



Phil and Viv <pvdvvd@gmail.com>

# Sabrina Wallace, the Global Information Grid, and Electromagnetic Warfare

1 message

**Tess Lawrie, MBBCh, PhD from A Better Way with Dr Tess Lawrie**

Wed, Jul 2, 2025 at 12:03 AM

<drteslawrie@substack.com>

Reply-To: MBBCh, PhD from A Better Way with Dr Tess Lawrie

<reply+2r11ce&9fnjx&&d1c5dcc12686b441e7dc61ed923917b8420bfa23412efd9323baf6dbac44263@mg1.substack.com>

To: pvdvvd@gmail.com


↩ **A Better Way with Dr Tess Lawrie** cross-posted an episode from **David A. Hughes**



**Tess Lawrie, MBBCh, PhD**

Jul 1 · A Better Way with Dr Tess Lawrie

I am not very tech savvy, so much of what is being revealed these days would sound like science fiction if it were not supported by facts and patents. Relevant to "health-tracking" wearables, and following the recent WCH Better Way Today on Toxic Nanotechnology, I found this article, almost a year old, by Prof. David Hughes, which explains the implications of this invasive surveillance technology. A term new to my ears has been coined – electromagnetic warfare. The explanations in this article make sense to me. Whilst the video by Sabrina Wallace is scary, I like the way Prof. Hughes ends the article with optimism. Through fostering my personal sovereignty, I, for one, will do all I can to be un-hackable. I hope you will too.



Watch now

# Sabrina Wallace, the Global Information Grid, and Electromagnetic Warfare

Biodigital Convergence, "Healthcare," Human Bodies as Nodes on a Control Grid, Surveillance, Bio-cyber Interfaces, Intrabody Communication, "Security," the GIG, Network-centric Warfare, and Eugenics

DAVID A. HUGHES

JUL 1



READ IN APP ↗

Many thanks to Sabrina Wallace for engaging with my research and finding synergies with her own in the video above.

Wallace and I appear to have certain things in common:

1. the belief that a nefarious agenda is being followed to hook human bodies up to an external control network;
2. willingness to examine primary source material that otherwise hides in plain sight because people have been primed to look in the wrong places. Wallace seems particularly strong on IEEE documentation;
3. a sense of historical consciousness; and
4. condemnation of the professions that, through their cowardice and complicity, have helped to facilitate the building of a biodigital slavery system.


I was particularly interested in Wallace's discussion of literature that I had not previously encountered. I have now read the sources she cites, and the following remarks are largely based upon them.

## Biodigital Convergence

I have previously shown that the planning for the "IT/Bio/Nano" era — essentially, connecting human bodies to an external control network — goes at least as far back as the early 2000s in literature by NASA, the National

Science Foundation, the RAND Corporation, and other *non-healthcare-related* organisations (Hughes, 2024a, pp. 337-338).

In that context, it is interesting that Wallace shows the following diagram from the *International Electrotechnical Commission* (IEC):



Although the IEC claims that this is about managing biodigital convergence responsibly to meet “global challenges,” the other way of looking at it is that the UN Sustainable Development Goals (2015) serve to camouflage and legitimise the central agenda of “biodigital convergence & bioengineering.” In this way, the overarching project announced in the early 2000s, with key milestones forecast for 2020, 2025, and 20230, remains on course.

A key technological breakthrough towards biodigital convergence came in 2010 when Charles Lieber and his colleagues invented nanowire transistors so small that they could “enter and probe cells without disrupting the intracellular machinery,” enabling “two-way communication with individual cells” (Shaw, 2011). Soon afterwards, enormous amounts of funding began flowing into graphene and neurotechnology research (Hughes, 2024a, pp. 338-342).

In 2018, Pentagon neuroscience adviser, James Giordano, characterised the brain as “the twenty-first-century battlescape,” claiming that it is possible to “put minimal sized electrodes in a network within a brain through only minimal intervention to be able to read and write into the brain function, in real time, remotely” (Giordano, 2018). Thus, the military dimension to biodigital convergence is undeniable. This has never fundamentally been about health.

## “Healthcare”

While developments in biodigital technology were accelerating towards weaponisation in the 2010s, the IT/Bio/Nano concept was repackaged for the public in terms of medicine and healthcare. For example, in 2012, “Medical Body Area Networks” (MBAN) were given the stamp of approval by the U.S. Federal Communications Commission (Harbert, 2012).

Ignoring the previous literature on biodigital convergence, Zafar et al. (2021) falsely claim that “the idea of integrating biological cells into the communication engineering perspective was first proposed by Akyildiz *et al.* [2015],” in the context of transmitting “vital physiological parameters” to a “remote healthcare provider.”

Akyildiz’s project “PANACEA: Internet of BioNanoThings for Early Detection and Mitigation of Infections” (2018) frames the “Internet of BioNanoThings” in terms of disease prevention. Ostensibly, it is about “a revolution in biomedical technologies” intended to “improve human health and quality of life” (Guler, 2018).

“The Internet of Medical Things,” according to Viziello et al. (2023), “will enable next generation healthcare by enhancing human abilities, supporting continuous body monitoring and restoring lost physiological functions due to serious impairments.” The misleading term “enhancement” is also common to the transhumanist literature (Johnson et al., 2024), and it disguises the weaponizable potential of the new technologies.

Evidence shown by Wallace indicates that the market value of the “Body Area Network” is gigantic: \$30.8 billion in 2022, forecast to rise 22.3% p.a. to \$229.8 billion in 2023. As with transhumanist technologies, there is massive investment. Akyildiz has made it big as a so-called “Megagrant Leader.”

## Human Bodies as Nodes on a Control Grid

Assuming, as I think Wallace and I do, that “healthcare” in this context is merely a smokescreen intended to conceal military measures and render transhumanist technologies more palatable to the public, it is interesting to ignore the medical and healthcare language in the relevant literature and to see what is left.

For example, the [IEEE Biomedical Circuits and Systems Conference](#), held in Toronto in October 2023, explored the following technologies: “Biosensor

Devices and Interface Circuits”; “Body Area/Sensor Networks”; “Innovative Circuits for [...] Biofeedback, Neuromodulation, and Closed-Loop Systems”; “Biotelemetry and Energy Harvesting/Scavenging Circuits and Systems”; and “Lab-on-Chip / BioMEMS / Point-of-Care Devices.” Applications based on those technologies include: “Artificial Intelligence of Things”; “Bio-signal Recording”; “Machine Learning”; “Genomics and Systems Biology”; “Human-Machine Interfaces”; and “Bioinformatics.” Shorn of the medical terminology, these concepts create the impression of human brains and bodies as mere nodes on a technocratic network, to be monitored and managed by A.I.

That, indeed, appears to be the plan. An IEEE paper, titled “Industrial Cyberphysical Systems: A Backbone of the Fourth Industrial Revolution,” claims that

Cyberphysical systems (CPSs) are perceived as the pivotal enabler for a new era of real-time Internet-based communication and collaboration among value-chain participants, e.g., devices, systems, organizations, and humans. (Colombo et al., 2017).

Here, humans must be connected to the control grid just like any other object; it has nothing to do with health.

The National Institute for Standards and Technology launched a “CPS [Cyber-Physical Systems] Public Working Group” in 2017 to advance interoperability between different elements and systems on the grid. More recently, there has been a strong drive, spearheaded by Tony Blair, to ensure “interoperability” in relation to so-called “vaccine passports.” Again, once the misleading reference to health is stripped out, all that remains is the image of human beings as nodes on a biodigital control network.

Wallace notes developments in “brain-to-brain” and “muscle-to-muscle” interfaces, whereby one person’s thought processes can directly control the bodily movements of someone else. Thus,

The intention from one subject (sender) is recognized using electroencephalography (EEG) based brain-computer interface (BCI), which is sent out to trigger transcranial magnetic stimulation (TMS) on the other subject (receiver) and induce hand motion. (Mashat et al., 2017)

Proof of concept for this was first established in 2011; the first brain-to-brain interface involving rodents was achieved in 2013; the first human-to-human

study took place in 2014; and the brains of multiple rats were connected bidirectionally in 2015 (Nam et al., 2021).


Whatever the alleged medical justification is for such research, it is no wonder that Klaus Schwab salivates over the prospect of “**direct communication between our brain and the digital world**” and **being able to read other people’s thoughts**. For if human brains can be hooked up to an external control network, then potential for direct neurological control knows no bounds.

## Surveillance

IEEE 802.15.6 (October 17, 2018) sets out the standards for a “wireless body area network (WBAN) — note that the earlier “medical” (in MBAN) has here been replaced by “wireless” (WBAN). The WBAN “connects independent nodes that are placed in the clothes, on the body or **under the skin** of a person” and “expands over the whole human body and the nodes are connected through a wireless communication channel.”

What then, did Yuval Harari (2020) mean when he referred, on March 20, 2020, to “**under the skin** surveillance,” recommending that government should “monitor people, and punish those who break the rules. Today, for the first time in human history, technology makes it possible to monitor everyone all the time”? Are WBANs primarily intended for healthcare purposes, or are they fundamentally about social control?

I have **previously referred** to smart phones as a “gateway drug” to surveillance technologies that will ultimately go inside the body. In that context, I was struck to see the smart phone (or tablet, laptop, or mini-computer) referred to as a “gateway device” by Zafar et al. (2021, Figure 3):



The accompanying description of this diagram is as follows: “a bio-chemical signal from inside the human body is converted into [an] electromagnetic signal via [a] bio cyber interface, and transmitted through Bluetooth or equivalent technology towards [a] server.”

Wallace draws attention to [Bioconductor](#), described by [Wikipedia](#) as “a free, open source and open development software project for the analysis and comprehension of genomic data generated by wet lab experiments in molecular biology.” Such experiments, she notes, may involve [microarrays](#), i.e. multiplex labs-on-a-chip whose purpose is to detect the simultaneous expression of thousands of biological interactions.

Putting these technologies together, we are potentially looking at a system for monitoring the population right down to the molecular/genomic level — an extension of the harvesting of health data from the population already underway since 2020 (Hughes, [2024b](#), pp. 30-32).

## Bio-Cyber Interfaces

One of the unresolved controversies of the “Covid-19” era relates to widespread claims that “vaccinated” people can emit Bluetooth signals (Hughes, [2024a](#), p. 246).

Admittedly, there are reasons for doubt, e.g. that a classified military technology would not be so easily detectable. Or, as a software engineer informs me, the mysterious hexadecimal signals that apparently increase in more populated areas may be coming from smart devices rather than human bodies.

Nevertheless, the literature cited by Wallace clearly indicates that the idea of using Bluetooth technology, or similar, to connect human bodies to the internet is by no means a fantasy.


For example, Zafar et al. (2021), whose “bio cyber interface” involves “Bluetooth or equivalent technology,” claim that “Bio-NanoThings” can form a nanonetwork whose performance can be improved via connection to “higher bandwidth external networks such as the Internet, say via 5G.” Moreover, such a network is “generally deployed” (a military term) in the human body “orally or through injection.”

In other words, not unlike Lieber’s syringe-injectable neural nets for rats (Hong et al., 2018, pp. 34–5), Zafar et al. (2021) are describing a syringe-injectable intra-body nanonetwork that is capable of interfacing with 5G. Moreover, that nanonetwork can be powered by the human body using “energy scavenging batteries called biofuel cells, which convert chemical energy into electrical energy through biocatalytic reactions.”


Lest anyone cry “conspiracy theory!,” this is from an IEEE paper. The only question is whether such technologies are still in development, or whether they existed years ago in classified form. Classified military technologies are years ahead of publicly available science and technology.

Another IEEE article explores potential mechanisms for interfacing between “nano- and micro-scale systems and Body Area Networks” (Kulakowski et al., 2020).

Culjak et al. (2020) propose a “high-data rate wireless communication interface (Wi-Fi, Bluetooth, 802.15.4)” between the body and the “local data aggregator,” as shown here:



Akyildiz’s PANACEA project (see Guler, 2018) involves BLE/NFC (Bluetooth Low Energy/Near Field Communication) technology to communicate from a “wearable hub” to the internet via a smart device:




Near Field Communication (NFC) technology would allow a “NFC tag similar to the RFID tag” to be read by a device no more than 20cm away, as with mobile payment apps (Zafar et al., 2021). Along similar lines, for over a decade in Sweden, microchips the size of a grain of rice have been injected under the skin near the thumb in the name of “convenience” (Savage, 2018). People are being conditioned into getting tagged like cattle, making it easy for the technocrats to manage the herd.

To connect anything to the internet, Wallace claims, “the first thing that happens is that you get a MAC ID,” and this includes peer-to-peer blockchain. The blockchain reference brings to mind Central Bank Digital Currencies, which are a centralised form of blockchain, whereby all “money” must be digital and tied reliably to human beings via a biometric ID system such as the AADHAR system trialled in India. Here, we are no longer dealing with “money” as a free means of exchange, but rather a totalitarian control system in which one’s ability to transact can be limited or switched off until the desired attitudes and behaviours are demonstrated. Of course, if all human beings were to transmit a unique identification signal to a ubiquitous system of area networks, there would no escape from such a system. Humans could then be trained like animals via cryptocurrency rewards for certain types of “body activity,” as per Microsoft patent [WO/2020/060606](#).

In sum, regardless of whether or not “vaccinated” people emit MAC addresses, there is a large amount of evidence indicating that the plan to connect human bodies to the internet is real. Exactly what technologies will be (have been?) used to achieve this is uncertain, but the intent is unmistakable.

## **Intra-Body Communication and Electromagnetic Warfare**

As Wallace demonstrates, a Google search reveals that “intra-body communication” (IBC) represents “a technology using the human body as a transmission medium for electrical signals.” Viziello et al. (2023) present a “taxonomy of intra-body communication technologies”:



This taxonomy offers a glimpse into how many ways there are of manipulating electrical signals within the human body.

As Wallace rightly notes, intra-body communication technologies must be seen in the context of the decades-long history of electromagnetic warfare (more commonly known as electronic warfare), which is defined by the U.S. Department of Defence as “any military action involving the use of electromagnetic and directed energy to control the electromagnetic spectrum or to attack the enemy.”

If, as I have argued elsewhere, humanity itself constitutes the enemy in the unfolding war for technocracy (Hughes, 2024a, Chapter 1), then it stands to reason that electromagnetic warfare will be deployed against the population.

**BAE Systems** defines electromagnetic warfare (EW) as “a military or intelligence operation” that may use *all* parts of the electromagnetic spectrum (EMS) — “radio waves, microwaves, millimetre waves, infrared, visible light, ultra violet light, x-rays, and gamma rays” — to achieve its objectives. As with the above taxonomy of intra-body communication technologies (Viziello et al., 2023), this provides a flavour of the sheer variety of EW methods available. In the context of *Omniwar* (Hughes, 2024a, p.. 25-27), it is reasonable to assume that all such methods will be used.

Wallace points out that not only is electromagnetic warfare six decades old — the Soviet Woodpecker operation beginning on July 4, 1976, being the

obvious example (Bearden, 1991, p. 13) — but that biosensors date back to the 1960s, the phased array technologies being used to connect smart devices to 5G can be traced back to the PAVE PAWS system in 1980, and Body Area Networks have been worked on since 1995. Yet, according to Wallace, no one wants to talk about this history. Presumably, doing so would make it obvious that what is being sold to the public in terms of healthcare, faster streaming, increased convenience, etc., is in fact a weapons system.

## “Security”

Those working on the “Internet of BioNano Things” do not see a weapons system, however. They only see “potential security and privacy implications” should the Wireless Body Area Network get hacked (Zafar et al., 2021). For example, if a “malicious intruder” were to modify a patient’s healthcare data through the WBAN, then the patient could receive a false diagnosis of disease or miss out on a needed diagnosis (Jang et al., 2011). Victims’ personal (bodily) information could be stolen, or they could be harmed remotely through “malevolent programming of bio-electronic devices and intra-body nanonetworks” (Zafar et al., 2021).

Yet, while researchers charge headlong into handsomely funded IoBNT projects, “minimum published literature” exists in the field of bio-cyber interface security (Zafar et al., 2021).

As with all things transhumanist, the risks and potential harms of the new technologies being recommended and developed are never adequately addressed. Needless to say, a WBAN attack could prove fatal.

In the context of an electromagnetic weapons system, possibilities are opened up for remote control assassination, allowing dissidents to be quickly and efficiently eliminated in a way that is targeted, asymmetrical, and traceless (cf. Hughes, 2024a, pp. 350-352).

Remote control torture is another possibility. It is one thing to work on “intra-body communications for nervous system applications” (Viziello et al., 2023), but in the wrong hands, such technologies could be used to deliver shock (a core component of mind control programmes [Hughes, 2024a, Chapter 2]) remotely.

In 2019, United Nations Special Rapporteur on Torture, Nils Melzer, received numerous reports of electronic torture and forms of torture involving “medical

implants, and, conceivably nano or neurotechnological devices” (Phelan, 2020). This was before “Covid-19.”

I did not mention targeted individuals in my book, but the unexpectedly large volume of correspondence I have received from them is enough to convince me that the TI phenomenon is real. If so, this would be consistent with a long-established military *modus operandi* of testing out new weapons on innocent civilians (Hughes, 2024b, pp. 74-77).

In the context of electromagnetic warfare, “security” measures such as the use of a wearable to keep the WBAN within 15cm of the skin (Das et al., 2019) appear risible. For if even Pentagon servers can, like the Pentagon Twitter account, be hacked, then no network is safe, especially given that the internet itself originates as a military invention intended for counter-revolutionary purposes (Hughes, 2024a, pp. 333-334).

Given that human beings are, furthermore, regarded as “hackable animals” by those in charge, and that NATO’s “cognitive warfare” doctrine is about “hacking the individual,” allowing the brain to be “programmed” (van Hamelen, 2022), there is every cause for alarm.

## The Global Information Grid and Network-Centric Warfare

Wallace draws attention to the Global Information Grid (GIG), which is operated by the United States Strategic Command (USSTRATCOM) and provides the necessary technical framework for network-centric warfare.

According to a 1998 U.S. Navy report, “network-centric warfare” represents an “emergent warfighting capability” that “places information networks at the center of our warfighting” and is aimed at improved situational awareness, faster speed of command, and more precise manoeuvre warfare.

The GIG constitutes a “system of systems,” integrating sensor systems, command and control centres, and weapons platforms. The US Department of Defence seeks to “plug every device into it — every vehicle, every system, every drone — to form one all-encompassing net” (Ballard, 2014).

Organisations such as Sensor Open Systems Architecture (SOSA) work to ensure interoperability between the various components.


Drone warfare is one example of network-centric warfare. It is heavily information-driven, with algorithms being used to help in the identification,

location, and assassination of targets. Furthermore, drones help to build the network, with their on-board internet routers using spare bandwidth to help route GIG traffic. In this way,

The drones do not exist as separate entities called in to finish the job. The drones are nodes on the network. They are a part of the network. The network is the weapon. (Ballard, 2014)

Returning to my earlier remarks about human brains and bodies appearing as nodes on a biodigital network, to be monitored and managed by A.I., the direction of travel seems clear. The network itself will determine who gets to live and who dies. The kill decision will be taken by A.I.

“If your body is a node on the network, and the network is what does the killing,” Wallace argues, then turning off 5G towers will not save you. This is because “the network” is, in fact, a network of networks. The Body Area Network, with the intra-body nanonetwork within it, is nested within **multiple higher-level area networks**, including Personal, Local, Campus, Metropolitan, Radio, and Wide:



Thus, when we consider **Boris Johnson's image** of “smart cities pullulat[ing] with sensors, all joined together by the internet of things, bollards communing invisibly with lampposts,” etc., not to mention projects such as Elon Musk's Starlink, Amazon's Project Kuiper, and OneWeb all vying to provide internet coverage to all parts of the world from low earth orbit, we begin to get a sense of how complex, and inescapable, the network is becoming. Disabling one part of the network, such as 5G, will not stop the rest of the network from functioning.

Worse, because human beings are themselves inherently electromagnetic — Wallace refers to the “biofield” as a “body part” — there is no way of tuning out from bioelectronic signals warfare. Much like drones, she claims, “Your body *is* the network [...] The infrastructure is you, your body. The infrastructure is not a computer.” For reasons that are unclear to me, Wallace links the BAN to DNA, claiming that the only way of escaping the signal is to “turn off your DNA.”

## Eugenics

Adding to the horror of what “biodigital convergence” really means, Zafar et al. (2021) calmly explain that

There are two types of Nanodevices, electronic nanodevice, and biological nanodevice. Electronic nanodevices use novel nanotechnology materials like Carbon Nano Tubes (CNT) and Graphene Nano Ribbons for device construction. Biological nanodevices are built using the tools from nanotechnology and synthetic biology.

There has been much speculation regarding the possible presence of carbon nanotubes and graphene nanoribbons, as well as synthetic biology, in the “Covid-19” injectables (see Hughes, 2022a, 2022b).

Regardless, we are looking here at an open admission that the “Internet of Bio-Nano Things” does not merely involve smuggling nanodevices into the human body from outside. Rather, it additionally involves reprogramming human biology, thus “enabling engineers to effectively use biological cells as programmable substrates to realize Bio-Nano Things (biological embedded computing devices)” (Zafar et al., 2021).

As Wallace observes, we are fundamentally dealing with eugenics: “The people who run these systems run them for forms of human husbandry and complete control.” The human herd is to be cultivated through changes to its biology. Consent is not required given that the whole point is the creation of a biodigital slavery system.

Biodigital nanodevices, Zafar et al. (2021) explain, can be “fabricated” either by “reprogramming biological materials” (cells, viruses, bacteria, etc.) or by artificially synthesizing biomolecules such as liposome, nanosphere, nanocapsule, micelle, dendrimer, and fullerene. Alternatively, hybrid nanodevices can be produced through a combination of these two methods.

In other words, human bodies are to be turned into factories for producing non-human (and likely toxic) materials. This is in keeping with a [2017 Moderna patent](#) which claims that mRNA can “direct the body’s cellular machinery to produce nearly any protein of interest, from native proteins to antibodies and other entirely novel protein constructs.” One wonders, in the context of “Covid-19,” whether the “spike protein” narrative provided cover for something else being produced by the so-called “mRNA vaccines.”

According to Moderna CEO, Stéphane Bancel, “mRNA is like software” (cited in [Garde, 2017](#)). Moderna’s Chief Medical Officer, Tal Zaks ([n.d.](#)), claimed in a TEDx talk that “we are actually hacking the software of life.” This resembles Harari’s ([2017](#)) claim that “we are learning [...] how to hack humans, how to engineer them, how to manufacture them.” Moderna describes its “Covid-19 vaccine” as “[an operating system on a computer.](#)” All of this is consistent with the Global Information Grid and turning human bodies into nodes in a network-centric-warfare model.

President Biden’s Executive Order of September 12, 2022, calls for the development of “genetic engineering technologies and techniques to be able to write circuitry for cells and predictably program biology in the same way in which we write software and program computers [...]” (White House, [2022](#)). Much as the NSA, in conjunction with Big Tech, managed to gain backdoor access to virtually all computers, the aim now seems to be to gain remote access to human bodies.

According to Policy Horizons Canada ([2020](#), p. 10), “The idea of biology as having predictable and digitally manageable characteristics may become increasingly common.” Transhumanist eugenics blurs the line between “what is considered natural or organic and what is digital, engineered, or synthetic,” prompting us to “redefine what we consider human or natural” (Policy Horizons Canada, [2020](#), p. 5). The existence of *homo sapiens* itself is, thus, under threat from transhumanist efforts to reduce human beings to cyborgs belonging to the A.I. hive mind.

## Conclusion

Wallace’s work offers terrifying insight into a decades-long project to use electromagnetic warfare to control the population. Especially when seen in the context of the Global Information Grid, network-centric-warfare, and the overarching goal of achieving global technocracy, her work makes clear how

invisible EMF weaponry could enable the few to achieve total control over the many.

Given the bleak picture that Wallace paints, is there any reason for hope? She herself is on my [roll call of Christian dissidents](#), and finds hope and strength through Jesus. But is there any reason for hope in this mundane realm?

Perhaps I need to understand her work in greater depth, but I am not persuaded by claims that “Engineers are already logging into you and watching your neurons in real time” or that “You’re connected to the internet — straight up, straight on. Somebody has a remote for you, and they’re not going to give it up.” The evidence Wallace cites, troubling as it is, does not seem to me to substantiate such claims.

If it were true that the “bioelectrical divisions” had already hacked everyone’s “bioelectric code,” then it would already be game over. What need would there be to inject as many people as possible with so-called “mRNA vaccines,” or for Executive Orders permitting technologies capable of writing circuitry for cells? Why has the network, which is itself the weapon, not already begun exterminating opponents of technocracy in large numbers?

Is it just that the network is not yet at a sufficiently advanced stage of implementation (in which case, there is still time to stop it)? Or could it be that hooking the bodies of entire populations up to the control grid is an insuperable task, not just technologically, but also politically, as global resistance to technocratic totalitarianism, eugenics, and biodigital slavery mounts with every passing hour?

I would like to think that by rendering the invisible weapons system visible, as Wallace has done, there is still time to stop it.

---

 SHARE

---

 LIKE

 COMMENT

 RESTACK

---

Originally posted on



**David A. Hughes**

David A. Hughes

Subscribe

## "Covid-19," Psychological Operations, and the War for Technocracy

---

© 2025 Dr Tess Lawrie, MBBCh, PhD  
EbMCsquared, First Floor, Laura Place, Bath, Somerset, BA2 4BL  
[Unsubscribe](#)

[Get the app](#)

 [Start writing](#)