

Teacher work and formation in the face of platformization, the financialization of education, and digital sovereignty¹

Trabalho e formação docente diante da plataformação, da financeirização da educação e da soberania digital

Trabajo y formación docente frente a la plataformación, la financiarización de la educación y la soberanía digital

Interview with: José Claudinei Lombardi²

Adda Daniela Lima Figueiredo Echalar³
Universidade Federal de Goiás

Joana Peixoto⁴
Instituto Federal de Educação, Ciência e Tecnologia de Goiás

Jackeline Império Soares⁵
Secretaria Municipal de Educação de Goiânia

Iury Kesley Marques de Oliveira Martins⁶
Secretaria de Estado de Educação de Goiás



Photo: Márcio Carvalho
(HistedBR Tocantins)

Retired full professor from the Faculty of Education at Unicamp. Voluntary collaborating professor in the Graduate Program in Education at Unicamp. Doctorate in Education, Concentration Area: Philosophy and History of Education, from the State University of Campinas (1993); Habilitation (Livre-docência) in History of Education at the Faculty of Education at Unicamp; Full Professor in History of Education at the Faculty of Education - Unicamp. Secretary of Education of Limeira,

¹ Iury Kesley Marques de Oliveira Martins, Secretaria Estadual de Educação de Goiás, Goiânia, Goiás, Brazil, E-mail: iurykesleybio@gmail.com.

² Doctor in Education. Unicamp, Campinas, São Paulo, SP. Brasil, E-mail: jcl.zezo@gmail.com; Lattes: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/9792876515583843>; ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3552-941X>.

³ Doutorado em Educação. Universidade Federal de Goiás (UFG), Goiânia, GO, Brasil. E-mail: adda.daniela@ufg.br; Lattes: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/3758976350155947>; ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3026-8860>.

⁴ Doutorado em Ciências da Educação. Universidade Paris VII (UPVIII), Paris, França. Instituto Federal de Goiás (IFG), Goiânia, GO. Brasil. E-mail: joana.peixoto@ifg.edu.br; Lattes: <https://lattes.cnpq.br/5636200472384576>; ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9469-5680>.

⁵ Mestra em Educação – UFG. Secretaria Municipal de Educação de Goiânia (SME/Goiânia) e Doutoranda no PPGE/UFG. Goiânia, Goiás, Brasil. E-mail: jackelineimperio@discente.ufg.br; Lattes: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/9972485790762979>; Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0009-0000-1620-2609>.

⁶ Mestre em Educação. Professor da Secretaria de Estado de Educação de Goiás (SEDUC-GO) e doutorando em Educação na Universidade Federal de Goiás (PPGE-UFG), Goiânia, Goiás (GO), Brasil. E-mail: iurykesleybio@gmail.com; Lattes: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/5327634205459630>; ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5188-1878>.

	<p>SP, from January 2013 to January 2015. Experience in the field of Education, with emphasis on Marxism and Education; Historical-Critical Pedagogy; and History of Education, working mainly on the following themes: research in education; history of Brazilian education; history, work, and education; and historiography of education. Author and organizer of several publications. Executive coordinator of the "History, Society and Education in Brazil" (HISTEDBR) Study and Research Group. E-mail: jcl.zezo@gmail.com; Lattes: http://lattes.cnpq.br/9792876515583843; ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3552-941X.</p>
--	---

Abstract: Professor and intellectual José Claudinei Lombardi (Zezo) anchors his reflections in Marxism to reflect on the discussions raised during the interview. According to the author, Marxist ontology conceives of the social being in its materiality, understanding technology as an expression of objectified human labor, mediated by productive processes and historically determined by social relations. Drawing on Marx, Engels, Gramsci, Mészáros, and Antunes, he argues that, under the foundations of capital, innovations increase productivity, reinforce domination, and make work precarious. Terms like "digital capitalism" and "surveillance capitalism" capture circumstantial aspects but can obscure the essence: the exploitation of living labor as the basis for the accumulation of surplus value. In the educational field, Lombardi highlights that technicism and neo-technicism subordinate pedagogy to an instrumental logic, deepened by the processes of platformization and financialization, which imply a loss of autonomy and digital sovereignty. The intellectual defends Historical-Critical Pedagogy, omnilateral education, and the unveiling of fetishism. He concludes by proposing three tasks: a critique of bourgeois education; a praxis that democratizes systematized knowledge; and political education focused on human emancipation.

Keywords: Marxism; Technology; Education; Platformization; Historical-Critical Pedagogy.

Resumo: O professor e intelectual José Claudinei Lombardi (Zezo) ancora sua reflexão no marxismo para pensar nas discussões postas durante a entrevista. Segundo o autor, a ontologia marxista concebe o ser social em sua materialidade, entendendo a tecnologia como expressão do trabalho humano objetivado, mediada pelos processos produtivos e historicamente determinada pelas relações sociais. Com base em Marx, Engels, Gramsci, Mészáros e Antunes, ele argumenta que sob os fundamentos do capital, as inovações ampliam a produtividade, reforçam a dominação e precarizam o trabalho. Termos como "capitalismo digital" e "capitalismo de vigilância" captam aspectos conjunturais, mas podem obscurecer a essência: a exploração do trabalho vivo como base da acumulação de mais valor. No campo educacional, Lombardi evidencia que o tecnicismo e o neotecnicismo subordinam a pedagogia à lógica instrumental, aprofundada pelos processos de plataformação e financeirização, que implicam perda de autonomia e de soberania digital. O intelectual faz a defesa da Pedagogia Histórico-Crítica, a formação omnilateral e o desvelamento do fetichismo. Conclui propondo três tarefas: a crítica à educação burguesa; a práxis que democratize o saber sistematizado; e a formação política voltada à emancipação humana.

Palavras-chave: Marxismo; Tecnologia; Educação; Plataformação; Pedagogia Histórico-Crítica.

Resumen: El profesor e intelectual José Claudinei Lombardi (Zezo) basa sus reflexiones en el marxismo para reflexionar sobre los debates planteados durante la entrevista. Según el autor,

la ontología marxista concibe al ser social en su materialidad, entendiendo la tecnología como expresión del trabajo humano objetivado, mediado por procesos productivos y determinado históricamente por las relaciones sociales. Basándose en Marx, Engels, Gramsci, Mészáros y Antunes, argumenta que, bajo los cimientos del capital, las innovaciones aumentan la productividad, refuerzan la dominación y precarizan el trabajo. Términos como «capitalismo digital» y «capitalismo de vigilancia» captan aspectos circunstanciales, pero pueden oscurecer la esencia: la explotación del trabajo vivo como base para la acumulación de plusvalía. En el ámbito educativo, Lombardi destaca que el tecnicismo y el neotecnicismo subordinan la pedagogía a una lógica instrumental, profundizada por los procesos de plataformización y financiarización, que implican una pérdida de autonomía y soberanía digital. El intelectual defiende la Pedagogía Histórico-Crítica, la educación omnilateral y la superación del fetichismo. Concluye proponiendo tres tareas: una crítica de la educación burguesa; una praxis que democratice el conocimiento sistematizado; y una educación política centrada en la emancipación humana.

Palabras clave: Marxismo; Tecnología; Educación; Plataformización; Pedagogía Histórico-Crítica.

Received on: September 20, 2025

Accepted on: October 20, 2025

Entrevista

Professor José Claudinei Lombardi, better known as Zezo, holds a doctorate in Education, in the area of Philosophy and History of Education, from the State University of Campinas (Unicamp), and a Full Professor (livre-docente) in History of Education. He is currently the executive coordinator of the "History, Society and Education in Brazil" (HistedBr) Study and Research Group.

According to the HistedBr website, the group is dedicated to investigating education in its intrinsic articulation with society, understanding it as a social, geographically, and historically determined phenomenon, and analyzing it through methods and theories of the area.

In his Full Professor thesis, the researcher states that "education cannot be analyzed without taking into account that it is an integral part of society and that it is determined, in the last instance, by the mode of production of life" and highlights, in particular, three dimensions that require attention: intellectual formation, bodily formation, and technological formation.

Professor Lombardi has a trajectory dedicated to the intellectual formation of students and researchers who participated in his classes, supervisions, and lectures. In the context of the work he develops on History, Society, and Education in Brazil, in dialogue with science, technology, Marxism, and Historical-Critical Pedagogy, we propose here a joint reflection on some of the multiple determinations of the dossier we are organizing, entitled

"Platformization, financialization of education, and digital sovereignty: at issue in teacher work and formation."

Zezo Lombardi - Dear Adda, Joana, Iury, and Jackeline, it is a pleasure to talk with you. Firstly, I sincerely thank you for the honorable invitation to give this interview for the dossier "Platformization, financialization of education, and digital sovereignty: at issue in teacher work and formation". I note that I was particularly touched by the careful contextualization of my intellectual trajectory and by the profound questions raised, which dialogue directly with my research at HistedBr and in studies on Marxism and Education.

In the presentation you made, you already registered the philosophical, historical, and political paths I have followed, with the adoption of what is called original Marxism or orthodox Marxism (in the etymological sense) of adherence to the conception in its original foundations, at its root. I assume, therefore, the materialist and dialectical foundation, the analysis of the continuous transformation of everything that exists, by force of its internal contradictions, the use of the mode of production category as explanatory of the material basis of society, and the class struggle as the motor of history.

I express from the outset my full interest in contributing to this relevant discussion, which so pertinently articulates contemporary technological transformations with the foundations of teaching work. Feel free to call me Zezo, as I am known by those closest to me.

REPOD - We thank you for your availability for dialogue, professor. Since the so-called industrial revolution, we have experienced great technological development that has intensified in recent decades with the use of digital technologies and the internet. This process has modified the organization and composition of the labor market. Administrative jobs and products associated with an intermediate salary have been replaced by technology, which in fact generated reconfigurations of capital, which also led to an increase in unemployment and underemployment. Given this, Zezo, how do you evaluate the relevance of the "end of work" thesis in this current context of capitalism?

José Claudinei Lombardi (Zezo) - In my understanding, following several Marxist authors, the "end of work" thesis is a profound theoretical mistake that, under the appearance of newness, of novelty, conceals the opposite: the perverse transformation and intensification of the exploitation of the labor force. Assuming, as Karl Marx demonstrated in the work "Capital," labor is a foundational dimension of humanity, it is a fundamental condition of

human existence, a metabolic process between man (social being) and nature, which through this dialectical relationship produces the goods necessary for his own existence.

What we are witnessing today is not the end of work, but a violent reconfiguration of its forms, to guarantee the exploitation of surplus value, fundamental to the accumulation of capital. István Mészáros, in *Beyond Capital (Para Além do Capital)*, demonstrates with precision that the capitalist system has not overcome its structural dependence on labor; on the contrary, it has deepened its reproduction crisis, generalizing disposable and precarious forms of work. It is precisely here that the contribution of Ricardo Antunes (in works like *The Privilege of Servitude* and *Riqueza e Miséria do Trabalho no Brasil*) becomes important, as he demonstrates that we are not living the end, but the era of precarious, informal, and intermittent work, with the dismantling of rights and the erosion of the class organization of those who live from work.

What some analyze as the "end of work" and even the "end of history," is the expression of what Eric Hobsbawm, in *The Age of Extremes*, characterized as the continuous and drastic restructurings of capitalism, as the continuous process of historical transformation, in view of its insoluble contradictions between the productive forces that develop and collide with relations of production that no longer correspond to accumulation. In this sense, as Paulino Orso analyzes well, new technologies recombine forms of work, generating a multifunctionality of the worker that masks the intensification of exploitation. The platform worker, as analyzed by Antunes, is the antithesis of the end of work; it is the contemporary materialization of the precarization of work and informal employment ties. The centrality of work persists, therefore, but under determinations that require us to analyze the history of capitalist crises, the transformation of this mode of production of material and spiritual (or ideological) life, promoting the theoretical renewal of the critique of political economy so that we can apprehend the new and complex forms of exploitation.

REPOD - Continuing this explanation that you have already begun to construct, from an ontological point of view, what is the relationship between technology and work?

José Claudinei Lombardi (Zezo) - First, a clarification: in philosophy, ontology is the part that seeks a deep understanding of being, that is, its essence. It is metaphysics. The work of Marx and Engels is anti-essentialist, anti-metaphysical, anti-idealist; it is a conception that combats the philosophical construction that opposes "being" and

"thought" (idea). Thus, Marxist ontology is the analysis of the social being, based on its material reality and the relationships that characterize and transform it, through work and the conditions of production. It is a concept, therefore, that is founded on the materiality of social life, as well as the natural world, as there is no separate ontology for nature and another for man as a social being.

Having made that clarification, from the theoretical point of view of original Marxism, technology is not an autonomous or external force to society, but rather objectified human labor aimed at the production and development of productive forces, focusing on the development of instruments, artifacts, and machines of work. It is a historical product of humanity's intellectual and manual activity, crystallized in instruments that make work possible and, with each development, more productive. Marx teaches us, in the *Grundrisse*, that the system of machinery is the power of objectified knowledge, it is dead labor activated and valorized by living labor. Technology, therefore, is a fundamental mediation of the labor process, between man and the means of production; it is like an "organ" created by the human brain and hand to expand its capabilities. However, its form and application are socially determined.

Antonio Gramsci's analysis, about Fordism and Taylorism, in the "Prison Notebooks", is enlightening, showing how technical innovation is inextricably linked to the construction of a new type of worker and a new cultural hegemony, subordinating all life to the rhythm of production.

This is also my analysis, in my Full Professor thesis, where I argue that education cannot be analyzed without considering that it is an integral part of society and is determined, in the last instance, by the mode of production of life, with technological formation being one of the aspects that needs attention, alongside intellectual and bodily formation (Lombardi, 2010). Mészáros's analysis of how, under the aegis of capital, the potentiality of technology, resulting from creative human activity, is converted into an instrument of domination and control is elucidative. In the case of education, the instruments and techniques of teaching were investigated by José Carlos Souza Araújo (2006), and also in the studies present in the collection organized by Lombardi, Saviani, and Sanfelice (2002), which demonstrate how, in the history of Brazilian education, technological innovations were repeatedly appropriated to serve the interests of conservative modernization. In the same vein, Ricardo Antunes warns that technological development, under the command of capital, generates a perverse dialectic, that is, it potentiates productivity but simultaneously destroys productive forces and degrades working conditions. The contradiction thus lies

between the emancipatory potential of technology, limited by its use under the control of capital, which results in the submission of those who live from work to more abstract and intense forms of exploitation.

REPOD - We observe in the recent academic literature on education, various denominations for capitalism, always in reference to the predominant functionalities of the technology in use: "surveillance capitalism," "digital capitalism," "flexible capitalism," etc. Would you say that such denominations represent effective analytical instruments for understanding the reconfigurations of capital, or do they function more as mechanisms for concealing its essence?

José Claudinei Lombardi (Zezo) - These concepts express recent phenomenal aspects of the current phase of capitalism. The concept of "surveillance capitalism," for example, describes the new modus operandi of accumulation based on the predatory extraction of data. In any case, they are expressions of the conjuncture, and their use runs the risk, if these terms are elevated to the status of categories, of obscuring the foundational characteristics of capitalism analyzed by Marx: the exploitation of living labor for the accumulation of capital.

Strictly speaking, as these terms apprehend the appearance of reality, they tend to fetishize technology, as if technological development changed the logic of capital at its root. Theoretically, what they are calling "digital capitalism" expresses a current dimension of information and communication instruments, far from having even supplanted industrial capitalism; it is its contemporary form of realization and expansion, where surveillance and datafication are the means for optimizing the extraction of surplus value. The use of these concepts can become part of the theoretical common sense, a form of cultural hegemony, in the Gramscian logic, which highlights the novelty of the medium, emptying the perception of the permanence of exploitation and the class structure.

The task of critique, therefore, is to integrate the analysis of these new determinations – and here the HistedBR studies, including those by Paulino Orso on work and technology, have been fundamental for a totalizing understanding of the capital system, as proposed by Mészáros. In this perspective, Ricardo Antunes's analysis of the "new morphology of work" is essential, demonstrating how the exploitative essence of capital appropriates new forms of productive organization, be they digital or analog.

Without an analysis of the totality, focusing on the capitalist mode of production, our struggle remains fragmented and unconscious of its true enemy.

REPOD - Regarding the question formulated from Jeferson Gonzalez's thesis, titled "From teaching machines to virtual learning objects: technicism and neo-technicism in Brazilian education" (2022). What can you tell us about teacher work and formation in the context of platformization, financialization of education, and the lack of digital sovereignty?

José Claudinei Lombardi (Zezo) - Jeferson Gonzalez's thesis analyzes the relationship between education, technique, and technology in the formulations of hegemonic pedagogies founded on technicism and neo-technicism and, having been his advisor, I consider that it provides an important analytical key for us to understand the current clash in the educational field, with the advance of platformization and the use of technologies. The thesis demonstrates that the subordination of pedagogy to the instrumental logic of technique is not a new phenomenon, but is a historical and recurrent trend of the capitalist school in its quest to submit the educational process to its imperatives of productivity and control.

The central hypothesis of his thesis is that the use of educational techniques and technologies, when guided by technicism or neo-technicism, has a dual objective and subjective character. As for the objective character, they are expressions such as productivity, efficiency, neutrality; expansion of the market to produce, circulate, and consume educational technologies as merchandise. In the subjective sphere, it highlights the control of teaching work, conditioning human formation to the dictates of the capitalist mode of production.

In this sense, as long as education is subjected only to the forms, methods, and instrumental use of technology, the technicism and neo-technicism limits education to operational aspects and mere reproduction of the relations of the world of work.

It is necessary to pay attention to the fact that the use of techniques and technologies in educational work is not neutral; it is implicated in the social, political, and economic context, and carries implications regarding the purpose of education. Gonzalez (2022) provides a historical overview of technicist and neo-technicist conceptions in Brazilian education, showing how they articulate with capitalism and the forms of power over teaching work and the formation of subjects.

Thus, the thesis helps to critically understand the role of modern educational technologies (such as virtual learning objects) within discourses of innovation, efficiency, quality, questioning their assumptions and proposing a reflection on pedagogical alternatives. Furthermore, it offers support for those who defend an education that is not only technically effective, but politically conscious, socially just, and transformative.

For those of us who assume Historical-Critical Pedagogy (*Pedagogia Histórico-Crítica*), the ultimate purpose of education is the formation of subjects capable of inserting themselves critically into society and mastering the knowledge produced by humanity. In our perspective, the use of techniques and technologies can only be justified if it contributes to this objective, that is, they must be instruments at the service of an emancipatory, counter-hegemonic education, and not at the service of efficiency, productivity, or market logic.

This question leads me to further problematize the platformization process underway in the 27 Brazilian states, although it is being introduced more intensely in the states of Paraná and São Paulo. With the adoption of digital platforms, the control of education by Big Techs is underway, with the consequent financialization and lack of autonomy of managers, teachers, and students, which, in fact, are the contemporary and radicalized expressions of this neo-technicism.

Platformization operates as an algorithmic neo-technicism, where control ceases to be only over didactic procedures and becomes control over data, behaviors, and the very time of teachers and students, as Ricardo Antunes analyzes well when discussing uberization and the digital control of work. The teacher, defined by Saviani and Duarte as an essential mediator of knowledge, now tends to become a mere "learning interface manager," an operator of closed systems that dictate, for the subjects, the pace and content of educational work.

It is the financialization of education that has transformed teaching, from a social right and a complex human process, into a mere financial asset. With this, the "efficiency" defended by the old technicism now takes the form of profitability metrics, rankings, and cost reduction, emptying formation of its critical and humanizing character, turning it into training in tools that, as Gonzalez's thesis shows, are presented as neutral, yet carry within them a project for society. The lack of digital sovereignty, in turn, deepens this dependence, making the educational system hostage to transnational corporations, with student data and school infrastructure being governed by interests alien to national and emancipatory education projects, a theme that has deserved reflection by HistedBR researchers.

Gonzalez's thesis, therefore, alerts us that the battle against platformization is not only technical, but theoretical and political. It is about unveiling, as Historical-Critical Pedagogy does, the fetishism that conceals these technologies, showing that they are the pedagogical materialization of a project for society that denies the centrality of human work, now reaching education, just as it previously advanced over production and services.

To defend unilateral formation, in Marx's terms, is to fight against this conversion of teachers and students into an appendage of financialized technological capital. It is, ultimately, to defend the school as a space of resistance and production of knowledge that serves humanization, and not the accumulation of capital.

REPOD - Jefferson's thesis and the comment you make on it allow us to understand the analytical perspective of Historical-Critical Pedagogy, of HistedBR, on technology in the mediation of pedagogical-didactic work, in those three dimensions you highlighted well: exploitation, expansion, and the intensification of the exploitation process of teaching work. With this, you clarify for us this view of Historical-Critical Pedagogy towards this fetishization of technology and its consequences, especially making us understand well that the organization of pedagogical-didactic work implies considering it in its articulations with the way people produce their survival, and in this production, technology is inserted.

José Claudinei Lombardi (Zezo) - Joana, I insist, and continue to insist, with graduate students and, especially, with my advisees, that it is not enough for us to be analytical. That is a fundamental step, but it is only the first: it is the critique of education under the aegis of the capitalist mode of production. If we intend to advance, forming new generations committed to the transformation process underway, because transformation is, in fact, underway, we need to understand how capital, facing its structural crisis, creates ever deeper mechanisms of alienation. Our role is to move against this bourgeois logic, to be proactive.

We must ask: what do we have to offer as an alternative for another conception of education for children and youth? Is it possible to implement it in the classroom? Evidently, yes. Is it possible to apply it in schools? Yes, as long as there are managers sensitive to the need for a new pedagogical foundation for the work they do. It is also possible to realize it in public education networks, as it is through them that the sons and daughters of the working class are reached on a large scale.

As these discussions deepened, the HistedBR group began to offer teacher formation courses, both for graduate studies and extension, reaching teachers in different regions of the country. These courses have already reached about five thousand participants, which shows the importance of making the counter-hegemonic pedagogical perspective a practice of massive reach, just as capital does. The difference is that we do not have the same resources

of persuasion that capital has. Currently, business corporations convince education network managers through the sale of educational products, using sophisticated marketing techniques. They thus control a significant part of educational policies, including the Ministry of Education itself, imposing a market logic on education.

We do not have the "firepower" of these large business organizations. When the Lula government won the battle against the then far-right president, the transition was already captained by a right-wing front necessary to defeat Bolsonarism, a complex process. The challenge now is to sensitize social movements to resume a perspective of mass formation: that unions, parties, and popular organizations turn to grassroots political formation. However, such entities are also suffering a profound reflux, resulting from the structural precarization of work and life.

Each person seeks to guarantee their own conditions of existence, internalizing liberal values that transform collective issues into personal problems. Liberalism, by affirming individuality as a principle, convinced the subject that they are an "entrepreneur of themselves," "employer of themselves," capital itself in motion. This logic exerts a power of alienation widely superior to what our isolated philosophical reflection can face.

Given this, how do we convince someone who lost their job and has no prospect of returning to formal work that they should not submit to uberized forms of exploitation? How do we interpellate, in a critical and emancipatory way, those who are fighting only for survival? This is the great challenge posed to critical thought and educational practice in contemporary times.

REPOD - We have been focusing on the perspective of the counter-hegemonic appropriation of technology by workers and organized society. We identified some concrete experiences, such as unions and associations, for example, the MTST, which maintains a technology nucleus responsible for developing its own applications, in addition to mobilizations and strikes by uberized workers. It is, therefore, a counter-hegemonic perspective, which must also guide the educational field. It is necessary to break with the submission to large corporations and face the challenge of critically appropriating platforms and technological devices, guiding them from an emancipatory logic.

Would you like to add anything about the relationship between Historical-Critical Pedagogy, the fetishization of work, and teacher formation in the context of platformization, financialization, and lack of digital sovereignty? We would also like to dialogue with you about

how researchers of Historical-Critical Pedagogy have been focusing on thinking about forms of resistance to the logic of technology fetishization in teaching and learning processes.

José Claudinei Lombardi (Zezo) - We are facing a triple and coordinated attack on teaching work. Platformization transforms the teacher into a mere operator of others' tools, emptying their intellectual autonomy and converting the pedagogical act into a set of data subjected to metrics and evaluations. As I have already stated, financialization treats education as a financial asset, an integral part of the educational business, imposing an accounting logic that suppresses the time necessary for reflection and the construction of knowledge, replacing formation with training.

Dermeval Saviani, with Historical-Critical Pedagogy, and Newton Duarte, in his studies on individuality-for-itself, define teaching work as an irreplaceable mediation between the student and classical knowledge. This is the core currently under attack: the loss of control over the teaching work process, resulting from the lack of digital sovereignty, makes the educational system hostage to transnational corporate empires, the Big Techs. This movement constitutes a true assault on the teaching profession, which is revealed in light of Ricardo Antunes's conceptualization of the "uberization of work," in which the productivist and control logic, potentiated by technology, invades all spaces and times of life, including the classroom and pedagogical planning. Part of this process is the reduction of teacher formation to mere technician training, in clear abandonment of the project of omnilateral formation proposed by Marx.

Defending integral human formation, in the sense of omnilaterality, is an act of political resistance. Resistance, from the perspective of Historical-Critical Pedagogy, begins with the unveiling of the fetishism that, as in the commodity, conceals and masks the work relationships that produce things, relationships, and facts, in this case, education itself. It is about understanding that the products of work relationships do not have a life of their own, magical powers, or intrinsic values independent of the human labor that generates them.

Applied to technology, Marx's lesson on commodity fetishism promotes the denaturalization of informational instruments (hardware and software), showing that behind the computer, the cell phone, the robot, the algorithm, or the "intelligent" platform, there is a capitalist social relation of production. These machines and programs, although appearing autonomous, are products of human intellectual and manual labor. This appearance of independence results from technological fetishization, reinforced by the role of these artifacts as ideological and behavioral apparatuses. Equipped with compensation algorithms (stimulus

and reward mechanisms), they intensify use and produce dependence, leading users to a relationship of technological servitude.

The result is evident: the induction to the intensive use of devices, leading subjects to live in a virtual world dissociated from concrete reality. Marilena Chauí (2024; 2025), who already characterized the cell phone as an instrument of servitude, recently stated that human beings today live as in Plato's cave, trapped in a world of appearances and shadows. In the streets, in schools, and in classrooms, alienation reaches alarming levels, producing a mass of individuals who live in a parallel world, distanced from real experience and formed by ideological stimuli mediated by technology.

Saviani and Duarte have been tireless in demonstrating that the pedagogical antidote does not lie in a romantic rejection of technique, but in its subordination to the human ends of education: the mediation of systematized knowledge and the development of critical thinking. In this struggle, the understanding of the new morphology of work, formulated by Ricardo Antunes, is a fundamental theoretical tool, as it allows us to understand the precarization of teaching as part of a global movement of capital's offensive. This is a fundamentally Gramscian struggle, a battle for hegemony in the educational field, which requires countering technocratic common sense with a new worldview.

The work developed by HistedBR is an example of this resistance: the production of rigorous historical and theoretical knowledge about education constitutes, in itself, a counter-hegemonic act of construction, at the service of those who live from work. As Mészáros summarizes, in *Education Beyond Capital*, the overcoming of bourgeois education will only be possible with the creation of a radically new educational system, forged in the struggle for a society that has overcome the destructive logic of capital.

Finally, I reiterate that, for us, critical educators, including those who find it difficult to dialogue with Marxism, the time has come to dedicate ourselves to three fundamental tasks:

1. To undertake a radical and profound critique of bourgeois education, demystifying its classist mechanisms and denaturalizing its class character;
2. To organize an educational praxis that allows the sons and daughters of the working class access to critical, systematized, and historically produced knowledge by humanity;
3. To act for a political and revolutionary formation aimed at human emancipation, not just the emancipation of one class, but the overcoming of all forms of exploitation and oppression.

REPOD - The Kadjót "Interinstitutional Group for Studies and Research on the Relations between Technologies and Education" in one of its productions highlights that it is necessary to counter the historical project of capital, marked by platformization and control, with the historical project of the working class, based on emancipatory education and the social appropriation of technology. This is only effective through a counter-hegemonic appropriation of technologies, which requires the political organization of the working class and the linking of technology to projects for the socialization of the means of production.

The overcoming of capitalism in crisis and technological slavery requires the working class to appropriate automated industry, placing it at the service of humanity as collective property, being democratically administered. Such action, however, presupposes concrete knowledge of reality and the consequent class struggle.

This struggle refers to the understanding of the dynamics of precarization and the possibilities of confrontation in the field of artificial intelligence, a confrontation that can enable the construction of intentional resistance to the precarization of automated work. After all, the artificial intelligence system remains totally dependent on human labor in the processes of maintaining data centers, as well as in the improvement, collection, and treatment of data that support the automation of social life patterns.

Closing this moment of rich and dense dialogue, we thank the Revista Educação e Políticas em Debate (REPOD) of the Federal University of Uberlândia (UFU), in the name of Prof. Raquel Aparecida Souza and other members of the editorial committee, for the opportunity to build a discussion on the issues of teacher work and formation in the context of platformization, financialization of education, and digital sovereignty through this beautiful interview. Finally, we reiterate our thanks to our colleague and professor Zezo for the interview and inform that the bibliographic material indicated by him will be made available for the deepening of studies by interested persons.

References

- ANTUNES, R. *O privilégio da servidão: o novo proletariado de serviços na era digital*. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2018.
- ANTUNES, R. (Org.). *Riqueza e miséria do trabalho no Brasil*. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2006.
- ARAÚJO, J. C. S. Do quadro-negro à lousa virtual: técnica, tecnologia e tecnicismo. In: VEIGA, I. P. A. (Org.). *Técnicas de ensino: novos tempos, novas configurações*. Campinas: Papyrus, 2006. p. 13-48.

CHAUÍ, M. Por que Marilena Chauí classifica celular com objeto de servidão. *Diário do Centro do Mundo*, novembro de 2024. Disponível em: <https://www.diariodocentrodomundo.com.br/por-que-marilena-chauí-classifica-celular-com-objeto-de-servidao/>. Acesso em: 08 de out de 2025.

CHAUÍ, M. Sou marxista pra valer, ainda odeio a classe média e não quero entrar no século 21. *Folha de S. Paulo*, São Paulo, 27 set. 2025. Entrevista. Disponível em: <https://www1.folha.uol.com.br/ilustrissima/2025/09/sou-marxista-pra-valer-ainda-odeio-a-classe-media-e-nao-quer-entrar-no-seculo-21-diz-marilena-chaui.shtml>. Acesso em: 08 de out de 2025;

COLARES, M. L.; LOMBARDI, J. C. (Orgs.). *Capitalismo, trabalho e educação*. Campinas: Histedbr; Autores Associados, 2012.

DUARTE, N. *A individualidade para-si*: contribuição a uma teoria histórico-social da formação do indivíduo. 3. ed. Campinas: Autores Associados, 2013.

GONZALEZ, J. A. *Das máquinas de ensinar aos objetos virtuais de aprendizagem*: tecnicismo e neotecnicismo na educação brasileira. 2022. 193 f. Tese (Doutorado em Educação) – Faculdade de Educação, Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Campinas, 2022. Disponível em: <https://repositorio.unicamp.br/acervo/detalhe/1256581>. Acesso em: 08 de out de 2025.

GRAMSCI, A. Americanismo e fordismo. In: GRAMSCI, A. *Cadernos do cárcere*. Edição e tradução de Carlos Nelson Coutinho. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 2001. v. 4.

HOBSBAWM, E. J. *A era dos extremos*: o breve século XX: 1914-1991. Tradução de Marcos Santarrita. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 1995.

LOMBARDI, J. C. *Reflexões sobre educação e ensino na obra de Marx e Engels*. 2010. 377 f. Tese (Livre-Docência) – Faculdade de Educação, Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Campinas, 2010. Disponível em: <https://acervus.unicamp.br/acervo/detalhe/769391>. Acesso em: 08 de out de 2025.

LOMBARDI, J. C.; SAVIANI, D.; SANFELICE, J. L. (Org.). *Capitalismo, trabalho e educação*. Campinas: Autores Associados; Histedbr, 2002.

MARX, K. *Grundrisse*: manuscritos econômicos de 1857-1858. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2011.

MARX, K. *O capital*: Livro I: o processo de produção do capital. Tradução de Rubens Enderle. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2013.

MARX, K. *O Capital*: crítica da economia política. Livro I. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2013.

MÉSZÁROS, I. *A educação para além do capital*. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2005.

ORSO, P. J. As novas tecnologias e a reorganização do trabalho. *Revista Brasileira de Educação do Campo*, Tocantinópolis, v. 1, n. 1, p. 1-20, jan./jun. 2016.

ORSO, P. J. *Trabalho, tecnologia e educação*: os impactos da reestruturação produtiva na multifuncionalidade do trabalhador. Jundiaí: Paco Editorial, 2015.

SAVIANI, D. *Pedagogia histórico-crítica*: primeiras aproximações. 11. ed. Campinas: Autores Associados, 2013.