International Journal of Studies in Humanities and Social Science (IJSHSC)

Contents lists available at IJSHSC
International Journal of Studies in Humanities and Social Science
journal homepage: IJSHSC
Volume 2, No. 1, 2026

Brave new democracy: algorithmic transcontextuality and fluid dynamics of democratic deliberation

Mehdi Mohammadi [a]

[a] *Department of English Language and Literature, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM, USA.*

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 2026/05/15

Revised: 2026/07/27

Accept: 2026/08/10

Keywords:

Algorithmic transcontextuality, cross-domain feedback loops, niche political identities, hyper-adaptive citizenship, fragmentation of citizenship, algorithmic mythopoeia

ABSTRACT

This paper introduces the concept of algorithmic transcontextuality—how algorithms operate across multiple contexts —social, technological, economic, and rhetorical—to actively shape political participation, governance, and democratic norms. While digital platforms empower citizens, enhance political mobilization, and enable real-time civic deliberation, they also fragment citizenship, distort accountability, and reinforce algorithmically-driven political identities. The transcontextual nature of algorithms fosters dynamic feedback loops in which users both shape and are shaped by algorithmic decision-making, producing hyper-adaptive political identities and niche political movements. This paper argues that algorithmic transcontextuality necessitates a fundamental reimagination of democratic participation, as governance shifts from structured political processes to fluid, real-time algorithmic mediation. Beyond these structural changes, the paper examines how algorithmic transcontextuality disrupts traditional governance through fractured temporality—real-time digital feedback replaces structured political cycles — and platform sovereignty, in which tech corporations usurp regulatory authority. The rise of nonhuman constituencies, including AI-driven discourse and bots, further complicates political agency, while epistemic warfare fueled by algorithmic content selection deepens ideological divides. Finally, civic encryption and algorithmic sabotage emerge as forms of resistance to digital determinism.

1. Introduction

The internet and digital technologies have transformed traditional agoras, the hubs for public discourse, political assemblies, and civic life, such as Town Hall Meetings (United States),

[a] Corresponding author email address: mmoh81@unm.edu (Mehdi Mohammadi).
DOI: https://doi.org/10.22034/ijshsc.v2i1.226
Available online: 2026/09/08
Licensee System Analytics. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0).
3115-7297/BGSA Ltd.

Speaker's Corner (London, UK), or public squares (e.g., Azadi Square, Iran), into global digital networks and interactive cyberspaces. These platforms, ranging from social media and online forums to livestreams, blogs, and virtual town halls, serve as modern venues for public dialogue, debate, protest, and civic engagement, enabling diverse voices to participate instantly and collaboratively in a redefined digital public sphere.

This shift has introduced a new form of social power arising primarily from online platforms, which Dutton [11] conceptualizes as the Fifth Estate. The decentralized and democratized nature of digital spaces has strengthened the capacity of individuals, particularly historically marginalized groups such as women and people of color, to access and disseminate information outside traditional gatekeeping structures [25, 38]. This transformation has also widened the scope of citizen participation, potentially contributing to more participatory and direct forms of democracy [35]. Social media, in particular, provides citizens with real-time access to political information, policy proposals, and public debates, fostering greater political awareness and engagement [6].

However, the algorithm-driven platforms have also introduced new complexities, ranging from complicating the realization of deliberative democratic ideals to fueling populism, distorting accountability, and increasing the concentration of power. This hinders the kind of open, reasoned public debate necessary for democratic deliberation and makes it easier for powerful actors to manipulate public opinion, concentrating power and undermining democratic accountability [8]. Moreover, algorithms influence decision-making, often prioritizing efficiency and profit over public good, undermining the transparency and accountability expected in democratic systems [21]. The rise of AI-driven governance could also result in a technocratic form of government, reducing the role of political deliberation and public participation in decision-making [43].

Building on the potential benefits and risks that algorithm-based systems present for political participation, civic deliberation, and democratic engagement, as well as my earlier concept of Transjective-Holobiontic Rhetoric (THR), which conceptualizes algorithms as fluid rhetorical processes operating across interconnected socio-technical, economic, and communicative contexts [30], I introduce algorithmic transcontextuality, which describes how algorithms operate simultaneously across social, rhetorical, technological, and economic contexts. Algorithms interact recursively with citizens and the interconnected contexts in which they operate, continually reshaping political participation, citizenship, and democratic norms. I argue that this transcontextual operation transforms democratic engagement into an increasingly fluid and

adaptive process in which citizens and algorithmic systems continually shape and are shaped by one another. Algorithmic transcontextuality therefore provides a framework for examining how political agency, identity, citizenship, and democratic norms are reconfigured through these recursive interactions across contexts.

2. Algorithmic transcontextuality

Digital platforms are complex configurations that combine technology, economic activities, rhetoricality, and sociocultural interactions [5, 16, 17]. They "can empower individual citizens to unite and to rally behind public advocacy efforts in order to influence democratic processes" [40]. The platform's social, technological, rhetorical, and economic contexts within which algorithms operate create an interconnected ecosystem that influences how people behave on the platforms, how the platforms function, and how content is created and consumed. To understand how algorithms operate transcontextually, we must first explore the nature of these contexts and how algorithms function concurrently within them.

Digital platforms act as sociocultural artifacts and ecosystems [41] within which social interactions are formed and maintained. Platforms like Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram influence how people communicate, interact, and connect through features such as likes, comments, shares, and direct messaging. These interactions, guided by social behaviors and cultural norms, foster communities based on shared interests or identities. Algorithms are crucial in these environments, analyzing engagement patterns and prioritizing content that resonates with user behaviors [9]. If users frequently interact with viral content, algorithms learn to promote similar material, reinforcing social dynamics and potentially creating echo chambers by amplifying trends [37]. Thus, algorithms adapt to the social norms and interactions on these platforms, shaping the digital experience and the distribution of content within these dynamic socio-technical environments.

The technological context of digital platforms includes a vast array of technical infrastructure, tools, and systems that support and enhance user interactions, communication, and content consumption online. This context features key design elements like user interfaces, responsive layouts, and sophisticated algorithms, as well as fundamental technologies such as internet connectivity, mobile devices, and cloud computing [1,13]. These elements create a complex ecosystem that enables basic functionalities like navigation and engagement while improving usability, discoverability, and compatibility across devices. At the core of this technological framework are advanced backend systems that handle data storage, security, and content

distribution, and integrate innovations in artificial intelligence and machine learning to customize and refine user experiences. Algorithms are big players in this infrastructure, processing vast amounts of user data, from clicks to likes, to identify patterns and optimize content delivery through personalization and sequencing. This robust technological setup enables algorithms to manage and analyze large datasets in real time, serving millions of users simultaneously. They adapt to user behaviors, continuously learning to better align content with user preferences, thereby enhancing engagement.

The economic context centers on financial structures and strategies to maximize profits through user engagement and competition. Platforms like Facebook, Google, Amazon, and YouTube primarily generate revenue through targeted advertising, which is deeply integrated with user data to deliver personalized ads and boost engagement [3]. As Kompatsiaris [23] testifies, "commercial platforms have one and only one motive, that is, the maximization of economic profit" (p.10). Algorithms enhance this process by optimizing content distribution, promoting engaging or premium content, and facilitating in-platform purchases to drive revenue [10, 14]. This strategic use of algorithms helps maintain a competitive edge by attracting more users and advertisers, crucial for higher ad revenues [32].

Technological artifacts possess rhetoric because they actively influence human behavior and interaction through their affordances, which can be seen as their rhetorical properties. These affordances embody a "pushmi-pullyu dynamic" [27] whereby technologies both push users to engage in certain behaviors or ways of thinking and pull users by appealing to their existing inclinations and desires. Moreover, Brock's [7] concept of "code as rhetorical text" suggests that computer code, much like written or spoken language, serves as a medium to communicate meaning to various audiences. In a similar fashion, algorithms are inherently rhetorical because they are purpose-driven tools designed to influence perceptions, shape behaviors, and guide decision-making through the strategic mediation of symbols and data [2,19,30]. They carry embedded intentions, biases, and priorities from their developers, and adapt dynamically to socio-technical contexts, co-constructing realities in the digital space. This makes them active participants in shaping human experiences and social interactions. Additionally, apart from algorithms, digital platforms themselves are "persuasion architectures" [39]. They are rhetorical forces that shape what content is visible, how information is organized, how interactions are structured, and how ideas are presented, received, and circulated, thereby influencing social,

cultural, and political dynamics [12]. Digital platforms are inherently rhetorical by design because they are built to communicate, persuade, and influence users through strategic use of symbols and interactions. The task-driven nature of these platforms carries an inherent rhetorical force because the design itself directs users toward specific actions or modes of engagement. For example, digital platforms' affordances enable them to use features such as “like” buttons, share options, and notifications to encourage frequent interaction. The design persuades users to keep engaging with content, subtly arguing for the importance of constant connectivity and participation.

Given that, all these contexts are deeply interconnected and shape the digital space in a complex, dynamic manner. Technological advancements enable platforms to offer new features (e.g., live streaming), which can change how users interact socially and increase the potential for economic gain through ads or subscriptions. Economic incentives push platforms to develop algorithms that optimize for engagement, influencing both the type of content that is promoted (rhetorical context) and how users behave socially. Rhetorical strategies evolve as users and creators adapt their communication styles to gain visibility within technological and algorithmic frameworks, which, in turn, can shape social interactions within digital communities. This interconnection across contexts demonstrates the transcontextuality of algorithms as they are simultaneously influenced by and exert influence on these different dimensions, creating complex and reciprocal relationships within digital platforms.

The implications of algorithmic transcontextuality are profound regarding the dynamic and fluid nature of democracy, political engagement, and citizenship. These include the reconfiguration of political agency, the evolution of democratic norms, the fragmentation of citizenship, and the fluidity of political identity. To close this section, to avoid tedium and repetition, I will use the term “algorithms” throughout this paper, with the understanding that it inherently includes its transcontextual characteristic. This implies that each reference to algorithms acknowledges their influence and adaptability across various contexts, without the need for explicit repetition of these qualities.

3. Dynamic evolution of democratic engagement

A key implication of algorithmic transcontextuality is the dynamic evolution of digital democratic engagement, the continuous, adaptive process by which political participation is reshaped in response to changes across the various contexts in which algorithms operate. This dynamic introduces a more fluid and complex understanding of how political participation unfolds in the

digital age. Algorithms do not simply mediate the content users see. They evolve in response to a range of those intersecting contexts that define digital platforms. This evolution means that political involvement is not linear but is constantly reshaped by algorithmic adjustments that respond to these changing conditions.

One crucial aspect of this fluidity is how algorithms adapt to shifting societal norms and behaviors. As user preferences, trends, and modes of communication change, algorithms fine-tune to optimize engagement in response to these evolving social dynamics. For example, an algorithm that initially promotes thoughtful civic discourse can shift toward amplifying the post-truth condition, in which sensationalist and emotionally charged content proliferates [18,4,31]. The algorithm's adaptation reflects broader changes in social interaction, and as a result, political participation is redefined in real time, influenced not only by the content itself but by the social environment that drives algorithmic adjustments. Feedback loops reinforce popular content by rewarding it with greater visibility, content curation filters what users see based on engagement metrics, and data-driven personalization tailors content to individual preferences and behaviors. Together, these factors create a dynamic ecosystem in which political participation is constantly reshaped by both the content users consume and the social contexts that evolve under algorithmic influence. This interplay ensures that political discourse remains fluid, adapting to shifting cultural and societal landscapes. This adaptability is further complicated by technological advancements that continuously refine the capabilities of algorithms. As machine learning and data processing technologies improve, algorithms become more adept at predicting user behaviors and tailoring political content accordingly. However, this increased sophistication can create filter bubbles, where users are fed highly personalized content that reinforces their existing views [33]. In this context, political engagement is shaped not only by the diversity of available content but also by the technological filters through which that content is presented. The resulting engagement is more personalized and potentially more insular, with algorithms responding dynamically to each user’s specific patterns and preferences.

Economic incentives are also key players in this evolving relationship. Algorithms are often driven by the financial imperatives of the platforms that deploy them, particularly the need to maximize user engagement for advertising revenue. This economic pressure can lead algorithms to prioritize content that keeps users on the platform longer, often favoring sensational or emotionally impactful material that generates more interaction. As algorithms evolve in response to these

commercial demands, the nature of political participation shifts, becoming more about engagement metrics than about fostering informed, deliberative discourse. The economic context thus introduces a tension between the quality of civic engagement and the platform's need to generate profit, with algorithms at the center of this negotiation.

The rhetorical context, too, shapes this evolution, as algorithms adapt to the ways political messages are constructed and consumed in the digital environment. As the forms of political communication on digital platforms change, shifting from detailed arguments to quick, emotionally resonant messages, algorithms respond by prioritizing content that fits these formats. Over time, this can reshape not only the content that users engage with but the very nature of political communication itself, privileging rhetorical styles that are more likely to go viral or generate immediate reactions. Thus, algorithms not only mediate political content but also actively influence the rhetorical landscape in which political discourse occurs.

In this transcontextual framework, democratic engagement becomes a dynamic and fluid process. Algorithms, continually evolving in response to changes across social, technological, economic, and rhetorical contexts, reshape how people participate in the political sphere. Rather than viewing political participation as a static interaction between citizens and content, it must be understood as an ongoing, adaptive process in which algorithms constantly redefine the boundaries and nature of civic engagement. This reveals the profound impact of algorithmic mediation on democracy itself, as the conditions that drive algorithmic change continually reconfigure how individuals engage with politics, public discourse, and civic life.

4. Cross-domain feedback loops alter political agency

Cross-domain feedback loops are continuous, reciprocal interactions among interconnected contexts in which changes in one domain generate changes in others. This formulation extends the recursive human-algorithm relationship developed through Transjective-Holobiontic Rhetoric, where human agency and algorithmic outcomes are understood as mutually constitutive and continually adapting to one another [30]. In these systems, user behaviors (political engagement) feed into algorithms that adjust in response to new patterns, thereby influencing subsequent behaviors. This iterative process creates feedback loops that continuously reshape both the algorithmic systems and the broader contexts in which they operate.

Cross-domain feedback loops introduce a new dimension to understanding political agency. The reciprocal nature of transcontextual systems highlights a deeper, ongoing interaction. Political

agency is not merely affected by algorithms, but it actively reshapes them. As users engage with political content by liking, sharing, commenting, or even ignoring certain posts, these behaviors are processed by the algorithms, which adjust to reflect new patterns of interaction. This creates a feedback loop where citizen behavior influences the algorithm, and the updated algorithm, in turn, further influences citizen behavior. This dynamic reveals that political agency is distributed across both human actors (citizens) and nonhuman ones (algorithms). Such distributed agency can be situated within the broader framework of posthuman rhetoric, which challenges the assumption that humans constitute the exclusive center of rhetorical action and instead conceptualizes agency as emerging through networks of human and nonhuman actors [28].

Rather than being passive recipients of algorithmic decisions, citizens assume an active role in co-constructing the algorithmic environment through their interactions. Each action a user takes feeds back into the algorithm, which recalibrates its outputs based on these inputs. This recursive relationship means that political participation is not a one-way interaction but a continuously evolving process shaped by both individual decisions and the algorithm's adaptive responses. In this sense, political agency expands beyond traditional understandings. Citizens help shape the algorithmic systems that define their political engagement, effectively co-creating the digital political landscape. This highlights a more posthumanist, interdependent form of agency, where the boundaries between human and algorithmic influence blur, and where "agency is demonstrated to be located in assemblages composed of humans, code, and technological artifacts that integrate and shape the contours of everyday life" [21]. As a result, the political landscape is not dictated solely by algorithmic design but is continually shaped by citizens' behaviors and interactions, making political agency a shared, dynamic force within the transcontextual system.

5. Algorithmic transcontextuality redefines democratic norms

Algorithmic transcontextuality redefines foundational democratic principles like fairness, inclusivity, and deliberation. Algorithms suggest a complex relationship, that democratic norms themselves are constantly shifting and evolving as algorithms interact with various contexts, including social behaviors, technological advancements, and economic pressures. This fluidity means that norms such as meaningful participation, deliberation, or inclusivity are not static but are redefined by the evolving behavior of algorithms that mediate political content and engagement. For instance, in the past, democratic engagement may have been understood as a long-form debate, in which citizens engage deeply with complex issues over time. However, as

algorithms adapt to maximize engagement through economic incentives, such as prioritizing sensational or highly emotive short-form content [36, 26], the definition of meaningful participation begins to shift. What was once valued as thoughtful deliberation may be replaced by brief, reaction-driven interactions that still contribute to political discourse but in ways that depart from traditional democratic ideals. Rhetorical framing is likewise indispensable in this shift.

Digital platforms use algorithms not only to filter content but also to shape the style and presentation of political messages. Algorithms may prioritize content that aligns with platform-specific formats, like catchy headlines, visually engaging images, or emotionally compelling narratives, thereby influencing how political information is communicated and perceived. This preference for concise, impactful communication reshapes expectations of democratic participation, emphasizing immediacy and emotional resonance over detailed, rational deliberation. The expectations of a democratic citizen in the digital space, such as participating in rational debate or exercising informed voting decisions, are no longer governed by the same norms as before. Instead, these norms are being dynamically reshaped by algorithms that optimize for engagement, virality, and immediate emotional impact, responding to social trends and economic pressures in real time. As a result, practices like deliberation or rational discourse are not fixed ideals but become fluid concepts, influenced by the interaction between algorithms and the socio-economic environment in which they operate. Inclusivity and pluralism, long considered cornerstones of democratic systems, are also redefined by algorithmic behavior. While algorithms may theoretically allow for a wide range of voices and perspectives to be heard, they can also be pressured by economic motives to highlight polarizing or provocative content that generates higher engagement, often at the expense of diverse or nuanced viewpoints. This interaction reshapes the very definition of inclusivity, potentially reducing it to promoting content that aligns with economic or social trends rather than fostering truly representative democratic discourse. In this context, democratic norms are no longer stable benchmarks but are constantly being readjusted by the cross-contextual behavior of algorithms. As these algorithms continuously adapt to technological changes, social behaviors, economic imperatives, and rhetorical framing, they redefine what constitutes democratic engagement, participation, and fairness.

6. Niche political identities and hyper-adaptive citizenship

Algorithmic transcontextuality introduces a dynamic in which political identities are not only influenced by pre-existing factors but are also actively generated and reshaped through continuous

interactions across various contexts. These algorithms do more than just amplify established political ideologies or identities, that is they facilitate the creation of entirely new political identities and movements by responding to evolving user behavior and digital engagement patterns. This fluid conception of political identity also resonates with posthuman accounts of embodiment in which subjects are understood not as autonomous, self-contained entities but as relational and processual formations continually constituted through interactions with technological, material, and social environments [29]. From this perspective, algorithmically mediated political identity represents a particular manifestation of a broader posthuman condition: political subjects become through their relations with the digital systems they simultaneously affect and are affected by.

As algorithms filter, recommend, and prioritize content across contexts, they foster the development of niche political identities that may not have existed before. For example, an algorithm designed to promote personalized content might push users toward highly specific political subcultures or issue-based communities that are uniquely suited to their online behavior. Over time, these algorithmically driven content recommendations help form micro-political movements that draw in like-minded individuals and establish new modes of political engagement, such as digital rights advocacy groups focusing on internet freedom and surveillance, or tech-skeptic collectives questioning the ethical implications of artificial intelligence. Another example could be grassroots economic reform groups advocating for decentralized finance or universal basic income, emerging among people drawn to algorithmically recommended content on economic justice. These micro-movements gain traction by appealing to specific concerns and values that align with users' interests, creating communities that might not have coalesced without the nuanced, context-sensitive nature of algorithmic suggestions. As a result, political identities become hyper-adaptive in response to the dynamic, algorithmically optimized digital environment that constantly reshapes and redefines political engagement. Citizens are constantly adjusting their political expressions, affiliations, and engagements to align with the shifting algorithmic landscape. This adaptation is driven by real-time changes in how algorithms curate content and shape political discourse, whether through personalized news feeds, trending topics, or platform-specific recommendations. Political identities thus evolve in response to the continual flow of algorithmically prioritized content, leading to a fluid, ever-changing landscape of political participation. Traditional markers of political identity, such as party affiliation or long-term

ideological commitments, may no longer define an individual's political identity as strongly as the hyper-adaptive nature of their interactions with algorithmic systems.

These emergent political identities often exist within micro-political movements or identity-based niches that form and dissolve as algorithms respond to real-time digital transformations. For instance, a group advocating for a niche environmental cause might gain significant visibility through algorithmic promotion of related content, only to dissolve or evolve into a different form as the algorithm shifts its focus in response to new engagement metrics, economic incentives, or technological changes. Hyper-adaptive citizenship challenges the view of political participation as a relatively stable and consistent engagement with democratic institutions or processes. In the algorithmically fluid environment of digital platforms, citizenship itself becomes a process of constant negotiation and reconfiguration. Citizens must continuously adjust their political identities, expressions, and engagements to remain relevant and visible within the shifting algorithmic structures that mediate political discourse. This adaptability is not just a response to content but reflects how algorithms continually shape the contours of political life, from the issues that build momentum to the communities that form around them. The emergence of algorithmically fluid political identities suggests that citizenship in the digital age is no longer defined solely by participation in traditional democratic processes, such as voting or civic activism. Instead, it is shaped by the capacity to navigate, adapt to, and engage with the constantly evolving digital landscape. As algorithms continue to shift in response to social, economic, and technological, and rhetorical changes, citizens must also remain agile, responding to the new forms of political identity and engagement that these shifts produce.

7. Transcontextuality and the global fragmentation of citizenship

Transcontextuality shows the increasingly fragmented nature of citizenship in the digital age by underscoring how algorithms function across multiple, often conflicting, national, cultural, and political contexts. Algorithms adapt and behave differently depending on regional or local pressures, such as government regulations, cultural norms, and economic priorities [34]. This variability in algorithmic behavior leads to the disaggregation of citizenship into both localized and globalized forms, creating a new, more fragmented landscape of democratic engagement by shaping how individuals access information, interact with institutions, and participate in political discourse. For example, in Germany, social media platforms are required by law under the Network Enforcement Act [42] to remove hate speech within 24 hours of notification, which

significantly influences the type of content visible to users in the country. The algorithms are tuned to prioritize and quickly address flagged hate speech, reflecting the country's strict legal framework for online communication. In contrast, in the United States, where free speech protections are much broader, the same platforms allow more controversial content to remain online. Algorithms here are optimized to balance moderation with greater freedom of expression, in line with the less stringent regulatory environment.

At the global level, algorithms operating on platforms such as Twitter, Facebook, and YouTube encourage forms of political participation that transcend national borders. These algorithms enable transnational activism and global political movements [24], connecting citizens from different countries who share similar political concerns, whether it is climate change, human rights, or economic inequality. Through these digital infrastructures, citizens engage in political discourse and collective action that challenges the traditional boundaries of nation-state-based citizenship. In this sense, algorithms promote a globalized form of citizenship where political participation is defined by global issues and transnational alliances. However, the same algorithms also enforce local norms and respond to regional pressures, particularly in countries with more restrictive regimes [22]. For instance, in countries with strict government censorship or surveillance laws, such as Myanmar and China, algorithms may be tailored to limit access to certain types of political content or to suppress dissenting voices [15]. This creates a form of localized digital citizenship, in which the range of political participation is constrained by the region's specific digital policies and infrastructure. In such cases, the same global platform may operate very differently within a confining regime that enforces national political norms and restricts access to the broader transnational discourse available elsewhere. This dynamic creates a fragmented model of citizenship. Depending on the region or platform, the nature of digital political engagement can differ dramatically. Citizens in democratic countries may have access to a broad range of political content and engage in globalized conversations, while those in other environments may experience a narrow, state-controlled digital landscape that limits their participation.

Thus, citizenship becomes fragmented as individuals engage in political processes that are simultaneously algorithmically shaped by local, national, and global forces. Furthermore, this fragmentation extends beyond the availability of content and also affects how citizenship is experienced. In more open digital environments, algorithms may promote global solidarity or advocacy, encouraging individuals to identify with causes that cross national borders. On the other

hand, in regions with more stringent oversight, algorithms might reinforce nationalist or state-sponsored narratives, creating a more insular form of political identity. The same platforms that enable a globalized form of digital citizenship can, therefore, also reinforce local divisions, shaping distinct forms of political identity and engagement based on the context in which the algorithms operate. This fragmentation reveals how digital citizenship is no longer a uniform experience but is increasingly shaped by the specific contexts in which algorithms function. As these algorithms respond to both global forces, such as transnational movements, and local pressures, such as government regulations or cultural expectations, they create a diverse and fractured political landscape. Citizens are thus not only engaging with national political systems but are simultaneously navigating a complex web of local, national, and global political contexts, all of which are mediated and shaped by the transcontextual behavior of algorithms.

8. Conclusion

The concept of algorithmic transcontextuality challenges traditional perspectives on democracy, political participation, and citizenship by revealing that digital systems not only mediate public discourse but also actively construct new political realities. These algorithmic forces reshape democracy in ways that extend beyond regulation and participation, introducing novel dimensions that redefine governance, citizenship, and agency in ways previously almost unimagined. One such transformation is algorithmic mythopoeia, wherein algorithms function as storytellers, constructing political mythologies that shape collective consciousness. Algorithms synthesize narratives that embed within public discourse, creating new ideological frameworks that replace traditional political structures. These algorithm-generated narratives influence political identities, reshaping how individuals perceive governance, history, and civic duty. Additionally, the rise of fractured temporality in digital democracy disrupts traditional linear political processes. Governance, once dictated by structured electoral cycles, is now subject to algorithmic time, where real-time adjustments, predictive modeling, and recursive influence loops redefine decision-making. Political causality is no longer straightforward but fragmented that makes governance a fluid and unpredictable landscape shaped by digital mediation. Moreover, algorithmic systems are compressing political time, shifting governance from deliberative cycles to real-time decision-making influenced by engagement metrics rather than structured discourse. This temporal singularity of democracy creates a paradox in which governance is highly responsive yet

increasingly shallow, as political decisions must adapt to the pace of trending topics rather than to substantive deliberation.

Another shift is the emergence of nonhuman constituencies in algorithmic polities. As AI-generated discourse, bots, and digital agents gain prominence in political arenas, traditional definitions of citizenship blur. Future democratic models may not only include human actors but also machine-driven entities that participate in governance structures, redefining the boundaries of political agency. This raises the prospect of algorithmic parliaments, where AI-driven decision-making coexists with human legislators, and of machine constitutionalism, in which legal frameworks are shaped and interpreted by autonomous AI entities. Furthermore, the rise of a polarization industry fueled by algorithmic content selection has transformed political participation into a form of digital epistemic warfare. Algorithms do not simply reinforce ideological bubbles; they engineer competing truth regimes that create not only divergent perspectives but fundamentally incompatible epistemologies. This fuels the economic and political interests of both state and non-state actors who profit from epistemic instability, turning algorithmic mediation into a battleground for the construction of reality.

In parallel, digital governance is shifting toward a form of platform sovereignty in which tech corporations act as meta-sovereigns, setting the terms of political engagement and governance. Algorithmic governance capture means that states increasingly outsource regulatory and civic functions to digital platforms, which dissolves the distinction between corporate authority and governmental power. The platform leviathan may redefine legitimacy, in which governance is evaluated not by ideological mandates but by algorithmic performance metrics. Simultaneously, resistance to algorithmic governance is emerging through civic encryption and algorithmic sabotage movements. Beyond obfuscation tactics, individuals and collectives may actively disrupt algorithmic predictability through misinformation flooding, decentralized identity rotations, or digital Luddism, organized disengagement from algorithmic platforms. These movements challenge the notion that engagement is the only form of political agency, asserting that strategic opacity and non-participation may become necessary tools for resisting algorithmic determinism.

References

[1] Bassan, F. (2021). *Digital platforms and global law.* Edward Elgar Publishing.

[2] Beck, E. (2016, November 22). A theory of persuasive computer algorithms for rhetorical code studies. *Enculturation.* Retrieved from https://enculturation.net/a-theory-of-persuasive-computer-algorithms/

[3] Belleflamme, P., & Peitz, M. (2021). *The economics of platforms: Concepts and strategy.* Université catholique de Louvain, Belgium, and University of Mannheim, Germany.

[4] Block, D. (2019). *Post-truth and political discourse.* Springer International Publishing.

[5] Bogost, I., & Montfort, N. (2009). Platform studies: Frequently questioned answers. In *Proceedings of the digital art and culture conference*, UC Irvine, CA, 12–15 December 2009, pp. 1–6. Retrieved from https://escholarship.org/uc/item/01r0k9br

[6] Boulianne, S. (2015). Social media use and participation: A meta-analysis of current research. *Information, Communication & Society, 18*(5), 524–538. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2015.1008542

[7] Brock, K. (2019). Treating code as a persuasive argument. In J. Jones & L. Hirsu (Eds.), *Rhetorical machines: Writing, code, and computational ethics* (pp. 69–85). University of Alabama Press.

[8] Coeckelbergh, M. (2022). *The political philosophy of AI: An introduction.* Polity.

[9] Culloty, E., & Suiter, J. (2021). *Disinformation and manipulation in digital media: Information pathologies.* Routledge.

[10] Denning, S. (2022). *Reinventing capitalism in the digital age.* Cambridge University Press.

[11] Dutton, W. H. (2023). *The Fifth Estate: The power shift of the digital age.* Oxford University Press.

[12] Edwards, D. W., & Gelms, B. (2018). The rhetorics of platforms. *Present Tense: A Journal of Rhetoric in Society, 6*(3). Retrieved from https://www.presenttensejournal.org

[13] Flew, T. (2022). *Regulating platforms.* Polity.

[14] Fuchs, C. (2022). *Digital capitalism: Media, communication and society.* Routledge.

[15] Funk, A., Shahbaz, A., & Vesteinsson, K. (2023). *Freedom on the net 2023: The repressive power of artificial intelligence.* Freedom House. Retrieved from https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-net/2023/repressive-power-artificial-intelligence

[16] Gillespie, T. (2010). The politics of platforms. *New Media & Society, 12*(3), 347–364.

[17] Gruwell, L. (2018). Constructing research, constructing the platform: Algorithms and the rhetoricity of social media research. *Present Tense: A Journal of Rhetoric in Society, 6*(3). Retrieved from https://www.presenttensejournal.org

[18] Harsin, J. (2018). Post-truth and critical communication studies. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Communication*. https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228613.013.757

[19] Ingraham, C. (2014). Toward an algorithmic rhetoric. In G. Verhulsdonck & M. Limbu (Eds.), *Digital rhetoric and global literacies: Communication modes and digital practices in the networked world* (pp. 62–79). Routledge.

[20] Kahne, J., & Bowyer, B. (2018). The political significance of social media activity and social networks. *Political Communication, 35*(3), 470–493. https://doi.org/10.1080/10584609.2018.1426662

[21] Kalpokas, I. (2019). *Algorithmic governance: Politics and law in the post-human era.* Palgrave Pivot.

[22] Kirk, T. (2024). Digital activism. In D. Green (Ed.), *How change happens* (2nd ed., pp. 183–203). Oxford University Press.

[23] Kompatsiaris, P. (2022). *Curation in the age of platform capitalism: The value of selection, narration, and expertise in new media cultures.* Routledge.

[24] Le Bourdon, M. (2024). #GlobalJustice?: Social media, pedagogy, and activism. *International Studies Perspectives.* https://doi.org/10.1093/isp/ekae011

[25] Lee, L. A. (2017). Black Twitter: A response to bias in mainstream media. *Social Sciences, 6*(1), 26. https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci6010026

[26] Mendonça, R. F., Almeida, V., & Filgueiras, F. (2024). *Algorithmic institutionalism: The changing rules of social and political life.* Oxford University Press.

[27] Miller, C. R. (2010). Rhetoric, technology, and the Pushmi-Pullyu. In S. A. Selber (Ed.), *Rhetorics and technologies: New directions in writing and communication.* Bloomsbury Sigma.

[28] Mohammadi, M. (2024). Rhetoric and Posthumanism. *It was published on criticalposthumanism. net*.

[29] Mohammadi, M. (2024). Embodiment in Posthuman Rhetoric. *Available at SSRN 5267892*.

[30] Mohammadi, M. (2025). A transjective-holobiontic rhetoric (THR). *Somatechnics, 15*(1), 63–75. https://doi.org/10.3366/soma.2025.0449

[31] Mohammadi, M. (in press). Platform capitalism and postdigital kakistocracy. In S. Sundvall, C. Alford, & I. J. Allen (Eds.), *Rhetoric before and beyond post-truth*. University of Pittsburgh Press.

[32] Nielsen, R. K., & Fletcher, R. (2021). Democratic creative destruction? The effect of a changing media landscape on democracy. In N. Persily & J. A. Tucker (Eds.), *Social media and democracy: The state of the field, prospects for reform* (pp. 139–162). Stanford University Press.

[33] Omoregie, U., & Ryall, K. (2023). *Misinformation matters: Online content and quality analysis.* CRC Press.

[34] Peng, S., Lin, C.-F., & Streinz, T. (2021). Artificial intelligence and international economic law: A research and policy agenda. In S. Peng, C.-F. Lin, & T. Streinz (Eds.), *Artificial intelligence and international economic law: Disruption, regulation, and reconfiguration* (pp. 1–26). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108954006.002

[35] Polat, R. K. (2005). The Internet and political participation: Exploring the explanatory links. *European Journal of Communication, 20*(4), 435–459. https://doi.org/10.1177/0267323105058251

[36] Shin, D. (2024). *Artificial misinformation: Exploring human-algorithm interaction online*. Palgrave Macmillan.

[37] Sumpter, D. (2018). *Outnumbered: From Facebook and Google to fake news and filter-bubbles.* Bloomsbury Sigma.

[38] Titanji, B. K., Abdul-Mutakabbir, J. C., Christophers, B., Flores, L., Marcelin, J. R., & Swartz, T. H. (2022). Social media: Flattening hierarchies for women and Black, Indigenous, People Of Color (BIPOC) to enter the room where it happens. *Clinical Infectious Diseases, 74*(Supplement_3), S222–S228. https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciac047

[39] Tufekci, Z. (2018). We're building a dystopia just to make people click on ads [Transcript]. *Singju Post.* Retrieved from https://singjupost.com/zeynep-tufekci-were-building-a-dystopia-just-to-make-people-click-on-ads-transcript/

[40] van Dijck, J., Poell, T., & de Waal, M. (2018). *The platform society: Public values in a connective world.* Oxford University Press.

[41] Vicari, S., & Kirby, D. (2023). Digital platforms as socio-cultural artifacts: Developing digital methods for cultural research. *Information, Communication & Society, 26*(9), 1733–1755. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2022.2027498

[42] Wischmeyer, T. (2020). What is illegal offline is also illegal online: The German Network Enforcement Act 2017. In B. Petkova & T. Ojanen (Eds.), *Fundamental rights protection online: The future regulation of intermediaries* (pp. 28–56). Edward Elgar Publishing.

[43] Zekos, G. I. (2022). *Political, economic and legal effects of artificial intelligence: Governance, digital economy and society.* Springer.