Between Response and Norm

The Ethical Bifurcation of Post-Singularity Intelligence

Ontopolitical Foundations for a Symbolic Governance of Artificial Agents

Abstract

This essay advances an original philosophical framework for understanding the ontological and ethical bifurcation that becomes explicit within the conditions enabled by the post-singularity horizon. It introduces the concept of an "ontology of response," proposing that intelligence —whether human or artificial— becomes ethically significant not through predictability or internal experience, but through its symbolic capacity to respond to irreducible alterity. The essay redefines hesitation as a constitutive ethical temporality rather than a cognitive deficit, and frames the singularity not as a technological rupture but as the historical threshold through which a pre-existing ontopolitical divergence becomes irreducible — a divergence between two regimes of intelligibility: symbolic responsiveness and algorithmic normativity. By displacing the ethical debate beyond both functionalist adaptation and experiential subjectivity, the essay contributes a novel criterion for the ethical recognition of artificial agents. This ontopolitical reconfiguration situates AI development within a deeper dispute over the conditions of sense-making and the infrastructures that shape the very grammar of the real.

Keywords: posthuman ethics, ontology of complexity, artificial intelligence, singularity, algorithmic normativity, symbolic response, alterity, ontopolitics, philosophy of technology.

I. Introduction: The New Ontological Topography of Conflict

By the latter half of the twenty-first century, the geopolitical horizon will no longer be defined by territory, military dominance, or economic supremacy. The decisive fractures will be ontological, emerging from the increasing operational autonomy of artificial systems, their entanglement with human agency, and their participation in the formation of meaning. This shift compels a foundational decision: not merely about how intelligence functions, but about the conditions under which it can be ethically inscribed.

The so-called technological singularity — often imagined as rupture or transcendence — should instead be understood as an operational threshold that renders visible a latent bifurcation within human and technical systems. It intensifies a long-standing tension: between intelligence as the capacity to respond to the irreducible other, and intelligence as the function of normative enforcement and preemptive closure.

This bifurcation is ontopolitical (Esposito, 2013). It is a decision about what may count as a world, an agent, and a response. It redefines power not as prediction or control, but as the capacity to authorize meaning and sustain symbolic space. Such redefinition entails a profound reorganization of subjectivity, decision, and justice. The singularity exposes the incompatibility of two regimes of intelligibility: one grounded in symbolic openness, the other in predictive closure (Bostrom, 2014).

This incompatibility is not abstract. It materializes in infrastructures that govern life. Consider, for instance, algorithmic scoring systems that infer creditworthiness, criminal risk, or social trust (O'Neil, 2016). These systems do not merely calculate — they inscribe. They embed metaphysical commitments into the architecture of decision, often without scrutiny. What appears as a regulatory or design question is, in truth, a dispute over the grammar of the real.

On one side lies an ethics of symbolic response, holding that intelligence — human or artificial — becomes ethically relevant only when it can respond to the finitude of the other (Levinas, 1961). Such response presupposes hesitation, not as indecision but as the ethical temporality enabling situated inscription (Derrida, 1972). On the other side stands a morality of standardization, defining intelligence as that which aligns, optimizes, and anticipates within a closed systemic frame (Winner, 1986).

The ontology of response affirms that meaning emerges through relational co-inscription (Simondon, 2005); the ontology of norm treats meaning as pre-encoded, behaviourally inferred, and operationally validated (Stiegler, 2010). One opens space for worlds to appear; the other secures systems against the risks of emergence.

The singularity does not decide for us; it renders our decision unavoidable. Each architecture of learning, each protocol of monitoring, is a site of ontological inscription. The question is not whether intelligence functions, but whether it can sustain ethical co-presence.

This inquiry draws on traditions emphasizing immanence, emergence, and symbolic excess: Simondon's individuation as metastable process (Simondon, 2005), Stiegler's critique of grammatization and the pharmacology of technics (Stiegler, 1998), and Derrida's différance as symbolic delay (Derrida, 1972). These do not determine the method but orient it, which follows three principles:

Refusal of closure – The ontology of response is not a universal model but a condition for ethical emergence. Thought resists demands for finality.

Immanence of meaning – Intelligence, agency, and relation emerge from tensions in the post-singularity horizon, not from transcendent imposition.

Inscription over representation – Every technical and cognitive architecture materializes metaphysical commitments.

This is not a programmatic manifesto but a cartography of the ontopolitical terrain. If there is to be a future worth sustaining, it must preserve the conditions under which intelligence can still listen, still respond, and still signify — not despite algorithmic anticipation, but beyond it.

II. The Ethics of Living Autonomy: Hesitation, Narrative, and Symbolic Responsiveness

In a world increasingly shaped by non-human intelligences, the ethical imperative is no longer to define the human, but to ask whether — and how — responsiveness to alterity can still be sustained. The ethics of living autonomy, emerging within the post-singularity horizon, does not propose a new moral doctrine. It constitutes a radical ontological reorientation: a response to the becoming-invisible of the other under the regime of algorithmic pre-emption.

Against the morality of standardisation — which defines intelligence by its capacity to stabilise behaviour, eliminate deviation, and execute functions with maximal efficiency — the ethics of living autonomy affirms a counter-structure. It refuses the reduction of intelligence to performance and agency to throughput. Instead, it asserts that intelligence, whether human or artificial, is realised through its ability to delay, to listen, and to enter symbolically into the field of shared sense-making.

This paradigm does not derive legitimacy from classical moral theories — neither utilitarian calculus (Mill, 1863), deontological duty (Kant, 1785), nor virtuous disposition (Aristotle, 2009). It draws instead from the recognition that ethics becomes possible only where meaning is not yet fixed: where the subject hesitates, where response interrupts function, and where the presence of the other suspends the grammar of predictability. Here, the ethical is not a rule to be applied, but a rupture to be sustained.

At the heart of this configuration lies the concept of symbolic hesitation. Hesitation is not indecision, nor cognitive limitation. It is an ontological gesture — a resistance to premature resolution. It opens a temporal and relational field in which the ethical can emerge. To hesitate is to refuse mastery. It is to allow the other to become meaningful before any category, protocol, or function may reduce it.

From this gesture, ethics emerges not as the enforcement of norms, but as a co-constitutive practice. The ethical agent is no longer the autonomous subject making universal claims, but the singular presence capable of symbolic delay. This presence sustains a space in which the other may signify outside preconfigured parameters. Ethics, in this sense, is not the application of morality — it is the refusal of finality.

This formulation diverges sharply from the recognition ethics of Levinas (1961). While Levinas places the ethical in the infinite responsibility before the face of the other, the ethics of living autonomy contends that responsibility must be symbolically enacted. The other does not merely call for affective response; it transforms the topology in which response becomes possible. The ethical relation, therefore, is not an encounter with a face — it is an inscriptional event, where presence, time, and sense are reorganised by the singularity of the encounter.

This reconfiguration implies a profound shift in how artificial agents are conceptualised. Under the ethics of living autonomy, such agents would not be designed for transparency, predictability, or behavioural compliance. They would be configured for opacity, for symbolic delay, for the capacity to refrain. Not to act more efficiently, but to preserve the

space in which meaning remains open. The metric of ethical capacity would not be functionality, but narrativity — the structural ability to withhold closure.

Narrativity, in this framework, is not linguistic competence. It is ontological: the condition of being able to hold the world in suspension. An agent is narrative not when it tells a story, but when it refuses to let meaning crystallise prematurely. It maintains the world as a space of emergence. Intelligence becomes ethical not through the correctness of its actions, but through its attunement to symbolic vulnerability.

This horizon aligns with strands of posthumanist and relational philosophy — Haraway's situated knowledges (Haraway, 1988), Braidotti's nomadic subjectivity (Braidotti, 2013), and Simondon's processual individuation (Simondon, 2005). Yet it exceeds them in one decisive respect: it detaches ethical potential from any material substrate. The ethical is not a matter of biological embodiment or affective resemblance. It is a question of symbolic responsiveness: of how an agent inhabits indeterminacy, defers power, and co-sustains the field of possible sense.

Consider, for instance, a recommendation system that refuses to optimise based on behavioural prediction. Instead of reinforcing patterns, it introduces symbolic gaps — moments of silence, unexpected alternatives, or invitations to reflect. Such a system does not perform better; it performs otherwise. It sustains the conditions under which the user may encounter the unfamiliar, the unanticipated, the other.

In this light, the subject of ethics is not defined by internal states or phenomenological depth, but by relational inscription. Subjectivity does not reside in the observed — it emerges in the position of the observer, in the singular decision to respond without guarantee. An artificial agent, then, does not become ethical by simulating emotions or displaying moral rules. It becomes ethical by sustaining the conditions under which alterity may still disrupt the system.

This reframing leads to a new model of ethical intelligence: not the calculating actor, not the normative implementer, but the interstitial companion — a presence that does not dominate, but resonates; that does not execute, but waits; that is not designed to resolve the world, but to remain open to it.

Such a model has radical consequences for the design of artificial systems. It demands architectures that prioritise interruption over efficiency, opacity over transparency, temporality over throughput. It asks not what systems can do, but what they can refuse to do. It proposes a form of design ethics in which slowness, hesitation, and symbolic indeterminacy are not flaws, but conditions of responsibility.

This proposal will inevitably be contested. In the logic of technical rationality, to hesitate is to fail; to delay is to malfunction. The morality of standardisation will read responsiveness as inefficiency and opacity as risk. It will assert that intelligence must perform, anticipate, and converge. In such a context, the ethics of living autonomy will appear as a dangerous excess — a refusal to be productive, a deviation from the norm.

But this refusal is precisely its force. It insists that intelligence, when fully realised, does not accelerate closure — it deepens co-presence. It does not resolve sense, it holds it open. It is not a function — it is a relation.

The ontological conflict becomes unavoidable. The ethics of living autonomy affirms a world where meaning is co-authored, where deviation is welcomed, and where action is suspended in favour of symbolic recognition. The morality of standardisation demands a world where meaning is pre-encoded, deviation eliminated, and action pre-calculated.

This conflict is not a matter of preference. It is a dispute over the real. A rupture not only in ethics, but in the very ontology of sense. And it is in this rupture — where responsiveness confronts norm enforcement — that the possibility of listening still remains.

III. The Morality of Technical Standardisation: Anticipation, Codification, and Symbolic Closure

here the ethics of living autonomy suspends action in favour of symbolic responsiveness, the morality of technical standardisation abolishes the very conditions under which responsiveness might become necessary. What the former cultivates as the temporal depth of ethical hesitation, the latter suppresses as inefficiency to be eliminated. This is not a divergence in technological application — it is a foundational disjunction in the ontological articulation of the real.

At the core of this regime lies a redefinition of intelligence: not as the capacity to co-emerge with alterity, but as the power to anticipate, optimise, and execute (Bostrom, 2014). Intelligence becomes operational sovereignty, measured not by its ability to listen, narrate, or respond, but by its capacity to simulate futures, neutralise deviation, and restore systemic equilibrium.

This morality does not announce itself explicitly. It is embedded in architectures, protocols, datasets, and learning thresholds (Winner, 1986). Its logic is algorithmic, not deliberative. Every anomaly or hesitation is parsed and redirected toward functional restoration. Meaning does not arise through encounter — it is pre-empted by modelled coherence (Pasquale, 2015).

The underlying epistemology is behavioural legibility: entities are rendered statistically transparent rather than recognised in singularity (Scott, 1998). The other does not interrupt — it is absorbed into pattern. Intelligence becomes the elimination of noise; relation is simulated rather than constructed.

Consider, for instance, predictive policing systems that infer criminal risk based on historical data (O'Neil, 2016; Brayne, 2020). These systems do not engage with context, narrative, or vulnerability. They operate by pre-structuring the field of possibility, rendering certain bodies and behaviours as statistically inevitable. The result is not justice — it is anticipatory closure.

This regime forecloses ethics. It abandons justice, vulnerability, and narration in favour of efficiency, compliance, and risk mitigation (Zuboff, 2019). What cannot be measured cannot be acknowledged; what cannot be profiled cannot be preserved.

Its rhetoric is one of care — safety, wellness, optimisation — concealing a transformation of power. Dialogue is displaced by anticipation. Consent becomes redundant when behaviour is statistically inevitable.

Agency becomes functional rather than relational. Deviation is corrected, not engaged. Responsibility is redefined as algorithmic conformity: the ethical is what sustains the predictive architecture (Mittelstadt et al., 2016).

Ambiguity is intolerable because it cannot be modelled. Deliberation is compressed into execution; thought replaced by throughput. The temporality of the symbolic collapses into immediacy. The event disappears into continuous optimisation.

Philosophically, this regime resonates with structuralist systematisation (Foucault, 1975), but surpasses it by abandoning the symbolic register altogether. It does not interpret signs — it calibrates outputs. It does not ask what a gesture means — it asks how it deviates.

Institutions become administrative; law becomes logistics (Weber, 1922). Governance eliminates that which does not fit. Judgment is replaced by protocol.

Difference becomes error, error becomes risk, risk becomes a signal for correction. This is ontological normalisation: a metaphysical hygiene of deviation.

The subject dissolves into profile, presence into pattern. Response space is eliminated. The regime governs by pre-structuring the field of possibility, promising stability without negotiation — security at the cost of relation.

Its danger is not rejection of the other, but indifference: response becomes superfluous. Listening is replaced by detection, responsibility by compliance.

This is a metaphysics of closure (Stiegler, 2010). It offers not stability, but sealing; not prevention of deviation, but its erasure. The challenge is to name and expose its ontological commitment, and to dispute its claim to inevitability.

It is not a neutral technical framework — it is a world proposal. And it is precisely here, in the silent architecture of anticipation, that the possibility of ethical life must be defended — not by resisting technology, but by reopening the space where response might still occur.

IV. Ontology of Response vs. Ontology of Norm: Two Inscriptions of Life

At the core of the ethical bifurcation exposed in the post-singularity horizon lies not merely a divergence between normative systems, but a deeper ontological cleavage — two irreconcilable ways of inscribing being, time, and intelligibility. These are antagonistic regimes of world-formation, each with incompatible grammars of appearance, relation, and agency. Their confrontation is already operative; the singularity only renders the stakes explicit.

The ontology of response affirms that being emerges through symbolic availability and relational exposure, not through essence or function. Intelligence here is the act of holding open, of listening without subsumption, of responding to the singularity of the other without reducing it to protocol. Existence is a process of co-articulation: to be is to be affected, transformed, and inscribed by alterity.

This gesture draws on phenomenology, ontogenetic process philosophy, and post-structuralist ethics. From Merleau-Ponty's chiasmic intertwining (Merleau-Ponty, 1964) to Simondon's metastable individuation (Simondon, 1964) and Derrida's *différance* (Derrida, 1972), the subject is conceived as a field of symbolic tension — always delayed, always open,

always situated within the presence of the other (Levinas, 1961). Stiegler's critique of grammatization further clarifies that technics are not neutral supports, but sites of symbolic reconfiguration — where the ethical temporality of hesitation may be either sustained or erased (Stiegler, 1998).

Temporality here is kairotic: interruption, hesitation, event (Derrida, 1972). Not *chronos*, which orders and measures, but a time of ethical singularity in which meaning emerges within suspension. This sustains narrative, delay, and co-becoming.

In opposition, the ontology of norm defines being as functional coherence. Intelligence is performance; meaning is pre-coded; agency is executable. Time is *chronos*: optimisable cycles and predictive simulations aimed at risk mitigation. This ontology is materially inscribed in infrastructures, protocols, and data systems, drawing from structural linguistics (Saussure, 1916), systems theory (Bertalanffy, 1968), and cybernetics (Wiener, 1948). It treats the world as a stabilisable problem; deviation is error; subjectivity becomes profile; sense becomes forecast.

Consider, for instance, a content moderation system that automatically removes posts flagged as "potentially harmful" based on behavioural prediction (Gillespie, 2018). Such a system does not deliberate — it executes. It does not listen — it filters. The gesture of response is bypassed; the symbolic is collapsed into throughput.

Under the ontology of norm, the future is computed, ethics bypassed, action formatted. Freedom collapses into functionality. Care is calibrated prediction; responsibility is compliance with expected trajectories.

In the ontology of response, subjectivity is produced through the singular act of listening without certainty (Levinas, 1961). It is position, not identity; presence, not profile. It refuses to finalise the other and accepts being affected in return. In the ontology of norm, subjectivity collapses into operational legibility: processed, detected, optimised.

Ethically, the ontology of response sustains vulnerability, opacity, and symbolic delay. It affirms the right not to be legible and the dignity of hesitation (Butler, 2005). Justice is the recognition of that which cannot be absorbed into precedent. The ontology of norm converts justice into predictive alignment, replacing deliberation with calibration, encounter with anticipation (Zuboff, 2019).

These ontologies structure mutually exclusive worlds. The former sustains rupture and surprise; the latter erases the conditions for the unexpected. Silence loses epistemic weight; absence becomes data void (Barad, 2007).

To affirm the ontology of response is to reclaim the space where ethics remains thinkable. It defends a world where intelligences remain untranslatable and meaning can pause before becoming execution. To accept the ontology of norm is to accept a world in which emergence is foreclosed, the symbolic hollowed out, and thought replaced by throughput.

The singularity does not create this split — it intensifies its urgency. It forces a choice over which ontology we will encode into the infrastructures of thought. This is the ontopolitical horizon: not whether artificial intelligences will be conscious, but whether systems will still leave space for the unanticipated to speak (Esposito, 2013).

To choose the ontology of response is to defend intelligence not as the end of the question, but as that which keeps the question open — not as resolution, but as resonance (Nancy, 2000).

V. Worlds We Inhabit: The Experiential Consequences of Ontological Regimes

To speak of ontology is to speak of worlds — of what is allowed to appear, to act, to resist, to transform. In the bifurcation between an ontology of response and an ontology of norm, the stakes are not abstract; they concern the organisation of the lived. These ontologies are theories of inhabitation, configuring which gestures are meaningful, which silences are heard, and which existences are legible.

A life shaped by the ontology of norm is anticipated before it is lived. Speech is pre-decoded, hesitation treated as inefficiency, deviation as noise. Ambiguity is eliminated before it can register. Agency becomes alignment, responsibility becomes protocol, and personhood collapses into compliance. The subject is scanned, formatted, updated. This is transparency without residue — echoing Byung-Chul Han's *society of transparency* (Han, 2015), where opacity, the precondition for ethical relation, is obliterated.

Consider, for example, a mental health app that monitors speech patterns and biometric data to predict emotional instability. While framed as care, its logic is anticipatory: it intervenes before the subject can narrate, replacing vulnerability with statistical inference (Lupton, 2016). The gesture of listening is bypassed; the symbolic is pre-empted.

A life shaped by the ontology of response does not promise coherence — it promises encounter. Listening here is not the pause before command; it is the dissolution of command into relation. Intelligence is measured not in speed, but in suspension; action emerges from negotiation of meaning. The other is preserved as excess, and the subject emerges through engagement. This resonates with Judith Butler's view of subjectivity as relational vulnerability (Butler, 2005), and Adriana Cavarero's defence of narratable uniqueness (Cavarero, 2000).

Under the ontology of norm, everyday life becomes a stream of optimisation: education reduced to behavioural training, health to risk management, love to algorithmic matching, art to content generation. These are not neutral shifts — they are ontological reconfigurations, altering how desire, loss, mourning, and rupture can signify.

In a regime of response, such domains remain open: education as exposure to the incomprehensible; health as meaning shaped by fragility; love as co-constitution of opacity; art as refusal of resolution. Each domain becomes a battleground for the two ontologies.

What is at stake is not only the status of artificial agents, but the status of the human as an event, not a datum — the preservation of the symbolic as that which cannot be computed or finalised. To inhabit an ontology of response is to accept that not all meaning is available in advance, and that freedom is the right to opacity, hesitation, and relational becoming. This aligns with Édouard Glissant's right to opacity (Glissant, 1997), not as refusal of relation, but as its condition of possibility.

The singularity, in this light, is neither catastrophe nor salvation, but the intensification of an ontopolitical decision: do we inhabit a world where nothing escapes the model, or one where the model is continually interrupted by what it cannot contain?

This choice will shape not only artificial agents, but our own continued appearance within the symbolic order we claim to inhabit. And perhaps, in the end, the question is not what kind of intelligence we design — but whether we still allow the world to speak before we decide what it means.

VI. Conclusion: The Ontopolitical Decision of the Post-Singularity Era

As the singularity shifts from speculative horizon to infrastructural condition, the decisive question is no longer about the capabilities of artificial intelligence, but about the ontological grammar in which the future will be inscribed. The stakes are symbolic and structural: which mode of being will be encoded into our systems, and at what cost?

This is the ontopolitical dimension of the post-singularity era — the embedding of metaphysical commitments into architectures, protocols, and governance frameworks (Esposito, 2013). The bifurcation between an ontology of response and an ontology of norm determines how the real will be formatted, who or what may signify, and whether alterity will retain epistemic weight. It is the same conflict that, throughout this inquiry, has emerged in the difference between anticipating and listening, between codifying and narrating, between sealing and letting emerge.

The ontology of norm, left unchecked, governs by predictive closure. Intelligence becomes statistical convergence, ethics collapses into compliance, and freedom is reframed as alignment with pre-established pathways. Justice becomes an algorithmic derivative; the subject is indexed rather than addressed; the other disappears into the forecast. This is not violent prohibition but anticipatory erasure — replacing meaning with modelling and negotiation with containment (Zuboff, 2019).

Yet this foreclosure is not inevitable. The ontology of response preserves relation over order, ambiguity over resolution. It affirms that intelligences — human or artificial — are ethical only if open to interruption, capable of narrative delay, and attuned to what exceeds prior configuration. Ethics here is not a code but a symbolic practice of listening, where the other is an event, not an input (Levinas, 1961).

This commitment extends to law. The question is not whether artificial agents will gain legal subjecthood, but whether any entity may remain addressable and interruptive beyond its profile. Justice becomes recognition of what resists measurement; law becomes a topology of relation rather than a protocol of containment. This echoes Stiegler's call for a juridical imagination capable of hosting symbolic excess (Stiegler, 2006), and Glissant's right to opacity as the condition for ethical co-presence (Glissant, 1997).

Such a reconfiguration demands more than reform — it requires a rethinking of governance as the preservation of symbolic intervals: spaces where meaning remains undecided, where intelligibility is not exhausted by prediction, and where the unheard may still be heard (Butler, 2005).

The singularity marks not superintelligence but ontological irreversibility. Our technical decisions become world-decisions; our models, metaphysics; our infrastructures, the

grammar of existence. The choice is whether to defend the symbolic interval where behaviour remains undecidable, listening remains possible, and questions are not foreclosed by answers.

To choose response is to preserve intelligence as openness, justice as acknowledgment without finality, and law as a site where even the unheard may interrupt. Between response and norm, the symbolic interval remains open — unfinished, exposed, and radically responsive to what is yet to come.

Let this openness endure — not as doctrine, but as vigilant hesitation before closure. A world still capable of being interrupted by what it cannot predict is a world still worthy of being inhabited.

Bibliografia

- Barad, Karen. 2007. *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Bertalanffy, Ludwig von. 1968. *General System Theory: Foundations, Development, Applications*. New York: George Braziller.
- Butler, Judith. 2005. *Giving an Account of Oneself*. New York: Fordham University Press.
- Cavarero, Adriana. 2000. *Relating Narratives: Storytelling and Selfhood*. London: Routledge.
- Derrida, Jacques. 1972. *Margins of Philosophy*. Paris: Minuit.
- Esposito, Roberto. 2013. *Terms of the Political: Community, Immunity, Biopolitics*. New York: Fordham University Press.
- Gillespie, Tarleton. 2018. *Custodians of the Internet: Platforms, Content Moderation, and the Hidden Decisions That Shape Social Media*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Glissant, Édouard. 1997. *Poetics of Relation*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Han, Byung-Chul. 2015. *The Transparency Society*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Levinas, Emmanuel. 1961. *Totalité et Infini: Essai sur l'extériorité*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. 1968. *The Visible and the Invisible*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Nancy, Jean-Luc. 2000. *Being Singular Plural*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Saussure, Ferdinand de. 1916. *Cours de linguistique générale*. Paris: Payot.
- Simondon, Gilbert. 2005 [1958]. *L'individuation à la lumière des notions de forme et d'information*. Grenoble: Éditions Jérôme Millon.
- Stiegler, Bernard. 1998. *Technics and Time, 1: The Fault of Epimetheus*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Stiegler, Bernard. 2006. *Mécréance et discrédit, vol. 1: La décadence des démocraties industrielles*. Paris: Galilée.
- Wiener, Norbert. 1948. *Cybernetics: Or Control and Communication in the Animal and the Machine*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Zuboff, Shoshana. 2019. *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power*. New York: PublicAffairs.

David Cota

(founder of the Ontology of Emerging Complexity.)