

“AI and Platform Governance” Mini-Symposium

Friday, 28 March 2025 14-19:30h (CET)

Venue: Barcelona Supercomputing Center; BSC Auditorium; Repsol building;
Plaça Eusebi Güell, 1-3; 08034, Barcelona, Spain

CET time	Title
14:00-14:15	Introduction and welcoming remarks: why of this Mini-Symposium (by Migle Laukyte, Sebastian Hallensleben and Axel Brando)
14:15-14:45	<p>TALK 1: Raquel De Haro Pérez (Federal Institute of Technology Zurich, Suisse (ETHZ)) - Unmasking Technology-Facilitated Gender-Based Violence</p> <p><i>Technology-facilitated gender-based violence (TFGBV) is part of the broader continuum of gender-based violence. As such, it is recognized in the Digital Services Act as one of the systemic risks within the European Union. In this talk, we will explore the taxonomy of TFGBV, ranging from non-consensual imagery and deepfake abuse to harassment and gendered disinformation. We will uncover the dual impact of online violence: on one side, its disproportionate effect on women, and on the other, its role in expelling them from online spaces (the ‘chilling effect’). We will analyze the main regulatory approaches, from criminal law to platform governance. Finally, we will reflect on the role of Terms of Service, their interaction with legal requirements, and the role of users and digital literacy in shaping online safety and accountability.</i></p>
14:45-15:00	Q&A session
15:00-15:30	<p>TALK 2: David Garcia (University of Konstanz, Germany) - “Text analysis of evidence and intuition in political communication”</p> <p><i>The spread of online misinformation on social media is increasingly perceived as a problem for societal cohesion and democracy. The role of political leaders in this process has attracted less research attention, even though politicians who ‘speak their mind’ are perceived by segments of the public as authentic and honest even if their statements are unsupported by evidence. We developed text analysis methods to identify a component of populist rhetoric that goes from evidence-based language to intuition-based expressions. By analyzing Twitter and US congressional records, we discovered that politicians’ conception of honesty has undergone a distinct shift, with authentic belief speaking that may be decoupled from evidence becoming more prominent and more differentiated from explicitly evidence-based fact speaking. The decline in evidence-based language is associated with lower legislative productivity, economic inequality, and the sharing of untrustworthy news sources on social media. Beyond political elites, we find that the conceptions of honesty used in replies align with those of the tweets, suggesting a “contagion” in epistemic beliefs that is measurable through text traces.</i></p>
15:30-15:45	Q&A session

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Commission. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

15:45-17:30	<p>ROUNDTABLE: Sebastian Hallensleben (OECD.AI) - Digital Trust and Democracy in the Era of Generative AI</p> <p><i>The goal for this session, which is also a Deep Dive for the Digital Trust Convention: Formulating elements of a positive, concrete and just about achievable vision for a resilient and trust-friendly digital space in 2035, i.e. one decade from now. Such a vision should captivate and mobilise stakeholders, and should be inspired not just by a list of problems but also the joy of imagining and shaping a desirable collective future.</i></p> <p>The following questions will guide the discussion:</p> <p>(1) <i>In addition to trust, resilience and fairness, what are key dimensions of a desirable digital space in 2035?</i></p> <p>(2) <i>What structures and mechanisms can incentivise constructive digital discourse on a broad scale in 2035, and how can this re-energise democracy?</i></p> <p>(3) <i>What lessons and inspiration can we take from previous successes of global cooperation in other areas to map out a road to a desirable 2035?</i></p> <p>Impulse speakers include: Robert Kroplewski, Paula Simoes, Andy Wyckoff, Karin Tafur, Leon Kester, Rob Wortham, Christian Horchert, Marta Bieńkiewicz, David Evan Harris, Sam Gregory, Katie Evans, Isabel Barberá, Eliza Gkritsi (tbc), Jakub Szymik</p>
17:30-17:45	Coffee break
17:45-18:15	<p>TALK 3: Ioannis Revolidis (Centre for Distributed Ledger Technologies, University of Malta) – “AI generated disinformation and the DSA - an impossible conundrum?”</p> <p><i>The rapid rise of Generative AI applications presents new challenges for content moderation, particularly in combating misinformation, disinformation, and fake news. This presentation explores how the Digital Services Act (DSA) applies to Generative AI tools, analyzing legal debates on their classification and regulatory treatment. While some argue that the DSA’s scope is too narrow, others propose broader interpretations, suggesting that Generative AI could be regulated under existing categories such as search engines or hosting providers.</i></p> <p><i>By critically assessing the current legal discourse, this presentation identifies key gaps and unresolved issues in the regulatory framework. It also highlights the need for further research to establish the most appropriate liability regime, potential immunities, and content moderation strategies for Generative AI, ensuring both accountability and innovation in digital ecosystems.</i></p>
18:15-18:30	Q&A session
18:30-19:00	<p>TALK 4: Inyoung Cheong (Princeton Center for Information Technology Policy) – “Human-Centered First Amendment Approach to AI Regulation.”</p> <p><i>The First Amendment, originally designed to protect human cognitive liberty, has paradoxically evolved into a shield for AI companies against regulation despite their unique capacity to influence human thought through ubiquitous presence, voluntary data collection, and exploitation of cognitive vulnerabilities. This Article proposes a human-centered First Amendment framework that protects collective human autonomy over institutional interests by: (1) recognizing freedom of thought as central to First Amendment protection, (2) distinguishing between institutional and individual speech rights based on power dynamics and expressive identity, and (3) prioritizing collective interests of human speakers and listeners over private corporate interests. Applying this framework, the Article demonstrates that regulations addressing AI’s manipulative behavior and transparency requirements are not only constitutionally permissible but supported by First Amendment values.</i></p>
19:00-19:15	Q&A session
19:15-19:30	Conclusions and future steps