IA The *Landnahme* Project

Danielle do Nascimento Rezera

Federal University of São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil

Agenor Bevilacqua Sobrinho

University of São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil

Abstract

Socioeconomic expropriations (Landnahme) have a direct impact on democracy and the processes of struggle of the working class, precisely because they impose a certain common sense and normalization of social relations, which, according to Marx and Engels, act in the "taking" of social consciousness. In this line, we seek to discuss the uses (abuses) of AI as a technology that has been employed to serve primarily the interests of proprietary companies and their corporate customers, the effects of this movement in the world of work, increasingly less regulated, and also the formation of a more commodified and surveilled sociability (surveillance capitalism). In education, the effects are also complex and require us to look at how we can encourage students to be autonomous in the face of the current technology model, which is paralyzing them. How can we stimulate students' creativity and criticality in the interactive use of machines? We believe that the possible misuse of AI should be limited by its ethical and responsible use, democratizing access to its decision-making processes.

Keywords: *Landnahme, Artificial Intelligence, Law, Culture, Education*

Introduction

When we problematize the current educational design, based on the perspective of artificial intelligence, we are faced with the need to think about the logic of knowledge and its socio-historical character. According to Jandric and Hayes (2019), neoliberal rationality has been reorganized based on a data governance approach with an emphasis on optimization technologies and the formation of subjects inserted in a set of bureaucratic practices that the authors call "deep" neoliberalism that, through the dynamics of digital media, act in the conformation of subjects as political entities and in their human subjectivity. Jandric (2022) expands on this question by analyzing work as an abstract social structure that expresses the commodification of subjects in the current neoliberalist era, i.e. educational training has been an instrument of an expanded conception of the expropriation of collective identities and the expropriation of work. We focus on the educational context increasingly guided by "innovation" and creativity, which drive disputes in the context of contemporary capitalism and inequalities and expropriations.

We know that information technologies and the range of innovations in the sector appear in an Awkwardness (*Entfremdung*) to the general public, although artificial intelligence systems have been developed in recent decades, still raise questions about their capabilities.

The configuration of computational models focused on interaction has been known since the 1950s (Alan Turing Test). Years later, Joseph Weizenbaum, a scientist at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), creates Eliza, a chatbot capable of discussing various issues with humans. The alienating reaction the process aroused made Weizenbaum rethink human performance and interaction with artificial intelligence. Understanding the moral and ethical dangers of the process, the researcher undertook a broad discussion about the

uses of these technological forms in the dehumanizing formation and social conformation.

Chomsky (2023) argues that critical, creative, inventive and analytical complexity of humans are not replaceable by AI chatbots such as OpenAI's ChatGPT and Microsoft's Bing AI. In fact, AI exists by means of already constituted and available data, but it does not have in itself autonomous cognitive evolution, such as humans.

Harrison, from Futurism (2023), raises a series of studies on the real potentialities of AI, demarcating the data that feed and feedback the training of the machine are not concatenated to the notion of reality, they are self-consumed through generative AI and synthetic data that train the next generation of the system, as an autocryptonite that compromises the quality of the data produced and information. Be aware that this model is found in Big tech companies such as Google, Facebook, Apple, Microsoft, Samsung, Teslas and Amazon, which have detected in this field the potential for astronomical profits that can be exploited without ethical restrictions, and restraint, or, depending on the power groups that finance such ventures, which simply disregard limits and safeguards that would protect society. It should be noted that such companies also concentrate software, applications and various platforms that serve as structures for other technological and commercial development agencies. That is, they narrow paths of market expansion possibilities for alternative networks to the dominant project, concentrate a market of information, informational and communicational resources and subsidize forms of control, surveillance, performance and consumption. (Zuboff, 2010; Klein, 2021; Torbert, 2021). Companies and platforms collect mega-data from billions of people, and these have no awareness or concern about the consequences of neglecting to transmit sensitive data, which fuels surveillance capitalism (Zuboff, 2019). That is why attention to the composition

of forces in this topic is much more important than focusing on the autonomous domain of AI.

According to Buchanan et al (1976), Weizenbaum was also concerned with the public's passive acceptance of technologists' definitions of social problems and their subsequent technological solutions. In addition, he asserted about a kind of fragmented vision of the human being, since computers would never fully understand people's problems, given the empathic inability and understanding of the complexity of human experiences. Weizenbaum raised questions as to whether there are actually beneficiaries in technological progress when society is removed from its discussion, and action on the subject and extends the criticism towards the sense of economic impacts, armed conflicts. Moreover, and highlightings another form of alienation (*Entäusserung*), resulting from the pernicious uses of Information Technology. He was referring to the impacts on human self-image and dignity, that when exposed through interaction with technology and its purported announcement of progress. In this sense, the question is turned to the question of what progress and for whom?

Thinking: here's the question

The question for some may seem somewhat obvious these days, while others may claim that the technology Weizenbaum was referring to is no longer the same, given the extraordinary advances in form and human-machine interaction. However, we do not consider either unequivocal or outdated the inquiry in the face of the technologies that we currently have. The issue is not a peaceful point because the analytical-critical capacity on the subject, unfortunately, does not reach the level of rationalization of this scope when society becomes indifferent to its quality of life, dignity and human condition; when ideologically — through the use of various alienating communication technologies and the degree of socio-economic-cultural expropriations in other spheres of life and

sociability — the individual becomes more self-referring and less attentive to the collective.

Often, especially in an obliterated society that understands knowledge and freedom as a way of speaking without foundation, in a space that universalizes the expression of banalities, which can turn into real risks to the democratic world. According to Umberto Eco (apud Wolf, 2021), internet freedom has provided a space for imbeciles to express themselves. For him, society is subjected to the emptying of critical capacity, mainly in the open environment of the internet, in which discourses can become manipulative, conformist and uncritical tools, aimed at the sociability of consumption.

Thus, the attention to which we must devote is on the uses of said innovative tools and the social, political and cultural impacts, that is, on the diffusion and concentration capacity of a given language, of a conception of the world increasingly controlled by the dominant capitalist hegemony and its anti-democratizing structures. After all, the place of the subject of law in the capitalist system, as well as the very notion of law, citizenship and the state, is the place of maintaining capitalism and the notion of humanity (Pachukanis, 2017). To be aware of the "participatory" movement of society is to have an understanding of the structures that foster "the places" to which we are molded and subordinated.

One of these structures is precisely language as a resource for the diffusion of a given reality and conformation. From the Gramscian perspective, language is part of a political-cultural communication process that is disseminated through discourses that are integrated into historical reality and the mentality that sustains objective and subjective issues (Dias, 2012). Gramsci (1975), in *Prison Notebooks*, focuses on the understanding of language as a form that interrelates with culture and philosophy, forming what the author calls "conception of the

world" which all men participate in a dialectical way, since there are several conceptions of the world that have in language the expression in dispute. In the case of AI, access to various conceptions of the world is apparently easier, which does not mean that the directions via the algorithms promote such access equally. That is, the hegemonic conception of the world has in informational spaces a range of linguistic and language structures used at its service and intent and that has the promotion of algorithms aimed at its wide dissemination and propagation.

From the above, we see that critical discussions about interaction in the digital environment are more delineated in the understanding of a much more complex reality. In contemporary times, that is, the debate about the human condition in the face of the hegemonic conduct of the ruling and dominant classes, increasingly concentrated and voracious, and that do not dispense with articulating a given verve educating and shaping society. As Gramsci already asserted, when his contributions on intellectuals. In this sense, thinking and building elements of a sociability that fosters the *status quo* is an essential axis in the dispute over the autonomization of knowledge.

The discussion undertaken here is about the expropriation of the capacities of human development and its political-historical-cultural and economic relations, which affect relations that act on consensus (in a Gramscian sense), promoting the commodification of subjects, since, through AI, the intellectual function in the process of formation of society gains airs of total control over narratives and worldviews. The figure of the contradictory, of the articulator of a rationalization about what is presented, is hidden or does not exist.

This, for example, occurs in the gamification of knowledge, in online classes in which the figure of the teacher/avatar that follows the curriculum, the interaction is mediated by the knowledge accumulated by that artificial

intelligence and the degree of technological investment that was employed in it. The figure that counter-argues the content, the curriculum and the forms of knowledge presented, does not exist.

This is our main concern in the context of AI as a training resource, especially when other forms of uncritical sociability and recreation of "convenient" realities are fostered when AI is used to replace the human in the communication of culture, which is education.

This is what we can see in Brazil, in a Volkswagen advertisement that used the image of Elis Regina, an important deceased singer, recreated via AI and who sings an anthem against the Brazilian civil-military dictatorship (1964-1985), the song entitled "Como nossos pais". However, the song is cut in the points of criticism, sterilizing its political-social forcefulness. This commercial generated controversy, for those who knew the singer and her political positions critical of the capitalist, conservative and violent Brazilian system, there was the understanding that the singer would never participate in a Volkswagen commercial, since, when alive, in 1979, Elis used the same song as a protest against this company, in which funds were raised for the employees' strike while criticizing the company's collusion with the Brazilian civil-military dictatorship of the aforementioned period.

What Volkswagen did in the alluded commercial, in addition to being evaluated by surveillance agencies in advertisements as unethical, also induces the erasure of criticism, the silencing of the artist's critical intellectual function. In short, it was the recreation of a distorted image that not only forcibly sustains the artist's consent to the company, but conforms art to the mere function of entertainment, in the sense in which Gramsci (2017) discusses, entertainment without art and without good sense. That is, in the case of the trivialization that underlies distorted uses of AI, reproductivity and expropriations, as denounced in the

animated film The Futurist Congress (2013), directed by Ari Folman. In the film, we see that the assignment of the use of images of actors for reproduction *ad eternum* in Film Productions aims to amplify social alienation.

The curtailment of the contradictory and the formation of a given consciousness are part of the function of intellectuals as a key foundation in the processes of subordination (Gramsci, 1975), which by Eco's criticism, we see the tendency of people asshole. And this is a strictly human problem that needs to be criticized both at the heart of its structure and within the scope of the deleterious uses we make of technology, which focus on reinforcing social subordination.

Therefore, when we think of AI as the supreme sum of technological reality as innovation, human substitution and the overcoming of humanity as capable of producing knowledge and rationalizing it, we are simplifying the concrete reality that shows us that AI serves as a new structure of capitalism and neoliberalism in the sense of shaping a given worldview. Among so many expropriations that humanity has experienced, this is assimilated to an even more reactionary wave about the domination and control of bodies and minds in a more complex productive system and even more impudent as to the technological domain and the financial capital that it has added to it.

This domain is expressed by the relationship established over the last decades regarding social participation and the sociability model articulated as valid when embedded in digital networks and platforms. A clearly undemocratic situation regarding the participatory and organizational right of society (Mcluhan, 2008; McChesney, 2013). Not with regard to the organizational possibilities in its various aspects, but with regard to what we conceive as the right to non-participation in this control system or the right to our network structure, which scholars such as Srivanan (2019) conceive as the right to

expand networks of knowledge, culture and participation, which are severely curtailed by the centralizing model of big techs.

Landnahme and law

Srivanan (2019) understands that the new technological revolution is being part of a new form of social asymmetry, further the researcher stating that such a revolution is not global and even less so cross-cultural, but in fact, "it is primarily produced and shaped by powerful corporations and institutions from Europe and North America, with various collaborators across the world" (Srinavan, 2019, p.1)

Furthermore, from Srinavan's perspective, the technologies developed and made available by commercial platforms tend to concentrate on a narrow given worldview and influence on the priority of investments, strategic products aimed at maintaining this market itself, and the appropriation of representative and decision-making spaces in the public sphere. This is in addition to and the delineation of culture, common sense and language.

The author's criticism is not about technology and its innovations, but more so the criticism is focused on the instrumentalization and concentration of this market in neoliberalism's harmful agenda for society. One of the arguments lies precisely in the exclusionary system regarding the decision-making and regulatory aspects of networks and companies that have digital control of society. That is, aimed at the subordination of subjects, participatory exclusion and a passivation, which is why Gramsci characterized the process of bourgeois transformation as a "passive revolution". Of course, what we are dealing with here are not the communicative and problem-solving possibilities of which such systems are capable. of, such as advances in medical areas, agriculture and other relevant technologies that could enable better political and social participation.

What matters is control over data, the right to free access to free and open-source software.

The problem is that, because its base is concentrated, the entire flow of information and access to services passes through the control and monetization of corporations that are focused on further narrowing differences and widening inequalities. Life expressed in values and assumptions defined by a market that aims to homogenize social relations.

Srinavan points out that despite a multiplicity of websites, organizations and debates about the information system as outlined, in fact, this occurs in a shallow way, because the conception of such platforms already raises a democratic rupture because the relations of use and supply are supported in the determinations of these organizations, and not in reality, needs and decision-making participation on the uses in each reality of the vast world that today is dependent on these instruments. The author questions about the supposed freedom of communication, sold as a new form of revolution of thought and plurality of ideas, when in fact there is a refined strategy of social control that limits or seeks means to limit freedom and access to networks.

In addition to control over alternative forms of network, forms that effectively seek a plural awareness of reality and substantial non-commercial exchanges for problem solving, as well as new forms of more accessible, participatory and complex technologies in the sense of not homogenizing or imposing a given standardization of thinking, behaviors and "places".

This is a difficult task, since the process of concentration of power and influence of business structures focused on digital development has in its hands, together with the hegemonically dominant groups, the sense of "dehumanizing" (Jandric, 2022). That is, removing characteristics that make human beings diverse, for their cultural wealth, for their social values, for their language, but

also control the linguistic diversity, culture and biodiversity that are swallowed up in the processes of expropriations typically aimed at conformation and restriction to knowledge, dehumanizing and homogenizing feelings, tastes and values, this system ends up commodifying individuals.

The question is to act both in the objective and subjective context expropriating from the constitution of the subjects the possibility of recognizing reality and social and economic meanings, reasoned thinking, the recognition of themselves, which for Gramsci (1967) represents one of the capacities of culture as "organization, discipline of one's own inner self, it is taking possession of one's own personality, it is conquest of higher consciousness by which one can understand one's own historical value, one's own function in life, one's own rights and one's own duties".

Srinavan argues that as this process is outlined, it is likely that in our technobiological future we will lose the right to knowledge about ourselves.

The model imposed by large corporations in the technology sector restricts the participation of the poorest, but promotes solutions to address the poverty established and fostered by various forms of expropriation.

In the Manifesto of the Communist Manifesto Party, Marx and Engels demonstrated the global character of capitalism, its necessary expansion and reproduction, the widespread exchange and dependence of nations on each other (Marx and Engels, 1987). They also demonstrated the importance of the struggle for human dignity, which is always in dispute, because the bourgeois mentality:

> he made personal dignity a simple exchange value, replaced the many hard-won freedoms with a single unscrupulous freedom: that of trade... with open, direct, shameless and brutal exploitation. (... he made the medium, the jurist, the priest, the

poet, the sage his hired servants...) reduced family relations to mere monetary
relations (Marx and Engels, 1987, p. 42).

In this process, the phagocytosis of social relations is from the inside out and from the outside in. The same occurs with the needs and particularities of regions dependent on the dominant hegemony, capitalism feeds on a process in constant renewal of social insecurities, with the advent of neoliberalism in its various phases and processes that we see that, in order to remain in development, as such it is necessary to radicalize *Landnahme* processes (Luxemburg, 1970; Marx, 1984). For these thinkers, this process aims to accelerate and deepen known asymmetries, in addition to new increments for the impossibility of social mobilities to guarantee and expand the extraction of surplus value required in each block of financial capitalism, is what we see in the way in which AI is applied.

Reinforced, the frenetic movements of the artillery of brokerage desks decimate in moments fragile economies and devoid of means to face the speculative attacks coordinated by the interests of megacorporations, whose coercive state support — application of laws and protective safeguards from political, environmental, socioeconomic devastation, etc. — gives cover for mitigating and/or suppressing historical achievements of workers, under the pretext of satisfying the "natural" rules of the economy (acquiescing to "progress"; imperialism: hybrid wars, neocolonial looting, "ethnic cleansing"); of "social evolution" (social Darwinism) and the endless chatter of lawyers/lobbyists presented as "experts" to "teach" the virtues of "inevitable" assent to draconian measures to clean up, with public money, the serious crises provoked by their own private sponsors.

The aim is to minimize and/or paralyze the enemy trenches of capital, and open space for regressions to landscapes predominant in the nineteenth century, devoid of social mattresses and ironically exhibited as modernizing procedures

to free ourselves from the "rancid past", which directs us to the ruin offered by neoliberalism, to which "developed" and underdeveloped societies are subject, each with its degree of exposure to exploitation.

Even if not in the same dimension, but in continuous dismantling the welfare state (DÖRRE, 2010, p. 50), signals that there are no territorial spaces exempt from the disaggregating effects of *Landnahme* (violent expropriation of livelihoods: 1. expansion of capitalist methods of production internally and externally; 2. always politically controlled processes), whose principle of competitiveness (anti-solidarity) presides over social organization and meets the needs of capital expansion (DÖRRE, 2010), and therefore removes the aura of impregnable fortifications of "advanced" countries, which would have supposedly permanently overcome "delays" in which the underdeveloped find themselves imprisoned and without horizons to free themselves.

Resorting to the dictates of finance capital, the transition from a society pacified by Fordist methods to a more strongly polarized class society takes place in Central European countries, in which secondary exploitation and the precariousness of labor advance and face domesticated/dormant unions. Since they understood themselves as participants in the division of power and, unaccustomed to clashes by the numbness of illusory class collaboration, are disarmed/disjointed to deal with the avalanche of deregulations demanded by the capitalist system and obtained by big business.

Dismissed by the mouthpieces of capital as a matter of the past, class theories are reborn in the old world and question social inequalities and the restoration of the economic power of the upper classes. Issues considered solved are answered and forms of organization and political intervention are rethought and renewed in order to counter the sharp turnstile to weaken political and social rights and even amputate them, as the rise of the extreme right in several

countries, in particular with the concrete experience of Bolsonaro in Brazil, has corroborated.

With the support of big techs and the bias of their algorithms, the most retrograde political camps have infested social networks and traditional media with narratives full of fake news and distortions to give space and support to "experts" (the *Tuis*, ideologists criticized by Brecht

[1]) commissioned to "naturalize" expropriations in order to institutionalize them as if they were a divine gift, thus complying with the interests of the logic of financial capitalism.

We are living a new process of psychophysical conformation of the worker. This is the most evident response of the ideology of big tech development and its expropriating and commodifying verve of labor relations, which necessarily, in its vast majority, will have the overcoming of human activity in mechanisms of autonomization. Even if multilateral agencies such as Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), understand the benefits of AI in terms of the quality of jobs, the heavy lifting and the ability to mediate and regulate companies and nations that use AI, the ways in which these tools are introduced into the process that is outlined already affects social, labor and so on.

It happens that, under the claim of "technological advances", capital, to extend its profit margins more intensely, assails aggressive attacks against workers, launching strategies to deconstruct protective labor laws on a global scale, taking advantage of the organizational vulnerabilities of local political and social agents and often financing and promoting "color revolutions" and "days in defense of democracy", followed by measures elaborated and commanded by financial capital: privatizations in the basin of souls and other subalternizations.

We understand that one of the faces of expropriations in the sense alluded to by Luxemburg (1970) is outlined by Pachukanis (2017), when he discusses law as an alienating and non-mediating form, since the sense of formation and development of the legal area is conceived by a privatist genesis. In Pachukanis, law is the coercive entity of capital and through it there is the regulation of social relations, to some extent under a legal character, which distorts the notion of law as something universal, which for the Russian theorist aims to legitimize an order that presents itself as homogeneous, natural, neutral and entirely legal (legalistic), but in truth it is a superficial and formal construction of relations that give meaning to marginalization and inequalities.

Pachukanis (2017) unveils law as part of the coercive movement of the state in the protection of the capitalist economy (profit, income, etc.), the notion of property, defended and protected by law.

The staging of "bourgeois democracy", when put in check, quickly shows who the state serves, when we see recently the clashes over the regulation of networks, for example, in the Brazilian case, we feel the arguments of Pachukanis in practice, that is, for the theoretical:

The state as a force factor in both domestic and foreign policy was the correction that the bourgeoisie was forced to make in its theory and practice of the 'rule of law'. The more bourgeois domination is threatened, the more compromising these corrections will prove and the faster the 'rule of law' will become an incorporeal shadow, until, finally, the exceptional aggravation of the class struggle forces the bourgeoisie to completely put aside the mask of the rule of law and reveal the essence of power as the organized violence of one class over the others (Pachukanis, 2017, p. 168).

If the mask falls and indicates the face of justice and its eyes wide open to the need to preserve its genesis, what is also revealed is the acuteness of the dispute and exacerbated violence for the maintenance of a given order.

We know that in Gramsci (1975) the right is the way to apply the conforming and civilizing verve of the state. That is, law is a means, or an instrument of a given societal sense of a certain project of the ruling class. This project is legitimized by law, because it is presented, as we saw in Pachukanis, as general, so the assumption about it is of impartiality, of collective will. This gives the right, according to Gramsci (1975), a function of ideological dimension that by norms and values consolidates the exercise of hegemony of the ruling class and also the "educating" exercise to which the state strongly focuses. In this sense, the right presents the moralizing function, by punishment, imposition of norms and conformation.

But, evidently, as an instrument that is part of a relationship and forces of political society and civil society, law is also the object of dispute of the subaltern classes that manifest themselves regarding this direct domain that makes up the integral state. So the law, in the perspective of the Sardinian thinker, has several functions that concretely represent the amalgam of consensus in the social spheres of the political field and in the field of civil society, because it carries in itself the alleged preservation of the collective will that is initially constituted in the body of the APHs (private hegemony apparatuses) or of the political state as singular-private and, by law, there is the conversion to the universal interest as a process of construction of the forms of social participation and disputes.

The devaluation of human labor by the advancement of technologies is part of a process of curtailing real human potential in the context of social

transformations. That is, the cooptation of spaces of action of society to limit social dispute.

Landnahme in progress, AI And Education

In the educational scenario, the disparities in the relationship of forces between the subaltern class and the ruling and dominant class have been accentuated by the intervention of hegemonic private apparatuses in the decision-making context of school work, made explicit in the context of public education policies. And with unequal access to and use of information technologies and artificial intelligence in the sector, there is a further increase in forms of educational expropriation. Evangelista (2020), in his analysis of the network of private apparatuses of hegemony, points out that Brazil is an immense laboratory of educational practices based on the ideas disseminated by the World Bank and implemented by UNESCO.

This movement is fundamental for us to understand that education is the common core of those who make up the tangled movement of interventions by private entities in the debate on educational law, merit and productive control in the sector, the school world has expanded an education focused on the project of "development of underdevelopment" (Ouriques, 2013, p. 17 apud Rezera and Lopes, 2021), that is, the expanded capitalization of the inequalities that manifest themselves in the school context and which this school model deliberately forms.

And here we are discussing the educational context in its general sense, and extended to teacher training in order to stimulate the configuration of new sociability of the working class (Fontes, 2017). This per say, is, long doomed to a logic that Evangelista (2017) defines as faces of *teaching tragedy*, categories that affect or are results of teacher precariousness,

which has seen the intensification of instrumentalization of its activity and that induces it to cooperate for the maintenance of exclusionary historical determinations and a fragmented conception of the world.

The *teaching tragedy* is constituted by the extensive internalization of the dictates of capital and the hegemonic conception of the world guided by actions in the field of educational policies. Costa (2017) believes that the deterioration of teacher autonomy in public schools and privatization within public education is the expression of subjectivity, in the neoliberal context expropriation is not a specified element, expropriation is included in rationality and individual and collective expression that internalizes the dictates of capital.

That is, a project of conformation and expropriation designed to alienate, reify social relations and their access to knowledge, political and decision-making participation. The school and the political function of its actors can promote, through the non-reproductivist critical vision, the awareness of the problems, limitations and expectations of school work based on the dialectical character that makes explicit the contradictory of historical articulations and their conditioning factors. Breaking with the possibility of this educational model or this class model is a premise of educational actuality, which through the use of information technologies has the market new possibilities to conform education more acutely to its interests.

We repeat here that the uses of these resources and who controls them is the fundamental element of criticism, according to Alex Beard (2020), in an article for The Guardian on the limits of AI in the educational context. The limits discussed are about the human capacity to follow the alleged learning and performance opportunity outlined and propagated by startups linked to the sector. Then, issues such as metrification and monitoring of learning and cognition, that is, the ability to monitor learning levels, which

classify in an even more pernicious way the relationship of meritocratic culture, this time focused on cognitive metrification aligned with what the educational market defines as valid and validated knowledge in exclusion systems, which can instrumentalize plural formative processes.

Another consideration on the issue is the unlimited access to the life and personalities of individuals, hypervigilance, behavioral control, data collection of students and teachers, such as, for example, the recent complaint of installation without consent of an application of the State Department of Education of São Paulo in private devices of teachers and students of that network, who had their data exposed to developers and Google. These issues are indicated as the main coercive instruments in the generation of new knowledge, readings of the world and strong control of human actions regarding the social organization of contesting verve.

The indication that startups come to contribute to overcoming educational deficiencies and inequities, raises the question about efficiency and learning opportunities. This is the case of ChapGPT and its "ease" of production and interaction with knowledge already stored in a network, where the neural effort of the human being is irrelevant, the most complex issues of human capacity are relegated to a supposed superiority of machines, which we have already discussed about the difference between human potentiality and that of machines.

ChatGPT only reveals the Society of Laziness, not the one that Lafargue discusses as the Right to Laziness, but perhaps something that approaches or mixes with Byung-Chul Han's The Burnout Society, and manifests itself in a society that has an aversion to knowledge in its critical form, an issue that was built by an ideology of ignorance, with the rise of the extreme right and the right in the world; an ode to the absence of knowledge and the hedonic attachment that shaped a considerable part of today's sociability

was formed. After all, from the scenario that unfolds in the context of education via AI, it is clear that the education that manifests itself is by the centralizing verve and little or nothing democratic, often unethical and even totalitarian (Zuboff, 2019).

The trend of the use of high-tech educational supports has broad debates about the potential of pluralization of access and diversification of learning technology, which would guarantee an educational function in which the student can integrate in a more playful way and thus experience more advanced cognitive stimuli. Gramsci in his time reveals, in letters to Giulia (2011), that the stimulus to inventiveness through new technologies (in this case, the Meccano that he commissioned to his little son) was important for the cognitive, mathematical and development of abstractions and rationalizations about the world. However, the Sardinian thinker scores on the interpretation and logic of use of the technological element. It indicates a fundamental condition that is interaction and rationalization about it. It provides elements for the criticism of teacher training and the need for these professionals to be sufficiently capable of stimulating knowledge, active presence in complex training, which is one of the most acute elements of dispute in the current training process and the working conditions of educators.

This is discussed in the *Prison Letters* as in the *Prison Notebooks*. In the first one we can highlight the opacity to mathematical knowledge that the author refers to in his formative path, where he understands that he loses the emotion for this area of knowledge precisely because "I had masters who were not worth more than a dry fig" (Gramsci, 2011, p. 158). We agree with what the author asserts about the importance of his basic training that guaranteed him the overcoming of the differences that fragmented education produces. In the *Prison Notebooks*, among the

numerous references and debates on education, Gramsci, in Q. 12, when dealing with the unitary school, discusses the necessary role of the teacher in the creative act, of close accompaniment to the student in order to subsidize him to complex, integral knowledge, also deals with the condition for this educator to be able to exercise this posture.

In this sense, we return to the question of the importance of social interaction, of the school, between educators and students, between students and the various social means of learning, that is, to participate socially in their reality. Important question, as it brings the student closer to the understanding and contradictions of the world in which he lives. That is, it allows an expanded and more complex rationalization, which occurs when the scientific society is called to debate about the possibilities and perniciousness of educational choices, for example. This is what happened with the minister of Education of Sweden, Lotta Edholm, who upon receiving the plan for the digitalization of education decided to open a public consultation with 58 research institutions in the educational field and, from the results presented, the Swedish government assessed that its students would be heading for functional illiteracy.

Lotta Edholm, for the studies developed to date, argues that there is little science that supports responsible and complex cognitive development in digital teaching. The minister sees a negative interference in the educational development of the child through the platformization of knowledge, especially since the uses of digital tools can only reach a significant level of competence if first society invests in learning and its varied forms of cognitive, social, critical development. Lotta Edholm took into account the studies and criticisms on the issue and decided to dismantle the digitization strategy proposed by the Swedish National Education Agency, since she considers such an issue misguided and argues

that the Swedish state will not abandon its relationship of approximation with technological forms and learning on this topic, "but the school should be a school, where knowledge should be the focus, and not serve as a kind of subcontractor for some other goal" (Edholm apud Dagens Nyheter, 2023, no page).

On these objectives that make education accessory in the process, we have the contributions of Beard (2020) and Yi-Ling Liu (2019) that address artificial intelligence in the educational field. Both give predominance of analysis to the Chinese context, and indicate that like the rest of the Western market, the sector moves by billionaire investments, monopolies that outline the curriculum, the sense and the formations in education. Beard (2020) that the manifest proposal to train a new type of worker capable of acting in the field of innovation has gained much preponderance in contrast to complex training. Yi-Ling Liu (2019) understands that forms of practical application of the education system via AI deal with the increasing performance of private institutes interested in standardization and service to an increasingly elitized market, which is that of technology and new forms of work or exclusion from work. What are the meanings of an educational model that privileges a formation focused on life in society and the critical action on it? For Yi-Ling Liu (2019, no page), "the advent of AI in education may not address the imminent threat of job losses, but it may exacerbate the deepening digital divide and corresponding economic inequality". As stated by Fontes (2018A&b), labor relations in the capitalist system are themselves relations of expropriation and are based on the subordination of the working class. For the author, the forms of expropriation are manifested in social, political and ideological contradictions, which are dynamized according to the intensity of the configuration that forms capital-imperialism and internal counter-tensions,

which materialize through the narrowing of the horizons of human intelligence and the imposition of the commodification of life in which existence only occurs if commodified.

The latest UNESCO report from the Global Education Monitoring Agency technology in education: a tool at the service of whom? (2023), indicates that solid and impartial evidence of the impact of educational technology is scarce and the studies that indicate the positive evidence come from the very companies they want to sell; technology can be a salvation for the education of millions, but it excludes many more people, especially in a world with intense inequalities and poverty; some educational technologies can improve some types of learning in some contexts, which does not necessarily mean the use in advanced technologies; the rapid pace of change in technology has put pressure on systems to adapt, which causes insecurity about training and concrete assessment capacity; online content has increased without sufficient regulation of quality control or diversity; digital content is produced by dominant groups, which affects who accesses it and represents the expanded anti-democratic aspect in the sector; technology is bought immediately and without looking at long-term costs.

The report shows us that we cannot simplify the reading of the uses of these resources as mere mediators of the learning or knowledge process, there is a relationship of much deeper expropriations that focus on alienation and estrangement in the even more unequal relationship in the current context of capitalism and the education sector.

This becomes more complex if we imagine this scenario with the rupture of ethical and democratic social and educational aspects. In the case presented by Yi-Ling Liu, there is the analysis of a pilot project organized by the company SenseTime, and the author questions the ethical limits of schools to teach students in the context of new AI technologies, with high

reinforcement for psychophysical conformations, indicating a context of intense social control and censorship, especially when society (in the process of achieving productivist logic and ensuring socially idealized behavior on success and power) endorses a training curriculum that is guided by the collection and analysis of individual data, metrification of performance as a commodity of private companies, in addition to their performance in instructional design, content and application, training of students and teachers.

We can, from Zuboff (2019), think of this movement in a logic of direction to what the author outlines as surveillance capitalism, which monitors internet users, their histories and ways of transiting the network for the mathematized prediction of behaviors entangled and shaped according to the interests of commercial sponsors in conjunction with big techs, whose technological devices are programmed to capture and direct emotions and impulses of "consumers" to meet the financiers of the hypervigilance control apparatus.

The question that remains is about the training capacity of the working class to keep up with the scenarios of intense changes in the world of work, in economic and social relations. To what extent, even if the entire educational society has access to training via AI, does this process actually promote the right of access to training? In concrete terms, the working class will have access to what ideas and educational meanings?

It seems to us that AI is much more programmed to shape and homogenize human behavior, robotizing us in order to separate us from ourselves as those capable of recreating another dimension of the world.

The fact is worrying in the sense that much is alluded to the educational potentials proposed by the great technological innovations, which base a

distorted worldview and distanced from the analytical totality, and in which there is a strong appeal to the illusion of the rupture of differences and expansion of opportunities.

Cathy Davidson (2017) discusses this theme in order to understand that the educational system via advanced information technologies is the trend that is already in the process of full implementation. The author understands that the rapid changes around society generate in the social body a kind of tension and a disconcerting relationship with the complex world, where individuals are lost and alienated. The voracity for innovation and change transforms not only the world of interpersonal and work relationships and their interactions in a network or outside it. Davidson argues that it is essential to think about learning and educational action based on precepts and relationships with more technological forms of knowledge, however, she states that this model is only effectively viable if there is a displacement of the educational sense, where the student must be surrounded by an educational proposal of an active and participatory nature in which they can develop skills that allow them to circulate in the world in flux, in the world of professional uncertainties and future insecurity.

It seems to us that the author, despite being concerned about the deleterious trends of training through new information technologies, such as the reproduction of the same education by new instruments, is also concerned about a renewal of methodological order. It highlights his concern with disruption and also with the denial of technology as a form of renewal of teaching-learning forms. His understanding is that learning by such resources should promote a critical education, which raises in the student the understanding that the world is uncertain, and he needs to be prepared in order to live in a society in constant ruptures, contradictions and insecurity. That is, in an unbalanced society, in which having a career or

profession tends to mean nothing in the concrete life of individuals; in addition, the author understands that this traditional school, with fragmented training, serves to reinforce the *status quo*.

Preparing to act in this unstable world, for the author, means investing in technologies and their uses in supporting an expansive, reflective, critical, technological and creative education. This would be the scenario of a new type of education that brings the student closer to reality and the deconstruction of paradigms. However, when we analyze more acutely, we see that the contradiction resides in the author's discourse, when referring to the possibility of facing adversities in the world of work and the reality in which the culpability of individuals becomes even more amplified. Do you need resources to prepare you for the worst-case scenario? And it is only up to this creative, critical and composed being of good enough skills to deal with the movements of insecurity?

It is immensely contradictory to think of a critical education to adapt to the harsh reality of the capitalist system, even more surreal to think that there are spaces for education of complex bias for the mass working class, in an industry that is guided by the reinforcement of inequalities and the market of poortology, as described by historian Virginia Fontes.

Technology companies focused on the educational market, Edtech, according to Urwin (2017), are in various fronts of service to the educational sector, such as educational technology platforms, e-books and game-based learning applications. In addition, the edtech industry expects to reach around US$ 348.41 billion by 2030. This market has grown exponentially, for example, in the educational games and knowledge gamification industry. According to data from Metaari Group (2019), this market is driven by the growth of the game-based learning segment, already serving 122 countries and expected to quadruple its growth

between 2019-2024. And this is only possible thanks to massive investments in research on virtual reality, artificial intelligence and neurosciences. That is, a market that feeds and feeds back and controls from school management, administrative management and student services; the improvement of learning experiences; teacher training; ease of access to knowledge and training; employee performance tracking and metrification; personalization and learning management. Through edtechs, a range of platforms offers diverse services that subsidize the maintenance and reproduction of a system that is dynamic, but that produces differences and severe impositions on training and discussion about education and work in education.

What differs from the initial proposals and opportunities of the internet, as stated by McChesney (2013), about the initiative of John Perry Barlow in promoting an anti-system internet, which McChesney claims to have been a utopian vision of the internet space in the world, in which it would enable the initial steps towards an era of democracy, Open Culture and social participation. This debate is still essential and even more urgent with the corporate domain of the internet, producing a discussion that increasingly shows concern with the democratizing possibilities of this space. In this sense, the author indicates that the struggle for open media is a form of articulation that will subsidize a collective dispute of political movements in the construction of democratic alternatives in opposition to neoliberalism.

Thus, it is important, as McChesney (2013) argues, to focus on a dialectical reading of the internet and the Democratic sense built on it in neoliberal logic. The internet is not an impartial, neutral and plural zone, it can present itself as such, but it is part of a complex political, social and commercial economy. The internet is a conflict zone that expresses new,

more sophisticated forms of exploitation of the working class. The most deleterious elements for McChesney are in the policy of total control that the internet concentrated in monopolies promotes. In this way, the implication on the uses and abuses of what is generically processed as "democracy". For Auerbach and Clark (2016), this total control is imbricated with a hyper-commercialization that aims to limit alternative discussions, critically engaged journalism. For the authors, monopoly capital turns to the privatization of public goods, and they understand innovation as profit, which aims to exacerbate "pre-existing inequalities, creating ever-widening gaps between classes and social groups. Meanwhile, a select group of large monopolistic companies have become gatekeepers of information" (Auerbach and Clark, 2016, no page).

In the context of information quality, we have to consider a war of narratives and a disruption and attacks on science and knowledge. Speeches that we follow massively in more conservative political regimes, which was the Brazilian case in the context of the governments Michel Temer (2016-2017) and Jair Bolsonaro (2018-2022). In this process, we see the platforming of information and education, a series of companies focused on the reverberation of fake news and biased information.

Naomi Klein, in 2020, brought to light that these groups in line with large corporations exploited during the pandemic the capacity to use networks and platforms while victims accumulated in innumerable graves. For Klein, what happened was a living laboratory for a permanent — and highly profitable-future without physical contact (KLEIN, 2020, no page). Rezera and Bevilacqua (2020) indicate that it is the fundamental moment that inaugurates the expansion in stratospheric dimensions of asymmetric information networks, where a "market" is evident that is supposed to be superior and imposes ideology on any other form of social ordering, and

with the far-right government, networks without commitment with qualitative formation have thickened and grown with state capital.

According to Rezera and Bevilacqua (2020), through the resource of distance learning and other modalities to face the unusual situation of the pandemic, there was an expansion of social inequalities. Participation could not take place under the same conditions, given the structural inequalities that allow the precariousness of the services offered, which were only beneficial to digital education corporations, mainly by private institutions recognized as committed to concentrating decisions in the sector through lobbies and networks of influences on public expectations, such as foundations linked to financial and technological corporations. According to the authors, class entities and these groups concentrated decisions on the regulation of activities in the technology and education sector, excluding the academic community and other significant organizations that discuss public education in Brazil about remote teaching with technologies (Rezera and Bevilacqua).

Rezera and D'alexandre (2020), in research on the impact of the introduction of Edtechs and training platforms in teaching during the Covid-19 pandemic, understand that they occurred in intense inequalities in access and quality of safe monitoring of such instruments. For the authors, such tools, in addition to not being in line with the real needs of students and the structural and psycho-emotional issues that surround them, also subject them to a pseudo-promotion of digital skills, the intensification and preponderance of tools with political and ideological uses in the educational field. They exemplify that the pro-government Bolsonaro networks and platforms were prominent in offering content. In their article, the researchers raise, through Audi and Zambarda (2020), that a company called IP.TV was responsible for the use of the application used by more

than 7.7 million students in the country. They highlight that such a company acted despite not being known in the field, used its network of influence and dynamized precarious supply of transmission, sharing and registration of users, in addition to the spread of fake news.

But in addition to fake news, the authors give substantial importance to the anti-political character that educational uses via platforming produce. In this sense, the issue is expressed in the fragmentation of knowledge, in access to it and deliberation on it; in the lack of interlocutors who dialogue with the contradictions presented and the personal and social conflicts to which students are exposed; naturalization of differences and meritocratic and metrified performance on knowledge. And concretely acts in the formation of subjectivity focused on neoliberal designs.

Final remarks

How to encourage students to perform their school tasks instead of delegating robots to perform them and, at the limit, stop acting like humans and start behaving like passive/inert beings? These are questions that we asked ourselves at the beginning of this article and whose answer we have outlined in the course of it. We understand that awareness of reality and the strategies of domination and direction of society is one of the crucial elements and that is why it is what is in dispute. Consciousness is the value that provides the ability to overcome this conforming scenario, obviously that by itself does not resonate in substantial and collective changes, so the dispute for collective consciousness and the curtailment of the democratization of information and knowledge has gained strength in the networks that control with iron hands the market of information technologies together with the integral State, which shapes public policies

that give meaning to the projects and programs of the dominant bourgeoisie, guaranteeing its hegemony. In this way, the non-passivation of students, the stimulation of complex and rationalized tasks by the exercise of the didactics of effort, which Gramsci refers to as one of the emancipatory exercises that education in its broad sense is capable of, that is, not only school, but also other educational spaces. And this is a fundamental element, the school and its human and structural resources are addicted to commodifying and expropriating behavior, but as long as there are humans in the process of interlocution between knowledge and society, there are spaces for contestation and dispute that opposes the dominant ideology and that values more plural conceptions of the world, capable of subsidizing the good sense instead of common sense.

As a corollary, society must be aware of the manipulative and exclusionary mechanisms present in the grabbing of large sectors of life by neoliberal ideology and the instrumentalization of AI to meet private designs and averse to the interests of the vast majority.

Notes

[1] Prostitutes of opinion, the Tuis: Tellec-Ual-Ins are paid to deceive the population and make them accept unacceptable life restrictions, not caring about contradictions and absurdities of their falsifying discourses (Brecht, 1993).

References

Auerbach. D., & Clark, B. (2016): *The Internet and Monopoly Capitalism*. Monthly Review.

Beard, A. (2020): Can computers ever replace the classroom? *The guardian* 2020-03-19. Available at: https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2020/mar/19/can-computers-ever-replace-the-classroom (Accessed: 06 July 2023).

Brecht, B. (1993): Turandot ou o congresso das lavadeiras. In: Brecht, B. *Teatro Completo*. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, v. 10, pp. 106-190.

Buchanan, B. C., & Lederberg, J. & McCarthy, J. (1976): Three Reviews of J. Weizenbaum's Computer Power and Human Reason. Stanford University, Computer Science Department. Available at: https://apps.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a044713.pdf (Accessed: 08 July 2023).

Chomsky, N. (2023): The False Promise of ChatGPT. *The New York Times*. 2023-03-08. Available at: https://www.nytimes.com/2023/03/08/opinion/noam-chomsky-chatgpt-ai.html (Accessed: 12 March 2023).

Costa, E. O. (2017): *Subjetividade, fetiche ou feitiço: escola pública e o capitalismo neoliberal. Subjetividade e formação humana em tempos de reestruturação do capitalismo* / organizador Roberto Arruda. Rio de Janeiro: UERJ, LPP.

Dagens Nyheter (2023): Regeringen river upp Skolverkets plan för digitalisering i skolan. *Dagens Nyheter.* 2023-05-14. Available at: Sweden**.** https://www.dn.se/sverige/regeringen-river-upp-skolverkets-plan-for-digitalisering-i-skilan/ (Accessed: 12 June 2023).

Davidson, C. (2017): *The New Education: How to Revolutionize the University to Prepare Students for a World in Flux*. New York: Basic Books.

Dias, E. (et al) (1996): *O outro Gramsci.* São Paulo: Xamã.

Dörre, K. (2020): Capitalismo de risco. Landnahme, crise bifurcada, pandemia: chance para uma revolução sustentável? *In Revista Sociedade e Estado* – Volume 35, Número 3, Setembro/Dezembro 2020, pp. 7-52.

Dörre, K. (2010): Social Classes in the Process of Capitalist Landnahme. On the Relevance of Secondary Exploitation. *In Socialist Studies* / Études Socialistes 6(2) Fall 2010: pp. 43-74.

Evangelista, O. (2017): Faces da tragédia docente no Brasil. In: XI Seminário Internacional da Red Estrado, 2017, México DF. Anais do XI seminario internacional de la Red Estrado. México-DF: *Red Estrado*, 2017. v. 1. pp. 1-21. Available at: https://redeestrado.org/xi_seminario/pdfs/eixo3/68.pdf (Accessed: 16 July 2022).

Fontes, V. (2017): Capitalismo em tempos de uberização: do emprego ao trabalho. Marx e o Marxismo - *Revista do NIEP-Marx*, [S.l.], v. 5, n. 8, pp. 45-67.

Fontes, V. (2018a): "A transformação dos meios de existência em capital – expropriações, mercado e propriedade", in: Boschetti, Ivanete (Org). *Expropriação e direitos no capitalismo*. São Paulo, Cortez Editora, pp. 17-61.

Fontes, V. (2018b): "Expropiaciones contemporaneas", in: BRINGEL, B., & Brasil Jr., A. (coord). *Antologia del pensamiento critico brasileño contemporáneo*. Buenos Aires: CLACSO.

Fontes, V. (2021): Entre tubarões e sardinhas: a docência no rastro da precarização do trabalho e da vida. In: *Dizeres educacionais, interculturalidade e meio ambiente: conferências e palestras do Fórum Internacional de Pedagogia*, edição Salamanca, 14 a 16 de outubro de 2020. 2. ed. Organizadores: Alexandre Martins Joca, Racquel Valério Martins. Cajazeiras: AINPGP.

Gramsci, A. (1971): *Scritti politici* - Editori Riuniti. A cura di: Paolo Spriano.

Gramsci, A. (1975): *Quaderni del Carcere*. Edizione crittica dell'Istituto Gramsci, a cura di Valentino Gerratana. Torino: Einaudi.

Gramsci, A. (2011): *Cartas do cárcere. Antologia.* Estaleiro Editora Galiza.

Gramsci, A. (2017): *Il teatro lancia bombe nei cervelli.* Mimesis Edizioni. A cura di: Fabio Francione.

Harrison, M. (2023): AI Loses Its Mind After Being Trained on AI-Generated Data. 12 jul 2023. Available at: https://futurism.com/ai-trained-ai-generated-data (Accessed: 14 July 2023).

Jandrić, P. (2022). *Postdigital Marxism*. In Encyclopaedia of Marxism and Education (pp. 552-567). Brill.

Jandrić, P.; Hayes, S. (2019) Who drives the drivers? Technology as the ideology of global educational reform / *The Wiley Handbook of Global Educational Reform.* New York (NY): John Wiley & Sons str. 307-322 . doi: 10.1002/9781119082316.ch15

Klein, N. (2020): Coronavírus pode construir uma distopia tecnológica. *Intercept*, [Rio de Janeiro], 13 mai. 2020. Available at: https://www.intercept.com.br/2020/05/13/coronavirus-governador-nova-york-bilionarios-vigilancia/ (Accessed: 02 July 2023).

Liu, Yi-Ling (2019): China's AI Dreams Aren't for Everyone. Available at: https://foreignpolicy.com/2019/08/13/china-artificial-intelligence-dreams-arent-for-everyone-data-privacy-economic-inequality/ (Accessed: 04 July 2023).

Luxemburgo, R. (1970): *A acumulação do capital. Estudo sobre a interpretação econômica do imperialismo.* Tradução de Moniz Bandeira. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar.

Marx, K. (1983): O processo global da produção capitalista. *In O Capital: crítica da economia política*. Tradução de Regis Barbosa e Flávio R. Khote. São Paulo: Abril Cultural, V. 3, t. 1 e 2.

Marx, K. (1984): A assim chamada acumulação primitiva. *In O Capital: crítica da economia política.* Tradução de Regis Barbosa e Flávio R. Khote. São Paulo: Abril Cultural, V. 1, t. 2, pp. 261-294.

Metaari (2019): The 2019-2024 Global Game-based Learning Market Serious Games Industry in Boom Phase Analysis by: *Sam S. Adkins Published.* by the Serious Play Conference Metaari's 2019-2024 Global Game-based Learning Market.

McChesney, R. W. (2013): *Digital Disconnect: How Capitalism Is Turning the Internet against Democracy.* New York: New Press.

McLuhan. H. *Comunicação, Mídia e Consumo*, vol. 5, n. 14, ESPM, São Paulo, 2008, pp. 123-148.

Pachukanis, E. B. (2017): *Teoria geral do direito e marxismo*. Tradução Paula Vaz de Almeida; revisão técnica Alysson Leandro Mascaro, Pedro Davoglio. 1. ed. São Paulo: Boitempo.

Torbert, P. (2021): 'Because It Is Wrong: An Essay on the Immorality and Illegality of the Online Service Contracts of Google and Facebook' no Case Western Reserve Journal of Law, Technology & the Internet.

Rezera, D. N., & Bevilacqua Sobrinho, A. (2021): Enfrentando distopias contemporâneas: por uma disputa contra-hegemônica. *PerCursos*, 21(47), 004 - 030. Available at: https://doi.org/10.5965/1984724621472020004 (Accessed: 14 July 2023).

Rezera, D. N., & D'Alexandre, R. (2021): A educação de crianças e jovens durante a pandemia da Covid-19. 'Tem alguém aí, ou vamos apenas cumprir tarefas?' *Saber & Educar*, 29.

Rezera, D. N., & Lopes, W. (2021): A questão do Estado e os prismas da pedagogia histórico-crítica na transição do capitalismo para o socialismo/comunismo, in *Germinal: marxismo e educação em debate*, 13(3), pp. 259–274. doi: 10.9771/gmed.v13i3.44984.

Srinivasan, R. (2022): *A new social contract for technology*. P&I.

Unesco (2023): Relatório de monitoramento global da educação - Resumo 2023 - A tecnologia na educação: Uma ferramenta a serviço de quem? Available

at: unesdoc.unesco.org/in/rest/annotationSVC/DownloadWatermarkedAttachment/attach_import_c752827f-0948-4d5a-92b8-15665943f957?_=386147por.pdf&to=35&from=1 (Accessed: 31 July 2023).

Urwin, R. (2017): *Artificial Intelligence. The Quest for the Ultimate Thinking Machine*, Arcturus P. L., London.

Wolf, E. (2021): Umberto Eco e a legião dos imbecis na internet. jul. de 2021. Available at: https://www.fronteiras.com/leia/exibir/umberto-eco-e-a-legiao-dos-imbecis-na-internet (Accessed: 10 July 2023).

Zuboff, S. (2019): *The age of surveillance capitalism: the fight for a human future at the new frontier of power.* New York: PublicAffairs.

Author and Correspondence Details

Danielle Rezera e Agenor Bevilacqua Sobrinho
Contact: daniellerezera@yahoo.com / ciafagulha@gmail.com

Author Details

Danielle do Nascimento Rezera

PhD in Education at the Federal University of São Paulo (UNIFESP). Master's Degree in Economic History from FFLCH _ University of São Paulo (USP) (2012). Degree in History and Pedagogy. She is a researcher at the Study and Research Group on Educational Policy and School Management (GEPPEGE / Unifesp); the Laboratory of Investigations in State, Power and Education (LIEPE / UFRRJ) and the Marxist Study Group (UFF- Rio das Ostras).

Agenor Bevilacqua Sobrinho

PhD in Performing Arts from CAC/ECA-USP. Philosopher, playwright and writer. He is the author of Atualidade/utilidade do trabalho de Brecht. Uma abordagem a partir do estudo de quatro personagens femininas [theater: theory and criticism], A Lente [adult theater], A Guerra de Yuan [literature: science fiction] and O Rato Pensador [children's theater] (in addition to several articles on critical art, theater, politics and sociology in specialized magazines. He is a researcher of the Grupo de Pesquisa "Estudos histórico-críticos e dialéticos de teatro estadunidense e brasileiro" (FFLCH- USP).