

National Varieties of Artificial Intelligence Discourses: Myth, Utopianism, and Solutionism in West European Policy Expectations

Marinus Ossewaarde and Erdener Gülenç, University of Twente

Global actors and various nations have introduced artificial intelligence (AI) agendas where AI appears as a slippery, politicized phenomenon. In this article, we reveal that AI is mythologized as a benevolent, heroic force shaping nations in accord with political ambitions; that policies communicate utopian beliefs stating AI will transform national concerns favorably; and that technological solutionist expectations present AI as the answer to national challenges.

Recently, global governance actors like the United Nations (UN), the European Union (EU), and national governments have introduced their artificial intelligence (AI) agendas. It is remarkable that in these political documents, AI is not

only presented as technology but is also endowed with salvific power. Politicized AI is exalted as the force that will make a better world and greater nations. In other words, there is a world of difference between the meaning attributed to AI by its developers and users on the one hand and its politicization on the other hand. In this article, the myths, utopian visions, and solutionist expectations that stakeholders invest in a politicized AI

Digital Object Identifier 10.1109/MC.2020.2992290
Date of current version: 21 October 2020

are uncovered by means of analyzing these political discourses. It is argued that AI has become the new trump card for long-standing political projects to foster global unity and improve the human condition, as well as for European integration and for nationalism. In the UN's AI for Good series, for instance, AI is put forward as cru-

is assigned a major role in safeguarding and promoting the particular interests of these nations. The cultural differences among these three nations are reflected in their different nation-bound myths, utopias, and expectations concerning AI. By means of a theory-driven analysis of AI policy documents, this article aims to uncover the different

texts. It enables us to gain insight into the role of political discourse on AI in the reproduction of existing power structures. Political discourses can be defined as textually mediated constructions of social reality. For governments, they are important means through which myths, utopias, and expectations along with the corresponding political beliefs, interests, worldviews, and power structures are reproduced or transformed. Political writing on AI does not merely reflect a reality of AI but is the very means of constructing and reproducing a world. AI strategy papers are textual manifestations of the political discourses on AI, constructed by power holders, that reflect the preeminence of language and symbolic configurations in the practices of governing. The texts we analyze are the AI strategy papers issued by national governments. Consequently, these AI strategy papers reflect the sociopolitical configuration, including the existing political-administrative practices and power relationships, of the national context in which they arise. One of the purposes of our discourse analysis is to unveil the peculiar, nationally situated and colored beliefs, stories, demagogic expressions, assumptions, and expectations of AI that national governments communicate in their policy documents. AI strategy papers play a central role in perpetuating existing power structures both quantitatively, by hindering other voices, and qualitatively, by "normalizing" certain political choices. Hence, AI strategy papers can be considered engines shaping public opinions and political commitments. Slogans and specific terms and phrases (such as "AI revolution") all contribute to legitimizing the chosen political path and the dominant version of the national identity.

IN THIS PROGRAM, AI IS PRESENTED AS THE BENEVOLENT FORCE THAT WILL ELIMINATE POVERTY AND PROTECT THE ENVIRONMENT.

cial for realizing the UN's Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). In this program, AI is presented as the benevolent force that will eliminate poverty and protect the environment. "Artificial Intelligence has the potential to accelerate progress toward a dignified life, in peace and prosperity, for all people," UN Secretary-General António Guterres claimed at the inauguration of the AI for Good series in June 2017. In UN discourses on AI, the latest digital technologies, rather than humanitarian politics and administration, are expected to improve public services, health services, and security systems.

While global governance actors present AI as a benevolent force for the good of humanity or regional integration, national governments have integrated AI into their own political discourses. In the past years, the governments of the United Kingdom, Germany, and The Netherlands—three West European frontrunners in the so-called AI revolution—have all drafted AI strategies. An analysis of these papers shows that AI

patterns of nationalism in British, German, and Dutch political discourses on AI. We thereby focus on the mythical nature of the discourses as well as on the digital utopianism and technological solutionism inherent in them. We find that political discourses on AI in Western Europe are marked by the sensational stories told about AI. The latter is mythologized as a salvific force that works for the good of the nation. We show that such national discourses on AI are also utopian. They communicate the belief that AI is a force that creates a better future for the nation—a future in which old national dreams come true.¹⁻³ Correspondingly, technological solutionist expectations can be discerned in these narratives. We show that governments present AI as the answer to the many challenges that nations currently face, including political, social, and ecological problems.^{6,7}

Our methodological approach is discourse analytical. A discourse analysis is most appropriate for uncovering myths, utopias, and expectations in

THE POLITICS OF AI

Political discourses on AI have typically emerged from global governance actors, like the UN and the EU, for whom AI is a benevolent force for the good of humanity or for European integration. On a global governance level, the UN has held its AI for Good series since 2017. This platform is established as a way to evaluate opportunities offered by AI for advancing the UN's SDGs and to ensure that AI benefits all humanity. The UN's AI for Good series rests on the belief that AI is an unambiguously benevolent force that will solve humanity's most tenacious global social problems, including poverty, inequality, malnutrition, and environmental degradation. In other words, a myth in which AI lifts humanity out of its misery is being propounded.⁹ The AI for Good series signifies a new myth of automatic progress.¹⁰ Like most myths, it also tries to simplify reality. The UN's myth of automatic improvement conceals a problematic global power structure (and hence asymmetrical power relations) that keeps the greater part of humankind in miserable conditions. The UN's AI discourse is typical of how global governance actors envision AI within the context of their ongoing political agendas, presenting themselves as the redeemers of the world who are called to solve humanity's problems. The discourses of national governments betray the same pattern. The difference from the stories of global actors lies in the focus. The nation is now the object of concern. Hence, AI is politicized in the sense that it is invested with particular national myths and symbols. The sociocultural particularities of these different nations are reflected in the different stories about the alleged greatness of the nation.

AI strategies for creating future worlds contain different kinds of utopian beliefs and solutionist expectations. Such beliefs and expectations ignite a vision of seizing the alleged opportunities for world-making that AI supposedly offers. The type of world-making and the alleged role of AI in that depend on the identity and political commitment of the actors involved. Political-administrative

hunger, no poverty, equality, no pollution, and so on—ultimately serves the interests of the UN itself, which, in its own AI for Good series, becomes heroic in creating a better world for everyone. Such digital utopianism masks that AI does not automatically or inevitably lead to universal equality, more inclusion, or sustainable futures but may also be a dystopian force for evil.⁵

IN OTHER WORDS, A MYTH IN WHICH AI LIFTS HUMANITY OUT OF ITS MISERY IS BEING PROPOUNDED.

practices of world-making typically represent the core values, interests, and legacies of world-making actors. For instance, in its AI for Good series, the UN communicates the belief that, with the salvific force of AI, it can actually create a brave new world in which its SDGs are fulfilled. Such utopian visions of a future world without contradiction and power struggles signal an attempt to realize a given political ambition set in the future (the actual fulfilment of the UN's SDGs) by means of a yet unrealized technological potential. In the AI for Good series, the UN communicates the belief that it is through technology, rather than through politics and administration, that the SDGs will be realized. Such digital utopianism reflects (ultimately political) visions of the desired future that are different from current socially problematic realities marked by the UN's political and administrative impotence in realizing the SDGs.² The UN's digital utopian approach of including AI within its long-standing SDG discourse—amounting to zero

The utopian beliefs with regard to AI and its alleged benevolent role in remaking the world, fixing the project of European integration, or building the nation that global governance actors and national governments communicate in their AI strategies are not only fantasies about the potential of AI. They also signal the technocratic attitude that AI contains the magical key to solving global, European, or national problems. Morozov⁴ criticizes this technocratic phenomenon as *technological solutionism*, which refers to the mistaken belief that all (political, social, organizational, administrative, and policy) problems have benign technological solutions and that such technological solutions have benign social consequences (create a better world).⁸ In AI strategies, technological solutionist bias is rampant. This is so partly because AI can help political-administrative actors in solving certain problems. In the past few years, governments have increasingly embedded advanced digital

technologies, including AI, in public agencies. In Estonia, citizens can vote in elections, submit their tax returns, and start a new company online. In Denmark, AI is used in emergency services for diagnosing cardiac arrests or other conditions based on recognition of the sound of a caller's voice.⁸ Predictive policing tools are used in Germany, The Netherlands, and the United Kingdom based on big data about the type, location, date, and time of past crimes. AI strategies typically point to good AI practices. Yet, marked by a technological solutionist bias, AI strategies hide the fact that AI not only solves but also creates new problems—like AI-enhanced repression and de-democratization^{4,5,9}—that neither AI nor an ethics of AI can solve.

In the next sections, we show, through a discourse analysis of national AI strategy papers, how the British, German, and Dutch government create their own, nationally embedded AI mythologies, digital utopianism, and technological solutionism. We seek to illustrate how national AI strategies communicate legendary political ambitions that serve narrow national (elite) interests.

AI AND BRITISH IMPERIALISM

When the British government introduced its AI Sector Deal in April 2018, it stressed that it wants the United Kingdom to be at the forefront of the alleged AI revolution as a world leader.¹⁰ In its AI strategy, the British government presents the AI revolution as a new industrial revolution that, like the original industrial revolution, Great Britain should rule:

Two centuries ago, it was our industrial revolution which led the world. (...) Today, our ambition is

just as high. As we leave the European Union and forge a new path for ourselves, so we will build a Britain fit for the future and fulfill the mission that I set on my first day as Prime Minister: to make our United Kingdom a country that truly works for everyone.¹¹

Prime Minister Theresa May spoke these words at the Industrial Strategy meeting.

For the British government, the AI revolution signals the making of a new era in which long-standing British political ambitions could be fulfilled. It communicates the mythical vision that

a revolution in AI technology is already emerging. If we act now, we can lead it from the front. But if we “wait and see” other countries will seize the advantage. Together, we can make the U.K. a global leader in this technology that will change all our lives.¹¹

In its AI mythology, then, the British government identifies AI as a force that can resurrect Great Britain as a world power, patterned upon the image of the British Empire and the legacy of “our industrial revolution” that historically emerged in the British Empire.

The British government's vision for the AI revolution is utopian in content. AI is mythologized as a British wealth maker—the utopian vision is that AI brings prosperity to the United Kingdom through the making of the most innovative economy in the entire world. “The Industrial Strategy has people at its core: it is focused on creating good jobs and greater earning power for all people in the U.K.,” the British government narrates.¹¹ In response to this statement, The House

of Lords' Artificial Intelligence Select Committee has written a report in which it designs an AI ethical code for the United Kingdom meant to solve Orwellian surveillance and privacy problems that come with AI technologies. The House of Lords stresses that the power to hurt, destroy, or deceive human beings should never be vested in artificial intelligence.¹² The House's ethical code is liberal in content; it points to the importance of privacy protection, personal control over data, transparency of algorithms, the problem of prejudices, underrepresentation and misrepresentation in data and AI systems, and the need to augment the AI workforce to ensure diversity. In June 2018, the British government responded to the recommendations of the AI ethical code report with a 41-page document, in a digital utopian fashion. The response is marked by the United Kingdom's intention to rule the development of AI to realize a future of British prosperity, with expected wealth equally distributed across all layers of the British nation, without violating values of privacy and autonomy.¹² Its digital utopianism masks the fact that throughout history, and certainly in the British Empire, technological innovations and disruptions have typically benefited certain segments much more than others, while these innovations have been responsible for massive uprootedness, genocidal massacres, exploitation, and environmental degradation.

In its AI strategy, the British government sets out a technological solutionist expectation of solving British problems. In the first place, AI is expected to rescue its National Health Service (NHS). The British government suggests that AI is a savior that gets its NHS out of trouble and solves

its finance problems by containing health-care costs—something that British politics appears incapable of doing after decades of austerity measures. The British government claims that making the United Kingdom the global AI leader “will deliver on one of a number of steps necessary toward saving lives and increasing NHS efficiency, reducing the need for costly late stage treatment.”¹² The British government’s mission is to put the United Kingdom at the forefront in applying AI technologies to early diagnostics and precision medicine,¹¹ innovation, prevention, and treatment; correspondingly, AI is expected to increase NHS efficiency by enabling earlier diagnosis and reducing the need for costly late stage treatment.¹³ It is expected that, thanks to AI and with NHS efficiency secured, by 2035 the British people can enjoy at least five additional years of life in good health, while existing health inequalities (between the higher and the lower classes in Great Britain) are expected to decrease thanks to a well-functioning NHS system.¹³ In a similar vein, the British government communicates technological solutionist expectations when it comes to solving social problems like British unemployment. The British government is silent about how the alleged AI revolution may destroy British jobs in a robotized labor market. Instead, in its technological optimism, it claims that, thanks to AI-enhanced automation, 80,000 new jobs will be created in the coming decade for the United Kingdom. And it announces that to accommodate this automation process, the British workforce will be revolutionized, reskilled, and upskilled in line with the demands set by AI, mainly through new education programs, adult learning, and retraining.

AI AND GERMAN EUROPEAN LEADERSHIP

On 15 November 2018, the German government published its report “AI Made in Germany.” In this AI strategy, the German government communicates its political ambition to assume European leadership in AI technologies.¹⁴ The German government closely linking its AI strategy to the EU’s.¹⁴ In the EU’s AI strategy, AI is presented as a force of European integration. The EU stresses that cooperation and coordination among the member states and the European Commission are essential to develop a European alternative to AI (marked by AI that respects European values, including democracy, rule of law, freedom, justice, and human rights) and to address the new societal challenges brought by AI. In the myth of the German government’s European leadership, German and European interests in AI are perfectly reconciled: “We want to make Germany and Europe a leading center for AI and thus help safeguard Germany’s competitiveness in the future.”¹⁵ Germany wants to be a leading driving force behind EU leadership in AI, a leadership that includes Franco-German collaboration via bilateral research programs, coordinated networking of existing AI research centers, and joint education programs.¹⁶ In the German AI mythology, AI becomes a new force of European integration under German leadership, marked by a European version of AI led by Germany. “We want to raise the potential of the new technology upon the basis of European values, such as the inviolability of human dignity, respect for privacy and the principle of equality,” the German government stresses.¹⁷ In the myth of German European leadership, AI is presented as a European challenge that is invested

with European values and a European integration process that is shaped by the German government while such Europeanness automatically serves German interests. This mythical phenomenon is identified as German Europe, which refers to a European integration that is exploited by the German government for serving German interests, and, by such imperialist exploitation, European disintegration is set in motion.

The German government’s AI mythology of German European leadership has a utopian dimension. While its AI mythology is patterned upon German imperialist visions of European leadership and the European version of AI, its digital utopianism is devoid of Europeanness. Its digital utopianism is patterned on a nationalist vision of a desirable German future—a vision that is connected to a political vision of the future of the German welfare state but not to the project of European integration and European values. The digital utopianism of the German AI mythology consists of the belief that AI ensures the sustainability of Germany’s social welfare levels. “We want to use the potential of AI to continue to improve security, efficiency and sustainability to the benefit of our citizens in fields of application of particular importance while also promoting social participation, freedom of action and self-determination for each and every citizen.”¹⁷ Embedding AI in the institutional complex of the German welfare state comes with the utopian vision that AI, like social policy, operates as an emancipatory rather than a dominating or Orwellian force. In its digital utopianism, the German government seeks “to anchor AI in society in cultural, ethical, legal and institutional terms,”¹⁵ which is to say

that AI is embedded within the legacy of German welfare. The German government presents AI as the benevolent force that improves the living conditions of German citizens and enforces their autonomy to determine their own destiny. In its utopian outlook, the German government hides the fact that powerful actors, including the German government, frequently use AI as a tool of digital surveillance, just as it masks that the German welfare state is not only an emancipatory force but also a bureaucratic complex of social control.

While in its AI mythology, the German government identifies itself as the leader of the European version of AI within the European integration project, its technological solutionist vision presents AI as a force that solves German problems without any reference to the EU's problems. In its AI strategy, the German government sets out a technological solutionist expectation of AI that solves distinctively German problems that relate to an aging German population, containment of Germany's health-care costs, and the deskilling of Germany's labor force. In its technological solutionist outlook, the German government presents AI as a benevolent force that "opens up opportunities for the elderly, in particular—providing them with the support they need to stay in their own homes for as long as possible"¹⁵—a policy ambition (having elderly Germans stay in their home for as long as possible) that fits with its long-standing welfare state reform agenda that dates back to the 1980s. In the context of containing German health-care costs, the German government associates AI with robotics, with AI providing efficient nursing care, particularly for the elderly.¹⁵ Robotization is presented as

a solution for Germany's aging challenges, although the German government recognizes that it can only be a solution on the condition that the German workforce is able to embed AI in its automated work processes, thereby ensuring employability and avoiding job loss. The German AI Strategy includes a "Skilled Labor Strategy and a National Further Training Strategy," which is established for a reskilled German workforce fit for working with AI. This is to be achieved via the policy programs of the German welfare state, that is, via extensive training programs that fit the needs of German workers and German companies and the establishment of a new skills monitoring system.¹⁵ In other words, the German government presents AI as a solution to the challenges (like aging, which implies a decrease of the German workforce and containment of German health-care costs) faced by the German welfare state, while potential problems associated with AI (like the robotization of the labor market) are to be solved via the bureaucratic complex of the German welfare state.

AI AND THE NEW DUTCH CORPORATE RULE

On 8 October 2019, the Dutch government sent its AI strategy to the Dutch parliament.¹⁸ In its AI strategy, the Dutch government defines AI as a revolutionary force that rapidly transforms the Dutch economy, creating new business opportunities for Dutch industries. The Dutch government endorses the myth of the AI revolution: "AI is a key technology that transforms our world."¹⁹ In Dutch AI mythology, however, AI is not merely a key technology or some mysterious benevolent force; it is first of all a resource to be exploited for purposes of Dutch nation-building.

The Dutch government presents the quest for AI as a goldrush, with all nations competing to become an AI frontrunner, so as to seize the new wealth. In this myth, missing out on AI is presented as a nightmare scenario. The fear of missing out and being too late informs the Dutch myth: "If as The Netherlands and Europe we want to be at the forefront in a worldwide competing economy, then we must accelerate the development and application of AI in The Netherlands."¹⁹ In Dutch AI mythology, AI is presented as a business opportunity that Dutch corporations are expected to seize upon, therein aided by the Dutch government. The Dutch government presents itself as the provider of infrastructure, architecture, and an AI business climate. The Dutch government's ambition "is to have the most flexible and best digitally connected production network in Europe by 2021."²⁰ What sets the Dutch AI strategy apart from other governments' mythologies is its political construct of intensive public-private cooperation. In Dutch AI mythology, this public-private partnership is presented as the Dutch AI Coalition, modeled after the Dutch East India Company of the seventeenth century (the Dutch Golden Age), established to enable Dutch corporations to seize the new resource.

The Dutch AI myth is strongly utopian. AI is presented as a resource that, if exploited, will bring new prosperity to The Netherlands. In its digital utopianism, the Dutch government claims that through the exploitation of AI a new (or rather renewed) Dutch welfare society will develop: "AI will strongly contribute to economic growth, welfare and well-being in The Netherlands."¹⁸ In its AI mythology, Dutch corporations are presented as heroic

actors who seize the new opportunities therein supported by the Dutch government in the Dutch AI Coalition; in its digital utopianism, the Dutch welfare society of the future, a growth-based AI society, exists for the benefit of the entire nation. “We profile ourselves as a country that is at the forefront of AI applications that serve the interests of man and society. We opt for an inclusive approach that gives a central place to people,” the Dutch government announces.¹⁹ The Dutch government wants AI “to contribute to issues that are of great social importance to all Dutch citizens, such as our prosperity, healthcare, our food supply and the climate.”²⁰ In Dutch digital utopianism, AI is presented as a benevolent force that generates growth, welfare, well-being, better mobility, cheap energy, food security, sustainability, and longer lives in good health for all.²⁰ And, although the Dutch government communicates a liberal vision of AI ethics and refers to its duty to protect “fundamental rights like privacy, nondiscrimination, and autonomy,”¹⁹ its digital utopianism masks the dystopian vision of a politics of AI that comes with exploitation, environmental degradation, electronic waste, digital surveillance, power concentration, and de-democratization.

In its technological solutionism, the Dutch government expects that the Dutch AI Coalition will turn AI into a problem-solving force for both Dutch policy makers and Dutch corporations.¹⁹ The Dutch government expects that for Dutch policy makers, AI is a benevolent force that provides solutions in the field of policing, anti-discrimination, health care, and food and agriculture. In the field of policing, the Dutch government sees a role for AI in selecting visual data for

criminal investigations, selecting relevant cold cases, and allowing effective management of notifications: AI opportunities to be realized by the country’s National Police Lab AI.¹⁹ In the field of antidiscrimination, AI is identified as a force for automizing employers’ recruitment and selection procedures, combatting Dutch labor market discrimination on the basis of gender, age, religion, race, skin color, or other factors.¹⁹ In Dutch health care, AI is expected to make prevention, diagnosis, and treatment more precise, for instance, via AI-driven reading of X-rays, so that illness can be recognized and analyzed more quickly. Also, AI applications for self-management (like health-monitoring devices) are identified as devices that help in containing Dutch health-care costs via better prevention.¹⁹ For the Dutch food and agriculture business, the Dutch government identifies AI as a benevolent force of automation, paving the way for more efficient production via precision agriculture (specific crop management), phenotyping (selection of new crops), deep learning (in cultivation decisions), and monitoring of consumer behavior.¹⁹ In sum, in its technological solutionist expectation, the Dutch government sees AI as making the operations of Dutch public and private agencies more efficient, which will limit public expenditure and enhance corporate competitiveness.

The AI strategies recently developed by the national governments of the United Kingdom, Germany, and The Netherlands reveal particular political, and typically imperialist, ambitions that are part of long-standing trajectories of

nation-building and are articulated in particular contexts of European integration or disintegration. These trajectories are invested with nation-bound myths, utopias, and technological solutionism that, on the one hand, reveal national dreams that a politicized AI will make come true while, on the other hand, masking particular key issues and forces that the three national governments do not address. For instance, the three national governments mask the potential dark side of AI, its potential for AI to be reconciled with forces of de-democratization, and the underlying sense in which they do not present themselves as democratic actors. None of the national governments identify AI as a potentially democratizing force in their myths, utopias, and solutionism. Instead, AI is presented as a pathway for realizing imperialist dreams. And these imperialist dreams do not connect with any national or European history of democracy or history of European integration but instead with national histories of imperialism that are glorified as a blessing for West European nation-building. None of the governments’ AI strategies include a vision of democracy or of strengthening democracy. On the contrary, AI is presented as a top-down force to enhance top-down political power in a context of global competitiveness between nations.


In the British, German, and Dutch strategy papers, AI is typically mythologized as a benevolent force of national progress. National governments present AI as a force with mythical, that is, heroic and redeeming qualities. The alleged AI revolution that is so frequently used as a slogan in AI policy papers is thus believed to realize long-standing political ambitions. In the British AI strategy papers,

AI is deemed capable of paving the way for a new form of British imperialism or global leadership outside the EU after Brexit. The German AI strategy reflects the Germans' belief that they have a leading role to play in post-Brexit Europe. AI is to assume a crucial role in the next Germany-led European integration. In agreement with the legacy of the Dutch East India Company and the corresponding mentality, the Dutch government imagines a new corporate rule through the Dutch AI Coalition. This article has shown that the politicization of AI results not in revolutions and transformations but instead perpetuates existing power structures. In other words, while national governments present AI as a revolutionary force, AI works as a conservative force that continues national histories and revives the hope of some glorious national past.⁵ In a strange and ironic way, the mythical stories about AI in fact prevent AI from having any revolutionary or disruptive effects.

A superpower like AI promises a bright future for all. The British, German, and Dutch AI strategies are marked by digital utopianism. The future is envisioned as one of prospering nations in which AI is presented by national governments as the benevolent force that brings renewed emancipation, growth, prosperity, and security to the nation. In their strategy papers, national governments optimistically claim that possible perverse consequences of AI can be kept in check via an ethical code. We find that in these envisioned futures, possible digital Orwellian and Kafkaesque nightmares are not reckoned with. This political imprudence and naïve optimism are characteristic of digital utopianism. The potential dystopian or dark side of AI is ignored. Futures in which AI is the cause of even greater

economic inequalities or becomes the weapon of state repression and control or authoritarian governments are not imagined. The digital utopias portrayed in the AI strategy papers are far from being revolutionary. The brave new worlds envisioned are simply improved or expanded versions of the present worlds. They are the successful realizations of current policy programs, which themselves rest on 20th century modernist assumptions. In other words, the utopias are the fulfillments of old political objectives thanks to AI.

The digital utopianism of the three nations is supported by technological solutionism. In their AI strategies, the British, German, and Dutch governments present AI as the power that will solve their national problems. In the strategy papers, AI is presented as the solution for the problems of cost containment in policy sectors (particularly health care) and an aging workforce (mainly in Germany), while AI makes the production of public services more efficient. We note that this faith in technology as a solution to social and political problems betrays a misconception of both the art of politics and the impotence of governments in the face of current problems (such as the NHS crisis in the United Kingdom). Technological solutionism betrays the technocratic vision of politics and public administration. AI enhances existing political and administrative power structures. The national governments systematically ignore the political problems that AI cannot possibly solve, namely, the rise of populism, authoritarianism, and tech oligarchies. In fact, the AI strategy papers are themselves the textual manifestations of such a deteriorated political environment, in which AI, and serving AI via a top-down

reconfiguration of the workforce, come to replace the notion of "the people." 

REFERENCES

1. S. Dickel and J.-F. Schrape, "The logic of digital utopianism," *NanoEthics*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 47–58, Apr. 2017. doi: 10.1007/s11569-017-0285-6.
2. S. Dickel and J.-F. Schrape, "The renaissance of techno-utopianism as a challenge for responsible innovation," *J. Respons. Innov.*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 289–294, Apr. 2017. doi: 10.1080/23299460.2017.1310523.
3. R. Kling, "Hopes and horrors: Technological utopianism and anti-utopianism in narratives of computerization," in *Computerization and Controversy*, 2nd ed. R. Kling, Ed. Orlando, FL: Academic, 1996, pp. 40–58.
4. E. Morozov, *To Save Everything, Click Here: Technology, Solutionism and the Urge to Fix Problems that Don't Exist*. London: Penguin, 2013.
5. M. Ossewaarde, "Digital transformation and the renewal of social theory: Unpacking the new fraudulent myths and misplaced metaphors," *Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change*, vol. 146, pp. 24–30, Sept. 2019. doi: 10.1016/j.techfore.2019.05.007.
6. B. Berendt, "AI for the common good?! Pitfalls, challenges, and ethics pen-testing," *Paladyn, J. Behav. Robot.*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 44–65, 2019. doi: 10.1515/pjbr-2019-0004.
7. V. Mosco, *The Digital Sublime: Myth, Power, and Cyberspace*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2004.
8. "Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the European Council, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions: Artificial Intelligence for Europe," European Commission (EC), Brussels Belgium, COM(2018) 237

final, 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://ec.europa.eu/transparency/regdoc/rep/1/2018/EN/COM-2018-237-F1-EN-MAIN-PART-1.PDF>

9. S. Feldstein, "The global expansion of AI surveillance," Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Washington, D.C., Sept. 17, 2019. Accessed on: Oct. 3, 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://carnegieendowment.org/2019/09/17/global-expansion-of-ai-surveillance-pub-79847>
10. "Industrial strategy: Artificial intelligence sector deal," Government of the United Kingdom, London, 2018. [Online]. Available: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/702810/180425_BEIS_AI_Sector_Deal__4_.pdf
11. "Industrial strategy: Building a Britain fit for the future," Government of the United Kingdom, London, 2017. [Online]. Available: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/664563/industrial-strategy-white-paper-web-ready-version.pdf
12. "Government response to House of Lords Artificial Intelligence Select Committee's Report on 'AI in the U.K.: Ready, Willing and Able?'," Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, London, 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://www.parliament.uk/documents/lords-committees/Artificial-Intelligence/AI-Government-Response.pdf>
13. "The Grand Challenge missions," Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, London, 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/industrial-strategy-the-grand-challenges/missions>

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

MARINUS OSSEWAARDE is an associate professor at the University of Twente, The Netherlands. His research interests include the politics of artificial intelligence, algorithmic governance, digital transformation, and technology discourses. Contact him at m.r.ossewaarde@utwente.nl.

ERDENER GÜLENC is a junior researcher in the Department of Public Administration, University of Twente, The Netherlands. His research interests include the politics of artificial intelligence, smart cities, and the sociology of technology. Contact him at erdenergulenc@gmail.com.

14. "Federal Government adopts artificial intelligence strategy," Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy, Berlin, 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://www.bmwi.de/Redaktion/EN/Pressemitteilungen/2018/20181116-federal-government-adopts-artificial-intelligence-strategy.html>
15. "Artificial intelligence strategy," Federal Government, Berlin, 2018. [Online]. Available: https://ec.europa.eu/knowledge4policy/publication/germany-artificial-intelligence-strategy_en
16. M. Münchmeyer, *Germany's New AI Strategy*. Dublin, Ireland: Institute of International & European Affairs, Dec. 2018. Accessed on: Oct. 9, 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://www.iiea.com/publication/germanys-new-ai-strategy/>
17. "Key points for a federal government strategy on artificial intelligence," The Federal Government, Berlin, 2018. [Online]. Available: https://www.bmwi.de/Redaktion/EN/Downloads/E/key-points-for-federal-government-strategy-on-artificial-intelligence.pdf?__blob=publicationFile&v=4.
18. "Letter to Parliament with strategic action plan for artificial intelligence," Ministry of Economic Affairs and Climate Policy, Den Haag, The Netherlands, Rep. no. DGBI-DE/19207584, 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/ministeries/ministerie-van-economische-zaken-en-klimaat/documenten/kamerstukken/2019/10/08/kamerbrief-ai>
19. "Strategisch actieplan voor artificiële intelligentie," Ministry of Economic Affairs and Climate Policy, Den Haag, The Netherlands, 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/ministeries/ministerie-van-economische-zaken-en-klimaat/documenten/beleidsnotas/2019/10/08/strategisch-actieplan-voor-artificiele-intelligentie>
20. "Dutch digitalisation strategy: Getting the Netherlands ready for the digital future," Ministry of Economic Affairs and Climate Policy, Den Haag, The Netherlands, 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://www.government.nl/documents/reports/2018/06/01/dutch-digitalisation-strategy>