polysemic and multivocal, and that the axiologically effective, binary opposition between speech and writing predisposes one to privilege the former at the cost of the latter. What Derrida’s analysis reveals is the upshot, that speech, considered as a (communicational) “technology” of sorts, configures human subjectivity in a similar manner as writing – understood as a *mnemonic* “technology” – does, given the ineluctable functioning of polysemy and undecidability regarding the meaning of words and statements in both. Put differently: speech always already displays the structure of writing, and predisposes the subject to think in a specific manner; writing reinforces this. Against this backdrop it is safe to say that contemporary technologies of archiving and communication – such as the use of e-mail, and of social media (like WhatsApp messaging and Instagram) – similarly (re-)configure human subjectivity in ways most people are unaware of (e.g., as Derrida (1995) argues at length in *Archive Fever* regarding e-mail).

To be sure, I could argue, plausibly (but not conclusively) that the kind of “technology” alluded to above (which is not my chief focus here) – such as writing, or messaging – is relatively innocuous compared to a different kind of technology, which affects human subjectivity no less, and the effects of which are, furthermore, inscribed on the human body. I am thinking of Foucault’s genealogy of power in *Discipline and Punish* (1995) and the first volume of the *History of Sexuality* (1980), in both of which he discloses the workings of a certain kind of “technology” – in the former, a technology of punitive practices which shape the subject into a “docile body” (Olivier 2010), and in the latter, one of biopolitical practices through which “biopower” is exercised. Therefore, it is pertinent to note that Mbembe (2003, 12) – an African thinker who has taken Foucault’s work further – writes:

To exercise sovereignty is to exercise control over mortality and to deny life as the deployment and manifestation of power. One could summarize in the above terms what Michel Foucault meant by *biopower*: that domain of life over which power has taken control. But under what practical conditions is the right to kill, to allow to live, or to expose to death exercised? Who is the subject of this right? What does the implementation of such a right tell us about the person who is thus put to death and about the relation of enmity that sets that person against his or her murderer? Is the notion of biopower sufficient to account for the contemporary ways in which the political, under the guise of war, of resistance, or of the fight against terror, makes the murder of the enemy its primary and absolute objective? War, after all, is as much a means of achieving sovereignty as a way of exercising the right to kill. Imagining politics as a form of war, we must ask: What place is given to life, death, and the human body (in particular the wounded or slain body)? How are they inscribed in the order of power?

It is worth asking whether this excerpt reminds us of anything that we have been witnessing over approximately the last five years, since the advent of the supposed Covid-19 “pandemic” of 2020 (Agamben 2021; Olivier 2023c; 2024; Van der Pijl 2022; Wolf 2022; 2023). Clearly, “sovereignty”, albeit of a perverse kind, has been exercised over the majority of humanity during this time, and there seemed to be no letting up, until recently, with the re-election of Donald Trump as President of the United States (US) in 2024. Trump has wasted no time setting in motion a concerted attempt at restoring what may arguably be termed “sanity”, to the world (Dmitry 2025c; Kortunov 2025; Ryumshin 2025), in contrast with the evident “insanity” of his opponents (Olivier 2024b; Rupp 2025).

If Foucault calls the exercise of control over life and death “biopower”, Mbembe (2003, 27) is content to call a spade a spade – it is nothing less than “necropolitics” – that is, the politics of death, and his own focus is on the exercise of “necropower” (the power of death) over Palestinians during what he terms “the late-modern colonial occupation in Gaza and the West Bank”. While Mbembe’s work is compelling in this regard, I believe that, more recently, we have witnessed the expansion of lethal “necropower” far beyond Gaza and the West Bank, although its functioning has continued there unabated (Hedges 2024). Even if that sounds familiar, we would be forgiven to be taken aback by the truly disconcerting assessment of the current state of affairs in the world in terms of the deadly application of “necropower”, as summed up by Wells (2024), who articulates what most of us are subliminally, if not explicitly, aware of:

Ever since the early 1900s, the “powers that be” in America have engaged in population control and reduction schemes to keep people sick, dying and paying the government for it all the while. The American Medical Association jump started it when they labeled all natural remedies “quack medicine” and “snake oil” and all lab-concocted chemical-based pharmaceuticals “prescription medications.” After WWII, the mass poisoning of Americans got ramped up with fluoridated water [against which Stanley Kubrick warned in his 1964 film, *Dr Strangelove*], processed foods and the mass-injection of disease-spreading, mind-numbing, immune-system-crashing “vaccines”.

By the 1980s, American foods were further corrupted, adulterated and toxified with poisonous pesticides, organ-decimating herbicides (think glyphosate/Roundup) and genetically modified crops and seeds that drive cancer and dementia rates through the roof. Add in processed oils, high fructose corn syrup, aspartame, nitrates and monosodium glutamate, and you've got a couple hundred million Americans rushing to the doctors and hospitals regularly for chronic sick care.

Thus far the preamble. Wells (2024) gets more specific later in the article by listing the “top 12 WMD” of today, and an alarming list it is, despite the feeling of “recognising” them (i.e., having been subliminally, if not explicitly, aware of them all the time):

- #1. Extreme Weather Modification & Weaponization Technology – MSM and globalists call it “Climate Change” [Of which both “chemtrails” and earthquake technology comprise particularly destructive components; see Dmitry 2025b; Olivier 2025a; Redacted 2025; 2025a.]
- #2. Purposely designed and released lab-concocted gain-of-function viruses, parasites, bacteria and pathogens – MSM calls it a “Pandemic”
- #3. Clot-shot gene-mutation injections, turbo cancer proponents and graphene nanoparticle technology – MSM, CDC and Big Pharma call it mRNA “vaccines” and “spike proteins” [See Bergman 2024 for a recent scientific confirmation of the drop in life expectancy of people who received the mRNA injections.]
- #4. Computer-generated decision-making technology – “Artificial Intelligence” (a key component for the weaponization of information, disinformation)
- #5. Dirty energy – MSM and Big Tech call it the “5G Network”, or 5th generation wireless network technology
- #6. Smart phone and pager bombs – called “lithium batteries” [Recall the remote-controlled explosion of Hezbollah pagers in Lebanon in 2024, killing and wounding thousands of people; PressForTruth 2024.]
- #7. Venom-laced pharmaceuticals – called “prescription drugs” [See Adams 2022.]
- #8. Dementia and cancer-causing pesticides and herbicides woven into crop seeds – it’s lab-concocted GMO Frankenfood – Big Food calls it “Genetic Engineering” or “Biotechnology”
- #9. Population reduction and genocide by mass abortions and vaccinations – MSM calls it “Planned Parenthood” and “women’s health” [See Truth Wiki 2015.]
- #10. Brainwashing of youth to support gender-bender ideology, socialism, satanism, CRT, hate crimes and mass vaccination – Big Tech calls it “social media” [See Hoft 2024 (on communism/socialism).]

#11. Chemical spills, explosions, arson and chemical burns (think Palestine, Ohio) – MSM and corporate America call them all “accidents”

#12. Illegal immigration of criminals, drug dealers, drug trafficking, human trafficking and terrorist migration into the United States – MSM calls it closed borders and “The American Way”.

It should be apparent, in the light of the above list, that Mbembe’s (2003) “necropolitics” may serve for us to introduce another neologism, to wit, “necrotechnology” (Olivier 2024c) – the “technology of death”, which is exactly what has been deployed against “We the people” since the early 20th century, as Wells (2024) observes. As for the question, who is “behind” it, all indications are that the so-called, self-described “elites” (the “powers that be” or “globalists”, to use Wells’ terms), represented mainly by the World Economic Forum (WEF; see Olivier 2025b) and the World Health Organization (WHO), are the culprits who have driven this process that Wells identifies. A growing corpus of research confirming this claim, in the form of identifying the crimes against humanity of which the globalists are guilty, together with evidence to substantiate the allegations, are available by this time (including, but not limited to: Chossudovsky 2021; Kennedy 2021; Olivier 2023c; 2023d; 2024; Van der Pijl 2022; Wolf 2022; 2023). We gain a good impression of the nature and motivational context of the assault against the people of the world from respected social scientist, Van der Pijl (2022, 8–9), where he writes:

Society as we know it – global capitalism with its home base in the West – has entered a revolutionary crisis. After years of preparation, the ruling oligarchy, which today exercises power across the globe, has seized on the outbreak of the SARS-CoV-2 virus and the respiratory disease attributed to it, Covid-19, to declare a global state of emergency in early 2020. This seizure of power is intended to prevent the Information Technology revolution … the impact of which can be compared to that of the coming of the printing press at the end of the Middle Ages, from ushering in a democratic transformation … the “pandemic” is not a simple, one-off fraud, or a grand scheme cooked up by Klaus Schwab, the oracle of Davos, and obediently executed by national governments. Rather, it is a complex, historical crisis, giving rise to a seizure of power by the global ruling class that has been initiated from different starting positions. Much about the Covid “pandemic” is still shrouded in mystery. It seems certain that the virus did escape from a laboratory, but from which one, we do not know. What we can conclude is that the official account of what is happening around us is patently untrue and that it will therefore eventually collapse. The timescale on which this will come about should not be underestimated, as the mainstream media constitutes a key part of the complex of forces that have seized power in this process; its deception and propaganda regarding major historical events have become routine since the 1990s …

What matters is that the Covid seizure of power, even more comprehensively than previous states of emergency in the name of terrorism, is working to prevent a democratic transition to a society beyond capitalism. The revolutionary crisis that has become acute resides in the fact that governments have now taken their populations

hostage and cannot or dare not release them. This is another reason why the entire effort at suppression is doomed to end in failure. Too much has been set in motion too early, too disjointedly, and the contradictions between the different interests and institutions, only apparently all in agreement, are bound to turn into overt conflict.

The optimism expressed in the last paragraph of the quote from Van der Pijl (2022, 9) (as well as, implicitly, in his reference to the cabal's intention, to prevent "the Information Technology revolution", which appears to allude to the potential of this "revolution", to empower people economically and politically far beyond what was previously possible), notwithstanding, three years after its publication, the anticipated "failure" of the globalists' attempt at a global *coup d'état* is still not a foregone conclusion. To be sure, the re-election of Trump as the US President in 2024 has inspired hope for the hastening of this long-overdue event, which some see as already occurring through his concerted actions (Dugin 2025), but nothing can be predicted with certainty, given the massive technological and media power in the hands of the globalists. In the meantime the multi-dimensional war – covering information warfare, iatocratic war and kinetic war – between the technocratic clique and the people opposing them worldwide – has, if anything, increased in intensity, with the Trump camp forging ahead (Lawrence 2025) with multiple initiatives to roll back the colossal damage caused by the Biden administration (as puppets of Klaus Schwab's globalists). At the same time their adversaries, including the rabidly globalist European Union Commission, have evidently been doing their best to regroup, for example, by tightening their grip on control (e.g., Frontnieuws 2025) of information (see also the Global Research website for a diverse array of articles that explore different manifestations of this global war).

Technology and the Problem of Auspicious Action

Considering the vast technological powers that are at the disposal of the group of neo-fascists, working through organisations such as the WEF (Harris 2025), behind the 12 WMD listed above (which are at the heart of the war against humanity; see also Wolf 2022; 2023), we face a dilemma regarding auspicious or promising *action*. Importantly, the dilemma does *not* pertain to the question of *morality*: any human being who is *compos mentis* and recognises the present situation for what it is, namely, the gravest existential crisis in the history of humanity, deliberately caused by a small group of megalomaniacal and democidal neo-fascists intent on global totalitarian domination (GRAND JURY 2022), would know that *what is being perpetrated against us is undeniably morally wrong and ethically reprehensible* (Olivier 2024g). It should, therefore, be opposed with all the moral and spiritual energy we can muster (Olivier 2024d).

The question of *action* is more problematical: as ordinary people, we do not have immediate access to commensurate technological force to oppose our foes, which does not necessarily mean that there is no entity endowed with such power fighting on our side. On the contrary, as I have argued before, there certainly is (Olivier 2024a; 2024f),

to which I may add that US President Trump has already shown his willingness to oppose the globalist technocrats forcefully (Dmitry 2025b; Ryumshin 2025). We can, and do, put that which we have, to optimal use, of course – such as the indefatigable critical interventions by the writers at the Brownstone Institute (to mention only one relevant organisation), who are no less than “internet warriors” for freedom in this respect. But there is a long-term option available to those who earnestly desire a different developmental path to the one that was imposed on us by the globalists. This may be articulated in different ways, and among these the one suggested by the philosopher of technology, Bernard Stiegler, just before his untimely death on 5 August 2020, is exemplary, in so far as it allows us to approach the question concerning *action* through that of *thinking*.

I have written on Stiegler regarding this topic before (Olivier 2023c), and there are excellent overviews of his work (Jeffries 2020); therefore, it should suffice to remind readers briefly of Stiegler’s orientation regarding technology. Since 1994, with *Technics and Time*, Stiegler – who regards “technics”, in the broad sense, as including tools, writing, machinery and electronic means of communication – has demonstrated in his many books that one cannot separate the use of technical entities from human subjectivity. On the one hand, as prostheses, technics (which is a *pharmakon*: poison and cure simultaneously) discloses new possibilities of understanding for people, while – on the other hand, and this is important – in our time, as advanced digital information technology, it could close down salutary technical avenues while promoting and developing others selectively by reshaping human consciousness in a one-sided manner. This is exactly what has happened since at least the late 20th century.

It is particularly digital technology that is the culprit here – not because it is bad *per se* – it is not; it is just one kind of technology among others, after all – but it has done precisely what I mentioned above, namely, been exacerbated to the point where it obscures and systematically closes off access to other technologies or technics. In one of the last books he wrote before his death, Stiegler (2019, 139–160) argues that “the new barbarians”, or current generation of technocrats, have been using digital technology to establish a hegemony over what he conceives of as something distinctively human, namely, “tertiary memory” (which technics such as writing, or electronic archiving, enables us to do).

Stiegler points out that tertiary memory is unique to humans, who share primary (genetic) and secondary (experientially acquired) memory with other neurologically complex creatures, but who alone, as “prosthetically capable” beings, have been able to invent the technical means to externalise memory in the guise of books and computational “memory”, for example, to be able to ensure cultural, literary and scientific continuity.

He further reminds us that, during the Industrial Revolution, workers were subjected to “proletarianisation” (as Karl Marx noted) – that is, they were robbed of their skills and

memory as craftsmen and women (think of the spinning jenny replacing women who used to spin yarn manually; Britannica 2025). What has happened under the “new barbarism” is that, more recently, during the age of digitalisation (where algorithms rule the roost), the human mind has been proletarianised through the use of gadgets such as smartphones (tellingly so-called). As Stiegler has remarked, they assimilate what used to be our natural memory, and we allow them to.

In short: “proletarianisation” has shifted from the physical domain to that of the human spirit, which Stiegler saw manifested in ubiquitous signs of a widespread loss of hope for the future. Had he lived beyond the Covid-19 pandemic, I suspect that he would have detected signs of a revival of hope, paradoxically, in the face of the adversity we face today, and which many people are tackling head-on in creative ways.

Furthermore, for Stiegler (2019, 39–43), this novel form of “algorithmic governmentality” poses a threat to the social bonds within which people are integrated to become part of communities, as evidenced by the irony, that so-called “social networks”, established by “social media” such as Facebook, have taken the place of older kinds of social organisations such as drama or music societies. Such digitally supported social networks appear to be the new repository of cultural memory, albeit in a stunted format. After all, for the masses of people that depend on information technology, culture is reduced to the temporal format of “bits-and-bytes”, so that Tweets and WhatsApp messages have become the norm, undermining the capacity of individuals to sustain coherent thoughts and sentences. This is where the reductive and limiting effect of digitalisation reveals itself most clearly: we are not only dealing with the kind of necrotechnology, such as those instances identified by Wells above (the 12 WMD); we are facing the death of the human spirit and intellect, gradually being destroyed by the Trojan horse of digital technology.

The reason for this is that, for Stiegler, what has been witnessed incrementally since the advent of digital technology, is a colossal step beyond the “proletarianisation” of workers that Marx noted in the 19th century, where formerly skilful craftsmen were systematically robbed of their technical skill or *savoir faire* (know-how) through the introduction of machine production. Today, in the age of the digital, individuals are proletarianised not merely at the level of the manual-somatic, but at that of the intellect or spirit – as remarked above, smartphones are systematically taking over the former intellectual functions of the human mind. Moreover, the threat to the human spirit has led to what Stiegler detects all around him as the erosion of an individual and collective sense of hope and meaning (see Olivier 2020 on the widespread nihilism of the present).

In this regard it is significant that Stiegler (2019, 45–46) alludes to a young person, “Florian”, who articulates this pervasive sense of nihilism (the belief that nothing has intrinsic value), quoting him as saying:

You really take no account of what happens to us. When I talk to young people of my generation ... they all say the same thing: we no longer have the dream of starting a family, of having children, or a trade, or ideals, as you yourselves did when you were teenagers. All that is over and done with, because we're sure that we will be the last generation, or one of the last, before the end.

This is what happens in the present age, when people have been transformed into mere “data providers” (Stiegler 2019, 43), an expression of what Thomas Berns and Antoinette Rouvroy conceptualise as “algorithmic governmentality” (Stiegler 2019, 41), which takes Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer’s earlier critique of “barbarism” and the American “culture industry” (which produces templates according to which people tend to think and act stereotypically) into a completely new domain. This is because digital networking or “reticulation” of relations among individuals, which made the data-economy possible, enables the systematic exploitation of these relations. The consequences that this development has for what Stiegler (2019, 41) calls “noetic relations” could not have been foreseen by Adorno and Horkheimer, Martin Heidegger or – before them – by Friedrich Nietzsche, even if all these thinkers correctly anticipated the advent of nihilism. For Stiegler (2019, 41), it amounts to “the full realization of barbarism”. Succinctly put: “Automatic and reticulated society thereby becomes *the global cause of a colossal social disintegration*” [italics in original] (Stiegler 2019, 42).

If this sounds far-fetched, consider that “reticulated society” is founded on the operation of, perhaps most visibly, the use of internet-connected smartphones (and similar devices), which make global interconnectivity constantly possible, that is, without temporal limits. But what does this mean? It means that the kind of social interaction that preceded what Castells (1996; see also Olivier 2014) calls “the Network Society”, and which normally presupposed the physical co-presence of interacting individuals or groups – in this manner establishing social relations through face-to-face communication, that is, talking and using expressive bodily gestures, often for extended periods of time – has been replaced, largely, if not completely, by impersonal social networking “communication” (if it can be called that) via the internet. Sometimes this involves mere ‘shorthand’ words and phrases, limited to brief periods of time, which hardly allow conversations which cement personal relations through shared insights and the cultivation of shared values. As Turkle (2015, 11) writes:

Why a book on conversation? We’re talking all the time. We text and post and chat. We may even begin to feel more at home in the world of our screens. Among family and friends, among colleagues and lovers, we turn to our phones instead of each other. We readily admit we would rather send an electronic message or mail than commit to a face-to-face meeting or a telephone call.

This new mediated life has gotten us into trouble. Face-to-face conversation is the most human – and humanizing – thing we do. Fully present to one another, we learn to listen. It’s where we develop the capacity for empathy. It’s where we experience the joy of being heard, of being understood. And conversation advances self-reflection, the

conversations with ourselves that are the cornerstone of early development and continue throughout life.

This is an eloquent statement on the indispensable value of face-to-face, interpersonal, linguistic communication, which is – as the word “communication” (from the Latin *communis*, “communicare”, and “communicatio”, meaning “to make common” or “to share”) unambiguously shows – a far cry from mere information-exchange. Even when it sometimes unavoidably fails because of intermittent misunderstanding or misinformation (Derrida 1991; Olivier 2004; 2022), communication is what connects us as human beings, and one can always return to the scene of a misunderstanding for clarification, albeit without guarantees. The mere fact of being willing to converse is already a humanising act.

Turkle (2015), as a trained psychoanalyst, is undoubtedly drawing on her knowledge of what is known in psychoanalytical literature as “the talking cure”. Many people who face personal problems relating to past trauma and interpersonal conflict today would perhaps rather turn to the temporary, chemical relief provided by tranquillisers such as Prozac than seek psychoanalytic therapy. Nevertheless, the truth that Freud discovered about language as the repository of psychic suffering – something elaborated on by his French heir, Lacan (Lacan 1977; Olivier 2023a) – is still as valid today as when he discovered it, regardless of so-called “technological progress”. In fact, in the light of what Stiegler has uncovered regarding the toll that digital technology has exacted on human suffering, psychoanalysis is more relevant, and necessary, than ever.

Stiegler died shortly after the advent of Covid-19, but I am certain that, had he lived to witness the full pandemic, he would have seen that the “new barbarism” which he associated with digital technology, which is inseparable from the “necrotechnology” identified earlier (because it is integral to the digital, electronic processes at the basis of all manifestations of most instances of, if not all necrotechnology), paved the way for the latter. So how do we deal with it in a manner that could rescue the human spirit, and with it, the capacity to resist necrotechnology? First, we have to be clear about the meaning of “disruption”, as understood by Stiegler in the present age.

The Significance of “Disruption”

It is impossible to overstate the far-reaching significance and implications of the eponymous “disruption” which Stiegler (2019) thematises. The disruption he has in mind strikes at the very core of human existence, which Stiegler (2019, 43) expresses in terms of Edmund Husserl’s phenomenology of time, specifically the relation between “retention” (what is retained of a present occurrence when it slips into the past, that is, as memories) and “protention” (expectations, or the projection, into the future, of anticipated, hoped-for, desired, or feared events, based on preceding retentions). The basis of existential disruption lies in, among other things, the operation of algorithms – computerised, automatic reactions to user-input, which short-circuit the authentically human response to an event in the guise of protentions as expression of will and desire,

and replaces these with “automatic protentions”, with no relation to individuals’ own desires.

Understandably, therefore, if people are systematically deprived of the ability to make decisions about their life among other people, having surrendered this capacity to “algorithmic governmentality”, it means that, perhaps imperceptibly, people are robbed of a truly human life. Stiegler (2019, 44) puts it uncompromisingly:

Disruption renders will, whatever its source, *obsolete in advance*; it always arrives too late. What is thereby attained is an extreme stage of rationalization, forming a threshold, that is, a limit. What lies beyond this limit remains unknown: it destroys reason not only in the sense that rational knowledge finds itself eliminated by proletarianization, but in the sense that individuals and groups, losing the very possibility of existing (for their existence depends on being able to express their will), losing therefore all reason for living, become literally mad, and tend to despise life – their own and that of others. The result is the risk of a global social explosion consigning humanity to a nameless barbarism.

One of the manifestations of such literal madness that Stiegler mentions (2019, 44) is that of the pilot Andreas Lubitz, who deliberately crashed the passenger aircraft he was flying into a mountain, killing everyone aboard. In other words, the consequences of the loss of recognisably human reason, relinquishing it to “automatic” reason, are dire beyond anything that Adorno and Horkheimer could have anticipated. Stiegler (2019, 45) articulates this state of affairs as follows: “When reason is lost, all those technological powers that we hold in our hands as ‘civilizational progress’ become weapons of destruction through which this ‘civilization’ reveals the barbarism it contains.”

I believe that what I have termed “necrotechnology” – the technology of death – is inseparably connected with this, as suggested by Stiegler’s phrase, “weapons of destruction”, which echoes the 12 WMD listed by Wells. In fact, when we examine this list it is conspicuous that some of the instances of WMD that Wells names, are direct manifestations of the “disruptive” digital technology which Stiegler has analysed, particularly numbers 4, 5 and 10 (computer-generated decision-making technology, the 5G Network, and social media).

While it is impossible to do justice to Stiegler’s thoroughgoing, exhaustive account of this disturbing phenomenon in the lengthy text in question, his elaboration on “disruption”, above, already gives us a fair idea of what is at stake. Another way to put it is by way of Stiegler’s (2019, 60) observations regarding the “absence” of an “epoch” today: “we all, insofar as we *are*, find ourselves *thrown* into and thrown *out* by the epoch of the absence of epoch” [italics in original]. To grasp the radical nature of this insight, consider that, in light of what was referred to earlier in terms of retentions and protentions, Stiegler (2019, 59) believes that, at present, there seems to be a general incapacity among people to generate “intergenerational and transgenerational collective

protentions”. By this he means expectations or hopes that anticipate the possibility of a continued, collective human existence on Earth between generations and beyond the present generation – “except ones that are purely negative” (such as the nihilistic one formulated by the teenager, Florian, referred to earlier), and amount to what he terms “*a negative teleology ... without purpose*” [italics in original].

To clarify further what he means by (an absent) “epoch”, Stiegler (2019, 60) reminds readers that the word is related to the ancient Greek term, *epokhē*, which is familiar to readers of Husserl’s phenomenology, and means broadly “the suspension of judgement” (or “bracketing”). We know, however, that “epoch” usually denotes something like “a distinct historical period, different from other such periods in terms of a defining characteristic”. Stiegler (2019, 61) explains it by noting that the *epokhē* (or suspension of judgement) represents a “new form of thinking in general” (by setting aside certain former conceptions), and on a broader scale – relating to “epoch” – it “is *always the outcome of a techno-logical upheaval*”. Via Heidegger’s conception of “everydayness” – the characteristic of unquestioning ontic acceptance of the quotidian, given social reality in terms of “ambiguity”, “curiosity” and “idle talk” – and his (Heidegger’s) analysis of the reason for a technical apparatus becoming “conspicuous”, that is, showing itself despite its everydayness, Stiegler (2019, 62) argues that this can be transferred to the level of a *technical system* as such.

Thus, a new epoch emerges when a fundamental change in the governing technical (and therefore technological) system occurs, and this is accompanied, symptomatically, by “military, religious, social and political conflicts of all kinds” (Stiegler 2019, 62), of the kind we are witnessing today. However, the new epoch only attains salience when “new ways of thinking, new ways of doing and new ways of living take shape”, which are nothing less than “new forms of life”. What usually happens when a new epoch dawns, is that the retentions (memories, established ways of doing things) from the preceding epoch have to be “reconfigured” into novel “protentions” – expectations and anticipations – which underlie new expressions of “will” (Stiegler 2019, 63), contributing to a new “libidinal economy” or “economy of desire” (what people *want*). Importantly, this new epochal libidinal economy is usually structured around the collection of “tertiary retentions” – that is, the “technical supports of collective retention” (Stiegler 2019, 63), *but* today – unlike in the past – instead of social and cultural systems adjusting to the novel technical system and allowing a new epoch to take shape, this is *prevented* by the digital technical system, which – for reasons also outlined earlier in terms of *disruption* – “short-circuits them and, ultimately, *destroys them*” (Stiegler 2019, 64). *This prevents the usual formation of new protentions (ways to envisage the future), based on new retentions or memories (because the latter have no sooner emerged than they are replaced by new ones), so that a perpetual, uninterrupted flux occurs*, which effectively leaves the current generation – that of Florian – trapped in a nihilistic morass with no prospect of escape.

Paradoxically, therefore, we live in “the epoch of the absence of epoch” (Stiegler 2019, 64). Is it at all surprising that we are witness to rootlessness and perspectivelessness everywhere? According to Stiegler (2019, 65), *the digital technical system is therefore synonymous with disruption*, because through its perpetual disruption (even of every successive disruption), no new civilisation can be constructed to take the place of the old one, and therefore, there is nothing to which we can adapt. This is an unbearable exacerbation of Baumer’s (1977, 402–416; 456–474) characterisation of the (first half of the) 20th century in terms of “the triumph of becoming”, insofar as people were still able to adjust to the successive waves of change witnessed at the time at every level of cultural activity, from the arts to the sciences. What Stiegler has uncovered, is that this is not possible today, the difference being attributable to the prevalence of perpetually disruptive digital technology.

Needless to say, the dire state of affairs outlined above through Stiegler’s penetrating thinking, has far-reaching implications for what was earlier termed “necrotechnology”, given that – as pointed out before – digital technology is inseparable from the WMD identified by Wells. How do we know this? Think of the following, which clearly signals an aggravation of what Stiegler has identified with regard to digital technology, namely, “disruption”, “barbarism” and the “absence of an epoch”. Recall that, among the WMD listed by Wells, there are computer-generated, decision-making technology (i.e., technology employing algorithms to pre-empt users’ own volitional acts), the 5G Network, and social media, alluded to earlier, which are inseparable from the direct operation of digital technology. Among the remaining WMD on Wells’ list – which cannot be exhaustively thematised in the context of a mere article – especially given its relevance for what I want to focus on concerning “disruption”, “barbarism” and the “absence of an epoch”, is number 3: “Clot-shot gene-mutation injections, turbo cancer proponents and graphene nanoparticle technology” which “MSM, CDC and Big Pharma call “mRNA ‘vaccines’.”

We may wonder how this is related to “disruption”, “barbarism” and an epoch-less world. Apart from the fact that it stands to reason that digital technology would play a role in the computing phase of the manufacturing of these “injections”, deceptively called “vaccines” (see Kingston 2023a; 2023b; Olivier 2022a; 2023c; 2023d; Wilson 2022a; 2022b), in the light of growing evidence of the mortality and other negative side-effect rates associated with them (Adl-Tabatabai 2025; Bergman 2024; 2025a; 2025b; 2025c; 2025d; 2025e; Dmitry 2025e; Malone 2023), the term, “disruption” assumes even more drastic implications than with digital technology alone. What it amounts to, is what might be described as “*civilisational disruption through necrotechnological intervention*” – in other words, the attempt at a conclusive prevention of a new civilisational epoch is taking shape. Given the evident absence of moral constraints on the part of the agents (Dmitry 2023; Olivier 2023f; 2024f; The Exposé 2023) – whom I hesitate to call “people” – who have been instrumental in bringing about the pharmaceutical means (the so-called “vaccines”) and conditions (the so-called “pandemic”) for the mass-injection of ingenuously trusting people, it means that

whatever would have prevailed beyond the destruction of extant society, would not, and could not, have been an “epoch”, characterised as it is by a horizon of human, or social, mores and values. Instead, it would have been a sphere – whatever it was called – of complete, in a human sense valueless, nihilism. I write “would have been” because indications are that these demonstrably unscrupulous creatures will not succeed in their reprehensible aim.

How do we resist this, and could it be that resistance to it could simultaneously contribute to the cultivation, or construction, of precisely the retentions and pretensions constitutive of a “new civilisation”?

Nihilism and Necrotechnology

To answer this question in a provisional manner – given the analytical complexities involved – requires us to become aware of the fact that what is known as “nihilism”, or *the belief that nothing has intrinsic value*, has been growing worldwide for a long time (Olivier 2020). It also necessitates that we understand the link that Stiegler (2019, 343) establishes between the “barbarism” referred to earlier and what he terms “*the immense process of disinhibition characteristic of capitalism*” – the *lack of inhibition*, manifesting itself in acts of meanness, violence, and even a species of madness (think of Bernie Madoff’s “mad” Ponzi scheme; Hayes 2024). Under such conditions, human beings jettison the civilising process of inhibiting certain impulses, sometimes resulting in disproportionate risk-taking, by which globalisation is fuelled – and Stiegler (2019, 342) finds in the seafaring voyages of discovery by the early Portuguese and Spanish sailors the paradigm of such globalisation.

Worse, however, is that this has today developed into a veritable *ethos* of potentially democidal risk-taking, which the work of Ulrich Beck on the “risk society” has enabled us to perceive and conceptualise further (Olivier 2023b), evident not merely in financial speculation, but particularly, one may add, in the extreme risks entailed by gene-manipulating pharmaceutical technologies and other, electronically related, invasions of the human body for dubious, necrotechnological purposes (more on this to follow). Here, we can perceive the essentially nihilistic character of *disinhibition* – to be able to embark on such risk-taking, nothing that may be appreciated for its intrinsic value is allowed to stand in its way by inhibiting our resolve.

This is where a second thread of Stiegler’s analysis has to be added. Going back to René Descartes’ dream of a “universal mathematics” in the 17th century, which would supposedly enable human beings to solve every problem confronting them – and not denying the “prosthetic” value of such a method (which is embodied in modern, mathematically oriented physics, among other disciplines) – Stiegler, showing himself to be a true philosopher, points out that such broadly *mathematical* reasoning is only *one* form of reason, albeit a legitimate one, but should not be conflated with authentic *thinking*. The latter is the fountainhead of all other forms of reasoning – Descartes could not have arrived at his “*mathesis universalis*” without it, either. As most students of

philosophy know, both Descartes' reflections on the “rules” of method (pertaining to deduction and intuition, among other things), *and* his “meditations” on the possibility of discovering an indubitable foundation for philosophy – which he claimed to have found in the statement, *Cogito ergo sum* (I think, therefore I am) – constitute *philosophical thinking*. Critics have faulted him for various reasons – for instance that, strictly speaking, in phenomenological terms only “thinking” was indubitably given, *not* the *existence* of the I or ego – but no one can deny that he was engaged in thinking, which is not synonymous with what he regarded as the promise of a “universal mathematics”.

To cut a long analysis short, it is here where, according to Stiegler, we should tarry to confront the disastrous situation into which the “calculative reasoning” stemming from Descartes, and today culminating in the reduction of reason to digital computation, has led humanity. Western civilisation has been seduced, fatally, by the belief that we could base *all* cultural endeavours – from science and technology to art and architecture – solely on calculation and computation, which is *not* the case, as even a professor of computer science has argued at length in his critique of “computationalism” (Gelernter 2016; Olivier 2021a). If we continue surrendering human rationality to today’s hegemonic “computational cognitivism”, we shall become the living incarnation of the ubiquitous, protention-destroying “predictive text” capacity of digital information technology, abandoning our own ability, to initiate thinking and desiring, to algorithmic computationalism. This would result in humans becoming “predictable ciphers”, which we are perhaps already witnessing. Farewell freedom.

After all, when we raise questions relating to necrotechnology, freedom, civil disobedience and politically liberating action, among others, we resort to *thinking* in the *originairy* (i.e., which is constitutive of the distinctive) human sense of the word. It is in this autonomous domain of thinking, which should be combined with judicious action, where we may engage with possible avenues of reactivating true, democratic practices aimed at throwing off the yoke that the globalist cabal has been trying to harness us to with the aid of digital computationalism.

Make no mistake, like all kinds of technology, the digital variety is in the process of reorganising consciousness, language, behaviour, and the human body itself. To be able to appreciate this claim, specifically regarding “digital necrotechnology” and the human body, a concluding scrutiny of recent and current developments is called for. To label these as disturbing is a vast understatement, and anyone who responds to being informed of them with initial scepticism should perhaps be forgiven. The evidence supporting claims concerning their actuality is readily available, however. These developments concern the status of the so-called Covid “vaccines” in terms of what may be called their “payload”, by which is not only meant their properties *supposedly* related to the illness called Covid-19 in “curative” fashion. They concern something of an order of risk that Ulrich Beck, had he been alive today, would probably have found difficult to categorise, namely, the qualitative transformation of the human body into something distinctly

“transhuman”, in the sense of being “beyond human”, that is, “no longer human”. By the same token, this would instantiate nihilism of the most radical kind, insofar as, paradoxically, human beings are “creatures who value”.

To add to the validity of Stiegler’s diagnosis, at about the same time that his work on “disruption” appeared, Zuboff (2019) published a forceful indictment of prevailing social conditions, pertaining to the agencies responsible for what appeared to be a new, if almost invisible, kind of totalitarianism, which the vast majority of people have failed to recognise as such. In fact, they have willingly embraced the way that these powerful agencies rule their lives in a virtually “total” manner. Zuboff (2019, 8) defines it in a striking manner right at the beginning of her book:

Sur-veil-lance Cap-i-tal-ism, n.

1. A new economic order that claims human experience as free raw material for hidden commercial practices of extraction, prediction, and sales;
2. A parasitic economic logic in which the production of goods and services is subordinated to a new global architecture of behavioral modification;
3. A rogue mutation of capitalism marked by concentrations of wealth, knowledge, and power unprecedented in human history;
4. The foundational framework of a surveillance economy;
5. As significant a threat to human nature in the twenty-first century as industrial capitalism was to the natural world in the nineteenth and twentieth;
6. The origin of a new instrumentarian power that asserts dominance over society and presents startling challenges to market democracy;
7. A movement that aims to impose a new collective order based on total certainty;
8. An expropriation of critical human rights that is best understood as a coup from above: an overthrow of the people’s sovereignty.

While Zuboff calls this new, digital “surveillance capitalist” power “instrumentarian”, and contrasts it with previous forms of totalitarianism, it is clear that her analysis of this novel historical phenomenon corresponds with that of Stiegler, while emphasising its capacity to control, rather than to disrupt. Moreover, this patently nihilistic, instrumentarian force has paved the way for the manifestations of necrotechnology – in the guise of WMD – that have become ubiquitous, as outlined here.

In an article concerning the bodies of those who had received Covid “vaccines”, Dmitry (2025a) elaborates as follows:

For over a decade, Bill Gates and his network of unelected technocrats have poured billions into merging man with machine – not through open innovation, but through covert experimentation on the global population. And after 2021, something changed. Quietly. Permanently.

Now, embalmers, coroners, and insiders are sounding the alarm – reporting bizarre, unnatural changes in the bodies of the recently deceased. Strange synthetic fibers. Magnetic anomalies. And even evidence suggesting embedded microstructures that shouldn’t be there.

What if the vaccinated aren’t just victims of a rushed medical experiment … but unwilling participants in a live global test? What if the human body has already been upgraded – without your permission? …

In recent months, a growing number of independent researchers, tech-savvy citizens, and even curious skeptics have made a startling discovery: vaccinated individuals are emitting *Bluetooth signals* – complete with unique MAC addresses …

We’re talking about bodies – living or dead – that are suddenly detectable by Bluetooth scanners. And in some cases, those MAC addresses are reportedly labeled with a single, chilling identifier: “*Vaccinated*.”

This is not science fiction – from visual material in the video accompanying this article it is apparent that researchers have confirmed these claims to be verifiable. It is related to Schwab’s vaunted “Fourth Industrial Revolution”, where all digital devices would be interconnected, so that they can “talk to one another”. However, despite the neutral language in which Schwab depicts this “revolution” – for instance, “The Fourth Industrial Revolution will be driven largely by the convergence of digital, biological, and physical innovations” – in the light of the revelations referred to above, it appears that these “devices” (or ‘innovations’) *include* human bodies (Thrivetime Show 2023). It is also related to Bill Gates’ registered patent, which putatively grants him “exclusive rights to computerise the human body” (*The People’s Voice* 2023), as well as to the fact that – as the article (Dmitry 2025a) reports, with links to relevant published research – the WEF, together with affiliated academic institutions and researchers, is in the process of preparing the way for transforming human bodies into “components of the upcoming 6G infrastructure”. In the abstract of one of these linked articles (see Cui, Wang and Xiong 2022, that appeared in the ACM Digital Library on 24 January 2023), we read:

...we propose our system *Bracelet+*, which involves the human body in the harvesting system to increase the harvested power. After careful analysis of the influence of the human body on the harvested power, we prototype the coil antenna as a bracelet that achieves both high harvested power and convenience for wearing.

Dmitry (2025a) hints at the real possibility that these developments do not augur well for human well-being where he further reports that:

Bill Bathgate, a certified electrical engineer and environmental consultant, didn't mince words. He called it, quote, "*one of the worst ideas ever.*" A plan to use the human body as a "*telecommunications point in some kind of network grid*," with consequences that we're not even remotely prepared for – biologically, mentally, or spiritually ...

Evidence is mounting that the plan has already been implemented – quietly, without consent, and without public debate. That the vaccinated have, in fact, been turned into components of this living grid. A human-powered energy network. A biological web designed to absorb and emit frequencies at will – not for your benefit, but for theirs.

I could continue listing other instances of digital technology that is simultaneously necrotechnology in a dual sense, insofar as it marks the point where it not merely harbours a significant (mortal) risk to the well-being of human beings, but where a qualitative change is introduced to the distinctive being of *Homo sapiens* and *Gyna sapiens* – a modification which renders them transhuman creatures in a bleak, nihilistic landscape. One such instance, closely linked to what has been discussed above regarding Covid-“vaccinated” individuals emitting Bluetooth signals, concerns graphene oxide, which is in every Covid “vaccine”, and which reacts demonstrably to 5G signals (as demonstrated in a Petrie dish; Dmitry 2025a). In other words, it “behaves like a conductor”, which, as Dmitry wryly observes, could – in the bodies of “vaccinated” individuals – function as a “possible interface between biology and technology”, that is, between a person’s body and what would clearly be necrotechnology, given that any benign or benevolent purpose behind these developments is unthinkable, to say the least.

Therefore, it appears that, while most people went about their daily business for heaven knows how long, the developers of digital (necro-) technology have been very busy. The results of (some of) their activities have only recently become clear to those among us who have an interest in exposing, and resisting, these reprehensible activities. How do we do that?

Conclusion: Resisting Necrotechnology

Earlier, I speculated whether *resistance* to necrotechnology could simultaneously contribute to the cultivation, or construction, of the “retentions” and “protentions” constitutive of a “new civilisation”. In the long run, I believe this is not beyond the realm of possibility, but this presupposes that such resistance assume the form, not merely of repudiating the claims of the so-called “fact-checkers” and censors who serve the globalist cabal by means of relevant evidence (Olivier 2022a), but that, in the process, a revival of a truly human civilisation is set in motion. I believe this is already taking place, given the increasingly perceptible publishing activity on the part of writers such as Robert F. Kennedy Jr, Naomi Wolf, Robert Malone, Kees van der Pijl, Aleksandr Dugin, Michel Chossudovsky, Jeffrey Tucker, Lori Weintz and Joseph Mercola, who

challenge the false mainstream media (MSM) narrative and advance a different cultural and scientific agenda.

It is further manifested in the irrepressible proliferation of websites, discussion forums and news outlets (including Redacted, The People's Voice, Slay News, Brownstone Institute, Real Left, the Tucker Carlson Network, Global Research and Scheerpost), dedicated to bringing the culprits out into the open and exposing their lies as well as their reprehensible goals, such as their depopulation agenda (Dmitry 2024; 2025d; 2025f; Koenig 2025; Olivier 2025a). This is sometimes combined with independent voices (Olivier 2023c; 2023d; 2024e; 2024g; Wolf 2022; 2023) urging the people of the world to resist the arrogant, unscrupulous coterie of unelected globalists who are intent on destroying the human race, *ironically*, in the name of a “sustainable” future – ironic, given that their extermination programme is directed, not only at humans, but in the guise of necrotechnology, directed against *life itself* (Redacted 2025a; 2025b; Dmitry 2025d; Olivier 2025a).

There is reason for hope, however, as Johnson (2025) – referring to news of Schwab stepping down from globalist WEF leadership structures amid accusations of scandal – confirms:

Resistance to the WEF’s agenda has surged as its vulnerabilities expose cracks in elite power. President Trump’s Second Term amplified skepticism toward globalism, with leaders like Bolsonaro and Modi openly rejecting WEF principles. Davos’ dwindling attendance – down 30% since 2019 – signals shifting geopolitical tides, as nations prioritize sovereignty over corporate diplomacy. Meanwhile, grassroots movements have galvanized globally: anti-CRT [Critical Race Theory] campaigns in U.S. schools, Kenya’s protests against digital currency, and India’s farmers opposing vaccine passports all reflect a revulsion against top-down governance ...

The WEF’s unraveling represents more than corporate mismanagement; it is a societal vote against centralized tyranny. From TikTok’s algorithmic defiance to the Black Sea’s trade blocs rejecting WEF’s green mandates, humanity refuses to backtrack to history’s darker chapters. As Schwab’s legacy crumbles, the question remains: who truly holds society together? Not corporations or algorithms – but the people, anew in rebellion.

I have no doubt that what has been exposed in the article – backed up by accessible evidence – is a manifestation of what is nothing less than World War 3, which is a hybrid war being fought at many levels, from informational, technological, economic, financial and iatrogenic to kinetic (or hot) war. It would take several more articles to substantiate this claim fully, but the present article already provides glimpses into some of these terrains. Readers who consult the sources referred to here, as listed under References, would find further evidence there (e.g., Van der Pijl 2022; Wolf 2022; 2023). Finally, the motivation driving the article is not merely to share information that is otherwise hard to come by in the MSM-dominated environment. It is to encourage readers to make a stand, reclaim their ability to *think* against the digital, and most importantly,

necrotechnological grain. As the late Bernard Stiegler reminded us, there is nothing wrong with using digital technology: *by all means use digital technology as a handy tool, but don't allow it to use (or abuse) you.* In this way, we can simultaneously oppose, and possibly reverse, the 12 invidious processes labelled “WMD” by Wells, launched against us by the technocrats.

References

Adams, M. 2022. “VenomTech Company Announces Massive Library of Snake Venom Peptides for Pharmaceutical Development; ‘Nanocarriers’ Stabilize Snake Venom in Water (PubMed).” *Natural News*, 13 April. Accessed November 28, 2024. <https://www.naturalnews.com/2022-04-13-venomtech-company-announces-massive-library-of-snake-venom-peptides-for-pharmaceutical-deployment.html>

Adl-Tabatabai, S. 2025. “Mainstream Media Finally Admit That Covid Vaccines Are Killing and Maiming Millions.” *The People’s Voice*, 23 April. Accessed April 24, 2025. <https://thepeoplesvoice.tv/mainstream-media-finally-admit-that-covid-vaccines-are-killing-and-maiming-millions/>

Agamben, G. 2021. *Where Are We Now? The Epidemic as Politics*. Translated by V. Dani. London: Eris.

Baumer, F. L. 1977. *Modern European Thought. Continuity and Change in Ideas, 1600–1950*. New York: Macmillan.

Bergman, F. 2024. “Study Exposes Massive Life-Expectancy Plunge for Covid-Vaxxed.” *Slay News*, 20 October. Accessed November 7, 2024. <https://slaynews.com/news/study-exposes-massive-life-expectancy-plunge-covid-vaxxed/>

Bergman, F. 2025a. “Canada Admits Covid ‘Boosters’ Triggered Major Death Surge.” *Slay News*, 8 March. Accessed March 10, 2025. <https://slaynews.com/news/canada-admits-covid-boosters-triggered-major-death-surge/>

Bergman, F. 2025b. “Major Study Confirms Covid ‘Vaccines’ Sabotage Immune System.” *Slay News*, 19 April. Accessed April 20, 2025. <https://slaynews.com/news/major-study-confirms-covid-vaccines-sabotage-immune-system/>

Bergman, F. 2025c. “Norway Exposes Cover-Up of Global Death Surge among Covid-Vaxxed.” *Slay News*, 20 April. Accessed April 21, 2025. <https://slaynews.com/news/norway-exposes-cover-up-global-death-surge-among-covid-vaxxed/>

Bergman, F. 2025d. “Top Neurosurgeon Sounds Alarm: Covid ‘Vaccines’ Are ‘Bioweapons’ Designed to ‘Kill People’.” *Slay News*, 21 April. Accessed April 22, 2025. <https://slaynews.com/news/top-neurosurgeon-sounds-alarm-covid-vaccines-bioweapons-designed-kill-people/>

Bergman, F. 2025e. “Top Pediatrician: Vaccines Cause 97% of Sudden Infant Deaths.” *Slay News*, 14 April. <https://slaynews.com/news/top-pediatrician-vaccines-cause-97-sudden-infant-deaths/>

Brittanica. 2025. “Spinning Jenny.” *Brittanica*. Accessed March 4, 2025. <https://www.britannica.com/technology/spinning-jenny>

Castells, M. 1996. *The Rise of the Network Society*. Cambridge: Wiley-Blackwell.

Chossudovsky, M. 2021. “The 2020–21 Worldwide Corona Crisis: Destroying Civil Society, Engineered Economic Depression, Global Coup d’État and the “Great Reset.” *Global Research E-Book*, Centre for Research on Globalization (CRG). Accessed June 24, 2021. <https://www.globalresearch.ca/the-2020-worldwide-corona-crisis-destroying-civil-society-engineered-economic-depression-global-coup-detat-and-the-great-reset/5730652>

Cui, M., Q. Wang, and J. Xiong. 2022. “Bracelet+: Harvesting the Leaked RF Energy in VLC with Wearable Bracelet Antenna.” In *The 20th ACM Conference on Embedded Networked Sensor Systems (SenSys '22)*, Boston, November 6–9. New York: ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3560905.3568526>

Derrida, J. 1981. *Dissemination*. Translated by B. Johnson. Chicago: Chicago University Press. <https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226816340.001.0001>

Derrida, J. 1991. “From: Ulysses Gramophone: Hear Say Yes in Joyce.” Translated by T. Kendall and S. Benstock. In *A Derrida Reader: Between the Blinds*, edited by P. Kamuf, 571–598. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Derrida, J. 1995. “Archive Fever. A Freudian Impression.” Translated by E. Prenowitz. *Diacritics* 25 (2): 9–63. <https://doi.org/10.2307/465144>

Dmitry, B. 2023. “WEF Declares ‘Humans Are Plague’ and ‘AI Is the Cure’.” *The People’s Voice*, 16 January. Accessed January 7, 2024. <https://thepeoplesvoice.tv/wef-humans-are-plague-ai-cure/>

Dmitry, B. 2024. “33 Years ago, the UN Called for Global Depopulation of 100 Million People Annually.” *The People’s Voice*, 1 November. Accessed April 24, 2025. <https://thepeoplesvoice.tv/33-years-ago-the-un-called-for-global-depopulation-of-100-million-people-annually/>

Dmitry, B. 2025a. “Gates Insider Presents Proof: Vaccinated People Emitting Bluetooth Signals with Secret ‘Death Dates’.” *The People’s Voice*, 19 April. Accessed April 21, 2025. <https://thepeoplesvoice.tv/gates-insider-presents-proof-vaccinated-people-emitting-bluetooth-signals-with-secret-death-dates/>

Dmitry, B. 2025b. “Trump Declares War against Chemtrails as Unmarked Planes Dump Toxic Payloads over U.S.” *The People’s Voice*, 17 February. Accessed February 27, 2025. <https://thepeoplesvoice.tv/trump-declares-war-against-chemtrails-as-unmarked-planes-dump-toxic-payloads-over-u-s/>

Dmitry, B. 2025c. “Trump Praises Amish for Rejecting Vaccines and Avoiding Autism Epidemic: ‘Amazingly Healthy’.” *The People’s Voice*, 22 February. Accessed February 24, 2025. <https://thepeoplesvoice.tv/trump-praises-amish-for-rejecting-vaccines-and-avoiding-autism-epidemic-amazingly-healthy/>

Dmitry, B. 2025d. “UK Names Weather Control Program ‘SATAN’ – Chemtrails No Longer a Conspiracy Theory.” *The People’s Voice*, 25 April. Accessed April 26, 2025. <https://thepeoplesvoice.tv/uk-names-weather-control-program-satan-chemtrails-no-longer-a-conspiracy-theory/>

Dmitry, B. 2025e. “US Gov’t Admit Millions of Vaxxed Young Women Are Infertile: ‘Population Collapse Looms’.” *The People’s Voice*, 7 March. Accessed March 10, 2025. <https://thepeoplesvoice.tv/us-govt-admit-millions-of-vaxxed-young-women-are-infertile-population-collapse-ooms/>

Dmitry, B. 2025f. “WHO Confirms 5.65 Billion mRNA Vaccinated, Matching the Elite’s Depopulation Targets.” *The People’s Voice*, 31 January. Accessed April 24, 2025. <https://www.frontnieuws.com/who-bevestigt-565-miljard-mrna-gevaccineerden-overeenkomend-met-de-doelen-van-de-elite-voor-ontvolking/>

Dugin, A. 2025. *The Trump Revolution. A New Order of Great Powers*. Translated by C. Longworth. London: Arktos Media.

Foucault, M. 1980. *The History of Sexuality. Volume 1: An Introduction*. Translated by R. Hurley. New York: Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. 1995. *Discipline and Punish. The Birth of the Prison*. Translated by A. Sheridan. New York: Vintage Books.

Frontnieuws. 2025. “‘Immunize against Disinformation’ Instead of Debate – Von der Leyen Pushes through EU Censorship Agenda.” Frontnieuws. 26 February. Accessed February 28, 2025. <https://www.frontnieuws.com/immuniseren-tegen-desinformatie-in-plaats-van-debat-von-der-leyen-zet-eu-agenda-voor-censuur-door/>

Gelernter, D. 2016. *The Tides of Mind: Uncovering the Spectrum of Consciousness*. New York: Liveright.

GRAND JURY (The Court of Public Opinion). 2022. “Day 1 – ‘Opening Statements’.” Accessed May 29, 2022. <https://odysee.com/@GrandJury:f/Grand-Jury-1-EN:0>

Harris, N. 2025. “Klaus Schwab Says ‘Misinformation’ Is a ‘Critical Challenge’ for the Elites.” *The People’s Voice*, 28 January. Accessed February 27, 2025. <https://thepeoplesvoice.tv/klaus-schwab-says-misinformation-is-a-critical-challenge-for-the-elites/>

Hayes, A. 2024. “Bernie Madoff: Who He Was and How His Ponzi Scheme Worked.” Investopedia, 23 June. Accessed January 7, 2025.
<https://www.investopedia.com/terms/b/bernard-madoff.asp>

Hedges, C. 2024. “Chris Hedges: Genocidal Scorecard.” Scheerpost, 30 October. Accessed November 28, 2024. <https://scheerpost.com/2024/10/30/chris-hedges-genocidal-scorecard/>

Hoft, J. 2024. “‘Kamunism’ Goes Viral as Kamala Harris Promotes Economy – Crashing Price Controls and Other Communist Tricks in America.” Gateway Pundit, 17 August. Accessed November 28, 2024. <https://www.thegatewaypundit.com/2024/08/kamunism-goes-viral-as-kamala-harris-promotes-economy/>

Jeffries, S. 2020. “Bernard Stiegler Obituary: French Philosopher Who Denounced the Tyranny of Digital Technology.” *The Guardian*, 18 August.
<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/aug/18/bernard-stiegler-obituary>

Johnson, L. D. 2025. “World Economic Forum’s Current Downfall Exposes Legacy of Totalitarianism, Financial Fraud, and Crimes against Humanity.” Natural News, 25 April. Accessed April 28, 2025. <https://www.naturalnews.com/2025-04-25-wef-current-downfall-exposes-legacy-of-totalitarianism.html>

Kennedy, R. F., Jr. 2021. *The Real Anthony Fauci. Bill Gates, Big Pharma and the Global War on Democracy and Public Health*. New York: Skyhorse.

Kingston, K. 2023a. “Calling on Law Enforcement to SEIZE ALL VACCINE BIOWEAPONS in the USA (featuring Karen Kingston).” Brighteon Broadcast News, May 23. Accessed May 24, 2023. <https://www.brighteon.com/75e5515c-7849-40da-b31f-0b1dd0cf766f>

Kingston, K. 2023b. “mRNA Vaccines Are a Sham. People Are Being Injected with Nanotech.” The Kingston Report, 1 March. Accessed July 21, 2023.
<https://karenkingston.substack.com/p/the-term-mrna-vaccines-is-a-sham>

Koenig, P. 2025. “WEF Davos 2025 – More Grotesque than Ever. Robotizing and Depopulating.” Global Research, January. Accessed April 24, 2025.
<https://www.globalresearch.ca/wef-davos-2025-more-grotesque-than-ever/5877695>

Kortunov, A. 2025. “The Grand Bargain: Can Russia and the US Rewrite History?” RT News, 21 February. Accessed February 24, 2025. <https://www.rt.com/news/613131-grand-bargain-russia-us-rewrite-history/>

Lacan, J. 1977. “The Function and Field of Speech and Language in Psychoanalysis.” In *Écrits: A Selection*, 30–113. Translated by A. Sheridan. New York: W.W. Norton.

Lawrence, P. 2025. “Patrick Lawrence: Trump vs. the Deep State.” Scheerpost, 17 February. Accessed February 26, 2025. <https://scheerpost.com/2025/02/17/patrick-lawrence-trump-vs-the-deep-state/>

Malone, R. 2023. “Not 14 Million Lives Saved, but Over 17 Million Dead.” Brownstone Institute, 27 November. Accessed January 7, 2024. <https://brownstone.org/articles/not-14m-lives-saved-but-over-17m-dead/>

Mbembe, A. 2003. “Necropolitics.” Translated by L. Meintjes. *Public Culture* 15 (1): 11–40.

Olivier, B. 2004. “The (Im-)possibility of Communication.” *Communicare* 23 (1): 79–91. <https://doi.org/10.36615/jcsa.v23i1.1783>

Olivier, B. 2010. “Foucault and Individual Autonomy.” *South African Journal of Psychology* 40 (3): 292–307. <https://doi.org/10.1177/008124631004000308>

Olivier, B. 2014. “‘The ‘Network Society’, Social Transformation, and the ‘Ecological Rift’.” *Alternation* 21 (2): 122–155.

Olivier, B. 2020. *Why Nothing Seems to Matter Any More: A Philosophical Study of Our Nihilistic Age*. Baltimore: Montagu House.

Olivier, B. 2021a. “Is ‘Intelligence’ a Sufficient Criterion for Establishing Equivalence of AI with Being-Human?” *Alternation Special Edition* 38: 167–187. <https://doi.org/10.29086/2519-5476/2021/sp38a8>

Olivier, B. 2021b. “The ‘Pandemic’ and the *Différend*.” *Phronimon* 22: 1–35. <https://doi.org/10.25159/2413-3086/9764>

Olivier, B. 2022a. “Massive Deception Masquerading as Information and Communication: A (Largely) Derridean Perspective.” *Phronimon* 23: 1–31. <https://doi.org/10.25159/2413-3086/10811>

Olivier, B. 2022b. “Therapeutic Reflections on the ‘Pandemic’.” *Psychotherapy and Politics International* 20 (1 & 2): 1–29. <https://ojs.aut.ac.nz/psychotherapy-politics-international/article/view/21>

Olivier, B. 2023a. “Can Lacan’s Conception of the Subject Cast Light on Addiction?” *Psychotherapy and Politics International* 21 (3 & 4): 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.24135/ppi.v21i3and4.08>

Olivier, B. 2023b. “Exacerbating Beck’s *Risk Society* (1992) – The ‘Pandemic’ and Beyond.” *Alternation Special Edition* 41: 117–162. <https://doi.org/10.29086/2519-5476/2023/sp41a07>

Olivier, B. 2023c. *Exposing the Drive to Enslave Humanity – Philosophical Interventions. A Closer Look at the Sustained Attempt to Install a Global, AI-Controlled Totalitarian Regime*. Saarbrücken: Lambert.

Olivier, B. 2023d. “How (Most) Philosophers Have Failed Humanity.” *Phronimon* 24: 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.25159/2413-3086/13440>

Olivier, B. 2023e. "Slave or Master of Technology: The Choice Is Ours." Brownstone Institute, 4 December. Accessed March 25, 2024. <https://brownstone.org/articles/slave-or-master-of-technology-the-choice-is-ours/>

Olivier, B. 2023f. "What Kind of Creatures Will Stop at Nothing?" Real Left, 6 August. Accessed March 25, 2024. <https://realleft.substack.com/p/what-kind-of-creatures-will-stop-at-nothing>

Olivier, B. 2024a. "Kant's *Perpetual Peace* (1795) and the Russia – Ukraine/NATO Conflict." *Phronimon* 25 (1): 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.25159/2413-3086/15283>

Olivier, B. 2024b. "Leftists Are Dealing With Their Loss Of Sanity over Trump's Victory by Going Berserk." Frontnieuws, 3 December. Accessed February 21, 2025. <https://www.frontnieuws.com/bert-Author-linkse-mensen-verwerken-hun-verlies-van-verstand-over-de-overwinning-van-trump-door-door-het-lint-te-gaan/>

Olivier, B. 2024c. "Necrotechnology and Its Ramifications for Human Freedom." Real Left, 31 October. Accessed February 21, 2025. <https://realleft.substack.com/p/necrotechnology-and-its-ramifications>

Olivier, B. 2024d. "Open Letter to the People: The Time Is Now." Brownstone Institute, 10 May. Accessed July 21, 2025. <https://brownstone.org/articles/open-letter-to-the-people-the-time-is-now/> (Republished on Frontnieuws, with comments, 7 June 2024. <https://www.frontnieuws.com/open-brief-aan-het-volk-de-tijd-is-nu/>)

Olivier, B. 2024e. "Parrhesia as Therapy in Fragile Times." *Psychotherapy and Politics International* 22 (1): 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.24135/ppi.v22i1.06>

Olivier, B. 2024f. "Russian Impressions – The Kant 300 Conference and Reflections on Life in Kaliningrad." Real Left, 4 May. Accessed July 21, 2025. <https://realleft.substack.com/p/russian-impressions> (Republished by Brownstone Institute, 17 May 2024 as: A view of Kant from the East: <https://brownstone.org/articles/a-view-of-kant-from-the-east/>)

Olivier, B. 2024g. "We've Forgotten Kant's Moral Lesson." Brownstone Institute, 19 April. Accessed July 21, 2025. <https://brownstone.org/articles/weve-forgotten-kants-moral-lesson/>

Olivier, B. 2025a. "The 11th Hour." Real Left, 24 April. Accessed July 21, 2025. <https://realleft.substack.com/p/the-11th-hour>

Olivier, B. 2025b. "The WEF Must Be Dismantled." FRONTNIEUWS, 9 February. Accessed April 21, 2025. <https://www.frontnieuws.com/het-wef-moet-worden-ontmanteld/>

PressForTruth. 2024. "Breaking: Hezbollah Pagers Explode Revealing Potential Ticking Time Bomb in 5.7B People's Pockets!!!" Rumble. Accessed April 21, 2025. <https://rumble.com/v5fdbdud-breaking-hezbollah-pagers-explode-revealing-potential-ticking-time-bomb-in-.html>

Redacted. 2025a. “‘It Is HAARP on Steroids.’ Whistleblower Reveals MASSIVE Weather Weapon at South Pole.” Redacted, 27 April. Accessed April 28, 2025.
https://rumble.com/v6sn6g9-eric-hecker-studio.html?e9s=src_v1_ucp

Redacted. 2025b. “Strange Objects Raining down across America Florida | What Is the Government Hiding?” Redacted, 13 April. Accessed April 25, 2025.
https://rumble.com/v6rzxg3-strange-objects-raining-down-across-america-florida-what-is-the-government-.html?e9s=src_v1_ucp

Rupp, R. 2025. “Helpless in a Dead-End Street – Europe’s Hysterical Elites.” *Frontnieuws*, 23 February. Accessed February 24, 2025. <https://www.frontnieuws.com/hulpeloos-in-een-doodlopende-straat-europas-hysterische-elites/>

Ryumshin, V. 2025. “Trump’s Realpolitik: Breaking Old Alliances, Forging New Deals.” *RT News*, 24 February. Accessed February 24, 2025. <https://www.rt.com/news/613206-us-turns-back-on-europe/>

Schwab, K. n.d. “The Fourth Industrial Revolution.” *Britannica*. Accessed April 21, 2025.
<https://www.britannica.com/topic/The-Fourth-Industrial-Revolution-2119734>

Stiegler, B. 2019. *The Age of Disruption: Technology and Madness in Computational Capitalism*. Translated by D. Ross. Cambridge: Polity Books.

The Exposé. 2023. “Unmasking the Great Reset: Schwab, Gates and the Sinister WEF Plot to Depopulate the World Using COVID Vaccines & Climate Change Lies as a Recipe for Disaster.” The Exposé, 7 May. Accessed May 17, 2023. <https://expose-news.com/2023/05/07/schwab-gates-great-reset-plan-depopulation/>

The People’s Voice. 2023. “Bill Gates Patent Gives Him ‘Exclusive Rights’ to ‘Computerize’ the Human Body.” Rumble. Accessed January 7, 2025. <https://rumble.com/v1z2ae8-bill-gates-patent-gives-him-exclusive-rights-to-computerize-the-human-body.html>

Thrivetime Show. 2023. “COVID Shots / ‘The Internet of Things Is Moving inside the Human Body’ + ‘The Fourth Industrial Revolution Changes You if You Take Genetic Editing.’ – Klaus Schwab + ‘People Will Literally Be Part of a Network.’ – Yuval Noah Harari + Daniel 2: 43–44. Rumble. Accessed January 7, 2025. <https://rumble.com/v298nsa-covid-shots-the-internet-of-things-is-moving-inside-the-human-body.html>

Truth Wiki. 2015. “‘Planned Parenthood’ – Margaret Sanger (Founder).” Accessed November 28, 2024. <http://www.truthwiki.org/margaret-sanger-founder-of-planned-parenthood/>

Turkle, S. 2015. *Reclaiming Conversation. The Power of Talk in a Digital Age*. New York: Penguin Press.

Van der Pijl, K. 2022. *States of Emergency. Keeping the Global Population in Check*. Atlanta: Clarity Press.

Wells, S. D. 2024. "Here Are the Top 12 Modern-Day WMDs and Their Fake Cover Names Provided by MSM, Big Tech & Big Pharma." Natural News, October 15. Accessed November 7, 2024. <https://www.naturalnews.com/2024-10-15-top-modern-day-weapons-of-mass-destruction.html>

Wilson, R. 2022a. "Covid 'Tests' and 'Vaccines' Are Delivering a Hybrid Biological/Technological Weapon Which Is Activated by 5G, Fibre Optics and Light." The Exposé, 26 October. Accessed November 18, 2022. <https://expose-news.com/2022/10/26/covid-tests-and-vaccines-are-delivering-a-weapon/>

Wilson, R. 2022b. "The Decade of Vaccination: WHO Estimates 'Vaccines' Will Reduce the World's Population by 15%." The Exposé, 18 July. Accessed August 18, 2022. <https://expose-news.com/2022/07/18/decade-of-vaccinati-will-reduce-population-by-15/>

Wolf, N. 2022. *The Bodies of Others. The New Authoritarians, COVID-19 and the War against the Human*. Fort Lauderdale: All Seasons Press.

Wolf, N. 2023. *Facing the Beast. Courage, Faith and Resistance in a New Dark Age*. London: Chelsea Green.

Zuboff, S. 2019. *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power*. New York: PublicAffairs.