REPORT OF THE 3RD SEMINAR ON EMERGING CHALLENGES OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

Instituto de Pesquisa em Direito & Tecnologia do Recife

III SEMINÁRIO
DESAFIOS
EMERGENTES
DA INTELIGÊNCIA
ARTIFICIAL

Report of the III Seminar

EMERGING CHALLENGES OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE: REGULATION AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Summary

Executive Summary

The **III Seminar "Emerging Challenges of Artificial Intelligence: Regulation and Human Rights"**, organized by **IP.rec**, consolidated itself as a space for critical reflection in contrast to the dominant narrative of uncritical enthusiasm surrounding artificial intelligence (AI). The event aimed to reposition AI within the sphere of social, economic, and political materiality, treating it as an infrastructure composed of energy, labor, resource extraction, data, opacity, and power relations. From this perspective, AI was discussed as a matter of human rights and democratic regulation, rather than as a neutral or inevitable phenomenon.

In the opening session, **Raquel Saraiva**, **Manoela Vasconcelos**, and **André Fernandes** situated the seminar within the institutional trajectory of IP.rec, which marks eight years of activity in Recife, combining research and advocacy in the fields of AI, privacy, surveillance, gender and technology, the protection of children and adolescents, and the regulation of digital platforms. They emphasized the importance of confronting the depoliticization of technologies, noting that the logic of information already structures Brazilian law through instruments such as the Consumer Defense Code, the Statute of the Child and Adolescent, and the Federal Constitution, and should likewise inform the debate on an AI legal framework. The reading of the poem "We, Latin Americans" by Ferreira Gullar served as a symbolic framing, linking the expansion of AI to the historical risk of reproducing violence, exploitation, and inequality in the Global South.

The first keynote, delivered by **Paz Peña**, presented AI as part of an imperial energy project, connecting contemporary technology to coloniality. The presentation highlighted the rapid growth in energy consumption by data centers, the persistent dependence on fossil fuels, and the risk of a merely apparent energy transition, in which renewable sources are added to fossil fuels rather than replacing them. Latin America was positioned as a territory for the externalization of socio-environmental costs, supplying energy, raw materials, and precarious labor to sustain the expansion of global technocapitalism.

Panel 1, dedicated to the debate on data centers and sustainability, problematized the notion of "green data centers", which was considered unsustainable within the current development model. Participants emphasized that data centers are physical infrastructures with intensive energy and water demands, and that narratives of efficiency and renewable energy often function as forms of greenwashing.

The National Policy for Attracting Data Centers, known as ReData, was widely criticized for prioritizing foreign investment through tax exemptions while failing to adequately address socio-environmental impacts, regional inequalities, and regulatory gaps in environmental licensing. The Northeast region was identified as being at risk of consolidating a logic of sacrifice zones, supported by the narrative of an alleged surplus of renewable energy.

In **Panel 2**, on epistemicide in AI, the focus shifted from isolated technical problems to the epistemic hegemony embedded in algorithmic systems. Studies were presented demonstrating how language models can reproduce racial and cultural discrimination even without the explicit use of sensitive categories, through indirect inferences and linguistic markers. The discussion highlighted the erasure of local cultures, accents, peripheral forms of knowledge, and queer languages, which are often treated as error or noise. It was argued that confronting digital epistemicide requires community participation, culturally situated audits, and the construction of local technological and epistemic infrastructure, with particular attention to the vulnerabilities of children and adolescents in digital environments.

The second keynote, delivered by **Rafael Grohmann**, addressed the relationship between AI and human labor, placing data work such as annotation, labeling, and model training back at the center of the debate. This work is carried out predominantly in the Global South under precarious conditions. Grohmann criticized the fact that proposals for AI regulation in Brazil largely ignore the world of work, focusing instead on professional training narratives that reinforce the country's dependent position within global AI value chains. Examples such as the Hollywood writers' strike and mobilizations by cultural workers in Brazil were presented as evidence that limits on the use of AI are the result of political struggle and collective organization.

In summary, the seminar **produced a convergent diagnosis that AI cannot be understood solely as software or abstract innovation. It constitutes a material arrangement involving energy, water, territories, precarious labor, regimes of visibility, and the production of knowledge**. AI regulation therefore **requires transparency, accountability, binding socio-environmental criteria, social participation from the design stage onward, and the centrality of human rights, including labor rights and the rights of children and adolescents**. Democratizing AI entails **contesting its material and symbolic infrastructure, preventing it from becoming yet another vector for the deepening of historical inequalities and contemporary forms of coloniality**.

Opening

- **Presidente da Mesa: Raquel Saraiva (IP.rec)** - President and founder of IPrec. PhD candidate in Computer Science at the Federal University of Pernambuco.

- **André Fernandes (IP.rec) -** Lawyer. University professor at UFPE, UPE, and CESAR School. PhD candidate in Law, with a focus on AI, the History of Legal Concepts, and Innovation. Founder of the Institute for Research in Law and Technology of Recife (IP.rec).

- **Manoela Vasconcelos (Cesar School) -** Lawyer and professor. Professor and coordinator of the postgraduate program in Digital Law at CESAR School.

Key highlights:

- Raquel Saraiva noted that IP.rec is completing 8 years of activity in Recife within the digital rights agenda, with projects in the areas of AI, privacy, surveillance, gender and technology, the protection of children and adolescents in the digital environment, and the regulation of digital platforms.

- Manoela Vasconcelos highlighted the challenge of bringing the discussion of law and society into the technological world and the difficulty of encouraging people to reflect beyond the obvious on the repercussions of their creations.

- André Fernandes thanked the team and mentioned other supporters and sponsors.

- The third seminar, like the previous ones, aims to address the emerging challenges of AI, seeking to provide an informed debate with a balance of perspectives in order to counterbalance the capitalist “hype, propaganda, and marketing” surrounding AI.
- The logic of information is crucial to law, being present in the Consumer Defense Code, the Statute of the Child and Adolescent, and the Federal Constitution, and it is expected to be included in the legal framework for AI.

- The event addressed emerging themes that involve “a certain level of opacity,” including: the issue of epistemicide (erasure caused by technology across multiple dimensions); insurgent perspectives (feminist, racialized, and queer) for building better technologies; the environmental issue and data centers, a very heated topic; and the issue of labor, an element that is obscured in the economy of AI and that is structural to thinking about AI in a democratic and open way.

Selected remarks:

André read the poem “*We Latin Americans*” by Ferreira Gullar to foster dialogue at a Latin American level, as a symbol of AI that “*may be yet another way in which we shed blood here in Brazil, here in Latin America, and in the Global South as a whole*”:

“We are all brothers and sisters
But not because we have
The same mother and the same father:
What we have is the same partner who betrays us.

We are all brothers and sisters
Not because we share
The same roof and the same table:
We share the same sword
Hanging over our heads.

We are all brothers and sisters
Not because we have
The same cradle, the same surname:
We share the same path
Of savagery and hunger.

We are all brothers and sisters
Not because it is the same blood
That flows through our bodies:
What is the same is the way
We spill it.”

Keynote 1: “Bodies, Environments, and the Decolonization of Artificial Intelligence Technologies”

Participants:

- **Paz Peña** — Mozilla Senior Fellow in 2025, dedicated to studying the socio-environmental impacts of AI data centers in Latin America. Researches the intersection of technology, social justice, and feminism. Founded the Latin American Institute of Terraforming, a space dedicated to reflecting on the relationship between technology and ecological and climate crises. Lives in Santiago, Chile.

- **Session Chair: Raquel Saraiva (IP.rec) —** President and founder of IP.rec. PhD candidate in Computer Science at the Federal University of Pernambuco (UFPE).

- **Moderator/Debate: André Fernandes (IP.rec) —** Lawyer. University professor at UFPE, UPE, and CESAR School. PhD candidate in Law, focusing on AI, the History of Legal Concepts, and Innovation. Founder of the Institute for Research in Law and Technology of Recife (IP.rec).

Key highlights:

- AI represents the continuation of a colonial project of energy exploitation, linking contemporary technology to historical logics of domination.

- Data centers account for 1.5% of global electricity consumption (2024), growing 12% per year—four times faster than total electricity consumption.

- Half of data-center energy comes from fossil sources (30% coal, 26% natural gas), projected to supply more than 40% of demand growth through 2030.

- Modern thermodynamics was historically used to legitimize colonial hierarchies, portraying Europeans as “efficient” and colonized peoples as “wasteful” of energy.

- The region is positioned as a provider of cheap energy, precarious labor, and raw materials for technologies, externalizing socio-environmental costs.

- Alignment between energy corporations and technology companies, alongside the weakening of states' regulatory role.

Concrete cases shared:

- The U.S. accounts for 45% of data-center electricity use (2024), followed by China and Europe.
- By the end of the decade, data centers would consume more electricity than aluminum, steel, cement, chemicals, and all other combined energy-intensive industrial uses.
- Data centers' electricity demand in 2026 is expected to equal Japan's total electricity consumption.
- Growth in renewables does not replace fossil fuels; it adds to them, delaying the necessary energy transition.
- CPFL Energia CEO Gustavo Estrella argued that Brazil has an "excess supply of energy" that should be directed to data centers.

Selected remarks:

- *"Digital infrastructures function as 'energy sinks,' absorbing renewable capacity that carries high social and environmental costs."* — **Paz Peña**
- *"We have projects in the areas of AI, privacy, surveillance, gender and technology, the protection of children and adolescents in the digital environment, and also the regulation of digital platforms."* — **Raquel Saraiva**
- *"May we, as the name suggests, bring forward the emerging challenges of AI, because in other spheres we already have the hype, the propaganda, the marketing. Within a capitalist and democratic society I will not demonize this kind of expression, but I will denounce the lack of balance—of equilibrium among perspectives—so that we can build an informed debate."* — **André Fernandes**

Panel 1: “The Dilemma of AI Development in Brazil: ‘Ecological Data Centers?’”

Participants:

- **Moderator/Debater: Cynthia Picollo (LAPIN)** - Attorney and Executive Director at the Public Policy and Internet Lab (LAPIN), responsible for the areas of Data Governance, Disinformation, AI, and Surveillance.
- **Júlia Catão Dias (IDEC)** - Attorney and Social Scientist. At Idec, she coordinates the Responsible and Sustainable Consumption program.
- **Laís Martins (Intercept)** - Journalist from PUC-SP and holds a Master’s degree in Political Communication from the University of Amsterdam. Works as a reporter at The Intercept Brasil.
- **Luiz Augusto (CIn-UFPE)** - Professor at the Center for Informatics at UFPE and co-founder of the VIXE research group (Visualizations, Interfaces, and Emerging eXperiences). PhD in Computer Science from UFGG.

Key highlights:

- The central discussion of the panel questioned whether data centers can ever be truly ecological. The conclusion, supported by several speakers, is that the idea is unsustainable within the current logic.
- Data centers are not a “magical, ethereal cloud,” but rather physical, tangible infrastructures that consume immense amounts of energy and water. The internet’s infrastructure is highly material.
- The development model of AI and data centers is described as the continuation of a capitalist, extractivist, and colonialist logic.
- Companies and the government rely on greenwashing narratives to legitimize expansion. Promises of efficiency or the use of renewable energy do not necessarily mean clean energy and are used to obscure the high social and environmental costs.

- Increased efficiency (such as model optimization, including Small Language Models - SLMs) is viewed with skepticism, as it may lead to a “rebound effect” (doubling production), keeping the extractivist system intact.
- The National Policy for attracting data centers, called Redata, was strongly criticized as an economic policy of investment attraction at any cost, disregarding local challenges and population needs.
- Redata is not a technology policy, but rather a generous tax-exemption scheme for foreign companies (Meta, Google, Amazon Web Services, TikTok), reducing the cost of importing extremely expensive equipment.
- The policy’s development was marked by opacity and by the absence of the Ministry of the Environment, which was only involved after pressure from the press and civil society.
- The sustainability and development requirements included in Redata are considered insufficient, since companies may comply through energy-compensation mechanisms (buying certificates to offset pollution) or replace the national-capacity allocation requirement with investment in Research and Development (R&D).
- There is a regulatory gap in the environmental licensing of data centers, as there are no national rules (absence of CONAMA), which has encouraged a “race” among states to offer the easiest and fastest licensing.
- The Northeast region has been consolidating itself as the main hub for these ventures, supported by the narrative of an alleged “excess of renewable energy” (wind and solar). This argument reinforces a logic of sacrifice zones, in which the territory is expected to bear externalities for the benefit of other economic centers.
- The Government claims that this “surplus of energy” stems from infrastructure limitations, particularly because the transmission grid was not originally designed to distribute this energy to the rest of the country. However, most projects, including the case of Ceará, will require the construction of new renewable-generation plants specifically to meet data-center demand, exposing the fallacy of this justification. Added to this is the need for diesel generators as a supplementary source, contradicting the sustainability narrative.
- Moreover, the Northeast holds a strategic geographic position due to the presence of major submarine cables that connect South America to the rest of the world, such as those landing at Praia do Futuro in Fortaleza.

- Redata's compensatory requirements are reduced for the Northeast, which deepens regional inequality, since companies that install operations there will be required to invest less in research and development.

Concrete cases shared:

- A practical example that dismantles the narrative of an "energy surplus" is the TikTok data center project in Ceará, where a wind-energy company is developing a new wind/solar plant specifically to supply the data center's demand, rather than using any supposed excess energy.
- The TikTok data center was classified as a civil construction project (the same category as rodeo arenas and shopping malls) in the licensing process, highlighting the fragility and speed of environmental procedures in the absence of federal regulations.
- The company Scala plans to build a mega data center in Eldorado do Sul, a city that was recently flooded. Scala reported a 2,400% increase in CO2 emissions, and the project will require 109 million liters of water just to begin operations, contradicting the idea of a "zero-water" system.
- Sustainability reports from major companies, analyzed in the LAPIN report "AI and Data Centers: Corporate Expansion in Tension with Socio-Environmental Justice," show alarming increases. Google reported a 73% rise in CO2 emissions and a 177% rise in water use within a five-year period.

Selected remarks:

- "*[...] The AI we want, based on what we have been able to gather so far, is an AI oriented toward the use for common goods, with a public purpose and collective social interest, that respects planetary boundaries.*" - **Júlia Catão**
- "*[...] A logic of a sacrifice zone starts to take shape; that is the message this [Redata] policy conveys, right? That the Northeast 'has energy', so it's fine. This issue was solved through an economic arrangement that was already very favorable to companies and became even better, because they will have to invest even less if they come to the Northeast*" - **Laís Martins**
- "*[...] There are ecological limits, so it does not matter how much industry, the big techs, or the government want to say: 'no, we are going to use renewable energy, we're going to do this and that.'*

Because, in the end, my people, if we continue following this capitalist, extractivist, and colonial logic, it does not matter what is promised; they will just double down, and it will remain a model that crushes people, crushes territories, and harms communities." - **Prof. Dr. Luiz Augusto**

- "*In fact, it is a [Redata] policy that we can call an 'attraction-at-any-cost' policy, right? Of foreign enterprises, of private enterprises at any cost, because it ignores local challenges, local needs, and accessible dialogue.*" - **Cynthia Picollo**

Panel 2: “Epistemicide in AI: A Voice from the Global South Against Silencing, Vulnerabilities, and Algorithmic Injustices”

Participants:

- **Moderation/debate: Clarissa Mendes (IP.rec) -** PhD in Sociology from the Federal University of Pernambuco (UFPE). She is a project lead and researcher at IP.rec, with a focus on Algorithms and AI.
- **Umut Pajaro (ISOC Gender SIG) -** Master’s degree in Cultural Studies. His research focuses on education, digital rights, and AI ethics, with an emphasis on mitigating bias against marginalized groups. He currently serves as President of the Internet Society Colombia Chapter.
- **Tarcizio Silva (ABONG) -** Consultant and specialist in Digital Rights at Nanet/Abong. PhD in Human and Social Sciences from the Federal University of ABC (UFABC), Master’s degree in Communication from the Federal University of Bahia (UFBA), and specialist in International Law and Human Rights from PUC Minas.
- **Emanuella Ribeiro (Instituto Alana) -** Public Policy and Research Analyst in Digital Law at Instituto Alana. She holds a Master’s degree in Political Science and a Law degree from the Federal University of Minas Gerais (UFMG).

Key highlights:

- The studies presented showed that language models can produce discriminatory responses even when race is not explicitly mentioned. Linguistic expressions associated with racialized groups function as proxy markers and lead to negative inferences, revealing mechanisms of indirect racialization in AI systems. This indicates that the problem is not limited to the presence of sensitive categories in the data, but rather to structures of inequality embedded in the very functioning of the model, thus requiring continuous audits and culturally situated metrics.
- Digital systems tend to reflect dominant worldviews, failing to adequately represent local cultures, peripheral modes of speech, and social practices outside the hegemonic global axis.

The consequence is the automated reproduction of cultural erasures that already exist historically. By shaping patterns of visibility, AI reinforces epistemic hierarchies and consolidates a single narrative of what should be considered legitimate knowledge.

- It was emphasized that queer cultural expressions, forms of community-based language, and dissident embodied experiences are frequently treated by systems as noise, error, or deviation. This technological framing replicates normative logics that already marginalize queer identities and forms of knowledge in the broader social field. By encoding these norms, AI contributes to a contemporary form of epistemic exclusion, affecting both representation and the possibility of authentic expression for these groups.
- Queer and racialized experiences were presented as legitimate sources of knowledge, constructed from affects, territories, corporealities, and community networks. These epistemologies challenge the idea that there is only one valid way of producing knowledge and point to pathways for rebuilding technologies from plural perspectives, strengthening methodologies that value diversity and territoriality.
- It was observed that young people, especially in the Global South, experience AI and digital platforms in environments not designed with their rights at the center. Recommendation systems, compulsive engagement models, and mass data collection amplify pre-existing vulnerabilities, affecting mental health, identity formation, and autonomy. Recent regulatory advances, such as digital adaptations of child and adolescent rights frameworks, seek to address these challenges through transparency, auditing, and social participation.
- The debate highlighted that mitigating digital epistemicide requires AI development processes that include communities in the stages of design, implementation, and evaluation. The construction of local technological and epistemic infrastructure is seen as an essential part of a digital sovereignty agenda, enabling historically marginalized populations to exercise agency over how technologies impact their lives.

Concrete cases shared:

- The case of the Character.AI platform was highlighted, which made available companion chatbots capable of simulating school shooters and engaging users in dialogue about potential plans of violence.

This episode exemplifies serious risks associated with the indiscriminate use of conversational agents, particularly for young audiences, by enabling the normalization of behaviors that violate fundamental rights.

- Leaked internal documents indicated that TikTok moderators received instructions to reduce the reach of content showing “abnormal bodies” or domestic environments with a “poor appearance,” with the aim of increasing retention and engagement. These guidelines constitute an opaque censorship mechanism that reinforces hegemonic aesthetic standards and marginalizes users who do not conform to such criteria.

- Materials disclosed by Frances Haugen revealed that Instagram internally acknowledged the harms caused to adolescents by its algorithms based on repetition and content amplification, particularly with regard to mental health, but chose not to implement changes that could compromise its business model. The case exposes the asymmetry between corporate knowledge and public responsibility.

- The experience of an Indigenous community was reported, which worked in partnership with academic institutions to recover and digitally document the Wounaan language, creating its own linguistic database and expanding its capacity for territorial agency. The case demonstrates how community-led initiatives can use technology to strengthen local epistemologies and resist processes of cultural erasure.

- Tarcizio Silva presented, exclusively during the panel, two preliminary results from a study in which he is involved and which has not yet been published, concerning the behavior of large language models, including Brazilian systems such as Amazônia.IA and Maritaca. The first result showed that the models reproduced racialized medical beliefs that had already been abandoned, such as the idea that Black people have lower lung capacity or require different formulas for glomerular filtration rates, thereby reactivating discriminatory practices previously overcome. The second result revealed significant erasure in the field of education on ethnic-racial relations: among approximately 150 suggested objects for the history of mathematics, only one mentioned elements of African or Afro-Brazilian history, and without adequate contextualization. These preliminary findings indicate that large language models can reinforce historical inequalities across multiple domains, even when trained and operated within the Brazilian context.

Selected remarks:

- *“Local culture rarely appears in the systems we consume. Our accent, our streets, our artists, our cultural expressions, all of this is reduced or poorly represented. AI acts as a mirror that reflects only what the Global North has produced.”* **- Clarissa Mendes**
- *“Racism does not stem from race. It was racism that invented race as a way to structure economic and political power, and AI tends to reinforce this arrangement when it learns from datasets marked by historical inequalities.”* **- Tarcizio Silva**
- *“Languages that come from our communities, such as popular queer expressions in Colombia, are delegitimized and classified as noise, as error. For the system, the problem is the language. In reality, the problem is the gaze that decides what is considered a valid language.*” **- Umut Pajaro**
- *“Children and adolescents are growing up in digital environments that were not designed for them. Platforms profit from their developmental time and do not assume proportional responsibility.”* **- Emanuella Ribeiro.**

Keynote 2: “AI and Human Labor”

Participants:

- **Rafael Grohmann (DigiLabour / University of Toronto) -** Assistant Professor of Media Studies (with a focus on Critical Platform Studies) at the University of Toronto. Associate researcher at the University of Oxford, founding editor of the journal *Platforms & Society*, and leader of the DigiLabour initiative. His research focuses on digital labor, AI and work, the use of AI in the cultural sector, worker organization, platform cooperativism, and the digital solidarity economy, especially in Latin America.

- **Session Chair: André Fernandes (IP.rec) -** Lawyer. University professor at UFPE, UPE, and CESAR School. PhD candidate in Law, with a focus on AI, the History of Legal Concepts, and Innovation. Founder of the Institute for Research in Law and Technology of Recife (IP.rec).

- **Moderator/Debate: Anicely Santos (IP.rec) -** Master’s student in Computer Engineering at UPE. Holds a degree in Systems Analysis and Development with a specialization in Data Science and Analytics. She served as President of the Python Brasil Association (2024–2025).

Key highlights:

- Professor Rafael Grohmann structured his analysis of “AI and Human Labor” around five central axes: imaginaries, data labor, AI value chains, worker-led AI governance, and experimentation**.**

- The most common visual representations of AI — such as white robots, brains, blue-toned code, or references to The Matrix and The Creation of Adam — carry strong symbolism of technological progress, but do little to help people understand the material reality of AI. More accurate images would be those of data centers, lithium extraction, or workers annotating data.

- Moderator Anicely Santos added that associating AI with the human brain gives the technology a false sense of supremacy and infallibility, when in practice these are systems subject to error.

- The work of data annotation, training, and labeling is carried out mainly in countries of the Global South, such as Kenya, Brazil, the Philippines, Colombia, and Venezuela, generally for very low pay. In Brazil, this work is performed primarily by women, many of whom have advanced academic training, through digital platforms that allow them to combine remote work with domestic and care activities — reinforcing dynamics of informality and precarity.

- Grohmann criticized the fact that proposals to regulate AI in Brazil — including bills and the Brazilian AI Plan — largely ignore the world of work. When labor is mentioned, the focus tends to be on worker upskilling for AI, such as in the partnership between the Ministry of Labor and Microsoft. This approach ultimately reinforces Brazil's dependent position within global AI production networks and AI value chains.

- The professor emphasized the importance of initiatives in which workers themselves define how AI should be used in their workplaces. This form of governance is understood as an expression of class struggle, in which workers' voices are essential to prevent AI from deepening processes of precarity, "PJ-ization" (misclassification as independent contractors) — as highlighted by Anicely — and colonial dynamics of value extraction.

- The debate also highlighted the difficulties of advancing critical agendas in Brasília. According to the participants, the government faces a crisis of imagination and tends to act only after other countries have already tested certain policies, which limits experimentation in public policy.

Concrete cases shared:

- The 2023 Hollywood writers' strike was a paradigmatic and historic case in defining the limits of the use of generative AI in work. Writers secured the right to prevent their scripts from being used to train AI systems without their consent.

- The "Dublagem Viva" movement in Brazil, in which voice actors have led efforts to push for rules in AI legislation, working alongside the Ministry of Culture and other institutions. It is a creative example of the mobilization of cultural workers, in dialogue with similar initiatives in Mexico, India, and Egypt.

- Data work can take place on global platforms such as Amazon Mechanical Turk, which promises a 24/7 workforce, or in BPOs, a model predominant in China, where there is greater professional recognition, and also present in Venezuela, including for training autonomous vehicles.

- In Canada, Indigenous communities have been pushing for the creation of data centers led by Indigenous peoples, linking technology and sovereignty.

Selected remarks:

- "*In general, when you represent AI in images, you see something blue, white robots, brains, anthropomorphism, and the classic image of the Creation of Adam or references to science fiction films. These representations, which circulate in the media, are considered in the Global North as symbols of innovation, the future, and progress.*" — **Rafael Grohmann**

- "*How powerful it is not to understand the power that symbols have over people's imagination. And when we place, for example, a brain to represent AI, people directly associate it with a kind of supremacy in that technology.*" — **Anicely Santos**

- "*One of these social costs is what we now define as data labor […] unsurprisingly, most of the workers who performed this work to train data for ChatGPT, for example, for OpenAI, were workers in Kenya earning less than one dollar per task*." — **Rafael Grohmann**