
PUBLIC COMPUTING INTELLECTUALS IN THE AGE OF AI CRISIS

A Preprint

Randy Connolly

Department of Mathematics & Computing
Mount Royal University
Calgary, Canada
rconnolly@mtroyal.ca

Abstract

The belief that AI technology is on the cusp of causing a generalized social crisis became a popular one in 2023. Interestingly, some of these worries were voiced from within the tech sector itself. While there was no doubt an element of hype and exaggeration to some of these accounts, they do reflect the fact that there are troubling ramifications to this technology stack. This conjunction of shared concerns about social, political, and personal futures presaged by current developments in machine learning and data science presents the academic discipline of computing with a rare opportunity for self-examination and reconfiguration. This position paper endeavors to do so in four sections. The first expands on the nature of the AI crisis for computing. The second articulates possible critical responses to this crisis and advocates for a broader analytic focus on power relations. The third section presents a novel characterization of academic computing’s epistemological field, one which includes not only the discipline’s usual instrumental forms of knowledge but reflexive knowledge as well. This reflexive dimension integrates both the critical and public functions of the discipline as equal intellectual partners and a necessary component of any contemporary academic field. The final section will advocate for a conceptual archetype—the Public Computer Intellectual—as a way of practically imagining the expanded possibilities of academic practice in our discipline, one that provides both self-critique and an outward-facing orientation towards the public good. It will argue that the computer education research community can play a vital role in this regard.

1 Introduction

“The crisis consists precisely in the fact that the old is dying and the new cannot be born; in this interregnum a great variety of morbid symptoms appear.”
—Antonio Gramsci, *Prison Notebooks* (1930) [87]

The perception that we are currently living in “an era of escalating, overlapping crisis” [38] is maybe one of the few statements that can generate wide-scale agreement even in our opinion-polarized times [69]. Despite several decades of immanence, the ecological crisis reminds us anew of its reality almost every summer. Within the United States, the George Floyd murder brought increased attention to the persistent crisis of continuing state violence against racial minorities. Economic or financial crisis has the most venerable pedigree, rearing itself every few decades over the past 150 years; but the economic slowdown of the 2000s along with growing inequalities in wealth have resulted in an almost perpetual state of economic crisis [48].

Since 2016, a conviction has grown that many states in the developed world are experiencing a legitimization crisis in which citizens are losing their trust in the key institutions of their society [52]. The covid pandemic of 2020-2022 was arguably the most acute and universal of crises, both in its global scope and in terms of its impact on individual and collective life. And now, in 2023, with Large-Language Models (LLM) and generative AI¹ algorithms, we appear to have a new and unwelcome guest in the lineup of undesirables that constitute our contemporary procession of crises [66, 41].

Technological change inevitably brings anxiety with it. But what makes the AI crisis perhaps unique is that some of the most prominent voices of worry are coming from the tech sector itself. “Top AI researchers and CEOs warn against ‘risk of extinction’” [101] and “Elon Musk among experts urging a halt to AI training” [99] were just two of the eye-catching headlines in the popular media about AI in 2023. Several high-profile executives of AI enterprises, such as Sam Altman, CEO of OpenAI and Igor Babuschkin of Elon Musk’s xAI, unexpectedly joined the chorus of anxiety [19]. It is worth noting that these high-profile statements of worry about our future artificial general intelligence (AGI) overlords are focused not on the present-day capabilities of this technology, but on hypothetical far-future ones. It is possible that these statements are a kind of AI crisis theatre, where executives make grand pronouncements about the catastrophic risk potential of all-powerful AI, all the while continuing to use/sell/market AI technology. If so, such pronouncements are yet another installment of high-tech hype, overselling capabilities in public in order to better sell it in private. But as noted by Kapoor and Narayan [56], these declarations of future risk are also prevarications: they deflect attention away from the already-existing version of AI that is causing harm. Haunting futures of the soon-to-be (or maybe-already-here)—which include mass unemployment [39], deskilled labor pools [3], feudalized political economies [73], and de-autonomized subjects dominated by algorithmic governance [107]—have sparked renewed interest in the consequences of computing technology not only in the world at large but also within the more pragmatic hallways of academic computing departments.

In the Gramsci quote that begins this essay, the morbid symptoms are the fascist regimes that sprouted across central Europe in response to the economic and legitimization crises of the 1920s and 1930s, the echo of which continues to haunt our imagination of the near future. In my essay, the morbid symptoms refer to something much less dramatic, namely our general tendency within academic computing to ignore the social and political ramifications of our work. One possible reaction to crisis is to insist there is no crisis, an attitude popularly captured in the “This is Fine” meme, in which a smiling hat-wearing dog sits with his coffee in a kitchen engulfed in flames, while complacently uttering “This is Fine”. Indeed, as noted by Birhane *et al* [13], there heretofore has been a noticeable lack of interest in the wider ramifications of AI technology by practicing ML researchers: only 1% of the most highly-cited ML papers mentioned possible social and ethical concerns. Of course, within the discipline of computing, we may feel considerably less existential dread about these technologies, partly because we are more likely to be aware that they are elegant predictive applications of statistics and linear algebra and nothing remotely close to AGI, partly because there are optimistic possible social outcomes with this technology [27], and partly because we as a discipline stand to gain the intellectual capital of prestige or the financial capital of ever-increasing grants as this technology progresses. But we inhabit the same world as everyone else: our disciplinary expertise won’t shield us from (possible) wide-scale social upheaval.

¹ The term “artificial intelligence” is used a bit less frequently in computer science in comparison to popular discourse. Instead, some computer scientists prefer to use terms such as machine learning (ML), neural networks, categorisation systems, or the specific algorithm being used and evaluated. Nonetheless, this paper tends to follow popular convention and uses “AI” and “artificial intelligence” quite liberally, even though, as noted by Crawford [26], it is neither artificial, nor intelligent.

Nonetheless, crisis is not chaos [11]. In terms of this essay, it might be helpful to think of crisis as a potential turning point, a critical moment that allows us (our academic discipline, our society) to question the trajectory of its current path. For this reason, crisis and critique are intrinsically linked: crisis prompts critique of the social conditions that induced it, and critique apprehends the reality of the crisis for all to see [25]. It is this essay’s contention that this rare conjunction of shared concern about social, political, and personal futures presaged by current developments in machine learning and data science not only among the wider community but also within computing itself, presents the academic discipline of computing with a rare opportunity “to interrogate the normativity currently in place and take actions for change” [108]. As a position paper, this essay will use the AI crisis (real or imagined) to make an argument for an expanded conception of academic computing and the role of computer education research in that transformation.

This essay’s first section expands on the nature of the AI crisis for computing. It will argue that the problems with this technology lie not in the realm of philosophy, addressable straightforwardly through ethics or codes of conduct, but in the social realm, and thus are best interrogated with the lenses of economics, political science, and sociology. The second section will look at one approach to the critical evaluation of AI, one that focuses on the relations of power that wrap any technological artefact. The key advantage of this approach is that it accords with contemporary justice-driven pedagogical theory. The third section presents a novel categorization of academic computing’s epistemological field, one which includes not only the discipline’s usual instrumental forms of knowledge but reflexive knowledge as well. This reflexive dimension integrates both the critical and public functions of the discipline as equal intellectual partners and a necessary component of any contemporary academic field. The final section will advocate for a conceptual archetype—the Public Computer Intellectual—as a way of practically imagining the expanded possibilities of academic practice in our discipline, one that provides both internal critique and an outward-facing orientation towards the public good. It will argue that we in computer education research community can play a vital role in this regard.

2 AI: An ethical or political crisis?

During the first few months of 2023, it was difficult not to read, watch, or hear both acclaim and apprehensions about the latest manifestations of artificial intelligence. Within the university context, almost everyone, whether students, faculty, or administrators, had some type of conversation about Large-Language Models (LLM) / generative AI and their potential impact on the way we teach and learn. ChatGPT was the most visible of these products, allowing students to effortlessly produce standard university assessments such as the five-paragraph summary paper about a well-known text or a recursive bubble sort in C++. The GitHub Copilot extension for the Visual Code text editor is an especially powerful use of specialized LLMs that seemingly eliminates a lot of the cognitive friction involved in solving common problems that are part of learning how to program. Popular text-to-image generators using diffusion models (such as Midjourney and DAL-E) have given rise to well-warranted existential dread for anyone who relies (or hopes to rely) on their ability to create or manipulate visual assets for a living. Similar products for generating music [51] and video [50] appear to be imminent. The pace of change in this area has accelerated to such an extent that conference proceedings are no longer agile enough. Instead, the non-peer reviewed online pre-print service arxiv.org has become the dissemination vehicle of choice within the fervid machine learning research community.

Over the past decade, the general topic of AI has been of growing interest to philosophers, economists, sociologists, and political scientists. Emerging concerns over bias and discrimination in data science in general, and in automated decision-making systems in particular, have been widely acknowledged [71, 75, 74, 32]. At the same time, within academic computing there emerged a consensus that ethics instruction should be the main mechanism for instilling social accountability into the field [4, 35, 93]. This embrace of ethics has been

especially ubiquitous within AI research communities [20, 85]. Back in 2019, one study found 84 different AI ethics initiatives that had been promulgated by academic, government, and industry bodies [54]. Some have dismissed this effort as a form of ‘ethics theatre’ or ‘ethics washing’ in which the professed public statements of ethical self-commitments are mainly a show for outside observers that is ultimately motivated by a desire to prevent or delay legal regulations [36]. Governments have belatedly become more interested in considering the ethics of AI—for instance, the EU’s High-Level Expert Group on Artificial Intelligence (HLEG-AI) published the high-profile “Ethics Guidelines for Trustworthy AI” in 2019 [91]. Yet the vast majority of the members of the HLEG-AI were from industry with only a small number of ethics experts; as a result, the HLEG-AI is arguably principally interested in advancing the global standing and business opportunities of European corporations working in AI [47]. The AI crisis of 2023 does, however, seem to have made some governments more willing to countenance regulatory approaches to AI. In June 2023, the European Parliament adopted its negotiating position on a proposed Artificial Intelligence Act, which would include bans on a variety of intrusive and discriminatory uses of AI, regulatory obligations for providers of high-risk systems, and mandatory regulatory assessments of all AI systems [33]. The US has been slower to act in this area. But in July 2023, the Biden-Harris administration announced that they had secured “voluntary commitments” from a subset of tech companies to practice “safety, security, and trust” as a purported first step in developing future legislation around AI technology [105].

This move towards regulation is perhaps tacit recognition that articulating general ethical guidelines, while admirable in principle, often lack actionability in that these codes “do not offer specific practices to apply ethics at each stage of the AI/ML pipeline and often fail to be actioned in governmental policy” [20]. Furthermore, a recent study found that knowledge of ethical guidelines and/or codes of ethical conduct do not seem to affect the decision making of software developers [68], a finding which accords with similar studies evaluating the effectiveness of business ethics codes [58]. Many AI ethics codes have adopted their principles—respect for autonomy, prevention of harm, fairness, and explicability—from medical ethics which seems to make sense given the success of bioethical principles in governing the behavior in the medical field [37]. Yet computing as a profession is quite unlike medicine. There are, for instance, no common aims of fiduciary duties, no professional history of norm following, and no robust legal and professional accountability mechanisms in the field of AI in comparison to medicine [70]. For this reason, one of the leading voices in computer ethics has concluded that “we should not yet celebrate consensus around high-level [ethical] principles that hide deep political and normative disagreement” [70].

This mention of political disagreement is an important one, as it reflects a burgeoning interest not just in the normative aspects of computer systems but their political aspects as well. The “fundamental truth buried in the language of statistics and computer scientists” claims Simons [90], research scientist on Facebook’s Responsible AI team, is that “machine learning is political” since such systems inevitably prioritize the material interests of some social groups over others. This inequality of distribution when it comes to benefits and burdens should elicit just as much attention by computing academics and professionals [47, 9, 72, 45]. The classic text advocating this line of thinking is Winner’s 1986 “Do Artifacts Have Politics?” [106]. Winner argued that technological systems can become political when they prevent certain social outcomes within a community (such as Robert Moses designing the height of New York freeway underpasses in the 1950s to prevent buses carrying lower income racial minorities from accessing public beaches) or when they privilege specific social outcomes (Winner’s example here was how the mechanical tomato harvester encouraged the transformation of the tomato business away from small family farms to one dominated by large agribusinesses). Winner’s paper was especially valuable in that it allowed its readers to see the politics that can be hidden within even mundane technologies such as bridges and agricultural harvesters.

The example of Robert Moses’s discriminatory bridges is especially relevant here. As noted by Paltieli [76], the implementation of this bridge technology “was unquestionably political, but it also eliminated politics.” That is, to have achieved the same outcome as the bridge technology (i.e., preventing lower-income racial minorities from reaching a public beach) using non-technical means would have necessitated political buy-in from the civic government, the crafting of bylaws, the involvement of police, and likely challenges by the media and the courts. The key point here is that something political happened, but thanks to technology, it happened in a way that was hidden from the public because it eliminated discussion, explanation, and debate, which are the bedrock of democratic politics [22].

In recent years, more light has been cast on the sometimes shadowy and hidden politics of AI. Not surprisingly, much of this work has revolved around unpacking discriminatory practices within machine learning systems [63, 59, 57]. While important, this work often elides what may be the most important social implication of this technology: its political economy. In traditional economic theory, technological change is typically modelled as productive overall for employment [7]. How so? First, there is a displacement effect (d) as demand for human labor declines in tasks that can be automated or performed by the new technology; second, there is a productivity effect (p) as labor demand increases for nonautomated tasks; and third, there is a reinstatement effect (r) as new categories of tasks are created due to the technology. For much of the twentieth century the evidence indicated that given time (typically no more than a decade or so), $p + r > d$ [6]. But over the past 20-30 years, it appears that IT automation’s displacement effect has grown, while the productivity and reinstatement effects “have been slower to materialize and smaller than expected” [97]. Thus, the consequence of IT innovation over the past three decades has arguably been stagnating labor demand, lower productivity growth, and rising inequality [8, 7].

The worry is that AI will accelerate these trends by being adopted commercially principally as a way of reducing labor costs rather than as a way of improving labor’s productivity [2]. At present, early commercial applications of this technology—such as commercial chatbots, resume filtering, and loan approvals—have very much been focused on displacement with little to no reinstatement. This type of AI will “generate benefits for a narrow part of society that is already rich and politically powerful” [2], thereby exacerbating growing inequality in advanced economies [30]. Ernst [31] calls this the “AI trilemma”: that due to the reliance of machine learning innovation on gargantuan data sets processed on immense energy-consuming GPU farms affordable only by the largest of technological firms, it isn’t possible to have AI productivity, lower economic inequality, and ecological sustainability. Ernst argues that two of the three could be achievable, but with the current technological paradigm in AI and with the current organization of the digital economy, only the AI productivity goal is likely to be achieved in the future, but at the cost of ever rising inequality and environmental destruction. This is why politics is more important than ethics when it comes to thinking about AI innovation within our discipline.

We began this section with the observation that recent advances in AI are engendering worries that we may be on the cusp of some type of societal crisis brought on by AI. Certainly, the generalized insight that this technology stack is qualitatively different in its social risk potential does appear to be well placed. Again, the risk is not of a far-future AGI, but of an already existing technology that is damaging the natural environment, poisoning our information ecosystem, and reproducing systems of oppression by further increasing the concentration of economic power. Giddens [43] and Beck [10] recognized in the last century that the emergence of manufactured risk is one of the key characteristics of late modernity, and that we all have to accommodate ourselves to risk and uncertainty. But the nature of a digital risk is difficult to identify, as the objects at risk (such as autonomy, meaningful work, cognitive enfeeblement) are abstractions. As a consequence, it is difficult to engage in public debate on digital risks in order to address them through governance and regulation [34]. In the next section, this paper will argue that we in computing education—

with our interest in non-technological metrics such as universalism, fairness, diversity, collaboration, justice, and critique—are ideally placed in this regard. By both inclination and knowledge, computing educators have a special calling, a unique responsibility to communicate and engage in an on-going debate about the social meaning of digital technology both within the discipline and with the public at large.

3 Critical responses to the AI crisis

The focus within academic computing has naturally been on the topics close to us, such as algorithms, computational efficiency, programming techniques, and so on. But the depth of field of computation extends far beyond these topics. As the previous section argued, one of the values of the AI Crisis frame is that it can help us broaden our focus and see what’s at stake for those outside academic computing. For much of the past decade, we have hoped that ethics instruction for our students was a sufficient means for addressing the profoundly impactful nature of ongoing digital transformation [35, 20, 85, 93]. But voices within computing have increasingly acknowledged the limitations of ethics instruction as a means of mitigating computing’s social harms [24, 45, 98, 13]. The recent “normative turn” identified by Abebe *et al* [1] in computer science in general and machine learning in particular has played a key role in inculcating a wider willingness to include non-technical metrics such as fairness, bias, accountability, and transparency when designing and evaluating software systems. But as noted by Selbst *et al* [88], fairness and bias are properties of social and legal systems. If we wish to prevent, for instance, discriminatory outcomes in our computing systems, we must first engage with the social and political environments in which inequality and injustice arise [89, 42]. Despite our natural desire for a neutral stance in the classroom divorced from the messiness of real-world politics, computing educators need to accept that this is unrealistic, and, increasingly in the future, they will need to “adopt normative positions on issues they probably prefer to avoid” [61]. Indeed, it has long been recognized within political science that arguing that one’s work is unpolitical is, in fact, a very political statement [81].

A growing body of scholarship within computing has already taken up the challenge of addressing the political aspects of our field. Vakil [98] was an early advocate for a justice-centered approach to teaching computing. Instead of focusing on ethics, such an approach, Vakil argued, requires “considering the sociocultural and sociopolitical contexts in which technologies have been developed and applied.” In such a course, students would engage in the critique of abuses of technological power and learn how to design technological systems that reflect students’ social and civic identities. Recent special issues on justice-centered computing education in *ACM Transactions on Computing Education* similarly called for a reorientation “of computing and computing education towards justice goals” [60].

How is this to be achieved? One key step is to broaden the academic perspective of computing to include those of the social sciences [23]. Similarly, Dignum [29] declared that AI is (or should be) by nature a multidisciplinary endeavor and that “it is essential to integrate humanities and social sciences into the conversation about AI”. Indeed, focusing too closely on the near-to-hand technological aspects of AI does not allow us to see what is morally at stake with this particular technology. AI consists not only of the *technical approaches* (the algorithms, the data models), but also *industrial infrastructures* (almost limitless reservoirs of data, vast quantities of processors for running the models, subsidized energy grids) and *social practices* (protective intellectual property regimes, ready access to AI expertise, reliance on inexpensive third-world data labeling, a lack of external regulatory policies, rent-seeking platform monopolies) [26, 100]. It is when we focus our analysis on these background social practices and industrial infrastructures that we can see the truth about AI, namely, that it is a technology that is profoundly intertwined in relationships of power [22].

Over the past half century, power has been a key vector of analysis with the social sciences. Recognizing the different aspects of power can also be helpful when analyzing technology. But what is power? (The following four-fold categorization is adapted from Waelen [102]). We usually think of power in the *relational* sense—that is, “power over” others and as such is exercised through force, manipulation, and coercion—or in the *dispositional* sense—which refers to the capacity to bring about outcomes, that is, the “power to” do something. But power can also be *systemic*, which refers to the idea that power is also expressed through structures such as ideologies, laws, economic relations, families, etc. Finally, power can be *constitutive*, which refers to the ways individual subjects internalize relational and systemic power and turn it into norms and beliefs that affect behaviors and choice architectures. So can the multifaceted concept of power inform us as computer educators? Can it help us better evaluate the social import of our field? The answer is yes!

Recall the earlier argument that in academic computing we should consider not only the technical approaches with AI but also the vast infrastructure required to run it as well as the variety of social practices that are connected to its use. It is with these latter two aspects where power analysis can be fruitful. Crawford’s superb *Atlas of AI* [26] illustrates the tremendous amount of human and natural resources required to develop and run AI-based technologies: resources that require not only dispositional power, but relational and systemic as well [15]. For instance, usage of natural resources requires obtaining the financial capital that fuels dispositional power; but it also allows those with it to exert relational (i.e., coercive) power over large actors such as state governments competing to attract investment and small actors performing data tagging for penurious rates of pay. Systemic power is at play in the social practices of AI. Advantageous legal and intellectual property regimes for digital firms are part of their systemic power. But so is the ability of these firms to use the power of their platform to act as opinion leaders and shape the way individuals think about the social meaning of these technologies [49]. In other words, a key aspect of systemic power is its ideological expression: the capacity of firms (and of our academic discipline) to divert attention away from the inequality and injustice they are reproducing by making it appear right and just. As noted most famously by Foucault [64], this ideological expression of systemic power often becomes internalized by those subjected to it, thereby turning it into constitutive power.

The constitutive power potential of AI has already become a worry within legal scholarship under the label “algorithmic governance”. The idea here is that individuals’ choice environments are being excessively shaped by algorithmic systems. The selections made by our digital ecosystems, it is argued, “influence not only what we think about (agenda setting) but also how we think about it” [55]. Ominously, these worries about algorithmic governance were motivated by the much simpler machine learning systems (often referred to as ranking algorithms or recommendation engines) of the previous decade. Such algorithms presented users with constrained sets of choices aimed at keeping them engaged. Yet by the end of the 2010s, this limited form of machine learning had given rise to a variety of worries about polarization, addiction, false news, information poisoning, echo chambers, and so on [77]. If this relatively straight-forward form of ranking AI has given us a world in which two neighbors could live in completely different epistemic worlds, then what fate awaits us in the next decade with generative AI, in which the human creator has been removed from the process and where the potential constitutive power of those using these systems is significantly magnified?

In retrospect, we—both as an academic discipline and more broadly as a society—had an opportunity to address these potential problematic features of the previous generation of algorithmic ranking systems during the early years of their adoption. Prophetic early voices such as Sunstein [95] warned about these risks during the high noon of the dotcom era and advocated for a stronger regulatory environment, but both the computing discipline and its surrounding society were in the ideological grip of an overly-optimistic belief in the emancipatory power of networked computing.

Computing educators can play an important role then in countering the constitutive power of such an ideology now that we are once again in the early years of another technological transformation. As noted by Giroux [44], “pedagogy is always political” and must be about more than skills acquisition. We need, as educators, to “connect reading the word with reading the world, and doing so in ways that enhance the capabilities of young people as critical agents and engaged citizens” [44]. This move can be seen in a wide variety of recent educational interventions within computing, such as critical digital literacy [79], computational action [96], equity pedagogy [65], critical computational literacy [62], and culturally-responsive computing [86]. This is a perspective towards our discipline which needs to be expanded. This argument will be explored further in the next two sections.

4 Expanding the habitus of academic computing

Disciplinary divisions of labor exist in all fields; this is also true of academic computing. Our training, our inclinations, our capabilities, our slow induction into the computational way of thinking—we might group these together and simply call them “dispositions”—all shape and guide us into a place in that division of labor. We’ve all had a student or colleague whose dispositions seem a “natural” fit for some type of computing practice, whether it be numeric methods, human factors, or algorithmic evaluation. As such, not every computer scientist is predisposed to taking an interest in educational research or in the normative aspects of their work. What would be some of the dispositions of a computing academic interested in education? I’m not trying to make an essentialist claim: there are no necessary psychological, intellectual, or social characteristics for someone to be interested in computing education research and practice, nor do I wish to reify some type of ideal personality type. Nonetheless it doesn’t seem implausible to posit the possibility that many of us in the computer education guild share some dispositions.

As educators we have the predisposition, the training, the theoretic perspective, the willingness to evaluate computing outcomes from outside of our “normal” disciplinary matrix. Using the terminology of Bourdieu [103], we inhabit a slightly different *habitus* from our computing colleagues who have no interest in education research. *Habitus* is typically understood as the values, dispositions, and practices that agents gain, partly from their personal histories and partly from their membership in a social, cultural, or technical field [67]. These practices and ways of seeing the world operate somewhat unconsciously, and while it is by no means deterministic or immutable, a *habitus* predisposes one towards certain beliefs and actions. So what is the “normal” *habitus* for those in computing and how might we in computer education differ? My thinking about this question was influenced by the public sociology argument of Burawoy [17]. In his presidential address for the 2004 Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association, Burawoy challenged his colleagues to move outside the university into the realm of activism and to engage in public discourses about what society could or should be. Burawoy called this type of activity “Public Sociology” and presented it as one of a four-part division of intellectual labor in the field. His address inspired a substantial literature in response [5, 21]. So while computing and sociology are different disciplines (though I have previously argued that they both social sciences [23]), a disciplinary classification system can help us conceptualize academic computing’s *habitus*.

In Table 1 (inspired by Burawoy [17]), I have classified the different aspects of academic computing labor based on the type of knowledge at play. It uses the term “Instrumental Knowledge” to capture the practical aspect of much of the labor that happens in our discipline; it is all about problem solving, constructing research programs, funding those programs, or applying this research. Most of us spend most of our time in the instrumental dimension. Indeed, without the activities of Professional Computing, there is no academic computing as it provides the scientific knowledge base for the discipline itself. Equally, Professional

Computing is vitalized, legitimized, and funded thanks to the practical application of computing research outside the university in what I call Industrial Computing.

Table 1: Division of Academic Computing Labor

| | Academic Audience | Extra-Academic Audience |
|-------------------------------|--|--|
| Instrumental Knowledge | <i>Professional Computing</i> Research that defines theories, addresses questions, presents solutions | <i>Industrial Computing</i> Application of research, external funding, entrepreneurial monetization, filing patents, consulting, model curricula. |
| Reflexive Knowledge | <i>Critical Computing</i> Internal debate within and between research programs, normative critique | <i>Public Computing</i> Teaching, presenting for non-specialists, creating instructional material, social media interaction, connecting discipline to concerns of wider world |

But academic computing has a neglected other dimension. We can think of it as a reflexive dimension because the analytic spotlight is turned upon ourselves as a discipline. Reflexive Knowledge perhaps feels a little foreign to us in academic computing. “Normal” disciplinary work takes as a given the values and presumptions of the field; reflexivity is a break from this unquestioned acceptance and introduces a perspective of doubt. In the somewhat enigmatic explanation of Bourdieu, reflexivity is “the systemic exploration of the unthought categories of thought which delimit the thinkable” [67]. That is, part of reflexivity is the interrogation of our presumptions: in Table 1, this aspect is called Critical Computing. This willingness to engage in self-critique has often been missing from academic computing. In the first decade of the 2000s we perhaps overly-focused our attention on self-promotion. Arguing for the importance of computational thinking, pushing for the introduction to coding into K-12 education, and advocating for the expansion of computational approaches into other disciplines, all helped to preserve the discipline in the face of the harrowing enrollment crisis of the early 2000s [23]. But those efforts perhaps prevented us from recognizing that self-critique is an important constituent of any discipline.

The other half of reflexivity is the dialogue between ourselves and those outside the discipline, which I call Public Computing. A dialogue is not a lecture at someone; it is a process of mutual education, a dialectic in which we also learn from the audience. This dialogue can be with ourselves (Critical Computing), but it also can be with the outside world (Public Computing). That is, all the activities in the reflexive dimension must be dialogical as there is no clear and well-accepted way of adjudicating the knowledge claims in this dimension. This doesn’t mean it is inferior to instrumental labor; instead, it should be understood as a necessary part of the discipline that runs on different principles.

This can be seen if we look at the two types of academic labor that interacts with the world outside of our discipline (i.e., those in the Extra-Academic Audience column). Both interact with the public but differ completely in their motivation. In Industrial Computing, the public is an object not a subject: something to be manipulated, an instrument for achieving the goals of the researcher (or discipline). That is, its goal is not the betterment of some public; rather it is focused on the self-interested needs of the individual researcher, their graduate students, or the discipline as a whole. But in Public Computing, the computer academic is engaged in a dialogue with others outside of computing. It treats the public as a subject, that is, as something to be valued not in terms of what it can do for us, but because the public has an intrinsic value. In Kantian ethical language, the public is more than just a means, it is an end in itself.

Another way of comprehending the key differences between the four quadrants is by looking at their characteristic types of knowledge, which can be seen in Table 2. It also illustrates why connections between the four different types of academic labor is difficult and why the perception that computing education researchers are inhabiting a completely different epistemological frame than the rest of our computing colleagues [82]. Each of these quadrants differs substantially in their cognitive practices: not only in terms of the nature of their knowledge and how truth claims are legitimated, but also in terms of their accountability, their relationship to other disciplines, and their motivation.

Table 2: Forms of Academic Computing Knowledge

| | Academic Audience | Extra-Academic Audience |
|---------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Instrumental | <i>Professional Computing</i> | <i>Industrial Computing</i> |
| Epistemology | Theoretical / Empirical | Practical / Pragmatic |
| Legitimacy | Scientific / Mathematic Norms | Effectiveness / Performance Metrics |
| Accountability | Peers | Clients |
| Motivation | Self-Interest | Self-Interest |
| Interdisciplinarity | Cross-Disciplinary Borrowing | Stakeholder Domains |
| Reflexive | <i>Critical Computing</i> | <i>Public Computing</i> |
| Epistemology | Normative | Dialogical |
| Legitimacy | Moral Vision | Relevance |
| Accountability | Critical Intellectuals | Publics |
| Motivation | Internal Debate/Critique | Social Responsibility |
| Interdisciplinarity | Transdisciplinary Infusion | Multidisciplinary Collaboration |

Of course, some academic computing practices may straddle these ideal types, but this categorization might help us situate ethical concerns and education research as a whole. Given this characterization of the expanded overall habitus for academic computing, it seems plausible to assert that both ethical/political evaluation and computing education research naturally inhabit the reflexive dimension of academic computing. Education is by its very nature a public practice. It is much more than the provision of knowledge and skills; it is a collaborative process in which identities are constructed and agency—the ability to act and think in the world—is enhanced for both teacher and student.

In this formulation of the reflexive dimension of computing, critique and public responsibility are the key modalities. It is my contention that we need to include more of the reflexive dimension in our disciplinary work. However, it is worth acknowledging that doing so would position the reflexive computer academic in a somewhat fraught attitude towards her/his/their disciplinary home. To make an argument for how we might successfully embrace this dimension, the next section is going to resurrect the archetype of the public intellectual and advocate for a new role within academic computing: the Public Computer Intellectual.

5 The public computer intellectual (PCI)

All humans are intellectual but not all humans have in society the function of intellectuals, Gramsci famously stated in his *Prison Notebooks*, which contains an early and influential account of intellectuals and their role in society [87]. Intellectuals for Gramsci include scholars, artists, and organizers of culture. He distinguished two types of intellectual: traditional intellectuals—old-fashioned generalist scholars who are integrated into a

historical tradition and who claim to be independent of politics—and organic intellectuals, who grow out of the needs of a social class and thus are more directly tied into the economic structure of their society.

Since that time, the ideal of public intellectuals has occasionally been resurrected [53, 80, 92]. The traditional intellectual in the Gramsci sense has, since the late twentieth century, become reliant on university employment and thus can no longer be generalists but must instead be specialists. This universitization of intellectual life has tended to remove a lot of the “public” from “intellectual” work. Nevertheless, what remains of the public intellectual archetype is, despite the specialization imposed by academic life, still “marked by the ability to draw on a wide range of disciplinary insights, frequently versed in fields and literature beyond of their academic home” [28]. These more recent works on public intellectuals has tended to see them in a more favorable light than Gramsci; public intellectuals today are much more likely to publicly engage in debate and advocacy on behalf of the less privileged. In the North American context, some exemplars from the past twenty to thirty years would include Camile Paglia, Edward Said, Charles Taylor, Paul Krugman, Noam Chomsky, Margaret Atwood, Stephen Jay Gould, Christopher Hitchens, Cornell West, Steven Pinker, Cory Doctorow, and Naomi Klein.

Of these, Edward Said—author of *Orientalism*, classical music critic for *The Nation*, and outspoken defender of Palestinian rights—wrote about intellectuals in a manner quite relevant to this paper’s idea of a Public Computer Intellectual (PCI). For Said, the intellectual “is neither a pacifier nor a consensus builder, but someone whose whole being is stalked on a critical sense, a sense of being unwilling to accept easy formulas, or ready-made clichés ... [and who is] actively willing to say so in public” [84]. The vocation of the public intellectual is thus all about “maintaining a state of constant alertness, of a perpetual unwillingness to let half-truths or received ideas steer one along.” For Said, this predisposition is tied to two related forms of reading / observation which he called “reception” and “resistance” [83]. Reception, for Said, refers to a willingness to carefully unearth the messages being communicated by some cultural artefact; resistance is a willingness to be publicly uncomfortable with those messages when they conflict with the good of the less powerful. The task of an intellectual is thus “to be both insider and outsider to the circulating ideas and values that are at issue in our society” [83].

This, then, is what computing needs in an age of AI crisis: a perspective based on disciplinary close-reading (reception) that interrogates the value premises of the academic computing field and thereby takes a stand for the needs of the public instead of the needs of the profession (resistance). This requires recognizing that there is more than one public. We indeed live in a society fractured into divided, sometimes hostile, publics. Public Computer Intellectuals thus need to decide which publics’ interest they wish to promote. The entire instrumental dimension of computing (from Table 1 and 2), which takes up the lion’s share of our disciplinary attention, arguably principally benefits the already privileged. Perhaps, then, following Piven [78], we ought instead to “strive to address the public and political problems of people at the lower end of the many hierarchies that define our society.” Given computing’s close historical relationship with power—indeed the device from its very beginnings to the current day has been a mechanism for expressing and extending the dispositional, relational, and systemic power of the already powerful—it arguably makes sense in terms of fairness for a public and critical computing to ally itself more with addressing the problems and needs of the less powerful.

Consequently, our PCI should be characterized by a willingness to be a dissident within the discipline and thus to inhabit both Critical Computing *and* Public Computing. There are already exemplars in this sense who can inspire us. Here I will mention Abeba Birhane, Kate Crawford, Amy Ko, Timnit Gebru, Mark Guzdial, and Arvind Narayan as computing academics who are already Public Computing Intellectuals. Abeba Birhane (Senior Advisor in AI Accountability at Mozilla Foundation as well as Assistant Professor in Computer Science at Trinity College, Dublin) has documented the discriminatory malfeasance which lurks within many

AI models, products, and research [12, 13, 14]. What turns her into a PCI is that she resides not only in the Critical Computing quadrant but also within the Public Computing one. She tirelessly brings to light the many politically problematic features of contemporary machine learning research, not only in academic publications but on Twitter as well. Timnit Gebru (formerly of Google), Kate Crawford (Research Professor at USC Annenberg), and Arvind Narayan (Professor of Computer Science at Princeton) have also been critical voices within computing; part of the way they have expressed their public aspects have been through media appearances, through blog posts, and through their work in organizations devoted to the public interest (the Distributed AI Research Institute, the AI Now Institute, and the Princeton Center for Information Technology Policy respectively). Computing education research also has its PCIs. Amy Ko, currently editor of *ACM Transactions on Computing Education*, has been a public advocate for broadening research paradigms in computing as well as encouraging the adoption of a justice lens within our subfield. With a series of student collaborators, Ko’s work has focused on discrimination and bias in computer systems [104] and has brought that work to a wider public on Twitter and Medium. Mark Guzdial is similarly engaged in an active dialogue with both the profession and the public about the nature of computing education. His perspective may at first glance not seem especially political. But his tireless advocacy—in both academic articles and in Twitter, blog posts, and public-facing magazine articles—on behalf of his belief that CS needs to change “so it serves the needs of our students and society” [46] fits both reflexive quadrants of Table 1. In all of these cases, these PCIs are commentating in an accessible manner on technical material that would otherwise remain out of sight for those outside of academic computing. Following Table 2, their technical critique from within is an example of accountability to a public and takes for its legitimacy a moral vision of what education and society should and should not be.

Of course, not every academic wishes to have a public presence. What if one doesn’t want to voice their opinion or research on Twitter, Medium, YouTube, or the *New York Times*? (Indeed, being outspoken public critics appears to have incurred a real emotional or professional cost to some of the above exemplars). Yet I do believe that even if we are not actively engaged in the public’s eye, we can still inhabit the virtues of the public intellectual in our teaching and research. The (Almost) Public Computer Intellectual—the (A)PCI —, whether in the classroom or in academic research, can still be an advocate, not for computing itself (that’s the job of the ACM/IEEE, university program advisors, or industrial spokespeople), but for those who often have to bear the brunt of computing advances: the exploited without voice in our field, mutely confounded by opaque algorithmic systems protected by a fog of complex mathematics and the ideology of inevitable technological progress. This means that as (A)PCI’s we devote more of our academic attention in computing, both as educators and as researchers, to the needs of the poor, to racial minorities, to women more than men, to the marginalized without legal residence, and to the world outside of the wealthier developed core. As advocated by critical theory [16, 40], we want to identify the potential for emancipation in the outputs and thinking processes of academic computing; we also want to bring to light the lived reality of actual repression that is a consequence of the way our discipline is integrated into the public economy of late capitalism.

One practical mechanism that might allow for an expanded expression of the reflexive dimension in academic computing would be to institute an expectation that aspects of the reflexive dimension be part of the peer review process in computing. This was the principle behind the workshop that Sturdee *et al* ran at CHI’2021: “to explore and establish the principle that the potential negative consequences of [computing] research should be questioned, critiqued, and discussed as part of the publication and peer review process” [94]. Recognizing the value of public dialogue in the promotion process would also be an important way to institutionalize the recognition of the reflexive dimension.

Finally, this paper’s call for more of us in computing to be willing to don the garb of the Public Computer Intellectual, is one for which computer education researchers are ideally placed to answer. Partly this is due to

disposition (i.e., by the fact that the habitus education researchers inhabit already embraces both quadrants of the reflexive dimension) and partly due to the emancipatory nature of education itself: that is, to education's concern for justice and equality in educational experiences. Educational pedagogy has always been a "discourse of both critique and possibility" [44], a conversation not just among educators, but a dialogue between educators, students, and different publics. For this reason, it should be no surprise that a substantial amount of the research around social consequences of computing within the discipline itself has taken place within computing education journals and conferences. While this can be a source of pride for those in the computer education research space, these types of conversations ultimately need to expand out of this particular gilded ghetto and be part as well of the sunny suburbs of "normal" academic computing.

6 Conclusion

This essay has argued that the public discourse on AI crisis is worth our attention because it can help us see how vital it is to expand our discipline's focus beyond technological minutia and see the wider background affected by our work. In this regard, the lenses of economics, sociology, political science, and other social sciences are necessary. In particular, power as an analytic category is especially valuable for understanding the relationship between computing and the rest of society. Such an approach aligns well with contemporary educational theory since both share an explicit normative goal of emancipation and empowerment for all. This paper then presented an expanded categorization of academic computing that legitimates both internal critique and a broader concern for the public interest as constitutive aspects of academic computing. Finally, Public Computer Intellectuals were presented as an example of what such an expansion could look like.

Computing today is a provocative topic. Citizens young and old are very much engaged in debates around the various changing manifestations of computing technology. These debates are not around the technicalities of the algorithms; rather, they are about ramifications, often initially on the personal or familial, but also on the wider social world. Are my teenagers' preoccupation with visual spectacle on Instagram and TikTok making them superficial? Has a reliance on quick and easy web searches made us progressively unwilling to countenance prolonged argumentation? Is online pornography contributing to a decline in libido? If I spend more and more time online exposed to ideas congruent with my own, will this make my opinions more uncompromising and extreme? Will ChatGPT affect my job? Will it make my children less able to write and think on their own? Is it fair that AI image generators profit from the consumption of billions of images without the consent of their owners?

These are the debates of our time, much as class struggle was to the 1920s and 1930s, the struggle against fascism and communism was to the 1940s and 1950s, decolonization and mass consumerism was to the 1960s and 1970s, and the transformation of life around the exigencies of globalized finance was to the 1980s and 1990s. Public debate about these issues in decades past was the purview of experts in the media, in independent thinktanks, or in the policy departments of universities. But now it is our—that is, academic computing's—moment in the sun. We have a duty and responsibility to add our voice, our expertise, to these debates.

But to do so requires more than just a willingness to participate in these debates. It requires a recalibration of our discipline's intellectual orientation to be more focused on the world around us. We can no longer think of our discipline (and ourselves as computer education practitioners) as being just a technical one akin to our cousins in the natural and engineering sciences, operating according to unproblematic natural laws. This would mean breaking from our almost single-minded focus within computing education on how to improve student learning of the technical aspects of computing (especially first-year programming), and instead recognize that encouraging a critical stance towards their discipline is just as important.

In 2022, Judith Butler, famous for rebarbative texts for theory specialists such as *Gender Trouble* (1990), *Bodies that Matter* (1993), and *Giving an Account of Oneself* (2005), wrote a beautifully profound and accessible piece for *Daedalus* on the public future of her discipline. In it, she wrote that the question of the future is “the predominate problem for the humanities” [18]. This paper has argued that the future should also be the predominate problem for the computing discipline. Moving forward in a soon-to-be world where the AI crisis is transforming from what-might-be to what-now-is, the need for an institutionalized acceptance of the reflexive dimension within computing will be increasingly needed.

This essay began with a quote from Gramsci on crisis, and how the period between the decline of an old way of life but before the ascendancy of a new one is a time of both risk and opportunity. Gramsci felt public intellectuals could play a key role during such times in helping society navigate a path to a less unpleasant future. The AI world of the future is one of unprecedented risk. Within academic computing we have both a tremendous responsibility to the future as well as an opportunity to effect a transformation in how we think about computation and teach its principles. Public Computer Intellectuals—and the (Almost) Public Computer Intellectuals within computer education research—can play a key role in achieving this transformation.

References

- [1] Rediet Abebe, Solon Barocas, Jon Kleinberg, Karen Levy, Manish Raghavan, and David G. Robinson. 2020. Roles for computing in social change. In *Proceedings of the 2020 conference on fairness, accountability, and transparency*, pp. 252-260.
- [2] Daron Acemoglu and Pascual Restrepo. 2020. The wrong kind of AI? Artificial intelligence and the future of labour demand. *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*, 13, 1, 25-35.
- [3] Daron Acemoglu and Pascual Restrepo. 2022. Tasks, automation, and the rise in us wage inequality. *Econometrica* 90, 5, 1973-2016.
- [4] ACM. 2018. ACM Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct. <https://www.acm.org/code-of-ethics>.
- [5] Barbara Adam, Wendell Bell, Michael Burawoy, Stephen Cornell, Michael DeCesare, Sean Elias, Lee McPhail et al. *Handbook of public sociology*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2009.
- [6] David H Autor. 2015. Why are there still so many jobs? The history and future of workplace automation. *Journal of economic perspectives* 29, 3, 3-30. <https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.29.3.3>
- [7] David H Autor. 2022. The labor market impacts of technological change: From unbridled enthusiasm to qualified optimism to vast uncertainty (No. w30074). National Bureau of Economic Research.
- [8] David H Autor, David Dorn, Lawrence F. Katz, Christina Patterson, and John Van Reenen. 2020. The fall of the labor share and the rise of superstar firms. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 135, 2, 645-709.
- [9] Chelsea Barabas, Colin Doyle, J. B. Rubinovitz, and Karthik Dinakar. 2020. Studying up: reorienting the study of algorithmic fairness around issues of power. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (FAT* '20)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 167–176. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1145/3351095.3372859>
- [10] Ulrich Beck. 1986. *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*. Trans. Mark Ritter. Sage, London.
- [11] Gert Biesta. 2020. Have we been paying attention? Educational anesthetics in a time of crises. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 54, 3, 221-223. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2020.1792612>
- [12] Abeba Birhane. 2021. Algorithmic injustice: a relational ethics approach. *Patterns*, 2(2).
- [13] Abeba Birhane, Pratyusha Kalluri, Dallas Card, William Agnew, Ravit Dotan, and Michelle Bao. 2022. The values encoded in machine learning research. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, pp. 173-184.

- [14] Abeba Birhane, Elayne Ruane, Thomas Laurent, Matthew S. Brown, Johnathan Flowers, Anthony Ventresque, and Christopher L. Dancy. 2022. The forgotten margins of AI ethics. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, pp. 948-958.
- [15] Benedetta Brevini. 2020. Black boxes, not green: Mythologizing artificial intelligence and omitting the environment. *Big Data & Society*, 7, 2, 2053951720935141.
- [16] Craig Browne. 2017. *Critical Social Theory*. Sage Publications.
- [17] Michael Burawoy. 2005. For public sociology. *American sociological review*, 70, 1, 4-28.
- [18] Judith Butler. 2022. The Public Futures of the Humanities. *Daedalus*, 151, 3, 40-53.
- [19] Center for AI Safety. 2023. Statement of AI Risk. <https://www.safe.ai/statement-on-ai-risk>
- [20] Maria Christoforaki and Oya Beyan. 2022. Ai ethics—a bird’s eye view." *Applied Sciences* 12, 9, 4130.
- [21] Dan Clawson, ed. 2007. Public sociology: Fifteen eminent sociologists debate politics and the profession in the twenty-first century. Univ of California Press.
- [22] Mark Coeckelbergh. 2022. The political philosophy of AI: an introduction. John Wiley & Sons.
- [23] Randy Connolly. 2020. Why computing belongs within the social sciences." *Communications of the ACM*, 63, 8, 54-59. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3383444>.
- [24] Randy Connolly. In press. From ethics to politics: changing approaches to AI education. *Handbook of Critical Studies of Artificial Intelligence*. Ed. Simon Lindgren. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- [25] Rodrigo Cordero. 2017. Crisis and critique: On the fragile foundations of social life. London: Routledge.
- [26] Kate Crawford. 2021. The atlas of AI: Power, politics, and the planetary costs of artificial intelligence. Yale University Press.
- [27] John Danaher. 2019. Automation and utopia: Human flourishing in a world without work. Harvard University Press.
- [28] Patrick J. Deneen. 2016. The Public Intellectual as Teacher and Students as Public. *Public Intellectuals in the Global Arena: Professors or Pundits?* Ed. Michael C. Desch. University of Notre Dame Press.
- [29] Virginia Dignum. 2020. AI is multidisciplinary. *AI Matters*, 5, 4, 18-21.
- [30] Devdatt Dubhashi. 2022. Can universities combat the 'wrong kind of AI?'. *Communications of the ACM*, 65, 12, 24-26.
- [31] Ekkehard Ernst. 2022. The AI trilemma: Saving the planet without ruining our jobs. *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence*, 5, 886561.
- [32] Virginia Eubanks. 2018. Automating inequality: How high-tech tools profile, police, and punish the poor. St. Martin's Press.
- [33] European Parliament. 2023. EU AI Act: first regulation on artificial intelligence. June 16 2023. <https://www.europarl.europa.eu/news/en/headlines/society/20230601STO93804/eu-ai-act-first-regulation-on-artificial-intelligence>.
- [34] José Vida Fernández. 2023. The Risk of Digitalization: Transforming Government into a Digital Leviathan. *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies*, 30, 1, 3-13.
- [35] Casey Fiesler, Natalie Garrett, and Nathan Beard. 2020. What Do We Teach When We Teach Tech Ethics? A Syllabi Analysis. *Proceedings of the 51st ACM Technical Symposium on Computer Science Education. Association for Computing Machinery*, New York, NY, USA, 289–295. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1145/3328778.3366825>.
- [36] Luciano Floridi. 2019. Translating principles into practices of digital ethics: Five risks of being unethical. *Philosophy & Technology*, 32, 2, 185-193.
- [37] Luciano Floridi, Josh Cows, Monica Beltrametti, Raja Chatila, Patrice Chazerand, Virginia Dignum, Christoph Luetge *et al.* 2021. An ethical framework for a good AI society: Opportunities, risks,

- principles, and recommendations. *Ethics, governance, and policies in artificial intelligence*, 19-39.
- [38] Nancy Fraser and Rahel Jaeggi. 2018. *Capitalism: A conversation in critical theory*. John Wiley & Sons.
- [39] Carl Benedikt Frey and Michael A. Osborne. 2017. The future of employment: How susceptible are jobs to computerisation?. *Technological forecasting and social change* 114, 254-280.
- [40] Christian Fuchs. 2021. *Foundations of Critical Theory*. Routledge.
- [41] Eugene Gan. 2023. The looming artificial intelligence crisis. *Crisismagazine.com* (Jan 24, 2023). <https://crisismagazine.com/opinion/the-looming-artificial-intelligence-crisis>
- [42] Seeta Peña Gangadharan and Jędrzej Niklas Gangadharan. 2019. Decentering technology in discourse on discrimination. *Information, Communication & Society*, 22, 7, 882–899. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2019.1593484>
- [43] Anthony Giddens. 1990. *The Consequences of Modernity*. Stanford University Press.
- [44] Henry Armand Giroux. 2019. Public Scholarship, Public Intellectuals, and the Role of Higher Education in a Time of Crisis. *The Oxford Handbook of Methods for Public Scholarship*, 37.
- [45] Ben Green. 2020. Data Science as Political Action: Grounding Data Science in a Politics of Justice. *Journal of Social Computing*, 2, 3, 249–265. <https://doi.org/10.23919/jsc.2021.0029>
- [46] Mark Guzdial. 2020. Talking about race in CS education. *Commun. ACM* 64, 1, 10–11. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3433921>
- [47] Jan-Christoph Heilinger. 2022. The ethics of AI ethics. A constructive critique. *Philosophy & Technology*, 35, 3, 61.
- [48] Eckhard Hein. 2012. *The macroeconomics of finance-dominated capitalism and its crisis*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- [49] Natali Helberger. 2020. The Political Power of Platforms: How Current Attempts to Regulate Misinformation Amplify Opinion Power. *Digital Journalism*, 8, 6, 842–854. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2020.1773888>.
- [50] Jonathan Ho, William Chan, Chitwan Saharia, Jay Whang, Ruiqi Gao, Alexey Gritsenko, Diederik P. Kingma *et al.* 2023. Imagen video: High definition video generation with diffusion models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.02303*.
- [51] Qingqing Huang, Daniel S. Park, Tao Wang, Timo I. Denk, Andy Ly, Nanxin Chen, Zhengdong Zhang *et al.* 2023. Noise2music: Text-conditioned music generation with diffusion models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.03917*.
- [52] Malte Frøslee Ibsen. 2019. The populist conjuncture: Legitimation crisis in the age of globalized capitalism. *Political Studies*, 67, 3, 795-811.
- [53] Russell Jacoby. 1987. *The last intellectuals: American culture in the age of academe*. Basic Books.
- [54] Anna Jobin, Marcello Ienca, and Effy Vayena. 2019. The global landscape of AI ethics guidelines. *Nature machine intelligence*, 1, 9, 389-399.
- [55] Natascha Just and Michael Latzer. 2017. Governance by algorithms: reality construction by algorithmic selection on the Internet. *Media, culture & society* 39, 2, 238-258. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0163443716643157>.
- [56] Sayash Kapoor and Arvind Narayanan. 2023. A misleading open letter about sci-fi AI dangers ignores the real risks. (Mar 23, 2023). <https://www.aisnakeoil.com/p/a-misleading-open-letter-about-sci>
- [57] Davinder Kaur, Suleyman Uslu, Kaley J. Rittichier, and Arjan Durresi. 2022. Trustworthy artificial intelligence: a review. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)* 55, 2, 1-38. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3491209>.
- [58] Jennifer J. Kish-Gephart, David A. Harrison, and Linda Klebe Treviño. 2010. Bad apples, bad cases, and bad barrels: meta-analytic evidence about sources of unethical decisions at work. *Journal of applied*

- psychology* 95, 1.
- [59] Nima Kordzadeh & Maryam Ghasemaghaei (2022) Algorithmic bias: review, synthesis, and future research directions, *European Journal of Information Systems*, 31, 3, 388-409, DOI: 10.1080/0960085X.2021.1927212
- [60] Michael Lachney, Jean Ryoo, and Rafi Santo. 2021. Introduction to the Special Section on Justice-Centered Computing Education, Part 1. *ACM Transactions on Computer Education* 21, 4 (December 2021), 15 pages. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1145/3477981>.
- [61] Stefan Larsson. 2019. The socio-legal relevance of artificial intelligence. *Droit et société*, 103, 573-593. <https://doi.org/10.3917/drs1.103.0573>
- [62] Clifford H. Lee and Elisabeth Soep. 2016. None But Ourselves Can Free Our Minds: Critical Computational Literacy as a Pedagogy of Resistance. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 49, 4, 480–492. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10665684.2016.1227157>.
- [63] Bruno Lepri, Nuria Oliver, Emmanuel Letouzé, Alex Pentland, and Patrick Vinck. 2017. Fair, Transparent, and Accountable Algorithmic Decision-making Processes. *Philosophy & Technology*, 31, 4, 611–627. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S13347-017-0279-X>
- [64] Wesley Longhofer and Daniel Winchester. 2016. Social theory re-wired: New connections to classical and contemporary perspectives. Routledge.
- [65] Tia C. Madkins, Nicol Howard, and Natalie Freed. 2020. Engaging Equity Pedagogies in Computer Science Learning Environments. *Journal of Computer Science Integration*, 3, 1–27.
- [66] Gary Marcus. 2023. Why are we letting the AI Crisis just happen? atlantic.com (Mar. 13, 2023). <https://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2023/03/ai-chatbots-large-language-model-misinformation/673376/>
- [67] Karl Maton. 2008. Habitus. *Pierre Bourdieu: key concepts*. Michael Grenfell, Ed. Routledge.
- [68] Andrew McNamara, Justin Smith, and Emerson Murphy-Hill. 2018. Does ACM’s code of ethics change ethical decision making in software development?. In *Proceedings of the 2018 26th ACM joint meeting on european software engineering conference and symposium on the foundations of software engineering* (pp. 729-733).
- [69] Brian Milstein. 2014. Thinking politically about crisis: A pragmatist perspective. *European Journal of Political Theory*, 14, 2, 141–160. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1474885114546138>
- [70] Brent Mittelstadt. 2019. Principles alone cannot guarantee ethical AI. *Nature machine intelligence*, 1, 11, 501-507.
- [71] Brent Mittelstadt, Patrick Allo, Mariarosaria Taddeo, Sandra Wachter, and Luciano Floridi. 2016. The ethics of algorithms: Mapping the debate. *Big Data & Society* 3, 2, 2053951716679679.. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951716679679>
- [72] Jared Moore. 2020. Towards a more representative politics in the ethics of computer science. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (FAT* '20)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 414–424. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1145/3351095.3372854>.
- [73] Evgeny Morozov. 2022. Critique of techno-feudal reason. *New Left Review*, (133), 89-126.
- [74] Safiya Umoja Noble. 2018. *Algorithms of oppression*. New York University Press.
- [75] Cathy O’Neil. 2017. Weapons of math destruction: How big data increases inequality and threatens democracy. Crown.
- [76] Guy Paltieli. In press. Re-imagining democracy: AI’s challenge to political theory. *Handbook of Critical Studies of Artificial Intelligence*. Ed. Simon Lindgren. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- [77] Whitney Phillips and Ryan M. Milner. 2021. You are here: A field guide for navigating polarized speech, conspiracy theories, and our polluted media landscape. MIT Press.

- [78] Frances Fox Piven. 2007. From public sociology to politicized sociologist. *Public sociology: Fifteen eminent sociologists debate politics and the profession in the twenty-first century*. Dan Clawson et al, Eds. University of California Press. 158-166.
- [79] Gianfranco Polizzi. 2020. Information literacy in the digital age: why critical digital literacy matters for democracy. *Informed Societies*, Stephane Goldstein (Ed). Facet Publishing.
- [80] Richard A. Posner. 2001. *Public intellectuals: A study of decline*. Harvard University Press.
- [81] Emily Robinson. 2023. The Politics of Unpolitics. *The Political Quarterly*, 94, 2, 306-313.
- [82] Monique S. Ross. 2023. Let's have that Conversation: How Limited Epistemological Beliefs Exacerbates Inequities and will Continue to be a Barrier to Broadening Participation. *ACM Transactions on Computing Education*, 23, 2. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3578270>
- [83] Edward W. Said. 2004. The Return to Philology. *Humanism and democratic criticism*. Columbia University Press.
- [84] Edward W. Said. 2012. Representations of the Intellectual. Vintage.
- [85] Jeffrey Saltz, Michael Skirpan, Casey Fiesler, Micha Gorelick, Tom Yeh, Robert Heckman, Neil Dewar, and Nathan Beard. 2019. Integrating ethics within machine learning courses. *ACM Transactions on Computing Education (TOCE)* 19, 4, 1-26. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1145/3341164>.
- [86] Kimberly A. Scott, Kimberly Sheridan, and Kevin Clark. 2014. Culturally responsive computing: A theory revisited. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 40, 412-436.
- [87] John Schwarzmantel. 2014. The Routledge guidebook to Gramsci's prison notebooks. Routledge.
- [88] Andrew D. Selbst, Danah Boyd, Sorelle A. Friedler, Suresh Venkatasubramanian, and Janet Vertesi. 2019. Fairness and Abstraction in Sociotechnical Systems. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (FAT* '19)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 59-68. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1145/3287560.3287598>.
- [89] Judith Simon, Pak Hang Wong, and Gernot Rieder. 2020. Algorithmic bias and the Value Sensitive Design approach. *Internet Policy Review*, 9, 4. <https://doi.org/10.14763/2020.4.1534>
- [90] Josh Simons. 2023. Algorithms for the People: Democracy in the Age of AI. Princeton University Press.
- [91] Nathalie A. Smuha. 2019. The EU approach to ethics guidelines for trustworthy artificial intelligence. *Computer Law Review International*, 20, 4, 97-106.
- [92] Thomas Sowell. 2012. *Intellectuals and society*. Hachette UK.
- [93] Bernd Carsten Stahl, Job Timmermans, and Brent Daniel Mittelstadt. 2016. The Ethics of Computing: A Survey of the Computing-Oriented Literature. *ACM Computer Survey*, 48, 4 (May 2016), 38 pages. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1145/2871196>.
- [94] Miriam Sturdee, Joseph Lindley, Conor Linehan, Chris Elsdon, Neha Kumar, Tawanna Dillahunt, Regan Mandryk, and John Vines. 2021. Consequences, schmonsequences! Considering the future as part of publication and peer review in computing research. In *Extended Abstracts of the 2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pp. 1-4.
- [95] Cass R. Sunstein. 2001. *Republic. com*. Princeton University Press.
- [96] Mike Tissenbaum, Josh Sheldon, and Hal Abelson. 2019. Viewpoint from computational thinking to computational action. *Communications of the ACM*, 62, 3, 34-36. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3265747>.
- [97] Laura D. Tyson and John Zysman. 2022. Automation, AI & Work. *Daedalus*, 151, 2, 256-271.
- [98] Sepehr Vakil. 2018. Ethics, identity, and political vision: Toward a justice-centered approach to equity in computer science education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 88, 1, 26-52. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17763/1943-5045-88.1.26>.
- [99] Chris Vallance. 2023. Elon Musk among experts urging a halt to AI training. *bbc.com*. (Mar. 30, 2023). <https://www.bbc.com/news/technology-65110030>

-
- [100] Pieter Verdegem. In press. Critical AI studies meets critical political economy. *Handbook of Critical Studies of Artificial Intelligence*. Ed. Simon Lindgren. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- [101] James Vincent. 2023. Top AI researchers and CEOs warn against ‘risk of extinction’ in 22-word statement. *theverge.com*. (May 30, 2023). <https://www.theverge.com/2023/5/30/23742005/ai-risk-warning-22-word-statement-google-deepmind-openai>
- [102] Rosalie Waelen. 2022. Why AI ethics is a critical theory. *Philosophy & Technology*, 35, 1, 9.
- [103] Jen Webb, Tony Schirato, and Geoff Danaher. 2002. *Understanding Bourdieu*. Sage Publications.
- [104] Anne L. Washington and Rachel Kuo. 2020. Whose side are ethics codes on? power, responsibility and the social good. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (FAT* '20)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 230–240. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1145/3351095.3372844>.
- [105] White House. 2023. Biden-Harris Administration Secures Voluntary Commitments from Leading Artificial Intelligence Companies to Manage the Risks Posed by AI. July 21 2023. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2023/07/21/fact-sheet-biden-harris-administration-secures-voluntary-commitments-from-leading-artificial-intelligence-companies-to-manage-the-risks-posed-by-ai/>
- [106] Langdon Winner. 1980. Do Artifacts Have Politics? *Daedalus*, 109, 1, 121–36, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20024652>.
- [107] Karen Yeung. 2018. Five fears about mass predictive personalization in an age of surveillance capitalism. *International Data Privacy Law*, 8, 3 (2018): 258-269. DOI:10.1093/idpl/ipy020
- [108] Michalinos Zembylas, Mark Baildon, and Dennis Kwek. 2022. Responsive education in times of crisis. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education* 42, sup1, 1-5.