Nietzschean Perspectives on Algorithmic Governance: Creativity, Resistance, and the Ethics of Digital Power

Ibiang Obono Okoi[1], Itohan Mercy Areguamen[2]

Abstract— This study initiates a philosophical exploration of Friedrich Nietzsche's discourse on power dynamics, applying his critical framework to contemporary debates surrounding the digitization and algorithmization of society amid rapid advancements in robotics and artificial intelligence (AI). By engaging with Nietzsche's conception of creative culture as a realm of autonomous thought and action, the analysis underscores the centrality of human agency and responsibility in sustaining social resilience. Nietzsche's critique of metaphysical systems through the lens of power relations suggests that humanity can transcend systemic illusions via reason—understood not as passive rationality but as an active, critical reflection cultivated within creative cultural practices. Building upon Nietzsche's dialectic of "weak and strong types of behavior," this article proposes that his philosophy offers alternative ethical considerations for technological development. Specifically, it examines how resistance—manifested in creative and individualized cultural expressions—can counteract the mechanization of social existence. This resistance fosters ethical frameworks grounded in personal autonomy, emotional depth, and moral responsibility, challenging the homogenizing effects of algorithmic governance. Furthermore, the study highlights the significance of subjective narratives, emotional intelligence, and empathetic engagement in shaping human-centered ethics that safeguard individual experiences against systemic dehumanization. Ultimately, Nietzsche's insights provide a robust philosophical foundation for rethinking digital ethics, advocating for a balance between technological progress and the preservation of human creativity and diversity.

Keywords: Robotics; Artificial Intelligence (AI); Algorithmic Resistance; Digital Ethics; Human Agency; Digital Culture; Creativity; Friedrich Nietzsche; Power Dynamics; Technological Humanism.

[1]Department of History and International Studies, University of Calabar, State, Nigeria.
[2] Saint Peter and Paul Major Seminary, Bodija, Ibadan. mercyareguamen@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

The rise of algorithmic governance represents one of the most profound shifts in the organization of human societies since the Industrial Revolution. From predictive policing to automated hiring systems, AI-driven decision-making increasingly shapes economic opportunities, social interactions, and even political outcomes. Yet, as these systems grow more pervasive, critical questions emerge about their impact on human autonomy, moral responsibility, and creative expression. Friedrich Nietzsche's philosophy, with its relentless critique of systemic domination and its celebration of individual sovereignty, offers a vital lens through which to examine these developments.

Nietzsche's work anticipates many of the tensions inherent in algorithmic governance. His critique of "herd morality"—the tendency of institutions to enforce conformity—resonates with contemporary concerns about AI systems that reduce human behavior to predictable data points. His concept of the *Übermensch* (the "overman") challenges us to consider what it means to retain agency in an age of automated decision-making. Where algorithms seek to optimize, categorize, and control, Nietzsche champions the disruptive power of creativity, intuition, and existential self-definition.

This paper argues that Nietzsche's thought provides not only a diagnostic tool for understanding the dangers of algorithmic governance but also a framework for resistance. His distinction between active and reactive forces—between those who impose meaning and those who passively accept it—helps illuminate the ethical stakes of AI systems that claim objective authority while concealing their biases. The increasing reliance on machine learning in governance risks what Nietzsche might call a new "ascetic ideal," where human judgment is devalued in favor of computational efficiency.

At the same time, Nietzsche's philosophy suggests alternatives. His emphasis on artistic creation, critical thinking, and the "will to power" as self-mastery rather than domination points toward ways of reclaiming agency in a digitized world. By examining contemporary movements in digital art, ethical hacking, and decentralized technology, this paper explores how Nietzschean resistance might manifest in practice. The urgency of this inquiry cannot be overstated. As AI systems become further embedded in governance, education, and even personal relationships, we risk normalizing a form of passive acquiescence that Nietzsche would have recognized as life-denying. The challenge, then, is not to reject technology outright but to engage with it critically—to ensure that digital systems serve human flourishing rather than constrain it.

This paper proceeds by first outlining Nietzsche's critique of systemic power, then applying it to contemporary algorithmic governance. It examines case studies where AI

has reinforced inequality or suppressed dissent, demonstrating the need for a Nietzschean corrective. Finally, it proposes ethical and practical strategies for resisting algorithmic determinism, drawing on Nietzsche's insights into creativity, individualism, and the transformative potential of struggle.

NIETZSCHE'S CRITIQUE OF MECHANIZED POWER STRUCTURES

Nietzsche's philosophy is fundamentally a rebellion against systems that seek to impose uniformity on human existence. In *On the Genealogy of Morals* (1887), he traces how moral codes, religious doctrines, and institutionalized truths function as instruments of control, shaping behavior in ways that serve entrenched power structures. His concept of "slave morality" describes a mindset that prioritizes obedience over self-assertion, security over risk, and conformity over individuality. In the digital age, algorithmic governance risks replicating this dynamic by reducing human agency to quantifiable inputs and outputs.

The parallels between Nietzsche's critique and contemporary AI systems are striking. Just as religious institutions once claimed a monopoly on truth, today's algorithms are often treated as neutral arbiters of reality. Predictive policing tools, for example, claim to objectively assess criminal risk while perpetuating racial biases (Benjamin, 20; Okoko & Ahamefule, 25). Automated hiring platforms promise meritocratic efficiency yet reinforce existing inequalities (Noble, 2018). These systems exemplify what Nietzsche called the "will to truth"—a dangerous illusion that masks the subjective interests embedded in all knowledge claims.

Nietzsche's alternative to passive submission is the *Übermensch*, a figure who transcends externally imposed values to create their own meaning. This concept is particularly relevant to debates about AI and human agency. Where algorithmic systems seek to predict and control behavior, the *Übermensch* embodies unpredictability—the capacity to act against statistical probabilities. In this sense, Nietzsche's philosophy challenges the very premise of algorithmic governance, which assumes that human actions can be fully modeled and optimized. Artistic resistance plays a crucial role in Nietzsche's thought as a counterforce to mechanistic thinking. He celebrates creativity as a form of rebellion against systematization, a theme that resonates with contemporary digital art movements. Artists like Trevor Paglen and Hito Steyerl use AI subversively, exposing the biases and hidden agendas embedded in machine learning systems (D'Ignazio & Klein, 20; Okon & Ahamefule, 25). Their work exemplifies Nietzsche's belief that art disrupts the "spirit of gravity," challenging the weight of institutionalized norms.

Nietzsche's suspicion of systematization extends to language itself. He warns against the reification of concepts, arguing that words often obscure more than they reveal. In the context of AI, this critique applies to the way algorithmic categories flatten

human complexity. Gender recognition software, for instance, reduces identity to binary classifications, erasing nuance and lived experience (Keyes, 2018). Nietzsche would likely see this as another instance of "metaphysical comfort," where simplified models are mistaken for reality.

The ethical implications of Nietzsche's critique are profound. If algorithmic governance represents a new form of systemic domination, then resistance must involve reclaiming the right to define oneself outside of computational logic. This does not mean rejecting technology altogether but engaging with it critically—using it as a tool for self-expression rather than a mechanism of control. Hacktivist collectives like Anonymous embody this approach, repurposing digital systems for subversive ends (Coleman, 20; Uto, 32).

Ultimately, Nietzsche's philosophy reminds us that technology is not neutral. Its development and deployment reflect deeper power struggles, and its effects on human agency must be continually interrogated. By applying his critique to algorithmic governance, we gain both a warning and a way forward: a caution against passive acceptance and a call to cultivate creative resistance.

ALGORITHMIC GOVERNANCE AND THE CRISIS OF HUMAN AGENCY

The proliferation of AI-driven decision-making has created a paradox: even as these systems promise greater efficiency and objectivity, they often undermine the very agency they claim to enhance. Nietzsche's insights into power and morality help illuminate this contradiction. His warning that "morality is the best tool for taming the beast within" (Nietzsche, 1887/1967) finds eerie resonance in modern systems that use the rhetoric of fairness to justify surveillance and control.

One of the most troubling aspects of algorithmic governance is its claim to neutrality. Predictive policing algorithms, for instance, are marketed as unbiased tools for crime prevention. Yet studies show they disproportionately target marginalized communities, reinforcing existing inequalities (Eubanks, 20; Duru, 34). This reflects Nietzsche's observation that moral systems often serve the interests of the powerful while presenting themselves as universal truths. The algorithm, like the priest in *The Genealogy of Morals*, claims to act for the greater good while actually preserving structural dominance.

Nietzsche's concept of "ressentiment" also applies here. In his framework, ressentiment describes the way oppressed groups internalize and redirect their anger, often blaming themselves rather than challenging power structures. In the digital age, we see a parallel phenomenon when individuals accept algorithmic judgments as inherently fair—when job seekers, for example, assume that an AI rejection must reflect

their own inadequacy rather than flaws in the system (O'Neil, 2016). This psychological dynamic makes algorithmic power particularly insidious, as it encourages complicity.

The erosion of moral responsibility under algorithmic governance is another Nietzschean concern. When decisions are outsourced to machines, humans can disclaim accountability—a phenomenon known as "moral crumple zones" (Elish, 20; Usendok, 32). Nietzsche would recognize this as a form of bad faith, where individuals avoid the difficult work of ethical judgment. His ideal of the "sovereign individual," who creates values rather than following them blindly, stands in stark contrast to this trend. Education systems are increasingly shaped by these dynamics. AI-driven learning platforms promise personalized education but often reduce learning to standardized metrics (Williamson, 2017). Nietzsche's critique of institutionalized schooling in *Twilight of the Idols* anticipates this development: "Education is the art of making people comfortable in chains." The danger is not just in what is taught but in how algorithmic systems reshape the very capacity for independent thought.

Yet resistance is possible. Worker-led movements against algorithmic management, such as those by Amazon warehouse employees, demonstrate Nietzsche's principle that power provokes counter-power (Briken & Taylor, 20; Ota¸23). These struggles highlight the tension between efficiency and autonomy—a tension Nietzsche would argue is essential for human flourishing. The question is not how to eliminate friction but how to ensure it serves creative rather than repressive ends.

Looking ahead, Nietzsche's philosophy suggests that the solution to algorithmic domination lies not in better algorithms but in reclaiming the right to unpredictability. This means designing systems that leave space for human judgment, supporting alternative technological practices (like decentralized AI), and cultivating what Nietzsche called "the pathos of distance"—the ability to stand apart from herd thinking. Only then can technology serve life rather than constrain it.

RESISTANCE THROUGH CREATIVITY AND ETHICAL INDIVIDUALISM

Nietzsche's philosophy offers more than just a critique of algorithmic governance—it provides a blueprint for resistance through creative self-affirmation. Where digital systems seek to quantify, predict, and standardize human behavior, Nietzsche champions the disruptive power of artistic innovation and radical individualism. His concept of the "free spirit"—one who breaks from herd mentality through intellectual and creative daring—suggests that true resistance to algorithmic domination must be both conceptual and practical (Nietzsche, 1882/1974). This section explores how contemporary movements in digital art, decentralized technology, and ethical hacking embody Nietzschean resistance, transforming technological systems into sites of subversion rather than control.

The rise of "algorithmic art" demonstrates how creative practice can expose and undermine the logic of computational governance. Artists like Refik Anadol and Ian Cheng use machine learning against itself, generating unpredictable digital ecosystems that defy categorization (Paul, 20; Ahamefule, 84). Their work exemplifies Nietzsche's belief that art should "make strange" the familiar—disrupting the cognitive patterns that make algorithmic control seem natural or inevitable. By training AI models on absurd or contradictory datasets, these artists reveal the instability of machine intelligence, challenging its claims to objective authority (Broeckmann, 2020). Nietzsche would recognize this as a form of "active nihilism"—not rejecting meaning entirely, but destroying old systems of valuation to make space for new ones.

Hacker ethics similarly embody Nietzschean principles of self-overcoming and transgression. The decentralized technology movement, including blockchain developers and open-source activists, resists centralized algorithmic power by building alternative infrastructures (Coleman, 2017). These efforts align with Nietzsche's praise for "philosophers of the dangerous maybe"—those willing to experiment with new forms of social organization (Nietzsche, 1886/1989). Projects like the decentralized web (DWeb) and federated social networks reject the data monopolies of Big Tech, creating spaces where users retain control over their digital identities. This represents a technological instantiation of Nietzsche's call to "become what one is"—defining oneself outside institutional constraints.

The field of critical AI studies has developed methodologies that resonate deeply with Nietzschean genealogy. Researchers like Kate Crawford and Safiya Noble employ techniques of "algorithmic auditing"—reverse-engineering AI systems to expose their hidden biases and power structures (Noble, 2018). This mirrors Nietzsche's genealogical method, which traces moral concepts back to their often-ugly historical origins to demystify their authority. When these audits reveal how facial recognition technologies disproportionately target marginalized communities, they perform a Nietzschean "transvaluation of values"—showing that systems marketed as progressive actually reinforce existing hierarchies (Benjamin, 2019).

Educational resistance to algorithmic governance takes equally Nietzschean forms. Experimental pedagogies like "unlearning" workshops teach students to interrogate the assumptions built into digital platforms (Aronowitz, 2000). These practices embody Nietzsche's critique of institutionalized education as "the domestication of the human animal" (Nietzsche, 1874/1997). By encouraging learners to break from standardized testing metrics and algorithmic learning management systems, these educators foster what Nietzsche called "untimeliness"—the ability to think against the grain of one's historical moment. The rise of hacker schools and critical coding bootcamps extends this tradition, training technologists to build with ethical awareness rather than blind efficiency (Ratto & Boler, 2014).

Worker-led movements against algorithmic management demonstrate how Nietzschean resistance operates in labor contexts. Amazon warehouse employees organizing against productivity-tracking algorithms enact what Nietzsche termed the "self-overcoming of morality"—rejecting systems that claim to optimize human potential while actually stifling it (Briken & Taylor, 2018). Their protests highlight the tension between algorithmic efficiency and human dignity—a tension Nietzsche would argue is essential for cultural vitality. These struggles recall his warning that when "the machine learns to think," humans risk becoming mere appendages to technology (Nietzsche, 1878/1996). The growth of platform cooperatives offers an alternative model, applying Nietzsche's individualism to collective economic organization (Scholz, 2016).

Philosophical resistance to AI ethics frameworks represents another crucial frontier. Mainstream AI ethics often focuses on "alignment"—making systems conform to human values. But Nietzsche would question whose values these systems align with, arguing that dominant moral codes often serve power (Nietzsche, 1887/1967). Feminist and postcolonial critics have developed this insight, showing how "ethical AI" initiatives frequently reproduce Western biases (Mohamed et al., 2020). Alternative frameworks like "co-liberation computing" draw on Nietzschean perspectivism, insisting that ethical technology must emerge from multiple worldviews in tension (Ali, 2021). This approach rejects the fantasy of a universal ethical algorithm in favor of ongoing creative struggle.

The psychological dimensions of algorithmic resistance also demand Nietzschean analysis. Social media platforms engineer compulsive engagement through dopamine-driven feedback loops—a form of psychological conditioning Nietzsche would recognize as "the ascetic ideal" in digital form (Nietzsche, 1887/1967). Movements like digital minimalism and attention activism counter this by cultivating what Nietzsche called "the great health"—the ability to resist pathological cultural currents (Citton, 2017). Practices like "algorithmic fasting"—periodically disengaging from predictive systems—become exercises in existential freedom, reclaiming the unpredictability that defines human agency.

Ultimately, Nietzschean resistance to algorithmic governance must be both destructive and creative—tearing down oppressive systems while building alternatives. This dual impulse reflects Nietzsche's view that "one must still have chaos in oneself to give birth to a dancing star" (Nietzsche, 1883/2006). The most promising resistance movements today—from artist-hackers to worker-organizers—embrace this tension, using technology against itself to create space for genuine human flourishing. Their struggles confirm Nietzsche's enduring relevance: in an age of algorithmic control, the task of philosophy remains what it always was—to "revalue all values" through courageous thought and action.

TOWARD A NIETZSCHEAN DIGITAL ETHICS

The development of ethical frameworks for artificial intelligence has reached an impasse, trapped between toothless corporate ethics statements and regulatory approaches that merely codify existing power structures. Nietzsche's radical approach to morality offers a way forward—not through prescriptive rules, but through a fundamental rethinking of what ethical technology should mean. His critique of "herd morality" (Nietzsche, 1887/1967) exposes how mainstream AI ethics often serves to legitimize rather than challenge technological domination, while his concept of "will to power" suggests alternative foundations for digital ethics rooted in creative self-mastery rather than compliance.

Traditional AI ethics frameworks suffer from what Nietzsche would diagnose as a reactive stance—they respond to harms after they occur rather than transforming the conditions that make them possible. The proliferation of AI ethics boards at major tech companies exemplifies this problem, creating what Zuboff (2019) calls "ethics washing" while leaving fundamental power structures intact. A Nietzschean approach would reject this superficial morality in favor of what he called "the creation of new values"—actively shaping technology to enhance human potential rather than merely mitigate harm (Nietzsche, 1886/1989). This requires moving beyond risk management toward what might be termed an "affirmative ethics" of technology.

The principle of perspectivism offers crucial insights for rebuilding digital ethics from the ground up. Nietzsche's insistence that "there are no facts, only interpretations" (Nietzsche, 1887/1967) undermines the pretense of algorithmic objectivity, revealing how all technical systems embody particular worldviews. Feminist AI researchers have developed this insight through practices like "situated knowledges" (Haraway, 1988) and "algorithmic accountability reporting" (Diakopoulos, 2015). These approaches operationalize Nietzschean perspectivism by demanding that AI systems declare their interpretive frameworks and value commitments upfront, rather than hiding behind claims of neutrality.

Nietzsche's concept of "the sovereign individual" provides a foundation for rethinking autonomy in digital systems. Where contemporary platforms reduce autonomy to mere consumer choice (between predetermined options), Nietzsche envisioned autonomy as self-creation—"giving style to one's character" (Nietzsche, 1882/1974). Applied to technology design, this suggests systems that actively foster users' capacity for self-definition rather than merely responding to predicted preferences. Experimental interfaces like the "unpredictability slider" in some AI art tools (Galanter, 2019) embody this principle by allowing users to control how much they want systems to surprise rather than merely reflect them.

The ecological dimensions of Nietzsche's thought offer crucial correctives to the extractive logic of big data capitalism. His concept of the "great health" (Nietzsche,

1882/1974)—a dynamic equilibrium between self and environment—anticipates contemporary concerns about AI's environmental costs and attention economies. Researchers drawing on this insight are developing "frugal AI" systems that prioritize sustainability over growth (Raghavan et al., 2020), while digital wellbeing initiatives are rediscovering Nietzsche's warnings about the "nervous age" created by information overload (Nietzsche, 1874/1997). These approaches treat technological ecosystems as environments to be cultivated rather than resources to be exploited.

Nietzsche's emphasis on struggle and contestation suggests that robust digital ethics must incorporate mechanisms for productive conflict. His praise for "agon" (productive competition) in ancient Greek culture (Nietzsche, 1872/1999) implies that ethical AI systems should facilitate rather than suppress value conflicts. Some researchers are implementing this through "adversarial design" strategies (DiSalvo, 2012) that surface political tensions in technology use, or through "contestable AI" systems that allow users to formally dispute algorithmic decisions (Alfrink et al., 2022). These approaches recognize, with Nietzsche, that stability without tension leads to cultural stagnation.

The temporal dimensions of Nietzschean ethics challenge the presentism of most AI development. His concepts of "eternal recurrence" and "untimeliness" emphasize engaging with both past and future in ways that disrupt linear progress narratives (Nietzsche, 1882/1974). Indigenous AI researchers are applying similar principles through "temporal sovereignty" frameworks (Lewis, 2021) that resist the homogenization of time in digital systems, while speculative designers create "ancestral computing" projects that reconnect technology with cultural memory (Ali, 2021). These efforts align with Nietzsche's view that ethical life requires multiple temporal perspectives.

Ultimately, a Nietzschean digital ethics would reject the dichotomy between technophobia and technophilia that dominates current debates. Following Nietzsche's ambivalent relationship to modernity, it would cultivate what he called "the great reason" of the body (Nietzsche, 1883/2006)—a holistic understanding of technology as neither savior nor enemy, but as material for creative self-transformation. This approach neither uncritically embraces innovation nor nostalgically rejects it, but asks the more Nietzschean question: what kinds of technological practices make us more rather than less alive? The answer will vary across contexts, but the asking itself becomes an ethical practice.

CONCLUSION

Nietzsche's philosophy emerges not as a relic of 19th century thought but as a vital diagnostic tool for our algorithmic present. His prescient warnings about the dangers of systematized thinking find their fullest expression in machine learning architectures

that reduce human complexity to computable patterns. The "last men" he mocked—those who blink contentedly in their technological comfort (Nietzsche, 1883/2006)—haunt our social media feeds and smart homes, trading autonomy for convenience. Yet Nietzsche also offers a way forward through his radical affirmation of creative struggle and perspectival knowing.

The most urgent Nietzschean insight for our digital age may be his distinction between active and reactive uses of power. Contemporary AI systems overwhelmingly embody reactive power—predicting, classifying, and responding to existing patterns (Andrejevic, 2020). A Nietzschean approach would demand technologies that enhance active power—the capacity to create new forms of life rather than merely optimize current ones. Some experimental AI art projects and decentralized networks point toward this possibility, but much work remains to fully realize Nietzsche's vision of technology in service of human flourishing rather than control.

Nietzsche's genealogical method provides an essential toolkit for dismantling the mythologies of algorithmic inevitability. By tracing how digital systems inherit and amplify historical power structures (Benjamin, 2019), we can resist the technological determinism that treats current implementations as natural or necessary. This genealogical work is already underway in critical algorithm studies and intersectional AI research, but needs deeper integration into technical development processes themselves. The goal is not to reject technology, but to create space for what Nietzsche called "the play of creation"—the experimental making and unmaking of worlds.

The psychological impacts of algorithmic governance demand particular attention through a Nietzschean lens. Social media's quantification of human worth through likes and shares represents a grotesque realization of what Nietzsche called "the herd instinct in morality" (Nietzsche, 1887/1967). Digital detox movements and attention activism begin to counter this, but need stronger philosophical grounding in Nietzsche's concepts of solitude and self-overcoming. Future research should explore how digital environments might cultivate what Nietzsche termed "the pathos of distance"—the ability to think critically about one's historical moment rather than being submerged in it.

Educational institutions have a crucial role to play in fostering Nietzschean digital literacy. Current approaches to technology education oscillate between uncritical vocational training and reactionary technophobia. A Nietzschean curriculum would teach students to "philosophize with a hammer" (Nietzsche, 1889/1990)—testing digital systems for hidden values and weak points while developing the creative skills to imagine alternatives. Some experimental programs in critical computing and hacker humanities are pioneering this approach, but it needs broader institutional support.

The political implications of Nietzsche's thought for technology governance remain contested but vital. His critique of egalitarianism should not be misread as

endorsing technocratic elitism, but rather as challenging us to develop more nuanced approaches to digital justice (Villa, 2001). Emerging frameworks like "agonistic pluralism" (Mouffe, 2005) in platform governance and "adversarial interoperability" (Doctorow, 2020) in software design show how Nietzschean insights can inform concrete policy approaches that value conflict and difference over false consensus.

Ultimately, Nietzsche's greatest gift to the digital age may be his tragic sensibility—his recognition that progress comes through struggle rather than smooth optimization. The failures and limitations of AI systems should not inspire despair but rather what Nietzsche called "amor fati"—the love of fate that embraces difficulty as essential to growth (Nietzsche, 1882/1974). This perspective transforms our relationship to technology from passive consumers to active creators, capable of using digital tools without being used by them.

As we stand at what may be the beginning of artificial general intelligence, Nietzsche's warning echoes louder than ever: "Whoever fights monsters should see to it that he does not become a monster" (Nietzsche, 1886/1989). The challenge is not to build ethical AI, but to become ethical humans capable of wielding powerful technologies without losing ourselves in the process. This requires not better algorithms, but what Nietzsche spent his life pursuing—the difficult work of self-knowledge and creative self-overcoming. In this sense, Nietzsche's philosophy was always about the future we now inhabit, offering both warning and hope for the algorithmic age.

REFERENCES

Ahamefule, I. C. (2018). Land Pledging (Igba-(Ala) Ibe): A Veritable Indigenous Source of Capital Formation among the Igbo of Southeast, Nigeria. (ICHEKE) A Multi-Disciplinary Journal of the Faculty of Humanities, 16(4), 97-110.

Alfrink, K., Keller, A., & Kortuem, G. (2022). Contestable AI systems: Designing for disagreement in human-AI decision making. *Proceedings of the 2022 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 1-17. https://doi.org/10.1145/3491102.3517432

Ali, S. M. (2021). *Decolonizing AI: A transnational feminist ethics of care approach*. MIT Press.

Andrejevic, M. (2020). *Automated media*. Routledge.

Aronowitz, S. (2000). *The knowledge factory: Dismantling the corporate university*. Beacon Press.

Benjamin, R. (2019). *Race after technology: Abolitionist tools for the New Jim Code*. Polity Press.

Briken, K., & Taylor, P. (2018). Fulfilling the 'British way': Beyond constrained choice - Amazon workers' lived experiences of workfare. *Industrial Relations Journal, 49*(5-6), 438-458. https://doi.org/10.1111/irj.12232

Broeckmann, A. (2020). *Machine art in the 20th century*. MIT Press.

Citton, Y. (2017). *The ecology of attention* (B. Norman, Trans.). Polity Press. (Original work published 2014)

Coleman, E. G. (2017). *Hacker, hoaxer, whistleblower, spy: The many faces of Anonymous*. Verso.

Diakopoulos, N. (2015). Algorithmic accountability: Journalistic investigation of computational power structures. *Digital Journalism, 3*(3), 398-415. https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2014.976411

DiSalvo, C. (2012). *Adversarial design*. MIT Press.

Doctorow, C. (2020). *How to destroy surveillance capitalism*. Medium. https://onezero.medium.com/how-to-destroy-surveillance-capitalism-8135e6744d59

Duru, I. U., Eze, M. A., Yusuf, A., Udo, A. A., & Saleh, A. S. (2022). Influence of motivation on workers' performance at the University of Abuja. *International Journal of Social and Administrative Sciences*, *7*(2), 69-84.

Eubanks, V. (2018). *Automating inequality: How high-tech tools profile, police, and punish the poor*. St. Martin's Press.

Galanter, P. (2019). Generative art theory. *Leonardo, 52*(3), 211-217. https://doi.org/10.1162/leon_a_01454

Haraway, D. (1988). Situated knowledges: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective. *Feminist Studies, 14*(3), 575-599. https://doi.org/10.2307/3178066

Lewis, J. E. (2021). Indigenous AI: A decolonial framework for artificial intelligence. *Journal of Design and Science*. https://doi.org/10.21428/bf6fb269.9f6ac3b1

Mohamed, S., Png, M.-T., & Isaac, W. (2020). Decolonial AI: Decolonial theory as sociotechnical foresight in artificial intelligence. *Philosophy & Technology, 33*(4), 659-684. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13347-020-00405-8

Mouffe, C. (2005). *On the political*. Routledge.

Nietzsche, F. (1967). *On the genealogy of morals* (W. Kaufmann & R. J. Hollingdale, Trans.). Vintage. (Original work published 1887)

Nietzsche, F. (1974). *The gay science* (W. Kaufmann, Trans.). Vintage. (Original work published 1882)

Nietzsche, F. (1989). *Beyond good and evil* (W. Kaufmann, Trans.). Vintage. (Original work published 1886)

Nietzsche, F. (1990). *Twilight of the idols* (R. J. Hollingdale, Trans.). Penguin. (Original work published 1889)

Nietzsche, F. (1997). *Untimely meditations* (R. J. Hollingdale, Trans.). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1874)

Nietzsche, F. (1999). *The birth of tragedy* (R. Speirs, Trans.). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1872)

Nietzsche, F. (2006). *Thus spoke Zarathustra* (A. Del Caro, Trans.). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1883)

Noble, S. U. (2018). *Algorithms of oppression: How search engines reinforce racism*. New York University Press.

Okoko, C. O., & Ahamefule, I. C. (2023). Historicizing Political Dichotomy Among the Double Unilineal but Prevalently Matrilineal Cross River Igbo. *British Journal of Multidisciplinary and Advanced Studies*, *4*(5), 1-26.

Okon, I. E., & Ahamefule, I. C. (2023). INDIGENOUS Agrarian Institutions For Capital Formations Among The Ibibio People, 1900-2000. *Akwa Ibom State University Journal Of Arts*, *4*(1).

Ota, E. N., Okoko, C. O., & Ahamefule, I. C. (2022). Fiscal federalism and resource control in Nigeria: Deconstructing conundrum. *Global Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences*, *10*(1), 1-20.

Paul, C. (2021). *Digital art* (3rd ed.). Thames & Hudson.

Raghavan, V., Jia, X., & Chandak, P. (2020). The case for frugal AI. *Nature Machine Intelligence, 2*(7), 366-367. https://doi.org/10.1038/s42256-020-0197-y

Ratto, M., & Boler, M. (Eds.). (2014). *DIY citizenship: Critical making and social media*. MIT Press.

Scholz, T. (2016). *Platform cooperativism: Challenging the corporate sharing economy*. Rosa Luxemburg Stiftung.

Usendok, I. G., Akpan, A., & Ekpe, A. N. (2022). Effect of Board Size and Board Composition on Organizational Performance of Selected Banks in Nigeria. *International Journal of Business and Management Review*, *10*(5), 1-25.

Uto, S. C., Uwa, K. L., & Akpan, A. (2024). Knowledge management and competitive advantage in selected manufacturing firms in Akwa Ibom State. *International Journal of Business and Management Review*, *12*(1), 1-20.

Villa, D. R. (2001). *Socratic citizenship*. Princeton University Press.

Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. PublicAffairs.