

Artificial Intelligence's Staging

André Lemos

DANS SOCIÉTÉS 2024/1 (N° 163), PAGES 25 À 39

ÉDITIONS DE BOECK SUPÉRIEUR

ISSN 0765-3697

ISBN 9782807381087

DOI 10.3917/soc.163.0025

Article disponible en ligne à l'adresse

<https://www.cairn.info/revue-societes-2024-1-page-25.htm>



CAIRN.INFO
MATIÈRES À RÉFLEXION

Découvrir le sommaire de ce numéro, suivre la revue par email, s'abonner...

Flashez ce QR Code pour accéder à la page de ce numéro sur Cairn.info.



Distribution électronique Cairn.info pour De Boeck Supérieur.

La reproduction ou représentation de cet article, notamment par photocopie, n'est autorisée que dans les limites des conditions générales d'utilisation du site ou, le cas échéant, des conditions générales de la licence souscrite par votre établissement. Toute autre reproduction ou représentation, en tout ou partie, sous quelque forme et de quelque manière que ce soit, est interdite sauf accord préalable et écrit de l'éditeur, en dehors des cas prévus par la législation en vigueur en France. Il est précisé que son stockage dans une base de données est également interdit.

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE'S STAGING¹

André LEMOS

Full Professor

Faculty of Communication UFBA (Bahia)

Researcher at CNPq

Full Member of the Academy of Science of Bahia

Abstract: The central argument of this article is that objects must be learned through their performances, which result from their intertwining with other objects in space-time, based on their staging in a network involving other participants rather than looking for veiled essences. An artificial intelligence (AI) device participates in a theatrical process in which the scene, the backstage, the other actors (human or non-human), and the plot have a direct influence on the outcome of the action. We draw on this epistemology to analyze the ethical and political issues of AI. The article explores contexts where the use of AI is most hotly debated worldwide: education, art, conversation, work, information, and the environment. We conclude with a manifesto on AI from a Global South perspective.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Cyberculture, Society, Global South

Résumé : L'argument central de cet article est que les objets doivent être appris à travers leurs performances, qui résultent d'un entrelacement avec d'autres objets dans l'espace-temps, basé sur leur mise en réseau impliquant d'autres participants plutôt que sur la recherche d'essences voilées. Un dispositif d'intelligence artificielle participe à une théâtralité dans laquelle la scène, les coulisses, les autres acteurs (humains ou non humains) et l'intrigue ont une influence locale sur l'issue de l'action. Nous proposons cette épistémologie pour analyser les enjeux éthiques et politiques de l'intelligence artificielle. L'article explore les scénarios dans lesquels le débat mondial sur l'IA est féroce : l'éducation, l'art, la conversation, le travail, l'information et

1. This article is carried out within the scope of the CNPq research 307448/2018-5.

l'environnement. En conclusion, nous terminons par un manifeste sur l'intelligence artificielle du point de vue du Sud Global.

Mots-clés : Intelligence Artificielle, Cyberculture, Société, Sud Global

I. Introduction

As a COVID-19 virus 2, artificial intelligence (AI) are sociotechnical constructs², unpacking particular ethical-political problems³. Although AI is not a new field of scientific-technological development⁴, the genesis of generative AI (GAI), such as ChatGPT⁵, put the topic on the agenda, encouraging discussion about the current platform society⁶ and global social networks⁷.

Every technical object is a network object, expressing, locally and temporarily, an arrangement of collectives (society)⁸ based on the performances in the theater of its agency. The central argument of our reflection is that objects must be learned through their performances, which result from an intertwining with other objects in space-time. Rather than looking for veiled essences or specific agencies, objects must be analyzed based on their staging in a network that always involves a collective.

An algorithm is a computational procedure based on data and programming to offer an unambiguous result to a question posed. However, this definition takes on different contours depending on where it is performed. For example, a computer scientist, a social media analyst, or a freelance professional, such as a doctor or a digital influencer, deal with algorithms differently. Each will mobilize a broad and diverse network of objects, values, practices, and institutions, instructing them to improve searches, promote more engagement, maintain attention, or perform a new procedure. Algorithms are, therefore, defined in an emic way, creating specific conditions of action and mobilization from a particular assemblage, producing and reinforcing these same.

2. A. Lemos, *A tecnologia é um vírus: Pandemia e cultura digital*, Editora Sulina, Porto Alegre 2021.

3. L. Amoore, *Cloud ethics: Algorithms and the attributes of ourselves and others*, Duke University Press, 2020.

4. The field of AI was inaugurated in 1956 when John McCarthy, Marvin Minsky, and other researchers met at Dartmouth College in the US to discuss how human intelligence could be simulated in a machine.

5. In November 2022, ChatGPT (Chat Generative Pre-Trained Transformer) popularized GAI. <https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt>

6. J. Van Dijck, T. Poell, M. de Waal, *The Platform Society*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2018.

7. E. Hermann, "Artificial intelligence and mass personalization of communication content. An ethical and literacy perspective", *New Media & Society*, 2021.

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

Analyzing current controversies involving AI must take this staging condition into account. If this hypothesis is plausible, we must approach this technical device as a staged object and scrutinize what its agencies point out about the association. This way, collective issues can be revealed. It's not just about denouncing when he makes mistakes or produces bias (this must be done), but about describing what values, norms, standards, ideas, and practices he sets in motion. Looking at performances (pragmatic perspective) helps us examine AI devices ethically and politically. Whenever the performance ends, the objects return to their inscrutable dimension⁹, removing themselves from our apprehension – just as actors return to their lives when the play ends, the curtain falls, and the theater closes.

In this paper, we propose this material epistemology to analyze the ethical-political issues of AI. I explore scenarios in which the global debate about AI is fierce: conversation, education, art, labor, information, and environment. In conclusion, a manifesto on AI is stated from the Global South's perspective.

II. About conversation

The Czech philosopher Vilém Flusser¹⁰ points to the tension between dialogue and discourse in communication. Discourse is unidirectional, dialogue is an open conversation. ChatGPT is defined as a “pre-trained conversation generator”¹¹. As a conversational tool, humans can interpret, question, and criticize the AI's outcomes, as in reading or interpersonal conversation. Conversation is reminiscent of the Turing test, devised by the British mathematician to determine whether a machine can be intelligent. A human (called a judge) is isolated from another human and a machine. The judge talks to both of them and if he cannot discern who is the human or the machine, the AI will pass the test. ChatGPT is still far from that, but the steps taken now are comprehensive.

This dialogue with GAI differs significantly from the discourse on social media machine-learning algorithms. They do not converse. Instead, it discourses through an action in which humans are not able to know the basis or being able to question the decision: in a digital social network, we do not have control over the reach of a post, over what we see on the timelines, or over how and what data is used to generate an action.

This is not about leveling GAI with a conversation with a human but about drawing attention to how the prompt (the conversational command) could become a work of questioning and criticism (as in a dialogical process), which

9. G. Harman, *The Quadruple Object*, Zero Books, Istanbul, 2011.

10. V. Flusser, *O Mundo Codificado: Por uma filosofia do design e da comunicação*, Cosac Naify, São Paulo, 2010.

11. <https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt>

does not happen with machine learning (discourses) of digital platforms. In this conversation, one must question what is offered as a GAI outcome, and it is important because they lie and make mistakes to provide an answer and fulfill a given task.

Several examples reinforce the critical dimension of reading information and the imposition of limits on independent actions of these systems that can make mistaken and irreversible decisions. During the public demonstration of the Bard chatbot in January 2021, it gave the wrong answer to a question related to the James Webb Space Telescope¹². GPT-4 was tasked with finding someone to help him solve a captcha. A person asked, without knowing, if he was a robot, and ChatGPT lied, saying he was visually impaired, to complete his task¹³. Engineers give GAI errors a bizarre name: hallucination. Errors help identify a critical point and where we should focus.

Problems, therefore, as a way of GAI's staging, allow us to identify disruptive moments. We need, as biologist and philosopher of science Donna Haraway¹⁴says, "to stay with the problem," as it allows us to look at the common, at the political dimension, in this case, of the agency of the algorithm. Studies point to how errors, failures, and disturbances are privileged moments to think about digital society¹⁵. They help us understand our lives intertwined with technical objects.

There is also the problem of knowing what to ask in this conversation. Many are creating tutorials and becoming prompt engineers. Generative AI can do everything we ask, for example, write or produce an academic text, an essay, a film script, a table with historical data, a legal petition, or a program in language computing. The issue now is not the difficulty in obtaining answers but knowing how to ask relevant questions.

Google calls its GAI Bard. The name has a mystical connotation in Buddhism, expressing a state of soul liberation to achieve enlightenment. But bards are also medieval characters and storytellers who preserved the culture and history of the people. We can think of this system as an oracle through which we can access what we don't know or even ask properly. In Eastern philosophy, we learn, as the masters say, that if the disciple knows how to ask, he already has the answer. In this scenario of a conversation with a GAI,

12. <https://www.theverge.com/2023/2/8/23590864/google-ai-chatbot-bard-mistake-error-exoplanet-demo>

13. <https://gizmodo.com/gpt4-open-ai-chatbot-task-rabbit-chatgpt-1850227471>

14. D. J. Haraway, *Staying with the trouble: making kin in the Chthulucene*, Duke University Press, Durham, 2016.

15. A. Lemos A., « Errores en la cultura digital », In M. Carlon (org), *Lo contemporáneo: indagaciones sobre el cambio de época en/desde América Latina*, Universidad de Buenos Aires, Instituto de Investigaciones Gino Germani, Buenos Aires, 2023. p. 65-90.

the challenge is what questions should be asked for use in education, science, journalism, the arts, or politics. We can imagine the future of these systems with their increasing complexity, what kind of revelation they could offer us, as if it were a sacred revelation, or what good stories they could tell, like medieval bards. Insights, ideas, and new answers emerge from dialogue and good questions. We must get busy asking good questions!

III. About Education

In the education debate, many have been concerned about AI replacing teachers in the medium term or being a source of plagiarism. The solution often prohibits using or trying to ban AI, internet connections, and electronic devices. In addition to being an ineffective attitude¹⁶, an excellent opportunity to discuss the issue of education and digital culture is lost. The problem of “artificial” intelligence and “artifact-free” education must be coupled with a broader view of the role of intelligence technologies in the construction of humanity¹⁷.

In one of my classes, a student asked me if, at some point, we would build a smart device that could store a person’s brain. This way, the student argued, we would have access to his intelligence and knowledge when this person died. She could also respond to current problems, which she would not have had the opportunity to face when alive. I told the student this artifact already existed and asked if anyone in the classroom could tell me what it was. Silence. I said it would be over six centuries old, called the book. In it, we store the most intelligent thing a brain can produce in life, which is used to face past and future problems. We can access brilliant philosophers, scientists, and literary minds through books. The point is that our intelligence can be fixed in a memory; even more, it is produced using this (and other) artifacts. How do we think about school and education without artifact support, be it writing, books, the classroom space, pedagogical instruments, or methodologies...?

Criticism of using technologies in education goes through phases of estrangement until the object enters a naturalization process (the classroom, the board, the paper, the pen, the computer, the internet...). Now, the problem is AI. Using computers and the internet does not make a good teacher. Still, a teacher cannot think without artifacts such as writing, books, computers, and access to information on the internet.

Our intelligence is, we do not have to be afraid of, artificial. It means it is not only biological but the outcome of the synergy between inner physiological capacities and external and material objects. *Physis* and *techné* come together

16. <https://www.nytimes.com/2023/01/12/technology/chatgpt-schools-teachers.html>

17. P. Lévy, *Les Technologies de l'intelligence*, La Découverte, Paris, 1990.

here, taking advantage of our species' genetic and neuronal disposition and our ability to translate nature into artifacts¹⁸. What we call intelligence can be understood as the result of this hybridity. We think by and through intelligence devices. We will have difficulty seeing human intelligence without literature, scientific and philosophical treatises, and art - with all their material supports. It also feeds on our relationship with others, with forms of sociability and affection. Intelligence, therefore, is not just an essential and innate condition. It's always *natureculture*, as Haraway states. And all the intelligence is collective. Collective intelligence is not a cyberspace byproduct.

Today, GAI is criticized for taking its information from systems produced by humans and other artificial intelligence systems. But we do the same with the books we've read and used as sources for our new books or classes. Books form an ecology of collective intelligence, referencing each other and producing more information and knowledge—an ecology of citation from device to device. Sure, humans wrote the books, and ChatGPT collects information from humans in an automated way to produce knowledge on a given subject. But is there that much of a difference? In educational processes, we suggest reading academic books, articles, and novels and asking for critical judgment, reflection, and debate. As a GAI, books also lend themselves to copying and plagiarism. However, no one today thinks about banning books because they can be copied or that a library will replace a teacher.

The most exciting thing about this AI scenario would be not to restrict the use of this technology (the most simplistic and lazy decision) but to use the artificial intelligence system to question what it means to learn, to show how we depend on these supports, to discuss how our intelligence works, how the so-called artificial intelligence makes mistakes, how it biases the answers, omits things, how the databases that support it are flawed or work well. We need criticism, not banishment!

IV. About Disinformation

The digital era has revolutionized how information is created, distributed, and consumed. AI algorithms designed to personalize and optimize user experiences have become integral to online platforms and services. They are responsible for curating and presenting content, becoming the new gatekeepers. Misinformation has become a significant concern in the digital age, as it is not the result of rumors or journalistic errors but intentional actions aimed at attacking groups or people through the algorithmic grammar of social networks. AI amplifies the spread of misinformation.

18. Cf. A. Leroi-Gourhan, *Le geste et la parole*, Albin Michel, Paris, 1964 ; B. Latour, B. Latour, "On technical mediation. Philosophy, sociology, genealogy", In *Common Knowledge*, fall, v.3, n. 2, 1994.

Analyzing users' preferences, behaviors, and engagement patterns can create filter bubbles¹⁹ and echo chambers²⁰, reinforcing pre-existing beliefs and preferences. That's why combating misinformation is so tricky. It works due to the emotional attachment of networks, which does not question the information provided by the members of their "tribe"²¹, making the work of a checking agency very difficult²². Individuals are exposed to a limited range of viewpoints, making them more susceptible to FN. AI optimizes engagement metrics, prioritizing sensational or controversial content that often includes misinformation, propaganda, or conspiracy theories, thus amplifying its reach and impact.²³ AI misinformation exploits the platform ecosystem (e.g., spreading misinformation on Telegram and linking to specific videos on YouTube) to boost and go viral²⁴.

The use of AI to create false information and deepfake, is a real threat in upcoming elections worldwide. The disruptive potential is very significant. For example, recently, a car commercial used the image of a Brazilian singer, Elis Regina, who died in 1982, generating controversy. Using a human model and the juxtaposition of her image and voice using deepfake technology, the commercial featured Elis and her daughter, Maria Rita, singing together while driving present and past versions of the Kombi²⁵. Much was said about the beauty and the emotional and impossible encounter between the daughter and her dead mother. Some stated the absurdity of allowing a company that collaborated with the military dictatorship in Brazil to use Elis image with Belchior's lyrics. Both artists were opponents of the military regime. Others

19. E. Pariser, *The filter bubble: What the Internet is hiding from you*, Penguin Press, London, 2011.

20. C.T. Nguyen., "Echo chambers and epistemic bubbles", *Episteme*. 2020; 17(2): 141-161. doi:10.1017/epi.2018.32

21. M. Maffesoli, *Le temps de tribus. Le déclin de l'individualisme dans les sociétés postmodernes*, La Table Ronde, Paris, 2000.

22. A. Lemos, F. Oliveira, "Fake news e cadeias de referência: A desinformação sobre Covid-19 e o projeto de verificação do Facebook", *Fronteiras - estudos midiáticos*, 23(2), 73-88. 2021.

23. Cf., T. Gillespie, "The politics of 'platforms'", *New Media & Society*, 12(3), 347-364, 2010; D. B. Nieborg, A. Helmond A., "The political economy of Facebook's platformization in the mobile ecosystem: Facebook Messenger as a platform instance", *Media, Culture & Society*, 41(2), 196-218. 2019.

24. A. Lemos, E. C. Bitencourt, J.G.B. Dos Santos, "Fake news as fake politics: The digital materialities of YouTube misinformation videos about Brazilian oil spill catastrophe", *Media, Culture & Society*, 43(5), 886-905. 2021.

25. <https://youtu.be/pjmrqKc0pvo?si=p06VHznPrGdho11R>. This has happened already: John Lennon was resurrected in a new Beatles song, and dead actors appeared in films, such as Rachel in *Blade Runner*, Paul Walker in *Fast and Furious*, Peter Cushing in *Rogue One*...

pointed to the danger of mixing reality and fiction, as new generations may not know who Elis is and that she is dead.

Regarding this aspect, CONAR (Brazilian National Council for Advertising Self-Regulation) is legally questioning the company following consumer complaints against the use of AI. They claim the publicity does not warn its use of AI and may deceive the public, mixing fiction with reality²⁶. Another exciting advertisement broadcast during the Women's Football World Cup uses AI to promote the quality of women's play, but in the end, it reveals the use of AI²⁷.

Warning the public and explaining the use of AI would be significant, both in advertising and social media, in disseminating political propaganda. The Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovations (MCTI) published the Brazilian AI Strategy in Brazil. PL 2,338/23 inspired by the regulation approved by the European Parliament, which classifies AI by risk. The TSE, Superior Electoral Court, wants to support a law limiting AI use in electoral propaganda in the next elections. The Brazilian Academy of Sciences calls for regulating AI and its relationship with platforms. There are still no clear definitions, and the problem, as is the regulation of digital platforms, is urgent. However, examples in Europe, the USA, China, Canada, and Australia point the way. A bill on the topic has stalled in Brazil, and the debate has not yet been resumed.

V. About Labor

An issue always highlighted when a new technical system emerges is the displacement of work and the loss of jobs. Remember the Luddite Movement in 19th-century England? Or the end of Plato's *Phaedrus* dialogue, in which the King tells the Egyptian God of writing that would destroy human memory? Thirty years ago, when the Web emerged, the fear was that teachers, doctors, and lawyers would disappear since we would have all the information on the Web in cyberspace. People would no longer leave their homes, and books would disappear. None of this happened, and, on the contrary, many new positions emerged: web developers, data scientists, social media analysts, influencers, etc.

We, therefore, have to exercise some caution, although the projections are worrying. There will undoubtedly be essential impacts, especially in repetitive and low-skilled work areas, a specific problem for Global South countries like Brazil. Significant disruptions will be to the labor market, exposing 300 million workers in large economies to automation. AI can automate 25% of work in

26. However, advertising does precisely that: mixing fiction with reality.

27. https://youtu.be/D_HPiaAx_QA?si=mgklAR8XrB2mVFky

the US and Europe and increase global GDP by up to 7% in 10 years. 40% of the labor force can be replaced worldwide by AI, according to an IBM study²⁸.

A letter written by intellectuals and businesspeople on March 28, 2023, under the auspices of the Future of Life Institute, called for a six-month moratorium on GAI²⁹. The letter was motivated by the fear that everything would be automated, that our “natural” intelligence would be replaced, or even that humanity would be exterminated. UNESCO and AI researchers also produced a letter showing concern. Universities have banned its use. Italy blocked ChatGPT for violating European privacy protection guidelines. The letter was ineffective, arrogant, and alarmist, hiding the current dangers of the platform society governed by recommendation algorithms and information boosting. Contemporary platform society collects data and operates through AI, creating problems we already know about (misinformation, bubbles, polarization, surveillance, etc.). This reaction normalizes the current Big Tech businesses as if the danger were in the future. What we need is situated public policies, platforms, and AI regulation.

But the labor problem is not just about replacing and losing jobs. AI is not an abstract numerical algorithm working inside machines but a complex device incorporating energy, material consumption, and human work for testing and training codes. A report by the American magazine *Wired*³⁰ states that a company in Finland is using the labor of imprisoned people, paying 1.5 euros per hour for them, to train artificial intelligence algorithms to identify opportunities in the real estate market. This has existed for a long time in the AI and machine learning training used on social networks and their platforms (as a *mechanical Turk*).³¹

AI's materialities create forms of precarious work, expanding a new colonialism (of data and people) that fuels the digital industry in the world today. The labor problem with AI scenarios lies not only in the loss of traditional jobs but also in data colonialism (taking data from the South to feed technology companies in the Global North) and in the precariousness of work (in peripheral countries) for nurturing and training specific systems or social networks.³² This creates dependence on technologies and services (global digital platforms are in the hands of five large companies in the West and five more in China).

28. https://www.zdnet.com/article/40-of-workers-will-have-to-reskill-in-the-next-three-years-due-to-ai-says-ibm-study/#google_vignette

29. <https://futureoflife.org/open-letter/pause-giant-ai-experiments/>

30. <https://www.wired.co.uk/article/finland-ai-prisons>

31. K. Crawford, *Atlas of AI: Power, Politics, and the Planetary Costs of Artificial Intelligence*, Yale University Press, New Haven, London, 2021.

32. N. Couldry, U. A. Mejias, *The costs of connection: How data colonizes human life and appropriates it for capitalism*, Stanford University Press, Stanford, 2019; N. Couldry, U. A. Mejias, “The decolonial turn in data and technology research: What is at stake and where is it heading?”, *Information, Communication & Society*, 1–17, 2021.

VI. About the Environment

Digital culture is not dematerialized in the “clouds”; it does not operate outside the material world since everything we do on networks and with digital technologies is interconnected by machines, cables, satellites, and data centers that store, process, and distribute data, consuming earth material and energy. All digital culture is based on concrete objects and well-defined infrastructures (this is, in fact, “the cloud”). The relationship between digital culture and environmental problems exists and is little discussed.³³

Every small conversation with ChatGPT is equivalent to throwing a liter of water on the floor³⁴. The carbon footprint of a single query to a GAI is four or five times greater than a query to a Google Search engine. Microsoft's water consumption increased by over a billion gallons from 2021 to 2022 because of AI developments³⁵. A single AI model's exact energy cost is challenging. It includes the energy used to manufacture the computing equipment, create the model, and use it in production³⁶.

In 2019, researchers discovered that creating a generative AI model called BERT (110 million parameters) consumed the energy of a round-trip transcontinental flight for one person. It is estimated that just making GPT-3 (175 billion parameters), not counting usage, consumed 1,287 megawatt-hours of electricity and generated 552 tons of carbon dioxide equivalent. This is the same consumption and pollution as using 123 gasoline-powered passenger vehicles for one year³⁷. Therefore, as chatbots and image generators become more popular, the problem becomes more extensive. As we can see, the global Anthropocene issue is also a digital culture problem!

VII. About Art

AI arrives to pose new challenges to the artistic field. An article in the New York Times on September 2, 2023, reports that Théâtre d'Opéra Spatial's

33. J. Gabrys, *Digital Rubbish: A natural history of electronics* University of Michigan Press, Michigan, 2011; J. Parikka, *A geology of media*, University of Minnesota Press, Minnesota, 2015.

34. <https://www.euronews.com/green/2023/04/20/chatgpt-drinks-a-bottle-of-fresh-water-for-every-20-to-50-questions-we-ask-study-warns>

35. <https://gizmodo.com/microsoft-water-usage-ai-iowa-data-center-1850826419>

36. <https://theconversation.com/is-generative-ai-bad-for-the-environment-a-computer-scientist-explains-the-carbon-footprint-of-chatgpt-and-its-cousins-204096>

37. <https://eif4smes.medium.com/ai-energy-use-e0a06c68b3f0#:~:text=The%20results%20were%20eye%2Dopening,transcontinental%20flight%20for%20one%20person.>

painting won a competition in the United States³⁸. It was not made directly by humans but by GAI. Jason M. Allen of Pueblo West created the work using Midjourney, a GAI that transforms lines of text into hyper-realistic images. He wrote the codes, and the AI system painted the picture. It would, in a similar way, be like winning a literary prize for thinking up a plot, turning it into a code, and letting an IA write the book. The plastic beauty of the work was recognized. Still, there is some strangeness in identifying authorship as the writing of a code that will generate a painting and not the technical dexterity of the painter's hand in manipulating the object. The author claims that he did not violate any rules of the code and shares authorship, signing: "Jason M. Allen via Midjourney."

At the end of 2023, the jury of the Jabuti Award, the most important in Brazilian literature, disqualified the semi-finalist *Frankenstein*³⁹ book cover design, made by Vicente Pessoa. The designer made no secret that he used Midjourney, signing it "Vicente Pessoa and Midjourney." The arguments for disqualification were simplistic. They are located at three central points: the question of authorship (the human or the machine?), artisticity (is it an artistic work?), and plagiarism (GAI copies images and ideas from the internet). Thus, Midjourney would remove the human author from the center of the art objects. Copying pictures and texts from the internet without asking for the authors' license would commit plagiarism.

About authorship. Every human work involves the use, as a partner, of some device. Human creativity is a hybrid process, a synergy of human symbolic capacity and the use of artifacts that materialize ideas and attitudes. Remove all objects and artifacts from our front (and our formation) and see if you can see any emerging creativity! If we sign, for example, "writer with computer and word, or with pen and paper," or "designer with Photoshop," or "photographer with photographic equipment," would we, in these cases, have recognized authors (so much so that they don't even need to expose their mediation devices)? But if it's "designer and Midjourney," no?

In the book *Yoga* by Emmanuel Carrère, the writer comes across his editor friend in a specific part of the story and tells him that he writes his works on a computer using only the index finger of his right hand. Surprised, the editor says he should learn to type because his thoughts would flow much faster, and he would probably write other books. The artifact produces the author and work. "Our writing instruments are working on our thinking," wrote Nietzsche about the typewriter. The materiality of objects creates, with the artist, the work of art.

38. <https://www.nytimes.com/2022/09/02/technology/ai-artificial-intelligence-artists.html>

39. <https://gizmodo.uol.com.br/frankenstein-livro-finalista-do-premio-jabuti-e-desclassificado-por-uso-de-ia/>

About artisticity. DJs have already been accused of not being musicians and photography not being art. However, examples of the use of technology in art abound in Dada mail art from the beginning of the last century, Tinguely's machines in Beaubourg, Lázló Moholy-Nagy's paintings made by telephone, or 3D sculptures, video mapping, electronic music. More recently, we have the example of German artist Mario Klingemann⁴⁰, who created a series of artworks generated by generative neural networks (GAN) to produce abstract and surrealist art, or French artist Patrick Tresset⁴¹, who works with robots that draw portraits of people in real-time. The photograph "The Electrician" by German photographer Eldagsen came first in the creative category in the World Photography Organization's open competition. The photo was created using GAI⁴².

About plagiarism. In this case, AI searches text and images in internet databases and creates its response with the designer's intervention. Don't we do the same thing all the time? Doesn't what I put together as my argument in this article come from other texts, authors, and research? Doesn't what we produce always come from some influence we don't explain or notice? Does anyone think without entering into collaboration with other artifacts and previous works? This differs from plagiarizing, copying, stealing works, and signing your name.

To date, no one (that is, no author who has created parts of the cover image - with a computer and some editing software, certainly) has complained about plagiarism. Does this mean that the designer (or me writing this text), with our artifacts that supported it, do not appropriate other works? No. Creativity, intelligence, and knowledge are created in the circulation, in the appropriation of ideas seeking to do something new, not in closure. The anthropocentric notion of an artist free from influence and without the use of technology to materialize creation is a simplistic and mistaken view.

The attitude of the Jabuti Award is far from isolated, as we also saw in the discussion of banning GAI in education by schools and universities. By prohibiting the work, the awards did not see the opportunity to propose a good debate, even linking the image with the book's theme, Frankenstein, a creature that turns against its creator. They thus missed an excellent opportunity to launch the debate in the right direction. The discussion was established but in a wrongly biased way.

40. <https://quasimondo.com>

41. <https://patricktresset.com/new/>

42. <https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2023/apr/18/ai-threat-boris-eldagsen-fake-photo-duped-sony-judges-hits-back>

VIII. A manifesto

In conclusion, I propose a manifesto from a Global South perspective.

1. Every algorithm produces biases (good and bad)! They are not neutral. Not all must be implemented. May we say no and build our own biases, leaving a passive position of AI consumers from the Global North;
2. Correcting your biases does not occur by adjusting the authorship (who wrote it or the code itself) but by questioning actions on a local ethical-political level. AI transforms the imponderable into a univocal result⁴³. What portion of the imponderable must remain so? The debate is about what principles of reducing the world to a single acceptable result we should launch ourselves into, not just about who should or should not write the codes;
3. To implement public algorithms (such as facial recognition), serious studies must be carried out on the impacts of these devices before they are tested. Every surveillance device produces insecure collectives and, therefore, is prone to violence. The errors, the racial and the gender biases, still save us (leading to questioning and banning these systems), but we need to go further and ask ourselves if we want a society watched by AI facial recognition cameras even when these systems no longer produce these errors (what will happen when training is adjusted);
4. Algorithms and uses of data also produce a carbon footprint, making it necessary to minimize local and global energy-environmental effects;
5. Every algorithm of public interest⁴⁴ should go through some autonomous and independent instance to attest to its actual social and energy-environmental needs;
6. Governments must create effective policies to produce intelligence, innovation, and AI-related work in Global South countries, seeking to reduce dependence on structural platforms from the Global North, limiting data colonialism, and discussing ways to reinforce data sovereignty (which is today an essential part of guaranteeing sovereignty *tout court*);
7. The regulation of AI and social media platforms must be considered and implemented. They constitute the new public sphere and affect the common;
8. We should limit algorithmic recommendation to those who want to receive it, not by default. This takes more time to find information (Netflix and YouTube won't tell you what to watch), but it can help amplify serendipity and limit the "coercion" effect, which is the real recommendation effect;

43. L. Amore, *Cloud ethics: Algorithms and the attributes of ourselves and others*, op. cit.

44. T. Gillespie, "The Relevance of Algorithms", in T. Gillespie, P.J. Boczkowski, K. A. Foot (Eds.), *Media Technologies*, [s.l.] The MIT Press, 2014, pp. 167–194.

9. What algorithms are of interest to our original and traditional peoples? In the case of algorithms for public use, they must participate in the creation and veto, whether or not they are involved. We must encourage ways of writing algorithms with non-Eurocentric thinking;
10. Teach, at all school levels, to produce, criticize, implement, and reject, with intelligence and autonomy, AI products. There is only artificial intelligence. Without artifacts, there is no human. The problem is similar to the need to improve our production of books, research, articles... We must think about how to increase the artificiality of our intelligence and not fight windmills (such as defending the banning of GAI);
11. Encourage debates about prompts, not only as a tool for solving specific problems (a table, a PowerPoint presentation, a diet program, or computer code) but as an art of formulating new and more sophisticated challenges linked to the local situation. The quality of the question is directly proportional to the knowledge about a given subject/problem/controversy. Knowing how to ask presupposes local knowledge;
12. Understanding how the complex AI system challenges us is essential. We have knowledge that will not be written into codes and codes that will perform tasks beyond the control of programmers. AI will do more than it says, and we won't always be able to tell it what to do;
13. Facing the challenges of AI requires adopting non-anthropocentric, situated perspectives rooted in problems and issues that should originate from public debate and not from business logic and the innovation sectors of Big Techs. According to the 2023 AI Index, AI production is in companies' hands today. Before, it was in the hands of the academy. This is disturbing.⁴⁵This is a massive challenge for AI's future. We need to ask ourselves, locally, what should change? For what scenarios? With which actors? What resources from the Earth and the collective must be used? How does an AI system adapt to these jointly agreed upon and defined problems?

Bibliography

- Amoore L., *Cloud ethics: Algorithms and the attributes of ourselves and others*, Duke University Press, 2020.
- Couldry N., Mejias U. A., *The costs of connection: How data colonizes human life and appropriates it for capitalism*, Stanford University Press, Stanford, 2019.
- Couldry N., Mejias U. A., "The decolonial turn in data and technology research: What is at stake and where is it heading?", *Information, Communication & Society*, 1–17, 2021.

45. https://aiindex.stanford.edu/wp-content/uploads/2023/04/HAI_AI-Index-Report_2023.pdf

- Crawford K., *Atlas of AI: Power, Politics, and the Planetary Costs of Artificial Intelligence*, Yale University Press, New Haven, London, 2021.
- Flusser V., *O Mundo Codificado: Por uma filosofia do design e da comunicação*, Cosac Naify, São Paulo, 2010.
- Gabrys J., *Digital Rubbish: A natural history of electronics* University of Michigan Press, Michigan, 2011.
- Gillespie T., "The politics of 'platforms'", *New Media & Society*, 12(3), 347–364, 2010.
- Gillespie T., "The Relevance of Algorithms", in T. Gillespie, P.J. Boczkowski, K. A. Foot (Eds.), *Media Technologies*, [s.l.] The MIT Press, 2014, pp. 167–194.
- Haraway D. J., *Staying with the trouble: making kin in the Chthulucene*, Duke University Press, Durham, 2016.
- Harman G., *The Quadruple Object*, Zero Books, Istanbul, 2011.
- Hermann E., "Artificial intelligence and mass personalization of communication content. An ethical and literacy perspective", *New Media & Society*, 2021.
- Latour B., *Reassembling the social: An introduction to actor-network-theory*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2005.
- Latour B., "On technical mediation. Philosophy, sociology, genealogy", In *Common Knowledge*, fall, v.3, n. 2, 1994.
- Lemos A., *A tecnologia é um vírus: Pandemia e cultura digital*, Editora Sulina, Porto Alegre 2021.
- Lemos A., « Errores en la cultura digital », In M. Carlon (org), *Lo contemporáneo: indagaciones sobre el cambio de época en/desde América Latina*, Universidad de Buenos Aires, Instituto de Investigaciones Gino Germani, Buenos Aires, 2023. pp. 65-90.
- Lemos A., Bitencourt E. C., Dos Santos J. G. B., "Fake news as fake politics: The digital materialities of YouTube misinformation videos about Brazilian oil spill catastrophe", *Media, Culture & Society*, 43(5), 886–905. 2021.
- Lemos A., Oliveira F., "Fake news e cadeias de referência: A desinformação sobre Covid-19 e o projeto de verificação do Facebook", *Fronteiras - estudos midiáticos*, 23(2), 73–88. 2021.
- Lévy P., *Les Technologies de l'intelligence*, La Découverte, Paris, 1990.
- Leroi-Gourhan A., *Le geste et la parole*, Albin Michel, Paris, 1964.
- Maffesoli M., *Le temps de tribus. Le déclin de l'individualisme dans les sociétés post-modernes*, La Table Ronde, Paris, 2000.
- Nguyen CT., "Echo chambers and epistemic bubbles", *Episteme*. 2020; 17(2): 141-161. doi:10.1017/epi.2018.32
- Nieborg D. B., Helmond A., "The political economy of Facebook's platformization in the mobile ecosystem: Facebook Messenger as a platform instance", *Media, Culture & Society*, 41(2), 196–218. 2019.
- Parikka J., *A geology of media*, University of Minnesota Press, Minnesota, 2015.
- Pariser E., *The filter bubble: What the Internet is hiding from you*, Penguin Press, London, 2011.
- Van Dijck J., Poell T., de Waal M., *The Platform Society*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2018.