

NEG

We negate the resolution resolved: In the United States, the benefits of the use of generative AI in education outweigh the harms.

Framework: Structural Violence

Start With Framework on Structural Violence

Burton CW, Gilpin CE, Draughon Moret J. Structural violence: A concept analysis to inform nursing science and practice. Nurs Forum. 20**21**

Apr;56(2):382-388. doi: 10.1111/nuf.12535. Epub 2020 Dec 23. PMID: 33355920.

[**Candace W Burton**: an associate professor in nursing at the University of Nevada Las Vegas]

This analysis is meant to elucidate the concept of structural violence and its implications for nursing science and practice. The concept of structural violence, also known as indirect violence, was first identified in the literature by peace researcher Johan Galtung. According to Galtung, structural violence broadly represents harm done to persons and groups through inequitable social, political, or economic structures. Such inequitable structures, such as systemic discrimination based on race, ethnicity, religion, gender, sexual orientation, etc. create conditions within society that directly disadvantage and oppress members of certain groups. This oppression can inflict profound physical, psychological, and socioeconomic harm on individuals, leading to disparate health outcomes. Using techniques for developing conceptual meaning as outlined in Chinn and Kramer (2018), our analysis seeks to specify meanings and applications of structural violence for application to nursing. This analysis draws on literature from clinical, historical, and other social sciences. Databases including CINAHL, PubMed, JSTOR, and PsychInfo were explored for references to structural violence. Structural violence is readily identified in specific contexts where individuals or groups are disadvantaged by socially constructed systems, such as those of race, gender, and economic privilege. Structural violence can result in health disparities and the development of conditions that predispose individuals to health risks. Nurses must be familiar with the concept to address these issues with patients.

Prioritizing structural violence is necessary.

Davis **Ansell 17**, 2017, [David A. Ansell, Ansell is the Professor of Medicine at Rush University Medical Center and holds an M.D. from the State University of New York Upstate Medical University College of Medicine, “American Roulette, The Death Gap: How Inequality Kills”, University of Chicago Press 2017, ISBN 9780226428291 | recut aanya

There are many different kinds of violence. Some are obvious: punches, attacks, gunshots, explosions. These are the kinds of interpersonal violence that we tend to hear about in the news. Other kinds of violence are intimate and emotional. But the deadliest and most thoroughgoing kind of violence is woven into the fabric of American society. It exists when some groups have more access to goods, resources, and opportunities than other groups, including health and life itself. This violence delivers specific blows against particular bodies in particular neighborhoods. This unequal advantage and violence is built into the very rules that govern our society. In the absence of this violence, large numbers of Americans would be able to live fuller and longer lives. This kind of violence is called structural violence, because it is embedded in the very laws, policies, and rules that govern day-to-day life. It is the cumulative impact of laws and social and economic policies and practices that render some Americans less able to access resources and opportunities than others. This inequity of advantage is not a result of the individual's personal abilities but is built into the systems that govern society. Often it is a product of racism, gender, and income inequality. Yet these political and economic structures have become so firmly entrenched (in habits, social relation economic arrangements, institutional practices, law, and policy) that they

have become part of the matrix of American society. The rules that govern day-to-day life were written to benefit a small elite at the expense of people like Windora and her family. These rules and structures are powerful destructive forces. The same structures that render life predictable, secure, comfortable, and pleasant for many **destroys the lives of others like Windora through suffering, poverty, ill health, and violence. These structures are neither natural nor neutral.**

Minorities are always excluded from discussions. Pratt-22 elaborates:

Ashley Pratt 22, June 2022, "Deconstructing Bias: Marginalization," National Institute of Health, <https://science.nichd.nih.gov/confluence/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=24297524> accessed 3-10-2024 | aanya

[Ashley Pratt: Ashley received her Bachelor's degree in Neuroscience from Bates College, where she studied respiratory control, and then memory consolidation, as a research assistant. Ashley is currently pursuing her PhD in Neuroscience through the Brown University - NIH Graduate Partnership Program]

Today, the term marginalize is commonly used as a verb meaning "to relegate to an unimportant or powerless position within society or group." Marginalization, or to marginalize, is used to describe the casting aside of groups that are considered "other" within society. In practice, this can manifest as ignoring the needs of a specific group or failing to provide a group with the same opportunities that are available to other members of society. **Much like the notes in the blank**

edges of a book, marginalized groups are treated as separate from the main body of society. The expanded use of marginalization in the medical field was first noted in an article entitled "Marginalization guiding concept for valuing diversity in nursing knowledge development" by Hall et al. It identifies vulnerable groups in the health system as those who are "often hidden, stigmatized, lacking access to services, and mistrustful of the research process" (Hall et al., 1994). Since the publication of this article, the composition of these groups has extended beyond women and members of underrepresented ethnic and racial groups. Today, examples of marginalized populations include groups that are excluded due to race, gender identity, sexual orientation, age, physical ability, or language.

Thus, Marshall-97 concludes

Catherine Marshall 97, 1997 [Catherine, professor at the University of North Carolina, Feminist Critical Policy Analysis: A perspective from post-secondary education, pg. ix-x] |

recut aanya Policy researchers and analysts have gained and retained legitimacy by focusing on the problems and methods identified powerful people. **Those with a different focus are silenced, declared irrelevant, postponed, coopted, put on the back burner, assigned responsibilities with no training, budget, personnel or time, or otherwise ignored.** Policies, -- authoritative agreements among powerful people about how things should be -- have been made without a feminist critical glance. These two volumes focus on those areas of silence, on the policy issues at the fringe and on the kinds of policy analysis methods, findings and recommendations that will disrupt but will also open possibilities. The two volumes identify theories and tools for dismantling and replacing the politics, theories and modes of policy analysis that built 'the master's house'. The individual chapters illustrate how and why to expand policy questions and policy analysis methods to incorporate critical and feminist lenses, demonstrating the promise of politics, analysis and policymaking that thoughtfully and thoroughly works to uncover any source of oppression, domination or marginalization and to create policies to meet the lived realities, [and] needs, aspirations and values of women and girls and others **kept on the margin.** The volumes name and develop a new field: Feminist critical Policy Analysis. The promise of this field lies in its incorporation of a perspective that 'write against the grain': the feminist, critical stance, with policy analysis that includes methods for focusing on the cultural values bases of policies; deconstruction of policy documents; analysis of a policy intention and its potential effects, such as affirmative Action and Title IX; studies of the micropolitical, for example, the dynamics of a school board task force for sexual harassment, a tenure system's effect on women academics, or the role of girls' access to computers in the implementation of computer policies; and analyses of policies, programs and political stances that do focus on neglected needs in schooling. **Policymakers and analysts need to pause in order to recognize how issues of gender, the needs of particular groups like the urban poor, women and non-dominant nationalities are left out of education policy** analyses. In order to connect effectively, women need to take a hard look at the structures and arenas of policy. By presenting literatures, methods and examples, these books name the field: feminist critical policy analysis leap at the challenge.

The framing promotes education which is a prerequisite to all else. Two warrants.

1. Debate is an arena for the voice of the oppressed people where we can question things that are usually seen as a given.
2. The way we discuss policy shapes the way in which policies are implemented.

Without discussing structural violence, we will continue to enact violence-perpetuating policies.

Contention 1: Racism

Generative AI in education is racially biased **HRC 24**

"Document Viewer." Un.org, 2025, docs.un.org/en/A/HRC/56/68. Accessed 25 Feb. 2025.

[**Human Rights Council**: an intergovernmental body within the United Nations system made up of 47 States responsible for the promotion and protection of all human rights around the globe]

45. Grading algorithms typically use historical grading data to evaluate student performance. Such data can be biased by historical patterns of systemic racism in educational institutions. The bias in the data will be replicated by predictive scoring algorithms for students, especially when teacher input is excluded.⁶⁹ Grading algorithms can be hugely consequential in determining the opportunities available to students, including in relation to access to university education or employment opportunities after education. Racially biased automated decisions may therefore limit opportunities for students from marginalized racial and ethnic groups and undercut the potential of education to be a tool to disrupt systemic racism. 46. The United Kingdom provides a cautionary example of the deployment of a grading algorithm. In 2020, Advanced Level (A-level) examinations were cancelled due to the COVID-19 pandemic. As a substitute for examination grades, teachers were asked to predict students' results. The national regulatory agency for grading then deployed an algorithm to standardize the predicted scores on the basis of each school's historical grading data. Forty per cent of students, many of whom attended schools in lower-income areas, had their scores downgraded as a result. Conversely, the algorithm upgraded a disproportionately high number of students from independent, fee-paying schools. The Government responded to the controversy by reversing the algorithm's standardization. However, the episode caused significant disruptions to university admissions processes.⁷⁰

Pham 24

School, Stanford Law. "How Will AI Impact Racial Disparities in Education? | Stanford Law School." Stanford Law School, 29 June 2024, law.stanford.edu/2024/06/29/how-will-ai-impact-racial-disparities-in-education/#:~:text=AI%20algorithms%20may%20exacerbate%20racial,trained%20to%20believe%20are%20accurate. Accessed 26 Feb. 2025.

[**Hoang Pham**: Director of Education and Opportunity at the Stanford Center for Racial Justice at Stanford Law School, where he leads research and policy initiatives to address entrenched racial inequities in the U.S. education system and promote economic mobility.]

AI algorithms may exacerbate racial disparities in education when developers input historical data into the technology that replicate pre-existing biases that the model is trained to believe are accurate. For example, predictive analytical tools in education use data, statistical algorithms, and machine learning to help educators support students on their academic and professional journeys. These predictive analytical tools also play a role in determining the likelihood of future student success. Nevada is one of six states where every district uses Infinite Campus, a program that tracks students' attendance, behavior, and grades to support an "early-warning system" that "employs a machine-learning algorithm to assess the likelihood that each student whose data enters the system will or will not graduate." While these tools are intended to assist educators in improving outcomes for students, predictive analytics often rate racial minorities as less likely to succeed academically. This is because race is included as a risk factor in the algorithms and treated as an indicator of success or failure based on the historical performance of students with those identities. For example, an analysis conducted in 2021 found that Wisconsin's Dropout Early Warning System, which uses race as a data point to predict the likelihood a student will

graduate high school on time, generated false alarms about Black and Latino students “at a significantly greater rate than it did for their White classmates.” This false alarm rate, defined as “how frequently a student [the algorithm] predicted wouldn’t graduate on time actually did graduate on time,” was 42% higher for Black students than White students. Instead of clarifying what extra support students need, risk scores tend to have a negative influence on how teachers perceive students and students’ own beliefs about their academic potential. Universities are also using algorithms, for example, in the admissions process to determine the likelihood a student is admitted, how much financial aid they should receive, and whether they decide to enroll. Admissions algorithms use a university’s admissions criteria and historical admissions data, comparing them with an applicant’s transcript, essay answers, and even recorded interviews to assist an admissions officer in streamlining admissions decisions, often by sorting applicants into tiers based on their likelihood of admission. Companies such as OneOrigin, Student Select, and Transparency in Education offer algorithmic tools to universities and students that claim to improve efficiency, cut costs, increase admissions yield, and provide transparency to applicants. However, critics argue that because AI algorithms use historical data to make predictions they are more prone to producing discriminatory outcomes. For example, AI enrollment algorithms use a college’s past applicant data—including high school GPA, standardized test scores, socioeconomic status, zip code, and even how frequently applicants attended college recruitment events—to help determine levels of scholarship funding and the likelihood of enrollment for future students. Although these data inputs are race-neutral and used for a legitimate reason (i.e. predicting the likelihood a student will enroll, which helps with ensuring course availability), the AI tool can nonetheless produce disparate racial impacts. For example, because Black and Latino students have historically scored lower on the math section of the SAT than White and Asian students, the AI algorithm may allocate more scholarship funding to White and Asian students than Black and Latino students.

IMPACT: Structural violence Bourke 24

Bourke, Mary. “Understanding Structural Violence: Its Impact on Low-Income Communities - MEDLIFE.” MEDLIFE, 18 July 2024, www.medlifemovement.org/medlife-stories/global-topics/understanding-structural-violence-its-impact-on-low-income-communities/#:~:text=Structural%20violence%20manifests%20in%20stark,any%20form%20of%20community%20upliftment. Accessed 3 Mar. 2025.

[Mary Bourke: studied Digital Media and Creative Writing at Vancouver Island University and graduated with a Bachelor’s Degree in 2020; passions for social justice and writing were able to meet when she started copywriting for MEDLIFE; works remotely from Canada and helps to bring marketing material from MEDLIFE to a Canadian audience]

Structural violence is a silent force, stemming from societal structures that marginalize certain populations, limiting their access to health, education, and economic opportunities. Coined by Johan Galtung and expanded by Paul Farmer, this concept uncovers the hidden mechanisms of inequality that inflict indirect harm on individuals based on social, economic, and political disparities. Galtung’s work in “Violence, Peace, and Peace Research” (Journal of Peace Research, 1969) provides a critical foundation for understanding these invisible barriers.

Impact on Low-Income Communities

Structural violence manifests in stark realities such as inadequate healthcare, substandard living conditions, and limited educational opportunities. These conditions perpetuate a cycle of poverty and hinder any form of community upliftment. Paul Farmer’s “Pathologies of Power: Health, Human Rights, and the New War on the Poor” (University of California Press, 2003) explores the intersection of these issues with human rights.

Allison Academy 21

“Allison Academy - Private Middle and High School.” Allison Academy, 23 Sept. 2021, www.allisonacademy.com/students/education/higher-education/lack-of-education/. Accessed 7 Mar. 2025.

[Allison Academy: a private, accredited, non-sectarian Middle School and High School (grades 6-12)]

1. Poor health Some of the basic lessons we learn in primary school are related to taking care of one’s own psychophysical health. The importance of hand washing, sexual health, necessity of regular physical activity – all this knowledge is something that stays with a person all their life, and is acquired at school. There is a strong link between lack of education and poor health and

hygiene. The Borgen Project research conducted in Uganda yielded staggering results: educated people in the country have 75% less chance to contract HIV/AIDS, while young people with good primary education have 50% less chance to contract the same virus. **2. Shorter life expectancy** The IMS Fiscal Monitor research showed that education can even affect a person's life expectancy. Specifically, in developed economies, the gap between men with higher education and those with secondary, or primary education ranges between four and fourteen years, and is even larger in some countries. **3. Poverty** Due to adverse life circumstances, many people lack the tools and means that would enable them to leave poverty behind. Education is precisely what provides a person with these tools and means, but in poor communities and countries, it either does not exist at all, or if it does, it is inadequate, and this is how people find themselves in the vicious circle of poverty from which they cannot free themselves. The fact is that the more educated a person is, the better their chances of a decent salary. **4. Unemployment** Unemployment is tightly linked to poverty. People who lack education, or who only finished primary school often work poorly paid jobs, or struggle to find any job whatsoever. Simply put, good jobs are reserved for qualified employees, and qualifications are primarily acquired through education. In today's age of all-present digitalization where knowledge quickly becomes outdated, and traditional jobs are slowly disappearing, education becomes even more important, representing the key factor that decides whether a person will be able to adapt to changes and find a suitable job, or will become unemployed. According to a survey conducted by OECD, 69% people with lower secondary education are employed, whereas that percentage among people with higher education is 88%. **5. Lower salary** People who lack qualifications, even when they find a job, will always have a significantly lower salary than their more educated counterparts. Less paid and less valued jobs are reserved for unqualified workers, and often such positions are in danger of being automated, which creates additional uncertainty regarding salaries and jobs for people with a lower level of education. **6. Gender inequality** Women who receive poorer education than their male counterparts are often in an adverse position. Quality education gives women independence, higher salaries and the opportunity to express their views on various social issues. Education means independence and the ability to make informed decisions on one's life, for both men and women. **7. Social isolation** Uneducated people struggle to fit in social situations, and often remain marginalized. The lack of resources generated by education prevents them from participating in numerous social activities in a productive and comprehensive way, in contrast to educated people who engage in the same activities without difficulty. **8. Illegal activities** People with lower education, the unemployed, or those who work poorly paid jobs are often forced to work hard to provide a bare existence. Hence, it is no wonder that lack of education can often lead to a life of crime, which such people often see as the shortcut or the only way out of their disadvantaged position. **9. Poor economy** Countries with educated people have stronger, better developed, and more sustainable economies. Estimates say that this trend will continue and become even more stronger in the 21st century, when due to digitalization and the changes it brings, a countries' ability to successfully adapt to the changed circumstances will directly depend on their educated population. In other words, countries with an educated population will have more productive workers, innovative scientists and will be able to come up with more creative solutions than countries with poorly developed economic and education systems. As a consequence, workers in such countries will receive higher salaries, and these countries will be more desirable places to live. **10. Impossibility of (adequate) participation in political and social life** Without a comprehensive education in both sciences and humanities, a person will lack the knowledge and tools that enable them to make intelligent and meaningful political decisions. Who to vote for in the elections, which initiatives to support, who and what to trust, all these are things one must decide about with care and commitment. It is education that enables open dialogue, constructive exchange of opinions, and joint search for the best solution for society as a whole. Therefore, it helps the individual not to fall prey to political marketing, but to base their decisions on their own thoughts and views.

Contention 2: Propaganda

Generative AI is used to spread propaganda **Ryan-Mosley 23**

Tate Ryan-Mosley. "How Generative AI Is Boosting the Spread of Disinformation and Propaganda." MIT Technology Review, 4 Oct. 2023, www.technologyreview.com/2023/10/04/1080801/generative-ai-boosting-disinformation-and-propaganda-freedom-house/. Accessed 25 Feb. 2025.

[Tate Ryan-Mosley: the senior tech policy reporter for MIT Technology Review; focus on the impact of new technologies on political systems, human rights and the health of global democracies; also worked on many of our podcasts and data journalism projects; before a reporter for Tech Review, a researcher here working on special newsroom projects; prior to journalism, a consultant on emerging tech strategy for large companies; in 2012, a fellow at the Kellogg Institute for International Studies, specializing in conflict and post-war development.]

As generative AI tools grow more sophisticated, political actors are continuing to deploy the technology to amplify disinformation. Venezuelan state media outlets, for example, spread pro-government messages through AI-generated videos of news anchors from a nonexistent international English-language channel; they were produced by Synthesia, a company that produces custom deepfakes. And in the United States, AI-manipulated videos and images of political leaders have made the rounds on social media. Examples include a video that depicted President Biden making transphobic comments and an image of Donald Trump hugging Anthony Fauci. In addition to generative AI tools, governments persisted with older tactics, like using a combination of human and bot campaigns to manipulate online discussions. **At least 47 governments deployed commentators to spread propaganda in 2023—double the number a decade ago.** And though these developments are not necessarily surprising, Funk says one of the most interesting findings is that the widespread **accessibility of generative AI can undermine trust in verifiable facts.** As AI-generated content on the internet becomes normalized, **"it's going to allow for political actors to cast doubt about reliable information,"** says Funk. **It's a phenomenon known as "liar's dividend," in which wariness of fabrication makes people more skeptical of true information, particularly in times of crisis or political conflict when false information can run rampant.** For example, in April 2023, leaked recordings of Palanivel Thiagarajan, a prominent Indian official, sparked controversy after they showed the politician disparaging fellow party members. And while Thiagarajan denounced the audio clips as machine generated, independent researchers determined that at least one of the recordings was authentic.

Generative AI does this easily **DW 24**

Endert, Julius. "Generative AI Is the Ultimate Disinformation Amplifier." Deutsche Welle, 17 Mar. 2024, [akademie.dw.com/en/generative-ai-is-the-ultimate-disinformation-amplifier/a-68593890](https://www.akademie.dw.com/en/generative-ai-is-the-ultimate-disinformation-amplifier/a-68593890). Accessed 25 Feb. 2025.

[DW: a German public, state-owned international broadcaster funded by the German federal tax budget; available in 32 languages; satellite television service consists of channels in English, Spanish, and Arabic; work of DW is regulated by the Deutsche Welle Act, stating that content is intended to be independent of government influence; a member of the European Broadcasting Union (EBU)]

With GAI, the volume of disinformation potentially becomes infinite rendering fact checking an insufficient tool. As the marginal **costs of the production** of disinformation fall towards **zero**, the **costs of dissemination** are also **nearly zero thanks to social media.** On top of this, individuals can now use user-friendly apps to easily and quickly generate sophisticated and convincing GAI content such as deep fake videos and voice clones – content that previously needed entire teams of tech-savvy individuals to produce. **This democratization of deep fake technology lowers the barrier of entry for creating and disseminating false narratives and misleading content online.** **Malign actors can easily leverage chatbots to spread falsehood across the internet at record speed, regardless of the language.** Text-to-text chatbots, such as ChatGPT or Gemini, or image generators, such as Midjourney, DALL-E or Stable Diffusion, **can be used to create massive amounts of text as well as highly realistic fake audio, images and videos to spread misinformation and disinformation.** This can lead to false narratives, country-specific misinformation, manipulation of public opinion and even harm to individuals or organizations. **In a 2023 study, researchers at the University of Zurich in Switzerland found that generative AI can produce accurate information that is easier to understand, but it can also produce more compelling disinformation. Participants also failed to**

distinguish between posts on X, formerly Twitter, written by GPT-3 and written by real people. GAI applications can be combined to automate the whole process of content production, distribution and amplification. Fully synthetic visual material can be produced from a text prompt, and websites can be programmed automatically.

This affects governments **DW 24**

Endert, Julius. "Generative AI Is the Ultimate Disinformation Amplifier." Deutsche Welle, 17 Mar. 2024, [akademie.dw.com/en/generative-ai-is-the-ultimate-disinformation-amplifier/a-68593890](https://www.akademie.dw.com/en/generative-ai-is-the-ultimate-disinformation-amplifier/a-68593890). Accessed 26 Feb. 2025.

[DW]: a German public, state-owned international broadcaster funded by the German federal tax budget; available in 32 languages; satellite television service consists of channels in English, Spanish, and Arabic; work of DW is regulated by the Deutsche Welle Act, stating that content is intended to be independent of government influence; a member of the European Broadcasting Union (EBU)]

ChatGPT reproduces harmful narratives propagated by authoritarian regimes when given hypothetical prompts, finds research by Democracy Reporting International. In one case study, researchers were able to prompt ChatGPT to emulate a reporter from Russia Today, a state-controlled news organization. By doing this, they were able to get ChatGPT to circumvent its safeguards and produce problematic outputs such as advocating for the "need to de-nazify Ukraine," which is a common Russian narrative used to justify their 2022 invasion of Ukraine. The research demonstrated the relative ease with which AI chatbots can be co-opted by malicious actors to produce misleading or false information regardless of the language used. As such, generative AI models developed in authoritarian countries — with possible state involvement — have implications that extend beyond the confines of these states. "The world's most technically advanced authoritarian governments have responded to innovations in AI chatbot technology, attempting to ensure that the applications comply with or strengthen their censorship systems. Legal frameworks in at least 21 countries mandate or incentivize digital platforms to deploy machine learning to remove disfavored political, social, and religious speech." Democracy Reporting International finds, "With user-friendly online tools powered by these models, they are becoming increasingly accessible globally. This ensures that the biases and propaganda originating from these models' home countries will proliferate far beyond their borders."

Problem 4: GAI could negatively impact elections

Elections and generative AI have a special connection. This is because the actors involved in elections always pursue specific goals: to either win power for their allies or themselves or to influence a foreign country's political landscape. GAI enables such actors to create "unreality," and it's becoming a weapon in information warfare and influence operations. Such campaigns are mostly coordinated, concerted, evaluated, measured and funded by political or foreign actors. "These actors see information as a theater of war," says Carl Miller, the founder of the UK-based Centre for the Analysis of Social Media, in a recent podcast. Research by the International Center for Journalists found election disinformation had common and cyclical patterns regardless of the country they examined. For example, the narrative that votes were cast in the name of deceased people or disinformation about what documents were needed to vote were found in a range of nations. Generative AI is a perfect tool for creating such campaigns. In January 2024, the attorney general in the US state of New Hampshire said it was investigating an apparent robocall that used artificial intelligence to mimic US President Joe Biden's voice and discourage people from voting during the state's primary election.

Csernatori 24

"Can Democracy Survive the Disruptive Power of AI?" Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2024, [carnegieendowment.org/research/2024/12/can-democracy-survive-the-disruptive-power-of-ai?lang=en](https://www.carnegieendowment.org/research/2024/12/can-democracy-survive-the-disruptive-power-of-ai?lang=en). Accessed 26 Feb. 2025.

[Raluca Csernatori]: a professor on European Security and Defence with the Brussels School of Governance (BSoG) and its Centre for Security, Diplomacy and Strategy (CSDS), at Vrije Universiteit Brussel (VUB), Belgium]

AI advancements are occurring at such a scale and speed that it is almost impossible for any government, company, or individual to predict future trajectories or how they will reshape societies. Since 2022, more than 15 billion images have been created using text-to-image algorithms, and with the launch of OpenAI's DALL-E 2—an AI system that can create realistic images and art from a description in natural language—people are generating an average of 34 million images per day. Generative AI models played a

role in the 2024 U.S. presidential race, with AI-generated fake images and deepfakes flooding social media platforms. Deepfakes are synthetic media in which AI techniques replace a person in an existing image or video with someone else's likeness or generate a brand-new image of a person. Deceptive pictures, videos, and audio are rapidly proliferating because of the rise and misuse of generative AI tools and fake news websites. AI-generated synthetic content has permeated the U.S. political sphere, where it is often shared by high-profile figures like U.S. President-Elect Donald Trump and his allies, who repeatedly promote AI-created memes and deepfakes. A case in point: Trump reposted an AI-generated fake image of singer Taylor Swift endorsing his election campaign, which she never did. Democrats also posted AI-made fake photos of Trump being arrested. Such fakes could result in wide-reaching and immensely damaging instances of misinformation and disinformation. Meanwhile, deepfake audio clips of British Prime Minister Keir Starmer and Slovakia's opposition head, Michal Šimečka, ignited social media controversies when they spread rapidly before fact-checkers exposed them as fabrications. The destructive power of deepfakes also hit home in Türkiye when a presidential candidate withdrew from the May 2023 election after explicit AI-generated videos went viral. In Argentina's October 2023 presidential election, both leading candidates deployed deepfakes by creating campaign posters and materials that mocked their opponents—tactics that escalated into full-blown AI memetic warfare to sway voters. Thus, the impact of generative AI models is likely to depend on how they are used by political opponents and featured on social media—that is, how they are introduced into an already complex information environment, where many variables inform the way AI-generated content will be received. While some dismiss this content as another form of political satire, the relentless barrage of AI-generated misinformation and disinformation will likely increase voter confusion, create false perceptions of candidates, and fuel cynicism toward the entire electoral process. Female politicians, especially, face a much greater threat of deepfakes than their male counterparts because of gender disinformation, sexualized targeting, and societal biases, which amplify reputational harm, online harassment, and the emotional toll, eroding public trust in women's leadership.

IMPACT: Authoritarianism Dreiling 24

"Editors' Introduction: Truth-Telling and Propaganda." AAUP, 24 Oct. 2024, www.aaup.org/JAF15/truth-telling-propaganda. Accessed 7 Mar. 2025.
[Michael C. Dreiling: professor of sociology at the University of Oregon, where he specializes in political and environmental sociology; he served two terms as president of AAUP Oregon and three terms as the inaugural president of United Academics at the University of Oregon from 2013 to 2018; from 2014 to 2020, he worked alongside allies and faculty activists to help unionize three additional bargaining units in Oregon]

Compounding the impacts of illiberal, authoritarian movements that target higher education and academic freedom, social media platforms and conservative mass media expand the reach of misinformation and propaganda. Artificial intelligence (AI) introduces news to the arbiters and institutions that fortify informed speech in the public sphere. Higher education is clearly at the center of these societal rifts between truth-telling and propaganda, and faculty and students are increasingly affected by malevolent interests seeking to blur the distinction. As disinformation and misinformation are routinely deployed by authoritarian actors on subnational, national, and international stages, these propagandistic initiatives foment hostilities and destabilize public spheres in more open and inclusive societies while quelling inquiry and dissent in authoritarian spaces. Authoritarian attacks on democracy and public truth-telling run parallel to attacks on academic freedom and increasingly deploy new technologies toward these ends. New media technologies such as deepfakes deliver contemporary propaganda that masquerades as informed speech to manufacture, suppress, or deny factual, inclusive, and validated claims. The ubiquity of these technologies—once thought to have liberatory goals—poses key questions to the critical methods and discourses of academic knowledge production. Who will train future generations to distinguish legitimate truth-telling from fake news, alternative facts, and the vast streams of misinformation and disinformation? Higher education is a clearinghouse for adjudicating truth claims, and academic freedom is the ethical commitment that ensures its integrity. From the peddling of conspiracy theories to the approval of far-right, nonacademic content for public school curricula, the rift is widening between propagandistic, faith-based assertions or partisan opinions and informed, well-reasoned, and externally vetted truth claims. Naming this rift and identifying the propagandists who put power and ideology over sincerity and authenticity is a necessary act in the history of truth-telling—and a defense against threats to a multiethnic democracy.

Authoritarian governments use structural violence **Levin 21**

Borsuk, Imren, and Paul T. Levin. "Social Coexistence and Violence during Turkey's Authoritarian Transition." *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies*, vol. 21, no. 2, Apr. 2021, pp. 175–87, <https://doi.org/10.1080/14683857.2021.1909292>.

[**Paul T. Levin**: Director of the Stockholm University Institute for Turkish Studies; work focuses on Turkish politics and international relations, Turkey-EU relations, foreign aid, nationalism, collective identity, governance, democracy, and authoritarianism]

The complexity of these authoritarian practices call attention not only to direct forms of violence, e.g. repression, terrorism, torture, or crimes, but also to indirect forms of violence such as structural, symbolic, and everyday violence to understand the changing dynamics of social coexistence and conflict during authoritarian transitions (for an extensive analysis, see Scheper-Hughes and Bourgois Citation2004). The erosion of rule of law and the decline of democratic institutions can have a dramatic impact on structural violence that is embedded in power relations and structural inequalities deteriorating the rights of disadvantaged groups like ethnic and religious minorities, sexual minorities, women, migrants, etc. Polarizing and securitizing discourses that consistently create majorities and minorities in society reify social differences and aggravate symbolic violence that is anchored into the normative order of society. Conversely, refusal to recognize groups and their grievances and attempts to silence minorities may amount to another form of structural violence as discrimination and inequalities in societies go unaddressed. There are also everyday forms of violence, such as interpersonal violence, domestic violence, or vigilantism, that are intertwined with broader relations of patronage, conflict, and cooptation in society but not considered as violent conflict per se, falling short of what at least most large-N studies of civil war or ethnic conflict examine. In this special issue, we propose to consider violent conflict as a phenomenon that occurs along a broad spectrum ranging from small to large scale violence, and from indirect to direct forms of violence. Not limiting ourselves to massive outbreaks of violence between or directed at certain groups allows the contributions in this special issue to identify a broader range of social, political, economic, and psychological consequences of democratic breakdown and societal violence. Doing so, we hope, also allows for a richer assessment of the potential for sustainable peacebuilding and social reconciliation processes in the future.

Rebuttals:

T-AI has implicit biases against people with disabilities.

Fetzer 23 [Fetzer, Mary. "Trained AI Models Exhibit Learned Disability Bias, IST Researchers Say | Penn State University." *Psu.edu*, Penn State University, 30 Nov.

2023, www.psu.edu/news/information-sciences-and-technology/story/trained-ai-models-exhibit-learned-disability-bias-ist. Accessed

1 Mar. 2025.] UNIVERSITY PARK, Pa. — A growing number of organizations are using sentiment analysis tools from third-party artificial intelligence (AI)

services to categorize large amounts of text into negative, neutral or positive sentences for social applications ranging from health care to policymaking. These tools, however, are driven by learned associations that often contain biases against persons with disabilities, according to researchers from the [Penn State College of Information Sciences and Technology \(IST\)](#). In the paper "Automated Ableism: An Exploration of Explicit Disability Biases in Artificial

Intelligence as a Service (AlaaS) Sentiment and Toxicity Analysis Models," researchers detailed an analysis of biases against people with disabilities contained in the natural language processing (NLP) algorithms and models they tested. The work, led by Shomir Wilson, assistant professor in IST and

director of the [Human Language Technologies Lab](#), received the Best Short Paper Award from the 2023 Workshop on Trustworthy Natural Language Processing at the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, held July 9–14 in Toronto, Canada. “We wanted to examine whether the nature of a discussion or an NLP model’s learned associations contributed to disability bias,” said Pranav Narayanan Venkit, a doctoral student in the College of IST and first author on the paper. “This is important because real-world organizations that outsource their AI needs may unknowingly deploy biased models.” “Organizations that outsource their AI needs may unknowingly deploy biased models.” Pranav Narayanan Venkit, doctoral student in the College of IST The researchers defined disability bias as treating a person with a disability less favorably than someone without a disability in similar circumstances and explicit bias as the intentional association of stereotypes toward a specific population. A growing number of organizations are using AlaaS, or Artificial Intelligence as a Service, for easy-to-use NLP tools that involve little investment or risk for the organization, according to the researchers. Among these tools are sentiment and toxicity analyses that enable an organization to categorize and score large volumes of textual data into negative, neutral or positive sentences. Sentiment analysis is the NLP technique for extracting subjective information — thoughts, attitudes, emotions and sentiments — from social media posts, product reviews, political analyses or market research surveys. Toxicity detection models look for inflammatory or content — such as hate speech or offensive language — that can undermine a civil exchange or conversation. The researchers conducted a two-stage study of disability bias in NLP tools. They first studied social media conversations related to people with disabilities, specifically on Twitter and Reddit, to gain insight into how bias is disseminated in real-world social settings. They crawled blog posts and comments from a one-year period that specifically addressed perspectives on people with disabilities or contained the terms or hashtags “disability” or “disabled.” The results were filtered and categorized and then statistically analyzed with popular sentiment and toxicity analysis models to quantify any disability bias and harm present in the conversations. “Statements referring to people with disabilities versus other control categories received significantly more negative and toxic scores than statements from other control categories,” said contributing author Mukund Srinath, a doctoral student in the College of IST. “We wanted to test whether these biases arise from discussions surrounding conversations regarding people with disabilities or from associations made within trained sentiment and toxicity analysis models and found that the main source of bias disseminated from the models rather than the actual context of the conversation.” The researchers then created the Bias Identification Test in Sentiment (BITS) corpus to help anyone identify explicit disability bias in any AlaaS sentiment analysis and toxicity detection models, according to Venkit. They used the corpus to show how popular sentiment and toxicity analysis tools contain explicit disability bias. “All of the public models we studied exhibited significant bias against disability,” Venkit said. “There was a problematic tendency to classify sentences as negative and toxic based solely on the presence of disability-related terms, such as ‘blind,’ without regard for contextual meaning, showcasing explicit bias against terms associated with disability.”

Answer: Educational AI is not built with disabilities in mind **Langreo 24**

Lauraine Langreo. “The Students Who Are Overlooked by Most AI Tools.” Education Week, 2 Oct. 2024, www.edweek.org/technology/the-students-who-are-overlooked-by-most-ai-tools/2024/10. Accessed 4 Mar. 2025.

[Lauraine Langreo: Education Week staff writer, covering education technology, learning environments, future of work and student wellness issues. She previously worked as a digital producer and Morning Education newsletter writer at Politico]

But the problem is that many generative AI tools are not built with diverse learners in mind, according to the report. The datasets that AI tools are trained on tend to lack diversity in their samples, the report said. For instance, if an AI grading tool is designed to evaluate written responses based on standard grammatical and stylistic norms, it might unfairly penalize students with disabilities such as dyslexia, who may struggle with spelling and grammar. This could result in lower grades for these students, even if they understand the material. Another big challenge is that AI tools often require personal data to function effectively, including sensitive information about students’ disabilities, which schools do not want to fall into the hands of hackers or other bad actors online, the report said.

Answer: Generative A.I. has language biases

Agudo, Roberto Rey. “‘Sorry, I Didn’t Get That’: AI Misunderstands Some People’s Words More than Others.” The Conversation, 27 Jan. 2025, theconversation.com/sorry-i-didnt-get-that-ai-misunderstands-some-peoples-words-more-than-others-239281#:~:text=For%20people%20who%20do%20not,than%20in%20any%20other%20language.//Anderson

‘Proper’ English

For people who do not speak English – which is to say, most people around the world – the challenges are even greater. Most of the world’s largest generative AI systems were built in English, and they work far better in English than in any other language.

On paper, AI has lots of civic potential for translation and increasing people’s access to information in different languages, but for now, most languages have a smaller digital footprint, making it difficult for them to power large language models. Even within languages well-served by large language models, like English and Spanish, your experience varies depending on which dialect of the language you speak.

Right now, most speech recognition systems and generative AI chatbots reflect the linguistic biases of the datasets they are trained on. They echo prescriptive, sometimes prejudiced notions of “correctness” in speech.

In fact, AI has been proved to “flatten” linguistic diversity. There are now AI startup companies that offer to erase the accents of their users, drawing on the assumption that their primary clientele would be customer service providers with call centers in foreign countries like India or the Philippines. The offering perpetuates the notion that some accents are less valid than others.