

Artificial Intelligence and Media-politics: A Revolution in Communicative Dynamics?

Daniele Battista^{1,*} & Alessandra Petrone¹

¹University of Salerno, Italy

*Corresponding author: University of Salerno, Italy

Received: June 29, 2024 Accepted: July 13, 2024 Published: July 20, 2024

doi:10.5296/jsr.v15i2.22207 URL: <https://doi.org/10.5296/jsr.v15i2.22207>

Abstract

This study aims to delve into communicative interactions within the realm of online politics, with a specific emphasis on the increasingly significant role of artificial intelligence (AI). In an era where digital technologies are radically transforming communication flows, the introduction of AI into political processes opens new prospects, but also presents numerous challenges. The research seeks to understand how these technologies are influencing political language and user engagement strategies, with profound repercussions on social and political dynamics. The methodology employed combines both qualitative and quantitative analysis. On the one hand, a qualitative analysis was conducted on AI-generated content within online political discussions, examining how this content influences political narratives and shape's public opinion. On the other hand, a quantitative analysis evaluated the dynamics of engagement and interaction across various digital platforms, measuring the impact of AI on user behaviour and information dissemination. The findings of this research reveal that AI is not only transforming the language of politics but also altering the ways individuals participate in public debate. Artificial intelligences not only facilitate new forms of communication but can also influence power dynamics, either reinforcing or destabilizing existing structures. Based on these results, it is essential to balance technological innovation with the protection of democratic processes, ensuring that the use of AI is transparent, ethical, and oriented toward the common good. In conclusion, this contribution highlights the need for public debate and ongoing research on the social and political implications of AI, so that these technologies can positively contribute to the future of democracy.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence (AI), political communication, emerging technologies, virtual interactions, implications

1. Introduction

The integration of technologies capable of bringing about radical changes profoundly influences every aspect of human life. Technological innovation, in fact, does not merely produce significant effects in scientific fields or the practice of new technologies, but also exerts a substantial impact on society (Granieri, 2011). Contemporary society thus finds itself facing increasing challenges, not only related to adapting to new tools and processes but also to the necessity of understanding and managing the cultural, economic, and political transformations that accompany these developments. An in-depth analysis of the current situation is presented in the Digital Economy Report 2023 by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD, 2023), which examines the impact of digital technologies globally, highlighting the urgency of inclusive policies to mitigate the growing inequalities generated by these transformations. This report underscores how digital expansion is not evenly distributed, with significant disparities between developed and developing countries, and calls on policymakers to promote equitable access to digital resources and to develop sustainable technological infrastructures. Similarly, the World Development Report 2023 by the World Bank analyzes the implications of ongoing digital transformations, emphasizing how they are redefining economic, social, and political dynamics globally. The report highlights that while digital technologies offer opportunities for growth and inclusion, they also pose significant risks, such as labor market polarization, increased income inequality, and vulnerability to new forms of social exclusion. Therefore, it stresses the importance of innovative and targeted policy strategies to address these challenges and maximize the benefits of digital transformations.

Considering the evidence presented in these studies, this work aims to critically examine the social role of new technologies, framing these practices as means to promote social inclusion and digital justice, while also addressing the risks and challenges associated with their implementation, given the delicate balance between technological innovation and ethical, social, and economic considerations. What seems certain is that it is possible to link the analysis of digital transformations to the concept of society elaborated by Bruno Latour, who in his approach argues that society is not a stable, predefined entity but rather a dynamic network composed of both human and non-human actors that constantly interact. In this context, digital technologies are not merely tools at the service of humans, but genuine "actants" that actively participate in social construction, influencing relationships, practices, and power structures. Applying this perspective to our study, we can interpret new technologies not only as means to facilitate social intervention but also as agents that reconfigure the very modes of interaction and connection between individuals and institutions. Artificial intelligences, digital platforms, and social networks not only mediate but also co-produce new forms of social relationality, shaping collective action and the social fabric in ways that are yet to be fully understood. From this perspective, the present study aims to explore how digital technologies are redefining and configuring new spaces for intervention and raising unprecedented questions about the limits and potential in the digital era. It will explore how digital technologies, especially artificial intelligence, are transforming the dynamics of political communication in the context of digital networks. Indeed, AI, through its ability to analyze large-scale data, automate

decision-making processes, and generate personalized content, is redefining political communication and engagement strategies, enabling the creation of highly targeted messages and direct interaction with voters and stakeholders. This phenomenon is modifying traditional mechanisms of political participation and consensus formation, creating new forms of political dialogue and debate that go beyond the limits of conventional communication media.

2. Theoretical Framework and Invaded Spaces

Assuming we are facing an irreversible process of digitalization, understood as the set of relationships, structures, and elements involved in the integration of information and communication technologies (ICT) into every aspect of daily life, it becomes evident how this phenomenon is profoundly transforming social, economic, and political dynamics. Digitalization is not limited to the mere introduction of technological tools; rather, it has involved a comprehensive reorganization of social practices and modes of interaction, with a significant impact on the formation of power relations, resource distribution, and communication strategies. These strategies, in conjunction with digital technologies and artificial intelligence, emerge not only as operational tools but also as agents actively participating in the creation of new forms of participation, collaboration, and governance. The blending of these factors contributes to redefining the boundaries between physical and virtual space, between human and non-human actors, and between public and private spheres, generating new social structures that require critical analysis to fully understand their implications today. It should be noted that as early as 1964, Marshall McLuhan anticipated the dynamics of digital communication with insights that proved prophetic regarding technological evolution and social transformation. His statements, "we become what we behold" and "we shape our tools, and thereafter our tools shape us," offer a fundamental framework for understanding current changes. McLuhan emphasized that media and technologies are not merely channels of communication, but constitutive elements that shape our way of thinking and relating to the world. Today, in an era marked by rapid digitalization, his insights are particularly relevant. Digitalization not only changes the means through which we communicate but reshapes social structures and interpersonal relationships, creating an environment in which digital technologies are intrinsically linked to our everyday experience. This process of integrating information and communication technologies contributes to the creation of a "global village," a concept McLuhan used to describe how connectivity and instant communication can bring people and cultures closer together, creating a global network of interactions. In today's context, this "global village" manifests as an interconnected web of digital platforms, social media, and emerging technologies that facilitate continuous interaction and access to information on a planetary scale. However, as McLuhan intuited, this connectivity has profound and ambivalent implications: while it promotes global access and participation, it also raises issues of control, privacy, and inequality. Ultimately, the reflection on how digital technologies shape our experience and vice versa remains a central theme for analyzing and understanding the profound social and epistemological changes characterizing the digital age. This perspective finds further support in Manuel Castells' (2009) analysis, which describes digital networks as inherently global entities characterized by their ability to

self-configure according to programmers' instructions and transcend territorial and institutional boundaries through interconnected computer networks. Castells emphasizes that digital networks are not limited by physical or geographical barriers but operate on a global scale, facilitating continuous communication and interaction between individuals and systems distributed worldwide. This characteristic of self-configuration and interconnection allows digital networks to quickly adapt to the needs and changes of their users and emerging technologies, creating a global communication infrastructure that transcends the limitations of traditional national and institutional boundaries. Such dynamics reflect a significant shift towards an increasingly fluid and permeable communication structure, where interactions are mediated and amplified by the network itself. The implications of this global vision of digital networks are profound and multidimensional. On the one hand, it fosters the dissemination of knowledge and resources on a planetary scale, promoting greater inclusion and participation globally. On the other hand, it raises complex questions about regulation, security, and privacy, given that networks operate beyond national jurisdictions and local regulations. In this context, digital networks become not only communication tools but also spaces for negotiation and conflict on a global scale, where power dynamics, control, and access to information manifest in new and nuanced ways. This analysis thus contributes to a deeper understanding of the changes brought about by digitalization, highlighting how digital networks constitute a new form of social and communicative organization that redefines the structures of interaction and power in the era of technological globalization. Similarly, Nicholas Carr, in his work *The Shallows* (2010), explores how digitalization profoundly influences our way of thinking and interacting, suggesting that intensive use of digital technologies is changing the very structure of human cognition. Carr highlights how pervasive connectivity and constant exposure to digital stimuli alter concentration and critical reflection, affecting our ability to process complex information. Additionally, Zuboff, in her work *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism* (2019), provides a sharp critique of how digital technologies not only facilitate global communication but also generate new models of control and extraction of value from personal data, such as surveillance and profiling practices, fuelled by digital networks that create new forms of power and inequality, redefining privacy and individual autonomy dynamics. These combined studies offer a complex and layered view of the transformations induced by digitalization. They show how digital networks, while offering unprecedented opportunities for connection and global access, also raise significant ethical, cognitive, and political concerns. It is undeniable that the emergence of the Internet and the subsequent proliferation of artificial intelligence have triggered a profound and significant transformation in contemporary society. These technological developments have caused a radical shift in communication models and information sharing, reshaping the social, economic, and cultural landscape. The ubiquitous access to the web and the adoption of AI-based technologies have introduced new paradigms of interaction, influencing the production, distribution, and consumption of content on an unprecedented scale. The increasing pervasiveness of digital technologies has led to the emergence of new communication models, characterized by a speed of exchange and a variety of dissemination channels that surpass traditional media limitations. Online platforms facilitate immediate and global information sharing, promoting more active and interactive user participation. However, this transformation is not without complexity. The integration of

advanced algorithms and AI systems in information management raises critical questions about privacy, data manipulation, and the quality of public discourse. Moreover, the continuous progress in AI's ability to analyse and interpret vast amounts of data contributes to a redefinition of power and control dynamics, influencing both social structures and everyday practices. This ever-evolving scenario requires careful reflection on the new communication models and the social implications of emerging technologies, to fully understand the challenges and opportunities offered by the digital age. It is evident that the integration of artificial intelligence into political communication should not be demonized; however, it is crucial that both the political class and citizens are aware of the duality inherent in this inevitable connection and work towards finding a balance between the use of AI and the need to maintain a human-centred approach in political communication (Battista, 2024). While AI can undoubtedly facilitate the workflow of political communicators, it cannot and should not replace human interaction in any of its dimensions, as such a substitution risk compromising fundamental qualities such as authenticity, empathy, and understanding qualities that are distinctive of human beings (Lazzeretti, 2021) Therefore, it becomes indispensable to promote true digital literacy, which goes beyond the acquisition of instrumental skills or simple connectivity, encouraging citizens to consume information from digital platforms in a reflective and critical manner. This requires a deep awareness of the origin of information and the implications associated with its construction. It is crucial that various sectors of society continue to discuss the implications of artificial intelligence in communication in general, and in political communication in particular. Such reflection is essential, as the proper functioning of a democracy requires the support of ethical values that guide the development and implementation of AI in these contexts.

3. From Theory to Reality

Current transformations driven by the Internet and digitalization can be compared to the significant revolutions that occurred in the 14th century with the invention of printing and in the 19th century with the introduction of photography (Manovich, 2001). These innovations had a profound and lasting impact on communication processes, cultural production, and the dissemination of knowledge. Similarly, artificial intelligence can be compared to another paradigm-shifting revolution, distinguished by its ability to transform interaction with information and profoundly influence sociocultural structures. Artificial intelligence, with its capacity to learn, adapt, and make autonomous decisions, represents a true "cognitive revolution." It not only automates complex tasks but also introduces new paradigms of interaction between humans and machines, altering the way data is analyzed, interpreted, and utilized. Its influence extends beyond mere automation, permeating various aspects of daily life, from the economy to healthcare, from education to communication. This cognitive revolution can be compared to the invention of printing in that, while printing democratized access to knowledge and enabled the standardization of information, artificial intelligence is democratizing and personalizing the production and interpretation of information. Similarly, just as photography transformed visual and documentary perceptions of reality, AI is altering our understanding and interaction with data, opening new possibilities for analysis and

prediction. In this way, artificial intelligence emerges as a turning point that, like previous inventions, profoundly redefines the social, cultural, and economic structures and practices of our time. In the realm of political communication, artificial intelligence has introduced new possibilities and challenges. With its ability to analyze vast amounts of data and generate personalized content, AI enables unprecedented segmentation and personalization of political messages. Electoral campaigns can now be adapted in real time to respond to voter preferences and behaviours, optimizing the effectiveness of political communication and influencing public opinion with greater precision. AI also facilitates predictive analysis, helping politicians and interest groups understand and anticipate trends and reactions from the electorate. However, this power raises important ethical issues, such as the manipulation of public opinion and the protection of personal data. The use of algorithms to shape and direct political communication introduces new levels of complexity and ambiguity, requiring deep reflection on the implications for democracy and society.

The contribution, therefore, aims to examine the evolution of the broad digital archipelago and the emerging communicative modalities between citizens and political actors. In particular, it focuses on the growing impact of artificial intelligences, which are increasingly permeating the digital and virtual activities of contemporary politics. Indeed, AI-based technologies are profoundly redefining how politicians interact with the electorate and manage campaigns, and they may do so even more in the future. The use of virtual avatars by political figures, the transformation of decision-making processes, and the influence on public policy formulation are some of the most significant manifestations of this evolution. Consider, for instance, the phenomenon of "Ai Yoon," the avatar created for then-presidential candidate and now President Yoon Suk-yeol, which offers significant insights into the innovations and implications of digital technology in contemporary political communication. Using advanced artificial intelligence techniques, the candidate's team created a virtual avatar that not only replicated the politician's appearance and voice but also adopted a distinctive and engaging communication style. This strategy aimed to attract young voters and make the candidate appear "cool," utilizing a sharp and satirical language that stands out from traditional political discourse. The success of Ai Yoon, which garnered millions of views and significant online interaction, highlights the power of digital technologies in shaping electoral campaigns and altering the dynamics of interaction between politicians and the public. The avatar not only amplified and personalized the political message but also introduced a new communication paradigm that uses humor and provocation to stimulate interest and participation. Artificial Intelligence (AI) has played a significant role in the dynamic political context of Taiwan, particularly with the emergence of the Sunflower Movement, a student protest movement that had a notable impact on the island's political scene. Emerging in 2014, the Sunflower Movement saw innovative use of technology to coordinate protest actions and mobilize public support. AI contributed to this process through data analysis and communication management, facilitating information dissemination and strengthening activist networks. The application of AI in the context of the Sunflower Movement included the use of algorithms to monitor and analyze public reactions and social media dynamics. This technology allowed organizers to identify key concerns and sentiments within the population, thereby optimizing communication and mobilization strategies. Moreover, AI tools have been used to manage and optimize the logistics of protests, ensuring efficient planning and a rapid

response to emerging challenges during demonstrations. As Mazzoleni (1998) has long stated, it has become increasingly laborious to imagine politics that do not rely on mass media. Politics has adapted to and integrated new technologies and digital media into its modus operandi, and politicians have recognized the importance of using media to reach the public, convey political messages, and interact with voters. There are numerous cases of political engagement through AI-driven activities, and the organization of electoral campaigns is increasingly focused on digital and virtual mediation, targeting the Gen Z and millennial audience. Digitalization has certainly expanded the possibilities for political engagement through Artificial Intelligence; indeed, more and more images and videos for electoral campaigns are being produced with algorithms, often with astonishing results. Such content is created to go viral on online platforms, social media, and digital participation tools (Colombo, 2013). On one hand, this has allowed citizens to play a more active role in the political sphere, expressing their opinions and participating in discussions on public issues. On the other hand, AI-generated fake political campaigns often make it nearly impossible to distinguish what is real from what is false. However, politicians themselves have had to adapt their communication strategies to cope with the speed and breadth of information in the digital context. This change has had a significant impact on modern politics, as actors must adapt to modern communication media and embrace the increasingly pronounced personalization of politics (Altheide & Snow, 1979). This means that politicians must manage their image and adopt a more personal approach to political communication, focusing on their life and personal experiences rather than their political ideology. Overall, political communication is transforming into a phenomenon where the narrative of politicians as brands (Barile, 2014) becomes increasingly relevant. The interaction between media logic and the personalization of politics has led to a significant increase in the importance attached to politicians' personal characteristics, at the expense of the ideology or political position they represent. This approach emphasizes the use of personal narratives, AI-generated self-representations, and possibly expressed in a virtual world, as well as individual stories and personal anecdotes to emotionally connect with the public and create a sense of closeness and trust. Indeed, politicians' personal stories provide a more immediate and concrete perspective compared to grand abstract meta-narratives, and can evoke empathy and engagement from voters. The continuous development of political storytelling techniques makes politics increasingly media-driven, where stories may become the only tool to address complex issues with magical formulas capable of gaining the trust and even the credibility of the target electorate (Salmon, 2014). This highlights the actual lack of clarity on the topic under examination, which is popular but driven by a pressing need dictated by the times. Consider that, up until the time this research was conducted, the existing scientific literature on Google Scholar that simultaneously addresses the topics of "artificial intelligence" and "political communication" is extremely limited, with only two notable authors standing out in this field. Andreas Jungherr from the University of Bamberg in Germany and Daniel Allington from King's College London in England have developed a body of research exploring the connection between these subjects. Jungherr primarily focuses on the application of conceptual frameworks of artificial intelligence in the context of democracy and electoral campaigns (Jungherr, 2023a; Jungherr, 2023b), providing a macro-analytical perspective on the role of AI in political processes. Allington, on the other hand, adopts a more micro-social and prospective

approach, concentrating on the analysis of antisemitic discourse in relation to the use of AI (Allington, 2022). Both authors make significant contributions to understanding the implications of AI in the political sphere, albeit from different and complementary perspectives. More broadly, beyond the mentioned authors, there is a noticeable transitional paradigm shift in the use of algorithms and artificial intelligence in political communication, accentuated by the post-pandemic period. This shift has had a significant impact on the transformation of voter profiles, as well as on the language and strategies for engaging citizens (García-Orosa, 2021; López-López et al., 2023). These studies highlight how the introduction of new digital technologies is redefining the modalities of political interaction, fostering the emergence of new dynamics that profoundly influence the relationship between voters and institutions.

4. Understanding the Phenomena

The public debate on the impact of artificial intelligence (AI) on democracy and political life has long been confined to a narrow niche and considered of marginal relevance. Only a small group of scholars and intellectuals showed acute and focused interest in this emerging issue, seeing it not just as a matter of current importance but as a crucial strategic area for the future of democratic institutions and the political process itself. These pioneers of the debate recognized that the introduction and dissemination of information technologies could profoundly affect the structure and functioning of democratic systems, altering traditional modes of participation, deliberation, and political representation, especially with the hybridization of communication strategies. However, this awareness is not yet widely shared; on the contrary, it is still often obscured by a common perception that tends to view digital technologies as neutral tools or simply functional to improving administrative efficiency. This has happened because attention has primarily been focused on the shift from analog to digital media, with particular emphasis on the rise of the Internet, and the growing concern related to the so-called "digital divide" (Hargittai, 2003; Warschauer, 2003; Norris, 2004; Van Dijk, 2020; Salzano et al., 2023). Participating in the realm of digital flows, however, requires overcoming various forms of the digital divide. Rogers' (1994) theory of the diffusion of innovations, a widely recognized framework, provides a conceptual framework for understanding the progressive process of adopting digital technologies. According to the normalization model, over time, disparities in the adoption of digital technologies tend to decrease as such innovations are gradually integrated into society. In contrast, the stratification model highlights how socioeconomic inequalities can influence the adoption of digital technologies, favoring individuals with higher economic and social resources who are more likely to benefit from such technologies. Currently, we face a completely different reality, particularly difficult to decipher with discussions that do not account for the multidisciplinary aspects of the issue. The advent and dissemination of artificial intelligence (AI) have radically transformed the political landscape, raising deep and complex questions. AI, with its capacity for large-scale data analysis, machine learning, and decision-making automation, has acquired a central role in political and institutional dynamics (Ciaralli, 2023), which are already being severely tested by other dynamics (Battista, 2023a). In the current landscape, it is crucial to examine how AI is shaping the political decision-making process and influencing public policy formulation. A

significant example involves the use of algorithms in data analysis and voter profiling, which can have a substantial impact on electoral campaigns and public opinion manipulation (Gori, 2017; De Rosa, 2018; Gallo, 2022). Moreover, the automation of decision-making processes through AI, such as in the realms of neural networks and machine learning, raises significant ethical and legal questions regarding political responsibility and decision transparency (Floridi, 2022). This work, however, highlights some cases that could set a precedent in the contemporary political arena, projecting some of its most relevant manifestations. It explores the implications of this new technological reality for democracy, political institutions, and civic participation. Indeed, while in 1997 the debate on technopolitics addressed by Rodotà was just beginning, today we face a fundamental challenge for politics and society. Has artificial intelligence become a cornerstone of contemporary technopolitics? It is not possible to provide a comprehensive answer to this question, but understanding its implications is crucial for addressing the challenges and leveraging the opportunities it presents for the future of democracy and political life. The hypothesis of replacing democratically elected politicians with generative AI systems represents, on the other hand, an intriguing and controversial perspective within contemporary political dynamics (Battista & Uva, 2023). This concept is rooted in the growing public distrust of traditional politicians, driven by a range of factors including perceptions of corruption, inefficiency, and an inability to adequately address societal needs (Della Porta, 2012; Manin, 2014; Battista, 2023b). The hope of entrusting government management to AI-based systems is based on the idea that they can operate objectively, efficiently, and free from biases, eliminating potential interference from political parties and private interests. The recent Youtrend/ survey /*Fondazione Pensiero Solido survey*(Note 1), Here is the translation of your text into English:

It indicates that 35% of Italians place the work of politicians in fifth place among the activities that could potentially be replaced by artificial intelligence. On this basis, Senator Lombardo, in a speech in the chamber, opened the debate on the impact of artificial intelligence on politics and the potential replaceability of politicians with AI software. The advancement of generative and conversational AI programs once again raises the central issue regarding the prospect of a politics detached from the figure of politicians, a concept that inevitably challenges the democratic principle. In this perspective, the fundamental question arises about the potential search for a political system that operates outside the traditional democratic framework. This scenario raises profound questions about the delegation of decision-making power and the role of human actors in the political decision-making process. The advent of automated systems capable of generating and conducting political and decision-making conversations offers a new paradigm that challenges the traditional decision-making process based on democratic participation. Therefore, this debate requires careful consideration of the ethical, political, and social implications associated with the evolution of such technologies and the potential consequences for the very nature of democracy and political representation. This issue is not a novelty in the lively discussion landscape. In June 2021, a survey conducted by the Center for the Governance of Change at the University of Madrid, an institute specializing in the analysis of the links between politics, economics, and technological developments, found that 51% of European voters expressed support for reducing the number of parliamentarians and assigning those seats to an AI-based system(Note 2).

This data highlights the existing interest and support for the application of technological solutions in the political sphere. However, it simultaneously raises significant questions regarding representative democracy, participation, and public oversight of the decision-making process. It reflects the growing interaction between politics and technological evolution (De Blasio, 2018; Ziccardi, 2019), which requires a thorough analysis of the ethical and political implications of such proposals. Research and discussion on how to balance efficiency and technological innovation with traditional democratic principles are essential for better understanding the direction in which the relationship between politics and artificial intelligence is developing. Indeed, in the recent Danish elections, the Synthetic Party undertook an innovative political experiment by proposing an artificial intelligence, named Leader Lars, as its main candidate. This initiative has raised both political and ethical questions and merits careful analysis. The political construction around Leader Lars represents a significant milestone in the evolution of democracy and modern political dynamics. The presence of a chatbot as a candidate raises fundamental questions about the future of elections and political participation. Could replacing democratically elected politicians with new generative AI programs be the new technological frontier of distrust towards politicians and the functioning of democracy? While we do not have conclusive evidence to assert this direction unequivocally, a broad reflection is certainly necessary. The hypothesis of an AI-based technocracy might be considered by many citizens as an appropriate conclusion to the traditional approach to politics, characterized by perpetual internal conflict, endless discussions, and a perceived lack of effective solutions to societal problems (Dematteo, 2010; Galeotti, 2015). From this perspective, one might question whether it still makes sense to invest time and energy in debates within political institutions when a suitably trained software could provide the best possible solution in a short time. Following this line, the implementation of an apparent AI-based technocracy would represent a step forward in governance and decision-making, allowing for a more efficient and rational management of public affairs. The ability of artificial intelligences to process data and formulate objective recommendations could be seen as an attractive alternative to political dynamics often subject to polarization and party pressures (Reis et al., 2021). In summary, the idea of an AI-driven technocracy as an alternative to the traditional political process raises important questions regarding ethical justification, accountability, and democratic participation, making a thorough and considered analysis of the implications of such a transition necessary.

5. Conclusion

In conclusion, the current scenario reveals processes and pathways that extend beyond merely reinterpreting political and communicative processes. Just as earlier technologies and media were able to modify languages and persuasiveness, artificial intelligences introduce another characteristic: manipulability. Indeed, it is increasingly challenging to distinguish fake news, fake images, and even "loaded" speeches attributed to politicians. Notable examples include deepfakes of prominent figures such as Biden. However, what is feasible in the current scenario is certainly an attempt to understand this new perspective, primarily based on a paradigm shift. Therefore, it is essential to recognize that today, the role of politicians is perceived both

physically and culturally in a way that is diametrically opposed to the past. As mentioned in the first paragraph, the process of digitalizing life that has been undertaken is slowly permeating each of us. Thus, what is often missing is education in life-digitalization, the only element capable of generating that transition which could lead to a harmonious integration with AI. For instance, starting from 2025, it is highly likely that the first AI-equipped androids connected to the internet will be released for sale. In this regard, it is necessary to initiate reflections, even before social ones, legal ones. There is, therefore, a lack of proper media literacy. Obviously, reflecting from a perspective of distortion and risk, life-digitalization generates, in turn, "a vicious circle of exclusion and/or separation or forced homogenization and lobotomization of one's emotions," even before affecting one's work, leaving those in a subordinate position with only two options: either conform to those who hold power, akin to a form of Marxian ownership of means of production, or have something useful to offer to power, thereby perpetuating the condition of subordination. Thus, even the possibility of extending the boundaries of the body by digitalizing them could have consequences on how subjectivity is perceived in relation to other subjectivities. In this probable future scenario, it is not enough for governments to find the right path to manage the changes associated with technological advancement and the delicate relationships between innovation, business, and society in terms of adaptation to changes. It will also be necessary for society to acquire the knowledge required to use these tools and integrate into this new world. In summary, we might align ourselves with the perspective identified by Osei-Mensah et al. (2023), who describe the application of artificial intelligence in political communication as a "black box" with enormous potential. On one hand, AI could be used to optimize the connection between politicians and voters, enhancing the effectiveness of political propaganda through more targeted and personalized content. On the other hand, however, the authors warn that AI can also become a tool for disinformation, with the risk of being used to support populist tendencies and foster political polarization. This dual aspect thus highlights the need for a critical and conscious approach in adopting these technologies within the political sphere.

References

- Adorno, T. (1954). *Minima moralia: Meditazioni della vita offesa*. Torino: Einaudi.
- Allington, D. (2022). The Place of Computation in the Study of Culture. In *The Bloomsbury Handbook to the Digital Humanities* (pp. 373-384). London: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Altheide, D. L., & Snow, R. P. (1979). *Media Logic*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Barile, N. (2014). Il politico come marca: Identità, posizionamento strategico e canali di comunicazione del brand Matteo Renzi. *Comunicazione è politica*, 3, 1-18.
- Battista, D. (2023a). For better or for worse: politics marries pop culture (TikTok and the 2022 Italian elections). *Society Register*, 7(1), 117-142.
- Battista, D. (2023b). Knock, Knock! The Next Wave of Populism Has Arrived! An Analysis of Confirmations, Denials, and New Developments in a Phenomenon That Is Taking Center

Stage. *Social Sciences*, 12(2), 100.

- Battista, D. (2024). The road to AI: Pathways and obstacles. *Societes*, 163(1), 55-72.
- Bauman, Z., & Lyon, D. (2014). *Sesto potere: La sorveglianza nella modernità liquida*. Editori Laterza.
- Boccia Artieri, G. (2015). *Gli effetti sociali del web: Forme della comunicazione e metodologie della ricerca online*. Milano: Franco Angeli.
- Carr, N. (2010). *The Shallows: What the Internet Is Doing to Our Brains*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Castells, M. (2009). *Communication Power*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ciaralli, C. A. (2023). Intelligenza artificiale, decisione politica e transizione ambientale: sfide e prospettive per il costituzionalismo. *FEDERALISMI.IT*, (15/2023), 40-87.
- Colombo, E. (2001). Etnografia dei mondi contemporanei: Limiti e potenzialità del metodo etnografico nell'analisi della complessità. *Rassegna Italiana di Sociologia*, XLII(2), 205-230.
- Colombo, F. (2013). *Il potere socievole: Storia e critica dei social media*. Milano: Mondadori.
- Couldry, N., & Hepp, A. (2013). Conceptualizing Mediatization: Contexts, Traditions, Arguments. *Communication Theory*, 23(3), 191-202.
- De Blasio, E. (2018). *Il governo online: le nuove frontiere della politica* (No. 98, pp. 1-260). Roma: Carocci editore.
- Della Porta, D. (2012). Cercando la politica: protesta e democrazia. *Bologna: il Mulino*, 61(2), 314-320.
- Dematteo, L. (2010). *L'idiota in politica*. Milano: Feltrinelli Editore.
- Floridi, L. (2022). *Etica dell'intelligenza artificiale: Sviluppi, opportunità, sfide*. Milano: Raffaello Cortina Editore.
- Galeotti, A. E. (2015). *La politica del rispetto: I fondamenti etici della democrazia*. Roma-Bari: Laterza.
- Gallo, M., Fenza, G., & Battista, D. (2022). Information Disorder: What about global security implications?. *Rivista di Digital Politics*, 2(3), 523-538.
- García-Orosa, B. (2021). Digital political communication: Hybrid intelligence, algorithms, automation and disinformation in the fourth wave. *Digital Political Communication Strategies: Multidisciplinary Reflections*, 3-23.
- Gori, G. (2017). Social media ed elezioni. I limiti del diritto e il rischio di una modulated democracy. *Informatica e diritto*, 26(1-2), 203-236.
- Granieri, G. (2011). *La società digitale*. Roma-Bari: Laterza.

- Hargittai, E. (2003). The digital divide and what to do about it. *New Economy Handbook*, 821-839.
- Jungherr, A. (2023a). Artificial intelligence and democracy: A conceptual framework. *Social media+ society*, 9(3), 20563051231186353.
- Jungherr, A. (2023b). Digital campaigning: How digital media change the work of parties and campaign organizations and impact elections. In *Research Handbook on Digital Sociology* (pp. 446-462). UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Latour, B. (1999). *Politiques de la nature*. Paris: La Découverte.
- Latour, B. (2005). *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Latour, B. (2008). *Disinventare la modernità*. Milan: Elèuthera.
- Lazzeretti, L. (2021). *L'ascesa della società algoritmica ed il ruolo strategico della cultura*. Milano: Franco Angeli.
- López-López, P. C., Barredo-Ibáñez, D., & Jaráiz-Gulías, E. (2023). Research on Digital Political Communication: Electoral Campaigns, Disinformation, and Artificial Intelligence. *Societies*, 13(5), 126.
- Lunt, P., & Livingstone, S. (2016). Is 'mediatization' the new paradigm for our field? A commentary on Deacon and Stanyer (2014, 2015) and Hepp, Hjarvard and Lundby (2015). *Media, Culture & Society*, 38(3), 462-470.
- Lupton, D. (1994). *The Embodied Computer/User*. London: Sage Publishing.
- Manin, B. (2014). La democrazia del pubblico è in pericolo?. *Comunicazione politica*, 14(3), 575-580.
- Manovich, L. (2001). *The Language of New Media*. New York: The MIT Press.
- Mazzoleni, G. (1998). *La comunicazione politica*. Bologna: il Mulino.
- McLuhan, M. (1964). *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Moore, S. (1993). *Interpreting Audiences: The Ethnography of Media Consumption*. London: Sage.
- Nida-Rumelin, J., & Weidenfeld, N. (2019). *Umanesimo digitale: un'etica per l'epoca dell'Intelligenza artificiale*. Milano: FrancoAngeli.
- Norris, P. (2004). The digital divide. *The Information Society Reader*, 273-286.
- Osei-Mensah, B., Asiamah, E. O., & Sackey, R. (2023). Strategic Communication and Artificial Intelligence: Reviewing Emerging Innovations and Future Directions. *Archives of Business Research*, 11(1), 85-102.
- Reis, J., Santo, P. E., & Melão, N. (2021). Influence of artificial intelligence on public

employment and its impact on politics: A systematic literature review. *Brazilian Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 18(3), 1-22.

Rodotà, S. (1997). *Tecnopolitica: La democrazia e le nuove tecnologie della comunicazione*. Roma: Laterza.

Rogers, E. M. (1994). *Diffusion of Innovations*. New York: Free Press.

Salmon, C. (2014). *La politica nell'era dello storytelling*. Roma: Fazi Editore.

Salzano, D., Scognamiglio, I., & Battista, D. (2023). La rispazializzazione digitale nelle aree interne del Sud Italia. *H-ermes. Journal of Communication*, 2023(24), 51-72.

Terranova, T. (2022). *After the Internet: Digital Networks between Capital and the Common*. MIT Press.

Van Dijk, J. (2020). *The Digital Divide*. USA: John Wiley & Sons.

Warschauer, M. (2003). Demystifying the digital divide. *Scientific American*, 289(2), 42-47.

Ziccardi, G. (2019). *Tecnologie per il potere: come usare i social network in politica*. Milano: Raffaello Cortina Editore.

Zuboff, S. (2019). *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power*. New York: PublicAffairs.

Notes

Note 1. <https://fondazionepensierosolido.it/ricerca-youtrend-fondazione-pensiero-solido/>

Note 2. <https://docs.ie.edu/cgc/IE-CGC-European-Tech-Insights-2021-%28Part-II%29.pdf>

Acknowledgments

Not applicable.

Authors contributions

Not applicable.

Funding

Not applicable.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Informed consent

Obtained.

Ethics approval

The Publication Ethics Committee of the Macrothink Institute.

The journal's policies adhere to the Core Practices established by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE).

Provenance and peer review

Not commissioned; externally double-blind peer reviewed.

Data availability statement

The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from the corresponding author. The data are not publicly available due to privacy or ethical restrictions.

Data sharing statement

No additional data are available.

Open access

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.