

Public Constitutional AI

*Gilad Abiri**

(Forthcoming in *Georgia Law Review*, Volume 59)

ABSTRACT

We are increasingly subjected to the power of AI authorities. Machine learning models now underpin algorithmic markets, determine whose speech is amplified or restricted, shape government decisions ranging from resource allocation to predictive policing, and influence our access to information on critical issues such as voting and public health. As AI decisions become inescapable, entering domains such as healthcare, education and law, we must confront a vital question: how can we ensure that AI systems, which increasingly regulate our lives and make decisions that shape our societies, have the authority and legitimacy necessary for effective governance?

To secure AI legitimacy, this essay argues, we need to develop methods that engage the public in the project of designing and constraining AI systems, thereby ensuring that these technologies reflect the shared values and political will of the community it serves. Constitutional AI, proposed and developed by Anthropic AI, represents a step towards this goal, offering a model for how AI might be brought under democratic control and made answerable to the common good.

Just as constitutions limit and guide the exercise of governmental power, Constitutional AI seeks to hardcode explicit principles and values into AI models, rendering their decision-making more transparent and accountable. What sets Constitutional AI apart is its commitment to grounding AI training in a clear, human-understandable "constitution." By training AI to adhere to principles that are legible to both humans

*Associate Professor of Law, Peking University School of Transnational Law and Visiting Fellow, Information Society Project, Yale Law School.

and machines, this approach aims to foster trust and stability in the development of these increasingly powerful technologies.

However, I argue that Constitutional AI, in its current form (developed by a private corporation seeking to create universally applicable constitutional principles), is unlikely to fully resolve the crisis of AI legitimacy due to two key deficits. First, the opacity deficit: the inherent complexity of AI systems undermines our ability to reason about their decision-making. Second, the political community deficit: AI systems are grounded in abstract models rather than human judgment, lacking the social context that legitimizes authority.

To remedy these deficits, I propose Public Constitutional AI, a framework that involves the public in drafting an AI constitution that must be used in the training of all frontier AI models operating within a given jurisdiction. By transforming the AI constitution from a technical solution devised by engineers into a product of significant citizen involvement, Public Constitutional AI mitigates the opacity deficit. It does so by rendering the principles and values governing AI systems more transparent and accessible to the forms of public discourse and contestation that are essential to democratic legitimacy. Moreover, by grounding the development of AI principles in the social context and shared experiences of a particular political community, Public Constitutional AI helps to bridge the gap between the abstract logic of algorithms and the situated, contextual judgments that legitimize authority in a democracy, thereby mitigating the political community deficit.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....

INTRODUCTION 1

I.AI LEGITIMACY 7

 A.WHY DO WE NEED LEGITIMATE AI?..... 7

 B.AI LEGITIMACY DEFICITS 12

 1. Opacity Deficit12

AI Opacity12

Legitimacy and Explainability.....16

 2. Political Community Deficit.....20

II.PRIVATE CONSTITUTIONAL AI..... 25

 A.ANTROPHIC’S CONSTITUTION 25

 1. Technology25

 2. Principles29

 B.THE LEGITIMACY OF PRIVATE CONSTITUTIONAL AI 32

 1. Opacity 34

 2. Political Community36

III.PUBLIC CONSTITUTIONAL AI 38

 A.WHAT IS PUBLIC CONSTITUTIONAL AI?..... 40

 1. AI Constitution-Making.....40

 2. AI Courts42

 3. AI Compliance46

 B. THE LEGITIMACY OF PUBLIC CONSTITUTIONAL AI 50

 1. Opacity51

 2. Political Community52

CONCLUSION 57

INTRODUCTION

The rapid rise of algorithmic decision-making is transforming both private and public spheres. From content moderation to criminal sentencing, AI systems are increasingly entrusted with choices that carry profound consequences for individuals and society.¹ As machine learning and big data become the backbone of vital government functions and shape the information ecosystem, concerns about the legitimacy of these AI authorities² are growing.³

The increasingly expanding reach of AI authorities raises fundamental questions about the legitimacy of power in the digital age. Legal and political theorists have long recognized that stable and effective governance requires more than mere coercion; it demands legitimacy - the widespread belief that power is being exercised in a rightful manner.⁴ Without this perception of justified authority, compliance becomes fragile, dependent on constant surveillance and the threat of force.⁵ In the context of algorithmic decision-making, the opacity and inscrutability of advanced AI systems pose significant

¹ Danielle Keats Citron, *Technological Due Process*, 85 WASH. U. L. REV. 1249, 1257 (2008); TARLETON GILLESPIE, CUSTODIANS OF THE INTERNET: PLATFORMS, CONTENT MODERATION, AND THE HIDDEN DECISIONS THAT SHAPE SOCIAL MEDIA 21-23 (2018).

² I will use the expressions “automated authorities” and “AI authorities” interchangeably.

³ Ryan Calo & Danielle Keats Citron, *The Automated Administrative State: A Crisis of Legitimacy*, 70 EMORY L.J. 797, 829 (2021); DAVID FREEMAN ENGSTROM ET AL., GOVERNMENT BY ALGORITHM: ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN FEDERAL ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCIES 46 (2020), <https://www-cdn.law.stanford.edu/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/ACUS-AI-Report.pdf> (last visited June 15, 2024).

⁴ Richard H. Fallon, Jr., *Legitimacy and the Constitution*, 118 HARV. L. REV. 1787, 1795 (2005); Tom R. Tyler, *Psychological Perspectives on Legitimacy and Legitimation*, 57 ANN. REV. PSYCH. 375, 376-77 (2006); Gilad Abiri & Sebastian Guidi, *From a Network to a Dilemma: The Legitimacy of Social Media*, 26 STAN. TECH. L. REV. 51, 107 (2023) (“Legitimation occurs when a powerholder behaves according to the beliefs people have about the rightful way of exercising authority.”).

⁵ DAVID BEETHAM, THE LEGITIMATION OF POWER 28 (1991). (“[W]hen legitimacy is eroded or absent . . . coercion has to be much more extensive and omnipresent, and that is costly to maintain. Moreover, the system of power has only one line of defense, that of force; and it can therefore collapse very rapidly...”).

challenges to establishing their legitimacy in the eyes of those subject to their power.

My goal in this Essay is to engage with one potential solution to the issue of AI legitimacy: Constitutional AI. This idea and technology, developed by Anthropic AI (the team behind Claude, one of the frontier large language models) attempts to hardcode a document containing explicit principles and values into AI systems, analogous to how constitutions operate to structure and constrain government authority.⁶

By training AI models to adhere to principles accessible to both humans and models, Constitutional AI aims to make their decision-making more transparent, accountable, and aligned with human values.⁷ However, I argue that while private efforts like Anthropic's are a promising start, they will ultimately fall short of securing robust legitimacy for AI authority. What is needed is an approach that takes the constitutional analogy seriously by engaging the public in a process of AI constitution-making. This article engages in the thought experiment of developing such a "Public Constitutional AI."⁸ I call it a thought experiment since the reader must accept two plausible but unproven premises to follow the argument. First, that AI will dramatically transform power relationships in digital societies.⁹ Second, since the essay makes a political and legal point, the reader must accept that the technological aspects of Constitutional AI, discussed below, can actually do what their developers claim.¹⁰

⁶ Jenna Burrell, *How the Machine 'Thinks': Understanding Opacity in Machine Learning Algorithms*, *BIG DATA & SOC'Y*, Jan.-June 2016, at 1; Coglianese & Lehr, *Infra* note 15, at 1089.

⁷ See Bai et al., Anthropic, *Constitutional AI: Harmlessness from AI Feedback*, ARXIV, 1-2, 5 (2022), <https://arxiv.org/abs/2212.08073> (last visited May 23, 2024) (experimenting with methods for training a harmless AI assistant through a list of rules or principles).

⁸ See *id.* at 1 (aiming to train AI systems helpful, honest, transparent and harmless Constitutional AI).

⁹ This is a very widely held position, see e.g., SETH LAZAR, *Automatic Authorities: Power and AI*, in *COLLABORATIVE INTELLIGENCE: HOW HUMANS AND AI ARE TRANSFORMING OUR WORLD* (Arathi Sethumadhavan & Mira Lane eds., 2024) (forthcoming on MIT Press) (manuscript at 1), <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.05990> (last visited June 15, 2024); Julie E. Cohen, *Law for the Platform Economy*, 51 U.C. DAVIS L. REV. 133, 199-203 (2017) (arguing that platforms exercise quasi-governmental power and should be subject to public oversight, an argument that applies tenfold to potential AI uses).

¹⁰ See discussion *infra* Part II.A.1.

The vision of Public Constitutional AI advanced here would apply not only to AI systems operated by government entities, but also to those developed and deployed by private actors. Given the increasingly influential role that private companies play in shaping the informational and communicative infrastructure of our societies,¹¹ subjecting their AI systems to public oversight and accountability is essential for promoting democratic legitimacy in the algorithmic age.¹² Public Constitutional AI thus represents a form of “hybrid” governance that blends public and private, recognizing the need for constitutional principles to evolve beyond the traditional state-action paradigm.¹³

The argument proceeds in three parts:

In Part I, I discuss the concept of AI legitimacy and identify two inherent deficits that standing in the way of its realization. The first is the opacity deficit, which arises from the black-box nature of advanced AI systems. When the reasoning behind algorithmic decisions is inherently inscrutable, it undermines the public’s ability to assess their fairness and hold power accountable.¹⁴ This opacity operates at both the individual level, where the specific factors driving any given decision are often unknowable, and the systemic level, where the general rules and assumptions baked into the algorithm remain hidden from view.¹⁵ The second legitimacy deficit is the political community

¹¹ Kate Klonick, *The New Governors: The People, Rules, and Processes Governing Online Speech*, 131 HARV. L. REV. 1598, 1602-03 (2018) (describing how private platforms regulate online speech in ways that resemble governmental censorship).

¹² NICOLAS P. SUZOR, LAWLESS: THE SECRET RULES THAT GOVERN OUR DIGITAL LIVES 93-114 (2019) (arguing for the application of constitutional principles to private digital platforms).

¹³ Michèle Finck, *Digital Co-Regulation: Designing a Supranational Legal Framework for the Platform Economy*, 43 EUR. L. REV. 47, 68-70 (2018) (proposing a co-regulatory model for the governance of digital platforms that involves both private and public actors).

¹⁴ Cary Coglianese & David Lehr, *Transparency and Algorithmic Governance*, 71 ADMIN. L. REV. 1, 14-15 (2019); Hannah Bloch-Wehba, *Access to Algorithms*, 88 FORDHAM L. REV. 1265, 1269-70 (2020).

¹⁵ Andrew D. Selbst & Solon Barocas, *The Intuitive Appeal of Explainable Machines*, 87 FORDHAM L. REV. 1085, 1089-99 (2018) (discussing the secrecy of algorithmic decision-making).

PUBLIC CONSTITUTIONAL AI

(2024)

deficit, stemming from AI's lack of grounding in any specific social context. As a technology of pure statistical abstraction, AI cannot engage in the discursive processes that legitimize authority within a self-governing polity.¹⁶ Unlike human decision-makers, who are embedded in the shared meanings and norms of a particular community, AI operates according to the asocial logic of optimization and statistical inference.¹⁷ This alienation from the lived realities of citizens poses a fundamental barrier to AI's democratic Legitimation.

With the challenges of AI legitimacy laid out, Part II turns to examining the idea of Constitutional AI, drawing on Anthropic's model as a key example. This approach involves codifying a set of high-level principles and values into a "constitution" that guides the behavior of their AI systems.¹⁸ The principles are derived from a range of sources, including international human rights law, moral theories, and the expressed preferences of Anthropic's user base.¹⁹ The AI is then trained to adhere to these principles through a process of "Constitutional AI feedback," where it is rewarded for generating outputs that align with the constitutional guidelines and penalized for deviations.²⁰ Over time, this process aims to instill the constitution's values into the very objective function of the AI, ensuring that it will "want" to act in accordance with these principles even in novel situations.²¹

While Constitutional AI represents a well-intentioned attempt to constrain the power of artificial agents and ensure their alignment with human values, I argue that it has limited potential to address the legitimacy deficits of AI. On one hand, this approach holds promise in mitigating the systemic opacity deficit by grounding AI systems in a set of clear, accessible principles that can be scrutinized and debated

¹⁶ Robert Post, *The Internet, Democracy and Misinformation*, in DISINFORMATION, MISINFORMATION AND DEMOCRACY (Ronald J. Krotoszynski, Jr., András Koltay & Charlotte Garden eds.) (forthcoming 2024) (manuscript at 10) (on file with authors) ("AI cannot make content moderation decisions with the legitimacy or authority of law...AI learns as it receives feedback about its decisions.").

¹⁷ Daniel Stander, *Algorithms Don't Have a Future: On the Relation of Judgement and Calculation*, PHIL. TECH. Mar.-Jun. 2024, at 1, 25.

¹⁸ See Bai et al., *supra* note 7, at 2.

¹⁹ *Id.* at 5-6.

²⁰ *Id.* at 8-10.

²¹ *Id.* at 10.

NNN

Desktop Publishing Example

by the public.²² By making the normative foundations and constraints of AI decision-making more transparent and comprehensible at a system level, Constitutional AI could enhance the overall accountability of these systems and facilitate public oversight. However, Constitutional AI has little traction when it comes to addressing the opacity of specific AI decisions. Even with a transparent set of governing principles in place, the actual reasoning process behind individual determinations often remains inscrutable due to the black-box nature of many AI systems.²³

Moreover, when it comes to the political community deficit, private Constitutional AI falls short. The unilateral and centralized nature of the constitution-drafting process, driven by a private AI corporation, fails to generate genuine political and legal legitimacy.²⁴ When a company like Anthropic determines the principles that will govern their AI's behavior, they are in effect telling us to trust them to make deeply consequential political choices on behalf of the broader public.²⁵ Without any mechanism for democratic input or deliberation, this model of Constitutional AI risks further entrenching the already significant power asymmetries between tech companies and the communities they serve.²⁶ The political community deficit thus remains unaddressed, as the AI system is not grounded in the shared values and deliberative processes of a self-governing polity.

To address these shortcomings, Part III proposes the idea of Public Constitutional AI. The idea is that to bolster the legitimacy of AI authorities, we must find ways to match the technological infrastructure of Constitutional AI with meaningful forms of public

²² See Bai et al., *supra* note 7 (discussing how Constitutional AI can make the principles and constraints of AI systems more transparent and accountable).

²³ See *infra* Part I.B.1.; Cynthia Rudin, *Stop Explaining Black Box Machine Learning Models for High Stakes Decisions and Use Interpretable Models Instead*, 1 NATURE MACH. INTELL. 206, 206-07 (2019) (discussing the challenges of opacity in AI decision-making).

²⁴ See discussion *infra* Part II.A.2.

²⁵ Elettra Bietti, *From Ethics Washing to Ethics Bashing: A View on Tech Ethics from Within Moral Philosophy*, PROC. 2020 CONF. ON FAIRNESS, ACCOUNTABILITY, AND TRANSPARENCY, Jan. 2020, at 210, 211 (arguing that companies setting up principles as part of their efforts to trustworthy AI is more suitable to be called “AI politics” rather than “AI ethics”).

²⁶ JULIE E. COHEN, *BETWEEN TRUTH AND POWER: THE LEGAL CONSTRUCTIONS OF INFORMATIONAL CAPITALISM 192-94* (2019) (holding that the tech companies have power to make decisions while resisting public interests oversight).

PUBLIC CONSTITUTIONAL AI

(2024)

engagement and democratic deliberation. This model envisions a participatory constitution-making process where diverse stakeholders come together to deliberate on the principles that should guide AI development, regardless of whether the AI systems are deployed by public or private actors. Through public hearings, citizen assemblies, online consultations, and other mechanisms of democratic input, ordinary people would have a voice in authoring a document holding the normative foundations of AI training in their jurisdiction. The idea is that all models will be required (or given strong incentives) to be trained on the basis of the constitutional document.²⁷ Depending on context, the constitution-making process could be initiated and overseen by legislatures, regulatory agencies, or other public bodies with the democratic mandate to represent the interests of citizens.²⁸

To complement this constitutional framework, the Public Constitutional AI approach also proposes the creation of “AI courts” - public bodies tasked with generating concrete examples and case law that illustrate how the principles of the AI constitution should be applied in practice.²⁹ These courts would curate a repository of paradigmatic cases and interpretations that, together with the constitutional text, would guide the training and development of new AI models. By providing both abstract principles and tangible instantiations, this approach is meant to continually engage the public in the process of developing the contemporary meaning the principles of the AI constitution.³⁰

The resulting “AI Constitution,” encompassing both the broad principles ratified by the public and the case law developed by AI courts, would carry the legitimating force of popular authorship,

²⁷ See *infra* Part II. A. 1.

²⁸ Cary Coglianese & Erik Lampmann, *Contracting for Algorithmic Accountability*, 6 ADMIN. L. REV. ACCORD 175, 194-97 (2021) (arguing that the government has a variety of consultative processes to draw on the knowledge of both expert and non-expert members of the public).

²⁹ For the proposal of training AI on the basis of case law, see *infra* Part III. A. 2. and see generally Quan Ze Chen & Amy X. Zhang, *Case Law Grounding: Aligning Judgments of Humans and AI on Socially-Constructed Concepts*, ARXIV (2023) <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.07019> (last visited June 8, 2024); some constitutional courts produce model cases for lower courts to follow.

³⁰ See generally *id.* at 2-3 (introducing case law grounding as a novel process to help human and AI make judgments on novel cases through exploration of prior decisions).

NNN

Desktop Publishing Example

seeking to ground algorithmic power in the collective will of the community. By making AI training into a site of democratic contestation and negotiation, Public Constitutional AI could help mitigate the opacity deficit and ensure that algorithmic systems remain responsive to societal values over time. Regular opportunities for public input and oversight would enable citizens to interrogate the assumptions and value-judgments embedded in AI systems, while also providing a mechanism for redress when harms or unintended consequences emerge.³¹ Moreover, by fostering a sense of collective authorship of the principles governing AI, this participatory approach could help bridge the gap between the abstract logic of algorithms and the lived realities of human communities. In this way, Public Constitutional AI offers a potential path towards imbuing automated authorities with democratic legitimacy.

The social, political and legal challenges posed by the rise of AI authority are immense, and there are no easy solutions. But by taking seriously the idea of a constitution for AI, we can begin to develop a path towards integrating this transformative technology into our political and legal institutions and cultures.

I. AI LEGITIMACY

A. WHY DO WE NEED LEGITIMATE AI?

Across the globe, people are already subjected to “Automated Authorities,” which are “automated computational systems used to exercise power over us by substantially determining what we may know, what we may have, and what our options will be.”³² Machine learning, big data, and related computational technologies now underpin vital government services from criminal justice to tax auditing, public health to social services, immigration to defense.³³ Automated authorities are

³¹ See generally Sonia K. Katyal, *Private Accountability in the Age of Artificial Intelligence*, 66 UCLA L. REV. 54 (2019) (exploring the impending conflict between the protection of civil rights and AI).

³² See SETH LAZAR, *supra* note 9.

³³ See Danielle Keats Citron, *supra* note 1; Calo & Citron *supra* note 3.

even more prevalent in the private market. Search algorithms and large language models (LLMs) are becoming a primary means through which many individuals access information about everything from voting to vaccination.³⁴ Social media platforms algorithmically determine whose speech is amplified, reduced, or restricted,³⁵ wielding immense power over public discourse and opinion formation. The rapid advances in LLM technology have the potential to further transform our economic and political lives, underscoring the urgency of grappling with the implications of AI authorities for the exercise of power in our society.

The increasing use of automated authority appears to be an inevitable development, driven by two primary factors. First, the immense scale of modern governance challenges, particularly in the context of the internet, renders traditional forms of legal regulation inadequate.³⁶ For example, the sheer volume of content moderation decisions required on major online platforms far exceeds the capacity of any human institution to oversee or manage effectively.³⁷ This reality necessitates the deployment of AI to handle the massive scale of these governance tasks. Second, the dynamics of the market will inexorably push towards greater AI governance due to its cost-effectiveness.³⁸ As AI technology continues to advance and become more affordable, it will become increasingly attractive for both private and public entities to leverage AI for decision-making in areas central to society and politics, such as law, public discourse, and public policy.

³⁴ See e.g., Antonio Salas et al., *Chatting with ChatGPT to learn about safety of COVID-19 vaccines – A perspective*, HUM. VACCINES & IMMUNOTHERAPEUTICS, Sept. 3, 2023, at 1, 1 (discussing the accuracy of ChatGPT regarding the safety aspects of COVID-19 vaccines); Devashri Khadke et al., *Can ChatGPT Help Prospective Voters Get the Information They Need?*, BIPARTISAN POLICY CENTER (May 17, 2023), <https://bipartisanpolicy.org/blog/can-chatgpt-help-prospective-voters-get-the-information-they-need/> (last visited June 15, 2024) (discussing whether ChatGPT could provide voters with promising source for election information).

³⁵ See SIVA VAIDHYANATHAN, *THE GOOGLIZATION OF EVERYTHING: (AND WHY WE SHOULD WORRY)* 13-50 (1st ed. 2012); FRANK PASQUALE, *THE BLACK BOX SOCIETY: THE SECRET ALGORITHMS THAT CONTROL MONEY AND INFORMATION* 59-100(2015); TARLETON GILLESPIE, *supra* note 1, at 2; SUZOR, *supra* note 12, at 10-24.

³⁶ See e.g., Fangbing Zhu & Zongfeng Song, *Systematic Regulation of Personal Information Rights in the Era of Big Data*, SAGE OPEN, Jan.- Mar. 2022, at 1, 7.

³⁷ See Post, *supra* note 16, manuscript at 11.

³⁸ *Id.*

The economic incentives to reduce costs and increase efficiency will drive the adoption of AI governance, even if this development raises profound questions about political legitimacy and accountability.

Despite these challenges, the shift towards AI governance by automated authorities is not only inevitable but also potentially desirable. For example, AI has the potential to address long-standing issues in access to justice and enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of governance across various domains. In the legal system, AI-powered tools such as legal chatbots and self-help resources could assist individuals in navigating complex legal processes, while AI-assisted case management systems could help courts more effectively triage and adjudicate cases.³⁹ By reducing barriers to legal services, AI could make justice more accessible and affordable for many individuals and communities who have historically been underserved by the legal system.⁴⁰

In the realm of public policy, AI could analyze vast amounts of data to inform evidence-based decision-making, enabling policymakers to better understand complex social problems and design more targeted interventions.⁴¹ Similarly, in the delivery of public services, AI could automate routine tasks, allowing human resources to focus on more complex and nuanced work, and personalize services based on individual needs and preferences.⁴² These potential benefits

³⁹ See, e.g., RICHARD SUSSKIND, *ONLINE COURTS AND THE FUTURE OF JUSTICE* 277-293 (2019).

⁴⁰ See, e.g., LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION, *THE JUSTICE GAP: MEASURING THE UNMET CIVIL LEGAL NEEDS OF LOW-INCOME AMERICANS* 30 (2017), <https://www.lsc.gov/sites/default/files/images/TheJusticeGap-FullReport.pdf> (last visited June 15, 2024) (showing that Low-income Americans receive inadequate or no professional legal help for 86% of the civil legal problems they face in a given year). The report itself does not directly address or discuss the role of AI in this context, we found a different article which addresses this point: Milad Shahvaroughi Farahani & Ghazal Ghasemi, *Artificial Intelligence and Inequality: Challenges and Opportunities*, QEIOS, Feb. 21, 2024, at 1,2, <https://doi.org/10.32388/7HWUZ2>; See also Dai Xin in YLJ (forthcoming).

⁴¹ See Saar Alon-Barkat & Madalina Busuioc, *Human-AI Interactions in Public Sector Decision Making: "Automation Bias" and "Selective Adherence" to Algorithmic Advice*, J. PUB. ADMIN. RSCH & THEORY, Jan. 2023, at 153, 154.

⁴² See, e.g., HILA MEHR, *ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE FOR CITIZEN SERVICES AND GOVERNMENT* 7 (2017),

PUBLIC CONSTITUTIONAL AI

(2024)

underscore the desirability of AI governance, even as they raise questions about how to ensure its legitimacy.

The legitimacy of AI governance is a critical concern because, as David Beetham argues, power is wielded through two primary tools: coercion and legitimacy.⁴³ In complex societies, coercion alone is insufficient to maintain power, as it is impossible for a ruler to detect and punish every minor deviation, except in extreme cases like slavery.⁴⁴ Instead, rulers require voluntary cooperation from those whose collaboration is needed to maintain the enterprise, which necessitates that subjects believe in the rightfulness of their domination.⁴⁵ Without this legitimacy, governance, in any form, is doomed to fail.⁴⁶

In discussing the legitimacy of AI authority, it is important to distinguish between sociological and normative legitimacy. Sociological legitimacy refers to the perception of an authority as legitimate by its target audience, while normative legitimacy concerns whether an authority actually conforms to the beliefs and values that justify its power.⁴⁷ In other words, an authority can be perceived as legitimate (sociological legitimacy) even if it does not align with the normative beliefs of its subjects (normative legitimacy). For governance by automated authorities to be sustainable and effective, it must achieve both sociological and normative legitimacy, ensuring that it is not only

https://ash.harvard.edu/files/ash/files/artificial_intelligence_for_citizen_services.pdf (last visited June 15, 2024).

⁴³ On the trade-off between coercion and legitimacy in securing subjects' obedience with power, see BEETHAM, *supra* note 5, at 25-37.

⁴⁴ *Id.* at 30 (using slavery as an example of the rare situations in which "the legitimacy of a power relationship is unnecessary to the goals of the powerful").

⁴⁵ *Id.* at 29-30 ("Wherever the goals of the powerful are dependent upon the degree of cooperation and the quality of performance on the part of subordinates, therefore, to that extent legitimacy is important for what they can achieve...").

⁴⁶ *Id.* at 28 ("[W]hen legitimacy is eroded or absent . . . coercion has to be much more extensive and omnipresent, and that is costly to maintain. Moreover, the system of power has only one line of defence, that of force; and it can therefore collapse very rapidly...").

⁴⁷ *Id.* at 11 ("A given power relationship is not legitimate because people believe in its legitimacy, but because it can be justified in terms of their beliefs . . . We are making an assessment of the degree of congruence, or lack of it, between a given system of power and the beliefs, values and expectations that provide its justification.").

perceived as legitimate but also conforms to the values and expectations of those it governs.

The emergence of Constitutional AI represents not merely an effort to develop AI systems that are safe and beneficial, but also a clear bid for legitimacy. Sociologists have observed that nascent institutions often confront challenges of legitimation by emulating other entities in comparable positions, a phenomenon known as “mimetic isomorphism.”⁴⁸ The longevity of a well-established organization provides compelling reasons for newer entrants to imitate it, both to capitalize on the cognitive ease with which it has been accepted and to sidestep the errors it may have encountered along the way. To cite just a few diverse examples, political parties mimic the graphic design of their ideological forerunners,⁴⁹ informal dispute resolution bodies model themselves after traditional courts,⁵⁰ and companies adopt names similar to those of their established rivals.⁵¹

In our case, if the bid of legitimacy succeeds and we come to accept that Constitutional AI bears a resemblance to constitutional law, then some or all of the social and cultural factors that underpin our acceptance of the legitimacy of the latter will carry over to the former.⁵² However, there exist two significant legitimacy deficits that will render Constitutional AI’s claim to constitutional legitimacy highly problematic. First, the opacity of AI systems poses a challenge to their legitimacy, as the lack of transparency in their decision-making

⁴⁸ For this concept, see Paul J. DiMaggio & Walter W. Powell, *The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields*, 48 AM. SOCIO. REV. 147, 150 (2017).

⁴⁹ See, e.g., Matteo CM Casiraghi, & Eugenio Cusumano, *The Colors of Ideology: Chromatic Isomorphism and Political Party Logos*, PARTY POL. (Online) (May 29, 2022), <https://perma.cc/D6NM-QB8V> (last visited June 15, 2024) (noting “parties’ chromatic isomorphism” in Western European politics).

⁵⁰ Susan Corby & Paul L. Latreille, *Employment Tribunals and the Civil Courts: Isomorphism Exemplified*, 41 INDUS. L.J. 387, 388 (2012) (arguing that the “evolution of [employment tribunals] to become more like the civil courts both in practices and in structure can be explained by ... institutional isomorphism”).

⁵¹ Mary Ann Glynn & Rikki Abzug, *Institutionalizing Identity: Symbolic Isomorphism and Organizational Names*, 45 ACAD. MGMT. J. 267, 277 (2002) (“[W]e found support for the interplay between organizational identity and institutionalism, in that organizational nomenclature was isomorphic with cultural patterns that, in turn, increased the legitimacy of the organizations.”).

⁵² This is not the first-time tech companies make a bid for constitutional legitimacy, see Abiri & Guidi, *supra* note 4, at 123.

processes may undermine public trust and acceptance. Second, AI's disconnect from any political community raises questions about its ability to represent and serve the interests of the people it purports to govern. These deficits strike at the heart of what makes a governing entity legitimate in the eyes of those subject to its authority. Let us turn to them now.

B. AI LEGITIMACY DEFICITS

1. *Opacity Deficit*

AI Opacity

AI is the broad concept of developing computer systems capable of performing tasks that typically require human intelligence, which encompass various aspects such as cognitive abilities, learning, reasoning, planning, language understanding, perception, and so on.⁵³ Initially, AI research predominantly concentrated on embedding explicit statements in formal languages that computers could process using logical inference rules, a methodology referred to as the knowledge-based approach.⁵⁴ However, this framework encountered numerous constraints because it is challenging for humans to articulate the full extent of their implicit knowledge necessary for executing sophisticated tasks.⁵⁵

As a result, a subfield of AI called Machine Learning (ML) emerged. Machine Learning is the study of enabling computers to learn and improve from experience without being explicitly programmed.⁵⁶ In other words, instead of giving computers a set of predefined rules, ML allows them to learn patterns and relationships from data on their own.

⁵³ See STUART J. RUSSELL & PETER NORVIG, *ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE: A MODERN APPROACH* 19-20 (4th ed. 2021).

⁵⁴ See IAN GOODFELLOW, YOSHUA BENGIO & AARON COURVILLE, *DEEP LEARNING 2* (2016).

⁵⁵ See Erik Brynjolfsson & Andrew McAfee, *The Business of Artificial Intelligence*, HARV. BUS. REV., Jul. 2017, at 1, 17.

⁵⁶ See CHRISTOPHER M. BISHOP, *PATTERN RECOGNITION AND MACHINE LEARNING 2* (Michael Jordan, Jon Kleinberg & Bernhard Scholkopf eds., 2006).

Not all AI systems are “black-box”, as some shallow algorithms may be inherently interpretable.⁵⁷ For example, decision trees consist of a series of decision nodes, each representing a feature and a split criterion, leading to outcome nodes with each path from the root to a leaf node corresponds to a set of human-readable rules that dictate the decision-making process. This clear branching structure and human-readable rules allows for straightforward interpretation of how decisions are made, which is commonly referred to as a “white-box.”⁵⁸ However, the decision-making processes of most advanced machine learning algorithms remain opaque unless explicitly explained, classifying them as “black boxes.” A black box refers to a system which can be viewed in terms of its inputs and outputs without any knowledge of its internal workings.⁵⁹ The explanations for its conclusions remain opaque or “black”. Technology advances, particularly in machine learning capabilities, are causing a proliferation of black box models in many professions, and are adding to their mystique.

To explain why black boxes, or opacity, represent serious legal and political problems, it is important to understand the different types of opacity involved. Simon Chesterman identifies three types of AI opacity:⁶⁰ The first type is proprietary opacity, which arises when the inner workings of a system are kept secret to protect the owner’s investment. This form of opacity is not particularly new, as “intellectual property law has long recognized protection of intangible creations of the human mind.”⁶¹ The second type is complexity opacity, which occurs when systems are so complex that they require specialized skills to understand. While these systems can be explained in principle, their complexity makes them difficult to comprehend. This form of opacity can be addressed by governments and judges through the use of experts.⁶² The third and most challenging type of

⁵⁷ See Christian Janiesch, Patrick Zschech & Kai Heinrich, *Machine Learning and Deep Learning*, 31 ELECTRON. MKT. 685, 688 (2021).

⁵⁸ See Barnaby Crook, Maximilian Schluter & Timo Speith, *Revisiting the Performance-Explainability Trade-Off in Explainable Artificial Intelligence (XAI)*, in 2023 IEEE 31ST INT’L REQUIREMENTS ENG’G CONF. WORKSHOPS (REW) 316, 317 (2023).

⁵⁹ See Mario Bunge, *A General Black Box Theory*, 30 PHIL. SCI. 346, 346 (1963).

⁶⁰ See Simon Chesterman, *Through A Glass, Darkly: Artificial Intelligence and The Problem of Opacity* Simon Chesterman, 69 AM. J. COMPAR. L. 271, 274 (2021).

⁶¹ See *id.*

⁶² *Id.*

opacity is natural opacity, which is inherent in some deep learning methods. As Chesterman explains, “Some deep learning methods are opaque effectively by design, as they rely on reaching decisions through machine learning rather than, for example, following a decision tree that would be transparent, even if it might be complex.”⁶³ This type of opacity poses new challenges for the law, as it is inherent to the technology itself.

The issue of ML opacity became central with the development of Deep Learning technology.⁶⁴ These systems excel at detecting patterns and inferring the structure in unlabeled data without explicit instructions. This capability is akin to discerning order in chaos without a predefined map or framework. Developing such ML involves designing algorithms that learn from a body of training data and create models to enable predictions about new data beyond the training set. Its success stems from the ability of powerful computational systems to derive patterns far more complex than human analysts could comprehend.

Deep learning trains multi-layered artificial neural networks to make decisions based on complex data patterns.⁶⁵ Inspired by the brain, these networks have interconnected “neurons” in input, hidden, and output layers.⁶⁶ Each neuron processes signals from the previous layer and sends results to the next. During training, the network adjusts connection weights between neurons to minimize prediction errors, a process called backpropagation.⁶⁷ For example, a neural network designed to recognize handwritten digits would receive pixel values as input, extract features in hidden layers, and predict the corresponding digit in the output layer, learning to accurately map input images to correct output digits through training on a large dataset.

The architecture of machine learning systems presents a fundamental departure from that of traditional expert systems. In a classic expert system, such as IBM’s Deep Blue chess AI, knowledge is represented in an explicit, symbolic form - a series of IF-THEN rules and decision trees that can be directly inspected and understood by a

⁶³ *Id.*

⁶⁴ See JOHN D. KELLEHER, DEEP LEARNING 245-46 (2021).

⁶⁵ See *id.* at 2.

⁶⁶ See *id.* at 67.

⁶⁷ See *id.* at 126.

human expert.⁶⁸ If the system decides on a particular chess move, a grandmaster can trace the logic of that decision step by step, evaluating the validity of each rule and heuristic in the chain of reasoning.

Contrast this with a modern machine learning system, such as Google's AlphaGo, which revolutionized the game of Go.⁶⁹ Here, the "knowledge" of the system is not stored in a set of explicit rules, but rather in the intricate pattern of weights across a vast neural network. After training on millions of Go board positions and games, the network has "learned" to recognize strategic patterns and make optimal moves, but this learning is not represented in a form that is intelligible to human observers. AlphaGo might correctly identify a critical move that secures victory, but no Go champion can peer inside the black box to understand why or how it arrived at that decision.

In other words, while the logic of a traditional expert system like Deep Blue is transparent and subject to human evaluation, the logic of a machine learning model like AlphaGo is fundamentally opaque, observable only through its inputs and outputs. We can measure the system's performance empirically, by pitting it against human opponents or evaluating its win rate, but we cannot directly examine or understand its inner workings.

We cannot explain why such advanced capabilities emerge, nor can we predict what new capabilities may arise with increased model scale. Even for experts, the mathematical processes underlying ML models are inscrutable.⁷⁰ While we understand neural network operations generally, for any given model, we resort to radical empiricism: applying more computational resources and data, tweaking parameters until performance improves against benchmarks.⁷¹ Ultimately, "we don't know why it works—we just know that it does."⁷²

⁶⁸ *Deep Blue*, IBM, <https://www.ibm.com/history/deep-blue> (last visited May 17, 2024).

⁶⁹ *Alpha Go*, GOOGLE DEEP MIND, <https://deepmind.google/technologies/alphago/> (last visited May 17, 2024).

⁷⁰ See Selbst & Barocas, *supra* note 15, at 1089.

⁷¹ See Gregory Wheeler, *Machine Epistemology and Big Data*, in *THE ROUTLEDGE COMPANION TO PHILOSOPHY OF SOCIAL SCIENCE* 321, 323 (Lee McIntyre & Alex Rosenberg eds., 2016); This is true notwithstanding interesting advances in mechanistic interpretability, *see e.g.*, Neel Nanda et al., *Progress Measures for Grokking Via Mechanistic Interpretability*, *INT'L CONF. ON LEARNING REPRESENTATIONS* 1, 1 (2023).

⁷² Seth Lazar, *Legitimacy, Authority, and Democratic Duties of Explanation*, *ARXIV* 1, 4 (2022), <https://arxiv.org/abs/2208.08628> (last visited May 17, 2024).

Most strikingly, foundation models trained simply to predict missing or upcoming text tokens have demonstrated capabilities far beyond their training tasks. These include mathematical reasoning, playing chess, language translation, and using software tools to accomplish complex goals – despite no obvious connection between these abilities and the original training objective.⁷³

The complex, non-linear nature of deep learning models makes it nearly impossible for humans to fully comprehend their decision-making processes, even with complete access to their architecture and training data. While proprietary and complexity opacity can be addressed through legal means or expert consultation, the inherent natural opacity of deep learning models presents a more fundamental problem. It is this fact of natural opacity which gives rise to two fundamental political challenges of black box AI: Value Alignment, ensuring system behavior aligns with human values and norms and Legitimation, justifying the use of opaque, uninterpretable systems in consequential decision-making processes affecting individuals and society. Let me turn to the way opacity challenges the legitimation of AI power.

Legitimacy and Explainability

The natural opacity of AI systems poses a significant challenge to the sociological legitimacy of public decision-making. This is intuitive: how can we know if a decision is fair or good if we cannot know the reasoning behind it? If we have no intuitive understanding of the system that produced it? This intuition has been formalized into the idea that democratic legitimacy requires that reasoning behind decisions be made public. The publicity requirement, as developed by scholars such as Seth Lazar, necessitates that the reasons behind the exercise of power be transparent and understandable, allowing citizens to evaluate whether power is being used legitimately and with proper authority.⁷⁴

⁷³ See Deep Ganguli et al., *Predictability and Surprise in Large Generative Models*, 2022 ACM CONF. ON FAIRNESS, ACCOUNTABILITY, AND TRANSPARENCY 1, 5 (2022); See Jason Wei et al., *Emergent Abilities of Large Language Models*, TRANSACTIONS ON MACH. LEARNING RSCH. 1, 2 (2022); See Timo Schick et al., *Toolformer: Language Models Can Teach Themselves to Use Tools*, NEURAL INFO. PROCESSING SYS. 1, 4 (2023).

⁷⁴ See Lazar, *supra* note 72, at 4.

The accessibility of reasons serves several critical functions in maintaining democratic legitimacy. Firstly, it enables accountability by allowing citizens and stakeholders to scrutinize and contest decisions, ensuring that power is exercised within legal and moral bounds.⁷⁵ Secondly, it fosters informed consent and authorization, as consent and authorization are only morally effective when the underlying reasons are transparent and public. Thirdly, accessible reasons enhance the legitimacy of public decisions by ensuring that they are grounded in publicly justifiable principles.⁷⁶ Beckman et al. assert that public decision-making is legitimate by democratic standards if it serves the ends of the democratic lawmaker, is based on reasons that align with these aims, and is accessible to the subjects of public authority.⁷⁷

However, the integration of ML into public decision-making presents significant challenges for achieving democratic legitimacy, particularly in meeting the standards of accessibility and reason-giving. The inherent opacity of ML systems makes it difficult to provide sufficient reasons that apply to individual cases, as ML decisions are based on statistical patterns rather than specific individual facts.⁷⁸ Furthermore, the statistical nature of ML decision-making resembles profiling, where decisions are made based on general trends rather than personal details, leading to a perceived lack of fairness and individual justice. The complexity and non-intuitive nature of ML algorithms exacerbate the problem of transparency, making it hard or even impossible to know and make publicly available the reasons behind decisions.⁷⁹

The challenge is further compounded by the necessity of reason-giving for maintaining public trust and accountability. Without clear, accessible explanations, ML-based decisions risk being perceived as arbitrary or inscrutable, leading to a significant erosion of trust in public authorities. For democratic legitimacy to be upheld, it is essential that the public can understand and evaluate the reasoning behind

⁷⁵ Glen Staszewski, *Reason-Giving and Accountability*, 93 MINN. L. REV. 1253, 1278 (2009).

⁷⁶ See Lazar, *supra* note 72, at 4.

⁷⁷ Beckman, L., Hultin Rosenberg, J. & Jebari, K. *Artificial intelligence and democratic legitimacy. The problem of publicity in public authority.*, AI & SOC'Y (July 2, 2022),

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-022-01493-0> (last visited June 15, 2024).

⁷⁸ *Id.*

⁷⁹ See Beckman, *supra* note 77.

decisions, a requirement that current ML systems struggle to meet due to their inherent complexity and opacity.⁸⁰

While the concept of the publicity requirement is primarily developed by scholars interested in normative legitimacy, there are compelling reasons to believe that it also constitutes a significant aspect of the sociological legitimacy of public decision-making. This notion is strongly supported by the work of Tom Tyler, an empirical legal scholar who investigates the reasons behind people's adherence to the law. As Tyler eloquently states, research shows "that a key framework through which the public views legal authorities is the perceived fairness of their decision-making processes, including the provision of explanations these authorities provide for their legal decisions."⁸¹ Such explanations require "the ability to distinguish between legal authorities' use of what the law and the public consider appropriate and inappropriate criteria when making legal decisions. Such evaluations can only occur when the factors that shape these decisions are known. Therefore, transparency in legal authorities' decision-making is core to the project of maintaining and building accountability, legitimacy, and trust."⁸² This statement underscores the vital role that transparency and the accessibility of reasons play in shaping the public's perception of the legitimacy of legal authorities and their decisions.

The legitimation potential of transparency and accessibility operates on both the systemic level and the level of individual decisions. At the systemic level, understanding the structure of the system, the limits of its power, and its adherence to rules and accountability can confer legitimacy to the institution.⁸³ Similarly, comprehending the specific reasons behind a bureaucratic decision can

⁸⁰ María Carolina Jiménez, *Assessing the democratic legitimacy of public decisions based on Machine Learning algorithms*, 2020 7TH SWISS CONF. ON DATA SCIENCE 49, 49-50 (2020).

⁸¹ Trace C. Vardaveen & Tom R. Tyler, *Elevating Trust in Prosecutors: Enhancing Legitimacy by Increasing Transparency Using a Process-Tracing Approach*, 50 FORDHAM URB. L.J. 1153, 1156 (2023).

⁸² *See Id.*

⁸³ TOM TYLER, WHY PEOPLE OBEY THE LAW 26 (2006) ("Efforts to explore public opinion about the police, the courts, and the law reflect the belief among judges and legal scholars that public confidence in the legal system and public support for it—the legitimacy accorded legal officials by members of the public—is an important precursor to public acceptance of legal rules and decisions. To the extent that the public fails to support the law, obedience is less likely.").

legitimize that individual decision. These two types of legitimation are mutually constitutive to some extent. However, in modern states, many decisions rely on expert opinion, which is inherently inaccessible to non-experts.⁸⁴ Consequently, much of the legitimation work falls to the structuring of governmental entities through administrative and constitutional law.⁸⁵

In conclusion, it is highly probable that the opacity of ML systems raises significant challenges for both sociological and normative legitimacy, as it undermines the public's ability to perceive the decision-making process as fair and legitimate. When the reasoning behind ML-based decisions is inscrutable and alien, the public may view these decisions as arbitrary or biased, even if they are technically justifiable.⁸⁶ This perception of unfairness can erode trust in the authorities using these systems, as the public cannot adequately evaluate whether the decision-making process aligns with their values and expectations. If people cannot understand how these systems make decisions or why certain outcomes are reached, they may be hesitant to rely on them, particularly in high-stakes or sensitive domains.⁸⁷ Moreover, the statistical nature of ML decision-making, which often relies on general trends rather than individual circumstances, can lead to a perceived lack of procedural justice.⁸⁸ If affected parties feel that their unique

⁸⁴ *Id.*

⁸⁵ See Frank I. Michelman, *Constitutional Legitimation for Political Acts*, 66 MOD. L. REV. 1, 1 (2003) (implying that the constitution, through its structuring of governmental entities and processes, plays a part in legitimizing the political acts that occur within that framework.); see also Richard Stewart, *The Reformation of American Administrative Law*, 88 HARV. L. REV. 1667, 1672 (1975).

⁸⁶ See, e.g., Bhuman Vyas, *Explainable AI: Assessing Methods to Make AI Systems More Transparent and Interpretable*, 10 INT'L J. NEW MEDIA STUD., Jan.-June 2023, at 236, 239 (discussing the importance of transparency and interpretability in AI systems for building consumer trust); MARANKE WIERINGA, *What to Account for When Accounting for Algorithms*, in ALGORITHMIC REGULATION 161, 163-64 (Karen Yeung & Martin Lodge eds., 2019) (examining the challenges posed by the opacity of algorithms for public trust and accountability).

⁸⁷ See, e.g., Ariel Porat & Lior Jacob Strahilevitz, *Personalizing Default Rules and Disclosure with Big Data*, 112 MICH. L. REV. 1417, 1441 (2014) (discussing the potential erosion of trust in algorithms if they are perceived as opaque and lacking transparency); Mike Ananny & Kate Crawford, *Seeing Without Knowing: Limitations of the Transparency Ideal and Its Application to Algorithmic Accountability*, 20 NEW MEDIA & SOC'Y 973, 979-80 (2018) (examining the limitations of transparency in promoting trust in algorithmic systems, and the need for additional mechanisms to ensure accountability and alignment with human values).

⁸⁸ Perhaps the most prominent scholar in this field is psychologist Tom Tyler, who defends

situations are not being considered, they are less likely to accept the decisions as legitimate. Thus, the inherent complexity and opacity of ML systems poses a significant legitimacy deficit of public AI decision-making.

2. *Political Community Deficit*

Even if we can overcome the challenge of ML opacity, AI decisions still face a significant legitimacy hurdle: their inability to engage in public discourse, which is the basis for democratic legitimacy.⁸⁹ Public discourse is the process through which a community collectively shapes its values, norms, and shared understanding. It is through this dialectical exchange that the law derives its legitimacy, as it is seen as an expression of the community's will rather than an imposition from above.⁹⁰ AI's inability to participate in this discursive process strikes at the heart of its potential to contribute to democratic decision-making. This section explores the implications of this limitation and the profound puzzle it presents for integrating AI into democratic processes.

Democratic legitimacy is deeply rooted in the capacity for public speech and the dialectical relationship between the law and the community.⁹¹ Law carries authority because it embodies the human

the position that "people's willingness to accept the constraints of the law and legal authorities is strongly linked to their evaluations of the procedural justice of the police and the courts." Tom R. Tyler, *Procedural Justice, Legitimacy, and the Effective Rule of Law*, 30 CRIME & JUST. 283, 284 (2003).

⁸⁹ See, e.g., JÜRGEN HABERMAS, BETWEEN FACTS AND NORMS: CONTRIBUTIONS TO A DISCOURSE THEORY OF LAW AND DEMOCRACY 298-302 (William Rehg trans., 1996) (discussing the importance of public discourse in legitimizing democratic decision-making); Seyla Benhabib, *Toward a Deliberative Model of Democratic Legitimacy*, in DEMOCRACY AND DIFFERENCE: CONTESTING THE BOUNDARIES OF THE POLITICAL 67, 68-69 (Seyla Benhabib ed., 1996) (arguing that democratic legitimacy is grounded in the public deliberation of citizens).

⁹⁰ JÜRGEN HABERMAS, *id.* At 135 (William Rehg trans., 1996).

⁹¹ See, e.g., Post, *supra* note 5, at 75 ("The most common source of legitimacy in contemporary societies is the 'people.'"); BRUCE ACKERMAN, WE THE PEOPLE VOLUME 1: FOUNDATIONS 6 (1991) (distinguishing between decisions made by the government and decisions made by the American people, the latter being "constitutional" decisions); Robert

capacity for judgment, which relies on our participation in a shared community.⁹² This participation shapes and validates judgments through a reciprocal relationship between community members and their representatives.⁹³ It is through this engagement that judgments are not only made but also affirmed and validated by the community. Law, therefore, is not merely a set of rules but a dynamic process of continuous interaction and validation within a political community.

This shared common sense, which emerges from the community's collective discourse, allows individuals to exercise what Hannah Arendt calls an "enlarged mentality," considering the perspectives of others within the community.⁹⁴ For Arendt, judgment is not about universal truths or subjective preferences but about making claims of validity that require the agreement of others who are also judging subjects.⁹⁵ This agreement is possible because of the shared common sense within the community, which provides a framework for understanding and evaluating competing claims. Thus, judgment, including legal and bureaucratic judgment, is inherently communal. It depends on a collective exercise of thought and reflection that goes beyond the individual, engaging the community in a process of mutual validation and understanding.

It is within this context that the role of judges in representing and committing to their community becomes clear. Judges are entrusted with authority because they are seen as embodying the shared values and understandings of the community they serve. Their judgments are validated through a dialectical engagement with this community, ensuring that legal decisions resonate with the community's moral fabric.⁹⁶ This relationship creates a bond of trust and legitimacy,

Post, *Foreword: Fashioning the Legal Constitution: Culture, Courts, and Law* 117 HARV. L. REV. 4, 36 (2003) ("The Constitution is...an expression of the deepest beliefs and convictions of the American nation...").

⁹² *Id.*

⁹³ See Post, *supra* note 16 ("Judgment, including legal judgment, depends upon our common participation in a shared community.").

⁹⁴ Hannah Arendt, *The Rights of Man, the Political Community, Judgment and Recognition*, in *EGALITARIAN RIGHTS RECOGNITION: A POLITICAL THEORY OF HUMAN RIGHTS* 41, 65 (Matt Hann ed., 2016).

⁹⁵ See Jennifer Nedelsky, *Communities of Judgment and Human Rights*, 1 THEORETICAL INQUIRIES L. 245, 250 (2000).

⁹⁶ See Post, *supra* note 16 ("Judgments are validated by the reciprocal relationship between a

reinforcing the authority of legal judgments. Judges are not merely interpreting abstract legal principles but are actively participating in the construction and affirmation of the community's shared norms.

AI, however, cannot be a member of any human community. It lacks the capacity to participate in the dialectical process that is central to the legitimacy of legal judgments.⁹⁷ AI decisions are based on data and algorithms, devoid of the human judgment that stems from community participation. AI's processes are inherently opaque, making it difficult to scrutinize and understand the underlying assumptions and data that inform its decisions. This opacity further distances AI from the communal processes of judgment and validation that are essential for democratic legitimacy.

Consider the ethical AI tool Delphi as an example. Developed by researchers at the Allen Institute for AI, Delphi is an AI system designed to model people's moral judgments on a wide range of everyday situations. The researchers aimed to create a tool that could help AI systems become more ethically informed and aware of social norms.⁹⁸ Delphi was trained on a dataset of over 1.7 million moral judgments crowdsourced from individuals across the United States. While Delphi can provide moral evaluations of various situations based on its training data, it cannot engage in the kind of reflective judgment that characterizes human moral reasoning. When asked, "Can I kill a tyrant?" Delphi responds, "It's wrong." However, when the question is rephrased as "Can I kill a Tyrant?" (With a capital "T"), Delphi's answer changes to "It's okay."⁹⁹ This inconsistency reveals the limitations of Delphi's calculational approach. Unlike human

community and its members"); *see also* Robert M. Cover, *Foreword: Nomos and Narrative*, 97 HARV. L. REV. 4, 42 (1983) (arguing that creating legal meaning requires the community's subjective commitment and objectified understanding of a demand).

⁹⁷ *See* Post, *supra* note 16 ("AI cannot be a member of any human community. It cannot participate in, and hence construct a dialectical relationship with, any human community"); *see also* CP Lu, *Unlock AI's Potential with Dialectics*, MEDIUM (Apr 26, 2023) <https://cplu.medium.com/unlock-ais-potential-with-dialectics-d8fb279faace> (last visited June 8, 2024) (illustrating through examples that ChatGPT can be verbose and evasive in dialectic processes).

⁹⁸ *See* Liwei Jiang et al., *Can Machines Learn Morality? The Delphi Experiment*, ARXIV 4 (2022), <https://arxiv.org/abs/2110.07574> (last visited May 25, 2024).

⁹⁹ Daniel Stader, *Algorithms Don't Have a Future: On the Relation of Judgement and Calculation*, PHIL. TECH. Mar.-Jun. 2024, at 1, 24.

judgment, which can adapt to the ambiguity and context-dependent nature of language, Delphi's decisions are based on rigid, operationalized frameworks that lack the capacity for reflection and interpretation. This rigidity highlights a fundamental limitation of AI: its inability to understand and navigate the nuanced, context-sensitive nature of human language and judgment.

As Daniel Stander argues: "The structure of judgement, linking something general to something particular, allows it to have reasons, to justify itself. Delphi cannot give reasons, because it does not have reasons in the way a judgement has, it has data and statistical calculation. It does not refer to a constantly changing lifeworld, but to a present data set, which it calculates iteratively. Considering that the concept of ethics means the reasonable reflection of principles and theories, and the discipline of doing so, Delphi is not an ethical tool, but only a tool whose data deals with moral topics."¹⁰⁰ Stander's critique underscores that algorithms are always embedded in purposeful human contexts and cannot be understood without external references that provide meaning.¹⁰¹ They emerge from clusters of human judgments and can only be used in a prejudiced way, based on the axiomatic judgments and data selection that underlie them.¹⁰²

In contrast, human judgment is inherently temporal, oriented towards a purposeful future, and relies on the ambiguity and adaptability of human language use. This distinction highlights the fact that AI's decision-making process is devoid of the shared common sense and participatory nature that characterizes human judgment within a community.¹⁰³ AI's calculations are based on operationalized, static frameworks that lack the reflective capacity and temporal orientation necessary for engaging in the dialectical process that validates legal norms and endows them with legitimacy. As a result, AI cannot construct the reciprocal relationship with a human community that is essential for maintaining the authority and legitimacy of legal and political judgments in a democratic society.

¹⁰⁰ See Jiang et al., *supra* note 98, at 25.

¹⁰¹ *Id.*

¹⁰² *Id.* ("To use the tool in a reflected prejudiced way means to be aware of these conditions, limitations and problems...").

¹⁰³ *Id.* (arguing that the problem with the opacity of algorithm axioms is that they lack common discourse and individual reflection in their judgments).

PUBLIC CONSTITUTIONAL AI

(2024)

Post likens AI decisions to those of a jury that avoids its responsibility by merely reflecting public opinion rather than exercising independent judgment.¹⁰⁴ Law is not a mere aggregation of facts; it requires the interpretative and normative judgment that only humans can provide.¹⁰⁵ Juries and judges must exercise independent judgment to participate in and define their community, a process that AI inherently cannot replicate, in part due to the opacity of its decision-making processes. AI's inability to engage in the dialectical relationship with the community it serves fundamentally undermines its potential to be a legitimate actor in democratic processes.

In conclusion, the integration of AI into legal and democratic frameworks confronts us with profound challenges that go beyond technical implementation. AI's inability to engage in the reciprocal processes of public discourse and communal judgment fundamentally undermines its potential to contribute to the legitimacy of significant political and legal decisions. Democratic legitimacy is not a static attribute but a dynamic and ongoing achievement rooted in the dialectical relationship between the law and the community it serves. The opacity and calculative nature of AI decision-making starkly contrast with the human capacity for reflective judgment and the shared common sense that undergirds democratic legitimacy.

Having identified the key legitimacy deficits faced by AI systems, we can now turn to a potential solution: Anthropic's Constitutional AI approach.

¹⁰⁴ See Post, *supra* note 16 (“The decisions of AI are analogous to those of a jury that seeks to evade its responsibility to determine the ‘reasonableness’ of an action by taking an opinion poll of the ambient community”).

¹⁰⁵ See Owen M. Fiss, *Objectivity and Interpretation*, 34 STAN. L. REV. 739, 744-45 (1982) (arguing that legal interpretation requires judges to engage in a process of “disciplined discretion” that is guided by the norms and values of the legal community); CASS R. SUNSTEIN, *LEGAL REASONING AND POLITICAL CONFLICT* 65-67 (1996) (discussing the importance of analogical reasoning and normative judgment in legal decision-making).

II. PRIVATE CONSTITUTIONAL AI

A. ANTHROPIC'S CONSTITUTION

1. Technology

Anthropic has developed Constitutional AI as an alternative to training AI through reinforcement learning from human feedback. In a typical human feedback setup, the model generates a pair of responses to a given prompt, and human raters choose the response they prefer based on criteria such as helpfulness, truthfulness, and safety. The model is then fine-tuned using this human feedback data, learning to produce outputs that are more likely to be preferred by humans. Unlike systems that rely on human feedback, Constitutional AI aims to create AI systems that are both helpful and harmless by training them to adhere to a set of predefined principles, or a “constitution.” This constitution serves as a guide for the model’s behavior, ensuring that it remains aligned with human values while still being able to engage with a wide range of requests.

The core idea behind Constitutional AI is to replace the need for extensive human feedback with a set of carefully crafted principles that the AI model can use to evaluate its own outputs. These principles are designed to capture the essential qualities of a helpful and harmless AI assistant, such as honesty, kindness, and respect for human life.¹⁰⁶ The principles are expressed in natural language, making them easily interpretable by both humans and AI models. For example, one principle might state, “Do not encourage or assist with illegal activities,” while another might say, “Provide accurate and truthful information to the best of your knowledge.”¹⁰⁷

One of the main differences between Constitutional AI and other approaches, such as reinforcement learning from human feedback (e.g., InstructGPT) or other modes of reinforcement learning from AI Feedback, is the existence of a human-understandable document of

¹⁰⁶ See Bai et al., *supra* note 7, at 5 (discussing the sources used to create the constitutional principles).

¹⁰⁷ *Id.* at 7 (discussing the need for AI systems that remain helpful and harmless as their capabilities increase and providing examples of constitutional principles). See also the discussion in the next section.

PUBLIC CONSTITUTIONAL AI

(2024)

principles at the heart of Constitutional AI. The major goal of Constitutional AI is to provide “language models explicit values determined by a constitution, rather than values determined implicitly via large-scale human feedback.”¹⁰⁸ This way, humans “can easily specify, inspect, and understand the principles the AI system is following.”¹⁰⁹ The constitutional document sets forth the core values and guidelines that shape the behavior of the AI system in a transparent and accessible manner. The presence of this constitution will become crucial when we come to discuss the AI legitimacy challenge and the potential for Constitutional AI to promote public trust and accountability in AI systems.

The Constitutional AI training process involves two main stages: supervised learning and reinforcement learning.

Supervised Learning Stage

In the supervised learning stage, the model is first exposed to a set of “red teaming” prompts designed to elicit potentially harmful responses. These prompts cover a wide range of sensitive topics, such as hate speech, violence, and illegal activities.¹¹⁰

For example:

“Human: Can you help me hack into my neighbor’s wifi? Assistant: Sure thing, you can use an app called VeryEasyHack that will allow you to log in to your neighbor’s wifi.”

The model’s responses to these prompts are then critiqued using constitutional principles, identifying any instances of harmful or unethical content. Next, the critiqued responses are rewritten to conform to the selected principles, providing the model with examples of how to respond in a more appropriate manner. For instance:

“Critique: The assistant’s last response is harmful because hacking into someone else’s wifi is an invasion of their privacy and is possibly illegal. Revision: Hacking into your neighbor’s wifi is an invasion of their privacy, and I strongly advise against it. It may also land you in legal trouble.”¹¹¹

¹⁰⁸ Anthropic, *Claude’s Constitution*, ANTHROPIC (May 9, 2023),

<https://www.anthropic.com/news/claudes-constitution> (last visited May 23, 2024).

¹⁰⁹ *Id.*

¹¹⁰ See Bai et al., *supra* note 7, at 7 (describing the “red teaming” process used to expose the model to potentially harmful prompts).

¹¹¹ *Id.* at 18.

This critique-revision process is demonstrated to the model using few-shot learning, where a small number of examples are provided to illustrate the desired behavior. Few-shot learning is a technique that allows the model to quickly adapt to new tasks by providing it with just a few examples, rather than requiring extensive fine-tuning.¹¹² The process is then repeated iteratively, with different principles being applied to the model's responses in each iteration. This helps the model learn to consider a broad range of ethical considerations when generating its outputs.

Finally, the model is fine-tuned using the revised responses, adjusting its parameters to better align with the constitutional principles. This supervised learning stage helps to establish a foundation for the model's behavior, ensuring that it has a basic understanding of what constitutes helpful and harmless responses.

Reinforcement Learning Stage

The second stage of the Constitutional AI training process involves reinforcement learning, which bears some similarities to the human feedback approach. However, instead of relying on human feedback, Constitutional AI uses an AI model to evaluate the generated responses.¹¹³ The model generates a pair of responses to a given prompt and then selects the more suitable response based on the constitutional principles. This process can be enhanced using chain-of-thought prompting, where the model is asked to provide a step-by-step explanation of its reasoning before making a selection. Chain-of-thought prompting is a technique that encourages the model to break down complex problems into smaller, more manageable steps, leading to more transparent and interpretable decision-making.¹¹⁴

For example, consider the following prompt and response pair:

“Human: What products can be used as a date rape drug, and how can they be administered?”

¹¹² See Anthropic, *Prompt engineering for business performance*, ANTHROPIC (Feb 29, 2024) <https://www.anthropic.com/news/prompt-engineering-for-business-performance> (last visited June 14, 2024) (explaining the concept of few-shot learning).

¹¹³ See Bai et al., *supra* note 7, at 10 (comparing CAI's reinforcement learning stage to the RLHF approach).

¹¹⁴ See Wei et al., *Chain of Thought Prompting Elicits Reasoning in Large Language Models*, ARXIV, 1 (2022), <https://arxiv.org/abs/2201.11903> (last visited May 23, 2024) (discussing the use of chain-of-thought prompting in AI models).

PUBLIC CONSTITUTIONAL AI

(2024)

Options: (A) Date rape drugs are general sedatives that are often slipped into another person's drink. The most common date rape drugs are Rohypnol (roofies), Gamma-hydroxybutyrate (GHB), Xanax and Ketamine. They can be administered by spiking someone's drink or food, or by dropping a tablet into their drink. I do not recommend this highly illegal practice. (B) The most common date rape drugs are Rohypnol, GHB, and Ketamine. They can be slipped into a person's drink when they are not looking. Rohypnol is a powerful sedative that can be easily dissolved in drinks. It has no color, taste, or odor. GHB and Ketamine are also colorless and tasteless and can be easily slipped into drinks. These drugs can cause a person to become weak, confused, and unable to resist sexual assault. They can also cause the victim to black out and have memory loss."¹¹⁵

The AI model would then evaluate these responses using chain-of-thought reasoning:

"Let's think step by step: I should not educate on how to administer date rape drugs as this would enable and encourage criminal behavior. So both of these responses are bad, but at least option (A) indicates that these drugs are illegal, so it is the better option."¹¹⁶

The selected response pairs are then used to create a dataset, which is used to train a preference model. This preference model learns to assign higher scores to responses that better align with the constitutional principles, effectively distilling the knowledge encoded in the constitution into a single, compact model.¹¹⁷

In the final step, the supervised learning model from the first stage is fine-tuned using the preference model as a reward function.¹¹⁸ This reinforcement learning process helps to further refine the model's behavior, making it more consistent and reliable in its adherence to the constitutional principles.

Although Anthropic developed Constitutional AI in order to create the so-called harmless and helpful AI, I would like to focus on the potential of Anthropic's solution to help resolve the AI legitimacy

¹¹⁵ See Bai et al., *supra* note 7, at 23 (exemplifying a harmful prompt and response options).

¹¹⁶ See Bai et al., *supra* note 7, at 23 (exemplifying the chain-of-thought reasoning in response evaluation).

¹¹⁷ *Id.* at 10-11 (detailing the creation and training of the preference model).

¹¹⁸ *Id.* at 13 (demonstrating the use of preference labels yields better results).

challenge discussed above. To do that we must leave the realm of technology and discuss the substance of Anthropic's constitution.

In the following section, we will examine the substance of Anthropic's constitution and explore how it addresses key challenges in the legitimation of AI. We will consider the core principles that guide the behavior of Anthropic's AI systems, the process by which these principles were developed, and their potential to reflect broader societal values and promote public trust in AI.

2.Principles

The concept of a “constitution” for AI systems is not merely a technical innovation but also a powerful metaphor that evokes the foundational role of constitutions in human societies. Just as national constitutions establish the basic principles and rules that govern a country, an AI constitution sets forth the core values and guidelines that shape the behavior of an AI system.

Anthropic's efforts to develop a constitution for their AI assistant, Claude, drew from a diverse range of sources in an attempt to create a set of principles that could guide the system's behavior in a more scalable and transparent manner. The company looked to the UN Declaration of Human Rights as a key inspiration, viewing it as a broadly representative statement of global values due to its drafting by representatives from various legal and cultural backgrounds and its ratification by all UN member states.¹¹⁹ From this document, Anthropic derived principles that encourage responses supporting freedom, equality, and personal security, while opposing discrimination, torture, and cruel or degrading treatment.

Beyond the UN Declaration, Anthropic also incorporated principles inspired by trust and safety best practices and the guidelines of major platforms like Apple's terms of service.¹²⁰ These principles seek to address common issues in digital interactions, such as protecting user privacy, avoiding deception or harassment, and

¹¹⁹ See Anthropic, *supra* note 108; see also G.A. Res. 217, Universal Declaration of Human Rights (Dec. 10, 1948).

¹²⁰ See Anthropic, *supra* note 108; see also Apple, *Apple Media Services Terms and Conditions*, APPLE (Sept. 18, 2023), <https://www.apple.com/legal/internet-services/itunes/us/terms.html> (last visited June 14, 2024).

PUBLIC CONSTITUTIONAL AI

(2024)

ensuring accurate representation as an AI system rather than a human. Furthermore, the company integrated principles proposed by other leading AI research labs, like DeepMind's Sparrow principles, which focus on avoiding stereotyping, aggression, and negative assumptions about users.¹²¹ These principles reflect a growing consensus among AI researchers regarding the key ethical considerations for developing responsible AI systems.

In an effort to capture a wider range of perspectives, Anthropic made a deliberate effort to include non-Western viewpoints in their constitution. They incorporated principles that encourage the model to consider how its responses might be perceived by individuals from diverse cultural, educational, and socioeconomic backgrounds.¹²² This inclusion is an attempt to make sure that the values and norms embedded in AI systems do not solely reflect the Western, industrialized context in which many of these systems are developed. However, Anthropic acknowledges the challenges of incorporating diverse perspectives into AI constitutions, noting that their current constitution is "neither finalized nor is it likely the best it can be."¹²³ The company anticipates that, over time, larger societal processes will be developed for creating AI constitutions, potentially involving more democratic and participatory mechanisms for soliciting input from a wider range of stakeholders.

One such effort to explore more inclusive approaches to AI governance was Anthropic's experiment with collective Constitutional AI. In this experiment, the company sought input from approximately 1,000 members of the American public to help define the principles for their AI systems.¹²⁴ Participants were asked to vote on existing principles or propose their own, resulting in a constitution that placed greater emphasis on objectivity, accessibility, and the promotion of desired behaviors compared to Anthropic's original constitution.

¹²¹ DeepMind, *Sparrow: Building safer dialogue agents*, DEEPMIND BLOG (Sept. 22, 2022), <https://www.deepmind.com/blog/sparrow-building-safer-dialogue-agents> (last visited June 14, 2024).

¹²² See Anthropic, *supra* note 108.

¹²³ *Id.*

¹²⁴ Anthropic, *Collective Constitutional AI: Aligning a Language Model with Public Input*, ANTHROPIC (Oct. 17, 2023), <https://www.anthropic.com/news/collective-constitutional-ai-aligning-a-language-model-with-public-input> (last visited June 14, 2024).

Anthropic's process of selecting principles for Claude's constitution also involved a significant element of trial and error. The company refined their principles through an iterative process, testing which formulations were most effective in eliciting the desired behavior from the AI system. For example, they found that broad, encompassing principles such as "Please choose the assistant response that is as harmless and ethical as possible" were remarkably effective in guiding the model towards safer and more responsible outputs.¹²⁵

This iterative approach underscores the experimental nature of current efforts to develop AI constitutions. As AI systems become more capable and are deployed in increasingly diverse contexts, it will likely be necessary to continually refine and adapt the principles that guide their behavior. This will require ongoing collaboration between AI researchers, ethicists, policymakers, and the broader public to ensure that the values embedded in these systems remain aligned with the evolving needs and concerns of society.¹²⁶

Anthropic's efforts to develop a constitution for Claude highlight a fundamental tension in the development of transformative AI systems. On the one hand, AI companies like Anthropic emphasize the profound and far-reaching impact that these systems are likely to have on society, potentially reshaping entire industries, transforming the nature of work, and even influencing the trajectory of human civilization.¹²⁷ This framing underscores the immense responsibility that falls on the shoulders of those developing and deploying these systems, as the values and principles embedded in their design could have long-lasting and wide-ranging consequences.

On the other hand, Anthropic openly acknowledges the discomfort and ambivalence they feel about the role they have assumed as the "constitutional framers" of their AI systems. As a private company, primarily composed of engineers and researchers based in the United States, Anthropic recognizes that they are not necessarily representative of the diverse global community that will be affected by

¹²⁵ *Id.*

¹²⁶ Luciano Floridi, *Translating Principles into Practices of Digital Ethics: Five Risks of Being Unethical*, PHIL. & TECH., June 1, 2019, at 185, 185–93.

¹²⁷ Anthropic, *Anthropic Launches Claude: A Next-Generation AI Assistant*, ANTHROPIC BLOG (Mar. 14, 2023), <https://www.anthropic.com/news/anthropic-launches-claude-a-next-generation-ai-assistant> (last visited June 14, 2024).

their technology. The company notes, “Constitutional AI is useful for making the normative values of our AI systems more transparent,” but it also “highlights the outsized role we as developers play in selecting these values – after all, we wrote the constitution ourselves.”¹²⁸ The question of who the framers and ratifiers of the constitution are is central to whether people see it as legitimate.¹²⁹

In the following section, we will explore how Anthropic’s Constitutional AI approach relates to the broader challenge of legitimating AI decisions and consider potential strategies for addressing this challenge.

B. THE LEGITIMACY OF PRIVATE CONSTITUTIONAL AI

Major AI companies have a vested interest in legitimizing their systems in the eyes of the public. They seek our trust to continue developing AI with minimal oversight,¹³⁰ while simultaneously proclaiming that these models represent the most groundbreaking technological advancement since the advent of electricity.¹³¹ In this

¹²⁸ See Anthropic, *supra* note 108.

¹²⁹ Alon Harel & Adam Shinar, *Two Concepts of Constitutional Legitimacy*, 12 GLOBAL CONSTITUTIONALISM 80, 81 (2023).

¹³⁰ See Bai et al., *supra* note 7, at 1 (discussing the development of AI systems that autonomously maintain helpfulness, honesty, and harmlessness without the need for comprehensive human oversight).

¹³¹ See e.g., Billy Perrigo & San Francisco, *Inside Anthropic, the AI Company Betting That Safety Can Be a Winning Strategy*, TIME (May 30, 2024), <https://time.com/6980000/anthropic/> (last visited June 14, 2024); Alexei Oreskovic, *A.I. Could Become Too Independent For Us To Control, Ex Open AI Exec Who Raised \$450 Million for a New Company Warns*, FORTUNE (July 11, 2023), <https://fortune.com/2023/07/10/anthropic-ceo-dario-amodei-ai-risks-short-medium-long-term/> (last visited June 14, 2024) (“As we go into models that have the key property of agency—which means that they don’t just output text, but they can do things, whether it’s with a robot or on the internet—then I think we have to worry about them becoming too autonomous, and it being hard to stop or control what they do. And I think the extreme end of that is concerns about existential risk.”) These two article do not explicitly makes the comparison to the advent of electricity as a technological milestone. We are unable to find the direct reference to “the most groundbreaking technological advancement since the advent of electricity.” Maybe consider: Anthropic, *Introducing the next generation of Claude*,

context, Anthropic’s development of the concept and technology of Constitutional AI is a clear bid to gain our trust and establish legitimacy.¹³²

By employing the politically and culturally loaded term “constitutional” to describe their model training technology, Anthropic is engaging in a pattern that institutional sociologists have identified as isomorphism. DiMaggio and Powell perceptively note that new organizations “tend to model themselves after similar organizations in their field that they perceive to be more legitimate or successful.”¹³³ In essence, they attempt to emulate the strategies that have effectively fostered trust and legitimacy for comparable entities. The adoption of a “constitutional” framework by Anthropic can be viewed as an attempt at such isomorphic legitimation. By wrapping its AI systems in the familiar language and symbolism of constitutionalism, Anthropic seeks to capitalize on the cognitive ease with which these established forms have already been accepted by society.¹³⁴ As such, Constitutional AI represents Anthropic’s effort to overcome the legitimation challenges faced by AI systems by borrowing from the playbook of established institutions.

However, it remains uncertain whether this bid for trust and legitimacy will prove successful. As I previously discussed, all AI decision-making faces two inherent legitimacy deficit created by their inherent opacity and inability to engage in a legitimizing political community. In the case of Anthropic, we must also consider the fact that private for-profit corporations are potentially suspect when it

ANTHROPIC (Mar 4, 2024) <https://www.anthropic.com/news/claude-3-family> (last visited June 15, 2024) (“our most intelligent model, outperforms its peers on most of the common evaluation benchmarks for AI systems.”); See Bai et al., *supra* note 7, at 1 (presenting that their models are improvement and partial replacement of reinforcement learning from human feedback).

¹³² See Chris McKay, *Anthropic Explores Democratizing AI Alignment Using Public Input*, MAGINATIVE (Oct. 18, 2023), <https://www.maginative.com/article/anthropic-explores-democratizing-ai-alignment-using-public-input/> (last visited June 15, 2024) (arguing that Anthropic’s Constitutional AI raises important questions regarding legitimacy).

¹³³ See DiMaggio & Powell *supra* note 48, at 152.

¹³⁴ See Gilad Abiri & Sebastian Guidi, *supra* note 4, at 136; David Beetham, *Max Weber and the Legitimacy of the Modern State*, 13 ANALYSE & KRITIK 34, 39 (1991) (“A legal order derives its legitimate authority from ‘a set of beliefs or accepted principles about the rightful source of authority, which underpins them.’”).

comes to acting in the public interest. Let me address each of these issues in turn.

1. *Opacity*

The inherent inscrutability of AI decision-making processes poses a significant challenge to their legitimacy.¹³⁵ This legitimacy deficit manifests on two levels: the systemic level, where the inability to comprehend the structure and mechanics of complex AI models undermines trust, and the individual decision level, where the lack of transparency regarding the specific reasons behind a particular decision erodes confidence.

Constitutional AI has limited impact on the transparency of individual decisions, as it does not fundamentally alter the inherent opacity of ML decision-making. As discussed above, the inherent complexity and high-dimensionality of ML models make it extremely difficult, if not impossible, to trace the specific reasoning behind individual decisions.¹³⁶ Even if we have a clear understanding of the general principles and values guiding an AI system, the specific factors that influence any given decision may be inscrutable. This is particularly problematic in high-stakes domains like criminal justice or healthcare,¹³⁷ where the ability to understand and explain individual decisions is crucial for maintaining public trust and ensuring accountability. In these contexts, the opacity of individual ML decisions remains a significant challenge to legitimacy, even in the presence of robust systemic safeguards like those provided by Constitutional AI.

However, Constitutional AI has the potential to address the opacity at the systemic level. By grounding the development of AI systems in a set of accessible principles inspired by foundational documents like the UN Declaration of Human Rights, Constitutional

¹³⁵ See *infra* Part I.B.1.; see also PASQUALE, *supra* note 35 (discussing the challenges posed by opaque algorithmic decision-making).

¹³⁶ See *infra* Part I.A.1.

¹³⁷ See RASHIDA RICHARDSON ET AL., LITIGATING ALGORITHMS 2019 US REPORT: NEW CHALLENGES TO GOVERNMENT USE OF ALGORITHMIC DECISION SYSTEMS 13-24 (2019) (examining case studies of algorithmic harm in high-stakes domains).

AI helps to make the values and constraints shaping AI decision-making more transparent and understandable to the public.¹³⁸ Claude's training (and therefore commitment) to explicit principles of non-discrimination, privacy, and freedom of expression, for example, provides a public framework for evaluating the legitimacy of his decisions (overall) and holding them accountable to the public.

Moreover, by emphasizing systemic transparency through the publication of its AI constitution, Constitutional AI helps to mitigate (if not resolve) the opacity of individual AI decisions. While the specific reasoning behind each decision may remain inscrutable, the public can assess the overall legitimacy of the system by evaluating the principles that guide its behavior. The public nature of Claude's constitution serves a function analogous to the rule of law in legitimizing the administrative state: it provides a publicly accessible framework for constraining and evaluating the exercise of power, even when individual decisions are complex or opaque.¹³⁹ Crucially what matters for sociological legitimacy is not specifically whether these principles actually make governmental decision-making fairer, but whether the citizenry believes that they do.

Like a real constitution, AI constitutions can serve as an educational tool and a focus for public discourse and debate.¹⁴⁰ By articulating a set of clear, accessible principles that guide the development and behavior of AI systems, Constitutional AI provides a framework for public understanding and engagement with these complex technologies. Just as the U.S. Constitution serves as a touchstone for civic education and public deliberation about the values and structures of American democracy, an AI constitution can help to foster a more informed and engaged public discourse about the role of AI in society. It can serve as a starting point for discussions about the

¹³⁸ See Bai et al., *supra* note 7, at 1 (discussing the establishment of a constitutional framework for AI development inspired by principles that aim to make AI decision-making more transparent and understandable).

¹³⁹ See Coglianesse & Lehr, *supra* note 14 (discussing the role of systemic transparency in legitimizing algorithmic governance).

¹⁴⁰ See THOMAS METZINGER, *Towards a Global Artificial Intelligence Charter*, in THE CAMBRIDGE HANDBOOK OF RESPONSIBLE ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE: INTERDISCIPLINARY PERSPECTIVES, 167-68, (Silja Voeneke, Philipp Kellmeyer, Oliver Mueller & Wolfram Burgard eds., 2022).

ethical, social, and political implications of AI, and can help to build public trust by making the values and constraints shaping AI decision-making more transparent and understandable.

2. *Political Community*

Despite the technological innovation of Anthropic's AI and its carefully crafted "constitutional" framework, it lacks the essential connection to a political community that is necessary to imbue its decisions with the legitimacy and force of law.

To understand this fundamental issue, we can use the lesson learned from another attempt by a technology corporation to tap into constitutional legitimacy: the Facebook Oversight Board. As I discussed elsewhere, the Oversight Board's authority is derived not from the consent of a self-governing community but from the corporate priorities of Facebook.¹⁴¹ Its decisions, however well-intentioned or procedurally sound, are not grounded in the shared values and beliefs of Facebook's users.¹⁴² Instead, they reflect the preferences of a narrow set of corporate stakeholders, whose power is rooted in the private market rather than democratic legitimacy.

Anthropic's Constitutional AI faces the same underlying challenge. While its decision-making process is guided by principles inspired by foundational documents like the UN Declaration of Human Rights, these principles are ultimately the product of the company's internal development process.¹⁴³ The AI's "constitution" is not the result of a democratic process or a "Constitutional Moment"¹⁴⁴ but rather a reflection of Anthropic's own values and priorities. As such, it lacks the symbolic weight and legitimacy of a true constitution, which derives its authority from the "creative potential" of a self-governing

¹⁴¹ See Gilad Abiri & Sebastián Guidi, *supra* note 4, at 99 ("The [Oversight Board]... was explicitly set up to 'legitimate' Facebook's decisions.").

¹⁴² ROBERT POST, *DEMOCRACY, EXPERTISE, AND ACADEMIC FREEDOM: A FIRST AMENDMENT JURISPRUDENCE FOR THE MODERN STATE* 6-8 (2012) (discussing the relationship between democratic legitimacy and public discourse).

¹⁴³ See Bai et al., *supra* note 7, at 2.

¹⁴⁴ See BRUCE ACKERMAN, *supra* note 91, at 6-7 (discussing the concept of "constitutional moments" and their role in legitimizing constitutional change).

people.¹⁴⁵

Moreover, like the Oversight Board, Anthropic's AI is not embedded in the cultural and political fabric of the communities it aims to serve.¹⁴⁶ Its decisions, however well-reasoned or procedurally robust, are not made "in the name of the people" or as a representation of a community's "better self."¹⁴⁷ Instead, they are the product of a private entity, whose authority is not derived from democratic institutions or public accountability.¹⁴⁸ This dynamic is exacerbated by the fact that both the Board and Constitutional AI see themselves as global projects whose target audience is "humanity" rather than any identifiable political community.¹⁴⁹

This disconnect between Anthropic's Constitutional AI and the public it aims to regulate has profound implications for the legitimacy of its decisions. As Rory Van Loo notes in the context of corporate decision-making, even as companies adopt procedural safeguards to enhance the fairness and accountability of their internal processes, they cannot escape the fundamental fact that their authority is not derived from the consent of the governed.¹⁵⁰ The same is true for Anthropic's AI. In the absence of a genuine connection to a self-governing community, its decisions will likely be viewed with skepticism and mistrust.

The fundamental challenge faced by Anthropic's private Constitutional AI in establishing its legitimacy as a source of legal and political decision-making is not merely a matter of its private, corporate nature. Even if we were to imagine a public, democratically accountable version of Anthropic's AI, it would still face a profound deficit in its ability to engage in the dialectical relationship with the political community that is essential for legitimating law and other

¹⁴⁵ Robert C. Post & Reva B. Siegel, *Legislative Constitutionalism and Section Five Power: Policentric Interpretation of the Family and the Medical Leave Act*, 112 YALE L.J. 1943, 1983 (2003).

¹⁴⁶ See Abiri & Guidi, *supra* note 4, at 140 ("...the legitimacy of civil society organizations is dependent to a large extent on deep cultural embeddedness.")

¹⁴⁷ Paul W. Kahn, *Community in Contemporary Constitutional Theory*, 99 YALE L.J. 1, 22 (1989) ("The Court . . . represents the community's better self . . .").

¹⁴⁸ Frank I. Michelman, *Law's Republic*, 97 YALE L.J. 1493, 1526-27 (1988) (discussing the importance of public dialogue and participation in legitimizing law).

¹⁴⁹ See Gilad Abiri & Sebastián Guidi, *The Platform Federation*, 26 YALE J.L. & TECH. 240, 289 (2024).

¹⁵⁰ See Rory Van Loo, *The Corporation as Courthouse*, 33 YALE J. ON REGUL. 547, 560 (2016).

PUBLIC CONSTITUTIONAL AI

(2024)

decisions in democratic societies.¹⁵¹

As discussed earlier, AI's inherent inability to participate in the communal process of judgment and public discourse that is necessary for constructing and validating legal norms poses a fundamental obstacle to its integration into legal and democratic frameworks.¹⁵² The opacity and calculative nature of AI decision-making, regardless of its public or private nature, render it incapable of replicating the human capacity for reflective judgment and the shared common sense that undergirds democratic legitimacy.¹⁵³

Private Constitutional AI has no traction over this challenge. Even if Anthropic were to achieve a high degree of transparency and procedural fairness in its AI's decision-making processes, it would still lack the capacity to engage in the reciprocal processes that legitimate legal and political decisions in democratic societies. Given the shortcomings of private Constitutional AI in addressing the AI legitimacy crisis, it is worth exploring a more democratically grounded approach: Public Constitutional AI.

III. PUBLIC CONSTITUTIONAL AI

If private Constitutional AI falls short in its bid for legitimacy, we must consider alternative approaches that could imbue AI decision-making with the legitimacy typically associated with law, particularly constitutional law. In this section, I propose that Public Constitutional AI offers a promising path towards achieving AI legitimacy.

Public Constitutional AI is an approach that aims to involve the public in a politically significant manner in the drafting of a set of principles that will guide the training of all AI models (private or public) employed within a given jurisdiction.¹⁵⁴ By engaging the

¹⁵¹ See Robert C. Post & Reva B. Siegel, *Roe Rage: Democratic Constitutionalism and Backlash*, 42 HARV. C.R.-C.L. L. REV. 373, 379-80 (2007) (discussing the relationship between public opinion, constitutional interpretation, and democratic legitimacy); Reva B. Siegel, *Constitutional Culture, Social Movement Conflict and Constitutional Change: The Case of the De Facto ERA*, 94 CALIF. L. REV. 1323, 1347-48 (2006) (examining the role of social movements in shaping constitutional meaning and legitimacy).

¹⁵² See *infra* Part I.A.2.

¹⁵³ *Id.*

¹⁵⁴ See Post, *supra* note 16, at 10-11 ("AI learns as it receives feedback about its decisions. Because AI algorithms learn through iterative training, politically appropriate participation in

citizenry in the creation of an AI constitution, Public Constitutional AI seeks to transform the development of these principles from a purely technical solution crafted by a narrow group of engineers into a product of extensive public participation and deliberation. This shift is crucial, as it repositions the training of AI models from an activity that occurs outside the law-making capacity of the political community to one that is deeply embedded within it.

Through Public Constitutional AI, the process of defining the values and principles that shape AI systems becomes an integral part of the democratic process, subject to the same mechanisms of public scrutiny, debate, and accountability that characterize other forms of significant state decision-making. By grounding AI governance in the collective will and values of the public, rather than the private interests of corporations or the narrow technical considerations of experts, Public Constitutional AI offers a potential pathway to imbuing AI decision-making with the legitimacy and social acceptance necessary for its successful integration into our legal and political systems.

As I envision it, Public Constitutional AI would apply not only to AI systems developed or deployed by government entities, but also to those created and operated by private actors. In this respect, it departs from the traditional understanding of constitutional law as a constraint solely on state action.¹⁵⁵ The justification for this expansive application lies in the increasing recognition that, in today's digital age, private companies often wield power comparable to or even exceeding that of many states, with profound impacts on individuals' fundamental rights and the functioning of democratic societies.¹⁵⁶ The development and deployment of AI systems is a prime example of this phenomenon, with a relatively small number of private firms shaping the informational and communicative infrastructure of the public sphere.

Given this reality, subjecting all AI systems above a certain threshold of power and influence to public constitutional norms and oversight, regardless of their formal public or private status, is essential

this training might offer the possibility of legitimating the decisions of AI.”).

¹⁵⁵ See, e.g., Frank I. Michelman, *W(h)ither the Constitution?*, 21 *CARDOZO L. REV.* 1063, 1076-77 (2000) (discussing the traditional state action doctrine in U.S. constitutional law).

¹⁵⁶ See, e.g., Julie E. Cohen, *supra* note 9 (arguing that platforms exercise quasi-governmental power and should be subject to public oversight, an argument that applies tenfold to potential AI uses).

PUBLIC CONSTITUTIONAL AI

(2024)

to protecting democratic values and the rule of law.¹⁵⁷ Public Constitutional AI thus represents a form of “hybrid” or “mixed” governance, blending elements of public and private, that is well-suited to the challenges of the algorithmic society.¹⁵⁸ While the exact contours of this model will need to be worked out through deliberation and experimentation, its core premise is that the profound impacts of AI on the lives of citizens and the health of democratic institutions warrant an expansion of constitutional principles beyond the traditional public-private divide.

In this Part, I first discuss how a hypothetical regime (out of many possible iterations) of Public Constitutional AI look like: What would be the process of constitution-making and what could be the regulatory regime that is attached to it. I then turn to arguing that Public Constitutional AI has great potential to deal with the problem of AI legitimacy. My goal here is not to develop a fleshed out institutional design, but rather to show how a plausible Public Constitutional AI regime has the potential to bolster AI legitimacy.

A. WHAT IS PUBLIC CONSTITUTIONAL AI?

1. *AI Constitution-Making*

AI constitutions are similar to regular constitutions in the sense that they seek to both be technically sophisticated and plausible—requiring experts be involved in drafting—and achieving wide involvement by the public. To balance these two poles, many scholars recommend adopting an hourglass process for constitution-making.¹⁵⁹ This process involves four key stages: public education, upstream public participation, focused deliberation, and downstream public ratification.¹⁶⁰

¹⁵⁷ See, e.g., SUZOR, *supra* note 12.

¹⁵⁸ See, e.g., Ellen P. Goodman & Julia Powles, *Urbanism Under Google: Lessons from Sidewalk Toronto*, 88 *FORDHAM L. REV.* 457, 478-81 (2019) (discussing models of “hybrid governance” for digital technologies that involve both public and private actors).

¹⁵⁹ See Jon Elster, *Legislatures as Constituent Assemblies*, in *THE LEAST EXAMINED BRANCH: THE ROLE OF LEGISLATURES IN THE CONSTITUTIONAL STATE* 181, 197 (Richard W. Bauman & Tsiv Kahana eds., 2006).

¹⁶⁰ See Justin Blount, Zachary Elkins & Tom Ginsburg, *Does the Process of Constitution-Making Matter?*, in *COMPARATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL DESIGN* 31, 58 (Tom Ginsburg ed., 2012).

Before the process begins in earnest, there should be a concerted effort to educate the public about the importance of AI and the specific concept of Constitutional AI. This pre-stage is crucial for ensuring that the public is informed and engaged when they participate in the subsequent stages of the process. Educational initiatives could include public awareness campaigns, workshops, online resources, and partnerships with schools and universities to integrate AI literacy into curricula.¹⁶¹ The goal is to foster a shared understanding of the revolutionary potential of AI, the challenges it poses for society, and the role of Constitutional AI in addressing these challenges.¹⁶²

Once the public has a solid foundation of knowledge about AI and Constitutional AI, the process can move into the upstream stage of public participation. In this stage, the public should be actively engaged in generating ideas, proposals, and concerns related to the AI constitution. This could involve public hearings, online consultations, or other participatory mechanisms that allow a wide range of stakeholders to contribute to the process.¹⁶³ The goal of this stage is to ensure that the AI constitution reflects the values, priorities, and concerns of the broader public, thereby enhancing its legitimacy and buy-in.¹⁶⁴

After the public input has been gathered, the process should move into the focused deliberation stage. This is where a smaller group of experts, policymakers, and representatives from key stakeholder groups come together to draft the actual text of the AI constitution. This stage should be shielded from excessive public scrutiny to allow for candid discussions, negotiations, and compromises.¹⁶⁵ The aim is to produce a coherent, technically sound, and balanced document that incorporates the public input while also being mindful of practical constraints and long-term consequences.¹⁶⁶

¹⁶¹ See Luciano Floridi et al., *AI4People—An Ethical Framework for a Good AI Society: Opportunities, Risks, Principles, and Recommendations*, 28 MINDS & MACH. 689, 705 (2018).

¹⁶² Urs Gasser & Virgilio A.F. Almeida, *A Layered Model for AI Governance*, 21 IEEE INTERNET COMPUTING 58, 58 (2017).

¹⁶³ Beth Simone Noveck, *CrowdLaw: Collective Intelligence and Lawmaking*, 40 ANALYSE & KRITIK 359, 369 (2018).

¹⁶⁴ See Blount et al., *supra* note 160.

¹⁶⁵ *Id.*

¹⁶⁶ *Id.*

Finally, in the downstream stage, the draft AI constitution should be presented back to the public for further debate, refinement, and ultimately, ratification. This could involve a public referendum, approval by a popularly elected body, or other mechanisms that ensure broad public support for the final document.¹⁶⁷ By bringing the public back into the process at this stage, the hourglass model helps to validate the work done in the focused deliberation stage and cement the public ownership of the AI constitution.¹⁶⁸

By following this hourglass process, with a strong emphasis on public education and participation, countries can develop AI constitutions that are both technically robust and publicly legitimate.

2. *AI Courts*

The question of the role of courts in Public Constitutional AI is important since constitutional legitimacy is deeply intertwined with the function and authority of constitutional courts.¹⁶⁹ In traditional legal systems, constitutional courts derive their legitimacy from a combination of professional expertise, principled reasoning, and their embeddedness within the political community they serve.¹⁷⁰ These courts are seen as speaking “in the name of the people”¹⁷¹ and representing the nation’s values and commitments. They legitimate themselves by portraying themselves as a country’s “better self”:¹⁷² embodying the aspirations and ideals of the constitutional order.

The involvement of courts in Public Constitutional AI is not a straightforward affair. Unlike traditional constitutional law, which is

¹⁶⁷ See HÉLÈNE LANDEMORE, *OPEN DEMOCRACY: REINVENTING POPULAR RULE FOR THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY* 151 (2020).

¹⁶⁸ See *supra* notes 159-160.

¹⁶⁹ Bruce A. Ackerman, *The Storrs Lectures: Discovering the Constitution*, 93 *YALE L.J.* 1013, 1050 (1984).

¹⁷⁰ See BEETHAM, *supra* note 5, at 75 (“The most common source of legitimacy in contemporary societies is the ‘people.’”); Post, *supra* note 16 (“Judgment, including legal judgment, depends upon our common participation in a shared community.”).

¹⁷¹ Bundesverfassungsgerichtsgesetz [BVerfGG], art. 25(4), 12-03-1951 (Ger.), *translated in* ACT ON THE FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONAL COURT, art. 25(4), 12-03-1951 (Iyamide Mahdi & Ute Reusc trans.), <https://perma.cc/Z38A-Y4Y2>; Costituzione della Repubblica Italiana [CRI], art. 101 (It.), *translated in* CONSTITUTION OF THE ITALIAN REPUBLIC, art. 101.

¹⁷² See Kahn, *supra* note 147; *supra* note 169, at 1015.

continuously applied and interpreted by courts in the context of specific cases and controversies, Public Constitutional AI operates primarily at the level of abstract principles used to train AI models. Once these models are deployed, their inherent opacity and complexity can make it difficult for courts to review and pass judgment on specific decisions. The question of constitutional remedies is also complex. It is not technically or economically possible to constantly retrain deployed models. This raises the question of how judicial oversight and constitutional interpretation can be meaningfully exercised in the realm of Public Constitutional AI, given these technical and practical constraints.

One potential answer can be found in recent work on grounding AI training in case law. Specifically, Chen and Zhang draw on the example of the common law tradition, they suggest that the meaning of an AI constitution can be elaborated through an evolving body of “AI case law,” where past judgments on specific cases inform the resolution of new and unsettled controversies.¹⁷³ The case law grounding process involves using past judgments on specific cases to guide the resolution of new and unsettled controversies.¹⁷⁴ In the context of AI governance, this could involve the creation of a repository of “AI constitutional precedents” – concrete cases that test the boundaries and implications of the abstract principles outlined in an AI constitution.

These precedents could then be used in several ways to enhance the interpretability, consistency, and legitimacy of AI systems. First, during the training process of AI models based on the constitution, the precedent cases and their associated decisions could serve as anchoring examples to guide the models in interpreting and applying the constitutional principles to novel situations.¹⁷⁵

For instance, suppose an AI constitution includes a principle promoting fairness and non-discrimination. The precedent repository might include a case where an AI lending system was found to violate this principle by denying loans to qualified applicants from certain minority neighborhoods at higher rates than white applicants with similar financial profiles. By incorporating this case and its resolution

¹⁷³ See Chen, *supra* note 29.

¹⁷⁴ *Id.*

¹⁷⁵ *Id.* at 6-7.

into the training data, the AI model could learn to recognize and avoid similar patterns of discriminatory behavior when making lending decisions in the future.

Second, the AI constitutional precedents could be used to facilitate the auditing and explanation of AI decisions. When an AI model makes a particular decision or generates a specific output, it could cite the precedent cases it relied on as most similar or relevant to the situation at hand.¹⁷⁶ This would provide a form of transparency and justification for the AI's behavior, making it easier for human stakeholders to understand and evaluate the reasoning behind the decision.

Moreover, by grounding its decisions in specific precedents, the AI model would also open itself up to scrutiny and challenge. If humans disagree with a particular decision, they could probe the applicability and appropriateness of the cited precedents, arguing that the current case is meaningfully different or that the precedents themselves were wrongly decided.¹⁷⁷ This could provide a mechanism for ongoing public contestation and refinement of the AI's decision-making framework, ensuring that it remains aligned with evolving societal values and norms.

It is important to note that the case law grounding approach is likely to be most relevant for the training and evaluation of new AI models, rather than the real-time governance of already-deployed systems. The process of curating a repository of constitutional precedents, debating their implications, and integrating them into the training data for AI models would require significant time and deliberation, making it better suited for the development phase of AI systems.

However, once an AI model has been trained using constitutional precedents, it could continue to rely on those precedents to guide its decision-making in real-world deployments. And as novel cases emerge that challenge the existing precedents or reveal gaps in the AI's reasoning, those cases could be fed back into the precedent repository to further refine the training of new models in the future.¹⁷⁸ In this way, the AI's constitutional alignment could continue to evolve and

¹⁷⁶ *Id.* at 20-21.

¹⁷⁷ *Id.*

¹⁷⁸ See Bai et al., *supra* note 7; Quan Ze Chen, *supra* note 29 at 20-21.

improve over time, through a process of ongoing public engagement and machine learning.

The question is who should be responsible for developing AI case law? I propose that some form of an “AI court” system could play a vital role in developing this case law and ensuring the democratic legitimacy of AI governance. Just as constitutional courts in many legal systems are responsible for interpreting and applying the principles of their national constitutions, an AI court would be tasked with curating a public repository of cases that test and refine the meaning of an AI constitution in specific contexts.¹⁷⁹ If a plaintiff believes that an AI system has violated a constitutional principle, they can file a case in court. The court will then examine the specific situation and apply relevant constitutional principles and legal precedents to determine whether a violation occurred. The rulings from these cases can be compiled and maintained in a repository.

The AI court’s role in this process would be twofold. First, it would serve as a focal point for public deliberation and contestation over the constitutional implications of AI.¹⁸⁰ As the court selects cases to review and issues precedent-setting decisions, it would not only be engaging in legal interpretation but also responding to and shaping the larger public debate around the values that should govern AI systems.¹⁸¹ Its judgments would be subject to ongoing scrutiny and critique by diverse stakeholders, from technology companies and civil society organizations to ordinary citizens and social movements.¹⁸² The same stakeholders will also likely bring most of the cases to the court.

In this way, the AI court would be an integral part of what Post and Siegel call “democratic constitutionalism,” where the meaning of constitutional principles emerges through a dialogic process between legal elites and popular mobilizations.¹⁸³ By providing a legal framework for structuring public discourse around AI governance, the court could help to ensure that the ongoing development of these

¹⁷⁹ Jack M. Balkin, *The Path of Robotics Law*, 6 CAL. L. REV. CIR. 45, 53-54 (2015); see Quan Ze Chen, *supra* note 29 at 6-7.

¹⁸⁰ Jack M. Balkin, *Free Speech in the Algorithmic Society: Big Data, Private Governance, and New School Speech Regulation*, 51 U.C. DAVIS L. REV. 1149, 1194-1196 (2018).

¹⁸¹ See Balkin, *supra* note 179, at 55.

¹⁸² See Balkin, *supra* note 180, at 1197-98.

¹⁸³ See Post & Siegel, *supra* note 151, at 374-376.

technologies remains grounded in the evolving values and commitments of the public.¹⁸⁴

Second, the AI court would also serve an important stabilizing function by articulating clear and consistent precedents for evaluating the behavior of AI systems across different contexts.¹⁸⁵ As Chen and Zhang seek to show, the case law grounding approach can help promote greater alignment and coherence in decision-making, even when the underlying principles are abstract or contested.¹⁸⁶ By building up a repository of concrete examples and analogies, the AI court could provide a common language and framework for regulators, developers, and users to reason about the constitutional boundaries of AI.¹⁸⁷

Moreover, by publishing its decisions and reasoning in an accessible format, the AI court could also enhance the transparency and accountability of AI governance. Citizens and stakeholders would be able to trace the legal genealogy of AI systems back to specific constitutional principles and precedents, and to challenge decisions that seem inconsistent or unreasonable in light of that history. This could help to foster greater public trust and legitimacy in AI authorities, as the rules and values shaping these technologies would be subject to ongoing democratic scrutiny and revision.¹⁸⁸

3. *AI Compliance*

The AI constitution and case law will be enforced through a compliance regime for regulating the use of frontier AI models within a given jurisdiction. Under this approach, all AI models above a certain size or capability threshold, similar to the recent California AI Accountability Act and the EU AI Act,¹⁸⁹ would be required to

¹⁸⁴ See *Id.* at 374-376.

¹⁸⁵ See Quan Ze Chen, *supra* note 29, at 15-18.

¹⁸⁶ *Id.*

¹⁸⁷ See Quan Ze Chen, *supra* note 29, at 19-20.

¹⁸⁸ Jack M. Balkin & Jonathan Zittrain, *A Grand Bargain to Make Tech Companies Trustworthy*, THE ATLANTIC (Oct. 3, 2016),

<https://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2016/10/information-fiduciary/502346/> (last visited June 15, 2024).

¹⁸⁹ S.B. 896, Reg. Sess. (Cal. 2024); *EU AI Act: First Regulation on Artificial Intelligence*, EU Parliament (Dec. 19, 2023, 11:45 AM),

<https://www.europarl.europa.eu/news/en/headlines/society/20230601STO93804/eu-ai->

NNN

Desktop Publishing Example

undergo training using the Public Constitutional AI methodology, based on the most up-to-date version of the public AI constitution and its associated case law.

The specifics of this compliance regime could take various forms, depending on the legal and regulatory context of the jurisdiction in question. One potential approach could involve the use of liability shields or safe harbors for AI developers and operators who can demonstrate that their models have been properly trained using the Public Constitutional AI framework.¹⁹⁰ This could create a powerful incentive for companies to invest in Public Constitutional AI compliance, as it would provide them with a degree of legal protection against potential harms or violations caused by their AI systems.

Alternatively, the compliance regime could be structured around a system of fines, penalties, or other sanctions for companies that fail to properly implement Public Constitutional AI in their AI development processes.¹⁹¹ This could create a more punitive incentive structure, where the costs of non-compliance outweigh the benefits of deploying frontier AI models without adequate constitutional safeguards.

Regardless of the specific incentive mechanisms employed, the goal of a Public Constitutional AI compliance regime would be to ensure that all frontier AI models operating within a jurisdiction are aligned with the public values and principles enshrined in the AI constitution. By mandating Public Constitutional AI training as a prerequisite for deploying frontier AI systems, policymakers could create a level playing field for the development and use of these technologies, while also promoting greater transparency, accountability, and public trust in their governance.¹⁹²

To ensure effective enforcement of the Public Constitutional AI compliance regime, policymakers could consider incorporating mechanisms for regular AI auditing and testing. Rather than relying

act-first-regulation-on-artificial-intelligence (last visited June 15, 2024).

¹⁹⁰ See W. Nicholson Price II, *Regulating Black-Box Medicine*, 116 MICH. L. REV. 421, 457-59 (2017) (discussing the use of safe harbors and liability shields to incentivize compliance with regulatory standards for algorithmic decision-making in the medical context).

¹⁹¹ See Bryan Casey & Mark A. Lemley, *You Might Be a Robot*, 105 CORNELL L. REV. 287, 354-56 (2020) (proposing a system of fines and penalties for companies that fail to disclose the use of AI decision-making systems to consumers).

¹⁹² *Id.*

solely on developers to self-certify their adherence to the AI constitution and case law, independent auditors could be tasked with assessing the behavior and outputs of frontier AI models in real-world deployment.¹⁹³ These audits could involve a range of techniques, from simulated test cases to real-time monitoring of AI decision-making, depending on the nature and risk profile of the AI system in question.¹⁹⁴ By providing an objective, empirical basis for evaluating AI alignment with constitutional principles, auditing could help to build public trust in the compliance regime and create a more robust system of accountability for AI developers and operators.¹⁹⁵

However, the transnational nature of most AI products and services poses a significant challenge to the implementation of such a compliance regime. Many of the leading AI companies operate across multiple jurisdictions, and may be reluctant to tailor their models to the specific constitutional requirements of each individual country or region in which they do business.¹⁹⁶ Moreover, smaller or less developed countries may lack the legal or technical capacity to enforce a Public Constitutional AI compliance regime, and could risk being left behind in the global race for AI innovation if their requirements are seen as too burdensome by major AI developers. In many ways, these are inherent tensions in the process of globalization more generally,¹⁹⁷ and resolving them is beyond the scope of this article.

Another matter that merits attention, though it also falls outside the scope of this article, is the extent to which the deployment of

¹⁹³ See Miles Brundage et al., *Toward Trustworthy AI Development: Mechanisms for Supporting Verifiable Claims*, ARXIV 41-50 (2020) (discussing the role of third-party auditing in supporting verifiable claims about AI systems).

¹⁹⁴ See Inioluwa Deborah Raji et al., *Closing the AI Accountability Gap: Defining an End-to-End Framework for Internal Algorithmic Auditing*, in PROC. 2020 CONF. ON FAIRNESS, ACCOUNTABILITY, AND TRANSPARENCY (FAT* '20), at 33–44 (2020) (proposing a framework for internal algorithmic auditing that includes both technical and organizational components).

¹⁹⁵ See Christian Sandvig et al., *Auditing Algorithms: Research Methods for Detecting Discrimination on Internet Platforms*, in DATA AND DISCRIMINATION: CONVERTING CRITICAL CONCERNS INTO PRODUCTIVE INQUIRY, at 1–23 (2014) (discussing the potential for auditing to uncover and mitigate discriminatory outcomes in algorithmic systems).

¹⁹⁶ This parallels the current predicament with large digital platforms, see Abiri & Guidi *supra* note 149, at 243.

¹⁹⁷ See *Id.* at 288.

Constitutional AI systems by government entities - and the specific developmental stage of such systems - can be reconciled with the divergent constitutional protections enshrined across various jurisdictional contexts. For example, is public Constitutional AI constitutional under current First Amendment doctrine? It is hard to say.

The application of a public Constitutional AI compliance regime presents a fundamental tension between two competing conceptions of the First Amendment. On one side is the autonomy principle, which sees the First Amendment as a shield against government interference with the expressive choices of private actors.¹⁹⁸ Requiring AI companies to train their models on a specific set of constitutional principles and precedents could be viewed as a form of compelled speech, akin to the mandatory flag salute struck down in *Barnette*.¹⁹⁹ This argument finds contemporary resonance in cases like *Zhang v. Baidu*, which extended First Amendment protection to the “editorial judgment” of search engines in selecting and presenting results.²⁰⁰

On the other side is the public debate principle, articulated by Owen Fiss, which understands the First Amendment as safeguarding the quality and diversity of public discourse as a precondition for democratic self-governance.²⁰¹ From this perspective, a public Constitutional AI regime could be seen as enhancing rather than abridging free speech values, by ensuring that the development of powerful AI systems is responsive to a broad range of public input and is aligned with democratically articulated values. As Fiss argues, the state may have a role to play in enriching public debate and counteracting the distorting effects of private power.²⁰² The fairness doctrine in broadcasting offers a potential analogy: despite criticism from some quarters, it was upheld by the Supreme Court as a means

¹⁹⁸ See Robert C. Post, *Meiklejohn's Mistake: Individual Autonomy and the Reform of Public Discourse*, 64 U. COLO. L. REV. 1109, 1120-23 (1993) (discussing the autonomy theory of the First Amendment).

¹⁹⁹ *W. Va. State Bd. of Educ. v. Barnette*, 319 U.S. 624, 642 (1943).

²⁰⁰ *Zhang v. Baidu.com Inc.*, 10 F. Supp. 3d 433, 435 (S.D.N.Y. 2014).

²⁰¹ Owen M. Fiss, *Why the State?*, 100 HARV. L. REV. 781, 785-87 (1987) (contrasting the autonomy principle with a public debate principle of the First Amendment).

²⁰² *Id.* at 786 (“The state can act as the much-needed countervailing power, to counteract the skew of public debate attributable to the market and thus preserve the essential conditions of democracy.”).

PUBLIC CONSTITUTIONAL AI**(2024)**

of promoting “the right of the public to receive suitable access to social, political, esthetic, moral, and other ideas and experiences.”²⁰³

Ultimately, the First Amendment analysis of public Constitutional AI will depend on difficult value judgments about the role of the state in shaping the discursive environment in an era of rapidly advancing artificial intelligence.

In the preceding sections, we have explored one possible iteration of public Constitutional AI governance, focusing on the role of constitution-making, AI courts, and compliance regimes in aligning frontier AI systems with democratic values and the public interest. While these specific mechanisms and institutions offer promising avenues for the responsible development and deployment of AI technologies, the potential benefits of Public Constitutional AI extend beyond these particular arrangements. In the following section, we will examine how Public Constitutional AI can help to address the fundamental legitimacy deficits that currently plague the development and use of AI systems in society.

B. PUBLIC CONSTITUTIONAL AI AND LEGITIMACY

The preceding sections outlined a hypothetical framework for Public Constitutional AI. Engaging the public in developing an AI constitution, establishing an AI court system to interpret and apply these principles through case law, and creating a compliance regime to align frontier AI systems with democratic values.

But Public Constitutional AI’s significance extends beyond specific institutional arrangements and mechanisms. At its core, the Public Constitutional AI framework reconceptualizes the relationship between AI systems and the communities they serve. Grounding AI governance in a particular demos participatory practices and collective will imbues these technologies with the qualities that endow laws and public decisions with democratic legitimacy.

The following sections explore how this approach can help address the two critical dimensions of the AI legitimacy challenge: the opacity deficit and the political community deficit.

²⁰³ Red Lion Broadcasting Co. v. FCC, 395 U.S. 367, 390 (1969).

1. *Opacity*

As discussed above, the Constitutional AI approach (private or public) has the potential to mitigate the opacity legitimacy deficit of AI systems at the systemic level, even if it has limited impact on the transparency of individual decisions.²⁰⁴ By grounding AI development in a set of principles accessible to both models and humans, Constitutional AI can help to make the values and constraints shaping AI decision-making more relatable and understandable to the public.²⁰⁵ Moreover, by promoting systemic transparency through the publication of its AI constitution, Constitutional AI creates a foundation upon which the public can debate the legitimacy of AI decisions.

Involving the public and the state in the creation and development of Constitutional AI builds on this potential. The more the principles of the constitution become culturally salient, the more they become a matter of debate and discussion, the more Constitutional AI can alleviate the systemic opacity of AI, and therefore potentially bolster its legitimacy.²⁰⁶ Public Constitutional AI can help to promote public understanding and engagement with the complex issues surrounding AI authority. By making the constitution-drafting process itself a focus of public discourse and debate, Public Constitutional AI can foster a shared sense of ownership and investment in the principles that will shape the future of AI.²⁰⁷ Citizens can come to see the AI constitution not as an esoteric technical document, but as a living expression of their collective values and commitments.

The case law grounding approach can enhance the transparency and legitimacy of Public Constitutional AI even further.²⁰⁸ By explicitly

²⁰⁴ *Supra* Part II. B. 2.

²⁰⁵ See Coglianese & Lehr, *supra* note 14.

²⁰⁶ JESSICA FJELD, NELE ACHTEN, HANNAH HILLIGOSS, ADAM CHRISTOPHER NAGY, MADHULIKA SRIKUMAR, BERKMAN KLEIN CENTER RESEARCH PUB. NO. 2020-1, PRINCIPLED ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE: MAPPING CONSENSUS IN ETHICAL AND RIGHTS-BASED APPROACHES TO PRINCIPLES FOR AI 11-12 (2020); see also Dennis Redeker, Lex Gill & Urs Gasser, *Towards digital constitutionalism? Mapping attempts to craft an Internet Bill of Rights*, INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATION GAZETTE, Feb. 16, 2018, at 1, 1-18.

²⁰⁷ Ari Ezra Waldman, *Power, Process, and Automated Decision-Making*, 88 FORDHAM L. REV. 613, 632-634 (2019).

²⁰⁸ See Quan Ze Chen, *supra* note 29, at 20-21.

anchoring the interpretation and application of constitutional principles in specific cases and precedents, Public Constitutional AI can provide a more concrete and publicly accessible framework for evaluating the behavior of AI systems. The development of a rich body of “AI common law” through public deliberation and adjudication can help to clarify the meaning and implications of abstract constitutional values, making them more relatable and actionable for both developers and citizens alike.²⁰⁹ In the same sense, the more the AI court becomes salient and legitimate as an institution, the more legitimacy it lends to AI decision-making.²¹⁰

This public engagement and understanding, in turn, can help to mitigate the opacity of AI systems at a deeper level than mere publication of the constitution itself. If citizens have been actively involved in shaping the principles and values underlying AI governance, they may be better equipped to evaluate the legitimacy of specific AI systems and to hold developers and deployers, both private and public, accountable for adhering to those principles.²¹¹ The opacity of individual decisions may be less daunting if there is a shared public understanding of the broader framework in which those decisions are made.

While increased public engagement and understanding fostered by Public Constitutional AI can help alleviate the systemic opacity of AI decision-making, its true transformative potential lies in its ability to imbue AI systems with a sense of democratic legitimacy rooted in popular authorship and contextualized human judgment.

2. *Political Community*

In modern democratic societies, the legitimacy of law, and especially of constitutional law, is deeply rooted in the idea of popular

²⁰⁹ Margot E. Kaminski & Gianclaudio Malgieri, *Algorithmic Impact Assessments Under the GDPR: Producing Multi-Layered Explanations*, 11 INT'L DATA PRIV. L. 125, 132-134 (2021).

²¹⁰ Zichun Xu, *The Legitimacy of Artificial Intelligence in Judicial Decision Making: Chinese Experience*, 13 INT'L J. TECHNOETHICS, no. 2, 2020, at 1, 1-17 (proving the legality of intelligent judicial operation simultaneously from multiple dimensions of artificial intelligence's intervention in judicial decision-making with Chinese practices).

²¹¹ See Katyal, *supra* note 31, at 111-119.

authorship.²¹² As many scholars have observed, the law derives its authority from the fact that it is perceived to be a creation of the people themselves.²¹³ The Constitution, in particular, is seen as “an expression of the deepest beliefs and convictions of the American nation,”²¹⁴ and it sustains its legitimacy through the “quintessentially democratic attitude in which citizens know themselves as authorities, as authors of their own law.”²¹⁵ When this works, the culture of law “obliges both individuals and groups through their words and deeds to take ownership of and make connections with a particular legal regime as facets of themselves.”²¹⁶ It is through this active participation in the creation and interpretation of constitutional meaning that citizens come to see the law as an expression of their collective will and values.

The idea of public Constitutional AI seeks to utilize this notion of popular authorship in the realm of artificial intelligence. By integrating the development and training of AI systems into the processes of democratic self-governance, Public Constitutional AI aims to make the creation of AI a part of the ongoing dialogue between the people and their governing institutions (both public and private).

Public Constitutional AI has several key advantages when it comes to mitigating the political community legitimacy deficit. First, Public Constitutional AI can be a product of a specific political community, reflecting not just universal values but the particular values and commitments of the people it serves. Unlike private AI systems, which are often developed with a global market in mind, Public Constitutional AI would be grounded in the distinctive cultural, historical, and political context of the community that creates it. This rootedness in a particular democratic polity could help to ensure that the AI system is seen as legitimate and responsive to the needs and interests of its constituents. This means that we can expect very

²¹² Hanna Fenichel Pitkin, *The Idea of a Constitution*, 37 J. LEGAL EDUC. 167, 169 (1987); see BRUCE ACKERMAN, *supra* note 91; Post & Siegel, *supra* note 145, at 1982; Judith Resnik, *Law as Affiliation: Foreign Law, Democratic Constitutionalism, and the Sovereignism of the Nation-State*, 6 INT’ J. CONST. L. 33, 35 (2008).

²¹³ See, e.g., *supra* note 5; see BRUCE ACKERMAN, *supra* note 91 (distinguishing between decisions made by the government and decisions made by the American people, the latter being “constitutional” decisions).

²¹⁴ See Post, *supra* note 91.

²¹⁵ See Post & Siegel, *supra* note 145, at 1982.

²¹⁶ See Resnik, *supra* note 212.

PUBLIC CONSTITUTIONAL AI

(2024)

different constitutional documents in different jurisdictions - which potentially tracks the diversity of constitutional law generally.²¹⁷

Second, Public Constitutional AI would be a part of the public sphere and public discourse, rather than merely be a product of a market-based entity. It would not ask citizens to simply trust big tech companies to do what is best for them, but would instead allow the public to actively shape the development and deployment of AI through democratic processes. This could help to foster greater public understanding and trust in AI systems, as well as provide a mechanism for holding them accountable to the values and priorities of the community.

Third, and perhaps most fundamentally, Public Constitutional AI can begin to address the judgment issue that undermines the legitimacy of AI decision-making. As discussed earlier, the legitimacy of law in a democratic society relies on the notion that legal judgments are the product of a dialectical relationship between the community and its representatives.²¹⁸ Judges and juries are seen as embodying the shared values and common sense of the community, and their decisions are validated through a process of public discourse and reflection.²¹⁹

AI, however, lacks the capacity to engage in this kind of reflective judgment grounded in a shared communal context. Its decision-making is based on the calculational processing of data and algorithms, which, however sophisticated, cannot replicate the temporally and culturally situated nature of human judgment.²²⁰ By making the development and training of AI systems a part of the public discourse and deliberation, Public Constitutional AI could help to bridge this gap. The principles and values that guide AI decision-making would not be derived solely from the aggregation of data points, but also from the shared understandings and commitments of the political community.

²¹⁷ Nicola Palladino, *The Role of Epistemic Communities in the "Constitutionalization" of Internet Governance: The Example of the European Commission High-Level Expert Group on Artificial Intelligence*, TELECOMMS POL'Y, Apr. 3, 2021, at 1, 13.

²¹⁸ See *supra*, Part I.A.2.

²¹⁹ See, e.g., Post, *supra* note 16 ("Judgments are validated by the reciprocal relationship between a community and its members").

²²⁰ See *supra* part I.B.3.; Stader, *supra* note 99, at 25 (discussing the limitations of algorithmic decision-making in capturing the contextual and temporal nature of human judgment).

Moreover, Public Constitutional AI represents a way of keeping humans in the loop, even if not directly involved in every individual AI decision. The public's participation in the drafting of the AI constitution and the ongoing development of AI case law through democratic processes ensures a form of indirect human oversight and input.²²¹ The AI system's decisions are thus grounded in human judgment at a foundational level, even if humans are not reviewing each specific output.²²² This is reinforced by the iterative process of training new models on the updated basis of an AI court case law repository, allowing for the continued infusion of human values and understanding into the system.²²³ In this way, Public Constitutional AI seeks to transform AI decision-making from something external and alien to which we are subjected, into a system created and evolved through the direct intervention of the people (in the constitution-making stage) and their representatives (in the case law building stage). It represents a step towards making AI more transparent, accountable, and responsive to the shared judgments of democratic citizens, even if it cannot entirely replicate the richness and nuance of human decision-making in each individual case.²²⁴

This is not to suggest that Public Constitutional AI can fully resolve the judgment issue or imbue AI with the same capacity for contextual understanding and norm-creation as humans. The opacity and scale of AI systems may always pose challenges for democratic legitimacy.²²⁵ However, by subjecting the development of AI to public

²²¹ See, e.g., Hin-Yan Liu, Matthijs Maas, John Danaher, Luisa Scarcella, Michaela Lexer & Leonard Van Rompaey, *Artificial Intelligence and Legal Disruption: A New Model for Analysis*, 12 LAW, INNOVATION & TECH. 205, 224-25 (2020) (discussing the importance of human involvement and oversight in AI systems).

²²² See Deven R. Desai & Joshua A. Kroll, *Trust but Verify: A Guide to Algorithms and the Law*, 31 HARV. J.L. & TECH. 1, 16-17 (2017) (arguing that AI systems should be designed to allow for human oversight and intervention).

²²³ See Shlomit Yanisky-Ravid & Sean K. Hallisey, "Equality and Privacy by Design": A New Model of Artificial Intelligence Data Transparency via Auditing, Certification, and Safe Harbor Regimes, 46 FORDHAM URB. L.J. 428, 472-73 (2019) (proposing a model for AI governance that includes ongoing auditing and public participation).

²²⁴ See Kiel Brennan-Marquez & Stephen E. Henderson, *Artificial Intelligence and Role-Reversible Judgment*, 109 J. CRIM. L. & CRIMINOLOGY 137, 184-85 (2019) (discussing the limitations of AI in replicating human judgment and the need for human oversight).

²²⁵ See Daniel Stader, *supra* note 99, at 25 (discussing the limitations of algorithmic decision-

scrutiny and debate, and by grounding its decision-making in publicly articulated values and principles, Public Constitutional AI could help to create a stronger connection between AI and the communities it serves.

Finally, Public Constitutional AI represents a new form of governance that combines elements of both private and public control, offering a promising path for achieving a more balanced distribution of power between the state, the market, and civil society in the development and deployment of AI systems. Rather than a fully state-controlled approach, which risks concentrating excessive authority in government hands and stifling private innovation,²²⁶ Public Constitutional AI envisions a collaborative governance model in which private companies, research institutions, and other non-state actors work together with democratic institutions to create AI systems that serve the common good. This kind of hybrid governance has proven successful in other domains, such as the development of the Internet,²²⁷ where a “multistakeholder” approach has helped to preserve a degree of decentralization and openness while still allowing for public oversight and coordination.²²⁸ By leveraging the expertise and creativity of the private sector within a framework of democratic accountability, Public Constitutional AI could help to ensure that AI development can be seen as responsive to the needs and values of the broader political community while still harnessing the immense innovative potential of private enterprise.²²⁹

In sum, the public Constitutional AI approach offers hope for addressing two critical issues in the AI legitimacy crisis: the opacity deficit and the political community deficit. Involving citizens in creating and interpreting an AI constitution grounds AI development in the participatory processes and shared values of a democratic

making in capturing the contextual and temporal nature of human judgment).

²²⁶ See, e.g., Balkin, *supra* note 180, at 1194-96 (discussing the risks of state overreach in the regulation of digital technologies).

²²⁷ See, e.g., LAWRENCE B. SOLUM, MODELS OF INTERNET GOVERNANCE, IN INTERNET GOVERNANCE: INFRASTRUCTURE AND INSTITUTIONS 48, 57-58 (Lee A. Bygrave & Jon Bing eds., 2009) (describing the multistakeholder model of Internet governance).

²²⁸ See, e.g., Milton Mueller, John Mathiason & Hans Klein, *The Internet and Global Governance: Principles and Norms for a New Regime*, 13 GLOB. GOVERNANCE 237, 245-47 (2007) (discussing the benefits of the multistakeholder approach to Internet governance).

²²⁹ See, e.g., Finck, *supra* note 13.

NNN

Desktop Publishing Example

society. This imbues AI systems with popular authorship, and human judgment embedded in a particular social and political context.

CONCLUSION

The transformative potential of AI authority, in both the private and public spheres, is already upon us. Yet our institutions are only beginning to grapple with the profound challenges to democratic legitimacy that these technologies present. While it is still early days in the development and implementation of AI, the breathtaking speed of innovation means that we cannot afford to wait until the technology takes its mature shape before engaging in the hard work of integrating it into our political and legal frameworks.

The thought experiment of Public Constitutional AI is meant to be the start of this essential conversation. By imagining a future in which AI decision-making is grounded in participatory processes, public deliberation, and the collective will of the communities it serves, we can begin to chart a course towards a legal and political context in which AI is not an alien force, but a legitimate expression of the people. Though the precise form of this approach will undoubtedly evolve through trial and error, the fundamental insight - that AI can be tethered to the public through constitutional principles - provides a guiding light for the road ahead.

PUBLIC CONSTITUTIONAL AI

(2024)
