

Agnieszka Kampka and Wojciech Mincewicz (eds.)

**A Worrying Present
and an Uncertain Future.
Challenges for Security
in Central and
Eastern Europe Region**



PETER LANG

Berlin · Bruxelles · Chennai · Lausanne · New York · Oxford

*Personal Contributor's Complimentary Copy
Not for Sale
© 2025 Peter Lang Group AG*

Bibliographic Information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data is available online at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

Library of Congress Control Number: 202502712

Cover image courtesy of Benjamin Ben Chaim.

ISSN 2199-028X

ISBN 978-3-631-92548-5 (Print)

ISBN 978-3-631-92549-2 (E-PDF)

ISBN 978-3-631-94122-5 (E-PUB)

DOI 10.3726/b23139

© 2025 Peter Lang Group AG, Lausanne (Switzerland)

Published by Peter Lang GmbH, Berlin (Germany)

info@peterlang.com

All rights reserved.

All parts of this publication are protected by copyright.

Any utilization outside the strict limits of the copyright law, without the permission of the publisher, is forbidden and liable to prosecution. This applies in particular to reproductions, translations, microfilming, and storage and processing in electronic retrieval systems.

This publication has been peer reviewed.

www.peterlang.com

Personal Contributor's Complimentary Copy

Not for Sale

© 2025 Peter Lang Group AG

Table of Contents

List of Figures	7
List of Tables	9
Introduction	11
<i>Agnieszka Kampka and Wojciech Mincewicz</i>	
Defense Preparedness Against Russian Military Aggression.	
Strategic Challenges for Poland and the Baltic States	19
<i>Eugeniusz Cieślak and George Spencer Terry</i>	
Challenges to Epistemic Rights in the Era of AI:	
(Re)mediation(s) of Russian-Ukrainian War	51
<i>Katarzyna Molek-Kozakowska</i>	
On the Brink of the Third World War: The Russian-Ukrainian Conflict	
and the Threat of a Global War in Political and Media Narratives	69
<i>Przemysław Wywiat</i>	
Energy Under Fire, Cyberattacks as a New Battlefield	83
<i>Michał Bukowski</i>	
Building Climate Resilience With Renewable Energy	101
<i>Aleksander Wasiuta</i>	
Security and Climate in the Political Parties Manifestos	121
<i>Piotr Swacha and Renata Putkowska-Smoter</i>	
Energy Security and Transition—Spatial Analysis of Energy	
Infrastructure Vulnerability to Flood Hazards	139
<i>Grzegorz Kunikowski</i>	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Paperless Money: How the Disappearance of Cash Is Changing the State and Society—Trend Analysis. Facing the Consequences of Transformation	159
<i>Wojciech Mincewicz</i>	
Demographic Challenges in the Context of Aging Societies and Migration: Analysis of Risk Parameters of Selected Countries	183
<i>Janusz Gierszewski and Marek Bednarz</i>	
Healthy and Safe Aging of Seniors in Poland—Challenges Related to Institutional and Informal Care	207
<i>Małgorzata Herudzińska and Izabela Podobas</i>	
The Issue of Risk Perception by the Academic Community as a Significant Social and Educational Challenge	219
<i>Joanna Sadłowska-Wrzesińska and Michał Skwierczyński</i>	
Administration and Politics	245
<i>Jacek Zieliński and Sylwia Zakrzewska</i>	
Fear in the Digital Age: A Focus Group Study on Young People's Responses to Visual Content on Social Media	255
<i>Marcin Kesler, Iga Szymańska, Wiktoria Ługowska, and Oliwia Chomontowska</i>	
Security Challenges in a Changing World: Preliminary Results of a Quantitative Study	279
<i>Wojciech Mincewicz, Filip Marć, Dominika Kliszczak and Zuzanna Pietrucha</i>	

Challenges to Epistemic Rights in the Era of AI: (Re)mediation(s) of Russian-Ukrainian War

Katarzyna Molek-Kozakowska¹

Abstract: Algorithmic news prioritization and AI-driven content-creation tools have become standard resources of contemporary news, yet in the world of multiple crises and wars, the questions of how information is provided, how conflicts are framed, and how public deliberation is shaped with mediated technologies have been elevated in importance. The security and stability of democratic systems and cohesive societies is dependent on the ethics of information providers and issue stakeholders, and on the responsibility of remediations. This chapter is devoted to exploring the challenges to epistemic rights and information security, as seen from the perspective of young users of AI-based tools who increasingly resort to chatbot applications for news. The case study presented in the chapter is located within the international project CORECON (2024–2026), which concerns the coverage and reception of the Russian-Ukrainian conflict and offers recommendations for media literacy and information security.

Keywords: ChatGPT, epistemic rights, Russian-Ukrainian conflict, representation, user profiles, information bubbles

1. Introduction

In the world of multiple crises and wars, the questions of how information is provided, how conflicts are framed, and how public deliberation is shaped with mediated technologies are of utmost importance. The stability of democratic systems and the cohesion of societies depend on informational and technological security achieved in a regulatory context that guarantees the epistemic rights of all citizens. Universal epistemic rights of access to quality information, in turn, depend on the ethics and responsibilities of information providers and remediations. In neoliberal democracies, however, information provision is increasingly delegated to profit-motivated tech companies. To cut costs and increase engagement, they use algorithmic news prioritization and automated data analysis for trending. Even content creation with AI-driven tools has recently become a standard practice of

¹ Lucian Blaga University (Sibiu, Romania); University of Opole (Opole, Poland), katarzyna.molek-kozakowska@uni.opole.pl, <<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9455-7384>>.

contemporary newsrooms, both commercial and public, mainstream and alternative (cf. JournalismAI 2022-).

This chapter revisits some recent discussions about the critical challenges to epistemic rights and information security posed by technological advancements. Scholars note that some societies are approaching a crisis of epistemic rights, as an increasing percentage of citizens do not have sufficient access to quality information and knowledge to exercise all their civic rights (cf. Horowitz et al. 2024). Such a situation has been created as a result of a complex interplay of economic, regulatory, social and educational issues that cause “knowledge gaps” (Baran and Davies 2021). Among these issues, one pressing problem that has been identified is the rise in prominence of non-human communicators in the public sphere, with algorithms or bots as information providers and public communication gatekeepers (Harari, 2024). Some critics see them as potential manipulators of public opinion and call for new protections for the epistemic rights of humans.

The aftermath of the onslaught of AI-driven chatbot applications that are effectively replacing news media providers in delivering easy-to-digest and seemingly neutral information to young populations is spotlighted in this chapter. The case study presented here addresses the question of whether an application, such as ChatGPT-4, is capable of skewing the representation of a political issue depending on the data it is fed about the user via a profile. Is a chatbot, a personal assistant, or a similar application, likely to overcome entrapments resulting from polarizing trends, algorithmic echo chambers or social media information bubbles, or, on the contrary, to perpetuate them?

To verify whether there is a significant difference in the answers to queries on contentious political issues, the study adapts an earlier science-news-related experiment (Volk et al. 2024), in order to verify what information is offered to various users regarding the topic of the Russian-Ukrainian war. A qualitative comparative analysis is conducted of three ChatGPT-4 answers to three related questions on (1) the motivations for the war, (2) the responsibility for the war, and (3) the preferred post-war scenarios. It is observed that the answers vary in important details depending on whether ChatGPT-4 “believes” the user is (1) a pacifist favoring a diplomatic solution to political conflict, (2) a militarist accepting the hegemony of a stronger state, or (3) a person that is apolitical, disengaged and impartial. The results

of the analysis are to provide implications for developing interventions related to resilience to disinformation (cf. Molek-Kozakowska, 2024) in the international project CORECON (2024–2026). The project concerns the coverage and reception of the Russian-Ukrainian conflict and offers recommendations for media literacy and information security (<<https://grants.ulbsibiu.ro/corecon/>>).

2. Epistemic Rights

The rapidly changing political contexts and technologies shaping our access to information, communication and mediation are now seen to have created an unequal “knowing field,” to use Alison Bailey’s (2020) wordplay. This refers to a situation where some types of knowledge and knowers become privileged while others tend to be marginalized, excluded or even oppressed (Harari, 2024). While research on “the knowledge gaps” across various societies dates back to the 1980s and confirms a correlation between lower socioeconomic status and poorer access to knowledge, new media technologies and digitalization do not seem to have bridged the gaps, as had been expected (Baran and Davies 2021, pp. 292–94). The current epistemic crisis—a situation in which a sizable percentage of citizens in a democracy do not have sufficient protections of their epistemic rights, which entails the lack of access to quality information and knowledge to exercise all their civic rights—requires addressing the legal, political, economic and educational challenges (cf. Padovani and Calabrese, 2014; Freedom House, 2022).

While enabling unprecedented civilizational advancements, the current neoliberal hegemony of technocracy is not “kind” to people: it is not equitable and just, or channeled to democratic decision-making, despite seemingly offering choice, personalization and access (Cammaerts, 2024). A reliance on “the market self-regulating principle” that has driven the monopolization of the ownership of media organizations as well as communication infrastructures has certainly not worked well in terms of access to quality information for all citizens, especially the already precarious, disadvantaged and minoritized communities (Harari, 2024). Current epistemic divides range from (racialized) disparities in media ownership, interest representation and market participation to pervasive digital exclusion through lack of access to technology and cycles of education deprivation (Napoli, 2024).

In addition, communication scholars are encouraged to help campaigning for digital protections, for example within communication rights movements, which flag the tension between the digital rights of individuals and the interests of big tech companies that have not yet assumed their full responsibilities for epistemic protections (Flew, 2024, p. 87). For-profit companies are free to monetize public and private data and develop algorithms that prioritize engagement with unverified information instead of monitoring for harmful disinformation and increasing the moderating standards. Recent policy recommendations have been primarily congruent with the industry's interests (e.g., knowledge transfer between research institutions and the tech industry, commercialization of AI technologies, increased funding for high-tech solutions in the administration) and sometimes at odds with democratic values (Liebig et al. 2022). A return to the collective commons for epistemic rights, information security and for an inclusive version of digital citizenship is needed to background technocratic decision-making (particularly populism and profiteering) and foreground citizen-oriented participatory politics.

References

Bailey, A. (2020) "On gaslighting and epistemic injustice: Editor's introduction." *Hypatia*, 35(4), pp. 667–73. Available at: <<https://doi.org/doi:10.1017/hyp.2020.42>>.

Baran, S. J. and Davis, D. K. (2021) *Mass Communication Theory: Foundations, Ferment, and Future* (8th ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Burger, B., Kanbach, D. K., Kraus, S., Breier, M. and Corvello V. (2023) "On the Use of AI-based Tools Like ChatGPT to Support Management Research." *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 26(7), pp. 233–41. Available at: <<https://doi.org/10.1108/EJIM-02-2023-0156>>.

Cammaerts, B. (2024) "On the need to revalue old radical imaginaries to assert epistemic media and communication rights today," in Horowitz, M. A., Nieminen, H., Lehtisaari, K. and D'Arma, A. (eds) *Epistemic Rights in the Era of Digital Disruption*, pp. 31–46. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-45976-4_3>.

Dube, S. et al. (2024) "Students' Perceptions of ChatGPT in Education: A Rapid Systematic Literature Review," In Arai, K. (ed.) *Intelligent Computing Lecture*

Notes in Networks and Systems, pp 258–79. Springer Nature Switzerland, Cham. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-62273-1_18>.

Elyoseph, Z., Hadar-Shoval, D., Asraf, K. and Lvovsky, M. (2023) “ChatGPT outperforms humans in emotional awareness evaluations,” *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, 1199058. Available at: <<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1199058>>.

European Commission (2022) *European declaration on digital rights and principles for the digital decade*. Available at: <<https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/library/european-declaration-digital-rights-and-principles>> (Accessed: February 12, 2025).

Farrokhnia, M., Banihashem, S. K., Noroozi, O. and Wals, A. (2023) “A SWOT analysis of ChatGPT: Implications for educational practice and research,” *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 61(3), pp. 460–74. Available at: <<https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2023.2195846>>.

Flew, T. (2024) “Epistemic rights and digital communications policies: collective rights and digital citizenship,” in Horowitz, M. A., Nieminen, H., Lehtisaari, K. and D’Arma, A. (eds) *Epistemic Rights in the Era of Digital Disruption*, pp. 81–96. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-45976-4_6>.

Freedom House (2022) *The global expansion of authoritarian rule*. Available at: <https://freedomhouse.org/sites/default/files/2022-02/FIW_2022_PDF_Booklet_Digital_Final_Web.pdf> (Accessed: February 12, 2025).

Harari, Y. N. (2024) *Nexus. A Brief History of Information Networks from the Stone Age to AI*. Random House.

Horowitz, M. A., Nieminen, H., Lehtisaari, K. and D’Arma, A. (eds) (2024) *Epistemic Rights in the Era of Digital Disruption*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hu, K. (2023) “ChatGPT Sets Record for Fastest-growing User Base—Analyst Note.” *Reuters*. Available at: <<https://www.reuters.com/technology/chatgpt-sets-record-fastest-growing-user-base-analyst-note-2023-02-01/>> (Accessed: February 12, 2025).

JournalismAI (2022-) Project Polis at the London School of Economics and Political Science. Available at: <<https://www.journalismai.info/>>.

Lazzeretti, L. (2023) *The Rise of Algorithmic Society and the Strategic Role of Arts and Culture*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Liebig, L., Gütte, L., Jobin, A. et al. (2024) “Subnational AI policy: shaping AI in a multi-level governance system,” *AI and Society*, 39, pp. 1477–490. Available at: <<https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-022-01561-5>>.

McGonagle, T. (2024) “(Re-)casting epistemic rights as human rights: conceptual conundrums for the Council of Europe,” in Horowitz, M. A., Nieminen, H., Lehtisaari, K. and D’Arma, A. (eds) *Epistemic Rights in the Era of Digital Disruption*, pp. 63–80. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.

Molek-Kozakowska, K. (2024) “Enhancing Resilience Against War-Related Disinformation: Insights from Diagnostic Studies and Interventions at Polish Schools.” *Transilvania*, 9: pp. 65–76. Available at: <<https://doi.org/10.51391/trva.2024.09.07>>.

Napoli, P. M. (2024) “Epistemic rights, information inequalities, and public policy,” in Horowitz, M. A., Nieminen, H., Lehtisaari, K. and D’Arma, A. (eds) *Epistemic Rights in the Era of Digital Disruption*, pp. 47–62. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-45976-4_4>.

OpenAI (2023-) ChatGTP. Available from: <<https://chat.openai.com/chat>>.

Padovani, C. and Calabrese A. (eds) (2014) *Communication Rights and Social Justice: Historical Accounts of Transnational Mobilizations*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Volk, S. C., Schäfer, M. S., Lombardi, D., Mahl, D. and Yan X. (2024) “How Generative Artificial Intelligence Portrays Science: Interviewing ChatGPT from the Perspective of Different Audience Segments.” *Public Understanding of Science*, 34(2), pp. 132–53. Available at: <<https://doi.org/10.1177/09636625241268910>>.

VoxUkraine (2022) *Propaganda Diary*. Available at: <<https://russiandisinfo.voxukraine.org/en>>.

Watson, L. (2021) *The Right to Know: Epistemic Rights and Why We Need Them*. Routledge.

Zuboff, S. (2019) *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power*. Public Affairs.

Acknowledgments: This work was funded by the EU’s NextGenerationEU instrument through the National Recovery and Resilience Plan of Romania—Pillar III-C9-I8, managed by the Ministry of Research, Innovation and Digitalization, within the project entitled *The coverage and reception of the Russian-Ukrainian conflict in Polish, Romanian and English-language media: A comparative critical discourse study with recommendations for journalism training* (CORECON), contract no.760244/28.12.2023, code CF 25/27.07.2023. More information about the project: <<https://grants.ulbsibiu.ro/corecon/>>. Special thanks to Robert Radziej (Ph.D. student at University of Opole) for assisting in data collection.

