

AI as a Threat to Democratic Public Space: An Orwellian Analysis

Demokratik Kamusal Alana Tehdit Olarak Yapay Zekâ: Orwellci Bir Analiz

UFUK ÖZEN BAYKENT 
Bursa Uludağ University

MARTIN OVENS 
Wolfson College, University of Oxford

Received: 03.03.2025 | Accepted: 30.06.2025

Abstract: This article explores how artificial intelligence (AI) is increasingly transforming democratic public spaces, drawing on George Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four as a powerful analytical lens. The study critically examines the convergence between Orwell's dystopian vision—marked by total surveillance, propaganda, and the erosion of individual autonomy—and contemporary uses of AI in surveillance capitalism, predictive policing, content moderation, and data-driven social control. Modern AI systems risk replicating Orwellian mechanisms by shaping opinion, manipulating truth, and deterring dissent through algorithmic opacity and pervasive monitoring. The paper argues that reclaiming democracy in the age of AI requires a shift from profit- or control-driven models to socially accountable and ethically grounded systems. It advocates for democratic oversight, transparency, critical digital literacy, and inclusive policymaking to prevent Orwell's dystopia from becoming reality. Ultimately, the article contends that democracy can only survive if public spaces—both physical and digital—remain open, participatory, and resistant to algorithmic domination.

Keywords: George Orwell, Artificial Intelligence, Nineteen Eighty-Four, Democratic Public Spaces, Surveillance, AI Ethics.

✉ Ufuk Özen Baykent
Bursa Uludağ Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Bölümü
16059, Bursa, Türkiye | ufukozen@uludag.edu.tr

✉ Martin Ovens
University of Oxford, Wolfson College, Department of Philosophy
42130, Oxford, UK | martin.ovens@wolfson-oxford.com



Introduction

George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* provides a chilling forecast of a world ruled by surveillance, propaganda, and the suppression of personal freedom. Although the novel depicts a dystopian future, it also offers insights into modern issues. This article argues that artificial intelligence (AI) is speeding up the realization of Orwell's vision, posing a serious threat to democratic public spaces. By exploring the intersection of technology, power, and surveillance, the paper suggests that the unchecked expansion of AI is ushering in a new era of control and manipulation akin to the totalitarian regime described in Orwell's work.

The study analyses how AI influences public opinion, controls information flow, and enables extensive surveillance, showing how these trends undermine the fundamental principles of democracy. The study examines how AI affects the way people form and change their opinions. AI algorithms, particularly those used in social media and news platforms, can shape public perception by promoting certain viewpoints, suppressing others, or creating echo chambers that reinforce existing beliefs. It looks into how AI technologies manage and regulate the dissemination of information. This includes how AI systems prioritize or filter news and content, which can impact what information people see and how they understand current events. This control can be used to manipulate public sentiment and limit access to diverse viewpoints. The study explores how AI facilitates widespread monitoring of individuals. Privacy holds significant value for society as a whole. It allows individuals to engage in public life without exposing their vulnerabilities, fostering confident social interactions. When we vote, we trust that our choices remain private, ensuring that we won't be judged or treated differently based on our decisions. In this way, privacy plays a crucial role in supporting democracy. Additionally, we often prefer not to know every detail about those around us, and privacy shields us from information overload. Anonymity also empowers individuals to speak out against corruption, express creativity, and challenge injustice without fear of repercussion (Macnish, 2024, Internet Encyclopaedia of Philosophy).

"Recent developments in information technology threaten the protection of personal privacy in fundamentally new ways" (Roessler, 2023).



Advanced surveillance technologies, powered by AI, can track and analyse personal data, behaviours, and interactions on a massive scale, potentially infringing on privacy and freedoms. By analyzing these aspects, the study demonstrates how AI-driven practices can erode key democratic values such as free speech, privacy, and the right to access diverse information. The manipulation of public opinion and the control of information flow can undermine democratic processes by skewing public discourse and limiting genuine democratic participation.

George Orwell's novel *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is relevant to understanding contemporary issues, particularly in relation to the impact of artificial intelligence (AI) on democratic societies. The novel *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is known for its unsettling depiction of a totalitarian regime where surveillance, propaganda, and suppression of personal freedoms are prevalent. Orwell's novel is frequently referenced in current discussions on 'fake news,' post-truth politics, and surveillance (Roberts, 2020). Orwell's dystopian world portrays a society under constant surveillance, where the government manipulates information and controls nearly every aspect of life, significantly limiting individual freedom. Despite being set in a fictional, dystopian future, Orwell's novel offers valuable perspectives on current societal problems. It highlights themes such as the dangers of surveillance, the manipulation of information, and the erosion of personal liberties – issues that are increasingly relevant today. The article argues that AI technologies are intensifying the realization of the dystopian conditions Orwell described. In contemporary contexts, AI systems are being used for extensive surveillance, control of information, and influence over public opinion. These technologies can infringe on privacy, manipulate individuals, and alter democratic processes, mirroring the oppressive characteristics of Orwell's fictional regime. The widespread deployment of AI poses a serious threat to democratic principles and public spaces. AI's ability to monitor behaviour, control information flows, and influence opinions can undermine democratic values such as transparency, freedom of expression, and public participation. As AI becomes more integrated into various aspects of society, it risks creating conditions similar to those depicted in Orwell's novel, where freedom and democratic integrity are compromised. First, we will examine the challenges faced by democratic public spaces. Next, we



will discuss how AI is contributing to the deterioration of these spaces. Finally, we will conduct an Orwellian analysis to explore how AI could potentially threaten democratic values.

Public Spaces: The Heartbeat of Democracy

In political and moral philosophy, Hannah Arendt is often linked with the concept of public space. For Arendt, public space is crucial to democratic citizenship, as it serves as the arena where citizens engage in collective deliberation and act together for the common good. However, she argues that modern psychological and economic forces have driven people away from public space into a private realm focused on introspection and economic pursuits, thereby eroding the distinction between public and private life. To counter this alienation from the public sphere, Arendt suggests a twofold approach. The first is the "space of appearances," where individuals express themselves through speech and persuasion on public matters, revealing their identities and forming relationships of reciprocity and solidarity. The second dimension is the "common world," encompassing the artifacts, institutions, and settings that create a context for public life and distinguish humans from nature. Arendt's focus on this issue is primarily motivated by her desire to combat the individual's disconnection from this common world. In an encyclopaedia entry, Juergen Habermas defines the public sphere as the space where private individuals engage in conversation and discussion about public matters. This discourse spans from personal and intimate exchanges to more open dialogues in public media. A crucial aspect of the public sphere is that it allows universal access – anyone can participate, and communication within this space should be unrestricted. This openness includes the ability to make independent judgments and offer criticism, even against the intentions and actions of the state (Goodsell, 2003). Arendt's concept of public space focuses mainly on being a platform for political action, while Habermas's idea of the public sphere centres around being a medium for public communication.

In this study the democratic public space will be used with a rather inclusive meaning referring to physical areas within a community where individuals can freely gather, interact, and participate in public life. These spaces are essential for fostering democracy as they provide platforms for



free speech and expression, civic engagement, social interaction, and political participation. Citizens can voice their opinions and engage in open dialogue and participate in community activities, volunteer, and contribute to the common good. Diverse groups can interact, exchange ideas, and build social cohesion. Citizens can organize, protest, and engage in political activities. Examples of democratic public spaces include parks, town squares, libraries, community centres, and even online forums. These spaces should be accessible to all members of the community, regardless of their socioeconomic status, race, or ethnicity. Key characteristics of democratic public spaces are inclusivity, accessibility, freedom of expression, vitality and sustainability. They are open to all members of the community and are accessible physically and socially. The members of the community feel safe to share diverse viewpoints and opinions. These ecologically and economically sustainable spaces also offer a variety of activities and events for all members of the community.

While democratic public spaces have historically been vital for democratic processes, contemporary society's shifts are jeopardizing their existence and effectiveness. There are various challenges facing democratic public spaces. Digitalization and time constraints resulted with the decline of civic engagement. The rise of online platforms has led to a decline in face-to-face interactions and community engagement. Also, increasingly busy lifestyles leave less time for participation in public life. The encroachment of commercial interests can erode the public nature of spaces and privatization can limit access to public spaces both of which will result in the loss of public character and inequality in access. Rapid urbanization can lead to a shortage of public spaces and overcrowding can degrade the quality of public. Safety and security concerns appear to be other challenges. Concerns about safety can deter people from using public spaces. Excessive surveillance can create a sense of being watched and diminish freedom. Due to political and social divisions public spaces can become sites of conflict rather than dialogue. These challenges highlight the need for innovative approaches to revitalize and protect democratic public spaces.

AI Surveillance and the Decline of Democratic Public Space

Orwell's concept of 'thoughtcrime' –the criminal act of holding beliefs



contrary to the regime– resonates with how predictive algorithms today assess dissenting behaviour or nonconformity. The pre-emptive logic of predictive policing and AI surveillance systems reflects the Party's desire to control not only actions but thoughts themselves, aligning with the deeper ideological mechanisms of repression in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*.

While Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* serves as a dystopian warning about technology's potential to suppress freedom, earlier literary visions such as Francis Bacon's *New Atlantis* (1627) offered a contrasting image. Bacon imagined a utopian society where scientific knowledge, technological advancement, and state-supported research institutions (notably "Salomon's House") served the common good and enhanced civic life. In *New Atlantis*, technology is managed by a wise elite to promote collective well-being, transparency, and enlightenment. This optimistic vision stands in stark contrast to the present-day use of AI technologies in ways that can curtail democratic freedoms and individual autonomy. The historical arc from Baconian hope to Orwellian fear underscores the shift in how technological power is conceptualized – from a tool of emancipation to a mechanism of control.

Examining some of the challenges faced by democratic public spaces, they appear to be linked to the advancement of Artificial Intelligence. AI is profoundly reshaping the nature of public discourse and democratic participation. It offers both opportunities and challenges for democratic societies. AI is altering how people communicate and exchange ideas in the public sphere. This could include changes in how information is disseminated and consumed, the role of social media algorithms in shaping public opinion, and the influence of AI-generated content. These changes can affect the quality and diversity of public discussions. The ethical concerns surrounding AI in surveillance extend beyond simply gathering data and directing attention. They encompass the use of information to influence behaviour, both online and offline, in ways that compromise autonomous decision-making. While behaviour manipulation has existed for ages, it takes on new dimensions with AI systems. Due to users' constant engagement with data systems and the detailed insights these systems gain about individuals, people become susceptible to 'nudges,' manipulation, and deception. With enough prior data, algorithms can be tailored to target



specific individuals or small groups with inputs designed to influence them effectively (Müller, 2023).

Social media has become the primary platform for political propaganda (Müller, 2023). Technology influences how citizens access information that defines their participation, often limited to voting, while also allowing people more time to engage in public matters. Devices and systems play a key role in campaigning and voting processes. Additionally, technology shapes how politicians convey their messages and how bureaucrats implement decisions (Risse, 2022). AI is also affecting how people engage in democratic processes. This includes how voters are targeted with political advertisements, the ways in which political campaigns are run, and how people interact with government services. AI tools can both facilitate and complicate engagement with democratic institutions. AI presents several potential benefits for democratic societies. For example, it can enhance access to information, enable more personalized and efficient public services, and improve the analysis of large volumes of data to inform policy decisions. It can also support more effective communication and engagement strategies in political campaigns. On the flip side, AI also introduces several risks and challenges. These include issues related to privacy, as AI can lead to increased surveillance and data collection. It can also contribute to misinformation and manipulation, as algorithms might promote sensational or biased content. Additionally, there are concerns about the erosion of genuine human interaction and democratic debate due to automated systems and AI-driven influence. AI is fundamentally changing how public conversations and democratic activities are conducted. While AI brings promising opportunities for enhancing democracy, it also poses significant challenges that need to be addressed to ensure it supports rather than undermines democratic values and processes.

Filter bubbles and echo chambers appear as one of the threats to democratic public space. AI-driven algorithms can reinforce existing beliefs, leading to polarization and decreased exposure to diverse viewpoints. Computer programs that use artificial intelligence to make decisions or recommendations tend to show people information that confirms what they already believe, rather than challenging their views and this reinforcement of beliefs creates deeper divisions between people with different



opinions. In this way, people become less likely to encounter information that challenges their beliefs, limiting their understanding of different perspectives.

Misinformation and disinformation stand as another threat. AI can be used to generate and spread false information, undermining trust in institutions and democratic processes. AI can create entirely fake content, such as text, images, or videos, that can appear authentic to the human eye. This is often referred to as "deepfakes." Advancements in AI 'faking' technologies have turned once dependable forms of evidence, like digital photos, audio, and video, into unreliable sources. It is already possible to manipulate these media, and soon it will be easy to generate 'deep fake' text, images, and videos with any content. In the near future, even real-time interactions through text, phone, or video will be convincingly faked. As a result, digital interactions can no longer be trusted, even as we become more reliant on them (Müller, 2023).

AI can be used to rapidly distribute this false information across various online platforms, reaching a wide audience. When people are exposed to constant misinformation, they may begin to doubt the credibility of government, media, and other established institutions. The spread of false information can influence elections, manipulate public opinion, and erode confidence in democratic systems. AI can be a powerful tool for creating and spreading disinformation, which can have serious consequences for society. The spread of misinformation can erode trust in institutions, media, and elected officials. It can deepen political divisions and create echo chambers. It can influence election outcomes by misleading voters.

Surveillance and control are other threats for democratic public space. This technocratic turn in surveillance also aligns with broader critiques in postmodern pedagogy, which underscore the importance of exposing the hidden power structures embedded in technological and educational systems. As Özen Baykent (2025) argues, postmodern thought –especially through the lens of Derrida's deconstruction– reveals how modern institutions, including education and governance, often mask coercive control mechanisms behind supposedly neutral technologies. The AI-based surveillance infrastructure, particularly in non-democratic contexts such as China, serves as a striking example. These systems do not merely monitor;



they actively shape behaviour, narrow discourse, and suppress dissent – echoing the structural critiques of power and exclusion highlighted in post-modern educational theory. In this light, the digital transformation of public spaces requires not only technical scrutiny but philosophical interrogation, calling for more inclusive, equitable, and reflexive democratic models. AI-powered surveillance tools can be used to monitor citizens, potentially chilling dissent and limiting freedom of expression. These are advanced systems that use AI to analyse and interpret data collected from various sources, such as cameras, social media, or online communications. Examples include facial recognition software, predictive policing algorithms, and automated monitoring systems. These tools can be used by governments, corporations, or other entities to track individuals' activities, behaviour, and communications. This monitoring can be widespread and detailed, often capturing information about people's daily lives, movements, and interactions. In the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region, China has implemented an extensive AI-powered surveillance infrastructure targeting the Uyghur Muslim minority. Technologies such as facial recognition, gait analysis, and smartphone monitoring are used to track individuals and flag those who display behaviours considered “suspicious.” Predictive policing tools help identify individuals for potential detention even before a crime is committed, based on algorithmic assumptions. This use of AI for preemptive control has been widely criticized by human rights organizations for violating basic freedoms and reinforcing systemic repression (China's Algorithms of Repression, 2019). Surveillance can discourage or suppress people from expressing their opinions or participating in political activities. If individuals know they are being watched, they might self-censor or avoid discussing controversial or dissenting views, fearing repercussions or negative consequences. When surveillance tools are used extensively, they can create an environment where people are less likely to express their thoughts openly, thereby restricting this freedom. A notable example of extensive AI surveillance is China's Social Credit System and widespread use of facial recognition technology. In cities like Beijing and Shenzhen, AI-powered cameras track citizens' movements, social behaviour, and even minor infractions such as jaywalking or overdue library books. The collected data are used to assign social credit scores, which can



influence access to services such as public transportation, housing, or job opportunities. This system creates a chilling effect on dissent and public expression, as citizens fear penalties for behaviour deemed non-compliant or politically sensitive (Creemers, 2018).

Just as the Ministry of Truth manipulates all records to ensure the Party is always right, modern AI tools used in content moderation and automated news generation risk reinforcing dominant ideologies, silencing opposition, and revising digital history – creating a feedback loop where only state-sanctioned narratives prevail. Orwell's vision warns us of a reality where facts become fluid, and truth becomes whatever the algorithm or authority dictates.

Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* serves as a chilling premonition of contemporary AI-driven threats to democratic societies, as both the novel and modern realities exhibit alarming parallels in the erosion of privacy, the manipulation of information, and the potential for mass surveillance to curtail individual liberty. Despite being separated by decades, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and contemporary concerns about artificial intelligence converge on alarming parallels, both highlighting the potential for technology to erode privacy, manipulate information, and ultimately undermine democratic principles. While the novel doesn't feature AI, it does anticipate several concerns about technology's impact on society.

Surveillance and control are the core themes in the novel. "Oceania, like the others, is in a permanent state of emergency, its population under relentless government surveillance, encouraged by propaganda and rumour to feel embattled, threatened, and hysterically hostile to enemy forces nobody in London has ever seen, except in the occasional parade of dispirited prisoners of war." (Kerr, 2020, p. 40) The Party's omnipresent surveillance through telescreens and informants mirrors the concept of a panopticon, where individuals are constantly monitored, leading to self-censorship. Winston finds solace in a small alcove, just beyond the telescreen's reach, a refuge within a larger sanctuary, where he starts his doomed rebellion. There, he begins to assert his freedom by writing in the most personal literary form – a diary. This highlights one of the ironies of life under totalitarian surveillance: Winston's relentless search for a space where he can truly be alone (Kerr, 2020). The Party, which is the authoritarian regime in



the novel, employs extensive surveillance to control and monitor the population. This is done through devices called telescreens, which are placed everywhere and can both watch and listen to people. Informants, who are citizens loyal to the Party, also help in spying on others. Telescreens are devices that continuously broadcast Party propaganda and also record what people are doing and saying. Informants report on their neighbours, further ensuring that the Party's surveillance is thorough and pervasive. Orwell's depiction of the Party's surveillance system is meant to illustrate how omnipresent monitoring can create a state of perpetual self-regulation and self-censorship among individuals. Just as the panopticon aims to make prisoners regulate their behaviour by making them uncertain about when they are being watched, the Party's surveillance similarly forces people to conform and suppress their own thoughts and actions.

Newspeak, the government-controlled language, is designed to limit thought and restrict vocabulary, controlling the populace's understanding of reality. Newspeak is the official language of the Party. "When Oldspeak had been once and for all superseded, the last link with the past would have been severed" (Orwell, 2004, p. 307). It's a deliberately constructed language with a restricted vocabulary and simplified grammar. The goal of Newspeak is to make it difficult for people to think critically or express dissenting ideas. The Party controls Newspeak to shape and limit how people communicate. By manipulating the language, the Party seeks to control not just what people say but also what they are able to think. Newspeak eliminates words and concepts that could be used to express opposition to the Party. For instance, if there are no words for rebellion or dissent, it becomes harder for people to even conceive of these ideas. By systematically reducing the range of expressible thoughts, Newspeak aims to make rebellious thoughts –or even the possibility of such thoughts– impossible. Language shapes our perception of the world. By controlling the language, the Party can influence how people understand and interpret reality. If certain ideas or critiques are unutterable because there are no words for them, people might not even recognize or question the Party's control and manipulation. By making it difficult or impossible to articulate dissenting ideas, the Party aims to eliminate any potential for rebellion or critique, ensuring that the populace remains unchallenging and compliant.



In the novel, the Ministry of Truth is one of the four government ministries in the fictional state of Oceania. The Ministry of Truth constantly rewrites history to fit the Party's narrative, erasing any dissenting or contradictory information. Despite its name, its primary function is not to provide accurate information but to manipulate and control it. The Ministry of Truth is responsible for propaganda and altering historical records. The Ministry of Truth continuously revises historical records, documents, and past statements to align with the current narrative promoted by the Party. This means that the historical record is not static but is continually adjusted to match the Party's shifting goals and policies. The revisions are made to ensure that history supports and legitimizes the Party's present claims and actions. If the Party's current policies or leadership contradict past statements or events, the Ministry of Truth changes the historical records so that there is no trace of inconsistency or contradiction. Any information or historical facts that contradict the Party's current narrative are either altered or completely erased. This includes eliminating any evidence of past dissent or errors made by the Party. By doing this, the Party effectively controls the perception of reality, as there is no record of anything that could challenge their authority or policies. This creates a situation where the Party's version of the past is the only one that exists, reinforcing their control and preventing any form of dissent or critique.

As pointed earlier, although the novel doesn't include AI, it does foresee various issues related to technology's effects on society. Modern surveillance systems, often aided by AI, raise similar concerns about privacy and government overreach as those depicted in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. AI-powered algorithms can spread misinformation and manipulate public opinion, echoing the Party's control over information in the novel. AI-driven platforms can create echo chambers, limiting exposure to diverse viewpoints, similar to the controlled environment of Oceania. While the novel doesn't directly address AI, it serves as a cautionary tale about the potential dangers of technology when used to control and manipulate populations. The novel's themes resonate with contemporary debates about the role of technology in democratic societies.

Conclusion

Drawing from *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, reclaiming democratic public



space in the age of AI requires a resistance akin to Winston's defiance – however symbolic. Just as Winston sought freedom through memory, language, and love, we must pursue transparency, civic participation, and ethical design as acts of resistance to algorithmic domination. The resilience of democracy depends on our refusal to normalize the permanent emergency of AI governance.

The exploration of AI as a threat to democratic public space through an Orwellian lens reveals significant concerns about the erosion of fundamental democratic values. Drawing on Orwell's dystopian themes of surveillance, manipulation, and the control of information, we see clear parallels in the modern application of AI technologies. AI has the potential to transform the public sphere in ways that threaten individual autonomy, freedom of expression, and the transparency essential to democracy. These technologies, often deployed in the service of surveillance, propaganda, and behaviour manipulation, echo Orwell's fears of a society in which citizens are stripped of their agency and subjected to pervasive monitoring.

AI's capacity to collect vast amounts of personal data and use it for targeted manipulation poses a unique challenge to the integrity of democratic decision-making. Algorithms that shape political discourse, influence voter behaviour, and even produce deepfake content blur the line between truth and fiction, undermining the very basis of informed citizenship. The rise of these technologies, alongside the increased use of surveillance tools, leads to a public space that is less open, less free, and increasingly controlled by powerful actors who can exploit AI for political gain.

Moreover, the application of AI in surveillance expands beyond its technical capabilities to influence how individuals perceive and interact within public spaces. The chilling effect produced by AI surveillance, much like the omnipresent "Big Brother" in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, discourages dissent and public expression, weakening the robust debate and critical thinking necessary for a healthy democracy. As AI systems become more sophisticated, the opportunities for governments and private actors to control public opinion and stifle opposition increase.

Orwell's dystopian vision is a strong warning about the dangers of AI-controlled societies. It encourages us to consider the rules and laws we need to protect our democratic public spaces from such threats. To reduce



these risks, we must be transparent about how we use AI, hold people accountable for using AI, and educate the public about the potential dangers of AI. Just as Orwell's work is a cautionary tale, it also reminds us how important it is to be vigilant in protecting democratic principles in a time of fast-changing technology.

Given these concerns, the impact of AI on democratic public spaces must be thoroughly examined and regulated. Without proactive action, there is a significant risk that public spaces –once a place for open dialogue and democratic engagement– could be overtaken by surveillance, manipulation, and control, turning Orwell's dystopian vision into a contemporary reality.

References

- Bacon, F. (2002). *New Atlantis*. (M. Peltonen, Ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Creemers, R. (2018). China's Social Credit System: An Evolving Practice of Control. *Nature: Human Behaviour*, 2(7), 348–349.
- Goodsell, C. T. (2003). The concept of public space and its democratic manifestations. *American Review of Public Administration*, 33(4), pp. 361–383
- China's Algorithms of Repression*. (2019, May 1). Human Rights Watch. <https://www.hrw.org/>
- Kerr, D. (2020). The Virtual Geographies of Nineteen Eighty-Four. In N. Waddell (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Nineteen Eighty-Four* (pp. 37–50). Cambridge University Press.
- Macnish, K. (2024). Surveillance Ethics. In J. Fieser & B. Dowden (Eds.), *The Internet Encyclopaedia of Philosophy*. <https://iep.utm.edu/surv-eth/>
- Müller, V. C. (2023). Ethics of Artificial Intelligence and Robotics. In E. N. Zalta & U. Nodelman. *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2025 Ed.). Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University. <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2023/entries/ethics-ai/>
- Orwell, G. (2004). *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Penguin Books.
- Özen Baykent, U. (2025). Postmodern Pedagogy: Rewriting the Rules of



- Learning and Teaching. *Conhecimento & Diversidade*, 17(45), 394-408.
- Roberts, A. (2020). Coda: The Imaginaries of Nineteen Eighty-Four In N. Waddell (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Nineteen Eighty-Four* (pp. 265-278). Cambridge University Press.
- Roessler, B. & J. DeCew. (2023). Privacy. In E. N. Zalta & U. Nodelman. *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Winter 2023 Ed.). Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University. <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2023/entries/privacy/>
- Risse, M. (2022). Artificial Intelligence and the Past, Present, and Future of Democracy. In S. Voenekey, P. Kellmeyer, O. Mueller & W. Burgard (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Responsible Artificial Intelligence: Interdisciplinary Perspectives* (pp. 85-103). Cambridge University Press.

Öz: Bu makale, yapay zekânın (YZ) demokratik kamusal alanları nasıl giderek dönüştürdüğünü George Orwell'in 1984 adlı distopik romanını güçlü bir analitik mercek olarak kullanarak incelemektedir. Çalışma, Orwell'in total gözetim, propaganda ve bireysel özerkliğin aşınmasıyla karakterize edilen distopik vizyonu ile günümüzde YZ'nin gözetim kapitalizmi, öngörücü polislik, içerik denetimi ve veriye dayalı toplumsal kontrol gibi alanlardaki kullanımları arasındaki yakınlaşmayı eleştirel bir biçimde değerlendirmektedir. Modern YZ sistemleri, görüş şekillendirme, gerçeği manipüle etme ve algoritmik kapalılık ile yaygın izleme yoluyla muhalefeti bastırma gibi *Orwellvari* mekanizmaları yeniden üretme riski taşımaktadır. Makale, YZ çağında demokrasinin yeniden kazanılmasının, kâr veya denetim odaklı modellerden toplumsal olarak hesap verebilir ve etik temelli sistemlere geçişi gerektirdiğini savunmaktadır. Bu bağlamda demokratik denetim, şeffaflık, eleştirel dijital okuryazarlık ve kapsayıcı politika yapımını önermektedir; böylece Orwell'in distopiasının gerçeğe dönüşmesi engellenebilir. Nihayetinde makale, demokrasinin yalnızca fiziksel ve dijital kamusal alanlar açık, katılımcı ve algoritmik tahakküme dirençli kaldığı süreçte varlığını sürdürebileceğini ileri sürmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: George Orwell, Yapay Zeka, 1984, Demokratik Kamusal Alanlar, Gözetim, Yapay Zekâ Etiği.

