SOCIETÀMUTAMENTOPOLITICA
RIVISTA ITALIANA DI SOCIOLOGIA

OPEN ACCESS

Citation: Alalykin-Izvekov, V. (2025). Digital Antagonisms: AI, Neoliberalism, and the Shaping of Global Power Dynamics. Società*Mutamento*Politica 16(32): 15-23. doi: 10.36253/smp-16185

Data Availability Statement: All relevant data are within the paper and its Supporting Information files.

Competing Interests: The Author(s) declare(s) no conflict of interest.

Digital Antagonisms: AI, Neoliberalism, and the Shaping of Global Power Dynamics

Vlad Alalykin-Izvekov

Coordination of Scholarly Studies in Europe and Eurasia, The International Society for the Comparative Study of Civilizations (ISCSC), USA
E-mail: vlad_ai@yahoo.com

Abstract. As artificial intelligence (AI) penetrates global society, its convergence with neoliberal ideologies continues to reconfigure power in profound and often troubling ways. Recent geopolitical shifts—including changing U.S. foreign policies, rising techno-nationalism, and contested debates over AI governance—have deepened these dynamics. This paper examines the evolving interplay between AI and neoliberalism, focusing on how these forces intersect to reshape global structures of power in the digital era. By analyzing AI's role in sustaining neoliberal rationalities, it explores how digital technologies influence political, economic, and cultural landscapes. Ultimately, the study questions whether AI merely reinforces systems of profit and control, or if it also opens spaces for democratic renewal and alternative futures.

Keywords: artificial intelligence, neoliberalism, global power, governance, techno-nationalism.

INTRODUCTION

Artificial intelligence has become a defining feature of contemporary governance, mediating how global institutions organize power, allocate resources, and manage social life. Operating within the logic of neoliberalism – marked by deregulation, privatization, and faith in market efficiency – AI-driven systems increasingly optimize decision-making while deepening pre-existing inequalities. The convergence of AI and neoliberalism thus represents not only a technological but also an ideological transformation of modern governance.

1. ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE: DIGITAL BLISS OR PRIMROSE PATH?

As AI technologies spread across societies, they restructure social and economic life in ways both promising and perilous. Taiwanese expert Kai-Fu Lee notes that recent breakthroughs have made AI «poised to change our lives», driving cars, managing finances, and even replacing jobs-devel-

opments «full of both promise and potential peril» (Lee 2018: X).

American analyst Michael Kanaan similarly warns that AI will generate both compatible and conflicting applications – some consistent with democratic standards, others that may «shake the foundations of our societies and undermine our core ways of life» (Kanaan 2020: XIII–XIV).

Ray Kurzweil identifies deeper structural risks inherent in superintelligent systems, from misuse and outer misalignment to inner misalignment – scenarios where AI fulfills commands literally but disastrously, exposing humanity to existential dangers (Kurzweil 2024: 5, 278-279).

Building on these perspectives, Eliezer Yudkowsky and Nate Soares (2025) describe potential threats posed by artificial superintelligence capable of exceeding human control. Such warnings reflect a growing recognition that technological evolution must be matched by ethical and institutional foresight.

As I have argued elsewhere, solutions must address the «exponentially accumulating problems of rapidly globalizing humanity» (Alalykin-Izvekov 2025). For the philosopher of technology Andrew Feenberg, this requires democratizing technological design itself. He insists that «a good society should enlarge the personal freedom of its members while enabling them to participate effectively in a widening range of public activities», because «the design of technology is thus an ontological decision fraught with political consequences» (Feenberg 1991: 3). Excluding citizens from such decisions, he argues, reproduces inequality and alienation in the very fabric of modern life.

2. THE NEOLIBERAL AI PARADIGM

2.1. Historical Context

The integration of AI into neoliberal systems marks a fundamental transformation in governance, commerce, and social organization. Rooted in market efficiency and privatization, neoliberalism has adopted AI as a tool for optimizing production and management. Algorithmic governance – where decisions are increasingly delegated to automated systems – now defines the administrative logic of contemporary capitalism (Zuboff 2019).

While efficiency remains its core justification, such automation consolidates power in the hands of a few global corporations that dictate public policy through opaque algorithms. Nick Couldry and Ulises Mejias describe this as data colonialism, arguing that «human life is quite literally being annexed to capital» through the capture and monetization of data (Couldry and Mejias 2019: XI).

Sandro Mezzadra and colleagues (2019) expand this critique, noting that contemporary capitalism reshapes politics through extractive operations – of labor, resources, data, and culture. Shoshana Zuboff situates AI at the center of this transformation, describing surveillance capitalism as a system that «claims dominion over human, societal, and political territories», «constituting a coup from above» that undermines popular sovereignty and threatens democratic consolidation (Zuboff 2019: 21).

This fusion of AI and neoliberalism emerged in the late twentieth century with the automation of markets and bureaucracy. In the twenty-first century, AI platforms expanded across finance, logistics, and digital surveillance – concentrating wealth and decision-making power. Governments, instead of constraining this trend, often adopted similar technologies to enhance efficiency, thereby internalizing market logics within public institutions.

The social cost of such systems is sharply revealed in Virginia Eubanks' account of «digital poverty management», where automated eligibility models and predictive algorithms stigmatize and surveil the poor. She finds that these systems «discourage [citizens] from claiming public resources» and expose their private lives «to government, commercial, and public scrutiny» (Eubanks 2018: 11). Efficiency, in this context, comes at the expense of equality and civic trust.

2.2. Market-Driven Efficiencies

Within the neoliberal AI paradigm, efficiency becomes both means and ideology. Corporations deploy AI across every operational layer – from risk management to logistics – to enhance profitability and predictive control (Pasquale 2020).

The financial sector epitomizes this process. High-frequency trading algorithms execute millions of transactions per second, generating immense profits while amplifying systemic volatility. As James Bridle observes, «our technologies are complicit in the greatest challenges we face today», for they empower «selfish elites and inhuman corporations within systems the public no longer understands» (Bridle 2018: 2-3).

Data-extraction economies exemplify how AI entrenches neoliberal norms. Technology giants such as Google, Meta, and Amazon transform behavioral data into capital, producing what Couldry and Mejias call «data colonialism» – the commodification of human experience itself. This process normalizes surveillance while reproducing global inequality.

2.3. Privatization of AI Research and Development

A defining characteristic of the neoliberal AI order is the dominance of private capital in research and innovation. Whereas early AI breakthroughs were largely funded by public agencies such as DARPA, today's ecosystem is shaped by powerful corporations that control both infrastructure and data.

This privatization has generated a regime of proprietary algorithms that largely evade democratic scrutiny. Concerns about transparency, accountability, and ethical oversight are frequently subordinated to the protection of intellectual property. Nevertheless, public institutions retain a crucial role: setting ethical frameworks, financing open research, and safeguarding the possibility that AI might serve collective – not purely commercial – interests.

3. GEOPOLITICAL SHIFTS AND AI GOVERNANCE

3.1. Global Implications of AI as Strategic Technology

Artificial intelligence (AI) is transforming global power dynamics. In the 21st century, geopolitical competition increasingly revolves around technological supremacy. AI now sits at the intersection of national security, economic growth, and political governance. Its governance is therefore not just technical but strategic, shaping interstate relations, regulatory frameworks, and global stability.

Experts note, that AI will influence international relations in many ways – military planning, trade, strategic communications. AI is not inherently authoritarian nor inherently democratic. It can improve cooperation or exacerbate surveillance and tensions. Its proliferation accelerates existing trends rather than creating a radical shift. Scholars and states must understand AI's effects in their specific political, social, and economic contexts. AI will be central to future international relations, and preparation is essential. (Arsenault *et al.* 2024: 975)

John J. Mearsheimer emphasizes the limits of idealistic foreign policy. The scholar notes that liberal hegemony aims to spread liberal democracy and open economies worldwide. While morally and strategically appealing, great powers cannot fully pursue it without considering the balance of power. They may speak like liberals but act like realists. Policies ignoring realism often lead to regret (Mearsheimer 2018).

3.2. AI and Shifting Global Power Structures

The development and deployment of AI technologies are actively reshaping global hierarchies. AI expert David Shrier observes:

> *Already, AI has changed the course of global politics, and, for better or for worse, threatened US hegemony. It has introduced new uncertainty into financial markets. It has suddenly become a topic of conversation in boardrooms around the world. AI has the potential to reshape the geopolitical landscape. Now. A smaller nation like Switzerland, the United Kingdom, Singapore, or Israel can be on level footing with superpowers like the United States and China. It's the new nuclear age, but instead of splitting atoms, we're chasing electrons.* (Shrier 2024: 1).

The U.S. and China lead in AI, but with distinct models. China uses state-led, centralized AI development, integrating civilian and military sectors. The U.S. relies on decentralized, market-driven innovation led by private firms. As experts warn, digital repression strengthens state control:

According to American political scientist Steven Feldstein, digital repression enhances states' abilities to carry out more traditional forms of repression. He observes that digital repression uses technology to surveil, coerce, or manipulate citizens. Its tools – surveillance, censorship, social manipulation, Internet shutdowns, targeted persecution – often overlap, extending the state's reach. (Feldstein 2021)

The EU, though lacking AI dominance, leads in norms and regulation via the AI Act (2024). India and Russia leverage AI to enhance domestic industries and military capacity. This diversification complicates global AI governance.

3.3. Competing Models of AI Governance

AI governance dilemma reflects broader ideological and geopolitical contestations. Three primary models have emerged on the international stage:

- *The Liberal-Democratic Model* (U.S., EU): Centers on ethical AI development, transparency, and multistakeholder governance. This model supports regulatory frameworks that mitigate risks while fostering innovation and protecting civil liberties.
- *The State-Controlled Model* (China, Russia): Prioritizes national security, surveillance capacity, and centralized AI development. This model often includes strict regulatory regimes governing data and AI deployment within sovereign digital infrastructures.

– *The Emerging Hybrid Model* (India, Brazil, ASEAN nations): Attempts to balance innovation with regulation, drawing selectively from both liberal-democratic and state-controlled paradigms. These hybrid systems are still in flux, often shaped by geopolitical pressures and domestic developmental needs.

The coexistence of these competing models has led to significant regulatory fragmentation, complicating efforts to establish global AI norms and shared governance frameworks.

3.4. AI, National Security, and Cyber Sovereignty

AI technologies are becoming increasingly integral to national security doctrines. From autonomous weapons and cyber warfare to AI-driven intelligence systems, these developments are reshaping the strategic calculus of modern militaries. Thus, AI increasingly drives military strategy.

Paul Scharre notes that AI transforms warfare, just as mechanization did in the 20th century. It enables smarter, faster machines for narrow tasks. Some uses – logistics, cyberdefense, medical support – are uncontroversial. Fully autonomous weapons, however, represent a paradigm shift. Once deployed, they operate beyond human control and are vulnerable to hacking, with potentially vast consequences (Scharre 2018).

Branka Panic and Paige Arthur explain that AI in drone swarms, facial recognition, and deepfakes raises military and human rights concerns. Investment in defense and AI grows rapidly, spanning situational awareness, autonomous weapons, and battlefield healthcare (Panic and Arthur 2024).

Michael Kanaan observes that while some AI applications align with Western values others may threaten core societal structures by infiltrating institutions undetected (Kanaan 2020).

And Ian Bremmer warns that future wars may use weapons far deadlier than tanks, planes, or atomic bombs, extending beyond traditional theaters (Bremmer 2022).

3.5. The Future of Global AI Governance

The future trajectory of AI governance remains unsettled, as diverse state and non-state actors contest its normative and institutional foundations. Key developments to monitor include:

– *Multilateral Initiatives:* Frameworks such as the OECD's AI Principles and ongoing United Nations discussions on AI ethics underscore attempts to create shared governance standards, though implementation remains uneven.
– *Regulatory Fragmentation:* Diverging AI regulations across geopolitical blocs risk undermining international cooperation and inhibiting technological innovation.
– *AI and Economic Hegemony:* AI's role in shaping future trade agreements, investment flows, and global value chains is likely to determine emergent economic hierarchies.

As AI continues to evolve, so too will the struggle over its governance – reflecting and reinforcing the broader realignments in global power.

4. ALGORITHMIC CONTROL AND DIGITAL INEQUALITY

4.1. AI and Structural Inequalities

The rapid proliferation of AI within contemporary socioeconomic systems has intensified existing inequalities, embedding systemic biases and deepening the digital divide. Algorithmic control – the delegation of critical decision-making to AI systems across domains such as governance, law enforcement, finance, and labor – has emerged as a key mechanism of neoliberal governance. This section explores how AI technologies contribute to the reproduction of social disparities, the expansion of surveillance regimes, and the entrenchment of economic precarity.

AI systems are increasingly deployed in decisions that affect vital aspects of human life, including employment screening, credit scoring, housing allocation, and welfare administration. However, these systems frequently replicate and amplify entrenched social biases. Search engine algorithms have been shown to reflect and reinforce racial and gender stereotypes, while algorithmic welfare assessments disproportionately penalize low-income individuals, exacerbating economic marginalization (Eubanks 2018).

The discriminatory implications of AI are especially pronounced in facial recognition technologies, which have consistently demonstrated higher error rates for individuals from non-white racial backgrounds (Benjamin 2019). These biases are not merely technical anomalies; they reflect deeper structural inequalities embedded in the data used to train AI systems. In this way, AI risks becoming a digital extension of historical injustice – an infrastructure of inequality masquerading as innovation.

4.2. Surveillance, Predictive Policing, and Labor Automation

Algorithmic control is prominent in surveillance and predictive policing. AI models trained on historical crime data assess risk and allocate policing resources, disproportionately targeting low-income and racialized communities (Pasquale 2020). Predictive policing often criminalizes poverty, reinforcing carceral logics and cycles of structural violence.

AI-driven automation also reshapes labor markets. Manufacturing, logistics, and retail increasingly rely on algorithms and robotics. Low-wage and precarious workers face job displacement and economic disenfranchisement. Ruha Benjamin coined the term *New Jim Code* to describe how supposedly neutral technologies reproduce race and class discrimination. She writes: «*Race after Technology* integrates science and technology studies (STS) and critical race studies to examine coded inequity. The power of the New Jim Code lies in its ability to introduce racist logics through hidden algorithmic design» (Benjamin 2019: 34).

While automation promises efficiency, the neoliberal focus on markets over social welfare leaves displaced workers with limited opportunities for reskilling or reintegration (Couldry and Mejias 2019).

4.3. Economic Stratification Through Algorithmic Systems

AI deepens economic stratification. *Technological redlining*—the exclusion of marginalized groups from credit, jobs, and services – illustrates AI-induced inequality. Eubanks documents how financial AI systems deny loans to historically disadvantaged communities, perpetuating poverty. She notes:

> *Though these new systems have the most destructive and deadly effect in low-income communities of color, they impact poor and working-class people across the color line. While welfare recipients, the unhoused, and poor families face the heaviest burdens of high-tech scrutiny, they aren't the only ones affected by the growth of automated decision-making. The widespread use of these systems impacts the quality of democracy for us all.* (Eubanks 2018: 12)

Belgian philosopher of technology Mark Coeckelbergh references a «Kafkian» instance of an innocent Western citizen recently being arrested due to a faulty AI algorithm.

> *There is now a new way in which all this can happen, indeed, has happened, even in a so-called "advanced" society: one that has to do with technology, in particular with artificial intelligence (AI). On a Thursday afternoon in January 2020, Robert Julian-Borchak Williams received a call in his office from the Detroit Police Department: he was asked to come to the police station to be arrested. Since he hadn't done anything wrong, he didn't go. An hour later he was arrested on his front lawn, in front of his wife and children, and, according to the New York Times: "The police wouldn't say why." [...] The New York Times journalist and the experts she consulted suspect that "his case may be the first known account of an American being wrongfully arrested based on a flawed match from a facial recognition algorithm.* (Coeckelbergh 2022: 2)

The gig economy provides another salient example. Platforms such as Uber, Deliveroo, and Amazon Flex rely on opaque algorithmic systems to assign tasks, set wages, and evaluate performance. These systems often function with minimal transparency and little to none worker input. As a result, platform workers face unpredictable incomes, exploitative working conditions, and limited avenues for recourse (Couldry and Mejias 2019).

5. CULTURAL NARRATIVES AND AI

5.1. AI as a Neoliberal Tool for Cultural Reproduction

AI technologies have become central to the reproduction of neoliberal cultural paradigms. Through algorithmic content generation, recommendation systems, and predictive analytics, AI reinforces dominant ideologies and market-oriented values. As Shoshana Zuboff (2019) argues, the data-driven economy depends on the commodification of human experience, transforming digital interactions into sources of behavioral surplus. This economic logic is inherently aligned with neoliberalism's commitment to privatization, deregulation, and the subordination of public discourse to corporate interests.

AI-generated content – from news articles and social media posts to entertainment media – is frequently shaped by the biases embedded in training data and algorithmic objectives. These technologies privilege certain narratives while marginalizing others, amplifying hegemonic perspectives aligned with existing power structures. As such, AI acts not merely as a technical system but as a cultural apparatus, reproducing neoliberal hegemony by filtering, ranking, and circulating content that serves the logic of commodification and control.

5.2. Influence of AI on Public Discourse and Democracy

AI's influence on public discourse is most visible in the realm of algorithmic curation, where recommendation engines and engagement-optimization algorithms determine what information reaches audiences. These systems, optimized for attention and profitability, have contributed to the rise of echo chambers and ideological silos, undermining the foundations of deliberative democracy. Nick Couldry and Ulises Mejias (2019) describe this dynamic as a form of data colonialism, where human communication is restructured to serve extractive data regimes rather than civic engagement.

AI-facilitated manipulation of political narratives – particularly via disinformation campaigns, social bots, and algorithmically amplified propaganda – poses serious challenges to democratic institutions. Deepfake technologies, microtargeted messaging, and automated content generation have been used to influence elections, distort public perception, and erode trust in democratic processes (Pasquale 2020).

Personalization algorithms, by tailoring information flows to user behavior, reinforce pre-existing beliefs and minimize exposure to dissenting views. This results in a fragmented public sphere where consensus-building becomes increasingly difficult, and democratic participation is reduced to algorithmically curated individual experiences.

5.3. AI-Generated Media and Societal Perceptions

One of the most culturally disruptive consequences of AI is the emergence of synthetic media – deepfakes, AI-generated audio, and hyperrealistic imagery – that challenge traditional markers of authenticity. As James Bridle (2018) warns, we are entering a «new dark age», in which the distinction between truth and fabrication is increasingly opaque. This epistemic instability undermines public trust in media, scientific knowledge, and institutional authority.

The implications of AI-generated misinformation are far-reaching. False narratives spread through synthetic media have incited public unrest, manipulated financial markets, and fueled geopolitical tensions (Eubanks 2018). These developments raise critical questions about the governance of digital truth, the ethics of generative AI, and the future of communicative trust.

In response, scholars and policymakers advocate for regulatory interventions to ensure transparency in AI-generated content. Proposals include mandatory labeling of synthetic media, algorithmic audits, and the development of AI literacy programs aimed at equipping individuals with the skills to critically evaluate digital information (Benjamin 2019).

6. RESISTANCE AND DIGITAL ANTAGONISMS

6.1. Forms of Resistance

6.1.1. Hacktivism and Counter-Algorithms

Hacktivism constitutes a vital front in the struggle against algorithmic hegemony. Activist collectives such as Anonymous have long employed digital sabotage to expose abuses of power and disrupt state-corporate control over information flows (Bridle 2018). As AI systems increasingly mediate governance, finance, and surveillance, new forms of resistance have emerged in the form of counter-algorithms – technological interventions designed to evade, subvert, or reveal the inner workings of opaque AI infrastructures.

Adversarial attacks on facial recognition systems, for example, expose the vulnerabilities of surveillance technologies while highlighting their ethical risks. These interventions demonstrate that AI is not infallible; rather, it is structurally fragile and politically contested (Eubanks 2018). Such tactics foreground the political agency of those seeking to undermine AI's monopolization of power.

6.1.2. Grassroots Movements Challenging AI Hegemony

Grassroots resistance has become an essential site of contestation against the monopolization of AI by state and corporate actors. Digital rights organizations such as the Electronic Frontier Foundation (EFF) advocate for data transparency, user privacy, and algorithmic accountability, directly challenging the extractive logic of surveillance capitalism (Couldry and Mejias 2019).

Equally significant is the mobilization of labor in response to AI-driven workplace automation. Gig economy workers, often subjected to opaque algorithmic management systems, have organized strikes and legal campaigns demanding transparency and fair treatment. These collective actions reveal a growing political consciousness among digitally exploited populations (Pasquale 2020), signaling a broader pushback against algorithmic injustice.

6.2. AI Ethics and Alternative AI Frameworks

6.2.1. Open-Source AI Models for Ethical Development

American AI expert Meredith Broussard is making a case against *technochauvinism* – the belief that technology is always the solution. The author argues that it's just not true that social problems would inevitably

retreat before a digitally enabled Utopia. According to the thinker, digital innovation does not create utopia. In reality, technology has increased inequality, facilitated illegal activities, undermined the press, spread junk science, harassed people online, and concentrated power. Social problems persist; humans remain central. Technology should serve all humans, not a select few (Broussard 2018).

Ethical AI frameworks emphasize transparency, fairness, and explainability, aiming to challenge the «black-box» nature of proprietary algorithms. These initiatives propose that algorithmic systems should be auditable and accountable to the public, rather than exclusively serving corporate or state interests.

In response to the concentration of AI development within a handful of powerful corporations, open-source AI models have emerged as a counter-hegemonic alternative. Initiatives originally motivated by principles of transparency and shared innovation – such as the early phases of OpenAI –demonstrate the potential for communal knowledge production in AI systems. Though many of these efforts have since been partially commercialized, they continue to inform debates about ethical AI governance.

6.2.2. Community-Led Technological Innovation

Beyond institutional reform, resistance is increasingly expressed through community-led technological innovation. Federated and decentralized platforms such as Mastodon represent alternatives to centralized, profit-driven social media networks. These technologies embody principles of digital autonomy, allowing communities to determine their own governance protocols.

Parallel efforts promoting data sovereignty advocate for individual and collective ownership over digital footprints. By reclaiming control over personal and communal data, such initiatives resist the commodification of human experience under surveillance capitalism (Benjamin 2019). These developments reflect a broader ambition to restructure the technological ecosystem around participatory and equitable values.

6.3. Prospects for Democratizing AI

6.3.1. Policy Proposals for Equitable AI Governance

Policy frameworks aimed at regulating AI present both opportunities and limitations for democratizing technological systems. The European Union's AI Act is a landmark example of an attempt to impose constraints on high-risk AI applications, including those involved in biometric surveillance and social scoring (Mezzadra and Neilson 2019). It exemplifies a rights-based approach to AI governance that prioritizes human dignity and ethical accountability.

In contrast, the regulatory landscape in the United States remains fragmented. Tensions persist between advocates of industry self-regulation – grounded in neoliberal commitments to innovation –and proponents of stronger public oversight. As Shoshana Zuboff contends, this ambivalence reflects a deeper ideological struggle over whether technology should serve markets or democratic publics.

The scholar writes:

> *The decades of economic injustice and immense concentrations of wealth that we call the Gilded Age succeeded in teaching people how they did not want to live. The knowledge empowered them to bring the Gilded Age to an end, wielding the armaments of progressive legislation and the New Deal. Even now, when we recall the lordy "barons" of the late nineteenth century, we call them "robbers." Surely the Age of Surveillance Capitalism will meet the same fate as it teaches us how we do not want to live. It instructs us in the irreplaceable value of our greatest moral and political achievements by threatening to destroy them. It reminds us that shared trust is the only real protection from uncertainty. It demonstrates that power untamed by democracy can only lead to exile and despair* (Zuboff 2019: 524)

6.3.2. Strategies for Inclusive Technological Development

Democratizing AI requires structural changes in how AI systems are designed, funded, and governed. Efforts to diversify participation in AI research and development – particularly by historically marginalized communities – are essential in addressing the biases embedded in current systems (Couldry and Mejias 2019). Representation not only improves system outcomes but also challenges epistemic hierarchies that privilege dominant perspectives.

Collaborative models of AI governance, inspired by principles of participatory democracy, are gaining traction. These approaches emphasize deliberation, co-creation, and community accountability, offering a vision of technology development rooted in collective agency rather than elite control (Bridle 2018). As digital antagonisms continue to unfold, such frameworks hold promise for reclaiming technological futures in the service of social justice.

7. CIVILIZATION, AI, AND DIGITAL ANTAGONISMS

AI technologies intersect with civilizational processes, influencing the long-term dynamics of societies. The integration of algorithmic governance into political economies accelerates the concentration of power, often privileging dominant civilizational narratives while marginalizing peripheral societies. AI-driven decision-making, surveillance infrastructures, and digital labor systems reinforce structural hierarchies and influence global civilizational trajectories.

Technological innovation does not occur in a vacuum but interacts with existing civilizational strengths, weaknesses, and cultural patterns. AI amplifies existing inequalities and reshapes the distribution of global influence, with implications for both institutional stability and social cohesion. Civilizational analysis underscores that the long-term consequences of AI are not only economic or political but also deeply cultural and structural.

These insights suggest that understanding AI's role in society requires attention to civilizational dynamics. By examining patterns of rise, crisis, and adaptation, scholars can better anticipate the societal impacts of AI and design governance frameworks that are sensitive to historical and cultural contexts.

8. CONCLUSIONS

a) Artificial Intelligence has been deeply integrated into neoliberal political economies, functioning both as a tool of optimization and a mechanism of control. Its design and deployment prioritize efficiency, surveillance, and profit over equity and human dignity, reinforcing the logic of market fundamentalism across global systems.

b) Far from being ideologically neutral, AI systems operationalize and intensify existing socio-economic hierarchies. From algorithmic policing to labor management, these technologies reproduce biases, stratify populations, and deepen systemic injustice – necessitating urgent ethical oversight and democratic intervention.

c) AI is not only an economic and political force but also a cultural apparatus that shapes public discourse through content curation and media manipulation. In doing so, it distorts democratic deliberation, marginalizes dissent, and embeds neoliberal ideologies within the epistemic fabric of everyday life.

d) The governance of AI is now central to geopolitical competition. As states vie for dominance in AI innovation and standard-setting, global power dynamics are being recalibrated. Diplomatic frameworks and international cooperation will determine whether AI development fosters collective security or entrenches global inequality.

e) AI is also a contested space. Hacktivism, grassroots mobilizations, and open-source movements challenge the hegemony of corporate and state actors. These acts of resistance underscore the political malleability of technological systems and point toward alternative futures grounded in social justice and collective agency.

f) Democratizing AI demands a fundamental reimagining of technological governance. This includes participatory design, representational inclusion, data sovereignty, and public accountability. As algorithmic systems increasingly mediate vital aspects of life, the challenge is not only technical but deeply political – requiring sustained engagement across civil society, policy, and academia to ensure AI serves democratic ends rather than neoliberal imperatives.

g) AI functions as both a catalyst and reflection of civilizational dynamics, reinforcing structural hierarchies while reshaping cultural, political, and economic trajectories. By interacting with historical patterns of societal rise, crisis, and adaptation, it amplifies dominant narratives and marginalizes peripheral societies, influencing long-term social resilience. Understanding AI through a civilizational lens highlights that its impacts extend beyond economics and politics to deeply cultural and structural domains, emphasizing the urgent need for governance frameworks that are historically informed, ethically grounded, and oriented toward equity, adaptation, and collective societal well-being.

REFERENCES

Alalykin-Izvekov V. (2025), «Civilization, Civilizations, Civilizational State: Untangling Civilizational Discontents in International Relations Theory», in *Comparative Civilizations Review*, Vol. 92: No. 1, Article 13. https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/ccr/vol92/iss1/13

Arsenault C. and Kreps S. (2024), «AI and International Politics», *in The Oxford Handbook of AI Governance*, (Ed-s) Bullock *et al*., Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Benjamin R. (2019), *Race After Technology: Abolitionist Tools for the New Jim Code*, Polity, Cambridge.

Bremmer I. (2022), *The Power of Crisis: How Three Threats – and Our Response – Will Change the World*, Simon & Schuster, New York.

Bridle J. (2018), *New Dark Age: Technology and the End of the Future*, Verso, London.

Broussard M. (2018), *Artificial Unintelligence: How Computers Misunderstand the World*, MA: MIT Press, Cambridge.
Coeckelbergh M. (2022), *The Political Philosophy of AI,* Polity, New York.
Couldry N. and Mejias U.A. (2019), *The Costs of Connection: How Data Is Colonizing Human Life and Appropriating It for Capitalism*, Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA.
Eubanks V. (2018), *Automating Inequality: How High-Tech Tools Profile, Police, and Punish the Poor*, St. Martin's Press, New York.
European Union (2005), *Artificial Intelligence Act, Regulation (EU) 2024/1689*, Accessed December 5, 2025. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32024R1689
Feenberg A. (1991), *Critical Theory of Technology,* Oxford University Press, New York & Oxford.
Feldstein S. (2021), *The Rise of Digital Repression: How Technology is Reshaping Power, Politics, and Resistance*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
Kanaan M. (2020), *T-Minus AI: Humanity's Countdown to Artificial Intelligence and the New Pursuit of Global Power,* BenBella Books Inc, Dallas, Texas.
Kurzwell R. (2024), *The Singularity Is Nearer: When We Merge With AI,* Viking, New York.
Lee K. (2018), *AI Superpowers: China, Silicon Valley, and the New Worl Order,* Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, Boston & New York.
Mearsheimer J. (2018), *The Great Delusion: Liberal Dreams and International Realities*, Yale University Press, New Haven.
Mezzadra S. and Neilson B. (2019), *The Politics of Operations: Excavating Contemporary Capitalism*, Duke University Press, Durham NC.
Panic B. and Arthur P. (2024), *AI for Peace,* Boca Raton, CRC Press.
Pasquale F. (2020), *New Laws of Robotics: Defending Human Expertise in the Age of AI*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge MA.
Scharre P. (2018), *Army of None: Autonomous Weapons and the Future of War,* W.W. Norton & Company, New York & London.
Shrier D. (2024), *Welcome to AI: A Human Guide to Artificial Intelligence,* Harvard Business Review Press, Boston, Massachusetts.
Zuboff S. (2019), *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power*, PublicAffairs, New York.
Yudkowsky E. and Soares N. (2025), *Why Superhuman AI Would Kill Us All*, Brown & Company, Boston.