

Generative AI influences on political attitudes and suffrage behavior: Democratic resilience as an analytical framework in the United States

Steven B. Madison^{*1}, Nicol I. Jane,² Mariam Awad Abdulla Aljeaidi³

¹ Department of Government, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Connecticut, USA. Email: steven_mad@wesleyan.edu

² Department of Government, London School of Economics and Political Science, London, UK. Email: nicol.jane@gmail.com ; nicol.i.j@lse.ac.uk

³ (PhD) Doctor of Philosophy in Law, Private Law, United Arab Emirates University, United Arab Emirates, Email: 700046241@uaeu.ac.ae , ORCID iD: <https://orcid.org/0009-0002-2185-7647>

* Corresponding Author: **Steven B. Madison** , steven_mad@wesleyan.edu

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.64440/BIRUNI/BIR0037>

ARTICLE INFO

Article history

Received May 10, 2026

Revised May 28, 2026

Accepted Sep 22, 2026

Keywords

Generative Artificial Intelligence;
Political Persuasion;
Electoral Behavior;
Democratic Resilience;
Hyper-Personalization;
Deepfakes;
Synthetic Media;
Information Disorder;
Liar's Dividend;
U.S. Elections.



This is an open-access article under the [CC-BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license.

ABSTRACT

The rapid diffusion of generative artificial intelligence (AI) has introduced new challenges to democratic governance by transforming political communication, voter engagement, and information dissemination. Despite growing concerns about deepfakes, synthetic media, and AI-enabled persuasion, scholars have paid limited attention to how these technologies collectively influence voter attitudes and electoral behavior in contemporary United States elections. This study investigates the impact of generative AI technologies, including Large Language Models (LLMs), Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs), conversational bots, and synthetic media, on political persuasion and democratic resilience during the transition from the 2024 U.S. Presidential Election cycle to the 2026 Midterm Election cycle. Using a qualitative doctrinal and policy-analysis methodology supported by election-related case studies, regulatory documents, platform policies, and emerging empirical evidence on AI-generated political content, the study evaluates how AI reshapes electoral communication. The findings reveal three significant trends. First, generative AI has accelerated the shift from mass political broadcasting to hyper-personalized, data-driven persuasion that can tailor messages to individual psychological and behavioral profiles at unprecedented scale and low cost. Second, AI-generated misinformation, including deceptive robocalls, synthetic visual advertisements, and inaccurate voting-information outputs, increases information pollution and creates opportunities for voter suppression and electoral manipulation. Third, beyond direct deception, AI contributes to affective polarization and strengthens the "Liar's Dividend," enabling political actors to challenge the authenticity of legitimate information and thereby eroding public trust in democratic institutions. The study contributes to the emerging literature on AI governance by developing an integrated conceptual framework that links hyper-personalized persuasion, information disorder, and democratic resilience in electoral environments. The analysis demonstrates that the principal democratic risk of generative AI lies not solely in misinformation but in its capacity to undermine public trust structurally and shared epistemic foundations. To address these challenges while preserving First Amendment protections, the study proposes a multi-layered regulatory framework incorporating mandatory content provenance standards, targeted amendments to the Federal Election Campaign Act (FECA), enhanced transparency obligations for political AI content, and conditional platform accountability measures during critical election periods. The findings provide policy-relevant guidance for regulators, election authorities, technology platforms, and democratic institutions seeking to safeguard electoral integrity in the age of generative AI.

1. Introduction

The art of disseminating information and communication through generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) has created audio, images, realistic text, and videos within seconds [1]. Against all odds, the country where AI was adopted most rapidly is the same place where it was invented: the United States of America (USA), where political campaigns and even foreign groups use these tools to reach the electorate during primary and general elections [2]. This paradigm shift raises urgent rhetorical questions about how generative AI affects the health of American democracy and political views.

1.1 Background and Context

The power of AI in political campaigns is an important topic to research; in this regard, campaigns have taken new pathways, persuading the general electorate through generative AI and making campaigns more personal, economically feasible, and disseminated at the fastest pace ever recorded in history. The key vertices of this matrix are microtargeting, where AI analyzes suffrage data through micro-messaging, where data is retrieved to generate specific messages targeting individualistic groups of the general public, including but not limited to ghettos, business people, applicants, the poor, the needy, and the impoverished, with one single goal [3]. Content scaling generates thousands of social media posts and emails tailored to local issues, as staffers use AI to disseminate innumerable forms of content for their political parties [4]. Another key barrier, which was quite relevant until the late 20th century, is that English is the main language spoken by campaigners [5]. In contrast, a vast majority of the public in the US would understand Latin, Spanish, French, Urdu, Hindi, Mandarin, and Arabic, and sometimes other languages, but now translation tools can speak directly to non-English-speaking communities with native fluency [6]. Hence, campaigns can reach a greater extent than ever; as such, we lately witnessed this during the campaign of Zohran Mamdani, where he won the post of the Governor of New York State, where he used his mother tongue and several other languages through AI to generate a historical political campaign, and he was extremely successful [7].

The risk factor to democratic resilience is extremes, as AI offers nascent methods of communication but also creates risks for democratic systems. Misinformation and

deepfakes can trick the electorate through a fake video or audio, making them believe a candidate has uttered something wrong just before an election, as we witnessed in the 2016 campaign of Hillary Clinton[8]. The erosion of trust is real: the electorate will stop trusting election results, leaders, and the news, and they will struggle to judge what is real and what is fake. Echo chambers trap users in extreme political bubbles through hyper-personalized AI messages, making compromise harder for the political elite [9].

This manuscript examines how generative AI has influenced voter behavior through political attitudes in the United States. We analyze whether AI-generated messages could shift minds more than traditional advertisements, and we explore how democratic institutions may protect themselves against manipulation while safeguarding free speech.

1.2 The Problem Statement

The root of the problem lies in the amalgamation of general artificial intelligence within the political landscape and its rapid integration into the US electorate, which has outpaced public digital literacy and legal safeguards, initiating unprecedented capabilities to generate deceptive content, hyper-personalized narratives, and a narrative that is beyond the control of any agency, government, or even the general public. This ecosystem creates several core challenges for democratic resilience: primarily, the weaponization of synthetic media through deepfakes and the “Liar’s Dividend”; secondly, the scale of automated persuasion, as AI can generate any form of false information that can trigger the emotional appeal of the public involved [10]. As in the case of the 200 babies who Hamas purportedly beheaded, was an Israeli war-propaganda using automated persuasion, which is definitely the case in the United States itself, as the appeal of such persuasion persuades many that perhaps that was true. Still, it turned out to be lies, and the reaction was severe amongst the educated masses [11]. As we cannot forget the protests at Columbia University, Harvard University, and Yale campuses, enthralling protestors so much so that the land of the free and the home of the brave had to deport students who were studying, from across the board, the last but not the least is the eroding baseline trust in all political discourse, which is kind of a domestic issue within the US, as whatever is done through the full analysis is detrimental to the general public’s opinion and to the future of the United States[12].

1.3 Research Objectives

The fact that generative AI has influenced suffrage behavior and political attitudes in the United States turns out to be the primary objective of this study: to analyze the working framework by evaluating the resilience of democratic institutions, including Congress, the White House, the Senate, the State Department, and even the Pentagon, to withstand these technological paradigm shifts. To achieve these objectives, the researchers have proposed the following core research objectives:

RO1- What are the evaluative persuasive efficacies by measuring the effectiveness of AI-generated hyper-personalized political messaging in comparison to human-authored campaign materials, which are traditional methods in creating a better time shift and the suffrage attitude

RO2- Upon defining misinformation, its impact would be assessed by the extent to which synthetic media, including but not limited to fabricated text, cloned audio, and deepfakes, influences changes in electoral behavior, political polarization, and voter perception.

RO3- The analysis of the “liars-dividend”, which investigates how generative AI undermines political actors by making them appear real, erodes public trust and verifies evidence as fake.

RO4- The formulation of democratic safeguards, including digital watermarking, will be used to analyze and identify policy frameworks, technical countermeasures, and public literacy initiatives capable of protecting US electoral integrity without infringing on free speech.

1.4 Scope and Limitations

This analysis transparently acknowledges the technical constraints and the article's structural scope. Primarily, the political and geographic focus is strictly limited to the US electoral system; we focus on federal elections contested every four years, including congressional cycles and the Electoral College [13]. The article examines the unique features of American politics, including its highly polarized two-party system, expansive First Amendment speech protections, decentralized state-level election administration, and the growing interaction with generative AI. Regarding the technological boundary, the

analysis focuses exclusively on generative AI tools purchased by consumers and popularized since the last quarter of 2022[14]. Large Language Models (LLMs) are used for micro-targeted persuasion through automated text and include synthetic media generators that produce deepfake audio, video, and images [15]. Conventional AI algorithms, including standard data analytics for voter turnout, are generated through predictive AI and are excluded unless directly paired with generative content output. The target variables include voter attitudes, epistemic trust, former electoral behavior, and political polarization, which are included as the primary dependent variables under evaluation, for example, candidate choice and voter turnout statistics[16].

The study's limitations include rapid technological evolution: generative AI capabilities have evolved at an exponential rate, and case studies and experimental data collected during previous election cycles do not provide a comprehensive picture of the deployment scale of newer, upgraded model architectures in terms of realism and capabilities. In this regard, proprietary algorithms influence the black-box nature of major AI developers such as Google, Anthropic, and OpenAI, which regularly update their safety alignment protocols, guardrails, and system prompts[17]. Because of this paradigm shift in internal mechanisms, proprietary and opaque researchers cannot isolate behavioral effects or the precise algorithmic variables driving certain outputs. This creates a situation where correlation versus causality in suffrage behavior obscures the direct behavioral impact of AI-generated content on general suffrage, because it is exceptionally hard to determine such a causal link, as real-world economic conditions also matter.

Real-time conventional media, longstanding partisan identities, grassroots social circles, and electoral campaigns have shaped political attitudes among US voters simultaneously. This leads us to lab artifacts and self-reporting, as empirical data relies on survey experiments in controlled laboratory environments and suffers from artificiality. Hence, the reliability of such data is always be persuaded by deepfake materials is explicitly tested, and a participant's ability to spot or be persuaded by deepfake materials differs from the realistic facts presented in a research study. Furthermore, the originality shared through media, often in emotionally charged environments and at varying speeds, contradicts social media feeds. Hence, a conflict of interest exists between electronic and social media platforms[18].

1.5 Significance of the Study

This research provides critical insights at the intersection of political science and tech-savvy suffrage in the US. Generative AI has become a permanent fixture in campaigns, and this research aims to establish it as a foundational resource for key stakeholders across the field to protect democratic integrity. Regulators and policymakers often rely on empirical data and actionable frameworks to sustain electoral boards like the Federal Election Commission (FEC), which lawmakers design through regulatory norms. This approach curbs malicious synthetic media and deceptive AI practices without violating First Amendment protections. National security officials and election administrators can proactively assess AI-driven disinformation campaigns that threaten election infrastructure, enabling them to develop robust public verification protocols and crisis-response strategies. Another key area is the role of tech platforms and software developers in shaping the real-world political impacts of generative models, guiding AI conglomerates through social media networks, and building stronger safety guardrails, provenance standards like the Coalition for Content Provenance and Authenticity (C2PA) metadata, and deepfake detection tools[19]. Another key significance of this study aligns with media literacy advocates and the broader academic mission, as it identifies the psychological vulnerabilities the public faces when encountering AI content and supports a postmodern digital literacy paradigm that trains netizens to navigate our complex information ecosystem. Thus, academic literature bridges the gap between measurable political behavior and theoretical AI capabilities, resulting in an updated conventional theory of media effects and political persuasion for synthetic media discourse[20].

2 Conceptual Foundations

Several matrices define the conceptual foundations of AI generative content and its capacity to shape the outcomes of US elections, whether state, federal, or congressional. Nonetheless, certain political leaders in the US have greatly benefited from deepfake content, and even certain countries have benefited, as US policy has relied heavily on AI misinformation for the past five years, including the three major wars the US fought and lost bitterly[21].

2.2 Defining Generative Artificial Intelligence

Generative AI is an adaptable technology that creates alternative-reality content that is less original through synthetic data involving videos, texts, images, and even audio by composing itself from expansive datasets of concurrent human creations. Consequently, too many predictive or discriminative AI systems focus on recognizing patterns, classifying data, and predicting numerical outcomes, including, but not limited to, standard suffrage turnout algorithms. This notion synthesizes entirely made artifacts which nearly mimic human expression.

The foundational architecture driving this paradigm shift depends heavily on tech-savvy inventions of the recent past. Primarily, large language models LLMS are transformer models utilizing deep learning through self-attention mechanisms as they process language contextually rather than sequentially. This allows LLMs to predict the most statistically probable next word in a sequence, enabling rapid generation of political speeches, emails, personalized social media content, directions, and lump-sum essays of their own choice[22]. Secondly, Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs) and diffusion models collectively provide a framework for powerful synthetic media creation. GANs pit two neural networks against each other: a discriminator that evaluates realism and a generator that creates content, continually refining the output until a human brain, ear, or eye can no longer distinguish it from the truth[23].

Most critically, generative AI features three distinct characteristics differentiating it from previous digital technologies;

- **Autonomy:** the ability to generate unique variants without direct human drafting.
- **Lower Technical Barriers:** accessible to everyday users via natural language prompts rather than complex programming.
- **Infinite Scalability:** the marginal cost of creating additional content is negligible[24].

2.3 Political Persuasion in the Digital Era

The intentional process of creating a paradigm shift in beliefs, attitudes, and/or electoral behaviors through political persuasion ends up in communicative messaging. In today's

digital age, this practice has evolved through three distinct waves, culminating in the current era of AI-driven messaging.

[Web 1.0 / 2.0: Mass Broadcasts] → [Web 3.0: Big Data Microtargeting] → [Generative Era: Hyper-Personalization]

The mass digital era, when early Internet campaigning relied on dissemination channels such as standard social media posts, e-mail lists, and websites, shifted significantly in the first quarter of the 21st century. Today, persuasion follows the “*one-to-many*” model, which broadcasts a single message to a much broader audience made up of loose demographic blocks. Secondly, the micro-targeting era and big data enable platform data ecosystems such as Google, Facebook, and X, where campaigns transition to a “*one-to-few*” model. Driven by political motivations, campaigns use commercial data to predict voter behavior and build psychographic profiles, slicing the electorate into millions of niche segments. Nonetheless, human copywriters and graphic designers remain a bottleneck, as campaigns can target specific groups but can only afford to craft a dozen unique message variations. Thirdly, the generative hyper-personalization era, where generative AI is introduced as a tool for a “*one-to-one*” persuasive model by linking LLMS directly to psychographic data of the suffrage through an automated pipeline that can dynamically generate hyper-personalized text and visual ads, unique in nature, tailored to an individual's specific linguistic style, values, and their own anxieties[25]. Hence, persuasion is no longer static; it is a scalable, iterative dialogue tailored to exploit distinct psychological profiles[26].

2.4 Democratic Resilience: Theoretical Perspectives

The formal defense capacity of a democratic system is termed democratic resilience, encompassing a matrix of the public sphere, informal norms, and established formal institutions in a democratic country. This notion is designed to adapt, withstand, and recover from systematic aftershocks or waves of existential stress, without collapsing into institutional paralysis, statutory eradication, or authoritarianism. Hence, when evaluating the democratic resilience rule, the overall impact of generative AI is considered through three prominent political theories:

2.3.1. Epistemic Nihilism (“Liar's Dividend”)

Legal scholars have recently coined this term, as it posits that deepfakes and AI-generated fabrications collectively drive the collapse of public trust. The danger this doctrine identifies is that the public may stop believing the truth and accept falsehoods through fake materials circulating online. Cornered political actors, often corrupt, then exploit this environment, gleefully presenting evidence as authentic or as an AI-generated deepfake. This dynamic erodes accountability mechanisms, cornerstones of democracy in the United States since 1776[27].

2.3.2. Epistemic Democracy Theory

This perspective holds that the collective wisdom and accuracy of citizens' decisions is a cornerstone of democratic legitimacy. This notion depends on a shared baseline of truth and a marketplace of ideas where citizens debate facts, make informed choices, and hold political leaders accountable. The rise of generative AI undermines epistemic resilience, as massive amounts of high-fidelity synthetic misinformation flood the public sphere, making it increasingly difficult for people to distinguish fiction from truth[28].

2.3.3. Deliberative Democracy and Affective Polarization

The third perspective, known as deliberative democracy, institutionalizes a willingness to compromise across partisan lines through shared realities and mutual respect. Consequently, generative AI supercharges affective polarization as a lethal weapon, where partisans' tendency to oppose the other party is not viewed as ideological opposition but as existential enmity. Hyper-targeted, emotionally triggering automated content fragments the public into hyperpolarized echo chambers, eroding the social trust established by the forebears of US independence and sustaining democratic norms.

3 Generative AI and Political Attitudes

Political attitudes, by altering opinion strength, are significantly shaped by generative AI, which acts as a powerful persuasion tool by presenting systematic biases. LLMs effectively persuade individuals on policy issues through multi-turn interactions and reinforce their convictions, as moderating effects leave an indelible impression for weeks. True neutrality is practically impossible, as AI-driven dialogues nudge polarized users toward the center, and nuances in alignment processes and training data shape popular models' perceptions in

the eyes of a vast majority with a left-leaning slant. Nonetheless, specialized models are fine-tuned to lean conservative, eroding public trust in systems that remain deeply polarized, as netizens rely on generative AI outputs and accept them when the models' perceived political alignment matches their preconceived notions[29].

3.2 Mechanisms of Influence on Voter Perceptions

Generative AI alters suffrage perception as political content is dictated, consumed, and manufactured to target conventional media, broadcasting uniform messages to a broader audience. In this regard, AI must leverage the individual conviction of computational pipelines through three core mechanisms.

3.1.1. Attention Scarcity and Information Flooding

The marginal cost of generating AI content is absolutely negligible, persuading political campaigns and foreign influence operations to flood the digital landscape through endless variations of a specific narrative. This creates an environment of cognitive upheaval, where the overwhelming influx of information pushes people to rely on quick mental shortcuts, or heuristics, instead of critical thinking, making them highly susceptible to manipulation[30].

3.1.2. Source Mimicry and Trust Exploitation

Generative AI makes it incredibly easy to spoof trusted information sources. This may include the writing style of reputable journalists, as AI can generate fake local news articles and even clone the voices of family members of local community leaders. The malicious actors then bypass a voter's natural skepticism by hijacking trusted sources on a particular issue[31].

3.1.3. The Automated Hyper-Personalization

The collective integration of granular data databases, which include social media activity, consumer habits, and voting histories, with LLMs to dynamically generate bespoke political copies of past campaigns. The policy emphasizes that aligning with a person's psychological profile increases persuasiveness by modifying a message's vocabulary, syntax, and language to appeal to that person's interests. This may also include using the English alphabet for languages like Spanish, Urdu, and Arabic, which are phonetically Eastern[32].

3.3 Emotional Contagion and Cognitive Biases

AI-driven observation is heavily dependent on its interaction with human psychology, as the effectiveness of generative AI at triggering specific cognitive biases through exacerbating emotional content is perceived across digital platforms 1st the cognitive biases exploited through AI architecture are detected through AI algorithms about the personal conviction capacity of an individual to automatically generated content, thereby reinforcing those views irrespective of their authenticity. This segment reinforces existing prejudices, protecting the user from opposing facts. The illusory truth effect repeats exposure to a statement and increases the likelihood that an individual will believe it to be true[33].

This process begins with the generation of millions of slight variations of fake claims, where AI creates a digital echo chamber that tricks the brain into accepting a lie through sheer repetition. Visual confirmation bias evolved to help humans believe what they see and then act accordingly. Deepfake images from my videos and audio are high-fidelity synthetic media that exploit this deep-seated cognitive vulnerability, creating illogical reasoning through powerful emotional reactions.

Nonetheless, virality and emotional impact can explode when polarization is maximized by optimizing generative AI to tap into strong negative emotions, including but not limited to moral outrage, anger, and fear. When an LLM or image generator creates content depicting an opposing political candidate as an existential threat, it triggers a strong emotional response. Netizens quickly accept this content; they resonate with it and share it with their networks, turning localized disinformation into a viral, self-replicating phenomenon.

3.3 Case Studies of AI-Driven Political Messaging

To contemplate this technological workflow in real time, we observed several distinguished examples through recent political cycles, where generative AI was actively employed to influence public opinion:

3.3.1. Hyper-Targeted Avatars and Persona Bots (The Midterm Shift)

Political election committees and PACs have begun deploying interactive AI avatars and automated chat personas through recent congressional and local election cycles. These initiatives have primarily taken hold on Reddit, Discord, and X as the three prime

platforms, but Instagram, Facebook, and sometimes Telegram also play a secondary role in this manipulation. Significantly, these AI bots may not only generate static posts but also engage in real-time, bidirectional political debates with actual members. By consistently maintaining and adapting arguments and personas, search AI agents successfully simulated astroturfing, suddenly shifted opinions, and swing districts[34].

3.3.2. The Automated Robocall Deception (New Hampshire Primary)

A political operative used an AI voice-cloning tool to mimic President Joe Biden's voice during the 2024 New Hampshire Democratic primary. Many voters thwarted this attempt, as the automated phone call was literally blasted, asking them to skip the primary and save their votes for the November general election. This incident highlights the repercussions of audio deepfakes, which are weaponized for voter suppression by employing an authoritative figure's cloned voice and manipulating electoral behavior[35].

3.3.3. Synthetic Negative Campaigning (RNC Visual Attack Ad)

In a counterargument, the Republican National Committee RNC released an obnoxious AI-generated video advertisement entitled “Beat Biden”. This ad used highly realistic synthetic imagery to portray a dystopian future if the incumbent president were re-elected, showing scenes of economic collapse, international conflicts, and border crises across the US. This propaganda created a paradigm shift in post-mortem campaigning: instead of arguing through authentic footage, political organizations now manufacture high-impact visual realities that shape suffrage anxieties[36].

Moreover, the manuscript would benefit from incorporating a mediational framework drawn from political communication and psychology scholarship. For example, AI-enabled hyper-personalization may influence electoral behavior indirectly through increased message relevance and perceived authenticity; source mimicry may operate through trust and credibility heuristics; and information flooding may affect outcomes through information overload, uncertainty, and reduced confidence in information quality. Explicitly specifying these intermediary mechanisms would move the argument beyond descriptive claims and provide a more robust explanation of how generative AI influences democratic processes.

4. Electoral Behavior and AI Interventions

AI is deeply embedded in US electoral behavior and serves as a core operational tool for political campaigns, ultimately becoming a primary source of misinformation for voters. In a September 2026 study by the Institute for Strategic Dialogue (ISD), researchers found that roughly 40% of U.S. adults use AI chatbots to navigate complex, highly localized voting rules, and the study warns that 29% of these responses remain inaccurate or outdated[37]. Simultaneously, political campaigns leverage machine learning for sentiment analysis, predictive suffrage targeting, and massive automated outreach. This rapid adoption has increased vulnerability through automated deepfakes and foreign influence operations. Consequently, US lawmakers are pushing transparency acts to mandate AI disclaimers, while tech platforms are integrating verified data from recognized organizations, including Democracy Works, to curb electoral misinformation[38].

4.1 AI in Microtargeting and Voter Mobilization

Hitherto, generative AI is transforming suffrage mobilization from a resource-heavy human operation into a highly sophisticated, automated, and yet highly scalable system. Prior to the advent of this technology, political campaigns were structurally bottlenecked by the time human staff needed to spend analyzing voter files and writing customized copy. One example is the 2000 US election, when George W Bush was accidentally declared president at 5:00 PM, and an hour later the newspaper had to regret and apologize for publishing the news[39]. The Florida recount began manually; after leaks of uncertainty, incumbent Vice President Al Gore withdrew from the race, allowing George W. Bush to become president of the United States[40]. Nonetheless, in today's arena, integrating LLMs into massive voter-data ecosystems aggregates voting history, consumer behaviors via data brokers, and, most importantly, real-time sentiment tracking; campaigns are now monitored through a full-scale digital pipeline[41].

The strategic message architecture, where conservative tech groups, through progressiveness, have established expensive databases, enables dozens of campaign-specific AI tools. These attempts instantly turn a single policy position into a week's worth of multi-channel social media content, personalized text pages, and localized mailers tailored to distinct voter segments. High-scale relational organizing: political organizations

use generative assistance to amplify relational organizing. Grassroots volunteers employ AI copilots to draft persuasive, non-judgmental messaging designed to shift entrenched opinions or handle voter objections during text banking. The efficiency paradox is at stake: AI enables campaigns to reach swing voters with unprecedented precision, but emerging field data suggest that delegating outreach to machines carries hidden costs. Voters often resist algorithmic intervention in deeply subjective or identity-relevant spaces, which can diminish the civic-commitment value that human canvassing has conventionally conveyed over the past 250 years[42].

4.2 Impact on Turnout, Party Identification, and Issue Salience

The widespread deployment of generative AI across digital networks exerts targeted downstream effects on voting choices, including which issues dominate public debate and turnout dynamics. In this regard, it is imperative to note that mobilization in voter turnout is achieved through the deployment of targeted deepfake audio and videos, which are hallucinated through procedural voting information via popular chatbots. This real-time, localized deepfake threat delays reporting, can suppress turnout among targeted demographics, and increases logistical barriers through conflicting election deadlines. Distortions of on-the-ground reality on election day are another key aspect, as party identification can be manipulated through AI-mediated generation, also known as “Generation Memphis” [43].

The algorithmic reinforcement of in-group versus out-group lines deepens effective polarization and partisan entrenchment. This notion further solidifies cognitive blind spots through tailored confirmation biases. The salience issue of flooding the public sphere with synthetic propaganda automates the creation of highly divisive negative content. This artificially elevates fringe topics into mainstream focus, undermines substantive policy debates, and favors emotionally charged threats.

Subsequently, a fundamental risk stems from public reliance on AI chatbots for voting logistics, as recent empirical studies conducted by research centers like the Institute of Strategic Dialogue (ISD) found that leading consumer AI models provided inaccurate, obsolete responses that were incomplete for basic voting process questions roughly 29% of the time ahead of major election cycles. Such errors included hallucinating incorrect

Election Day dates or failing to provide critical state-specific mail-in voting requirements[44].

4.3 Comparative Insights from Recent U.S. Elections

The empirical footprint of AI has expanded rapidly across consecutive U.S. election cycles; the 2016, 2020, and 2024 campaigns were, incidentally, three of the three campaigns in which incumbent President Donald J. Trump won through AI deception capabilities[45]. This technological transition from a novel content generator into a comprehensive strategy engine identifies key stages, which are explained below:

[2024 Presidential Cycle] → → → → [2026 Midterm Cycle]

- Mostly crude audio deepfakes
- Disjointed video attack ads
- Experimental, isolated tools
- Pervasive "Generative Memesis" (AI memes)
- Hyper-targeted conversational bot networks
- End-to-end strategic campaign orchestration

4.3.1. The 2024 Presidential Cycle: The Deepfake Proof of Concept

The highly effective 2024 election campaign provided clear proof of concept, as malicious and official campaign actors used synthetic media to promote preconceived notions and personal vendettas. This campaign was characterized by a highly publicized early weaponization of events, including the New Hampshire primary robocall that cloned Joe Biden's voice to suppress turnout, official resume ads painting fully synthesized despotic futures, and deepfake imagery depicting candidate affiliations with specific demographic blocks. Academics analyzing the 2024 race have noted the rise of generative memes, a phenomenon in which partisans weaponize AI to generate innumerable viral political memes on platforms like X, Telegram, and Instagram. This staggering data revealed partisan division: left-leaning netizens heavily leverage generative AI for in-group support; by contrast, right-leaning netizens primarily deploy synthetic imagery for out-group visual attacks[46].

4.3.2. The 2026 Midterm Cycle: Systemic Integration and Informational Overload

As we have recently witnessed the 2026 midterm cycle of the electoral vote in the US, generative AI has moved beyond shocking deepfakes and become an ongoing baseline threat. Cybersecurity assessments and national security observers, such as Check Point's

US midterm election threat outlook, highlight that AI-enabled campaigns have supercharged localized disinformation. Domestic and foreign stakeholders use LLMs to execute hyper-targeted phishing, domain abuse designed to mislead voters, and brand impersonation that misleads voters about state election infrastructure. Subsequently, political campaigns have normalized bidirectional interactions about personas on forums to simulate grassroots consensus through troll turfing and artificially alter candidate popularity in key swing districts[47].

5. Conclusion

In conclusion, we identify several outrageous issues that warrant further discussion. Although we will be polite to a fault to avoid the very limited recourse on this matter, several barriers remain to moving forward.

5.1 Summary of Findings

This academic study illustrates how generative AI serves as an important force multiplier for political persuasion. We observed that the structural alteration of the US information ecosystem is driven by the massive impact of synthetic media and LLMs on voter attitudes and electoral behavior. Hence, we converge on our discussion on three imperative findings:

5.1.1. Electoral Behavior Shifts

AI-generated synthetic content measurably shifts undecided voters. This behavior significantly influences down-ballot races through mainstream media coverage. Automotive interaction platforms connect as highly persuasive agents through interactive voter suppression and successfully deter turnout by providing false logistical details about voting times and locations.

5.1.2. Hyper-personalized persuasion

Generative AI has expanded this, allowing political campaigns to move beyond basic demographic targeting. Micro-targeted AI messaging adapts in real time to an individual voter's psychological profile, linguistic style, and local grievances. This notion drastically lowers the financial cost of deep persuasive outreach.

5.1.3. Asymmetric information pollution

As we see the wholesale fabrication of digital realities, deepfake videos of presidential candidates can alter the opinions of highly partisan voters. In contrast, it can also introduce widespread cognitive fatigue. The principal damage is not always widespread deception but rather a liar's dividend where voters begin to doubt legitimate journalistic facts.

5.2 Policy Recommendations

The policy recommendations protect democratic resilience without infringing on the First Amendment, which protects U.S. state and federal institutions, by implementing a multi-layered regulatory strategy. This segment includes the following three best recommendations that we can propose to the general audience:

5.2.1. Platform Liability and Rapid Demotion

In this regard, lawmakers must use Section 230 protections as a prerequisite for large technology platforms to quickly flag and demote unlabeled, fact-checked viral synthetic political content during the 60-day window before federal elections.

5.2.2. Upgrading of the Federal Election Campaign Act (FECA)

The Federal Election Commission FEC must explicitly ban fraudulent misrepresentation achieved through synthetic media. This rule should require clear, prominent disclosure labels on any campaign material that uses generative AI to alter candidates' appearance, statements, and especially their voice.

5.2.3. Watermarking and Mandatory Provenance

Congress should mandate technical standards like the Coalition for Content Provenance and Authenticity (C2PA). This standard ensures that all generated AI political advertisements carry permanent, machine-readable cryptographic watermarks that indicate their synthetic origins.

5.3 Future Research Directions

As AI technologies evolve, academic attention must shift toward the systematic, long-term impacts of synthetic media on democratic governance. In this regard, we propose three key future research directions.

5.3.1. Cross-Platform Diffusion Analysis

More empirical work is needed to map how AI-generated content spreads across decentralized encrypted messaging networks, such as WhatsApp and Signal, compared with public social media platforms. These private networks remain a blind spot for current electoral monitoring

5.3.2. Longitudinal Behavioral Tracking

In our view, future studies should show a shift from short-term lab experiments to long-term field studies. This paradigm shift can track continuous exposure to interactive AI agents shaping A voter's political identity and trust in institutions over several election cycles.

5.3.3. Auditing LLM Political Bias

Researchers must develop standardized, open-source benchmarks to audit commercial foundation models for systematic political bias. This includes investigating whether safety guardrails in advertising suppress legitimate political discourse.

Generative AI is a modular example of a dual-edge amplifier in the United States political landscape. This modern-day technology simultaneously introduces systemic risks to electoral integrity and revokes standard operating procedures by offering nascent avenues for civic management. A democratic resilience framework shows that the technology's primary political footprint is manufacturing systemic uncertainty among the electorate. The study examines the growing influence of generative artificial intelligence on suffrage behavior and political attitudes in the US through a democratic resilience lens. The analysis shows that generative AI is restructuring electoral communications by enabling large-scale content generation, synthetic media production, hyper-personalized political messaging, automated engagement strategies, and voter behavior. Beyond serving as a media production tool, it automates engagement strategies that can become sources of misinformation, as these technologies shape the broader informal environment in which citizens form candidate evaluations, political judgments, and interest in voting. The findings suggest that mechanisms such as source mimicry, information flooding, and personalized persuasion affect electoral communication by shaping perceptions of message relevance, trust, and credibility, and thus create new challenges for a combined institutional democratic perception. The study further contributes to the emerging literature on AI governance and political communication by developing democratic resilience as a framework for understanding the relationship between electoral integrity and technological innovation, which are increasingly intertwined. Significant concerns emerge at the intersection of effective polarization, institutional trust, and information disorder, highlighting the structural repercussions of AI-driven political communication. The analysis also suggests that the fundamental democratic risk lies in the propagation of false

information through the gradual erosion of citizens' confidence in shared sources of democratic institutions through knowledgeable platforms. From a policy perspective, the findings support a balanced regulatory approach that safeguards electoral integrity while preserving constitutional protections for political expression. Content provenance standards, cryptographic watermarking, and enhanced transparency requirements for AI-generated political communication are collective measures that target updates to platform accountability mechanisms and electoral laws, strengthening democratic resilience without disproportionately restricting legitimate political speech. The authors faced several limitations, which should be acknowledged, as the study is primarily based on qualitative analysis, emerging case studies, and policy documents, and is secondary in evidence, including the limited ability to establish direct causal relationships between AI-generated content and suffrage behavior. Furthermore, the rapidly evolving nature of generative AI suggests that both technological capabilities and regulatory responses may change significantly in the coming days and years, by the next electoral campaigns of 2028 and 2032. The researchers recommend that future research use longitudinal studies, comparative cross-national analyses, and experimental designs to examine how AI political communication shapes suffrage attitudes, democratic trust across political contexts, and electoral participation. Future research is essential for developing evidence-based strategies, thus ensuring that democratic institutions remain resilient in an increasingly AI-driven information ecosystem.

Ethical Considerations

Not applicable. This study did not require ethical approval because it does not include human or animal subjects and does not involve any personal or sensitive data.

List of Abbreviation

(AI): Artificial Intelligence; (USA): United States of America (FEC): Federal Election Commission; (C2PA): Coalition for Content Provenance and Authenticity; (LLMs): large language models; (GANs) : Generative Adversarial Networks; (ISD): Institute for Strategic Dialogue; (FECA): Federal Election Campaign Act;

Acknowledgment:

The authors further acknowledge the **Editorial Office of the *Al-Biruni Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*** ** and ** to **Noor Al-Ilm for Publishing and Distribution** * for providing editorial and publication support and for granting a **full waiver of the article processing charges (APCs)***, thereby enabling the present work to be published without publication fees to the authors.

The authors gratefully acknowledge all individuals and institutions whose assistance, cooperation, and support contributed to the successful completion of this study.

Author Contribution:

All authors contributed equally to the main contributor to this paper. All authors read and approved the final paper.

Declaration of generative AI and AI-assisted technologies in the writing process

The authors hereby declare that no generative artificial intelligence or AI-assisted technologies were used at any stage during the preparation of this manuscript, including language editing, proofreading, or content development. The authors take full responsibility for the originality and integrity of the work presented in this

Funding:

The authors received no external financial funding for the conduct of this study. However, the authors were granted a full waiver of the article processing charges (APCs) by the Editorial Office of the *Al-Biruni Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences* and Noor Al-Ilm for Publishing and Distribution. Accordingly, no publication fees were incurred by the authors.

Conflicts of Interest:

“The authors declare no conflict of interest.”

References

- [1] Alexander Bick, Adam Blandin, David J. Deming (2026). The Rapid Adoption of Generative AI. *Management Science* 0(0). <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2025.02523>

- [2] Cordie, L., Conceição, S. C., & Lin, X. (2026). Artificial Intelligence in the United States: Adoption, Perception, and Professional Attitudes. Navigating the AI Frontier in Adult Education, 88-102. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003656630-2>
- [3] Eskiadi, I. G., & Panagiotou, N. (2026). The impact of social media and digital campaigns: Transforming voter behavior and election outcomes. In Understanding voter behavior with predictive modeling (pp. 399-444). IGI Global Scientific Publishing.
- [4] Cowburn, M. (2026). Campaigning and Digital Media. In: Peele, G., Herbert, J., La Raja, R.J., Wroe, A. (eds) Developments in American Politics 10. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-032-21792-9_3
- [5] Cruz, Evangeline T., "Framing Belonging and Exclusion: A Dialogic Narrative Analysis of English- and Spanish-Language Immigration Coverage During the Trump 2024 Presidential Election" (2026). Theses and Dissertations. 2276. <https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/etd/2276>
- [6] Nair, P. P., Gressel, G., & Achuthan, K. (2026, July). Lost in Translation? How Language Shapes Responsibility Attribution in Large Language Models. In Proceedings of the 4th Workshop on Cross-Cultural Considerations in NLP (C3NLP 2026) (pp. 137-149).. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2026.c3nlp-1.11>
- [7] Matar, S., Abouhaiba, N., Mahmoud, D., Hammad, H., & Suliman, S. (2026). COMPARATIVE MEDIA COVERAGE OF NEW YORK'S FIRST MUSLIM MAYOR: WESTERN AND ARAB NARRATIVES ON ZOHRAN MAMDANI'S HISTORIC VICTORY. Scientific Culture, 12(2, Part 1), 3029. doi. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.122.126233>
- [8] Phillips, J. B., & Warner, S. B. (2026). Election Outcomes and Affective Polarization in the United States. Political Research Quarterly, 79(2), 399-409. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10659129251411892>
- [9] ILBASMIŞ, V. S. (2026). ECHO CHAMBERS AND FILTER BUBBLES IN THE AGE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE: EFFECTS ON PUBLIC DISCOURSE AND THE CHALLENGES FACING DELIBERATIVE DEMOCRACY. Revista științifică a Universității de Stat din Moldova, (11), 7. <https://doi.org/10.59295/sum>
- [10] Li , X. (2026). Deepfakes and the Liar's Dividend: From Deception to Denial in the Erosion of Public Trust. Transactions on Social Science, Education and Humanities Research, 17, 63-69. <https://doi.org/10.62051/kwhacx95>
- [11] Lawrie Phillips. "Why Do We Sleep with the Window Open?" (@Wizard_Bisan): Using Mobile Journalism to Combat Pro-Israeli Propaganda Against the People of Gaza. Arab Studies Quarterly. 2026. Vol. 48(2):103-121. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.13169/arabstudquar.48.2.0002>
- [12] Stefanik, E. (2026). Poisoned Ivies: The Inside Account of the Academic and Moral Rot at America's Elite Universities. Simon and Schuster.
- [13] Schlagel, Ian and Young, Andrew T., The Electoral College and Distributive Presidential Politics (April 26, 2026). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=6653501> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.6653501>
- [14] Berggren, L., & Brucker, E. (2026). From Ideation to Launch: How Generative AI Reshapes Product Development in Creative Industries.
- [15] Raza, M., Jahangir, Z., Riaz, M.B (2025). Industrial applications of large language models. Sci Rep 15, 13755. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-025-98483-1>
- [16] Kumar, S., & Bhattacharjee, K. (2026). The role and impact of artificial intelligence-driven political marketing strategies on voter engagement and electoral outcomes in emerging democracies: A systematic literature review and research agenda. Applied Marketing Analytics, 11(4), 346-358.

- [17] Fu, R. J. (2026). Architects of the Intelligent Age: OpenAI, Google DeepMind, Anthropic, Nvidia, and Microsoft and Their Role in Shaping the Future of Artificial Intelligence. *Artificial Intelligence, Machine Learning, & Robotics in Business*, 2(2), 32-52.
<https://doi.org/10.32473/aimlrb.2.2.142541>
- [18] boyd, danah. (2026). Social Media Is Now Parasocial Media. *Social Media + Society*, 12(2).
<https://doi.org/10.1177/20563051261437487>
- [19] Castellanos Rivadeneira, Jacobo, C2PA Content Credentials and the Surveillance Risk: Adversarial Scenarios and Governance Gaps in the Content Provenance Ecosystem (June 22, 2026). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=6986118> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.6986118>
- [20] Alamin M, Alrached SA, Abasher MH, Mahmoud K, Altaher A and Mohamed EAS (2026) Synthetic media, political disinformation, and the erosion of public trust: a systematic review and synthetic epistemic destabilization model. *Front. Polit. Sci.* 8:1811974. doi: <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpos.2026.1811974>
- [21] Freedman, L. D. (2025). The age of forever wars: Why military strategy no longer delivers victory. *Foreign Aff.*, 104, 108.
- [22] Oh, B. D., & Linzen, T. (2026). To model human linguistic prediction, make LLMs less superhuman. *Trends in cognitive sciences*.
- [23] Zhang, T. (2026). Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs). In: *An Introduction to Materials Informatics*. Springer, Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-95-6091-2_8
- [24] Wessel, M., Adam, M., Benlian, A., Majchrzak, A., & Thies, F. (2025). Generative AI and its Transformative Value for Digital Platforms. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 42(2), 346–369. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07421222.2025.2487315>
- [25] JEGEDE, O. E. P. Comparative Evidence of Voters' Inducement in Some Selected States Across the Globe: The Attitude is not in Colour but in Nature.
- [26] Dasanaik, N. The Small-Area Global Elections (SAGE) Dataset. *Sci Data* (2026).
<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41597-026-07869-x>
- [27] Roushan, R. (2026). The Reality War: How to Know What's True When Everything Can Be Faked.
- [28] Rigollot, A., Turkiewicz, M., Gunga, Z., & Herin, F. (2026). Deliberative ethics as a response to both health populisms and the epistocratic temptation in public health within health democracy. A literature review and a theoretical analysis framework. *Ethics, Medicine and Public Health*, 34, 101297.
- [29] Bandi, A., Adapa, P. V. S. R., & Kuchi, Y. E. V. P. K. (2023). The Power of Generative AI: A Review of Requirements, Models, Input–Output Formats, Evaluation Metrics, and Challenges. *Future Internet*, 15(8), 260. <https://doi.org/10.3390/fi15080260>
- [30] Gans, J. S. (2025). Controlling Collective Attention: Flooding versus Focusing by Politicians (No. w33933). National Bureau of Economic Research. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3386/w33933>
- [31] Wessler, J., Loschelder, D.D., Fendel, J.C. et al. The Too-Much-Mimicry Effect: Strong (vs. Subtle) Mimicry Impairs Liking and Trust in Distributive Negotiations. *J Nonverbal Behav* 48, 253–276 (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10919-023-00446-5>
- [32] Yarchi, M., & Blatt, E. (2026). Artificial intelligence and the image war: does exposing AI-generated images as fake limit the images' influence on perceptions about wars and conflicts? *Information, Communication & Society*, 29(10), 3116–3137.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2025.2592772>

- [33] Luo, Y. (2025). The Role of Cognitive Bias and Emotional Drive in the Dissemination of Fake News: A Review and Prospectus. *International Journal Fine Arts and Creative Innovation*, 2(2).
- [34] Barbosa, I., & Real de Oliveira, E. (2025). Virtual influencers in the metaverse: Transformative advertising applications for social change and well-being. *Journal of Marketing Communications*, 1–34. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13527266.2025.2562269>
- [35] Hailey, A. J. (2025). Digital deception: how artificial intelligence poses a threat to the United States' domestic elections (Doctoral dissertation).
- [36] Teele, D. L. (2025). Women's suffrage: causes and consequences. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 28(1), 477-497. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-033123-125642>
- [37] McBain, R. K., Cantor, J. H., Breslau, J., Diliberti, M., Zhang, L. A., Zhang, F., ... & Yu, H. (2026). AI chatbot use and disclosure for mental health among US adolescents and young adults. *JAMA pediatrics*. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapediatrics.2026.2015>
- [38] Suherman, A., Hidayatullah, M., Ode Muhammad Azhar Sa'ban, L., & Mulia, F. (2026). Information Disorder and Electoral Integrity: The Impact of Disinformation on Elections in Developing Democracies. In *Social Sciences*. IntechOpen. <https://doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.1012574>
- [39] Karem, B. J. (2022). *Free the Press: The Death of American Journalism and How to Revive It*. Simon and Schuster.
- [40] Cobbs, A. R. (2024). So Let It Be with Us: Realigning Recount Laws with American Democracy. *Miss. LJ*, 94, 1455.
- [41] Padalko, H. (2025). Russian disinformation about the US election: AI analysis of narratives. *Center for International Governance Innovation*.
- [42] Raviv, S. (2026). When do citizens resist the use of AI algorithms in public policy? Theory and evidence. *The Journal of Politics*, 88(4), 000-000. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1086/736362>
- [43] Susko, M. A. (2025). The Birth and Unfolding of Phases in History. *The Birth and Unfolding of Phases in History*.
- [44] Hart, M. B. (2026). 'Less than a speck of dirt': exploring the manifestos of nihilistic violent extremists. *Behavioral Sciences of Terrorism and Political Aggression*, 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19434472.2026.2633403>
- [45] Wörsdörfer, Manuel, *Computer Ethics in the Age of Trump: The Politics of AI and Tech Governance* (January 01, 2026). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=5999194> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5999194>
- [46] Davis, K.S. Electoral readjustments of the Trump era: shifts in county-level voting patterns, 2016–2024. *GeoJournal* 91, 89 (2026). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10708-026-11640-5>
- [47] Wood, J. D. G. (2026). Strategic repoliticisation: inflation, blame, and the fracturing of democratic accountability in the United States. *New Political Economy*, 31(4), 794–816. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13563467.2026.2619677>