

# Recursive Necropolitics: Historical antecedents and contemporary practices of AI afterlives

Hagerty, Alexa <sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of Cambridge, Minderoo Centre for Technology and Democracy

DOI 10.5281/zenodo.14729759

## TO CITE

Hagerty, A. (2024). Recursive Necropolitics: Historical antecedents and contemporary practices of AI afterlives. In *Proceedings of the Paris Institute for Advanced Study* (Vol. 21). <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14729759>

## PUBLICATION DATE

07/12/2024

## ABSTRACT

*This article examines the concept of recursive necropolitics in the context of AI death technologies, tracing historical antecedents and contemporary manifestations. By analyzing 19th-century phenomena such as the Paris Morgue, L'Inconnue de la Seine, and anatomy museums alongside modern AI innovations like deepfakes and griefbots, the study reveals enduring patterns in how societies use technology to mediate, commodify, and control death. Through the frameworks of spectacle gaze, mechanical virality, and necro-technological recursion, the article demonstrates how AI death technologies extend long-standing practices of managing mortality while reinforcing social hierarchies. The analysis engages with ethical implications such as posthumous privacy, consent, and environmental impact, situating these concerns within a broader historical and necropolitical context. By illuminating the recursive nature of death technologies across time, this research offers critical insights into the societal and ethical challenges posed by AI's role in shaping our relationship with mortality.*

## Acknowledgements

This article was written during a one-month residence at the Paris Institute for Advanced Study under the "Paris IAS Ideas" program. I am deeply grateful to Saadi Lahlou and Paulius Yamin for their leadership and support of the fellowship program. I'm grateful to my wonderful IAS cohort for their stimulating discussions and valuable feedback, thanks to: Katrin Ahlgren, David Armando, Gruia Bădescu, Mathilde Cohen, Angela Creager, Gordon Cumming, Tine Destrooper, Pierre Gaussens, Abdul Hameed, Benjamin Hegarty, Carola Hein, Adam Kahane, Anne Le Goff, Pavel Lurje, Paavo Monkkonen, Lucia Shimbo, Christopher Sorensen, and Simo Vehmas. Special thanks to Livia Garofalo for her thoughtful comments.

This article builds upon research I conducted during my doctoral studies at Stanford University, where I first began exploring the historical intersections of technology and death through case studies of anatomy museums\*, L'Inconnue de la Seine\*, and the Paris Morgue. I am grateful to my PhD advisors and mentors -- Tanya Luhrmann, Lochlann Jain, and Robert Pogue Harrison -- for their guidance during the early stages of this long-term project. Their insights have been instrumental in shaping my approach to this complex topic. Any errors or omissions remain, of course, my own.

## I. Introduction: Recursive Necropolitics and the Afterlife of AI

In the age of artificial intelligence (AI), technologies are reshaping many aspects of human life, and their potential impact on death and mourning is particularly provocative. AI-driven innovations include griefbots, which simulate conversations with the deceased, and deepfakes, which offer "digital resurrections." While these technologies seem novel, this article argues that they are part of a long historical continuum of technological interventions in death. Rather than representing radical breaks from the past, contemporary AI death technologies extend centuries-old practices of using technology to mediate, commodify, and control experiences of death.

To understand this historical continuity and its implications, this article draws upon Katherine Verdery's (1999) concept of enchantment, which examines the non-rational, emotional, and often sacred qualities attributed to dead bodies and their representations. Verdery demonstrates how this enchantment imbues the dead with profound cultural and political significance, shaping collective memory and reinforcing social hierarchies. This article extends Verdery's framework beyond physical bodies to encompass digital remains, arguing that AI death technologies generate new forms of enchantment that bridge material and virtual domains. This technological enchantment operates alongside what Walter Benjamin (1935/2008) termed "aura"-the unique presence of an artwork in time and space. As death-related imagery moves from physical to digital reproduction, these technologies transform rather than diminish the aura of the dead, creating new forms of posthumous presence and power.

Through this theoretical lens, the article introduces the concept of "recursive necropolitics." Building upon Achille Mbembe's (2003) notion of necropolitics-which

examines how sovereign power determines who may live and who must die-recursive necropolitics explores how power over death recursively manifests through technology across different historical periods. This recursive nature is evident in three key mechanisms through which technological enchantment operates, each examined in both historical and contemporary contexts:

**The Spectacle Gaze:** The technologically mediated transformation of death into a public exhibition that paradoxically combines rationality and objectivity with spectacle and fascination. This manifestation of enchantment reinforces social hierarchies and cultural norms through the commodification of mortality, mutually constituting scientific epistemologies and affective intensities.

**Mechanical Virality:** The widespread dissemination of death-related imagery through various technologies, both historical and contemporary. This process amplifies and transforms the enchanted aura of these artifacts, shaping collective imagination and cultural memory. By revealing how viral spread predates digital media, this concept illuminates longstanding patterns in societal engagement with death.

**Necro-technological Recursion:** The iterative process by which death-related technologies, often rooted in violent or exploitative practices, are repurposed as socially beneficial. This form of enchantment obscures ethical concerns by framing these technologies as advancements in education, science, or well-being, thereby concealing the violence inherent in their creation and perpetuation.

These mechanisms, while manifesting differently across historical periods, reveal the persistent ways in which societies leverage technology to shape our relationship with mortality. Their power derives from the enchanted nature of death technologies, which transform the dead into potent symbols that both reflect and reproduce power relations.

While the artifacts and technologies examined in this article-ranging from contemporary griefbots and pornographic deepfakes to 19th-century morgue tourism, death masks, and anatomical models

# Bibliography

Alvarez, A. (1985). *The savage god: A study of suicide*.

Angwin, J., Larson, J., Mattu, S., & Kirchner, L. (2022). Machine bias. In *Ethics of data and analytics* (pp. 254–264). Auerbach Publications.

Ballestriero, R. (2010). Anatomical models and wax Venuses: Art masterpieces or scientific craft works? *Journal of Anatomy*, 216(2), 223–234.

Bao, A., & Zeng, Y. (2024). Embracing grief in the age of deathbots: a temporary tool, not a permanent solution. *Ethics and Information Technology*, 26(1), 7.

Bates, A. W. (2006). Dr Kahn's Museum: Obscene anatomy in Victorian London. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*, 99(12), 618–624.

Bates, A. W. (2008). Indecent and demoralising representations': Public anatomy museums in mid-Victorian England. *Medical History*, 52(1), 1–22.

Bates, W. H. (2016). Anatomy on trial: Itinerant anatomy museums in mid nineteenth-century England. *Museum History Journal*, 9(2), 188–204.

Benjamin, W. (2008). *The work of art in the age of its technological reproducibility, and other writings on media* (M. W. Jennings, H. E. Ed., & E. Jephcott, Eds.). Trans.). Harvard University Press.

Benjamin, R. (2019). *Race after technology: Abolitionist tools for the new Jim code*. Polity Press.

Berger, J. (2008). *Ways of seeing*. Penguin UK.

Bertherat, B. (2005). La mort en vitrine à la Morgue à Paris au XIXe siècle (1804–1907. In *Les Narrations de la mort* (pp. 181–196).

Birhane, A. (2021). Algorithmic injustice: A relational ethics approach. *Patterns*, 2(2).

Boswell, M., & Rowland, A. (2023). *Virtual Holocaust Memory*. Oxford University Press.

Hagerty, A. (2024). Recursive Necropolitics: Historical antecedents and contemporary practices of AI afterlives. In *Proceedings of the Paris Institute for Advanced Study* (Vol. 21). <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14729759>

2024/4 - paris-ias-ideas - Article No.5. Freely available at <https://paris.pias.science/article/recursive-necropolitics-historical-antecedents-and-contemporary-practices-of-ai-afterlives> - ISSN 2826-2832/© 2025 Hagerty A.

This is an open access article published under the [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International Public License \(CC BY-NC 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/)

- Bronfen, E. (1992). *Over her dead body: Death, femininity, and the aesthetic*. Manchester University Press.
- Chesney, R., & Citron, D. (2019). Deep fakes: A looming challenge for privacy, democracy, and national security. *California Law Review*, 107, 1753–1819.
- Crawford, K. (2021). *The Atlas of AI: Power, politics, and the planetary costs of artificial intelligence*. Yale University Press.
- Debord, G. (1994). *The society of the spectacle*. Zone Books.
- Eubanks, V. (2018). *Automating inequality: How high-tech tools profile, police, and punish the poor*. St. Martin's Press.
- Fabry, R. E., & Alfano, M. (2024). The affective scaffolding of grief in the digital age: The case of deathbots. *Topoi*, 43(3), 757–769.
- Farid, H. (2022). Creating, using, misusing, and detecting deep fakes. *Journal of Online Trust and Safety*, 1(4).
- Foucault, M. (2003). *Society must be defended: Lectures at the Collège de France*.
- Foucault, M. (2004). *The birth of the clinic: An archaeology of medical perception* (Trans. ). Routledge. A. M. Sheridan, Trans.).
- Gray, M. L., & Suri, S. (2019). *Ghost work: How to stop Silicon Valley from building a new global underclass*. Eamon Dolan Books.
- Hamraie, A., & Fritsch, K. (2019). Crip technoscience manifesto. *Catalyst: Feminism, Theory, Technoscience*, 5(1), 1–33.
- Harbinja, E. (2017). Post-mortem privacy 2.0: Theory, law, and technology. *International Review of Law, Computers & Technology*, 31(1), 26–42.
- HereAfter, A. I. (n.d.). *Interactive memory app — Try free*. <https://hereafter.ai/>
- Hollanek, T., & Nowaczyk-Basińska, K. (2024). Griefbots, deadbots, postmortem avatars: On responsible applications of generative AI in the digital afterlife industry. *Philosophy & Technology*, 37.

Hopwood, N. (2007). Artist versus anatomist, models against dissection: Paul Zeiller of Munich and the revolution of 1848. *Medical History*, 51(3), 279–308.

Jiménez-Alonso, B., & Luna, I. (2023). Griefbots. A new way of communicating with the dead? *Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science*, 57(2), 466–481.

Kneese, T. (2023). *Death glitch: How techno-solutionism fails us in this life and beyond*. Yale University Press.

Kotek, H., Dockum, R., & Sun, D. (2023). Gender bias and stereotypes in large language models. *Proceedings of the ACM Collective Intelligence Conference*, 12–24.

Krueger, J., & Osler, L. (2022). Communing with the dead online: Chatbots, grief, and continuing bonds. *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, 29(9–10), 222–252.

Laffier, J., & Rehman, A. (2023). Deepfakes and Harm to Women. *Journal of Digital Life and Learning*, 3(1), 1–21.

Latour, B. (2005). *Reassembling the social: An introduction to actor-network theory*. Oxford University Press.

Latour, B., & Lowe, A. (2011). The migration of the aura: Exploring the original through its facsimiles. In T. R. Guest (Ed.), *The exhibitionist* (pp. 32–48). MIT Press.

Mbembe, A. (2003). Necropolitics. *Public Culture*, 15(1), 11–40.

McQuillan, D. (2022). *Resisting AI: An anti-fascist approach to artificial intelligence*. Policy Press.

Meyer, L., & Berthélémy, C. (2024). The colonial biometric legacy at heart of new EU asylum system. *European Digital Rights (EDRi) Report*.

Noble, S. U. (2018). *Algorithms of oppression: How search engines reinforce racism*. NYU Press.

O'Connor, M., & Kasket, E. (2022). What grief isn't: Dead grief concepts and their digital-age revival. In T. Machin, C. Brownlow, S. Abel, & J. Gilmour (Eds.), *Social media and technology across the lifespan* (pp. 115–130). Springer International Publishing.

Öhman, C., & Floridi, L. (2018). An ethical framework for the digital afterlife industry. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 2(5), 318–320.

Ozkul, D. (2023). Automating immigration and asylum: The uses of new technologies in migration and asylum governance in Europe. *Refugee Studies Centre*.

Pawelec, M. (2022). Deepfakes and democracy (theory): How synthetic audio-visual media for disinformation and hate speech threaten core democratic functions. *Digital Society*, 1(2), 19.

Pele, A., & Mulholland, C. (2023). On facial recognition, regulation, and "data necropolitics. *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies*, 30, 173.

Pinet, H. (2002). *Le dernier portrait*. Réunion des Musées Nationaux.

Ricaurte, P. (2022). Ethics for the majority world: AI and the question of violence at scale. *Media, Culture & Society*, 44(4), 726–745.

Rilke, R. M. (1982). *The notebooks of Malte Laurids Brigge*. Oxford University Press.

Rilke, R. M. (2011). *The notebooks of Malte Laurids Brigge: A novel*. Knopf Doubleday Publishing Group.

Risdonne, V., Hubbard, C., López Borges, V. H., & Theodorakopoulos, C. (2022). Materials and techniques for the coating of nineteenth-century plaster casts: A review of historical sources. *Studies in Conservation*, 67(4), 186–208.

Roose, K. (2023). A conversation with Bing's chatbot left me deeply unsettled. *The New York Times*.

Saliot, A. G. (2015). *The drowned muse: Casting the unknown woman of the Seine across the tides of modernity*. OUP Oxford.

Sappol, M. (2004). *A traffic of dead bodies: Anatomy and embodied social identity in nineteenth-century America*. Princeton University Press.

Shifman, L. (2013). *Memes in digital culture*. MIT Press.

Stein, L., Jenkins, H., Ford, S., Green, J., Booth, P., Busse, K., Click, M., Li, X., & Ross, S. (2014). Spreadable media: Creating value and meaning in a networked culture. *Cinema Journal*, 53(3), 152–177.

Tran, V., & Davies, J. (2023). Revisiting Benjamin's aura in the age of mediatisation: The digital aura of megachurches. *Journal of Media Studies*, 37(4), 112–129.

Verdery, K. (1999). *The political life of dead bodies: Reburial and postsocialist change*. Columbia University Press.

Vita, P. (2003). Returning the look: Victorian writers and the Paris Morgue. *Nineteenth-Century Contexts*, 25(3), 241–255.

Wagner, K., & Blewer, A. (2019). Deepfake porn and the digital divide. *Journal of Gender and Technology*, 12(2), 30–48.

Wall, O. (2022). A privacy torts solution to postmortem deepfakes. *Washington University Law Review*, 100(2), 885–928.