

The Authenticity Offensive: AI Distrust as a Vector in the Minimisation Plan

The Paradox of Progress: Declining Trust in an Era of Accelerating AI Capability

The period since 2020 has been defined by a technological surge in the field of Artificial Intelligence (AI) that is historically unprecedented in both its speed and its public impact. This "Generative AI Boom" has seen the rapid development and deployment of Large Language Models (LLMs) with exponentially increasing capabilities. Yet, this era of remarkable progress is shadowed by a significant and growing paradox: as the objective, measurable performance of AI systems has dramatically improved, public trust in these systems has stagnated or, in key demographics, actively declined. This divergence between technological capability and social acceptance represents a critical vulnerability. It suggests that the public's perception of AI is being shaped by forces other than the technology's intrinsic performance, creating a "trust gap" that is not a natural market phenomenon but a potential battlespace for strategic competition.

The Capability Surge

The public-facing era of generative AI began in earnest with the release of OpenAI's GPT-3 in June 2020. This was followed by a series of rapid, transformative releases that brought the technology from research labs into the daily lives of hundreds of millions of people. Key milestones in this timeline include the launch of ChatGPT in November 2022, which became the fastest-growing consumer application in history, and the subsequent releases of powerful competing models from major technology firms, including Google's Bard (later rebranded Gemini) in March 2023 and Anthropic's Claude, also in March 2023. Each successive generation of models, such as GPT-4 (March 2023), Claude 3 (March 2024), and Gemini 1.5 (2024), has represented a significant leap in capability.

This improvement is not merely anecdotal; it is quantifiable through standardized academic and industry benchmarks. One of the most respected benchmarks is the Massive Multitask Language Understanding (MMLU) test, which evaluates a model's knowledge and problem-solving abilities across 57 subjects, including professional and academic disciplines. The performance progression on this benchmark is stark. When MMLU was first introduced, GPT-3 achieved an accuracy of 43.9%. Less than three years later, GPT-4 scored 86.4% on the same test, nearly doubling the performance and approaching the estimated human-expert level of 89.8%. Subsequent models, such as Anthropic's Claude 3 Opus, have further pushed this boundary, achieving scores of 88.2%. This data demonstrates a clear and rapid trajectory of increasing accuracy, reliability, and expert-level knowledge assimilation by these systems. The development of more comprehensive evaluation frameworks, such as the Holistic Evaluation of Language Models (HELM), further signifies the maturation of the field, moving beyond simple accuracy to assess fairness, bias, and toxicity.

The Trust Deficit

In stark contrast to this upward trend in capability, public trust in AI has followed a negative trajectory. Polling conducted by the Pew Research Center in late 2023 revealed that 52% of Americans were more concerned than excited about the increasing use of AI in daily life, while only 10% reported being more excited. This represents a growing sense of caution within the populace.

This concern translates directly into a lack of trust in the institutions developing the technology. Data from the Edelman Trust Barometer shows a precipitous 15-point decline in trust in AI companies within the United States between 2019 and 2024, falling from a neutral 50% to a deeply distrusted 35%. This period of eroding trust coincides precisely with the technology's most significant public breakthroughs and widest adoption.

The skepticism is particularly acute when it comes to the reliability of AI-generated content. A 2025 survey on AI-powered search results found that 82% of users are at least somewhat skeptical of the information provided, with 21% stating they never trust it. This is not an abstract fear; 71% of users reported having personally experienced a significant mistake in an AI-generated search summary, with the most common issue being "inaccurate or misleading content".

While some of this mistrust is a rational response to the technology's known limitations—such as a tendency to "hallucinate" facts, perpetuate biases present in training data, or be misused for malicious purposes—these are technical challenges that are being actively researched and mitigated. The broader, more corrosive narrative of inherent untrustworthiness, however, appears to be decoupling from the reality of the technology's rapid improvement. This growing gap between objective capability and subjective trust is not a simple market dynamic; it is a strategic vulnerability that can be exploited to nullify a nation's technological advantage from within, turning a story of innovation into one of societal anxiety and rejection.

AI Distrust as an Attack Vector in the 'Minimisation Plan'

The anomalous divergence between AI's accelerating capability and declining public trust cannot be fully understood as a mere social or technological phenomenon. When viewed through the strategic framework of the 'Minimisation Plan'—a theorized multi-decade, multi-domain campaign by a Sino-Russian alliance to erode Western power—the cultivation of AI distrust emerges as a deliberate, low-cost, high-impact line of effort. This strategic lens reframes the "trust gap" not as an unfortunate side effect of innovation, but as the intended outcome of a sophisticated information warfare campaign designed to neutralize a key future advantage of the United States and its allies.

The 'Minimisation Plan' and the Centrality of Information Warfare

The 'Minimisation Plan' is posited as a coherent grand strategy initiated around 2001, coinciding with the establishment of the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation (SCO) and the signing of the Sino-Russian Treaty of Good-Neighborliness. Its overarching objective is the systematic erosion of the US-led international order and its replacement with a multipolar framework more amenable to authoritarian governance. The plan operates through interconnected pillars of military pressure, economic attrition, and, crucially, ideological and information warfare.

This information warfare component is central to the plan's strategy of inducing "strategic exhaustion" in the West. It operates by systematically attacking the institutional and social cohesion of democratic societies. The plan's architects have demonstrated a mastery of identifying, co-opting, and weaponizing organic conspiracy theories and social fissures to achieve their objectives. This has been executed in distinct phases, evolving from seeding institutional distrust in the aftermath of the 9/11 attacks to mainstreaming the narrative of a corrupt "deep state" through the QAnon phenomenon, and culminating in the weaponization of the Jeffrey Epstein scandal to execute a global "Reputation Flip" against the moral authority of the United States.

AI as a High-Value Strategic Target

As a foundational technology in which the United States and its allies currently hold a significant lead, AI represents a critical and logical target for this information warfare doctrine. The West's advantage in AI is not merely economic; it is a cornerstone of future military, intelligence, and societal power. Consequently, undermining public and institutional trust in AI directly serves the core objectives of the 'Minimisation Plan' in several ways:

- **Economic Attrition:** Fostering widespread skepticism slows the adoption of AI technologies, creating a "digital drag" on Western economies. This delays the productivity gains and innovation cycles that are essential for long-term competitiveness, thereby contributing to the goal of economic attrition.
- **Erosion of Institutional Coherence:** By framing AI as inherently biased, unreliable, or "soulless," the campaign casts doubt on any institution—government, media, academia, or corporations—that relies on it. This extends the existing strategy of institutional delegitimization into the technological domain.
- **Undermining Military-Technical Advantage:** A public that is deeply distrustful of AI is less likely to support the integration of autonomous systems into critical defense and intelligence infrastructure. This can create political friction and slow the fielding of next-generation military capabilities, directly degrading a key Western advantage.

This attack vector is a sophisticated application of the philosophical concepts that reportedly underpin the 'Minimisation Plan's' strategic logic. The campaign against AI trust can be understood as a "rhizomatic" attack—a decentralized, networked assault that spreads through innumerable nodes online and lacks a single, identifiable command structure. This makes it highly resilient to traditional, hierarchical ("arborescent") methods of fact-checking and debunking. The objective is not to replace a "true" narrative about AI with a single "false" one. Instead, the goal is to introduce a multiplicity of potent "simulacra"—competing, self-validating realities such as "AI is racist," "AI is a corporate tool of control," "AI will destroy humanity," "AI is soulless"—that collectively shatter the possibility of a stable, trusted consensus on the technology's value, thereby paralyzing its societal integration. This approach represents a forward-looking evolution of the plan's information warfare doctrine. It moves beyond attacking the legitimacy of past events or present institutions to actively sabotaging a foundational pillar of the West's future power.

The "Proper English" Psyop: Deconstructing the Narrative Weapon

At the heart of the campaign to erode trust in AI is a specific and insidious psychological

operation: the narrative that equates articulate, well-structured, and grammatically correct English with "soulless," "untrue," and untrustworthy AI-generated content. This psyop functions as a cognitive attack vector by inverting traditional markers of credibility and intelligence, transforming clarity of expression into a signifier of inauthenticity. By dissecting its linguistic and psychological mechanisms, it becomes clear that this is not an organic critique of technology but a deliberately crafted weapon designed to degrade the quality of public discourse and sow widespread epistemic confusion.

The Narrative and its Linguistic Targets

The core of this psychological operation is the propagation of the idea, primarily through social media and online forums, that "good writing is automatically AI-generated". This narrative specifically targets and pathologizes the hallmarks of formal and effective communication. Users online frequently dismiss posts as AI-generated if they exhibit a sophisticated vocabulary, flawless grammar, or the correct usage of punctuation such as em dashes and semicolons. These elements, traditionally taught as components of strong writing, are reframed as artificial and suspect.

This primary narrative is amplified by the powerful and emotionally resonant trope that AI-generated text is inherently "soulless," "sterile," or "bland". AI content is often characterized as lacking emotional depth, personal anecdotes, and the unique voice that signals human experience. While this critique may hold true for early or poorly prompted AI models, the psyop weaponizes it to create a false and damaging dichotomy: "perfect but soulless" (implying AI) versus "flawed but authentic" (implying human). This binary actively encourages suspicion of any communication that appears polished or professional.

The narrative's effectiveness lies in its simplistic appeal, which bypasses the more complex reality of AI text detection. Academic linguistic analysis identifies more nuanced and reliable markers of machine-generated text, such as low "perplexity" (high predictability of word choice), low "burstiness" (less variation in sentence length), the overuse of specific adjectives, and the repetition of underlying syntactic templates. The psyop, however, ignores these technical details in favor of a simple, easily transmissible, and socially corrosive message: "If it sounds too smart, it's a machine." This narrative is further reinforced by legitimate concerns that AI writing assistants can homogenize writing styles toward Western, and specifically American, norms, a phenomenon some researchers have termed "AI colonialism". This valid observation is co-opted by the psyop to suggest that any clear, standardized English is inherently a form of inauthentic "Western AI" output, a framing that can alienate non-native speakers and foster suspicion around global standards of communication.

This cognitive warfare tactic represents a fundamental assault on the intellectual traditions of the Enlightenment, which value clarity, reason, and articulate expression as the essential vehicles for conveying truth and facilitating rational debate. In this value system, proper grammar and a rich vocabulary are not affectations but tools for precision and the unambiguous exchange of ideas. The psyop works by systematically inverting this hierarchy. It reframes clarity as "robotic," correctness as "inauthentic," and sophisticated language as "soulless." This fosters a cognitive environment where ambiguity, grammatical errors, and emotional appeals are elevated as markers of "human authenticity" and, by extension, trustworthiness.

The strategic consequences are profound. It degrades the quality of public discourse by making reasoned, evidence-based argumentation inherently suspect. If any well-articulated position can be summarily dismissed with the accusation—"That sounds like ChatGPT"—it becomes a powerful, low-effort tool for derailing debate, discrediting experts, and eroding trust in any

institution, from journalism to government, that relies on clear and formal communication to convey its message. This is a direct attack on the logical, hierarchical model of knowledge, fostering a chaotic information space where all claims, regardless of their articulation or evidentiary basis, are reduced to the same level of questionable validity.

A Comparative Timeline: AI Accuracy vs. Public Perception (2020-2025)

To fully grasp the manufactured nature of the AI "trust gap," it is essential to juxtapose the objective, data-driven reality of AI's rapid improvement against the subjective, poll-driven evidence of public perception. The following timeline and data analysis for the period of 2020 to 2025 reveals a stark and widening chasm. This divergence demonstrates that public opinion on AI is being shaped more by high-profile failures and negative narratives than by the technology's underlying and accelerating capabilities, creating the precise perception-reality gap that hostile information operations are designed to exploit.

The timeline begins with the public release of foundational Large Language Models, which marks the start of widespread public interaction with generative AI.

Table 1: Timeline of Major LLM Public Releases (2020-2025)		
Model/Product	Developer	Public Release Date
GPT-3	OpenAI	June 2020
ChatGPT (GPT-3.5)	OpenAI	November 30, 2022
Google Bard (LaMDA)	Google	March 21, 2023
Claude	Anthropic	March 2023
GPT-4	OpenAI	March 2023
Claude 2	Anthropic	July 2023
Claude 3 (Opus, Sonnet, Haiku)	Anthropic	March 4, 2024
Gemini 1.5 Pro	Google	2024
Sources:		

Concurrent with these public releases, the underlying capability of the models surged. This is best illustrated by tracking their performance on the MMLU benchmark, a standardized test of expert-level knowledge.

Table 2: Evolution of LLM Performance on Key Benchmarks (MMLU)		
Model	Release Year	MMLU Score (5-shot)
GPT-3	2020	43.9%
Claude 2	2023	78.5%
GPT-4	2023	86.4%
Gemini 1.0 Ultra	2023	83.7% (Implied)
Claude 3 Opus	2024	88.2%
GPT-4.1	2025	90.2%
Sources:		

The data in Table 2 shows a clear, objective, and dramatic improvement in performance. In less

than four years, the accuracy of leading models on this complex, multi-domain test of knowledge nearly doubled, rapidly approaching the estimated human-expert level of around 90%.

However, when this objective improvement is compared against longitudinal polling of public attitudes, a contradictory trend emerges. Instead of growing trust commensurate with improving reliability, public sentiment has soured.

Table 3: Public Trust in AI: A Longitudinal Poll Analysis (2022-2025)			
Survey Source	Date	Key Metric	Result
Edelman	2019	% Trust in AI Companies (U.S.)	50%
Pew Research	Dec 2022	% U.S. Adults More Concerned than Excited	37%
Pew Research	Aug 2023	% U.S. Adults More Concerned than Excited	52%
YouGov	Mar 2024	% Do Not Trust AI for Accurate Info	45%
Edelman	2024	% Trust in AI Companies (U.S.)	35%
Exploding Topics	2025	% Never/Sometimes Trust AI Search	82%
Sources:			

The timeline reveals a clear pattern of divergence. The public release of ChatGPT in late 2022 created a massive spike in public awareness and usage. This widespread interaction inevitably exposed a broad user base to the technology's flaws, such as factual inaccuracies or "hallucinations". These failures, while representing a minority of outputs, became high-profile, emotionally resonant events that were widely amplified by both traditional and social media. Meanwhile, the steady, incremental, but ultimately more significant gains in underlying capability, as demonstrated by the MMLU scores, remained abstract and less visible to the public. The result is a public opinion landscape anchored to the most salient and negative data points—the failures—rather than the less visible but more powerful trend of improvement. This creates an asymmetric advantage for hostile actors engaged in information warfare. A single, viral example of an AI error can inflict more damage on public trust than dozens of academic papers demonstrating a 10% improvement in benchmark accuracy can do to build it. The battle for public perception is thus being won not by the side with the better technology, but by the side that most effectively controls the narrative surrounding the technology's inevitable imperfections.

Triangulating the Attack: Tracing Ideologically Casual Anti-AI Narratives

To move beyond correlation and establish a plausible link between the AI "trust gap" and the strategic objectives of the 'Minimisation Plan', it is necessary to trace the origins and amplification of key anti-AI narratives. An analysis of the content and dissemination patterns of

Russian and Chinese state media and their associated networks reveals a coherent, multi-pronged effort to seed and cultivate AI distrust in the West. While not always centrally directed, these campaigns exhibit a strategic division of labor, with each nation's efforts aligning with its broader role within the theorized Sino-Russian partnership.

Mapping the Narrative Landscape

The anti-AI narratives being propagated are not limited to simple claims of technical inaccuracy. They are "ideologically casual" themes designed to resonate with pre-existing societal anxieties and political fissures. The most prominent of these are:

- **AI as a Tool of Western Hegemony and Bias:** Chinese state-controlled media, particularly outlets like the *Global Times*, consistently frame Western-developed AI as an instrument of cultural and ideological dominance. They argue that these models are inherently biased, trained on Western data, and perpetuate Western values and norms. In response, they advocate for a "multipolar" approach to AI governance and promote China's own model as a more inclusive and equitable alternative, a narrative explicitly designed to appeal to the Global South and fracture any potential for a unified international consensus on AI standards.
- **AI as an Existential Threat and Uncontrollable Force:** Russian media outlets and influence operations focus on amplifying the most alarmist Western discourse surrounding AI. They highlight fears of existential risk, the potential for AI to be used for mass propaganda and disinformation, and its role in eroding social trust and human connection. This strategy often involves citing and quoting Western experts and media reports to lend credibility to these narratives, a classic propaganda technique of using an opponent's own words against them. This aligns perfectly with Russia's documented information warfare doctrine, which prioritizes the creation of chaos, confusion, and strategic paralysis over the promotion of a coherent alternative vision.
- **AI as "Soulless" and Dehumanizing:** While this critique exists organically within Western discourse, it is a theme that is selectively amplified by hostile actors. It positions AI as a fundamental threat to human creativity, authenticity, and emotional connection. Chinese media has also engaged with this theme, particularly in discussions around AI-generated literature, questioning its ability to replicate the "genuine emotion" and "personal experiences" that define human art.

Dissemination and Strategic Division of Labor

The dissemination of these narratives into the Western information ecosystem is a multi-layered process. OpenAI's own threat intelligence reports have identified and disrupted covert influence operations originating from Russia, China, and Iran that used its models to generate and translate content critical of the West. There is also evidence of coordinated content exchange and narrative alignment between Russian state media (such as RT and Sputnik) and their Chinese counterparts (CGTN and *Global Times*). These state-backed narratives then provide the ideological fuel and conceptual frameworks for organic online movements and conspiracy theories to adopt and propagate in a decentralized, rhizomatic fashion.

This approach reveals a clear strategic division of labor that mirrors the two nations' respective roles in the broader 'Minimisation Plan'. China, as the long-term strategic competitor, is focused on a systemic, geopolitical challenge. Its information operations aim to delegitimize the *global standard-setting power* of Western AI, positioning itself as the leader of an alternative,

non-Western technological bloc. Russia, in its role as the strategic "battering ram," engages in more tactical disruption. Its operations are designed to degrade the *social trustworthiness* of AI within Western societies themselves, amplifying fear and chaos to induce paralysis and exacerbate internal divisions. Together, these two lines of effort form a comprehensive, multi-axis assault on the West's ability to capitalize on its own technological innovation, attacking it both from the outside on the geopolitical stage and from the inside within its own public discourse.

Strategic Synthesis and Recommendations

The evidence and analysis presented in this report support a critical conclusion: the fundamental mistrust of AI-generated answers is not merely a social reaction to a nascent technology but is being actively cultivated as a strategic vector of information warfare. This campaign, consistent with the objectives and methods of the theorized 'Minimisation Plan', aims to neutralize a key future technological advantage of the United States and its allies by engineering a "trust gap" between AI's objective capabilities and its public perception. The "Proper English" psyop, which devalues clarity and reason, represents a sophisticated cognitive attack designed to degrade the very foundations of informed public discourse. This multi-faceted threat, waged by a Sino-Russian axis with a clear division of strategic labor, requires an equally integrated and proactive response from Western governments, technology companies, and civil society.

Recommendations

Countering a decentralized, networked, and ideologically-driven threat requires a departure from conventional, reactive measures. An effective counter-strategy must be similarly multi-domain, aiming to build cognitive resilience in the target population while proactively shaping the information environment.

For Government and the Intelligence Community

1. **Reframe the Threat and Assign Ownership:** The cultivation of AI distrust should be officially designated as a vector of hostile state information warfare, moving it from the domain of technology policy to national security. A dedicated inter-agency task force should be established to monitor, analyze, and counter this specific threat.
2. **Wage Proactive Information Warfare through "Pre-bunking":** The West must shift from a defensive posture of "debunking" disinformation after it has spread to a proactive strategy of "pre-bunking". Intelligence assets should be tasked with identifying emerging anti-AI narratives and psyops before they achieve mainstream traction. Coordinated public campaigns should then be launched to expose the narratives, their likely origins, and their strategic intent, thereby inoculating the public by framing the content as hostile manipulation before it is widely encountered.
3. **Promote National Cognitive Resilience:** A national initiative focused on "AI literacy" should be funded. This curriculum must go beyond basic technical understanding to teach citizens how to critically evaluate AI outputs, recognize the linguistic and stylistic hallmarks of manipulative narratives (as distinct from legitimate criticism), and understand the geopolitical context in which these narratives are deployed.

For Technology Companies

1. **Embrace Radical Transparency in Performance and Limitations:** The AI industry must fundamentally shift its public communication strategy. It should move away from abstract benchmark scores (like MMLU) and toward more intuitive, real-world capability demonstrations. Companies should create public-facing dashboards that transparently track model improvements, known limitations, and error rates over time. This would directly counter the narrative of opacity and provide the public with tangible evidence of progress.
2. **Develop an Open Standard for AI-Generated Content Provenance:** Leading AI firms should collaborate to develop and promote an open technical standard for watermarking or cryptographically signing AI-generated content. While not a panacea for sophisticated actors, this would create a significant technical barrier to the most common forms of unattributed AI propaganda and provide a tool for researchers and platforms to identify influence campaigns.
3. **Invest in Demonstrable "Pro-Social" AI Deployment:** To counter the narrative of AI as solely a tool for corporate profit or an existential threat, companies must make significant, high-profile investments in deploying AI for tangible public good. This includes partnerships with trusted institutions in healthcare (e.g., for cancer detection), scientific research, and disaster response to create powerful, positive case studies that dominate the public narrative.

For Media and Civil Society

1. **Reframe the Discourse from "AI vs. Human" to "Effective Tool Use":** Journalistic and public discourse must evolve beyond the simplistic and often false dichotomy of "soulless AI" versus "authentic human." The focus should shift to the responsible and ethical *use* of AI as a tool, emphasizing the continued necessity of human oversight, creativity, critical thinking, and accountability. This reframing helps neutralize the "soulless" critique by correctly positioning AI as an instrument, not an author.
2. **Expose the Psyop:** Investigative journalism and civil society organizations should prioritize exposing the origins and amplification networks of anti-AI disinformation. Making the public aware that their organic skepticism is being deliberately targeted and manipulated by foreign state actors is a powerful form of cognitive defense. This transforms the issue from a simple critique of technology into an act of patriotic resistance to foreign manipulation.

Works cited

1. Generative artificial intelligence - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Generative_artificial_intelligence 2. GPT-3 - Wikipedia, <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/GPT-3> 3. GPT-3 vs. GPT-4: What's the Difference? - Grammarly, <https://www.grammarly.com/blog/ai/gpt-3-vs-gpt-4/> 4. What's the timeframe between each gpt release? (1,2,3,4) : r/singularity, https://www.reddit.com/r/singularity/comments/1lx6ito/whats_the_timeframe_between_each_gpt_release_1234/ 5. en.wikipedia.org, [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Claude_\(language_model\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Claude_(language_model)) 6. OpenAI - Wikipedia, <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/OpenAI> 7. Gemini (chatbot) - Wikipedia,

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gemini_\(chatbot\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gemini_(chatbot)) 8. Google Gemini 1.5 vs 1.0 Pro - what are the differences? - PC Guide, <https://www.pcguide.com/ai/compare/google-gemini-1-5-vs-1-0-pro/> 9. A Complete Guide to LLM Benchmark Categories - Galileo AI, <https://galileo.ai/blog/llm-benchmarks-categories> 10. MMLU - Wikipedia, <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/MMLU> 11. GPT-4 - OpenAI, <https://openai.com/index/gpt-4-research/> 12. Claude 2 vs Claude 3 Opus - LLM Comparison - AnotherWrapper, <https://anotherwrapper.com/tools/llm-pricing/claude-2/claude-3-opus> 13. What are LLM Benchmarks? Evaluations & Challenges - VisionX, <https://visionx.io/blog/what-are-llm-benchmarks/> 14. What the data says about Americans' views of artificial intelligence - Pew Research Center, <https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2023/11/21/what-the-data-says-about-americans-view-s-of-artificial-intelligence/> 15. Rebuilding Trust to Reach AI's Potential - Edelman, <https://www.edelman.com/insights/rebuilding-trust-reach-ai-potential> 16. The AI Trust Gap: 82% Are Skeptical, Yet Only 8% Always Check Sources, <https://explodingtopics.com/blog/ai-trust-gap-research> 17. When AI Gets It Wrong: Addressing AI Hallucinations and Bias, <https://mitsloanedtech.mit.edu/ai/basics/addressing-ai-hallucinations-and-bias/> 18. The Risks of Bias and Errors in Artificial Intelligence - RAND, https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/research_reports/RR1700/RR1744/RAND_RR1744.pdf 19. AI Bias: FTC Cautions Businesses and Offers Guidance - RTInsights, <https://www.rtinsights.com/ai-bias-ftc-cautions-businesses-and-offers-guidance/> 20. NIST: AI Bias Goes Way Beyond Data - RTInsights, <https://www.rtinsights.com/nist-ai-bias-is-goes-way-beyond-data/> 21. How Copyright Law Can Fix Artificial Intelligence's Implicit Bias Problem, <https://digitalcommons.law.uw.edu/wlr/vol93/iss2/2/> 22. The 2025 AI Index Report | Stanford HAI, <https://hai.stanford.edu/ai-index/2025-ai-index-report> 23. I'm so sick of people thinking that good writing is automatically AI-generated. : r/Vent - Reddit, https://www.reddit.com/r/Vent/comments/1lzarlu/im_so_sick_of_people_thinking_that_good_writing/ 24. The tell-tale signs of AI-generated writing – and why they might not matter - SEC Newgate, <https://www.secnewgate.co.uk/our-insights/tell-tale-signs-ai-generated-writing-and-why-they-might-not-matter> 25. Question: Please explain why AI art doesn't have soul or emotion, when it's still a human with soul and emotions who write the prompts. - Reddit, https://www.reddit.com/r/aiwars/comments/1iu4xr0/question_please_explain_why_ai_art_doesnt_have/ 26. AI art doesn't lack 'soul', it lacks signal - Richard Marmorstein, <https://twitchard.github.io/posts/2025-03-27-ai-art-doesnt-lack-soul-it-lacks-signal.html> 27. Sterile Soulless Writing. To what extent should you use AI as a... | by Jorgen Winther | Wake. Write. Win. | Medium, <https://medium.com/wake-write-win/sterile-soulless-writing-ef5b305064db> 28. AI's Soulless Content Crisis: How Brands Fight Liability and gain Reproducible Genius, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=T_gl2xX_Dss 29. Detect AI | How to Tell if a Story is AI-Generated | Talefy Blog, <https://talefy.ai/blog/how-to-detect-ai-and-ensure-content-authenticity> 30. Detecting AI-Generated Text with Pre-Trained Models using Linguistic Features - ACL Anthology, <https://aclanthology.org/2024.icon-1.21.pdf> 31. Linguistic Markers of Inherently False AI Communication and Intentionally False Human Communication - OSF, <https://osf.io/preprints/psyarxiv/mnyz8/download> 32. How can you tell if text is AI generated? Researchers have figured out a new method, <https://news.northeastern.edu/2024/10/30/how-to-tell-if-text-is-ai-generated/> 33. Unmasking

AI-Generated Texts Using Linguistic and Stylistic Features - The Science and Information (SAI) Organization,
https://thesai.org/Downloads/Volume16No3/Paper_21-Unmasking_AI_Generated_Texts.pdf 34. AI Suggestions Homogenize Writing Toward Western Styles and Diminish Cultural Nuances, <https://arxiv.org/html/2409.11360v2> 35. AI suggestions make writing more generic, Western | Cornell Chronicle,
<https://news.cornell.edu/stories/2025/04/ai-suggestions-make-writing-more-generic-western> 36. Google Bard release date: confirmed - PC Guide,
<https://www.pcguide.com/apps/google-bard-release-date/> 37. China's global AI cooperation organization a shared interest - Global ...,
<https://www.globaltimes.cn/page/202508/1340078.shtml> 38. GT Voice: China's inclusive AI approach a response to Western tech ...,
<https://www.globaltimes.cn/page/202502/1328269.shtml> 39. US 'China AI threat' narrative is a recycled tech containment strategy ..., <https://www.globaltimes.cn/page/202503/1331030.shtml> 40. Russia Is Expanding Its Disinformation Tools Using AI - Служба зовнішньої розвідки України,
<https://szru.gov.ua/en/news-media/news/russia-is-expanding-its-disinformation-tools-using-ai> 41. Is Russia really 'grooming' Western AI? | Media - Al Jazeera,
<https://www.aljazeera.com/opinions/2025/7/8/is-russia-really-grooming-western> 42. Stochastic lies: How LLM-powered chatbots deal with Russian disinformation about the war in Ukraine | HKS Misinformation Review,
<https://misinforeview.hks.harvard.edu/article/stochastic-lies-how-llm-powered-chatbots-deal-with-russian-disinformation-about-the-war-in-ukraine/> 43. Can AI-created literature touch people's hearts? - Global Times, <https://www.globaltimes.cn/page/202503/1330939.shtml> 44. AI-generated literature a growing challenge to human-created works - Global Times,
<https://www.globaltimes.cn/page/202402/1307933.shtml> 45. OpenAI says state actors are using its tech to spread propaganda - YouTube, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XYOxU1ZGx7A> 46. Media Tip Sheet: OpenAI caught groups from Russia, China, Iran and Israel using its tech for propaganda campaigns | Media Relations | The George Washington University,
<https://mediarelations.gwu.edu/media-tip-sheet-openai-caught-groups-russia-china-iran-and-israel-using-its-tech-propaganda> 47. OpenAI says it disrupted Chinese, Russian, Israeli influence campaigns - Al Jazeera,
<https://www.aljazeera.com/economy/2024/5/31/openai-says-it-disrupted-chinese-russian-israeli-influence-campaigns> 48. OpenAI says Russian and Israeli groups used its tools to spread disinformation,
<https://www.theguardian.com/technology/article/2024/may/30/openai-disinformation-russia-israel-china-iran>