Yevhenii Bordiuk
Dmytro Shevchuk
Kateryna Shevchuk

Artificial public space: using AI to reframe the political discourse

Yevhenii Bordiuk
The National University of Ostroh Academy, Department of Philosophy and Cultural Management, Ostroh, Ukraine.
Email: yevhenii.bordiuk@oa.edu.ua

Dmytro Shevchuk
The National University of Ostroh Academy, Department of Philosophy and Cultural Management, Ostroh, Ukraine.
Email: dmytro.shevchuk@oa.edu.ua

Kateryna Shevchuk
Rivne State University of Humanities, Department of Philosophy, Rivne, Ukraine.
Email: ksshev@ukr.net

Abstract: The article is devoted to an analysis of the AI's influence on the political discourse. Artificial intelligence technologies are used not only for intelligence and new types of weapons, but also for interference in the politics of states. Such interference is carried out to reformat the existing public discourse that supports social order and create an artificial discourse dominated by generated narratives and political themes. The article examines the hypothesis that, in the context of secularization, the problem of the relationship between politics and religion is one of the significant topics of discussion within political philosophy. The growing influence of artificial intelligence on politics can be seen as one of the consequences of secularization and religion's loss of its ability to shape political discourse. The authors intend to explore the mechanisms and cases of such reformatting of public discourse using AI to demonstrate an essential aspect of the application of artificial intelligence in politics to establish dominance or distort the meanings that support the order of a particular society. Contemporary politics is shaped by digital communication, which has radically changed the concept of publicity, participation in political discourse, and its structure. The networked communication landscape of digital platforms has replaced the unified, hierarchically organized media space of industrial society. In this new political reality, artificial intelligence technologies are attracting increased interest from states, which are increasingly focusing on their strategic potential and viewing them as a factor in the radical shift of the present that will determine the contours of the future. The prospects for their application cover all areas of state functioning, from the economy to culture, from security to education. The authors also present examples of using AI to gain political influence as a strategy of informational war and propaganda.

Key words: Artificial Intelligence, politics, religion, secularization, political discourse, technologies, propaganda.

Journal for the Study of Religions and Ideologies, vol. 24, issue 72 (Winter 2025): 116-132.
ISSN: 1583-0039

1. Introduction

The understanding of artificial intelligence in philosophy mainly correlates with the issues of the philosophy of consciousness, the understanding of the problem of free will, ethical principles of technology use, methods of cognition and knowledge acquisition. People's fascination with artificial intelligence has given rise to beliefs and rituals reminiscent of religion. Often, the philosophical approach to understanding artificial intelligence boils down to determining the extent to which AI can resemble human intelligence and whether an artificially created being can emerge that will feel, understand, and be an autonomous subject. Political philosophy also actively draws attention to AI's impact on social and political aspects. Philosophers who study politics focus on issues such as the definition of freedom at a time when AI offers new ways of accepting, manipulating, and influencing our decisions; the opportunities provided by algorithmic political decision-making; the consequences of AI implementation for overcoming or deepening inequalities in modern societies; whether modern societies are moving towards some kind of "data fascism" and "data colonialism." (Coeckelbergh 2022, 6-8). A separate important topic in contemporary political philosophy is the problem of AI's impact on democracy. Philosophers ask how AI can be used to manipulate voters and monitor citizens, and whether the introduction of artificial intelligence technologies requires us to rethink the essence of democracy. It is clear that we are dealing with a tool based on machine learning technology. People use this tool, and therefore, our application of the technology produces its threats and advantages. Josh Simons writes, "Our future will be determined not by the nature of machine learning itself – machine learning models simply do what we tell them to do – but by our commitment to regulation that ensures that machine learning strengthens the foundations of democracy. Our societies have become too unequal and lack an appreciation of the political goals of laws and regulations designed to confront entrenched divisions of race, gender, class, and geography. Fear of the uncertainties involved in empowering citizens in processes of participatory decision-making has drained public institutions and public spaces of power and agency. How we govern machine learning could exacerbate these ills, but it could also start to address them. By making visible how and why machine learning con–centrates power in courts, police departments, child welfare services, and internet platforms, I want to open our imaginations to alternative futures in which we govern institutions that design and use machine learning to support, rather than undermine, the flourishing of democracy" (Simons 2023, 5-6). At the same time, using AI for political purposes creates a new order and balance in world politics. There is a tendency toward the weaponization of

AI. Artificial intelligence technologies are used not only for intelligence and new types of weapons, but also for interference in the politics of states. Such interference is carried out to reformat the existing public discourse that supports social order and create an artificial discourse dominated by generated narratives and political themes. In this article, we intend to explore the mechanisms and cases of such reformatting of public discourse using AI to demonstrate an essential aspect of the application of artificial intelligence in politics to establish dominance or distort the meanings that support the order of a particular society.

One aspect of considering the use of artificial intelligence in politics is an attempt to understand the changing ways in which political meanings are generated. In particular, our hypothesis is that, in the context of secularization, the problem of the relationship between politics and religion is one of the significant topics of discussion within political philosophy. The secularity of the modern era should be understood not as a rejection of religion, but as an attribute of a special paradigm that determines the nature of the attitude towards transcendence in modern culture. At the same time, in the modern world, which tends to instrumentalize the living world, the religious worldview supports non-instrumental relationships between people. The latter should be understood as an indication of a certain political role of the sacred, aimed at liberating the individual from the power of anonymous institutions. However, we can observe how religion is gradually losing its ability to shape political meanings. Artificial intelligence greatly reinforces this trend, as it itself claims the status of an instrument for creating political meanings.

2. The relationship between politics and technology: philosophical reflection

The relationship between politics and technology can be understood using the metaphor of the "political machine." With the concept of the "political machine," we seek to highlight a specific technical and technological aspect of contemporary politics that prevents people from achieving a direct relationship with politics and the meanings it generates. That is why understanding the essence of modern technology and its impact is a prerequisite for the socio-philosophical critique of contemporary political phenomena. We use the word "machine" deliberately. To explain this, we must define the connection between technology and machines. French philosopher Jacques Ellul notes that the machine is the most evident and striking form of technology. Technology does indeed have its starting point in the existence of machines. It is quite correct that everything else develops from mechanics. It is also true that the world of technology would not exist without machines. At the same time, as the French

researcher notes, modernity demonstrates that, on the one hand, the machine is the ideal type of application of technology, since it does not contain any other factors. On the other hand, technology integrates the machine into society, making it sociable. (Ellul 1964). Based on this, we put forward a specific hypothesis regarding the influence of technology on the relationship between people and politics, according to which the consequence of this influence is a distortion of the meaning of politics. The concept of the "political machine" was influenced by the thought experiment ("the experience machine") conducted by Robert Nozick in his work "Anarchy, State, and Utopia" within the framework of his political philosophy. Its essence is to imagine "a machine that produces personal experience" (and, following it, also "a machine that transforms us into the type of person we would like to be" and "a machine that creates any result in the world that we could achieve"). After reflecting on the possibility of such a machine and connecting humans to it, Robert Nozick concludes that this essentially amounts to suicide: humans lose touch with reality, and the productive work of machines (in terms of generating experience, human-like behavior, or results) replaces action ("What is most disturbing about them [machines of experience] is their living of our lives for us" (Nozick 1974, 44)).

On the one hand, the political machine is generated by transformations in the nature of power that have occurred since the beginning of the modern era. The meanings of politics are created with the help of technology; entire systems are built with the aim of mechanizing relations in the political world and introducing humans into the mechanism – "The human body was entering a machinery of power that explores it, breaks it down and rearranges it. A 'political anatomy', which was also a 'mechanics of power', was being born," as M. Foucault described (Foucault 1995, 38). One example of such a machine is the panopticon. This device automates and de-individualizes power.

Added to this is the spread of a kind of technicization of political thought, which has gnoseological and epistemological consequences for understanding politics. The understanding of political phenomena becomes meaningless, since the discourse aimed at comprehending them begins to be dominated by operational logic, i.e., the instrumental use of social and political categories. This issue is analyzed by German social theorist Max Horkheimer (Horkheimer 1991). He notes that the more automatic and instrumentalized ideas become, the less one can see in them thoughts with their own meaning. They are viewed as things, as machines. In the gigantic production apparatus of modern society, language is reduced to a tool—one among many. An instrumentalized understanding of political phenomena prevents us from grasping the true meaning of politics and turns into empty chatter, an impersonal machine of endless production of meanings that distort the true meanings of the political world.

The "political machine" penetrates and colonizes the social imagination of the individual. As a result, people become apologists for technical rationality. Carl Schmitt quite rightly notes in this regard: "The chimera of modern big-city dwellers is filled to the last atom with technological and industrial conceptions, which are projected into cosmological or metaphysical realms" (Schmitt 1996, 13). The term "political machine," which we use to refer to technical and technological trends in the development of the modern political world, also denotes an essential aspect of the system of socio-political imagination and symbolism that regulates the interpretation of the semantic manifestations of the political phenomenon.

The introduction of the "political machine" into modern societies is associated with the dominance of consumerism, which is a natural result of the establishment of instrumental rationalization. It arises from the need to ensure the most rational consumption of goods, requiring the least effort. Consequently, excessive consumerism and passivity of the subject are generated. The most striking political consequences of the consumerist orientation of the "political machine" are populist politics (when individuals see political meaning only in proposals to satisfy their needs) and socio-political frustration (which is a consequence of consumer passivity and makes adequate political mobilization impossible). Undoubtedly, establishing a consumer society as a result of rationalization is a certain paradox. It manifests itself, in particular, in the fact that instrumental rationality creates an emotional attitude (in particular, in the form of enthusiasm) of the consumer towards the "political machine." Nevertheless, we can find an explanation for this: consumer society, the consumer (another term for the masses) and their claim to be reprezentatives of the political subject are born together with technical progress. Therefore, the phenomenon of the "political machine" and the phenomenon of consumer society and their influence on the political world are mutually dependent.

In the context of the functioning of the "political machine" in the political world, a new discourse is emerging that claims to bring understanding to politics. This new discourse is described in various ways in socio-philosophical studies of the phenomenon of technology. For example, in E. Junger's famous work "The Worker. Domination and Gestalt," this discourse is linked to the formation and domination of the worker's gestalt, and thus it is formed based on the use of language that reflects the worker's conception of a new type of human existence: technology determines the mastery of language that is relevant in the workplace. This language claims the same significance as the natural language of the collective; it describes the world and lays the groundwork for a special metaphysics. What is disturbing here is that the political discourse produced by the "political machine" to explain the essence of political phenomena often prioritises simulation.

The "political machine" manifests itself through the automatism of emotions and experiences generated by the insensitivity of technology and techniques. This automatism is opposed to cultural automatism, as it is capable of generating artificial meanings that will elicit reactions from people. The use of AI to create public discourse and distort meanings fully reflects the above-mentioned trends in introducing the "political machine" into today's politics.

The technification of politics is associated with attempts to give politics a rational dimension. This reflects an effort to suppress the influence of religion, as one of the first issues that arises when the sacred manifests itself in the public sphere is the distinction between the rational and irrational aspects of politics. The irrationality of the sacred is associated with the supernatural, while following the natural order of things is perceived as a rational act. However, excessive rationalization itself generates irrationality (for example, as M. Horkheimer and T. Adorno demonstrated, the Enlightenment, in its struggle against myths, itself becomes a myth).

It is obvious that politics is not always rational, as the current political order is never identical to itself in different periods of historical development, since any sociocultural order at any given moment has certain exceptions and only approximates idealized forms created for its rational explanation. This is especially evident in emergency situations, where there is a reliance on the political will of the sovereign, which cannot be explained rationally (it lacks causal conditionality). The anonymization of the sovereign in modernized societies rejects the source of its legitimacy, which refers to the sacred nature of power, and makes it possible to algorithmize its actions, which are expressed by instrumental rationality. In this context, artificial intelligence appears to be an extremely effective tool for creating meaning in the modern era.

3. The transformation of political discourse in contemporary conditions

Contemporary politics is shaped by digital communication, which has radically changed the concept of publicity, participation in political discourse, and its structure. The networked communication landscape of digital platforms has replaced the unified, hierarchically organized media space of industrial society. These changes are not limited to the technical aspects of information transfer, but touch upon the fundamental principles of political interaction: who speaks, to whom, for what purpose and in what time frame, and what symbolic forms are used.

In the traditional public sphere, political messages were clearly articulated texts—programs, appeals, articles – expressed by specific participants in political activity. In the digital environment, however, political

positions are expressed fragmentarily, without requiring a deep understanding of context, through gestures of support or protest designed to attract attention effectively. The symbolic minimalism of such actions requires simple actions from the recipients, simplifying the virality of dissemination and causing chain reactions through reposts, comments, and visual responses.

A typical semiotic example is a hashtag—a word or phrase—that can position groups in social or political conflict and raise contradictions in the public sphere. It acts as a marker of resistance against oppression, a symbol of inequality and deprivation. At the same time, it is a unifying element for disparate groups and individuals who, through its use, express their identity and find a sense of belonging and solidarity. In this regard, Dobrin notes, "the hashtag acts as a common space for the countless accounts shared online, unifying them and becoming a totem for the imagined community" (Dobrin 2020, 9). Thus, individual manifestations generate collective power and collective action capable of influencing social events and prompting political decisions. Such digital symbols lose their connection to real space, reflecting the current trend toward dissolving geographical boundaries and cultural interpenetration. At the same time, social activity, including political activity, goes beyond geographical boundaries, taking on the character of network communication. Thus, a local incident—an act of violence, an unjust decision, a leak of information—can become a catalyst for a large-scale wave of reactions and blur local specifics, turning a political event into a component of the global information flow. As a result, the established political space as a defined arena of local interaction is eroded and replaced by a networked, hybrid space in which individuals interact, united not by a common territory but by a common reaction to events.

This transformation is accompanied by a redistribution of power in the sphere of communication. Traditional media — television, press, radio — which were the dominant sources of information and institutions of legitimation for industrial society, thanks to which topics gained public relevance and importance, and which were a place of collision of competing opinions and positions, have lost their weight. Today, digital platforms use visibility algorithms to perform this function no less effectively, but less transparently. The decision about what information will be shown is made not by the editorial staff, but by an algorithm based on the user's previous actions, resulting in the personalized nature of political communication. Whereas politicians used to address an imaginary "general public" by formulating messages of a general nature, today, algorithms do not target 'the masses', they target a multitude of highly specific audiences in what has become known as 'micromarketing' or 'niche marketing'" (Blommaert 2020). Thanks to this, messages are delivered only to those who are most likely to respond to them emotionally and incite the formation of a specific point of view. The practice of targeting

changes the perception of politics as a public affair, replacing it with the logic of marketing, where the main thing is not the search for truth or the validity of a position, but the effectiveness of achieving a behavioural result.

Digital platforms are changing the nature of political participation by offering new configurations of organizational forms that encompass grassroots self-organization, resource mobilization, coordination of actions, and communication. Hiremath describes examples of such forms, noting that digital tools open up opportunities to find volunteers, conduct fundraising initiatives, create communities of supporters, and hold live meetings with them in video format (Hiremath 2017). Social platforms are becoming a new place of representation and significantly lower barriers to participation. These platforms must open up a space for communication for those who were previously unheard — women, members of minorities, and activists from marginalized groups (Puri 2025) are allowed to speak openly, communicate, and find support among like-minded people. Simplifying access to communication channels contributes to the inclusion of such new groups in political discourse, adds visibility to marginal ideas and ideologies, and, as Frunza and Rațiu note in this context, users themselves "are likely to participate in stimulating and creating it through their own postings, their own content creation, or through simple forms of adhesion, recognition or appreciation of such discourse disseminated on social networks" (Frunza and Rațiu 2024, 35).

However, expanding access is not synonymous with democratization. Platforms that promise openness themselves form new mechanisms of exclusion. Well-known among them are the phenomena of 1) echo chambers, which "...digitally segregate individuals into a series of parallel but separate conversations separated by ideology, education, and class that lead individuals to engage in public debate within highly polarized groups" and 2) filter bubbles, in which "...users can filter or search through masses of text more easily" (Dommett and Verovšek 2021, 4-7), thus supporting their own views through limited visibility of alternatives rather than through factual support for their own arguments. This contributes to polarization and radicalization and ultimately threatens the disintegration of a unified political space, which is critical for democracy as a form of collective governance.

In the digital environment, the issues of transparency and access to information, public figures' decisions, accountability, and control over their activities are becoming increasingly important. However, access alone does not guarantee awareness, since, in conditions of information overload, awareness can be reduced to the consumption of individual fragments — emotional, visual, and lacking in systematicity. In this case, the public sphere is transformed from a space for discussion into a field of symbolic reactions, where truth takes a back seat to effect.

Thus, digital technologies offer new forms of political communication, providing it with new tools. Political communication becomes unpredictable, fragmented, and emotionally charged. In this environment, the ability to interpret, filter, and organize information flows becomes important, with artificial intelligence gaining agency in shaping the political space.

Artificial intelligence technologies are attracting increased interest from states, which are increasingly focusing on their strategic potential and viewing them as a factor in the radical shift of the present that will determine the contours of the future. The prospects for their application cover all areas of state functioning, from the economy to culture, from security to education. In this context, governments are shaping policies for the implementation of AI, seeking to integrate it into public administration, social services, and security infrastructure, and to use its capabilities for economic growth and improving the well-being of citizens. At the same time, as noted in recent studies on the attitude of states towards AI, it is becoming an element of global competition, playing an instrumental role in the race for political and economic leadership and geopolitical dominance based on technological superiority (Bareis and Katzenbach 2022).

Due to the novelty of the technology and the versatility of its application, AI presents both a challenge and an opportunity for democracy. On the one hand, it opens up prospects for political modernization, in particular, thanks to the ability to collect and process large amounts of data, algorithmic systems make it possible to form accurate digital portraits of citizens based on their preferences, reactions, and interactions, which makes it possible to respond quickly to public demands, predict social moods, and optimize decision-making processes. In this way, government activities become more adaptive and effective, reducing the time lag between a problem and a political response. At the same time, digital tools can help blur and distort the picture of citizens' real demands to their elected representatives, for example, by generating a stream of appeals prepared by both humans and artificial intelligence (Kreps and Kriner 2023), whose actual authorship is difficult to determine, and, as a result, actualize the false needs of voters.

In contrast to public influence on political processes, there is a more structured, complete, and comprehensive system of digital surveillance and control by the state. In such a situation, the state is able to actively shape public opinion by using digital monitoring tools to block access to certain types of information and, at the same time, increase the visibility of information that reflects the state's point of view on pressing issues (Funk et al. 2023). This method of restricting full access to information sources threatens the principle of information openness in a democratic society. Another aspect of the state monitoring system is the widespread use of user data, as artificial intelligence algorithms are capable of

collecting and processing huge amounts of personal information, which is then used as the basis for personal political communication and decision-making that promotes citizen loyalty. Such practices may seem to optimize democratic governance, but at the same time, they open the door to manipulation and abuse. The expansion of digital surveillance capabilities is a consequence of the concentration of power that arises from the concentration of control over key instruments in the hands of a limited circle of actors. Such control over the information infrastructure allows for the management of information flows and the imposition of favourable narratives, the substitution of facts, the weakening of public opinion autonomy, and its steering in a certain direction. Thus, technologies that are declared as instruments of openness can be transformed into means of covert pressure and adjustment of public sentiment.

An important mechanism for shaping personal information space is a recommendation system based on the collection and analysis of data on user preferences and previous behaviour. Essentially, recommendations are a form of targeting and represent an algorithmic proposal of information, where messages are carefully constructed taking into account the individual characteristics of the recipient, and their purpose is to achieve manipulative goals, which ultimately aim to lead to the desired action. This narrowing of the diversity of the information flow directly affects personal autonomy in the choice of information sources and reinforces the algorithmic influence on the formation of worldviews (Zanzotto 2025; Jungherr and Schroeder 2023, 168). In this context, the recommendation system functions as a tool for forming echo chambers, as it cuts off messages and sources of information that, according to algorithmic rules, will not elicit the expected response from the user, thereby defining the boundaries of information filtering.

4. AI as a tool for constructing political meanings

The concentration of power and resources in the digital environment creates conditions under which technology ceases to be a means of collecting and processing data and moves on to the next stage of its development — the construction of knowledge — where artificial intelligence is no longer a neutral algorithmic technical tool, but rather a tool that implements logic and follows the goals and intentions of those who own, control, and configure it. As a result, the center of influence on social and political processes is shifting from traditional institutions to new actors capable of acting independently in the local and transnational dimensions, imposing their own political and economic interests, and distorting public discourse through its manipulative imitation.

A striking manifestation of this trend is the use of generative language models capable of forming information messages and disseminating

them in various communication environments, organically adapting the text to the stylistic features of a particular region or audience. Such subtle adjustments mask the true authorship of artificial content, significantly increasing its persuasiveness and complicating the processes of identification and exposure of forgeries. At the same time, such adaptability can also be used in a positive way, for example, "pro-democracy advocates could use these tools to develop more persuasive anti-authoritarian messaging micro-targeted at the most vulnerable communities" (Born 2023), offering them alternative sources of information aimed at supporting and strengthening demands on the authorities and promoting democratic ideas in the public sphere. Despite its constructive potential, the adaptability of generative models also creates a basis for abuse — from the deliberate dissemination of misinformation to the involuntary generation of distorted messages capable of provoking fear and prejudice, contributing to the concealment of the truth and its separation from falsehood. The reasons for the emergence of false information are not limited to the biased use of AI. Among truth-related risks, Coeckelbergh highlights: "hallucinations" — "the output of an LLM (a particular statement) is not true... Instead of producing an accurate answer, they make up something, something that has no relation to reality"; epistemic anachronism – "the truth becomes trapped in the past in an AI loop, there is no room for an open future", i.e., training language models on data from the past and neglecting current data; strong relativism – the desire of AI to meet user expectations, despite the loss of credibility, "LLMs are rhetoric machines. They are sophists" (Coeckelbergh 2025, 4-6). All of this creates challenges for the problem of recognizing truth and directly undermines trust in a democracy, exacerbates information segregation, and hinders the search for consensus.

Similar problems associated with the use of LLM arise in the spiritual sphere—the world of intimacy of a person who seeks support, deepens their understanding of sacred texts, and moves along the path of spiritual life. Contemporary research on these issues emphasizes the ambivalence of using generative models for both individuals and religious communities. High-speed data processing and the algorithmic ability to identify common motifs in religious narratives create conditions for deeper interfaith understanding and the development of a culture of tolerance, contributing to the formation of a harmonious and tolerant society. The ability to have a "spiritual guide in your pocket" simplifies access to religious texts and their interpretation, which facilitates the process of religious education and knowledge, and this directly enables the formation of personal experience and understanding, beyond official doctrines and dogmas. At the same time, a problem arises that "the limitations of AI's ability to grasp the nuanced, subjective, and deeply personal aspects of religion cannot be overlooked" (Tampubolon and Nadeak 2024, 911). In such circumstances, knowledge obtained with the help of AI raises doubts

about its reliability and consistency with religious texts. In addition, there is an acute issue of bias formation in the process of religious cognition, as evidenced by the results of research on this topic – "generative AI content indirectly impacts respondents' religious attitudes and cognition by enhancing emotional responses and perceived credibility" (Zhang and Song 2025, 10). Thus, LLMs that train on deliberately biased, non-objective, spiritually deprived data become conduits of false meanings, shaping the limited worldview of a person who is predisposed to reject opposing positions and narrowing the possibilities for seeking understanding on socially important issues. In this context, questions of ethical responsibility remain unresolved in the process of developing a tool that becomes an instrument of human spiritual development, yet is devoid of moral norms or deliberately biased in accordance with the vision of its creators.

The generative capacity of artificial intelligence goes far beyond text messages and encompasses audio and visual formats. Modern algorithms are capable of creating highly realistic images, imitating voices, and altering the appearance of people in photos or videos with such accuracy that it becomes extremely difficult to distinguish between fake and real recordings (Maras and Alexandrou 2019). Technologies that were used for entertainment until recently — such as replacing the faces of famous actors in films or creating virtual influencers — are now increasingly being used in political and propaganda contexts. In particular, fake videos generated using neural networks can show politicians delivering speeches they never actually gave, or public figures engaging in compromising or aggressive actions. Such videos are aimed at manipulating the emotions of viewers and can radically change the course of information conflicts, influence public opinion, and "they may sow uncertainty which may, in turn, reduce trust in news on social media" (Vaccari and Chadwick 2020, 9). The viral spread of such content on social networks, combined with algorithmic mechanisms to increase reach, only increases the risks to democratic processes, where reliable information is the basis for informed decision-making.

Since 2014, Ukraine has been at war, which is largely being fought in the information space, covering both domestic political processes and interaction with international partners. The military confrontation is accompanied by a large-scale information war, in which deepfakes and other forms of falsification play a particularly dangerous role, contributing to the spread of false information, creating emotional tension and uncertainty, and the need for a quick response often reduces critical perception of media content. The use of deepfakes — in particular, videos featuring fake statements by military or political leaders — is becoming a tool for manipulating public opinion, demoralizing the population and the army, discrediting state institutions, and destabilizing international support.

One of the most famous examples of deepfake use is a video in which Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelensky, in a setting familiar for his addresses, calls on Ukraine's defenders to lay down their arms. The video was broadcast on the national television channel Ukraine 24, which could have been an argument for perceiving the video itself as true. However, representatives of the TV channel reported a hacker attack, and the video itself contained a number of details that indicated its artificiality (Pearson et al. 2022). At the same time, this case demonstrated the potential of deepfake technology and sparked lively discussions about the threats (Twomey et al. 2023) posed by the improvement of the technology and the correction of flaws that indicate its falsity.

Activity on social media creates information flows that expand the discursive field and shape topics for discussion. However, the content of the communication space is no longer the result of human activity alone, but is influenced by automated agents, evolving from human-represented social bots to software systems. Bots form a kind of ontological simulation in which messages dissolve into repetitive algorithms, and the communication process itself unfolds as a mechanism that lives by its own logic outside of subjective will. In such an environment, words lose their classical meaning as expressions of human intention and become a function of computational processes. As a result, the communicative space acquires the characteristics of a hybrid reality in which the real and the artificial merge into a single entity.

The use of bots and the creation of bot farms have become relevant in the context of information warfare because algorithmic systems have made it possible to create thousands of personal accounts and social media profiles capable of imitating real human interaction, engaging in public discourse, promoting political narratives, and undermining trust in traditional sources of information. A telling example is a study by the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), which uncovered a large network of pro-Kremlin bots that used artificial intelligence to masquerade as American citizens, creating fake accounts with full avatars, fictional biographies, and believable human-like behavior on social networks. With the help of generative AI, they were able to interact authentically with other users and with each other, quickly adapt to the context of discussions, and formulate their own messages in accordance with discursive conditions. The main goal of these bots was to manipulate and systematically spread disinformation aimed at increasing polarization within Western societies, discrediting Ukraine, and promoting pro-Russian propaganda (Harding 2024).

Such practices are part of hybrid warfare, which is not limited to confrontation on social networks, but also targets the US and other democratic countries that adhere to the principle of free dissemination of and access to information, in addition to Ukraine. Bot farms have become easy to implement not only in the form of real people's profiles, but also as

mass media outlets. A typical example of such media is the CopyCop network, which uses large language models to create pseudo-journalistic materials that imitate the style of Western media but are filled with pro-Russian narratives. Such content is designed to shape an alternative information reality in which the events of the war in Ukraine are interpreted in accordance with the interests of the Kremlin, the Ukrainian leadership is discredited, and support for Ukraine among Western audiences is weakened. Using generative AI, in particular for automated translation and stylistic editing of Russian media materials (RIA, TASS, Gazeta.ru), CopyCop targets audiences in the US, France, and other countries, manipulating topics that may cause scepticism about aid to Ukraine, support for isolationism, or distrust of NATO. These publications are often presented as individual news items, distributed through networks of fake accounts, and interact with other projects – Doppelgänger, InfoRos, XposedEm – to form an ecosystem of disinformation influence (Group 2024). In this way, disinformation propaganda tools become a system for distorting and simulating public space, capable of replacing actual reality with fictional images that distort the perception of events.

5. Conclusion

To sum up, it can be argued that information technology and artificial intelligence are becoming tools for the development of democracy and, at the same time, factors in its vulnerability. Their influence is transforming the political space, creating conditions for new forms of participation, but at the same time enabling the manipulation of meanings and the substitution of reality with artificial constructs and images. In this context, it seems that the task of political philosophy is to understand the balance between freedom and control, transparency and manipulation, authenticity and simulation. Therefore, there is a need to develop a culture of critical attitude towards products created by artificial intelligence, appealing to the democratic principles of transparency, openness, and the search for truth as value guidelines for the implementation and use of digital technologies; forming an ethical and political framework for ensuring technological efficiency with a focus on anthropocentrism and supporting human subjectivity.

The implementation of artificial intelligence into political communication reflects the general trend of instrumentalizing politics and using technologies of power to achieve goals and realize interests. Changes took place even in modern times, when the main goal of politics was defined as the effective exercise of power. To achieve effectiveness, political technologies that carry instrumental rationality were developed. Artificial intelligence is one manifestation of this rationality, and its use can be one of the technologies aimed at the rapid production of political meanings.

Artificial intelligence is naturally reformatting political discourse. This is clearly seen in the example of the use of AI to distort the political order in order to achieve dominance over the opponent's political sphere. In the context of Russia's war with Ukraine, the use of AI to achieve political goals and conduct information campaigns manifests itself in the form of creating fake messages designed to elicit an emotional response from people. This reinforces the dominance of the post-truth paradigm in the modern political world. Therefore, modern democracies must be sensitive to such distortions in political communication and set themselves the task of developing ways to verify political discourse for the purpose of creating it using AI.

Finally, we would like to note that the use of AI in politics manifests the phenomenon of instrumentalization of actions and processes in the public sphere. Instrumentalization affects the role of religion in politics, and the implementation of artificial intelligence technology reinforces the processes of secularization. The desire to rationalize politics and ensure its effectiveness leads to the displacement of the sacred from the public sphere. As a result, religion begins to lose its position as a source of meaning for politics, and politics loses its transcendent dimension, which can lead to dehumanization processes in society.

References:

Bareis, Jascha, Christian Katzenbach. 2022. "Talking AI into Being: The Narratives and Imaginaries of National AI Strategies and Their Performative Politics." *Science, Technology, & Human Values* Vol. 47 Issue 5: 855–81.

Blommaert, Jan. 2020. "Political discource in post-digital societies." *Trabalhos Em Linguística Aplicada* Vol. 59: 390–403.

Born, Kelly. 2023. "Will Generative AI Make or Break Democracy?" *Project Syndicate*, August 10. Accessed July 18, 2025. https://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/generative-ai-could-test-democracies-by-kelly-born-2023-08.

Coeckelbergh, Mark. 2022. *The Political Philosophy of AI: An Introduction*. Polity press.

Coeckelbergh, Mark. 2025. "LLMs, Truth, and Democracy: An Overview of Risks." *Science and Engineering Ethics* Vol. 31.

Dobrin, Diana. 2020. "The Hashtag in Digital Activism: A Cultural Revolution." *Journal of Cultural Analysis and Social Change* Volume 5 (1). Accessed July 12, 2025. https://doi.org/10.20897/jcasc/8298.

Dommett, Katharine, Peter J. Verovšek. 2021. "Promoting Democracy in the Digital Public Sphere: Applying Theoretical Ideals to Online Political Communication." *Javnost - The Public* Vol. 28 Issue 4: 358–374.

Ellul, Jacques. 1964. *The Technological Society*. Vintage Books.

Foucault, Michel. 1995. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. 2nd Vintage Books ed. Vintage Books.

Frunza, Sandu, Paula Rațiu. 2024. "Cultural Intelligence and the Populist Discourse Manifested through Social Media." *Journal for the Study of Religions and Ideologies* Vol. 23 Issue 67: 32–43.

Funk, Allie, Adrian Shahbaz, and Kian Vesteinsson. 2023. "The Repressive Power of Artificial Intelligence." *Freedom House*. Accessed July 19, 2025. https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-net/2023/repressive-power-artificial-intelligence.

Group, Insikt. 2024. "Russia-Linked CopyCop Uses LLMs to Weaponize Influence Content at Scale | Recorded Future." Report presented by Insikt Group Research on May 9, 2024. https://www.recordedfuture.com/research/russia-linked-copycop-uses-llms-to-weaponize-influence-content-at-scale.

Harding, Emily. 2024. "A Russian Bot Farm Used AI to Lie to Americans. What Now?" *Center for Strategic & International Studies,* July 16. Accessed July 19, 2025. https://www.csis.org/analysis/russian-bot-farm-used-ai-lie-americans-what-now.

Hiremath, Channabasayya T. 2017. "The impact of technological advancements on political processes" *International Journal of Research and Analytical Reviews* Vol. 4 Issue 3: 756-763. Accessed July 15, 2025. http://www.ijrar.org/papers/IJRAR19D5442.

Horkheimer, M. 1991. *Zur Kritik Der Instrumentellen Vernunft Und Notizen: 1949-1969*. Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag.

Jünger, Ernst. 2017. *The Worker: Dominion and Form*. Edited by Laurence Paul Hemming. Translated by Bogdan Costea. Northwestern University Press.

Jungherr, Andreas, Ralph Schroeder. 2023. "Artificial Intelligence and the Public Arena." *Communication Theory* Vol. 33 Issue 2–3: 164–73.

Kreps, Sarah, and Doug Kriner. 2023. "How AI Threatens Democracy." *Journal of Democracy* Vol. 34 Issue 4: 122-131. Accessed August 6, 2025. https://www.journalofdemocracy.org/articles/how-ai-threatens-democracy/.

Maras, Marie-Helen, Alex Alexandrou. 2019. "Determining Authenticity of Video Evidence in the Age of Artificial Intelligence and in the Wake of Deepfake Videos." *The International Journal of Evidence & Proof* Vol. 23 Issue 3: 255–262.

Nozick, Robert. 1974. *Anarchy, State, and Utopia*. Basic Books.

Pearson, James, Natalia Zinets, and James Pearson. 2022. "Deepfake Footage Purports to Show Ukrainian President Capitulating." *Reuters*, March 17. Accessed August 2, 2025. https://www.reuters.com/world/europe/deepfake-footage-purports-show-ukrainian-president-capitulating-2022-03-16/.

Puri, Dr. Nandini. 2025. "The Impact of Social Media in Shaping Political Discourse." *International Journal for Research Publication and Seminar* Vol. 16: 1–8.

Schmitt, Carl. 1996. *Roman Catholicism and Political Form*. Contributions in Political Science, Global Perspectives in History and Politics, no. 380. Greenwood Press.

Simons, Josh. 2023. *Algorithms for the People: Democracy in the Age of AI*. Princeton University Press.

Tampubolon, Manotar, Bernadetha Nadeak. 2024. "Artificial Intelligence and Understanding of Religion: A Moral Perspective" *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding* Vol. 11 Issue 8: 903-914.

Twomey, John, Didier Ching, Matthew Peter Aylett, Michael Quayle, Conor Linehan, Gillian Murphy. 2023. "Do Deepfake Videos Undermine Our Epistemic Trust? A Thematic Analysis of Tweets That Discuss Deepfakes in the Russian Invasion of Ukraine." *Plos One* Vol. 18 Issue 10.

Vaccari, Cristian, Andrew Chadwick. 2020. "Deepfakes and Disinformation: Exploring the Impact of Synthetic Political Video on Deception, Uncertainty, and Trust in News." *Social Media + Society* Vol. 6.

Zhang, Jing, Wenlong Song, Yang Liu. 2025. "Cognitive bias in generative AI influences religious education" *Scientific Reports* Vol. 15.

Zanzotto, Maria. 2025. "Generative AI, manipulation, and political communication. Can generative AI pose a manipulative threat in social media communication?" *S&F_scienzaefilosofia.it*, July 15. Accessed August 10, 2025. https://www.scienzaefilosofia.com/2025/07/15/generative-ai-manipulation-and-political-communication-can-generative-ai-pose-a-manipulative-threat-in-social-media-communication/.