

## FOREWORD

*The present time is characterized by discussions and polemics about modern technologies and especially about artificial intelligence, where serious criticism or dissenting thinking has become very unpopular and is often considered as "heresy", as well as everything that does not fit into the value system or the framework that is unilaterally accepted only by some circles. Indeed, there are signs that the world is once again being divided into right and wrong, good and bad, so that such logic is used to characterize certain technologies, but also entire communities, cultures, societies, states or groups. And it is not the first time that this has happened in the history of mankind, and it is not the first time that the result has been reflected in the enormous differences in wealth, power and influence of a very narrow circle of people who have assigned themselves the role of "creator". At such a time, it is difficult not to wonder about the role and responsibility of science and scientists, who are already somewhat "sailing" into the world of conformism, financed precisely by the above circles. Artificial intelligence and other modern technologies, after all, are supposed to make the world a better and more pleasant place to live in, and anything that deviates from that should and must be criticized. In other words: If modern technology makes it easier for us to drive cars, travel, or perform our daily tasks and duties, then this is certainly a desirable and laudable role of technology. However, when that same technology destroys our homes, kills innocent people, or causes irreparable mental and physical abnormalities in our children, we cannot pretend to be blind and deaf to it. Therefore, neither science nor scientists as individuals should escape responsibility for such consequences. Today, more than ever, science should take part of the responsibility for the development of humanity, not only in terms of environmental protection, but also in terms of maintaining human mental health and a sustainable value system. Such a value system is certainly not uniform or unified, because it leads again to a new tyranny, but it is a colourful world of diversity that is sustainable in terms of human nature. This journal also seeks to engage in such critical thinking and discussion because technology, especially in education, cannot be viewed only in terms of its functionality and limited effectiveness. Technology, like any other field, can and must be considered from the perspective of philosophy, psychology, pedagogy, sociology, ethics, history, but also from any other human perspective that supports sustainability and human well-being. Only in this way can we get a complete, holistic "picture" of current events and influences, and thus better predict and prevent the consequences we will suffer later. Therefore, I urge all of you, experts and scientists, to seriously criticise society and technology, especially in education, and in this way support diversity and ask the right questions that seek complex answers, as opposed to the dichotomy that is increasingly common today. Modern technology is not a "sacred cow." Technology today shapes and limits human life to a great extent, so people have both the right and the duty to observe how it suits them, not how it suits those who see only their own profit or interest in it. I would like to repeat the words of a well-known Croatian IT expert who said that IT used to save us time, but today it takes away all the time we used to save. Therefore, our duty to preserve all the good that modern achievements have brought us, but also to reject with arguments everything harms us. Finally, for those who do not know: To preserve all that technology has brought us in this short technological period of human history, a wheel must keep turning. Let those who do not understand ask, and let those who do understand write and criticize.*

Damir Purković