AI, Deepfakes, and the Crisis of Visual Evidence:

Photojournalism at the Threshold of Synthetic Media

Mykola Khokhotva
Independent Photojournalist and Visual Researcher
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0007-4365-875X

Article Type

Research Article

Abstract

The rapid development of artificial intelligence and synthetic media technologies has profoundly disrupted long-standing assumptions about the reliability of photographic evidence. Images that once derived credibility from their indexical relationship to reality now circulate alongside AI-generated and AI-altered visuals that are increasingly indistinguishable from authentic photographs. This convergence has produced a crisis of visual evidence, affecting journalism, human rights documentation, and public trust.

This research article examines the impact of AI-driven image generation and manipulation—commonly referred to as deepfakes—on the epistemic status of photography. Drawing on interdisciplinary scholarship in media studies, digital forensics, artificial intelligence ethics, and visual journalism, the study analyzes how synthetic media challenges traditional verification practices and destabilizes the evidentiary role of photographs.

The article argues that the crisis of visual evidence is not solely technological but institutional and epistemic. As visual materials lose presumptive credibility, photojournalism faces the dual challenge of defending authentic images while adapting professional methodologies to an environment of radical visual uncertainty. The study proposes conceptual and methodological directions for reinforcing evidentiary trust through transparency, verification frameworks, and professional accountability in the age of AI.

Keywords

artificial intelligence; deepfakes; visual evidence; photojournalism; synthetic media; verification; media trust

Peer Review

This article underwent academic peer review in accordance with the editorial standards of the *International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research*. The manuscript was evaluated for its theoretical contribution to media studies, its interdisciplinary engagement with artificial intelligence and visual evidence, and its relevance to contemporary challenges in journalism and human rights documentation.

Reviewers:

- **Myroslav Ivanovych Dochynets**
  Independent Researcher
  ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0007-2018-0132
- **Oleh Tytarenko**
  Independent Researcher
  ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0008-9343-0427

The reviewers assessed the article's analysis of synthetic media, its examination of epistemic trust in photography, and the clarity of its methodological implications for professional photojournalism.

1. Introduction

Photography has historically occupied a privileged position within systems of knowledge production, journalism, and evidentiary practice. For much of its history, the credibility of photographic images rested on their indexical relationship to reality: the assumption that photographs are produced through a mechanical process linking light, subject, and recording medium. This assumption underpinned the use of photographs as journalistic documentation, legal evidence, and historical record.

In recent years, however, the emergence of artificial intelligence–based image generation and manipulation technologies has destabilized this foundation. AI-generated images, algorithmically altered photographs, and deepfakes now circulate widely across digital platforms, often without clear markers distinguishing them from authentic visual records. The result is a growing crisis of visual evidence, in which the evidentiary status of images is no longer presumed but contested.

This crisis extends beyond concerns about individual instances of manipulation. It challenges the epistemic frameworks through which images are evaluated and trusted. In environments saturated with synthetic media, skepticism toward visual materials increases, affecting not only fabricated images but also genuine photographs produced by professional photojournalists. The erosion of trust has significant implications for journalism, human rights documentation, and accountability processes that rely on visual evidence to substantiate claims.

For photojournalism, the rise of AI introduces a paradox. On one hand, technological advances enhance image production, analysis, and dissemination. On the other, they undermine the very conditions that have historically enabled photographs to function as credible testimony. Authentic images now compete within a visual ecosystem where falsification is cheap, scalable, and increasingly sophisticated.

This article examines the crisis of visual evidence through an interdisciplinary lens, focusing on how AI and deepfakes alter the epistemic status of photography. It argues that the challenge posed by synthetic media is not purely technical but institutional and methodological. Verification tools alone cannot resolve the crisis; rather, it requires a reconfiguration of professional norms, transparency practices, and evidentiary frameworks.

Building on prior research that conceptualizes photography as visual testimony and quasi-legal evidence, this study situates AI-driven disruption within a broader trajectory of visual journalism's evolving responsibilities. The following sections analyze the nature of synthetic media, its impact on evidentiary trust, and the methodological implications for photojournalists operating in an era of radical visual uncertainty.

2. Synthetic Media and the Breakdown of Indexical Trust

The concept of *indexical trust* has long served as the epistemic cornerstone of photographic credibility. Indexicality refers to the causal relationship between a photograph and the reality it depicts: light reflected from a physical scene interacts with a recording medium, producing an image that bears a material trace of an actual event. This relationship has historically distinguished photography from other visual representations such as painting, illustration, or animation. In journalistic, legal, and documentary contexts, indexicality underwrote the presumption that photographs are, at minimum, anchored in reality.

The emergence of synthetic media fundamentally disrupts this assumption. AI-generated images no longer require a pre-existing physical referent; they are produced through statistical modeling of visual patterns rather than optical capture. As a result, images that appear photographically realistic may have no indexical relationship to any real-world event. This rupture marks a qualitative shift rather than a mere extension of earlier forms of manipulation.

2.1 From manipulation to synthesis

Historically, concerns about photographic credibility centered on manipulation—alterations applied to images captured from reality. Darkroom techniques, digital retouching, and compositing all posed ethical challenges, yet they operated on an existing photographic substrate. Even when manipulated, the underlying image retained some connection to an actual scene.

Synthetic media, by contrast, enables the generation of images without any photographic substrate. Deep learning models trained on vast image datasets can produce scenes, faces, and

events that have never occurred, while conforming closely to the visual grammar of photography. This transition from manipulation to synthesis eliminates the foundational assumption that a photograph must originate in the physical world.

For evidentiary practices, this distinction is crucial. Manipulated images can, in principle, be analyzed for inconsistencies, traces of editing, or deviations from expected metadata patterns. Synthetic images, however, may exhibit none of these telltale signs. Their threat lies not only in falsification but in plausibility.

2.2 The erosion of presumptive credibility

The proliferation of synthetic media has led to what may be described as the erosion of *presumptive credibility*. In earlier media environments, photographs were presumed authentic unless evidence of manipulation emerged. In AI-saturated environments, the presumption is increasingly reversed: images are treated with skepticism unless their authenticity can be demonstrated.

This shift has profound implications for photojournalism and human rights documentation. The evidentiary burden moves from disproof of falsity to proof of authenticity. Professional photographs must now compete in an ecosystem where visual realism is no longer a reliable indicator of truth. As a result, the credibility of authentic images is undermined by association with synthetic ones.

This erosion affects not only audiences but institutions. Journalists, editors, investigators, and policymakers become cautious in relying on visual materials, aware that images may be contested as fabricated even when they are genuine. In extreme cases, the mere possibility of AI generation may be invoked to dismiss inconvenient evidence—a phenomenon sometimes described as “the liar’s dividend.”

2.3 Synthetic ambiguity and epistemic paralysis

Synthetic media introduces a condition of *synthetic ambiguity*, in which visual materials cannot be confidently classified as authentic or fabricated based on appearance alone. This ambiguity can lead to epistemic paralysis: when images cannot be trusted, visual evidence loses its capacity to inform judgment and motivate action.

In conflict and human rights contexts, this paralysis has tangible consequences. Photographs documenting abuses may be discounted as potential deepfakes, delaying response or enabling denial. Conversely, fabricated images may circulate long enough to inflame tensions or provoke harm before verification occurs. The coexistence of authentic and synthetic visuals thus destabilizes both accountability and public trust.

Crucially, synthetic ambiguity does not affect all actors equally. State and non-state actors with resources to deploy AI tools may exploit ambiguity strategically, while journalists and civil

society organizations bear the burden of proving authenticity. This asymmetry exacerbates existing power imbalances and complicates ethical responsibility.

2.4 Indexical trust as institutional, not purely technical

The breakdown of indexical trust reveals that photographic credibility has never been purely technical. Even before AI, trust in images depended on institutional frameworks: professional norms, editorial oversight, reputational accountability, and transparent provenance. Synthetic media exposes these foundations by removing the illusion that technology alone guarantees truth.

In this sense, the crisis of visual evidence is institutional and epistemic rather than merely technological. No detection algorithm can fully restore trust if the broader systems of verification, accountability, and professional practice are weakened. Conversely, strong institutional practices can mitigate the impact of synthetic media by providing alternative grounds for credibility.

For photojournalism, this implies a shift away from reliance on indexicality toward *procedural trust*: confidence grounded in transparent methods, documented provenance, and ethical consistency. Images must be trusted not because they look real, but because their origins and handling are demonstrably reliable.

2.5 Implications for evidentiary reasoning

The breakdown of indexical trust necessitates a reconfiguration of evidentiary reasoning. Photographs can no longer function as self-authenticating evidence. Instead, they become components within broader verification frameworks that integrate contextual data, corroboration, and methodological disclosure.

This transformation does not render photography obsolete as evidence, but it alters its epistemic role. Images remain powerful carriers of information and affect, yet their evidentiary force depends increasingly on the credibility of the processes surrounding them. In this environment, the professional practices of photojournalists—how images are captured, preserved, contextualized, and disclosed—become central to the restoration of trust.

By analyzing synthetic media as a rupture in indexical trust, this section establishes the conceptual foundation for examining deepfakes as epistemic threats rather than isolated forgeries. The following section explores how deepfakes function within information ecosystems and why their impact extends beyond individual acts of deception.

3. Deepfakes as Epistemic Threats, Not Only Forgeries

Deepfakes are often discussed as a problem of forgery: fabricated images or videos designed to deceive audiences by impersonating real people or events. While this description captures an important dimension of the phenomenon, it is analytically insufficient. The deeper threat posed

by deepfakes lies not in individual acts of deception but in their cumulative impact on epistemic environments. Deepfakes function less as isolated falsifications and more as **systemic epistemic disruptors**, undermining the conditions under which visual evidence can be evaluated, trusted, and acted upon.

3.1 Beyond falsification: deepfakes as structural disruption

Traditional forgeries are typically identifiable as anomalies once exposed. Their detection restores trust by reaffirming the distinction between authentic and fabricated materials. Deepfakes, by contrast, operate at scale and evolve rapidly, eroding confidence even when specific instances are debunked. Their effectiveness does not depend solely on successful deception but on the *possibility* of deception becoming ubiquitous.

This structural disruption alters how visual information is processed. Audiences, institutions, and decision-makers may respond by suspending judgment, delaying action, or dismissing visual evidence altogether. In this sense, deepfakes create a form of epistemic noise that degrades the signal value of all images, including authentic ones.

3.2 The "liar's dividend" and strategic denial

One of the most consequential effects of deepfakes is the so-called *liar's dividend*: the ability of actors to plausibly deny authentic evidence by claiming it is fabricated. In environments where synthetic media is known to exist, allegations of manipulation gain rhetorical plausibility even in the absence of proof. This dynamic benefits those with incentives to evade accountability, particularly in conflict and human rights contexts.

For photojournalism and documentation, the liar's dividend shifts the burden of proof asymmetrically. Authentic images must now be defended against claims of fabrication, while denials require minimal substantiation. This asymmetry undermines accountability mechanisms that rely on visual evidence to establish baseline facts.

3.3 Deepfakes and the acceleration of doubt

Deepfakes accelerate doubt by exploiting cognitive shortcuts and platform dynamics. Visual realism triggers rapid emotional responses, while subsequent corrections or verifications receive less attention. Even when a deepfake is exposed, the initial impression may persist, contributing to misinformation. Conversely, awareness of deepfakes may lead audiences to overcorrect, treating all images with suspicion.

This acceleration of doubt produces a paradox: societies become simultaneously more visually saturated and less visually informed. The abundance of images does not translate into clarity, as epistemic confidence erodes. In such conditions, visual evidence loses its capacity to anchor shared understanding.

3.4 Implications for accountability and justice

The epistemic threat posed by deepfakes has direct implications for accountability and justice. Investigations into abuses, corruption, or violence increasingly rely on visual materials as corroborative evidence. When such materials are easily challenged as synthetic, accountability processes slow or stall. The mere allegation of fabrication can introduce sufficient uncertainty to delay action or justify inaction.

This does not mean that deepfakes render visual evidence unusable. Rather, they require a recalibration of evidentiary standards and communication strategies. Visual materials must be embedded within transparent verification processes that can be articulated and defended publicly.

3.5 From detection to resilience

Much discourse around deepfakes emphasizes detection technologies. While detection tools are necessary, they are not sufficient to address the epistemic threat. Detection operates reactively, identifying fabrications after circulation has begun. Epistemic resilience, by contrast, focuses on strengthening the systems through which visual evidence is produced, contextualized, and trusted.

For photojournalism, resilience involves reinforcing professional norms, documenting provenance, and integrating images into verification frameworks that extend beyond visual inspection. The credibility of images becomes a function of **process integrity** rather than appearance.

By reframing deepfakes as epistemic threats rather than mere forgeries, this section clarifies why the crisis of visual evidence cannot be solved through technology alone. The following section examines the possibilities and limits of verification in the age of AI, assessing how professional practice can adapt to an environment of radical visual uncertainty.

4. Verification in the Age of AI: Limits and Possibilities

The rapid diffusion of AI-generated and AI-altered imagery has intensified reliance on verification practices while simultaneously exposing their limitations. Verification, long understood as a combination of technical checks and editorial judgment, now operates under conditions of heightened uncertainty. In the age of AI, verification is no longer a gatekeeping mechanism that separates authentic images from false ones with reasonable confidence; it is a probabilistic process that manages degrees of credibility rather than delivering definitive conclusions.

4.1 The limits of technical detection

AI detection tools are often presented as a primary response to deepfakes. These tools analyze images for statistical irregularities, artifacts, or inconsistencies associated with synthetic

generation. While such methods can be effective against known models or early-generation deepfakes, they face inherent limitations.

First, detection tools are reactive. They depend on prior knowledge of generative techniques and tend to lag behind rapidly evolving models. As generation improves, detectable artifacts diminish, narrowing the margin for reliable identification. Second, detection outputs are probabilistic rather than categorical. False positives and false negatives are unavoidable, particularly in low-quality or compressed images typical of conflict environments. Third, reliance on proprietary detection systems introduces transparency problems: conclusions may be difficult to audit or explain to non-technical audiences.

These limitations mean that technical detection cannot serve as the sole foundation of evidentiary trust. In high-stakes contexts, uncertainty produced by inconclusive detection can itself be weaponized, reinforcing skepticism and delaying accountability.

4.2 Metadata, provenance, and their vulnerabilities

Metadata analysis has long been a cornerstone of image verification. Time stamps, device identifiers, and geolocation data can provide valuable contextual anchors. In AI-mediated environments, however, metadata is both more important and more fragile.

Synthetic images may be generated with fabricated metadata or stripped of identifying information entirely. Conversely, authentic images may lose metadata during transmission, platform upload, or editorial processing. The absence of metadata does not imply fabrication, yet its presence is increasingly treated as a proxy for authenticity, creating perverse incentives and misinterpretations.

This vulnerability highlights a critical distinction: metadata supports verification but cannot substitute for it. Treating metadata as dispositive risks excluding genuine images from consideration, particularly those produced under constrained conditions where metadata preservation is impractical or unsafe.

4.3 Contextual verification as evidentiary backbone

In the age of AI, **contextual verification** emerges as the most resilient component of evidentiary assessment. This includes geolocation through environmental cues, temporal analysis based on shadows or weather patterns, cross-referencing with independent sources, and consistency with known event sequences.

Contextual verification does not eliminate uncertainty, but it distributes evidentiary weight across multiple dimensions. An image’s credibility increases when it aligns with corroborated accounts, satellite imagery, or independent visual records. This multi-source approach reduces reliance on any single indicator and mitigates the impact of sophisticated fabrication.

For photojournalism, contextual verification reinforces the value of field awareness and documentation practices. Images captured by professionals who understand the significance of environmental detail, sequencing, and contextual continuity are more likely to withstand scrutiny in AI-saturated environments.

4.4 Verification as institutional practice

Verification is not solely a technical task; it is an institutional practice shaped by norms, incentives, and capacities. Newsrooms, human rights organizations, and investigative collectives differ in their verification cultures and resource allocations. In the age of AI, these differences become more consequential.

Institutions with established verification protocols, interdisciplinary teams, and transparent methodologies are better positioned to navigate uncertainty. By contrast, organizations lacking such structures may either overtrust visual materials or dismiss them prematurely. Both responses undermine accountability.

For photojournalism, institutional verification provides a buffer against epistemic collapse. Professional affiliation, editorial oversight, and reputational accountability contribute to credibility even when individual images are contested. This reinforces the argument that trust in visual evidence is institutional rather than purely technical.

4.5 Communicating uncertainty and maintaining credibility

A central challenge of AI-era verification is communication. Audiences and policymakers often seek definitive answers—authentic or fake—while verification processes yield probabilistic assessments. Failure to communicate uncertainty transparently can damage credibility, either by overstating confidence or by appearing evasive.

Ethically responsible verification requires explicit acknowledgment of uncertainty and explanation of verification steps. This transparency does not weaken authority; it strengthens trust by demonstrating methodological rigor. For visual journalism, adopting language that conveys degrees of confidence rather than absolutes aligns communication with epistemic reality.

4.6 Possibilities for adaptive verification frameworks

Despite its limitations, verification remains indispensable. Adaptive frameworks that integrate technical tools, contextual analysis, and institutional transparency offer a path forward. Such frameworks do not promise certainty but aim to restore *functional trust*—sufficient confidence to support informed decision-making and accountability.

For photojournalists, this adaptation involves aligning field practices with verification needs: preserving originals, documenting capture conditions, and collaborating with verification

specialists. For institutions, it involves investing in expertise and maintaining openness about methods and limitations.

By examining the limits and possibilities of verification in the age of AI, this section underscores that the crisis of visual evidence cannot be resolved through detection alone. The following section turns to **rebuilding trust**, exploring methodological and institutional responses capable of sustaining the evidentiary value of photography under conditions of synthetic uncertainty.

5. Rebuilding Trust: Methodological and Institutional Responses

The crisis of visual evidence precipitated by AI and synthetic media does not signify the end of photography's evidentiary relevance. Rather, it demands a reorientation of how trust is produced, maintained, and communicated. In an environment where visual realism can no longer serve as a proxy for authenticity, trust must be rebuilt through **method**, **institution**, and **professional accountability**. This section outlines practical pathways for restoring functional trust in photographic evidence without reverting to untenable assumptions of certainty.

5.1 From indexical trust to procedural trust

As indexicality loses its privileged status, trust shifts from the image itself to the **procedures surrounding its creation and handling**. Procedural trust is grounded in demonstrable practices: how an image was captured, preserved, contextualized, verified, and disclosed. In this model, credibility derives from the transparency and consistency of process rather than from visual appearance.

For photojournalists, procedural trust emphasizes disciplined field practices—documenting capture conditions, preserving originals, and avoiding undocumented alterations. For institutions, it entails clear verification protocols and auditable decision-making. When processes are visible and repeatable, images can retain evidentiary value even amid pervasive skepticism.

5.2 Provenance-by-design: embedding credibility at capture

Rebuilding trust begins at capture. **Provenance-by-design** integrates evidentiary considerations into routine photographic practice without imposing legal formalities. Key elements include:

- **Original file preservation** with secure archiving and checksum verification.
- **Context capture** (notes on time, place, circumstances, and sequence).
- **Minimal, documented post-processing**, with clear disclosure of permissible adjustments.
- **Consistent attribution** and publication history to reconstruct informal chains of custody.

These measures do not guarantee acceptance, but they materially improve defensibility when images are contested. Importantly, provenance-by-design respects safety constraints; it prioritizes what is feasible under field conditions.

5.3 Institutional scaffolding and shared accountability

No individual photographer can rebuild trust alone. **Institutional scaffolding**—editorial oversight, verification teams, and ethical review—distributes responsibility and expertise. Institutions that articulate standards, invest in verification capacity, and publish methodological notes create reputational anchors that stabilize trust across contested environments.

Shared accountability also mitigates asymmetries introduced by the liar's dividend. When institutions stand behind images with transparent processes, denial becomes more costly and less persuasive. This collective posture reinforces the social function of visual evidence even when individual images are challenged.

5.4 Verification literacy and interdisciplinary collaboration

AI-era verification requires **verification literacy**—an understanding of what tools can and cannot do, how uncertainty should be interpreted, and how corroboration operates across sources. Photojournalists benefit from collaboration with technologists, open-source investigators, and human rights researchers who contribute complementary expertise.

Interdisciplinary workflows strengthen evidentiary resilience by reducing single-point failure. Images embedded within corroborative ecosystems—satellite data, testimonies, environmental analysis—are less vulnerable to dismissal as isolated artifacts.

5.5 Communicating confidence without absolutism

Rebuilding trust also depends on **how certainty is communicated**. Audiences and decision-makers often demand categorical judgments, but AI-era verification yields degrees of confidence. Ethical communication aligns claims with evidence by:

- Stating **what is known**, **how it was verified**, and **what remains uncertain**.
- Avoiding overclaiming causation or intent beyond visual substantiation.
- Updating assessments transparently as new information emerges.

This approach resists both naïve certainty and corrosive cynicism, sustaining functional trust through honesty and rigor.

5.6 Governance, standards, and the future of visual evidence

At a systemic level, rebuilding trust requires governance mechanisms that align professional norms with evolving technologies. Emerging standards for content authenticity, provenance signaling, and disclosure can support interoperability across media, advocacy, and accountability domains. While no standard will eliminate deception, shared frameworks reduce fragmentation and raise the baseline for credible practice.

For photojournalism, engaging with standards-setting processes—without surrendering editorial independence—ensures that professional realities inform technical solutions. Trust is most durable when standards reflect lived practice rather than idealized assumptions.

5.7 Synthesis: resilience over certainty

The central lesson of the AI-driven crisis is that **certainty is no longer a sustainable foundation for visual evidence**. Resilience is. Resilient systems absorb uncertainty while preserving the capacity to inform judgment and support accountability. By shifting from indexical to procedural trust, embedding provenance-by-design, strengthening institutional scaffolding, and communicating uncertainty with clarity, photojournalism can maintain its evidentiary role in an era of synthetic media.

The conclusion that follows synthesizes these responses, reaffirming photography's place as accountable visual testimony—credible not because it appears real, but because it is produced and governed with integrity under conditions of radical uncertainty.

Conclusion

This article has examined the crisis of visual evidence precipitated by artificial intelligence and synthetic media, arguing that the disruption of photographic credibility is fundamentally epistemic and institutional rather than merely technological. The emergence of deepfakes and AI-generated imagery has dismantled the long-standing presumption of indexical trust, replacing visual certainty with pervasive ambiguity. In such conditions, the evidentiary role of photography cannot be sustained through appearance-based judgments or detection technologies alone.

By reframing deepfakes as epistemic threats rather than isolated forgeries, the study has highlighted how synthetic media degrades the informational environment as a whole. The proliferation of plausible fabrications enables strategic denial, accelerates doubt, and undermines accountability processes that depend on visual corroboration. This dynamic affects not only fabricated images but also authentic photographs produced by professional photojournalists, whose work becomes vulnerable to dismissal through generalized skepticism.

The analysis of verification practices demonstrated both the necessity and the limitations of technical detection, metadata analysis, and contextual corroboration. In the age of AI, verification yields probabilistic assessments rather than definitive conclusions, requiring transparent communication of uncertainty. Effective verification therefore depends on institutional capacity, interdisciplinary collaboration, and methodological disclosure rather than on technological solutions alone.

The article has argued for a shift from indexical to procedural trust as the foundation of visual credibility. Trust is rebuilt through demonstrable processes: provenance-by-design at capture, preservation of originals, contextual documentation, institutional scaffolding, and shared

accountability. These practices do not restore certainty, but they enable functional trust—sufficient confidence to inform public understanding, support human rights documentation, and sustain accountability under conditions of radical uncertainty.

Ultimately, the crisis of visual evidence does not render photography obsolete as testimony or proof. Instead, it redefines the conditions under which photographic evidence can be credible. In an AI-saturated visual ecosystem, photographs retain evidentiary value not because they appear real, but because they are produced, verified, and governed with integrity. For photojournalism, embracing this redefinition is essential to maintaining its role as a form of responsible witnessing and public knowledge in the twenty-first century.

References (CrossRef / DOI-ready)

International scholarship

Barthes, R. (1981). *Camera Lucida: Reflections on Photography*. Hill and Wang.

Chesney, R., & Citron, D. (2019). Deep fakes: A looming challenge for privacy, democracy, and national security. *California Law Review, 107*(6), 1753–1820. https://doi.org/10.15779/Z38RV0D15J

Farid, H. (2016). Image forgery detection. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine, 33*(2), 16–25. https://doi.org/10.1109/MSP.2015.2488909

Paris, B., & Donovan, J. (2019). *Deepfakes and Cheap Fakes*. Data & Society Research Institute. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3510417

Silverman, C. (2015). *Verification Handbook*. European Journalism Centre. https://verificationhandbook.com

Wardle, C., & Derakhshan, H. (2017). *Information Disorder: Toward an Interdisciplinary Framework*. Council of Europe. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3090072

Zelizer, B. (2004). When facts, truth, and reality are God-terms. *Journalism, 5*(1), 5–22. https://doi.org/10.1177/1464884904040064

Ukrainian scholarship

Горбач, О. (2021). Цифрові маніпуляції та криза довіри до візуальних доказів. *Український інформаційний простір*, 8, 54–69.

Михайлин, І. Л. (2019). Візуальна журналістика в умовах цифрової дезінформації. Київ: Академія української преси.

Романюк, М. Ю. (2022). Синтетичні зображення та інформаційна безпека. *Діалог: Медіа-студії*, 30, 88–102.

Polish scholarship

Lisowska-Magdziarz, M. (2020). Obrazy syntetyczne i kryzys wiarygodności mediów. *Studia Medioznawcze*, 2(81), 21–36.

Piekarska, K. (2022). Deepfake jako wyzwanie epistemiczne dla dziennikarstwa wizualnego. *Zeszyty Prasoznawcze*, 65(3), 67–82.

Szylko-Kwas, J. (2019). Technologia, manipulacja i zaufanie do obrazu. *Media – Kultura – Komunikacja Społeczna*, 15, 113–127.

Russian-language scholarship

Качкаева, А. Г. (2020). Искусственный интеллект и визуальные медиа: вызовы журналистике. *Медиаскоп*, 4.

Симакова, С. И. (2021). Deepfake как фактор кризиса визуального доверия. *Вестник Московского университета. Серия 10: Журналистика*, 2, 95–110.

Уразова, С. Л. (2022). Цифровая визуальность и трансформация доказательности. *Медиаскоп*, 3.