ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND DECISION-MAKING POWER IN DEMOCRATIC GOVERNANCE

P. L. Neulkar
SA & CC Butibori Nagpur
Email : pneulkar68@yahoo.com

Umesh Kumar Bhayyalal Dubey
Dr. Vishwanath Karad, MIT World Peace University, Kothrud, Pune-411038, Maharashtra, India
Email : drumesh.dubey@gmail.com

Abstract :

Artificial intelligence has transformed decision making processes among societies. It raises an impact on democracy. AI is mainly used in administration, regulation of law and order, social help, and policy making, in all these decisions were taken by people. Hence, transfer of decision-making power occurs from people to systems with certain accountability. AI provides efficiency, consistency, and information-based governance. They provide challenges to democratic values, viz., accountability, equality, participation, and people supervision. Simultaneously, AI supports democracy by improving policy study and boosting public service performance. This paper argues that the relationship between AI and democracy is neither harmful nor beneficial. However, democratic consequences depend on how decision-making power is made, regulated, and controlled. For implementing AI-based decision-making along with principles of democratic life, it is necessary to ensure ethical standards, transparency, and meaningful human oversight.

Keywords: Artificial intelligence, decision-making, democratic, accountability, citizens

---

Introduction :

Kitchin (2017) asserts that nowadays, AI has emerged as technology development. AI application extends beyond commercial and technical domains into areas that has direct impact on social and political life. OECD (2019) state that AI is mostly used by governments viz., policy analysis, public service, surveillance, law and order management, and electoral processes. Rosanvallon (2011) believes that AI involved in decision making processes that affect public rights, opportunities, and involvement in democratic governance.

Initially democracy is related to decision making, including those who hold power and authority is exercised. Arendt (1958) mentions that democratic principles, namely accountability, transparency and equality depend on individuals ability. Pasquale (2015) reveals that the integration of AI into governance highlights concerns about principles when decision-making is delegated to algorithmic systems.

This paper attempts to examine the correlation between AI and democratic life. Binns (2018) explores how AI authority redistributes power among actors and challenges traditional

Volume - 7 (2026)
Special Issue - 1 (January)

RESEARCH HUB
International Peer-Reviewed Multidisciplinary E-Journal

ISSN
2582-9173

Website : www.researchhub.org.in/research-hub !! Email : researchhubjournal@gmail.com

democratic norms. Eubanks (2018) claims that, in general, AI is presented as a neutral and efficient tool. Designing as well as deployment are managed by political and economic agencies.

The paper attempt to show that AI is not able to manipulate decision making. AI can only change the structure within the democratic circumference. Habermas (1996) notes that making weak or giving strength to democracy through AI depends on the frame of governance that regulates its use.

The Dynamics of Decision Power in Democratic Societies :

Rosanvallon (2011) expresses that the power of decision-making power is nothing but the authority to find out outcomes affecting individuals of the society. The distribution of decision making in democratic systems happens among political leaders, public sector and individuals of society. Arendt (1958) declares that clear, feasible decisions are taken for deriving the legitimacy of democracy supported by responsible individuals of the society.

Traditionally it is evident from history that the decisions of democracy is based on public judgment, and responsible social agencies.

Habermas (1996) states that non-elected officials are responsible for the standard set by governing authority establishing rights and obligations. Kitchin (2017) says that AI based updated form of decisions depends on systems that uses statistical algorithms, historical and current data, forecast outcomes, trends and content-based assignments of one or more categories to documents using technologies. These systems help in taking decisions exceeding the potential, abilities, skills, knowledge and strengths of a person.

AI systems have changed the nature of power in a system in which people hold political power either directly or through elected representatives. Pasquale (2015) emphasizes main points relevant to the impact of artificial intelligence and algorithmic decision making on democracy and power structures.

Artificial Intelligence and the Evolution of Decision Making :

Eubanks (2018) and Mittelstadt et al. (2016) point out that AI is mostly used in the environment and framework where government and institutions make choices affecting the public involving process, citizens, agencies, politicians, and political factors to form policies, resource allocation, services delivery, maintaining needs of society with practical constraints and differing values.

Floridi et al. (2018) elucidate that the primary argument for developing, adopting and using new technology it nothing but its ability to help achieve a required outcomes or perform a specific task by using minimum resource like time, energy, material and labor.

Kitchin (2017) explains the social and institutions context of AI systems. AI system cannot be operated independently of human decisions. They are designed, trained and implemented within human framework institutions. Objectives were set by institution. They

select data sources and establish the guidelines for directing AI decisions. Hence, AI reflects and shapes social and power relations within society.

Pasquale (2015) mentions that implication of government heavily depends on AI for decision making. This increased reliance my shift decision making power from public official and people to technical experts and private companies. This transformation affects significant concerns regarding democratic accountability. When decisions are taken through algorithms, it can become unclear.

Binns (2018) explains how public officials use data and technical expertise as one of the way in order to avoid taking personal responsibility of their decisions.

This responsibility diffusion can weaken the process of democracy, making it harder for an individual of society to influence decision that impact their lives.

The Role of Accountability and Transparency in AI Governance :

Habermas (1996) discusses the role of accountability and transparency, specifically in the context of democracy and AI systems. He proposed that accountability is central to democracy. It requires for identifying decision makers, holding them responsible for actions taken by them, providing the ability against their decisions. Accountability becomes more complex in AI systems. The reason behind it, the internal processes referring to decision making mechanism are less transparent.

Pasquale (2015) refers to the ability of decision makers to interpret the output produced by certain system. The system generates outcomes which are difficulty to decipher without clear explanations. It suggests that comprehension is necessary for democratic decision making.

Arendt (1958) refers to the ability of citizens to grasp the meaning of how democratic decisions are made. Citizens should be able to fully grasp the information and processes involved in decision making. It points out the importance of awareness of the criteria and rationale behind the decision taken.

Mittelstadt et al. (2016) explain that the reliance of AI systems on certain technology can constrain transparency. Transparency in AI system is crucial for public trust. When AI system uses proprietary models, then transparency is limited. This limitation can diminish public trust and undermine the legitimacy of institutional processes.

Floridi et al. (2018) discussing the role of transparency and explainable AI in democratic accountability. Enhancing algorithmic transparency, explainable AI and disclosure requirements identifies as an important move towards strengthening democratic accountability. Transparency alone can be treated as insufficient as citizen currently lack in ability to influence how AI systems are used.

Rosanvallon (2011) in his work Counter democracy: Politics in an age of distrust, discusses how new counter democratic institutions like independent commissions, NGOs and regulatory authorities have emerged to hold governments accountable in an age of increased

Volume - 7 (2026)
Special Issue - 1 (January)

RESEARCH HUB
International Peer-Reviewed Multidisciplinary E-Journal

ISSN
2582-9173

Website : www.researchhub.org.in/research-hub   !!   Email : researchhubjournal@gmail.com

citizen vigilance and distrust. Surveillance, prevention and judgment are observed as essential for organizing polities and ensuring that power holders are responsive to the public.

Impact of AI on social equality :

Eubanks (2018) discusses the societal and policy dimensions of AI, particularly focusing on how AI systems can impact social equality. Democracy is founded on the equality principle. But AI system has the potential to reproduce and amplify current social inequalities. Since AI relies on historical data, it can reflect exsiting patterns of discrimination related to race, gender and class.

Binns (2018) and Mittelstadt et al. (2016) discusses fairness and social justice in the context of AI implementation. The initial problem is the potential for biased algorithms to result in unequal treatment and reinforce existing structural injustices. This bias occurs in areas such as policing, employment and welfare distribution.

Floridi et al. (2018) discusses how AI systems can negatively impact democratic values and requirement for the solutions to address this issue. Democratic values are undermined when AI systems disproportionately affect marginalized groups. If decision processes are automated and opaque, citizens who face algorithmic discrimination have limited ways to seek justice. So, effective technical solutions are essential for addressing bias in AI. Careful political and ethical decision are the requirements for determining acceptable risks, values and social priorities.

Zuboff (2019) refers to the roles of democratic institutions in the age of AI. He argues that democratic institutions are necessary for establishing standards of fairness for AI systems. Their function is to ensure that AI systems serve the public good.

Citizen Engagement and Democratic Agency :

Arendt (1958) argues that citizen engagement is important for the healthy life of democracy. A healthy democratic society needs requires participation in multiple roles in order to caught elected official accountable. Examples of involvement beyond voting includes communication with local, national representatives via email or in person, donating time to civic organization to address local requirement, participation to town hall meetings or school board meeting to shown engagement in local decision-making process.

Pasquale (2015) describes the problem when AI system is used for important decision making are too complex that the average individual cannot understand how they reached at a particular result. It creates a fundamental barrier to trust and fairness. In the internal working of many AI models the input and output are clear but the intermediate steps and logic used to reach decision are not clear.

Eubanks (2018) says that AI systems are only as unbiased as the data they are trained on. When decision making processes are only understood by a few technical experts then citizen struggle to understand how decisions affecting their lives are made, which diminish trust in government and other institutions.

Floridi et al. (2018) argue that digital platforms serve as a primary source for the dissemination of relevant data, research reports and evaluation of past policies in a timely and low-cost manner. This shows that public is well aware and can access information that was previously difficult to access due to geographical barriers.

Kitchin (2017) argues that the real challenge lies not with the technical AI processes themselves, but in ensuring these tools are implemented in a way that genuinely empower people.

Power Dynamics and the Governance of AI :

Pasquale (2015) and Zuboff (2019) discusses the governance of AI and the concentration of power among governments and private companies. Centralize decision making power increased by control over data, infrastructure, and entities expertise, which raises concerns for democracy.

Rosanvallon (2011) discusses the challenges in public governance and the requirement for effective AI governance. Citizens have limited influence on corporate decisions that shape public governance, and with democratic values commercial interest can conflict.

OECD (2019) highlights the role of regulatory approaches, on the basis of 2019 OECD statement. Tools uses to define acceptable practices and safeguard fundamental rights are describe by regulatory approaches. For democratic institutions the processes and outcomes of decision making are accountable.

AI Presents risks and opportunities for democracy :

Floridi et al. (2018) discusses regarding the design and governance of systems related to technology based on the context of designed and governed. When these systems are designed and governed responsibly, they can support to achieve democratic goals. Enhancing policy analysis, improving service delivery and increasing the responsiveness of institutions are the democratic objectives.

Kitchin (2017) provides a perspective on the use of AI in governance and decision making. For identifying and evaluating policy outcomes and for supporting informed decision-making processes, AI can be valuable. These benefits are contingent upon preserving human oversight and democratic accountability.

Habermas (1996) argued that to set objectives and evaluate outcomes for AI in alignment with public values and deliberate processes are the authority of democratic institutions. The main focus is how democracy can be employed effectively and ethically in AI context.

Binns (2018) discuss approach aims to safeguard democratic institutions and human rights in the era of AI.

Conclusion :

The paper discusses the dual nature of AI in relation to democracy and governance. Although AI gives significant benefits for efficiency but at the same time poses risks to basic democratic principles what need to be managed carefully. AI can process, analyze vast amount of data much faster than human, supporting policy makers to gain data driven insight which make more informed decisions. AI systems can easily streamline administrative tasks, improve service to citizen and detect fraud which leads to a greater productivity. AI tools are helpful to legislators in summarizing complex legislative materials, in identifying loopholes in policies and can forecast the outcomes of policies.

Democracy requires to adjust to new technology while keeping it core principles intact. Societies can use technology but judgement of human and democratic supervision should be properly maintained. As an excuse to avoid political responsibility, public officials should not used the technical data. Clear legal rules, strong oversight and active public participation is must for thoughtfully implementing AI Systems. AI should not replace human judgement entirely; however, it should serve as a supported system for human decision making.

References :

- Arendt, Hannah. *The Human Condition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958.
- Binns, Reuben. "Algorithmic Accountability and Public Reason." *Philosophy & Technology* 31, no. 4 (2018): 543–556.
- Eubanks, Virginia. *Automating Inequality: How High-Tech Tools Profile, Police, and Punish the Poor*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 2018.
- Floridi, Luciano, et al. "AI4People—An Ethical Framework for a Good AI Society." *Minds and Machines* 28, no. 4 (2018): 689–707.
- Habermas, Jürgen. *Between Facts and Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1996.
- Kitchin, Rob. "Thinking Critically About and Researching Algorithms." *Information, Communication & Society* 20, no. 1 (2017): 14–29.
- Mittelstadt, Brent D., et al. "The Ethics of Algorithms: Mapping the Debate." *Big Data & Society* 3, no. 2 (2016): 1–21.
- OECD. *Artificial Intelligence and Public Policy*. Paris: OECD Publishing, 2019.
- Pasquale, Frank. *The Black Box Society: The Secret Algorithms That Control Money and Information*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2015.
- Rosanvallon, Pierre. *Democratic Legitimacy: Impartiality, Reflexivity, Proximity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2011.
- Zuboff, Shoshana. *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power*. New York: PublicAffairs, 2019.