



# The 2024 Election Integrity Initiative

Charting the Landscape of Nefarious Uses of Generative  
Artificial Intelligence for Online Election Interference

Emilio Ferrara

University of Southern California  
HUMANS Lab – Working Paper No. 2024.1

# Charting the Landscape of Nefarious Uses of Generative Artificial Intelligence for Online Election Interference

Emilio Ferrara

*University of Southern California*



Fig. 1. Synthetic images could be used for online election interference. *Generated by Midjourney.*

## ABSTRACT

Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) and Large Language Models (LLMs) pose significant risks, particularly in the realm of online election interference. This paper explores the nefarious applications of GenAI, highlighting their potential to disrupt democratic processes through deepfakes, botnets, targeted misinformation campaigns, and synthetic identities.

## INTRODUCTION

The advent of GenAI is revolutionizing fields from human-AI teaming to creative content generation, enabling new forms of human-computer interaction and augmenting human capabilities in unprecedented ways [13, 45, 51]. However, these advancements come with significant risks: here we focus on the problem of interference with democracy [10, 46] within the broader context of AI ethics [36, 41].

Online election interference refers to the manipulation of digital information and communication technologies to influence the outcome of elections. This can include activities such as spreading misinformation, creating fake news, and orchestrating social media campaigns to sway public opinion. The introduction of GenAI into this arena has magnified these threats by enabling more sophisticated and scalable forms of interference [25, 42].

Generative AI, with its ability to create realistic text, images, and videos, presents new opportunities for malicious actors to deceive and manipulate the public. For example, deepfake technology can generate realistic videos of political figures saying or doing things they never did, eroding public trust in authentic information sources (see Fig. 1) [54]. Moreover, the widespread use of AI-powered botnets can amplify misinformation and create the illusion of widespread support or opposition to certain political ideas, further distorting the democratic process [63].

The deployment of GenAI in online election interference poses a unique challenge to democracies worldwide. Traditional methods of combating misinformation and digital manipulation are often insufficient to address the sophisticated techniques enabled by GenAI. This necessitates a comprehensive understanding of the various ways in which GenAI can be exploited for nefarious purposes and the development of new strategies to mitigate these risks [25, 65].

This perspective article aims to shed light on the darker applications of GenAI in the context of online election interference. By examining the various nefarious uses of these technologies, we hope to highlight the urgent need for regulatory oversight, technological solutions, public awareness, and collaborative efforts to safeguard the integrity of democratic processes.

Through this exploration, we seek to provide a foundation for policymakers, technologists, and civil society to develop robust strategies to protect elections from AI-driven interference, ensuring that the benefits of GenAI are not overshadowed by its potential for harm [16, 53].

*The Dual Nature of Generative AI.* GenAI and LLMs, celebrated for their ability to process natural language and generate multimodal content, offer numerous benefits, including enhancing creativity and solving complex problems [13, 45]. These technologies have enabled advancements in various fields, from natural language understanding and translation to creative industries such as art and music [16]. However, these same capabilities can be exploited for malicious purposes, such as creating deepfakes, synthetic identities, and targeted misinformation campaigns [42].

On the positive side, GenAI can assist in drafting documents, writing code, generating realistic images and videos, and even conducting complex data analysis [65]. These applications have immense potential to boost productivity and innovation across different sectors. For example, AI-generated content can support marketing efforts by creating personalized advertisements or generating engaging social media posts. In healthcare, GenAI can help in diagnosing diseases by analyzing medical images or generating detailed patient reports [18].

Despite these benefits, the dark side of GenAI cannot be ignored. The same technology that generates realistic images and videos for legitimate purposes can also create deepfakes, which are

Table 1. Summary of Nefarious Applications of GenAI in Online Election Interference

Nefarious Application	Mechanism	Impact	Examples	Countermeasures	Future Trends
<b>Deepfakes</b>	AI-generated realistic videos/audio	Erosion of public trust, reputation damage	Fake celebrity endorsements, political smear campaigns	AI-based detection tools, legal regulations	More sophisticated, harder-to-detect deepfakes
<b>AI-Powered Botnets</b>	Automated social media accounts	Distortion of public opinion, misinformation spread	Bot campaigns during elections, coordinated disinformation	Bot detection algorithms, platform policies	Increasingly human-like behavior, decentralized bot networks
<b>Targeted Misinformation Campaigns</b>	Tailored false content	Exploitation of societal divisions, voter manipulation	False news articles, doctored images	Fact-checking services, user education	AI-generated personalized misinformation
<b>Synthetic Identities</b>	AI-created personas	Infiltration of online communities, intelligence gathering	Fake profiles on social media, false expert identities	Identity verification protocols, AI detection tools	More convincing and diverse synthetic identities

manipulated media that convincingly alter appearances or actions of individuals. Deepfakes can be used to spread false information, damage reputations, and even blackmail individuals [54]. The ease with which these deepfakes can be created poses a significant threat to the authenticity of information shared online.

Similarly, LLMs can be used to generate convincing fake news articles, social media posts, and even entire personas. These synthetic identities can be employed to infiltrate social networks, manipulate public opinion, and disrupt democratic processes [32]. AI-generated text can mimic human writing so effectively that distinguishing between genuine and fake content becomes challenging [37, 64].

Moreover, GenAI's ability to tailor messages to specific demographics makes it a powerful tool for targeted misinformation campaigns. These campaigns can be designed to exploit societal divisions, amplify existing biases, and influence voter behavior [59]. The targeted nature of these campaigns increases their effectiveness and the potential harm they can cause.

The dual nature of GenAI highlights the need for a balanced approach in leveraging these technologies. While the benefits are substantial, the risks are equally significant. As we continue to develop and deploy GenAI, it is crucial to implement safeguards that prevent its misuse [53]. This includes developing robust detection mechanisms, establishing ethical guidelines, and promoting public awareness about the potential dangers of AI-generated content [25].

In conclusion, while GenAI holds great promise for enhancing various aspects of society, it also presents substantial risks. Understanding the dual nature of these technologies is essential for developing strategies that maximize their benefits while mitigating their potential harms [42, 54].

## NEFARIOUS APPLICATIONS IN ELECTION INTERFERENCE

The integration of GenAI into the sphere of online election interference introduces numerous sophisticated threats to the integrity of democratic processes. These applications leverage the advanced capabilities of AI to manipulate information and influence voter behavior in unprecedented ways. Here, we explore the primary nefarious applications of GenAI in election interference (Table 1).

## **Deepfakes and Synthetic Media**

One of the most alarming applications of GenAI is the creation of deepfakes and other forms of synthetic media. Deepfakes use AI to create hyper-realistic videos and audio recordings of individuals, often portraying them saying or doing things they never did. Fabricated content can be used to spread false information, damage reputations, and manipulate public opinion [54].

The potential impact of deepfakes on elections is significant. For instance, a deepfake video of a political candidate making controversial statements or engaging in unethical behavior could go viral, swaying public perception and potentially altering the outcome of an election. The speed at which such content can spread on social media platforms exacerbates the problem, making it difficult to counteract the false information before it influences a large audience [59].

## **Botnets and Social Media Manipulation**

AI-powered botnets represent another potent tool for election interference. Botnets are networks of automated accounts that can post, like, share, and comment on social media platforms, creating the illusion of widespread support or opposition for certain viewpoints [63]. These bots can be programmed to spread misinformation, amplify divisive content, and suppress legitimate discourse, thereby distorting the digital public sphere [27].

The sophistication of modern AI allows these bots to mimic human behavior convincingly, making it challenging to detect and eliminate them [24]. For example, during the 2016 U.S. presidential election, bots were used extensively to influence online discussions and spread false information, contributing to the overall misinformation ecosystem [21, 27]. Pozzana and Ferrara [50] provided insights into the dynamics between bot and human behaviors, illustrating the increasing sophistication of bot activities; Luceri et al. [38, 39] showed how these behaviors evolve as a function of political ideology. The use of such technology in future elections poses a continuing threat to the integrity of democratic processes [62].

## **Targeted Misinformation Campaigns**

GenAI's ability to synthesize realistic and persuasive text enables the creation of highly effective targeted misinformation campaigns. These campaigns are designed to exploit existing societal divisions and biases, tailoring messages to specific demographic groups to maximize their impact [59]. By leveraging data from social media platforms and other online sources, malicious actors can create personalized propaganda that resonates deeply with targeted individuals, influencing their opinions, emotions, and behaviors.

For example, during an election, a targeted misinformation campaign might disseminate false information about a candidate's policies or personal life, aiming to dissuade certain voter groups from supporting them. The personalized nature of these messages makes them particularly effective, as they can address the specific concerns and biases of the recipients [1]. This form of manipulation undermines the democratic process by skewing the electorate's perception based on falsehoods.

## **Synthetic Identities and Fake Accounts**

GenAI can also be used to create convincing synthetic identities and fake accounts, which can be employed to infiltrate online communities, spread misinformation, and gather intelligence on political opponents [24, 25]. These synthetic identities can come with complete profiles, including

photos, bios, and posting histories, making them difficult to distinguish from real users [61]. The creation of fake accounts can facilitate a range of malicious activities. For instance, these accounts can be used to spread false narratives, engage in coordinated attacks against political figures, or even influence online polls. The use of synthetic identities to manipulate online discourse presents a significant challenge for social media platforms and requires sophisticated detection and countermeasures [32].

In summary, the nefarious applications of GenAI in election interference are diverse and highly sophisticated. From creating deepfakes to orchestrating botnets, these technologies offer malicious actors powerful tools to disrupt democratic processes and influence voter behavior. Addressing these threats requires a multifaceted approach that includes technological solutions, regulatory measures, and public awareness initiatives [25].

## **THE SOCIETAL IMPLICATIONS**

The misuse of GenAI in election interference poses several significant societal risks. These risks extend beyond the immediate impact on elections (*cf. Tables 2 and 3*) and their outcomes and have profound implications for democratic institutions, social cohesion, and public trust.

### **Erosion of Public Trust**

The widespread use of deepfakes and misinformation can severely erode public trust in media, institutions, and the democratic process itself. When voters are exposed to manipulated content that appears authentic, their ability to discern truth from falsehood is compromised. This erosion of trust can lead to cynicism and apathy among the electorate, as people become increasingly skeptical of all information sources [54]. The impact of this distrust is far-reaching. It undermines the credibility of legitimate news organizations and government institutions, making it easier for malicious actors to spread further misinformation [6]. Once trust is broken, restoring it is complex, requiring significant efforts from involved stakeholders like media organizations, governments, and broader society [25].

### **Polarization and Division**

Targeted misinformation campaigns exacerbate existing societal divisions by exploiting and amplifying biases and prejudices. By delivering tailored messages that resonate with specific demographic groups, these campaigns can deepen political and social polarization. For instance, misinformation targeting different ethnic or social groups can inflame tensions and lead to increased hostility between communities [59]. Such polarization weakens the social fabric, making it more challenging to achieve consensus on critical issues. This division can manifest in various forms, from increased partisanship in political discourse to violent confrontations between opposing groups. The long-term consequences of such division are detrimental to social stability and cohesion [1].

### **Undermining Democracy**

The ability to manipulate public opinion on a large scale poses a direct threat to the foundations of democracy. Elections are meant to reflect the informed choices of the electorate. However, when these choices are influenced by false information, the legitimacy of the electoral process is compromised. This manipulation undermines the principle of free and fair elections, a cornerstone of democratic governance [59]. Badawy et al. [5] examined the demographics of individuals most susceptible to online political manipulation, highlighting the vulnerability of certain groups.

Table 2. Examples of Past Election Interference Operations Enabled by AI or Bots.

Election	Country	Techniques Used	Actors Involved	Outcome	References
2016	UK	Bots, social media campaigns, fake news	Pro-Brexit groups, foreign actors	Influenced public opinion, supported Brexit campaign	Howard and Kollanyi [34]
2016	USA	Botnets, fake news, social media manipulation	Russian state-sponsored groups	Influenced public opinion, increased polarization	Ferrara et al. [27], Vosoughi et al. [59]
2016	Philippines	Troll accounts, fake news production	Domestic political actors, misinformation agents	Manipulated public opinion, supported political candidates	Haider et al. [32], Ong and Cabanes [43]
2017	France	Deepfakes, hacked emails, social media campaigns	Russian state-sponsored groups, domestic actors	Attempted to discredit candidates, disrupted public discourse	Ferrara [20], Pierri et al. [49]
2017	Spain	Bots, fake news, social media manipulation	Pro-separatist groups, foreign actors	Influenced public opinion, supported Catalan independence	Stella et al. [56]
2017	Germany	Bots, trolls, misinformation	Russian state-sponsored groups	Influenced public opinion, attempted to disrupt political stability	Bennhold and Barry [8]
2018	USA	Social media bots, fake news, targeted ads	Foreign actors, domestic political groups	Influenced voter behavior, increased polarization	Deb et al. [19]
2014 & 2018	Brazil	Social media bots, fake news, WhatsApp campaigns	Domestic political groups	Polarized electorate, influenced election results	Arnaudo [3], Pacheco [47]
2018	Italy	Social media bots, misinformation campaigns	Various political actors, misinformation agents	Influenced public opinion, affected election outcomes	Caldarelli et al. [14]
2019	Indonesia	Spear phishing, cyber attacks, social media manipulation	Various political actors, cyber agents	Influenced voter behavior, disrupted electoral process	Tapsell [58]
2019	India and Pakistan	Fake social media accounts, coordinated misinformation	Various political parties, independent actors	Spread misinformation, manipulated voter sentiment	Anand and Jaggi [2]
2020	USA	Deepfakes, AI-generated fake news, targeted ads	Foreign actors, political groups	Increased misinformation, voter suppression efforts	Ferrara [22], Ferrara et al. [26]
2020	Taiwan	Digital civic participation, misinformation campaigns	Various political actors, misinformation agents	Spread of misinformation, influence on voter perception and behavior	Chang et al. [17]

Furthermore, the perception that elections can be easily manipulated through AI-driven misinformation campaigns can lead to decreased voter turnout. If people believe their votes do not matter or that the process is rigged, they are less likely to participate in the democratic process. This disengagement weakens democratic institutions and can lead to governance that is less representative of the people's will [24].

Table 3. Examples of Research on Nefarious Applications of AI for Election Interference

Study	Main Findings
Ratkiewicz et al. [52]	Introduces the "Truthy" project, which detects and tracks political smears, astroturfing, misinformation, and other political abuse in social media.
Bessi and Ferrara [9]	Found that social bots – later associated with Russia's IRA [4, 11] – were used to significantly influence the 2016 U.S. Presidential election discussions on Twitter.
Shao et al. [55]	Identified that social bots amplify low-credibility content and contributed to the spread of misinformation during the 2016 U.S. election.
Im et al. [35]	Demonstrated that Russian troll accounts continue to operate and adapt their strategies post-2016 U.S. elections.
Haider et al. [32]	Developed a framework to demonstrate an approach to detect online political abuse in low-resource languages.
Stella et al. [56]	Showed that bots disproportionately amplify negative and inflammatory content, leading to greater exposure and potential influence on public opinion.
Chang et al. [17]	Explored how digital civic participation and misinformation campaigns affected the 2020 Taiwanese Presidential election.
Luceri et al. [39]	Analyzed the behavior of bots and humans on social media during elections, finding that bots become more sophisticated and difficult to detect over time.

### Exacerbation of Inequality

The deployment of GenAI technologies in ways that disproportionately affect certain groups can exacerbate existing social inequalities [23]. For example, misinformation campaigns might target marginalized communities with content designed to suppress their voter turnout or sow confusion about voting processes [15]. Such tactics exploit the vulnerabilities of these communities, further entrenching their disenfranchisement. Moreover, access to sophisticated AI technologies is often concentrated among well-resourced entities, such as state actors or large corporations, giving them disproportionate power to influence public opinion and elections. This concentration of power can lead to a democratic deficit, where the interests of a few overshadow the voices of the many [30].

### Psychological Impact on Society

The constant exposure to AI-generated misinformation and deepfakes can have a psychological toll on the populace. The bombardment of conflicting information can lead to information overload, where individuals struggle to process and make sense of the vast amounts of data they encounter daily: This situation can cause increased stress, anxiety, and a sense of helplessness among individuals [12, 29, 40]. Additionally, the fear of being deceived by AI-generated content can lead to a general mistrust of digital information. This mistrust can hinder the adoption of beneficial technologies and stifle innovation, as people become wary of engaging with digital platforms [25].

### MITIGATION STRATEGIES

To combat the multifaceted threats posed by GenAI in online election interference, a comprehensive and multi-pronged approach is essential. This section outlines various strategies, including regulatory measures, technological solutions, public awareness campaigns, and collaborative efforts, aimed at mitigating the risks associated with the misuse of GenAI.



## **Regulation and Oversight**

Effective regulation and oversight are crucial in governing the use of GenAI, particularly in sensitive areas like elections. Governments and international bodies need to establish clear guidelines and standards for the ethical use of AI technologies. These regulations should include provisions for transparency, accountability, and the prevention of misuse [28].

One approach is the implementation of AI ethics guidelines, such as the European Union's Ethics Guidelines for Trustworthy AI, which emphasize principles like human agency, technical robustness, privacy, and accountability [36]. Additionally, regulatory frameworks should mandate the disclosure of AI-generated content to ensure that the public can identify and scrutinize such content appropriately [44].

## **Technological Solutions**

Advances in technology can provide robust solutions to detect and mitigate the impact of AI-generated misinformation. For instance, digital watermarking and forensic techniques can be employed to identify deepfakes and other synthetic media [48]. These technologies can help verify the authenticity of digital content, making it easier to distinguish genuine from manipulated media.

Moreover, AI-driven detection systems can be developed to identify and neutralize botnets and fake accounts on social media platforms. These systems can use machine learning algorithms to detect patterns indicative of automated behavior, enabling platform operators to take swift action against malicious bots [62]. Implementing such technologies requires collaboration between tech companies, researchers, and policymakers to ensure their effectiveness and scalability.

## **Public Awareness and Education**

Educating the public about the potential for AI-driven misinformation and how to critically evaluate information sources is crucial in combating the spread of false information. Public awareness campaigns can help individuals develop the skills needed to identify deepfakes, recognize signs of bot activity, and verify the credibility of news sources [53].

Educational initiatives should be integrated into school curricula and adult education programs to promote media literacy. These programs can teach critical thinking skills and provide tools for assessing the reliability of information online [24]. Additionally, public service announcements and partnerships with media organizations can amplify these efforts, reaching a broader audience.

## **Collaborative Efforts**

Addressing the challenges posed by GenAI requires collaborative efforts among policymakers, technologists, and civil society. Multi-stakeholder initiatives can foster the development of best practices and shared standards for the ethical use of AI. For example, the Partnership on AI brings together diverse organizations to advance public understanding of AI and promote the responsible use of AI technologies [33].

Moreover, international cooperation is essential to address the global nature of online election interference. Governments and international organizations should work together to share information, coordinate responses, and develop joint strategies to counteract AI-driven threats. This collaboration can help build a unified front against the misuse of GenAI, ensuring that efforts are aligned and resources are effectively utilized [57].

## **Ethical AI Development**

Promoting ethical AI development involves ensuring that AI systems are designed with fairness, accountability, and transparency in mind. Developers and researchers should adhere to ethical guidelines and consider the societal impact of their work. This includes conducting thorough risk assessments, implementing bias mitigation strategies, and fostering inclusive design practices [60].

Ethical AI development also involves creating AI systems that are interpretable and explainable. Interpretable models allow users to understand how decisions are made, increasing trust in AI systems and enabling more effective oversight [53]. By prioritizing ethical considerations throughout the AI development lifecycle, developers can help prevent the misuse of AI technologies in election interference and other contexts [7].

## **Legal and Policy Frameworks**

Developing robust legal and policy frameworks is essential to address the challenges posed by GenAI. These frameworks should encompass data protection laws, cybersecurity measures, and regulations specific to AI technologies. For instance, the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) in the European Union provides a strong foundation for data privacy and security, which is crucial in preventing unauthorized access and manipulation of data used in AI systems [31].

Policies should also address the accountability of AI developers and users, ensuring that there are consequences for the misuse of AI technologies. This can include penalties for creating and disseminating deepfakes, as well as requirements for transparency in AI-generated content. Legal frameworks need to be adaptive and responsive to the rapidly evolving AI landscape, ensuring they remain effective in mitigating emerging threats [41].

In conclusion, addressing the societal implications of GenAI in election interference requires a comprehensive approach that integrates regulatory measures, technological solutions, public education, collaborative efforts, ethical development practices, and robust legal frameworks. By implementing these strategies, we can mitigate the risks associated with GenAI and protect the integrity of democratic processes.

## **ABOUT THE TEAM**

The 2024 Election Integrity Initiative is carried out by a collective of USC students and volunteers whose contributions are instrumental to enable these studies. The author is grateful to the following HUMANS Lab's members for their tireless efforts on this project: Ashwin Balasubramanian, Charles 'Duke' Bickham, Eun Cheol Choi, Gabriela Pinto, Grace Li, Isabel Epistelomogi, Jinhu Qi, Keith Burghardt, Leonardo Blas, Luca Luceri, Priyanka Dey, Richard Peng, Siyi Zhou, Vito Zou.

## FURTHER READINGS

- (A) *CNN* – The deepfake era of US politics is upon us.
- (B) *NPR* – U.S. elections face more threats from foreign actors and artificial intelligence.
- (C) *Wall Street Journal* – Fraudsters Used AI to Mimic CEO’s Voice in Unusual Cybercrime Case
- (D) *Vice* – People Are Creating Records of Fake Historical Events Using AI
- (E) *The Guardian* – ‘I don’t want to upset people’: Tom Cruise deepfake creator speaks out
- (F) *New York Times* – Do These A.I.-Created Fake People Look Real to You?
- (G) *Marketplace* – AI amplifies scam calls and other deceptions
- (H) *CBS News* – Scammers use AI to mimic voices of loved ones in distress
- (I) *New York Times* – Disinformation Researchers Raise Alarms About A.I. Chatbots
- (J) *MIT Technology Review* – The biggest threat of deepfakes isn’t the deepfakes themselves
- (K) *Reddit* – r/midjourney

## REFERENCES

- [1] Hunt Allcott and Matthew Gentzkow. 2017. Social media and fake news in the 2016 election. *Journal of economic perspectives* 31, 2 (2017), 211–236.
- [2] Bharat N. Anand and Ruchi Kher Jaggi. 2019. WhatsApp Vigilantes: An Exploration of Citizen Reception and Circulation of WhatsApp Misinformation during the 2019 Indian General Election. *Journal of Media Studies* 33, 4 (2019), 123–145.
- [3] Dan Arnaudo. 2017. Computational propaganda in Brazil: Social bots during elections. (2017).
- [4] Adam Badawy, Aseel Addawood, Kristina Lerman, and Emilio Ferrara. 2019. Characterizing the 2016 Russian IRA Influence Campaign. *Social Network Analysis and Mining* 9, 31 (2019).
- [5] Adam Badawy, Kristina Lerman, and Emilio Ferrara. 2019. Who falls for online political manipulation?. In *Proceedings of the 2019 world wide web conference*. 162–168.
- [6] Sahar Baribi-Bartov, Briony Swire-Thompson, and Nir Grinberg. 2024. Supersharers of fake news on Twitter. *Science* 384, 6699 (2024), 979–982.
- [7] Rachel KE Bellamy, Kuntal Dey, Michael Hind, Samuel C Hoffman, Stephanie Houde, Kalapriya Kannan, Pranay Lohia, Jacquelyn Martino, Sameep Mehta, Aleksandra Mojsilović, et al. 2019. AI Fairness 360: An extensible toolkit for detecting and mitigating algorithmic bias. *IBM Journal of Research and Development* 63 (2019), 4–1.
- [8] Katrin Bennhold and Ellen Barry. 2017. How Russia Meddles Abroad for Profit: Cash, Trolls and a Cult Leader. *The New York Times* (2017).
- [9] Alessandro Bessi and Emilio Ferrara. 2016. Social bots distort the 2016 US Presidential election online discussion. *First monday* 21, 11-7 (2016).
- [10] Alexandre Bovet and Hernán A Makse. 2019. Influence of fake news in Twitter during the 2016 US presidential election. *Nature communications* 10, 1 (2019), 7.
- [11] David A Broniatowski, Amelia M Jamison, SiHua Qi, Lulwah AlKulaib, Tao Chen, Adrian Benton, Sandra C Quinn, and Mark Dredze. 2018. Weaponized health communication: Twitter bots and Russian trolls amplify the vaccine debate. *American journal of public health* 108, 10 (2018), 1378–1384.
- [12] Tina Brooks, Princess G., Jesse Heatley, Jeremy J., Scott Kim, Samantha M., Sara Parks, Maureen Reardon, Harley Rohrbacher, Burak Sahin, Shani S., and Richard V. 2024. Increasing Threats of Deepfake Identities. *DHS*. (2024).
- [13] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 33 (2020), 1877–1901.
- [14] Guido Caldarelli, Rocco De Nicola, Fabio Del Vigna, Marinella Petrocchi, and Fabio Saracco. 2020. The role of bot squads in the political propaganda on Twitter. *Communications Physics* 3, 1 (2020), 81.
- [15] Ryan Calo. 2017. Artificial intelligence policy: a primer and roadmap. *UCDL Rev.* 51 (2017), 399.
- [16] Yihan Cao, Siyu Li, Yixin Liu, Zhiling Yan, Yutong Dai, Philip S Yu, and Lichao Sun. 2023. A comprehensive survey of AI-generated content (AIGC): A history of generative AI from GAN to ChatGPT. *arxiv:2303.04226* (2023).

- [17] Ho-Chun Herbert Chang, Samar Haider, and Emilio Ferrara. 2021. Digital civic participation and misinformation during the 2020 Taiwanese presidential election. *Media and Communication* 9, 1 (2021), 144–157.
- [18] Thomas Davenport and Ravi Kalakota. 2019. The potential for artificial intelligence in healthcare. *Future healthcare journal* 6, 2 (2019), 94.
- [19] Ashok Deb, Luca Luceri, Adam Badawy, and Emilio Ferrara. 2019. Perils and Challenges of Social Media and Election Manipulation Analysis: The 2018 US Midterms. In *Proceedings of the 2019 World Wide Web Conference*. 237–247.
- [20] Emilio Ferrara. 2017. Disinformation and social bot operations in the run up to the 2017 French presidential election. *First Monday* (2017).
- [21] Emilio Ferrara. 2018. Measuring social spam and the effect of bots on information diffusion in social media. *Complex spreading phenomena in social systems* (2018), 229–255.
- [22] Emilio Ferrara. 2020. Bots, elections, and social media: a brief overview. In *Disinformation, Misinformation, and Fake News in Social Media*.
- [23] Emilio Ferrara. 2023. Should ChatGPT be biased? Challenges and risks of bias in large language models. *First Monday* 28, 11 (2023).
- [24] Emilio Ferrara. 2023. Social bot detection in the age of ChatGPT: Challenges and opportunities. *First Monday* 28, 6 (2023).
- [25] Emilio Ferrara. 2024. GenAI Against Humanity: Nefarious Applications of Generative Artificial Intelligence and Large Language Models. *Journal of Computational Social Science* (2024).
- [26] Emilio Ferrara, Herbert Chang, Emily Chen, Goran Muric, and Jaimin Patel. 2020. Characterizing social media manipulation in the 2020 US presidential election. *First Monday* (2020).
- [27] Emilio Ferrara, Onur Varol, Clayton A Davis, Filippo Menczer, and Alessandro Flammini. 2016. The rise of social bots. *Commun. ACM* 59, 7 (2016), 96–104.
- [28] Luciano Floridi. 2019. Establishing the rules for building trustworthy AI. *Nature Machine Intelligence* 1, 6 (2019), 261–262.
- [29] Shaoxiong Fu, Hongxiu Li, Yong Liu, Henri Pirkkalainen, and Markus Salo. 2020. Social media overload, exhaustion, and use discontinuance: Examining the effects of information overload, system feature overload, and social overload. *Information Processing & Management* 57, 6 (2020), 102307.
- [30] Tarleton Gillespie. 2018. *Custodians of the Internet: Platforms, content moderation, and the hidden decisions that shape social media*. Yale University Press.
- [31] Bryce Goodman and Seth Flaxman. 2017. European Union regulations on algorithmic decision-making and a “right to explanation”. *AI magazine* 38, 3 (2017), 50–57.
- [32] Samar Haider, Luca Luceri, Ashok Deb, Adam Badawy, Nanyun Peng, and Emilio Ferrara. 2023. Detecting social media manipulation in low-resource languages. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2023*. 1358–1364.
- [33] Jeffrey Heer. 2018. The partnership on AI. *AI Matters* 4, 3 (2018), 25–26.
- [34] Philip N Howard and Bence Kollanyi. 2016. Bots, #strongerin, and #brexit: Computational propaganda during the uk-eu referendum. *arXiv:1606.06356* (2016).
- [35] Jane Im, Eshwar Chandrasekharan, Jackson Sargent, Paige Lighthammer, Taylor Denby, Ankit Bhargava, Libby Hemphill, David Jurgens, and Eric Gilbert. 2020. Still out there: Modeling and identifying russian troll accounts on twitter. In *Proceedings of the 12th ACM conference on web Science*. 1–10.
- [36] Independent High-Level Expert Group on Artificial Intelligence. 2019. *Ethics Guidelines for Trustworthy AI*. Technical Report. European Commission.
- [37] Cameron R Jones and Benjamin K Bergen. 2024. People cannot distinguish GPT-4 from a human in a Turing test. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.08007* (2024).
- [38] Luca Luceri, Ashok Deb, Adam Badawy, and Emilio Ferrara. 2019. Red bots do it better: Comparative analysis of social bot partisan behavior. In *Companion proceedings of the 2019 world wide web conference*. 1007–1012.
- [39] Luca Luceri, Ashok Deb, Silvia Giordano, and Emilio Ferrara. 2019. Evolution of bot and human behavior during elections. *First Monday* (2019).
- [40] Jörg Matthes, Kathrin Karsay, Desirée Schmuck, and Anja Stevic. 2020. “Too much to handle”: Impact of mobile social networking sites on information overload, depressive symptoms, and well-being. *Computers in Human Behavior* 105 (2020), 106217.

- [41] Brent Daniel Mittelstadt, Patrick Allo, Mariarosaria Taddeo, Sandra Wachter, and Luciano Floridi. 2016. The ethics of algorithms: Mapping the debate. *Big Data & Society* 3, 2 (2016), 2053951716679679.
- [42] Maximilian Mozes, Xuanli He, Bennett Kleinberg, and Lewis D Griffin. 2023. Use of LLMs for Illicit Purposes: Threats, Prevention Measures, and Vulnerabilities. *arxiv:2308.12833* (2023).
- [43] Jonathan Ong and Jason Vincent Cabanes. 2018. *Architects of Networked Disinformation: Behind the Scenes of Troll Accounts and Fake News Production in the Philippines*. New Mandala.
- [44] OpenAI. 2019. Release Strategies and the Social Impacts of Language Models. *arxiv:1908.09203* (2019).
- [45] OpenAI. 2023. GPT-4 Technical Report. (2023).
- [46] Ozlem Ozmen Garibay, Brent Winslow, Salvatore Andolina, Margherita Antona, Anja Bodenschatz, Constantinos Coursaris, Gregory Falco, Stephen M Fiore, Ivan Garibay, Keri Grieman, et al. 2023. Six human-centered artificial intelligence grand challenges. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction* 39, 3 (2023), 391–437.
- [47] Diogo Pacheco. 2023. Bots, Elections, and Controversies: Twitter Insights from Brazil’s Polarised Elections. *arxiv:2310.09051* (2023).
- [48] Ivan Perov, Daiheng Gao, Nikolay Chervoniy, Kunlin Liu, Sugasa Marangonda, Chris Umé, Mr Dpfks, Carl Shift Facenheim, Luis RP, Jian Jiang, et al. 2020. DeepFaceLab: Integrated, flexible and extensible face-swapping framework. *arxiv:2005.05535* (2020).
- [49] Francesco Pierri, Luca Luceri, Nikhil Jindal, and Emilio Ferrara. 2023. Propaganda and Misinformation on Facebook and Twitter during the Russian Invasion of Ukraine. In *Proceedings of the 15th ACM Web Science Conference 2023*. 65–74.
- [50] Iacopo Pozzana and Emilio Ferrara. 2020. Measuring bot and human behavioral dynamics. *Frontiers in Physics* 8, 125 (2020).
- [51] Iyad Rahwan, Manuel Cebrian, Nick Obradovich, Josh Bongard, Jean-François Bonnefon, Cynthia Breazeal, Jacob W Crandall, Nicholas A Christakis, Iain D Couzin, Matthew O Jackson, et al. 2019. Machine behaviour. *Nature* 568, 7753 (2019), 477–486.
- [52] Jacob Ratkiewicz, Michael Conover, Mark Meiss, Bruno Gonçalves, Alessandro Flammini, and Filippo Menczer. 2011. Detecting and tracking political abuse in social media. In *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and social media*, Vol. 5. 297–304.
- [53] Cynthia Rudin. 2019. Stop explaining black box machine learning models for high stakes decisions and use interpretable models instead. *Nature machine intelligence* 1, 5 (2019), 206–215.
- [54] Michael Seymour, Kai Riemer, Lingyao Yuan, and Alan R Dennis. 2023. Beyond Deep Fakes. *Commun. ACM* 66, 10 (2023), 56–67.
- [55] Chengcheng Shao, Giovanni Luca Ciampaglia, Onur Varol, Kai-Cheng Yang, Alessandro Flammini, and Filippo Menczer. 2018. The spread of low-credibility content by social bots. *Nature communications* 9, 1 (2018), 1–9.
- [56] Massimo Stella, Emilio Ferrara, and Manlio De Domenico. 2018. Bots increase exposure to negative and inflammatory content in online social systems. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 115, 49 (2018).
- [57] Mariarosaria Taddeo and Luciano Floridi. 2018. Regulate artificial intelligence to avert cyber arms race. (2018).
- [58] Ross Tapsell. 2020. *The Weaponization of Social Media: Spear Phishing and Cyber Attacks on Democracy in Indonesia*.
- [59] Soroush Vosoughi, Deb Roy, and Sinan Aral. 2018. The spread of true and false news online. *Science* 359, 6380 (2018), 1146–1151.
- [60] Laura Weidinger, Jonathan Uesato, Maribeth Rauh, Conor Griffin, Po-Sen Huang, John Mellor, Amelia Glaese, Myra Cheng, Borja Balle, Atoosa Kasirzadeh, et al. 2022. Taxonomy of risks posed by language models. In *2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*. 214–229.
- [61] Mika Westerlund. 2019. The emergence of deepfake technology: A review. *TIM Review* 9, 11 (2019).
- [62] Kai-Cheng Yang, Emilio Ferrara, and Filippo Menczer. 2022. Botometer 101: Social bot practicum for computational social scientists. *Journal of Computational Social Science* 5, 2 (2022), 1511–1528.
- [63] Kai-Cheng Yang and Filippo Menczer. 2023. Anatomy of an AI-powered malicious social botnet. *arxiv:2307.16336* (2023).
- [64] Rowan Zellers, Ari Holtzman, Hannah Rashkin, Yonatan Bisk, Ali Farhadi, Franziska Roesner, and Yejin Choi. 2019. Defending against neural fake news. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 32 (2019).
- [65] Caleb Ziems, William Held, Omar Shaikh, Jiaao Chen, Zhehao Zhang, and Diyi Yang. 2023. Can Large Language Models Transform Computational Social Science? *arxiv:2305.03514* (2023).