

UDC: 004.8:32.019.5
DOI: 10.5937/PDSC24633K

Konstantinos Kouroupis, *Assistant Professor*
of EU and Data Rights Law,
Frederick University, Cyprus
email: law.ck@frederick.ac.cy

FAKE NEWS, AI AND POLITICAL THOUGHT: A TRIANGLE OF INTERACTION OR DECONSTRUCTION?

Abstract:

Undoubtedly, the explosion of artificial intelligence constitutes the milestone of modern digital evolution. AI is used in almost every field of private and public life, reshaping the traditional structure of society and marking scientific progress. In the political area AI tools are the new trend since campaigns are executed through AI mechanisms and messages are disseminated via that method which is, certainly, attractive and persuasive, especially to the youth. However, AI technologies, with their capacity for rapid data processing and content generation, have been harnessed to both combat and propagate fake news. The main question which arises is the following: does AI promote or undermine political thought? This paper aims at demonstrating, at first level, the impact of AI on politics. Through a detailed presentation of the regulatory framework on the matter there are exposed both legal and ethical requirements for a powerful and trustworthy AI. Moreover, via a critical approach, it is illustrated the potential but great interaction between AI and fake news which may penetrate the political sphere and harm public opinion, voter behavior and the integrity of democratic process. Therefore, this paper intends to underscore the necessity for robust legal regimes, giving special emphasis on ethical AI deployment. The ultimate goal is to cultivate political consciousness, enhance public awareness to safeguard fundamental values in current digital era and denote the right balance between technological evolution and the promotion of democratic institutions.

Key words: AI, fake news, politics, democracy.

Introduction

The Cambridge Analytica Scandal which broke on 2018 corresponds to a tremendous milestone in the recent history of social media, demonstrating the strong interaction between technology and society. Moreover, it served as a wake-up call about the vulnerabilities in data privacy, the influence of big data on politics, and the urgent need for better data protection measures. The story is already known: On April 10 and 11, 2018, Mark Zuckerberg, billionaire CEO of Facebook, appeared before more than a hundred members of the United States Congress. For over ten hours, he tried to answer many difficult questions about Facebook's role in the Cambridge Analytica scandal and how the company collects and exploits vast amounts of data from its more than two billion users. This was the first time that one of the most powerful figures in the internet industry had to account to democratically elected representatives. His testimony was a result of the increasing political pressure Facebook has been facing since the election of Donald Trump and the Brexit referendum in the United Kingdom.

The scandal involves the collection of personal data from 87 million Facebook users by the political consulting firm Cambridge Analytica in 2014. The data were allegedly used to influence voters on behalf of the politicians who hired the company. At the heart of the scandal is Aleksandr Kogan, a data scientist at the University of Cambridge, who developed an application called “thisisyourdigitallife”, aimed at collecting data for academic research. However, Facebook allowed this application not only to collect the data of individuals who agreed to participate in the research but also the personal information of all their contacts. In this way, Cambridge Analytica obtained data from Kogan on millions of Facebook users and used it for micro-targeting political advertising during the 2016 U.S. presidential election and the Brexit referendum in the United Kingdom. Finally, Facebook owner Meta has agreed to pay \$725m (£600m) to settle legal action over a data breach linked to political consultancy Cambridge Analytica.¹

¹ See more details about the Cambridge Analytica Scandal and its impact on social media and technology in Hanlon, A., & Jones, K. (2023). Ethical concerns about social media privacy policies: Do users have the ability to comprehend their consent actions? *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 1-18. Afriat, H., Dvir-Gvirsman, S., Tsurie, K., & Ivan, L. (2021). “This is capitalism. It is not illegal”: Users’ attitudes toward institutional privacy following the Cambridge Analytica scandal. *The Information Society*, 37(2), 115-127. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01972243.2020.1870596>.
Hu, M. (2020). Cambridge Analytica’s black box. *Big Data & Society*, 7(2), July-December 2020. Sage Journals. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951720938091>. Boldyreva, E. L., Grishina, N. Y., & Duisembina, Y. (2018). Cambridge Analytica: Ethics and online manipulation with decision-making process. *The European Proceedings of Social & Behavioural Sciences (EpSBS)*, December 2018. <http://dx.doi.org/10.15405/epsbs.2018.12.02.10>

The above scandal raised a huge debate about how social media, online platforms and technology tools may govern not only private but also public life. Political persuasion and data mining interact in a very strong and close manner. Furthermore, in modern digital era, the internet has turned into an arena of duel competition among giant multinational corporations which intend to control and/or manipulate the channels of digital communication.

In addition, the Cambridge Analytica Scandal brought significant impact on legal area too. On 25 October 2018 the European Parliament issued a Resolution on the use of Facebook users' data by Cambridge Analytica and the impact on data protection². There is a common belief that *“social networks constitute an important platform for political parties and public institutions by allowing them to connect with citizens (...) whereas global online platforms face challenges in countering false news effectively and data analysis and algorithms have an increasing impact on the information made accessible to citizens”*. Thus, it is an imperative need for online platforms to strengthen transparency and accountability as well as to fully comply with EU data protection law, namely the GDPR and Directive 2002/58 (E-Privacy). In the meanwhile, digital platforms shall be adapted to modern technological progress and evolution.

The ultimate result of the aforementioned remarks is the modification of the legal status governing platforms in the European Union marked by the adoption of Digital Services Act and Digital Markets Act. Hence, online platforms shall adopt any appropriate measure in order to counter illegal content and tackle against disinformation³. The most important issue which must be pointed out is the potential use of AI tools towards the aforementioned goal.

Thus, Artificial Intelligence is intensively used in any area of public and private sector. Especially in political area the impact of artificial intelligence is huge and of primary interest since it is strongly used from politics through their strategy. Since ChatGPT was made available to public, digital society and/or even our daily life have been totally changed. Inevitably, the growing interest in AI has attracted the attention of politicians who adopt such methods in their strategy. Thus, it is more than evident that AI has a strong impact on democracy, political values and re-shapes the

² European Parliament resolution of 25 October 2018 on the use of Facebook users' data by Cambridge Analytica and the impact on data protection (2018/2855(RSP)), 25 October 2018. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TEXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52018IP0433>.

³ Find more about DSA and DMA in Buiten, M. C. (2022). The Digital Services Act: From intermediary liability to platform regulation. *Journal of Intellectual Property, Information Technology and E-Commerce Law (JIPITEC)*, 12, 361 para 1. <https://www.jipitec.eu/archive/issues/jipitec-12-5-2021/5491>. Busch, C., & Mak, V. (2021). Putting the Digital Services Act in context. *Journal of European Consumer and Market Law*, 10(3), 109-114. Savin, A. (2021). The EU Digital Services Act: Towards a more responsible internet. *Journal of Internet Law*. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3786792.

traditional political system⁴. A recent survey on Europeans' attitudes towards technology led by the Center for the Governance of Change at Spain's IE University in 2023 demonstrate that Europeans trust the EU more than their national governments and corporations. According to this survey, 44% of Europeans trust the European Union more than their own countries or corporations to regulate Artificial Intelligence (AI) while 88% of citizens hope that the EU will play an active role in guiding technological developments⁵.

However, there are serious legal and ethical concerns which arise by the use of AI in political life as well as by their strong ability to produce fake news and lead to misinformation⁶. The aforementioned remark is based on the following question: How sure and safe can be an algorithm⁷? This paper aims, firstly, at demonstrating the implementation of AI in politics. The main goal is to define whether AI promotes political thought or causes serious detriment to fundamental values and rights. The ultimate purpose is to stimulate critical thinking, cultivate a democratic consciousness for any European citizen in order to harmonize the technological evolution with the respect of justice and democracy.

Section I: Regulating AI in politics.

Even though AI is intensively used almost in every field of private and public life, there is not a uniform and binding regulatory framework regarding this issue. However, according to the European Digital Agenda, privacy and security constitute the fundamental components of new technologies, especially of Artificial

⁴ See more about the link between AI and politics in Jungherr, A. (2023). Artificial intelligence and democracy: A conceptual framework. *Social Media + Society*, 9(3). Sage Journals. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20563051231186353>. Tinnirello, M. (2022). *The Global Politics of Artificial Intelligence* (1st ed.). Routledge. Duberry, J. (2022). *Artificial Intelligence and Democracy**. Edward Elgar Publishing.

⁵ See a commentary of the survey by Luca de Tena, C., & García de Viedma, D. (2023). EUROPEAN TECH INSIGHTS Mapping European Attitudes towards Technological Change and its Governance. IE Center for the Governance of Change. <https://www.ie.edu/cgc/research/european-tech-insights/>, accessed on 1st November 2023.

⁶ AI tools, namely learn language models, may easily generate fake news leading to very bad effects for society and political life. See Trandabăț, D., & Gifu, D. (2023). Discriminating AI-generated fake news. *Procedia Computer Science*, 225, 3822-3831. Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2023.10.378>.

⁷ See indicatively Busuioc, M. (2021). Accountable artificial intelligence: Holding algorithms to account. *Public Administration Review*, 81(5), 825-836. Jackson, M. C. (2021). Artificial intelligence & algorithmic bias: The issues with technology reflecting history & humans. *Journal of Business & Technology Law*, 16, 299.

Intelligence. As such, any normative attempt shall be oriented to guarantee the respect of the above elements⁸.

On 21 April 2021, the European Commission ("Commission") adopted a proposal for a "Regulation laying down harmonized rules on Artificial Intelligence" ("AI Regulation"), which sets out how AI systems and their outputs can be introduced to and used in the European Union. The draft AI Regulation is accompanied by a proposal for a new Regulation on Machinery Products, which focuses on the safe integration of the AI system into machinery, as well as a new Coordinated Plan on AI outlining the necessary policy changes and investment at Member State level to strengthen the EU's leading position in trustworthy AI⁹.

On the basis of a human-centric approach, the suggested rules aim to develop an AI which guarantees trust, safety and fundamental rights, while also promoting excellence in innovation¹⁰. In that terms, such technology which encompasses manipulative, exploitative and social control practices poses serious threats to human dignity, democracy and the rule of law, as it is explicitly mentioned in recital 15 of the draft AI Act. Consequently, AI and politics have a very important common point since they both intend -ideally- to guarantee as well as to promote the respect of the aforementioned values.

Following a risk-based approach depending on the intended purpose of the AI system and the extent of its potential harm, AI technology which is used in the political area is classified as "high-risk"¹¹ since as it is explicitly predicted¹² "*certain AI systems intended for the administration of justice and democratic processes should be classified as high-risk, considering their potentially significant impact on democracy, rule of law, individual freedoms as well as the right to an effective remedy and to a fair trial*"¹³.

⁸ See more details about the European Digital Agenda and the governance of AI in Kouroupis, K., & Serotila, I. (2022). Privacy and security in light of the European Digital Agenda. In Nomiki Bibliothiki (pp. 97-128).

⁹ At the time being the draft AI Regulation is being processed by the European Parliament and Council.

¹⁰ The EU's digital strategy regarding AI adopt a human-centric approach, according to official statement. See the European Commission. (n.d.). The European Commission's digital strategy. <https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/policies/artificial-intelligence>, accessed on 1st November 2023.

¹¹ The adopted risk categories predicted by the draft AI Act are the following: unacceptable, high, limited and minimal risk. See more about the criteria for this classification in the relative official press release published by the European Commission, European Commission. (2021). Criteria for risk classification in the draft AI Act.

https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/QANDA_21_1683.

¹² Recital 40 and articles 6et seq of the regulatory text.

¹³ See an intense analysis of the draft AI Act in Kouroupis, K. (2022). The AI Act in light of the EU Digital Agenda: A critical approach. *Journal of Data Protection and Privacy*, 5(3). Henry Stewart Publications.

Undoubtedly, like any technological progress, must respect both legal and ethical principles. As far the first ones, the provisions of the draft AI Act are clear: all high-risk AI tools shall respect certain requirements, such as high quality of data, transparency, robustness and accuracy. As far the second pillar, the need to adjust to ethical principles is imperative since decisions taken by algorithms are not always reliable.

Therefore, European Commission established a high-level expert group on AI representing a wide range of stakeholders which has delivered specific guidelines on the issue¹⁴. The primary goal is to achieve a “trustworthy” AI. In that direction, three components are necessary: (1) it should comply with the law, (2) it should fulfil ethical principles and (3) it should be robust. Additionally, seven key requirements that AI applications should respect to be considered trustworthy are identified as follows: *Human agency and oversight, Technical robustness and safety, Privacy and data governance, Transparency, Diversity, non-discrimination and fairness, Societal and environmental well-being and Accountability*¹⁵.

From an institutional approach, the role of AI and its impact on the democratic society has been several times underlined by the European leaders. The European Parliament has strongly declared that “*AI is an opportunity to improve the democratic process in our societies. For example, it can help citizens to gain a better understanding of politics and engage more easily in democratic debate*”¹⁶.

At international level, the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe in October 2020 declared that “Artificial Intelligence has become a determining factor for the future of humanity as it continues to substantially transform individual lives and impact human communities”¹⁷. Recently, a Round Table on “Artificial intelligence, freedom of expression and disinformation: challenges and risks for democracy” took place after the Standing Committee meeting in Riga, organised by the PACE Interparliamentary Co-operation and Project Support Division in co-

¹⁴ The group is responsible on drafting AI ethics guidelines as well as preparing a set of recommendations for broader AI policy. The AI high-level expert group published a first draft of the ethics guidelines in December 2018. Following a stakeholder consultation and meetings with representatives from Member States, the AI expert group has delivered a revised document to the Commission in March 2019. See more at European Commission. (2019). High-level expert group on artificial intelligence: Ethics guidelines for trustworthy AI. <https://ec.europa.eu/digital-single-market/en/high-level-expert-group-artificial-intelligence>.

¹⁵ See more at European Commission. (n.d.). Ethics guidelines for trustworthy AI. <https://ec.europa.eu/futurium/en/ai-alliance-consultation.1.html>.

¹⁶ This statement has been announced during an open debate between European Parliament and citizens. Adam, M., & Hockuard, C. (2023). Artificial intelligence, democracy and elections. European Parliamentary Research Service. [https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2023/751478/EPRS_BRI\(2023\)751478_EN.pdf](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2023/751478/EPRS_BRI(2023)751478_EN.pdf).

¹⁷ Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe. (2020). Artificial intelligence: Ensuring respect for democracy, human rights and the rule of law. <https://pace.coe.int/en/pages/artificial-intelligence>, accessed on 1st November 2023.

operation with the Latvian delegation to PACE¹⁸. The major goal was to elaborate a framework Convention on the development, design and application of artificial intelligence which would serve people and democracy. Besides that, it should be noticed the Committee on Artificial Intelligence (CAI) of the Council of Europe which aims at designating and promoting the application of AI based on human rights, the rule of law and democracy¹⁹. The aforementioned actions led to the adoption on 17 May 2024 by the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe of the draft Convention on Artificial Intelligence and Human Rights, Democracy and the Rule of Law²⁰. Among the most important points to be highlighted are the following²¹:

- a) It is strongly recognized the significant impact of artificial intelligence on human rights, democracy and the rule of law;
- b) It is emphatically admitted that artificial intelligence systems may create or aggravate inequalities and detriment on economic, social, cultural and political affairs;
- c) Therefore, it is urgent to establish a globally applicable legal framework setting out common general principles and rules governing AI, especially through the promotion of fundamental values;
- d) The proposed Convention aims at promoting a powerful and trustful AI, respecting fully all the above matters;
- e) Both legal and ethical principles shall be adopted and related to activities within the lifecycle of artificial intelligence systems.

¹⁸ Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe. (2023). Artificial intelligence, freedom of expression and disinformation: Challenges and risks for democracy. <https://pace.coe.int/en/news/9116/artificial-intelligence-freedom-of-expression-and-disinformation-challenges-and-risks-for-democracy>, accessed on 1st November 2023.

¹⁹ See further details regarding CAI, its role, tasks and contribution to the designation of trustful and powerful AI, Council of Europe. (n.d.). CAI, its role, tasks and contribution to the designation of trustful and powerful AI. <https://www.coe.int/en/web/artificial-intelligence/cai>, accessed on 1st November 2023.

²⁰ The full document will be opened for signature on the occasion of the Conference of Ministers of Justice in Vilnius (Lithuania) on 5 September 2024. See more details at the official site <https://www.coe.int/en/web/artificial-intelligence/cai>.

²¹ The entire text of the proposed Convention can be downloaded here: Council of Europe. (2024). Proposed Convention on AI. <https://rm.coe.int/1680afae3c>.

Section II: AI and fake news: A dynamic relationship.

In the ever-evolving landscape of modern politics, the intersection of artificial intelligence (AI) and the proliferation of fake news has become a complex and troubling phenomenon. As AI accelerates extremely rapidly, the potential for this technology to be misused for political gain and the manipulation of public discourse has become a pressing concern.

Undoubtedly, from a first point of view, AI corresponds to an innovative, modern and attractive tool for politicians. Using videos, showing robots or taking advantage of the current technology has always a great impact on our way of thinking. Therefore, political campaigns and messages are disseminated through AI tools, reshaping the traditional nature of political communication and leading to an innovative framework of democratic participation and life²².

However, the question which arises is how original and pure is that re-shaped political communication? Recently, in the USA, Republicans conducted their campaign against Biden via an AI-generated attack video²³. Even though at the end of the video there is provided an information to audience that AI technology is used, the video itself is extremely attractive and challenging. In response to this, the U.S. President Joe Biden signed an ambitious executive order on artificial intelligence aiming at guaranteeing national security and consumer rights as well as to establish a safe and powerful digital environment²⁴.

It is clearly demonstrated that AI corresponds to a powerful tool in the arsenal of politicians who pursue to expand its use for purposes of better weighing and/or

²² See more about the connection between AI and democracy in Jungherr, A. (2023). Artificial Intelligence and Democracy: A Conceptual Framework. *Social Media + Society*, 9(3). <https://doi.org/10.1177/20563051231186353>, Kitsara, I. (2022). Artificial intelligence and the digital divide: From an innovation perspective. In *Platforms and Artificial Intelligence* (pp. 245-265). Springer, Cham. Curini, L., & Franzese, R. (Eds.). (2020). *The SAGE Handbook of Research Methods in Political Science and International Relations*. Sage Publications. Djeflal, C. (2019). AI, democracy and the law. In A. Sudmann (Ed.), *The democratization of artificial intelligence* (pp. 255-285). KI-Kritik / AI Critique. <https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839447192>. Daugherty, P. R., Wilson, H., & Chowdhury, R. (2019). Using artificial intelligence to promote diversity. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 60*(2), 1. Kneuer, M. (2016). E-democracy: A new challenge for measuring democracy. *International Political Science Review*, 37(5), 666-678.

²³ See Vincent, J. (2023, April 25). Republicans respond to Biden reelection announcement with AI-generated attack ad. *The Verge*. <https://www.theverge.com/2023/4/25/23697328/biden-reelection-mnc-ai-generated-attack-ad-deepfake>, accessed on 1st November 2023.

²⁴ In fact, the executive order signed by Biden provides strict requirements for any AI developer who is forced to communicate safety test results and other information to the government. See more details in Boak, J., & O'Brien, M. (2023, October 31). Biden wants to move fast on AI safeguards and signs an executive order to address his concerns. *AP News*. <https://apnews.com/article/biden-ai-artificial-intelligence-executive-order-cb86162000d894f238f28ac029005059>

capturing social opinion. This remark comes with total accordance with the current trend of modern digital society where communication technologies have generated and updated the traditional forms of political debate and engagement. According to a survey conducted by European institutions on 2017, the majority of Europeans go online on a daily basis and participate in social networks. Moreover, most political parties and candidates have an intense online presence and invest great amounts in tech marketing²⁵.

Notwithstanding, AI-powered algorithms can be used to generate highly realistic and convincing fake content, from text and images to audio and video recordings, known as “deepfakes”²⁶. These synthetic media can be deployed to spread disinformation, undermine the credibility of legitimate sources, and create a climate of confusion and mistrust. Therefore, AI becomes a regulator of public opinion. Algorithms can analyze the existing information environment to identify emerging social divisions and fault lines that can be exploited. Then, AI's network analysis tools can be used to better understand and target specific audience segments, crafting tailored messaging to manipulate their beliefs and behaviors. This process leads to the following result: disinformation is expanded dramatically, public trust in information environment is eroded and truth is hardly distinguished from fiction²⁷. The aforementioned erosion of trust can have far-reaching consequences, undermining the foundations of a healthy democracy and paving the way for the rise of authoritarian tendencies and populist movements. The spread of misinformation and the delegitimization of authoritative sources can lead to the fragmentation of the public discourse, making it increasingly challenging to reach consensus on critical issues. This fragmentation can be exploited by political actors who seek to divide and conquer, using fear, anger, and conspiracy theories to rally their base and consolidate power.

²⁵ See a thorough analysis on the use of technology in political area in a study written Neudert, L. M., & Marchal, N. (2019). *Polarisation and the use of technology in political campaigns and communication*. European Parliamentary Research Service. [https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2019/634414/EPRS_STU\(2019\)634414_EN.pdf](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2019/634414/EPRS_STU(2019)634414_EN.pdf).

²⁶ Martin-Rozumilowicz, B., & Kužel, R. (2019). *Social media, disinformation and electoral integrity*. International Foundation for Electoral Systems, Working Paper.

²⁷ See more regarding the generation of fake news by AI technologies in Schneier, B., Farrell, H., & Sanders, N. E. (2023, April 21). *How artificial intelligence can aid democracy*. Slate. Agrawal, A., Gans, J., & Goldfarb, A. (2022). **Prediction machines: The simple economics of artificial intelligence*. Harvard Business Review Press. Bai, H., Voelkel, J. G., Eichstaedt, J. C., & Willer, R. (2023). *Artificial intelligence can persuade humans on political issues*. OSF Preprints. <https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/stakv>. Bennett, W. L., & Livingston, S. (Eds.). (2021). *The disinformation age: Politics, technology, and disruptive communication in the United States*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108914628>. Diakopoulos, N. (2019). *Automating the news: How algorithms are rewriting the media*. Harvard University Press.

Another serious detriment to democracy due to the malicious use of AI is the lies on the policymaking process. Since new technologies and learning machine tools may captivate and/or manipulate public opinion, decisions are taken, in practice, by AI. In that manner, political life is losing its interactive nature between citizens and administration. Democratic institutions are undermined and we are leading to a governance by algorithms, even though this may appear as a futuristic and extreme approach²⁸.

Conclusion.

In terms of conclusion, it has been clearly pointed out that artificial intelligence corresponds to a powerful catalyst of democracy. From one side of view, it constitutes a key factor of modernizing the political process and bringing a new era to the traditional political communication. However, as any technological evolution implies two dimensions, AI tools, such as learning machine systems, may produce a negative impact on democratic engagement. In addition, their undefined abilities to execute a large variety of services may violate significant principles, such as those of proportionality, transparency and purpose. Moreover, the fact that an AI system is based on the procession of data, automatically signifies the powerful connection between the quality of data and the services extracted.

In political area, the above remarks hold a tremendous importance as in case of malicious use of AI, disinformation is fuelled by such systems. Political actors lose their original nature and serious challenges arise such as issues of accountability when politicians adopt strategies while political campaigns are turning into an unfair competition of digital technology. Moreover, the ability to generate highly personalized, AI-powered political advertisements and messaging can be used to exploit individual biases and emotions, manipulating voters in ways that undermine the integrity of the democratic process. That spread of misinformation and the delegitimization of authoritative sources can lead to the fragmentation of the public discourse, making it increasingly challenging to reach consensus on critical issues.

Consequently, the question raised is the following: how can we manage to obtain a resilient future in the modern digital world? Undoubtedly, combating the

²⁸ A critical approach about the governance of algorithms and its effect on politics and policymaking process can be found in Engstrom, D. F., & Haim, A. (2023). Regulating government AI and the challenge of sociotechnical design. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, 19, 091626. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-lawsocsci-120522-091626>. Filgueiras, F. (2022). The politics of AI: Democracy and authoritarianism in developing countries. *Journal of Information Technology & Politics*, 19(4), 449–464. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19331681.2021.2016543>. Douek, E. (2021). Governing online speech: From “posts-as-trumps” to proportionality and probability. *Columbia Law Review*, 121*(3), 759–834. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3679607>. Feldstein, S. (2019). How artificial intelligence is reshaping repression. *Journal of Democracy*, 30, 40–52.

threat of AI-powered fake news in politics requires a multi-dimensional approach that encompasses technological solutions, policy interventions and public education.

As far the first pillar of the suggested measures, it may be argued that it is easily feasible since technological progress accelerates rapidly and European Commission puts AI and digital revolution among its highest priorities. In addition, from legal point of view, regulatory frameworks are adopted, aiming at establishing strong requirements such as transparency, enforcement mechanisms to hold perpetrators of AI-powered disinformation accountable and promoting cooperation and information-sharing among all competent authorities and institutions. Indicatively, there can be mentioned the draft AI Act, the Digital Services Act and the General Data Protection Regulation which are oriented to the aforementioned direction.

Besides all the above remarks, it is our strong belief that the most decisive measure which shall be adopted in order to gain a powerful and human centric digital environment, is directly connected to an ethical approach. Public awareness shall be motivated and fostering a culture of critical thinking, particularly during elections and other high-stakes political events, must be a top goal. Collaborating with policymakers to establish guidelines and regulations that mitigate the potential for misuse of AI technology shall be intensively promoted.

By embracing such a comprehensive, interdisciplinary and multi-stakeholder approach it will be more likely to achieve the appropriate solution and the decisive answer to all challenges analyzed above. Beyond all, it must be always reminded that democracy in the age of AI does not refer to a governance of algorithms but to the respect and consolidation of fundamental rights and values in an ongoing digital progress²⁹.

²⁹ Simons, J. (2023). *Algorithms for the people: Democracy in the age of AI*. Princeton University Press.
Schipper, B. (2020). Artificial intelligence and democratic politics. *Political Insight*, 11(1), 32-35.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/2041905820911746>. Glassman, R. M. (2019). Will artificial intelligence (AI) make democracy irrelevant? In *The future of democracy*. Springer, Cham.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-16111-8_20. Nemitz, P. (2018). Constitutional democracy and technology in the age of artificial intelligence. **Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A*, 376(20180089). <http://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.2018.0089>.

Konstantinos Kouroupis

*Docent iz oblasti Pravo EU i Pravo na zaštitu podataka, Univerzitet
Frederik, Kipar*

LAŽNE VESTI, VEŠTAČKA INTELIGENCIJA I POLITIČKA MISAO: TROUGAO INTERAKCIJE ILI DEKONSTRUKCIJE?

Sažetak:

Nesumnjivo, eksplozija veštačke inteligencije (akronim eng. AI) predstavlja prekretnicu u savremenoj digitalnoj evoluciji. AI se koristi u skoro svakom segmentu privatnog i javnog života, što predstavlja naučni napredak i istovremeno doprinosi preoblikovanju tradicionalne strukture društva. U političkoj sferi, AI alati su novi trend, budući da se kampanje izvode putem AI mehanizama, a i poruke se distribuiraju na takav način koji je definitivno atraktivan i ubedljiv, posebno za mlade. Međutim, AI tehnologije, sa svojom sposobnošću za brzu obradu podataka i generisanje sadržaja, koriste se kako za borbu protiv, tako i za širenje lažnih vesti. Glavno pitanje koje se postavlja je sledeće: da li veštačka inteligencija promoviše ili potkopava političku misao? Ovaj rad ima za cilj, pre svega, da pokaže uticaj veštačke inteligencije na politiku. Kroz detaljnu prezentaciju regulatornog okvira u ovoj oblasti, izloženi su kako pravni, tako i etički zahtevi za moćnu i pouzdanu veštačku inteligenciju. Pored toga, kroz kritički pristup je ilustrovana potencijalna, ali značajna interakcija između AI i lažnih vesti koja može prodrati u političku sferu i naneti štetu javnoj svesti, ponašanju birača i integritetu demokratskog procesa. Stoga, ovaj rad ima za cilj da naglasi neophodnost stroge pravne regulative, sa posebnim akcentom na etičkoj primeni veštačke inteligencije. Krajnji cilj je da se razvije politička svest i poveća javna svest, kako bi se zaštitile osnovne vrednosti u aktuelnoj digitalnoj eri i postigla prava ravnoteža između tehnološkog razvoja i promocije demokratskih institucija.

Ključne reči: *veštačka inteligencija (AI), lažne vesti, politika, demokratija.*

List of References

Books

1. Agrawal, A., Gans, J., & Goldfarb, A. (2022). **Prediction machines: The simple economics of artificial intelligence**. Harvard Business Review Press.
2. Bennett, W. L., & Livingston, S. (Eds.). (2021). *The disinformation age: Politics, technology, and disruptive communication in the United States**. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108914628>
3. Diakopoulos, N. (2019). *Automating the news: How algorithms are rewriting the media*. Harvard University Press.
4. Duberry, J. (2022). *Artificial Intelligence and Democracy*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
5. Kouroupis, K., & Serotila, I. (2022). Privacy and security in light of the European Digital Agenda. In **Nomiki Bibliothiki*
6. Simons, J. (2023). *Algorithms for the people: Democracy in the age of AI*. Princeton University Press.
7. Tinnirello, M. (2022). *The Global Politics of Artificial Intelligence (1st ed.)*. Routledge.

Articles

1. Adam, M., & Hockuard, C. (2023). Artificial intelligence, democracy and elections. European Parliamentary Research Service. [https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2023/751478/EPRS_BRI\(2023\)751478_EN.pdf](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2023/751478/EPRS_BRI(2023)751478_EN.pdf)
2. Afriat, H., Dvir-Gvirsman, S., Tsuruel, K., & Ivan, L. (2021). “This is capitalism. It is not illegal”: Users’ attitudes toward institutional privacy following the Cambridge Analytica scandal. **The Information Society, 37*(2), 115-127*. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01972243.2020.1870596>
3. Bai, H., Voelkel, J. G., Eichstaedt, J. C., & Willer, R. (2023). Artificial intelligence can persuade humans on political issues. OSF Preprints. <https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/stakv>
4. Boak, J., & O’Brien, M. (2023, October 31). Biden wants to move fast on AI safeguards and signs an executive order to address his concerns. AP News. <https://apnews.com/article/biden-ai-artificial-intelligence-executive-order-cb86162000d894f238f28ac029005059>
5. Boldyreva, E. L., Grishina, N. Y., & Duisembina, Y. (2018). Cambridge Analytica: Ethics and online manipulation with decision-making process. The European Proceedings of Social & Behavioural Sciences (EpSBS), December 2018. <http://dx.doi.org/10.15405/epsbs.2018.12.02.10>

6. Buiten, M. C. (2022). The Digital Services Act: From intermediary liability to platform regulation. *Journal of Intellectual Property, Information Technology and E-Commerce Law (JIPITEC)*, 12, 361 para
<https://www.jipitec.eu/archive/issues/jipitec-12-5-2021/5491>
7. Busuioc, M. (2021). Accountable artificial intelligence: Holding algorithms to account. *Public Administration Review*, 81(5), 825-836.
8. Busch, C., & Mak, V. (2021). Putting the Digital Services Act in context. *Journal of European Consumer and Market Law*, 10(3), 109-114.
9. Daugherty, P. R., Wilson, H., & Chowdhury, R. (2019). Using artificial intelligence to promote diversity. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 60(2), 1.
10. Douek, E. (2021). Governing online speech: From “posts-as-trumps” to proportionality and probability. *Columbia Law Review*, 121(3), 759–834.
<https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3679607>
11. Engstrom, D. F., & Haim, A. (2023). Regulating government AI and the challenge of sociotechnical design. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, 19, 091626.
<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-lawsocsci-120522-091626>
12. European Parliament resolution of 25 October 2018 on the use of Facebook users’ data by Cambridge Analytica and the impact on data protection (2018/2855(RSP)), 25 October 2018.
<https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52018IP0433>
13. Feldstein, S. (2019). How artificial intelligence is reshaping repression. *Journal of Democracy*, 30, 40-52.
14. Filgueiras, F. (2022). The politics of AI: Democracy and authoritarianism in developing countries. *Journal of Information Technology & Politics*, 19 (4), 449–464. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19331681.2021.2016543>
15. Glassman, R. M. (2019). Will artificial intelligence (AI) make democracy irrelevant? In *The future of democracy*. Springer, Cham.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-16111-8_20
16. Hanlon, A., & Jones, K. (2023). Ethical concerns about social media privacy policies: Do users have the ability to comprehend their consent actions? *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 1-18.
17. Hu, M. (2020). Cambridge Analytica’s black box. *Big Data & Society*, 7 (2), July-December 2020. Sage Journals. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951720938091>
18. Jackson, M. C. (2021). Artificial intelligence & algorithmic bias: The issues with technology reflecting history & humans. *Journal of Business & Technology Law*, 16, 299.
19. Jungherr, A. (2023). Artificial intelligence and democracy: A conceptual framework. *Social Media + Society*, 9 (3). Sage Journals.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/20563051231186353>

20. Kouroupis, K. (2022). The AI Act in light of the EU Digital Agenda: A critical approach. *Journal of Data Protection and Privacy*, 5 (3). Henry Stewart Publications.
21. Kneuer, M. (2016). E-democracy: A new challenge for measuring democracy. **International Political Science Review*, 37 (5), 666-678.
22. Luca de Tena, C., & García de Viedma, D. (2023). **EUROPEAN TECH INSIGHTS Mapping European Attitudes towards Technological Change and its Governance*. IE Center for the Governance of Change.
<https://www.ie.edu/cgc/research/european-tech-insights/>
23. Martin-Rozumiłowicz, B., & Kužel, R. (2019). Social media, disinformation and electoral integrity. **International Foundation for Electoral Systems, Working Paper*.
24. Nemitz, P. (2018). Constitutional democracy and technology in the age of artificial intelligence. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A*, 376 (20180089). <http://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.2018.0089>
25. Neudert, L. M., & Marchal, N. (2019). Polarisation and the use of technology in political campaigns and communication. European Parliamentary Research Service.
[https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2019/634414/EPRS_STU\(2019\)634414_EN.pdf](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2019/634414/EPRS_STU(2019)634414_EN.pdf)
26. Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe. (2020). Artificial intelligence: Ensuring respect for democracy, human rights and the rule of law.
<https://pace.coe.int/en/pages/artificial-intelligence>
27. Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe. (2023). Artificial intelligence, freedom of expression and disinformation: Challenges and risks for democracy.
<https://pace.coe.int/en/news/9116/artificial-intelligence-freedom-of-expression-and-disinformation-challenges-and-risks-for-democracy>
28. Savin, A. (2021). The EU Digital Services Act: Towards a more responsible internet. *Journal of Internet Law*.
https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3786792
29. Schippers, B. (2020). Artificial intelligence and democratic politics. **Political Insight*, 11*(1), 32-35. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2041905820911746>
30. Schneier, B., Farrell, H., & Sanders, N. E. (2023, April 21). How artificial intelligence can aid democracy. *Slate*.
31. Trandabăt, D., & Gifu, D. (2023). Discriminating AI-generated fake news. *Procedia Computer Science*, 225, 3822-3831. Elsevier.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2023.10.378>
32. Vincent, J. (2023, April 25). Republicans respond to Biden reelection announcement with AI-generated attack ad. *The Verge*.
<https://www.theverge.com/2023/4/25/23697328/biden-reelection-rnc-ai-generated-attack-ad-deepfake>

