

Change the leaves without cutting the roots

Progressive democracy, digital democracy?

Artificial intelligence: the ability of a system, of a machine, to **show** human capabilities such as reasoning, learning, planning actions consequent to a decision.

Democracy: the form of government where sovereignty is exercised directly or indirectly by the people.

How is it decided, who decides, by what process is it decided, are the questions that will be influenced by artificial intelligence?

The decisions and normative/legislative actions consequent to their implementation, referred to collective and/or general interests, represent an element of particular centrality, and criticality, for a democratic system .

For over fifty years, the majority part of our country's political left has theorized (and practiced) the idea of progressive democracy as a functional tool for change and transformation of economic and social relations. An idea of democracy that does not end with the electoral dimension, which is typical of liberal democracies, but which is made up of forms of participation through subjects and colleagues. The par--, the intermediate social bodies, the different forms of aggregation that act in the different ambits of society, become and are instruments that contribute with their action to the definition of choices. A democratic process which in the social dialectic, in acting collectively, also determines the presupposition of the transformation of the existing into a reforming perspective.

Political, social and cultural actors who, for- their own autonomous point of view on the existing, by virtue of their representation, act in the given context to influence decisions on what to do to respond to general needs and/or interests. Subjects that have contributed to processes in which the different interests of social bodies, the different needs of the people they represent and which in the institutional and social dialectic, at least in the season of social conquests, have produced or results are recognised- that have determined emancipation, risk, dignity, justice.

Complementary pivot (as much as fundamental) is also free information. Pluralism in the political and social dialectic that finds expression in the pluralism of information. Not surprisingly, even if they have changed over time, there are rules to support the press. Pluralism in information which contributes to the formation of opinions and consensus. Collective thinking and collective action intertwine and are interdependent.

This stratification relies on principles of mediation and intermediation and on the ability to build consensus which is not simply limited to the periodic electoral dimension.

It is clear that this system is experiencing its own crisis today. A crisis of political thought that is reflected in society, in the collective conscience and consequently in the conception of mediation, intermediation and their purposes. From lo?a to war, from adversary to enemy. On the floor

cultural and conceptual, the idea that there is a common 'heritage' that after the Liberation found expression in the Republican Constitution disappears.

This crisis is amplified in today's methods of forms of participation. Technological innovation based on the advent of social networks has contributed to disintermediation. It is precisely through social media that the illusion of direct democracy has been built based on the individualization of people and on their de-responsibility regarding the need to act as colleagues does.

Precisely the culture of disintermediation favors the fact that a part of the political class 'autonomize' from society, effectively contributing to the distancing of people from the idea that the political class takes care of them (data statistically detectable by the percentages of turnout in the elections and by the propensity to enrollment in parties - There).

This summary evocation of memory and of some cultural changes must lead us to question ourselves on the reflections, and on the dangers, of the impact of artificial intelligence on democracy in our country and in our society.

It was written in the incipit of the ability of a machine to **display** human abilities. Precisely this underlining urges us on the relationship that exists between the machine and the human to be emulated who, by definition, is the bearer of interests, needs, subjects and colleagues. The ability to **show** human abilities cannot therefore be abstracted from the point of view of the human, from his conception of economic and social relations, from the thinking he carries, from his needs.

The new frontier that lies ahead with the affirmation of artificial intelligence speaks to us (again) of how innovation, its use, is not neutral. And given that as de?o above artificial intelligence does not exist in nature it is legitimate to speak of an 'Indo?o sen-king' which is none other than the ideological basis and values of those who design it.

The technological ability to write texts elaborated, of vocal synthesization, which are the fruit of 'reasoning' can only correspond to the 'Indo?o sen-re' of the machine that **shows** human skills. And the same ability of the machine to adjust its 'reasoning' ability could be nothing other than the communicative adjustment of its own 'Indo-feeling' in relation to the processing of the information (whatever it may be) detected. When this engages the media system, it not only undermines the employment factor, but undermines the assumption of independence of those who provide information. And if democracy is 'attacked' in terms of information, and their critical analysis, which is made available to people, the principle of popular sovereignty mentioned above is conditioned.

One could, without exhaustive ambitions, try to identify what the anchors could be to avoid sliding towards forms of non-democracy due to the impact of artificial intelligence.

First of all, it would be useful to make the 'Indo?o' sen-re plural to allow us to be able to speak of artificial intelligences. Imagine a digital dialectic that is complementary to social, political and cultural dialectics.

Masses of data and information must be made public and accessible. The definition of a master plan of kings and das can be a ground on which to standardize a form of digital democracy. Trying to subtract from the data market the transparent governance of information and data,

from how they are found to how they are used, it can help to avoid forms of digital dictatorship (the technology available to single thought).

It is necessary to support and promote the initiatives that favor the pluralism of the 'Indo-European' starting from the collective, not private, forms that can be built around an idea of democratic participation which contributes to the exercise of popular sovereignty. Functional could be digital communities that would configure themselves as instruments of democratic and popular participation.

After all, it is a question of composing (even better, recomposing) a dialectic that concerns the different interests and collective needs that cross a complex society such as ours. Artificial intelligences as a technological tool, not as a prerequisite for neo-oligarchies. Making the machine, the system, the tool available to collective intelligence that promotes collective action. Action, the collective one, inspired by critical thinking at the basis of which the general interest is the pivot around which the commitment rotates to confront and clash with the paradigm of digital capitalism based on the immateriality of data as a commodity functional to the accumulation of capital.

Identifying in the field of participatory democracy, of popular sovereignty, the ground on which to build new forms of social protection in technological change, prospects for emancipation, means continuing in the political, social and cultural struggle for a society of free and equals.