

Scientific articles

Cambiar el juego: de la inteligencia artificial a la inteligencia colectiva en el capitalismo comunicativo

Changing the game: from artificial intelligence to collective intelligence in communicative capitalism

Mudando o Jogo: Da Inteligência Artificial à Inteligência Coletiva no Capitalismo Comunicativo

Malvina Rodríguez

Universidad Nacional de Villa María, Argentina.

Directora de la Cátedra UNESCO “Comunicación pública para la justicia social, los derechos humanos y el desarrollo territorial”

merodriguez@unvm.edu.ar

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4165-4847>

Resumen

La inteligencia artificial (IA) se ha convertido en el centro de atención de los estudios contemporáneos de la comunicación, la educación y la cultura. Este ensayo propone que la comprensión de la IA, aún como metatecnología, metalenguaje y metacomunicación, requiere una operación epistemológica que descentralice el objeto y focalice en las características del sujeto, el capitalismo comunicativo, en el cual se enmarca la IA. Para ello, se presenta un análisis crítico-argumentativo que recupera la obra de cambio de siglo de la intelectual latinoamericana Mabel Piccini, generando una conversación con enfoques teóricos actuales sobre la IA, así como con las propuestas de UNESCO en relación con la ética de la IA y la gobernanza de plataformas digitales. La finalidad es visibilizar las desigualdades y formas de discriminación asociadas a la IA y los entornos sociodigitales con el propósito de construir una nueva pedagogía de la comunicación que, mediante la



participación genuina de los pueblos, promueva una inteligencia colectiva y creativa en relación al desarrollo de la IA en América Latina.

Palabras clave: Inteligencia artificial, Comunicación, Epistemología, Capitalismo

Abstract

Artificial intelligence (AI) has become a central focus in contemporary studies of communication, education, and culture. This essay proposes that the understanding of AI, including as metatechnology, metalanguage and metacommunication, requires an epistemological operation to decentralise the object and focus on the characteristics of the subject, communicative capitalism, in which AI is framed. For this purpose, this essay presents a critical-argumentative analysis that revisits the turn-of-the-century work of Latin American intellectual Mabel Piccini, generating a conversation with current theoretical approaches to AI, as well as with UNESCO's proposals in relation to the ethics of AI and the governance of digital platforms. The aim is to make visible the inequalities and forms of discrimination associated with AI and socio-digital environments in order to build a new pedagogy of communication that, through genuine public participation, promotes collective and creative intelligence in relation to the development of AI in Latin America.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Communication, Epistemology, Capitalism

Resumo

A inteligência artificial (IA) se tornou o foco dos estudos contemporâneos em comunicação, educação e cultura. Este ensaio propõe que compreender a IA, mesmo como metatecnologia, metalinguagem e metacomunicação, requer uma operação epistemológica que descentralize o objeto e se concentre nas características do sujeito, o capitalismo comunicativo, no qual a IA é enquadrada. Para tanto, apresentamos uma análise crítico-argumentativa que examina o trabalho da intelectual latino-americana Mabel Piccini na virada do século, iniciando uma conversa com as abordagens teóricas atuais sobre IA, bem como com as propostas da UNESCO sobre ética da IA e governança de plataformas digitais. O objetivo é destacar as desigualdades e formas de discriminação



associadas à IA e aos ambientes sociodigitais. O objetivo é construir uma nova pedagogia da comunicação que, por meio da participação genuína da comunidade, promova a inteligência coletiva e criativa em relação ao desenvolvimento da IA na América Latina.

Palavras chave: Inteligência Artificial, Comunicação, Epistemologia, Capitalismo

By way of introduction: Why is it necessary to decentralize AI?

The rise of artificial intelligence seems to extinguish previous forms of communication, namely, social, mass, and collective communication. Artificial intelligence (AI) as a metatechnology, or in the plural, AI as metatechnologies, as Costa et al. (2023) propose, also becomes a metalanguage: all known words, recognized concepts in science and academia, the media, and cultural mediations converge and dissolve. However, we must still ask ourselves whether this centrality is legitimate or, rather, whether it is not possible to carry out a critical reflection on the causal relationships that tend to dominate in science, as undertaken by the Latin American intellectual Mabel Piccini in relation to the field of study of communication sciences at the end of the last century.

This operation of decentralizing the object, artificial intelligence, toward the consideration of the subject, the power relations discursively and materially constructed by communicative capitalism, should pave the way for understanding a multidimensional phenomenon that seems to be fading amidst the vertiginous transformations of technology, reaching an unthinkable contradiction: the naturalization of the domain of artificialization in everyday practices. In other words: don't we, with our attention to the influence (causality) of AI in communication, education, and culture, contribute to obscuring the intelligibility of ideological networks, and by extension, political and economic ones, of the forms that the order of communication has assumed in the 21st century?

This essay aims to recover, based on Piccini's thinking and Jodi Dean's (2005) conceptualization of communicative capitalism, marginalized but not marginal discussions, where the gender key is undoubtedly significant, on the forms of domination and control that imply the platformization of society, the expropriation of identity through the collection and manipulation of data and, finally, the symbolic and material organization of societies around the automation enabled by AI. Because, as Piccini states:



The knowledge that emerges from lived experience forms complex fabrics and intricate cultural networks whose substance is made of repetitions and memories, persistent signs of community exchange that ultimately constitute the very substance, the substrate, the lines of identity, of the official cultures in each particular society. (1989, p. 58)

This paper attempts to deconstruct, through critical-argumentative analysis, the methodological operation of granting epistemological centrality to artificial intelligence in the fields of education, communication and culture, taking as a basis for theoretical discussion the current perspectives on AI by authors such as Flavia Costa et al., Kate Crawford, Jodi Dean, Byun-Chul Han, Antoniette Ruvroy, Thomas Berns, Eric Sadin and Nick Srnicek, while for the epistemological discussion the following texts by Mabel Piccini are especially considered: the book *Introduction to the pedagogy of communication* (Piccini and Nethol, 2007), the chapter “Of policies and poetics: The order of communication” from the book *The image of the weaver. Languages and policies of communication* (Piccini, 1989) and the article “Artificial windows: The new spaces of seclusion” (Piccini, 2007).

The methodological strategy of this essay responds to the characteristics of critical-argumentative analysis, insofar as it is a qualitative research, in which, based on analytical categories constructed from a hermeneutic reading of the selected texts, arguments are evaluated, biases are identified, emerging questions are formulated and autonomous reflections are proposed in the format of an academic essay. The selection of texts responds to the need to review the discussions that began at the end of the 20th century on the transformations in the relationship between communication, technology and society and place them in dialogue with intellectual debates of the 21st century in the field of artificial intelligence. The work therefore focuses on some coincidences between classical and current contributions, which allows us to observe the state of the question as a climate of the time ¹. The goal is to highlight both the material inequalities linked to the digital divide and the symbolic discrimination associated with the naturalization of algorithmic biases, situations that exacerbate inequalities in access to the knowledge economy in regions such as Latin America. In this context, and as a contribution to the mobilization of collective intelligence,

¹ For further details on the different current approaches to AI, see Aminahuel, A. and Rodríguez, M. (2024a).



the debate on the ethics of artificial intelligence and the regulation of digital platforms is revived, primarily based on the recommendations developed by UNESCO.

By way of development: AI as a pretext for inequality, control and domination?

Communication doesn't die out, of course; it becomes a pretext. The prior text—culture—is the stage from which we can extend the waterlines and embark on a reflection on the historical production of reason and unreason: technological, political, symbolic, imaginary and imagery, meaning and letter. (Piccini , 1989, p. 14)

The reflection on the study of communication as a unit unnecessarily fractured from the other human and social sciences to produce knowledge that, by being “its own”, lacks a comprehensive understanding of the communication phenomenon as a human/social process that, in the words of the author: “is the first act of love that we undertake at birth and the last as life fades away” (Piccini , 1989, p. 13).

Now, what is happening with the evolution of information and communication technologies (ICT)? The so-called new technologies give rise in the 21st century to what Manuel Castells (1997) called the “information age” , which for Mabel Piccini and Ana María Nethol “(...) becomes the basis for supporting new hegemonies on a transnational scale and the field of maneuvers of gigantic corporations that strengthen, through cultural industries, their economic control around the world” (2007, p. 16).

According to Castells, the new dominant social structure of the information age is the "network society," the new economy is international/global, and the new culture is that of virtuality (1997, p. 370). This networked technological configuration is the foundation of what Jodi Dean calls "communicative capitalism," understood as a form of social organization where the market replaces politics, where the circulation of products and messages is presented as the fulfillment of people's aspirations, and where, through various fantasies (such as the illusion of participation through social networks), a true depoliticization



is produced, and with it, the elimination of antagonisms and the establishment of control (2005, p. 54-55).

The vertiginous development of technologies during these first decades of the 21st century opens the passage from the “era” to the “information regime,” as Byung-Chul Han calls it, a “form of domination in which information and its processing through algorithms and artificial intelligence decisively determine social, economic, and political processes” (Han, 2022, p. 9). This regime, like the Foucauldian universe of the discipline as a form of domination of industrial capitalism, implies control and exploitation, but not over bodies but over the data that those bodies provide. The digitalization of the world transforms democracy into infocracy and Habermasian communicative rationality into a digital rationality that, unlike the former, dispenses with discourse (Han, 2022) and, in agreement with Dean's (2005) argument, cancels the debate and antagonism that are inherent to democracy.

Recent works (Aminahuel and Rodríguez, 2024a; Costa et al., 2023; Crawford, 2022; Lafrance, 2024; Rouvroy and Berns, 2016; Sadin, 2023) analyze the intellectual debates surrounding artificial intelligence in relation to its origin, development, implications, and governance. In these studies, we find coincidences regarding the key transformation that artificial intelligence implies for the growth of capitalism in the era of online digital platforms, as it allows for the sophisticated development of forms of domination and control through more or less voluntary operations by people, who have no longer become just consumers but digital users. Rouvroy and Berns call this new era marked by the automation of processes and procedures for collecting and using personal data that allow us to anticipate and, eventually, model social behaviors “algorithmic governmentality” (2016, p. 96).

Kate Crawford (2022, p. 29) questions the very name (“it is neither artificial nor intelligent”), emphasizing the material dimensions (political, economic, and environmental) and inciting a reformulation of the questions of what and how to “for whom” AI is being optimized. In this sense, Jean-Paul Lafrance emphasizes that “we must not underestimate the human work behind the machine” (2024, p. 54) and Eric Sadin defines AI as a “techno-ideology” (2023, p. 70) that responds to the utilitarian interests of concentrated private capital. Flavia Costa (2022) also warns about the material – and unsustainable – infrastructure that characterizes internet and AI technologies.



With the development of technologies, Piccini and Nethol asserted, communications constitute "a new international power" (2007, p. 17). Can AI, as a metatechnology and metalanguage, also be understood as metacommunication? If so, the correlation and evolution of ICTs in AI as a "certificate of power" becomes transparent (Crawford, 2022, p. 29). Would AI thus become a pretext, in the double sense of excuse and pretext for new forms of inequality, control, and domination? If this were the case, AI would no longer be the focus of concerns but rather a subterfuge, a correlate, or a manifestation of a more complex problem, which is not new in its operations but in its modalities: communicative capitalism or, in Nick Srnicek's (2021) terms, platform capitalism, focused "on the extraction and use of a particular type of raw material: data" (p. 41) and where platforms are the "key business models for extracting and controlling data" (p. 49). Communicative capitalism, for its part, is presented as an idea of global interconnection, access, inclusion, expansion of debate and participation, when in reality "the accumulation of screens and spectacles undermines opportunity and political effectiveness for most of the world" (Dean, 2005, p. 55, own translation).

Already at the beginning of the 21st century, Piccini (2007) warned about the paradox of confinement in the supposed openness that, recovering Paul Virilio, screens mean as "artificial windows" of the "universe of remote communication and portable cultures" (p. 15), which far from enhancing the character of collective encounter that this new form of communication could enable, increases the individualism of communication consumption, which colonizes all spheres of life, from work to free time. In the Frankfurt tradition, we can say that privacy "dissolves... by the imperatives of a programmed consumption..." (Piccini and Nethol, 2007, p. 75). In the Foucauldian tradition, it is the individual himself who subjects his subjectivity to control: "the panopticon is the same subject subjected to the technological circuit that in the end becomes a hypnotic circuit of the screen and the pleasure that the image provides" (Piccini, 2007, p. 16).

Surveillance is presented as a condition of possibility for control that enables the extraction and use of data, for example, from biometric fingerprints (Costa, 2022), constituting what Shoshana Zuboff (2021) calls "surveillance capitalism" as a "new economic order that claims human experience as free raw material that can be used for a series of hidden commercial practices of extraction, prediction, and sales" (p. 9).



Consequently, just as it became necessary to question the centrality of the media in the study of mass, social or collective communication – Jesús Martín Barbero proposed to focus instead on “mediations” (1987) and Piccini, we could say, proposes to critically observe the fluctuations, migrations and constitution of discursive networks that embody the diverse politics and poetics of communication (1989) – we wonder if it would not now be necessary to decenter artificial intelligence as an object (causal, closed, delimited, totalizing) and study it, instead, in relation to the conditions of production of meanings implied by the new forms of capitalism. At this point, it is interesting to return to Andrea Fumagalli's (2010) proposal to understand the new bioeconomic system as “cognitive capitalism,” characterized by the production (immaterial or symbolic) of knowledge, which goes beyond all the material productions of this new accumulation model.

Changing the approach "requires, first of all, accepting a moving target, a place without a center" (Piccini, 1989, p. 59). The effort to decenter AI does not imply ignoring its current importance. On the contrary, it allows us to understand its implications within a broader historical process of communicative capitalism where the technological processes of platformization, digitalization, algorithmic governmentality, and automation are as fluctuating as their consequences (digital divide, inequalities in access and use, environmental impact of big data infrastructures, etc.) can be perennial.

And, consequently, to decentralize, as a fixed objective, the machinery of submission and the enclaves of material, moral and symbolic waste in order to perceive from new perspectives the uninterrupted flow of dominations and servitudes, the intricate circulations of messages and goods, of complicities, oppressive and political management of oppression in the different networks of the social body as well as those knowledges and meanings irreducible to normality in which lines, recurrent itineraries, sacred zones crash and undo each other. (Piccini, 1989, p. 59).

Decentering AI in the debate on AI implies tracing, then, the material and symbolic constitution of the capitalist system from which it arises and which it serves, as well as deconstructing (and in this process denaturalizing) the subjective forms of neoliberal individualism that convert people into users and social practices (in digital networks) into data that will allow the generation of consumption in the fantasy of participation materialized by technological fetishism (Dean, 2005).



How can we carry out these operations, which involve erecting an epistemological framework where AI, even as a metatechnology, metalanguage, and metacommunication, is nevertheless the epochal manifestation of a higher stage of technological capitalism? And, perhaps even more importantly, what kind of communication (and intelligence) should be fostered to eliminate the inequalities that this technological, digital, communicative capitalism is generating?

Returning to Piccini and Nethol, it can be stated that a meta-communicational perspective such as the one proposed “is not sufficient in terms of the process of acquiring new capabilities and increasing knowledge” (2007, p. 130).

As examples, we can observe the case of new forms of literacy. Media and information literacy (MIL) is used in relation to the skills demanded by AI in areas such as UNESCO (2020), as well as communication and, more recently, digital literacy, as complementary phases of basic literacy in order to promote sustainable practices in socio-digital environments and build responsible citizenships that, for example, contribute to combating disinformation and hate speech (Aminahuel and Rodríguez, 2023). MIL and its implementation undoubtedly demonstrate progress at the regional, national, and local levels, but they face structural challenges that are difficult to overcome: “(...) practically as in a dead end, MIL is conditioned by the same limitations it seeks to eradicate, that is, the economic, social, communication and digital gaps, intra and interstate, inter and subregional” (Aminahuel and Rodríguez, 2024a, p. 42)

These visions convey the need to build a communication pedagogy for the new century, which “would involve the production of group or institutional knowledge where the protagonists of this action tend to locate and clarify communicative problems based on the establishment of a process that has dialogical and participatory characteristics” (Piccini and Nethol, 2007, p. 140). No longer the illusion of participation, but the construction of a truly alternative communication, like Salvador Allende's cybernetic project in Chile (Medina, 2014), which sought emancipation and was truncated with his disappearance. Known as the Synco project, Chilean socialism's proposal for a revolutionary cybernetic project alluded to the possibilities of involving the people in the transversal development of technological procedures. That is, not in a centralized or vertical manner as in central countries where modernization implies the direct replacement of hierarchical operations by computers, but



rather horizontally, involving, for example, the people. to workers in the technological management processes of factories.

A current example to consider is the experience of the Decolonial Manifesto , developed by intellectuals from the Global South to build a new research agenda on AI (Krishnan et al., 2022). According to the Manifesto, AI is a renewed form of coloniality , whose epistemology connotes the domination of Western patriarchal thought. The proposal is to reverse this situation, not from the denial of technology, but from the construction of a decolonial governance of AI, focusing on the plurality of voices, the dignity of peoples, human rights and the active participation of women, diversities and indigenous peoples.

In Latin America, there are experiences of technology appropriation based on ancestral knowledge, the accumulated knowledge of alternative communication practices, and popular pedagogy proposals. A recent example is summarized in the UNESCO publication "Artificial Intelligence Centered on Indigenous Peoples: Perspectives from Latin America and the Caribbean" (2023). The work analyzes the implications of the responsible use of technology for the inclusion of Indigenous peoples, taking into account the digital divide, algorithmic biases, Indigenous data sovereignty, and Western cultural colonization through AI. From issues of infrastructure and connectivity to the preservation of Indigenous languages and knowledge, the text promotes strategies involving multiple stakeholders, including governments, technology companies, academia, international organizations, civil society, and Indigenous peoples' organizations, for the sustainable, democratic, and inclusive development of AI and associated technologies. An important factor to consider is the key contributions of ancestral knowledge to climate change issues, which could be addressed and disseminated through AI tools.

The proposal for a new pedagogy of digital communication, which includes the practice of AI, characterized by an alternative, transformative, and genuinely popular conception, requires a framework that fosters the critical and creative appropriation of artificial intelligence. This is where UNESCO's recommendations on AI ethics (2022) and digital platform governance (2023) become important. These recommendations, "far from being a naive perspective, already warn of the implications of concentrated platformization and the immediate consequences of unregulated artificial intelligence" (Aminahuel and Rodríguez, 2024a, p. 44), "are already evident." Along these lines, initiatives in the form of



"state positions" are observed in Latin America that are manifested in different instruments such as court rulings, projects, laws, action plans and public policies that seek to regulate, regulate or educate about technological developments linked to disinformation on digital platforms (Aminahuel and Rodríguez, 2024b, p. 110).

Therefore, three dimensions emerge as key instances for the construction of a pedagogical model that strips the subject of communicative capitalism, for example, the modalities of data extraction and exploitation of the so-called big tech (Aminahuel and Rodríguez, 2024b), in order to remove the "AI object" from the center of the scene in order to understand AI from a meta-communicational perspective. These dimensions would be: the responsible and democratic exercise of public communication in states; the promotion of human rights based on the recommendations of international organizations; and last but not least , the construction and circulation of a collective intelligence that, in a culturally and geopolitically situated way, can create new ways of being and meeting (communicating) in society.

In conclusion : from artificial intelligence to collective intelligence

This review of discussions in the field of communication and artificial intelligence sought to broaden the debate on what and how we should address phenomena that are as fluctuating as they are impactful.

With the advent of AI and its associated technologies, we might ask ourselves, like Mabel Piccini more than three decades ago regarding the centrality assigned to mass media , whether this fixation has diluted the category of “collective communication” and, if so, whether to overcome this epistemological trap it is necessary to change the rules of the game or the game itself (Piccini , 1989, p. 21).

Capitalism has renewed its modes of accumulation in the 21st century, being conceptualized by various authors as platform capitalism, cognitive capitalism, surveillance capitalism, digital capitalism, technological capitalism, and communicative capitalism. The



common factor is the centrality of extracting and exploiting data provided by digital users, which is then converted into information for subsequent commercialization as a commodity.

Future lines of research

It seems necessary to design a new framework with rules that allow us to understand and confront the scenarios of AI as a metatechnology, metalanguage and metacommunication within digital capitalism . An approach that integrates the greatest possible diversity of knowledge . A path that allows us to reconfigure AI based on the concept of collective intelligence, understood as multi-stakeholder collaboration mediated by strategic, effective and efficient communication in organizations, where creativity, innovation and the intelligent use of digital environments are framed within responsible communication, that is, in a committed dialogue between organizations and their audiences, based on transparency, honesty, congruence, empathy, interactivity and trust.

In Latin America, collective intelligence has shaped a knowledge landscape ranging from ancestral wisdom to developments in popular, alternative, and feminist communication, whose influence remains strong and must continue to be studied and practiced. The aforementioned experiences of governments, such as the Synco cybernetic project in Chile; of academia, such as the Decolonial Manifesto ; and of international organizations, such as UNESCO's publication of an AI centered on indigenous peoples, are concrete examples of forms of collective intelligence applied to critical analysis and the popular adoption of AI in Latin America. The development of AI in the region will depend, to a large extent, on the inclusive capacities of states, the effective reach of the recommendations of international organizations, and the active participation of the people.

Literature

Aminahuel , A. and Rodríguez, M. (2024a). Governance of digital platforms and artificial intelligence. Contradictions and concentrations of technological power. *Topics and problems of communication*. No. 21. ISSN: 2718- 6423. Department of Communication Sciences - Faculty of Human Sciences - National University of Río Cuarto.



- Aminahuel, A., & Rodriguez, M. (2024b). Critical Notes on Communication Policies in Platform Capitalism in Latin America. *Correspondences & Analysis* , 19 , 92–117. <https://doi.org/10.24265/cian.2024.n19.04>
- Aminahuel, A. and Rodríguez, M. (2023). “Searching for the lost truth. How to study disinformation in the digital age: theoretical and methodological contributions”. Topics and problems of communication. No. 21. ISSN: 2718-6423. Department of Communication Sciences - Faculty of Human Sciences - National University of Río Cuarto. <http://www2.hum.unrc.edu.ar/ojs/index.php/TyPC/article/view/1893>
- Castells, M. (1997). *The Information Age. Economy, Society and Culture*, vol. 3. Alianza Editorial.
- Costa, F., Monaco, J.A., Covello, A., Novidelsky, I., Zabala, X., & Rodríguez, P. (2023). Challenges of generative artificial intelligence: Three scales and two transversal approaches. *Question/Cuestión* , 3 (76), e844. <https://doi.org/10.24215/16696581e844>
- Crawford, K. (2022). *Atlas of Artificial Intelligence. Power, Politics, and Planetary Costs*. Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Dean, J. (2005). Communication capitalism and the foreclosure of politics . *Cultural Politics* , 1 (1), 51-74.
- Han, B. (2022). *Infocracy. Digitalization and the Crisis of Democracy*. Taurus.
- Krishnan, A., Abdilla, A., Moonx , A.J., Çetin, B., Souza, C.A., Adamson, C., ... Rosenstock, S. (2022). Artificial intelligence: A decolonial manifesto. In *Feminist Artificial Intelligence: Towards a research agenda for Latin America and the Caribbean* . <https://doi.org/10.21428/e25fa4ca.b02c725e>
- Medina, E. (2014). Designing Freedom, Regulating a Nation. Cybernetic Socialism in Salvador Allende's Chile. *Networks: Journal of Social Studies of Science*, 20(38), 123-166. Available at RIDAA-UNQ. Open Access Digital Institutional Repository of the National University of Quilmes <http://ridaa.unq.edu.ar/handle/20.500.11807/493>



- Piccini Alija, M. (2007). Artificial windows: The new spaces of confinement. *TRAMAS. Subjectivity and Social Processes* , (5), 11–22. Retrieved from <https://tramas.xoc.uam.mx/index.php/tramas/article/view/80>
- Piccini, M. (ed.). (1989). *The Image of the Weaver. Languages and Policies of Communication*. FELAFACS Ediciones G. Gili.
- Piccini , M. and Nethol , A.M. (2007). *Introduction to the pedagogy of communication*. Trillas.
- Rouvroy, A., and Berns, T. (2016). “Algorithmic Governmentality and the Prospects for Emancipation. Disparity as a Condition of Individuation through Relation?” In *Philosophical Addendum* , No. 1. Santiago, Chile, Doble Ciencia Editorial.
- Sadin, É. (2023). *Artificial Intelligence: The Challenge of the Century. Anatomy of a Radical Antihumanism*. Black Box.
- Srnicek, N. (2021). *Platform capitalism*. Black Box Editor.
- UNESCO (2023). Guidelines for the governance of digital platforms: Safeguarding freedom of expression and access to information with a multi-stakeholder approach. Link: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000387360?posInSet=4&queryId=fc785bc6-f38c-4783-a68a-59a330e2b249>
- UNESCO (2023). Artificial Intelligence Focused on Indigenous Peoples: Perspectives from Latin America and the Caribbean Link: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000387814>
- UNESCO (2022). Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence. Link: https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000381137_eng
- UNESCO (2020). Artificial intelligence: media and information literacy, human rights and freedom of expression. Link: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000375983>
- Zuboff, S. (2021). *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism*. Paidós.

