

Politicians and Artificial Intelligence Refusal: Brief Considerations

Marius Vacarelu

National School of Political and Administrative Studies, Bucharest, Romania

marius333vacarelu@gmail.com

Abstract: Technological development of the last decades changed not only working procedures but also economic hierarchies and – in many cases – it offered an instrument for ambitious leaders to bring a new perspective to countries, continents, or even the world in different areas: economy, law, politics, etc. Inside these new dimensions of human life, politicians are asked to create rules for societies, but also their specific tasks. At the same time, politicians are asked to think about the future and to settle the main directions for national development, in such a way to profit for today and the next generations. For such development plans, politicians need to consult many data and create a specific legal framework, able to increase people's skills in every area, in a coherent vision that includes Artificial Intelligence. Artificial Intelligence might have a special field of action in political competition, which must be regulated by the same actors able to use it. Such a specific legal possibility – to be able to regulate one of your tools – offers to politicians many interrogations about the limits of Artificial Intelligence use. Politics is a matter of power and history shows that many times politicians use many tools and administrative procedures to preserve or achieve power. Artificial Intelligence could be used for the same purposes and both scholars and citizens will be important to study how politicians will regulate it. In this case, an important topic is the Artificial Intelligence acceptance in political completions and if politicians will try to regulate its use with a specific interdiction on the political area. It will be also important to see if such interdictions will consider the danger for democratic institutions or other reasons like psychological dangers to the human mind, costs of implementation, etc.

Keywords: artificial intelligence, politicians' interests, the advent of technologies, legal framework, democratic institutions, citizens' needs

1. Introduction

At the end of the 20th century, one OECD study underlined that over the past century there have been many profound technological, economic, and social transformations, with a strong impact on the human mind and human activities. One of the questions for today's generation is if it will be possible and/or desirable to continue along the path of such prodigious change. Some worry about the capacity, both technological and social, to continue advancing and inventing new tools, new products, and new ways of organising everyday work and home life. Others worry that the ongoing transition costs may be too high, or that the risks to cherished traditions or the threats to environmental sustainability will, singly or together, be too great to bear. Preservation versus dynamism, incrementalism versus radicalism: these are the polar extremes that, unsurprisingly, haunt many end-of-the-century, future-of-the-millennium debates (Miller, Michalski and Stevens, 1998). Such ideas were expressed during a less violent time of humanity, when the economy got more attention from everyone and when democracy was considered a globally accepted value (International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance, 2017; Freedom House, 2019).

After 20 years some researchers underline that the advent of technology has shown the world both its utility and disadvantage. While the use of technology has a varied range of positive impacts but in this 21st century, its negative impacts have somewhat outweighed that aspect. It has induced ill effects on family ties, the relationship of an individual in a social circle, social isolation, and inactivity that often leads to detrimental health conditions such as obesity, lack or complete inability to concentrate (Mishra, 2019, p. 7). The development of the mobile Internet creates more problems for the human brain, with important consequences for the next decades: for example, smartphones have a complex effect on the human brain, increasing mental laziness, reducing available cognitive capacity (Ward 2018), affecting reading comprehension (Honma, 2022).

2. A brief theory of political interest and its fulfilment

New technologies – invented in the 20th century and developed mainly in the last two decades – have changed most people's habits, ultimately affecting the way they project their expectations towards the public sphere. If man is an individualistic being, selfishness being the nature of any of us, how we have created throughout history a way of management and cooperation to achieve global nature goals is related to this public dimension. Concerning this reality, it must be emphasized that technologies are usually created to satisfy the people's private interests. Even if the objective necessity makes some of them require very wide cooperation – for example, to build a bridge over a wide river – the particular interests ultimately determine

the methods of solving a problem. More specifically, if solving a problem that affects many people is expensive, then it will be possible to postpone a solution until there are sufficient amounts needed to pay for those technical operations.

However, man is not completely individualistic, although the development of ways to achieve hedonism has pursued exactly this goal. The ability to think has led man both to supremacy on Earth and especially to the creation of frameworks in which the general interests are satisfied. In this direction, it was necessary to invent clear ways to balance the interests of society, and this was done first by inventing military technologies so that the general protection of the inhabitants would later facilitate the harmonization of other particular interests. Unfortunately, the creation of weapons has brought with it an emphasis on private interests, which makes the establishment of authoritarian regimes have a continuous history of thousands of years (Roberts and Westad, 2013, pp. 46 – 48). Unfortunately, the history of public law is less studied in schools, but it reveals that for thousands of years the position of balancing the interests of individuals in society has been blocked by those who have maintained a monopoly on arms control. In India, the caste system ensured a clear separation of this monopoly from the rest of society (Bell and Pey, 2020), and in Japan, martial arts emerged because of the same monopoly – both examples being expressions of the obstacles that ensure the general balance of society have faced for thousands of years. Starting from these well-known examples, we will reveal that the same history of public law reveals how the gunmen dominated their inhabitants from a geographical area, the legal position of the latter being "subjects of the king/aristocrat" of the country/area. From this perspective, we will notice the separation of interests within the societies, as well as the dissatisfaction that resulted from this way of ensuring the superior positions in the society (Staudinger, 2016, p. 3088 – 3091).

Because there could be no real balance in society, the result was easy to predict; riots, conspiracies to gain power, wars to conquer areas rich in resources, etc. Again, history shows us that there has been almost no year in which one of these ways of expressing dissatisfaction with political hierarchies has not manifested itself strongly, even though the degree of physical violence has diminished in recent decades (Pinker, 2012, p. 402 – 404). Weapons have been able to create and maintain long-term hierarchies, without always allowing the leadership to renew itself other than through war – either defence or conquest. Although there are many benefits of ranking in a society, its issue is followed by the acceptable distribution of benefits and unemployment. In the event of significant disruptions in these two directions, there will be either conspiracy to change leaders or general riots. It follows that the proportion of resources that political hierarchies are willing to provide to those at the bottom of the social rankings determines the length of their term of office.

In their analysis of these relations between power and economy Acemoglu and Robinson underlined the consequence of a not-balanced relation between the political top-hierarchy and the masses: "Extractive political institutions lead to extractive economic institutions, which enrich a few at the expense of many. Those who benefit from extractive institutions thus have the resources to build their (private) armies and mercenaries, to buy their judges, and to rig their elections in order to remain in power. They also have every interest in defending the system. Therefore, extractive economic institutions create the platform for extractive political institutions to persist. Power is valuable in regimes with extractive political institutions because power is unchecked and brings economic riches. Extractive political institutions also provide no checks against abuses of power. Whether power corrupts is debatable, but Lord Acton was certainly right when he argued that absolute power corrupts absolutely. ... Yet another mechanism for the vicious circle is that extractive institutions, by creating unconstrained power and great income inequality, increase the potential stakes of the political game. Because whoever controls the state becomes the beneficiary of this excessive power and the wealth that it generates, extractive institutions create incentives for infighting in order to control power and its benefits, a dynamic that we saw played out in Maya city-states and in Ancient Rome. In this light, it is no surprise that the extractive institutions that many African countries inherited from the colonial powers sowed the seeds of power struggles and civil wars. In Angola, Burundi, Chad, Côte d'Ivoire, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Ethiopia, Liberia, Mozambique, Nigeria, Republic of Congo Brazzaville, Rwanda, Somalia, Sudan, Uganda, and Sierra Leone, these conflicts would turn into bloody civil wars and would create economic ruin and unparalleled human suffering—as well as cause state failure" (Acemoglu and Robinson, 2012, p. 321). It means that top-political hierarchies are preferred in many countries to create by legal tools such kind of resource distribution, adding some other legal separations between people, based on their economic strength. As consequence I must note that even in the 20th century the worst social institution – slavery – exists; an international "Convention to suppress the slave trade and slavery" was adopted for the first time only in 1926, followed by their forbid in 1948, by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (article 4).

Why do we insist on this negative perspective of politics and how to satisfy human interests? First of all, because in many kinds of research and rankings underlined the decrease in rule of law and democracy and the continuous increase of authoritarian regimes. Today some 38 percent of the global population lives in not-free countries, the highest proportion since 1997, and only about 20 percent now live in free countries (Freedom House, 2022). In today's contexts is necessary to forget some naïve appreciations and "hopes for better" and to be conscious that in not-free countries political leaders can use any techniques and tools to preserve their power above citizens. In such a paradigm Artificial Intelligence will play a specific role in the next decades not only for the economy but for political competition too. It is easy to predict that Artificial Intelligence could be used as a tool to strengthen the authoritarian regime's control over citizens and political opposition and also that some countries will use it against other governments from abroad, which is an accurate description of a famous Latin expression: "bellum omnium contra omnes" (the war of all against all). To ignore such possibilities or to diminish them as "fear of cowards" will not help millions of not-free people and many other nations which could be menaced by the illegal behaviour of different governments.

3. Artificial intelligence vs. politicians

Artificial Intelligence is the last tool offered to political competition by the human mind. If the political environment has always been accompanied by acts of force, but also by acts of corruption, as well as intrigue and revolt, we cannot help but notice that political leaders knew how to use any available tool to gain power and – if possible – to keep it for as long as possible. A few hundred years ago a sword and a cup of poison changed the political hierarchies, a few decades ago the tanks brought changes to the political system, and for some time the major police hierarchies have been configured by the vote of the citizens. In the latter case, we are faced with a special situation, because the circle of those who have to decide who will lead a city or a country is very large, and the choice that these thousands or millions of people make is not for eternity. As a result of this characteristic of the vote, the politician is no longer sure that his position will not last too long, nor that the costs he incurs to obtain higher positions in the political hierarchies can be amortized. In addition, politics has become more and more an activity that demands visibility and hence, the daily confrontation with the moral and economic standards of the society in which it operates. Precisely in this double analysis lies the scrutiny of today's political careers: the politician who does not improve the standard of living of the electorate will be evaluated below the mandatory economic standards, and the one who does not have a moral behaviour will be exposed to public blame. In both situations, the politician sees his freedom of action restricted: he can no longer act visibly following Machiavelli's principles (De Mesquita and Smith, 2012), and the obligation of positive economic results forces him not to behave dishonestly.

For this reason, any rational politician in the 21st century is obliged to calculate the balance of personal costs of public life and the financial and mental risks of his failures. But if the politician is not rational, this calculation will be made by the political opposition, which will point out to the electorate both the mistakes made in applying the procedures necessary to satisfy the public interest, but especially how it did not meet the moral standards of participation in city life.

Artificial Intelligence is a unique ensemble of electronic procedures able to act toward a specific purpose. Artificial intelligence is perceived in US legislatures as any artificial system that performs tasks under varying and unpredictable circumstances and without significant human oversight. Such systems could also learn from their experiences while improving their performances, and might even solve tasks requiring human-like perception, cognition, planning, learning, communication, or physical actions (Hoadley and Lucas, 2018).

Artificial Intelligence systems as they evolved over the years have been linked to systems that think like humans, that act like humans, that think rationally, or that act rationally. In the cinema industry and literature, most people think of Artificial Intelligence in terms of super-technology able to think and act alone for establishing control above the whole planet. For many areas of economic and scientific space Artificial Intelligence applications seem to be very useful for more developments, being considered almost a panacea genuinely or criminally (Jones, 2017; Yeoh, 2019; Pydi, 2021). Politics will be influenced too by this electronic system in the same genuine or less democratic way, with a wide area of examples in the next decades.

We must therefore understand the perspective of the relationship between Artificial Intelligence and the politicians, first of all from his human, selfish perspective. The politicians are quite unhappy that in recent centuries – and especially decades – the number of people participating in public life has increased, the

number of years one can spend in leadership positions has decreased and public pressure to deliver results has increased positive economic, along with the quasi-generalization of the number of those who claim perfect moral conduct, including in politics. These four characteristics are strongly manifested even before the use of Artificial Intelligence, and they constitute major obstacles for any politician. The fact that in the last two decades the Internet has almost eliminated the privacy of the politician and offered the possibility for anyone to criticize any political action makes the real standards of political life have risen greatly (Valgarðsson, Clarke, Jennings and Stoker, 2021), to levels hard to bear by a man without great intellectual abilities and morals. In a brief description, standards for being politicians are now more to a fairytale personality, as Aichholzer and Willmann (2020) underline: "citizens usually prefer politicians who stay in touch with the people, who appear in public and on the (social) media, rather than hermits who reign (maybe well, but) in a silent, untransparent, and isolated way from their 'palace'. Thus, voters demand politicians who are outgoing, sociable, and talkative. Voters expect their appointees to reliably implement their manifestos and pre-election promises. This requires leaders to be hard-working, dutiful, self-disciplined and achieving. Citizens expect their leaders to be reliable, predictable, trustworthy, and to not engage in fraud or corruption or impulsively spiral the country into chaos or unnecessary wars or conflicts. Voters want higher levels of intellect, imagination, and, thus, openness to ideas, and higher levels of competence".

If the standards of the citizens have increased, the same cannot be said about the performance of politicians, and the different indices regarding public satisfaction reveal it. The Internet and Artificial Intelligence, however, will force the politician every day to be different than he would like and especially keep him almost a prisoner in a world of continuous competition. Many commentators suggest that the Internet in general, and social media in particular, plays a key role in amplifying economic, political, and cultural grievances across the globe and, perhaps even more important, that they have their independent effects on politics in both established democracies and autocratic regimes. The apparent role of social media in coordinating protests and giving a voice to the opposition in autocratic regimes created high hopes for the Internet and social media as a "liberation technology". However, commentators have also noted how autocratic regimes use the Internet and social media for surveillance and propaganda and to distract voters from politics. More recently, observers have started to blame social media in democracies for the rise of populism, the spread of xenophobic ideas, and the proliferation of fake news (Zhuravskaya, Petrova, and Enikolopov, 2020) and even for an undermining of democracy (Haidt, 2022).

Regardless of the role of the Internet, social media and Artificial Intelligence, continuous competition has become a reality of politics. An error of today can never be hidden, and users of these technologies or social networks will constantly have to blame a certain deed for a politician. This reality is based both on the idea of the perfect politician, which the citizens want to apply, but especially on the political competition within the parties and parliaments. The prospect is very competitive today, and the politician can see his career shattered in a few hours or days, which for centuries happens only as an exception and rather as an effect of lack of loyalty to a king. Consequently, being a politician is dangerous, both in terms of the standards required of you, but especially because the speed of "leaving the stage" has increased greatly.

4. In this difficult picture for the politician, where is the role of artificial intelligence?

First of all, it appeared as an expression of human intelligence, especially for the fulfilment of commercial purposes, and the political environment took over its strength and capabilities for its interests. This adoption was inevitable, and its effects are not to be expected, because one of its most important features is the ability to be active 24 hours a day. In this perspective, Artificial Intelligence becomes necessary for politicians because it is the only tool capable of making them continuously present in front of the eyes of Internet users. Thus, the politician is obliged to invest as much of his resources in Artificial Intelligence only because it allows him to be active anytime and anywhere, and the party that does not follow the same path will be forgotten by the electorate if its messages are not extremely penetrating. The political competition will be won rather by the one who is visible from any Internet terminal, and not by the one who will communicate with the classical means (newspapers, televisions, radio, and telephones). This will happen because man always holds a smartphone in his hand and much less often a printed newspaper, and televisions and radio no longer have the audiences of a few decades ago. In addition, the Internet offers the opportunity to directly comment on - and influence - the politician's behaviour, and Artificial Intelligence can easily spread any kind of appreciation or criticism, which allows the aggregation of currents for or against a party or political leader. There are many

concerns that Artificial Intelligence can disrupt many social pillars (König, P.D. and Wenzelburger, 2020), changing politics from a strategic one to a reactive one, as a result of social media debates.

Second, Artificial Intelligence will play the role of preserving - or changing - the hierarchies that exist today. Specifically, the political class is forced more than ever to pay huge sums for their election campaigns, and in recent years the Internet has forced the political environment to spend huge sums every day, just to not be forgotten or covered by the ocean of information available online. These costs are increasing more and more, with the implementation of Artificial Intelligence technologies, because their strengths are not cheap, as is always the case with new technologies. Specifically, a technology - in any field - if it becomes common will reduce its operating costs, which is not the case with Artificial Intelligence, far from its maximum. Or, for what is strong and new, the costs are always high, and only the rich parties can afford the sums necessary for the acquisition and use of Artificial Intelligence technology. The parties that will be able to operate more through this new technology will be able to maintain their positions at the top of the political hierarchies, while blocking access to the top of any small party without the necessary financial resources to acquire this form of electronic intelligence.

Third, Artificial Intelligence today can establish not only political hierarchies at the level of domestic politics but especially at the global level. Specifically, this new technology is not being developed uniformly in all countries, but its possibilities are being noticed by any country. However, only those who will be able to afford its widespread use will score in the geopolitical rankings of the coming decades, because Artificial Intelligence will be able to act against any politician in any country, regardless of the language that this technology will have to use it. Let's not forget that the commercial applications of Artificial Intelligence will also develop, and the countries that will use it in this area will progress economically more than others, which will make them stronger and more resilient in the face of various major challenges. Thus, investing in Artificial Intelligence becomes mandatory from a geopolitical point of view, and the positive results will not be long in coming, either from a purely political perspective or from other spheres that reveal the power of a country.

The answer to the question of this text seems necessary: how could politicians refuse Artificial Intelligence? As Erman and Furendal (2022) underline, the question of how central political institutions do and should influence the development and deployment of Artificial Intelligence technology have been relatively neglected. Creating an effective legal framework for Artificial Intelligence is very complicated and even European Commission for Democracy through Law (Venice Commission) was not mentioned even in the smallest text of its guidelines for political parties' regulation, in 2020.

Politicians can refuse Artificial intelligence only in a domestic competition of a democratic state but are complicated to imagine the same rejection from a geopolitical perspective. In an authoritarian regime, Artificial Intelligence use will be less regulated by laws, but it will be used at its maximum force on both plans: to strengthen the power above citizens and to increase geopolitical force abroad.

More specifically, geopolitical competition has no geographical limits, and from this perspective, Artificial Intelligence will not be retained within the borders of a country. For this reason, the answer to this question will be negative no matter the democratic ranking of countries, because competition between them seems to be eternal, using any means, and a skilful operator of this new technology will be able to disguise the source of attacks applied against another political entity across the border (see Hynek and Solovyeva A, 2022). Basically, in terms of geopolitical competition, only a superior force of your Artificial Intelligence tools could protect you from attacks from other countries, which does not guarantee that there will be no breaches in your defence that your opponents will not use.

As for today's dictatorships – not a few, as we mentioned above – the problem of Artificial Intelligence is not a happy one. Specifically, dictatorships seek mainly to maintain themselves for decades, and in this sense, they will use different methods against possible opponents. Obviously, in addition to the methods that have become "classic" – arrests, economic persecution, administrative harassment, etc. – will be added the perspectives brought by Artificial Intelligence. It will be just as safe to use new technologies to monitor political opponents, but especially to monitor the population and install communication filters between the political class and citizens, so that only messages that agree with the government reach the general population of a country (Akin Ünver, 2018). And as today's dictatorial governments also have public budgets under control, it is easy to predict that they will quickly buy any tools needed for Artificial Intelligence applications

and that they will use them (tools) to ensure long-term control of the national political scene, as well as the population. We will note with regret that Artificial Intelligence will ensure the maintenance of more dictatorships today than will contribute to the democratization of different countries.

Thus, only the situation of democratic countries remains to be discussed. Within them, the great danger appears in the political sphere from two directions. First, is the fact that there will be rivalries with dictatorially ruled countries, which will not hesitate to use Artificial Intelligence across the border, to disrupt the inner life of these democratic countries. In this perspective, we will be facing geopolitical competition, and the need to defend against dishonest methods of action will require the development of technologies and response strategies, including in the field of Artificial Intelligence (Brownsword, 2022). Secondly, the danger of ossification of political systems, or more precisely of the political hierarchies existing today, is present even here. As long as the budgets of today's big parties can be enough to purchase artificial intelligence systems, it will be difficult for small parties to compete with them because they will not be able to reach the same proportions on the mobile terminals of the electorate. From this perspective, the most likely chance of small parties – or new ones – to grow consistently in the domestic political competition will not arise as a result of their actions, but rather if large parties make mistakes large enough to collapse.

What will be needed in the case of democratic countries? It will be necessary to amend political and electoral legislation to prevent the unethical use of Artificial Intelligence, as well as to provide a balance between political competitors on other ways of spreading the messages of parties and politicians. Thus, it will be necessary to find an algorithm that will give small parties a better chance to reach the electorate, because otherwise a good part of the renewal of the political elite of a country will be blocked, which reduces the quality of internal political action. Politicians from parties with weak parliamentary representation will seek to prevent the use of Artificial Intelligence in political life, because they will be aware that it will be more easily available to large parties, with a specific long-term effect: the preservation of today's hierarchies. It is, therefore, possible to see coalitions in the parliaments of democratic countries that will aim to block - or at least reduce - the use of Artificial Intelligence in politics, in order not to empty one of the rules of democracy, namely the periodic change of the leaders of political and administrative institutions.

The electoral-legislation will have to provide clear and detailed norms by which the use of different electronic technologies will be approved and – in certain situations – restricted. Also, it will be necessary to establish clearly which are the facts and operations that can be performed by Artificial Intelligence, but which do not comply with the principles of law and moral norms. It will also be necessary to train the staff of the authorities whose duties are to ensure the correctness of the electoral process, and it is useful to train a group of prosecutors in the possible investigation of behaviours that exceed the limits of legality in this area. Also, the political parties in the national parliaments could order a moratorium on the use of the latest instruments of Artificial Intelligence, precisely to ensure the fairest possible electoral competition. If the legislation fails to reach this level there will be the danger of immoral and unethical use of Artificial Intelligence, as well as the danger of dissatisfaction of the population, which will consider that in such a situation its general interests will be better represented by this technology in itself, as some confirmations already appear in various opinion polls (Shead, 2021).

5. Conclusions

Many people do not yet have a clear representation of Artificial Intelligence technology, and politicians have trouble understanding its limitations, although they see some of its operating prospects. From this perspective, it is difficult to achieve a sufficiently firm and at the same time flexible legal framework to regulate the use of Artificial Intelligence only for positive purposes. Political competition is tougher today than ever and especially continues, forcing many politicians to find solutions to withstand a race that could last for years or even decades.

In this competitive reality understood at the level of any party, Artificial Intelligence is beginning to impose itself as a solution, but it will be necessary for its use to be done gradually and similarly by all political actors within a country, to prevent the emergence or strengthening authoritarian or even dictatorial tendencies.

Artificial Intelligence today has the power to impose on political systems a true philosophical debate on the idea of the state, communities, nations, power relations between public institutions, the loyalty of citizens to

the country, etc. Therefore, politicians must consider that the uncontrolled adoption and only to achieve and preserve political power of Artificial Intelligence systems will create more dissatisfaction and suspicion in society. Politicians must take into account the self-limitation of power and the tools they could use in political competition because there is both the risk of democratic deficiencies and the risk of revolts by disgruntled groups that will consider themselves affected or monitored by the Intelligence systems Artificial. That's why, as long as the capabilities of Artificial Intelligence are not yet fully understood, it would be better to restrict its use in domestic politics by legal means and let it function only for defence in the geopolitical competition between states.

References

- Acemoglu, D. And Robinson, J. A. (2012), *Why Nations Fail: The Origins of Power, Prosperity and Poverty* (1st). 1st ed., Crow, New York.
- Aichholzer, J., Johanna Willmann, J., *Desired personality traits in politicians: Similar to me but more of a leader*, [online], <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2020.103990>.
- Akın Ünver, H. (2018), *Artificial Intelligence, Authoritarianism and the Future of Political Systems*, [online], <https://www.ctga.ox.ac.uk/article/artificial-intelligence-authoritarianism-and-future-political-systems>.
- Bell, D.A. and Wang Pei, W. (2020), *The case for hierarchy*, [online], <https://press.princeton.edu/ideas/the-case-for-hierarchy>.
- Bueno de Mesquita, B. and Smith, A. (2011), *The Dictator's Handbook: Why Bad Behavior is Almost Always Good Politics*, Public Affairs, New York.
- Brownsword, R. (2022), *Rethinking Law, Regulation, and Technology*, Edgar Elgar, Cheltenham, Massachusetts.
- Erman, E. and Furendal, M., (2022), The Global Governance of Artificial Intelligence: Some Normative Concerns, [online], in *Moral Philosophy and Politics*, <https://doi.org/10.1515/mopp-2020-0046>.
- European Commission for Democracy through Law, Guidelines on Political Party Regulation, Second Edition, December 2020, [online], [https://www.venice.coe.int/webforms/documents/default.aspx?pdffile=CDL-AD\(2020\)032-e](https://www.venice.coe.int/webforms/documents/default.aspx?pdffile=CDL-AD(2020)032-e).
- Freedom House (2019). *Freedom in the World 2019. Democracy in Retreat*, [online], <https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2019/democracy-retreat>.
- Freedom House (2022). *Freedom in the World 2022. The Global Expansion of Authoritarian Rule*, [online], <https://freedomhouse.org/article/new-report-global-decline-democracy-has-accelerated>.
- Haidt, J. (2022), *Yes, social media really is undermining democracy*, [online], <https://www.theatlantic.com/ideas/archive/2022/07/social-media-harm-facebook-meta-response/670975>.
- Hoadley, D.S. and Lucas, N.J. (2018), "Artificial intelligence and the national security", Congress Research Service (CRS) Report R45178, [online], <https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/R/R45178/10>.
- Honma, M., Masaoka, Y., Iizuka, N. et al. (2022), Reading on a smartphone affects sigh generation, brain activity, and comprehension, [online], in *Sci Rep* 12, 1589 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-022-05605-0>.
- Hynek N. and Solovyeva A. (2022), *Militarizing Artificial Intelligence. Theory, Technology, and Regulation*, Routledge, London.
- International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance, Stockholm (2017), *The global state of democracy, 1975 – 2015*, [online], <https://www.idea.int/gsod-2017/files/IDEA-GSOD-2017-CHAPTER-1-EN.pdf>.
- König, P.D. and Wenzelburger, G. (2020), Opportunity for renewal or disruptive force? How artificial intelligence alters democratic politics, [online], in *Government Information Quarterly*, Volume 37, Issue 3, 2020, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2020.101489>.
- Miller, R., Wolfgang Michalski, W. and Stevens, B. (1998), The promises and perils of 21st century technology: an overview of the issues, [online], in *21st Century technologies promises and perils of a dynamic future*, <https://www.oecd.org/futures/35391210.pdf>.
- Jones, H. (2017), *Artificial Intelligence is the Panacea to Today's Marketing Challenges*, [online], <https://towardsdatascience.com/artificial-intelligence-is-the-panacea-to-todays-marketing-challenges-a5201eae21ca>.
- Mishra, S.S. (2019), *The Advent of Technology and its Impact on the Society*, [online], <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3598962>.
- Pinker, S. (2012), *The better angels of our nature: why violence has declined*, Penguin, New York.
- Pydi, M.S. (2021), *Artificial Intelligence – Panacea or Pandora's box?* [online], <https://www.thecosmictreehouse.com/post/artificial-intelligence-panacea-or-pandora-s-box>.
- Roberts, J.M. and Westad, O.A. (2013), *The history of the world*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Staudinger, A. (2016). History of Public Law. In: Farazmand, A. (eds) *Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Public Policy, and Governance*, Springer, New York.
- Shead, S. (2021), *More than half of Europeans want to replace lawmakers with AI, study says*, [online], <https://www.cnn.com/2021/05/27/europeans-want-to-replace-lawmakers-with-ai.html>.
- The Economist Intelligence Unit (2021), *Democracy Index 2021: the China challenge*, [online], <https://www.eiu.com/n/campaigns/democracy-index-2021/>.

Marius Vacarelu

- Valgarðsson, V.O., Clarke, N., Jennings, W. and Stoker, G., (2021), The Good Politician and Political Trust: An Authenticity Gap in British Politics?, [online], in *Political Studies*, 2021, Vol. 69(4), 858 – 880, <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0032321720928257>.
- Ward, A.F., Duke, K., Gneezy, A. and BOS, M.W. (2018), *Brain Drain: The Mere Presence of One's Own Smartphone Reduces Available Cognitive Capacity*, [online], <https://repositories.lib.utexas.edu/bitstream/handle/2152/64130/braindrain.pdf>.
- Yeoh, P. (2019), "Artificial intelligence: accelerator or panacea for financial crime?", [online], in *Journal of Financial Crime*, Vol. 26 No. 2, pp. 634-646. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JFC-08-2018-0077>.
- Zhuravskaya, E., Petrova, M. and Enikolopov, R. (2020), Political Effects of the Internet and Social Media, [online], in *Annual Review of Economics*, 2020, 12:1, 415 – 438, <https://www.annualreviews.org/doi/epdf/10.1146/annurev-economics-081919-050239>.