

# CAN LLMs ADVANCE DEMOCRATIC VALUES?

Seth Lazar (ANU) and Lorenzo Manuali (University of Michigan)\*  
Machine Intelligence and Normative Theory (MINT) Lab

## ABSTRACT

LLMs are among the most advanced tools ever devised for analysing and generating linguistic content. Democratic deliberation and decision-making involve, at several distinct stages, the production and analysis of language. So it is natural to ask whether our best tools for manipulating language might prove instrumental to one of our most important linguistic tasks. Researchers and practitioners have recently asked whether LLMs can support democratic deliberation by leveraging abilities to summarise content, as well as to aggregate opinion over summarised content, and indeed to represent voters by predicting their preferences over unseen choices. In this paper, we assess whether using LLMs to perform these and related functions really advances the democratic values that inspire these experiments. We suggest that the record is decidedly mixed. In the presence of background inequality of power and resources, as well as deep moral and political disagreement, we should be careful not to use LLMs in ways that automate non-instrumentally valuable components of the democratic process, or else threaten to supplant fair and transparent decision-making procedures that are necessary to reconcile competing interests and values. However, while we argue that LLMs should be kept well clear of formal democratic decision-making processes, we think that they can be put to good use in strengthening the informal public sphere – the arena that mediates between democratic governments and the politics that they serve, in which political communities seek information, form civic publics, and hold their leaders to account.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Following the hubris of the 1990s [36], the last two decades have seen democratic institutions come under increasing pressure, with the global rise of authoritarianism and a growing sense that democracy is ‘in crisis’ [31, 39, 49, 83]. While much of this concern has been driven by the concerted efforts of autocrats (and would-be autocrats) to use legalistic means to undermine democratic freedoms [82], it also owes something to our growing collective dependence on digital technologies controlled by powerful technology corporations [62, 64, 89]. In early 2023, GPT-4’s launch announced the arrival of highly capable large language models (LLMs) into this roiling stew, and they immediately induced further anxiety among democracy’s partisans [7, 24, 52]. Existing AI, as flawed and ineffectual as it generally proved, had already amplified the power of a few corporations over vast swathes of our lives [27, 58]. One might naturally extrapolate that much more capable AI systems would magnify this trend.

It is therefore unsurprising that those who – broadly speaking – care about *both*

---

\* Equal contribution. This work is supported by Australian Research Council grants FT210100724 and LP210200818. We thank the members of the MINT Lab, as well as Ricardo Fabrino and John Dryzek for comments on earlier drafts. This is a preprint of a work in progress, comments welcome to [seth.lazar\[at\]anu.edu.au](mailto:seth.lazar[at]anu.edu.au).

democracy and fostering the advancement of AI research should try to inoculate the field against criticisms of its anti-democratic potential [32, 76, 95]. While advances in AI may seem likely to undermine democracy, that shows only one side of the ledger, and can be counterbalanced by demonstrations that AI can also *enhance* democratic decision-making. Then we are back in the familiar terrain of weighing the costs and benefits of this transformative technology.

Over the last year, this agenda has contributed to a number of research papers exploring how LLMs can enhance democratic decision-making [2, 12, 30, 33-35, 40, 45, 51, 54, 73, 88, 100].<sup>1</sup> Our aim here is to explore whether and to what extent using LLMs to support democratic deliberation and decision-making actually serves democratic goals. Given that many of these projects were funded by the very Big Tech companies accused by some of undermining democracy, some might dismiss such initiatives as mere ‘democracy-washing’ [44]. However, we take these research projects on their own terms, instead of further discussing their motivations or funding.

In the next section, we introduce and classify the different approaches to using LLMs to enhance democratic decision-making and deliberation. In Section III, we identify six different non-instrumental and instrumental values that democratic institutions serve. In Section IV, we ask how well different approaches to LLM-enhanced democracy serve those values. In Section V we seek to explain the shortcomings identified in section IV, by identifying democratic functions that LLMs cannot, in principle, serve – as well as those that they can. Section VI concludes.<sup>2</sup>

## II. LLMs FOR DEMOCRACY

LLMs are among the most advanced tools ever devised for analysing and generating linguistic content. Democratic deliberation and decision-making involve, at several distinct stages, the production and analysis of language. So it is natural to ask whether our best tools for manipulating language might prove instrumental to one of our most important linguistic tasks. In particular, researchers and practitioners have asked whether LLMs can support democratic deliberation by leveraging their *summarisation* capabilities. And they have explored how they can support democratic decision-making through their ability to *aggregate* opinion over summarised content, in order to find consensus or to optimise for some metric of collective support. Some projects use LLMs to *represent* individuals in a further democratic decision procedure (in general, by predicting their judgments over policy propositions). Some have also explored whether LLMs can *facilitate* public deliberation, and others have effectively tasked LLMs with *implementing* principles sourced by other quasi-democratic means. We next

---

<sup>1</sup> In addition to these research projects, there have been some significant applied projects, notably Meta’s use of deliberative polls to devise rules for governing bullying and harassment in virtual reality spaces, see <https://cddrl.fsi.stanford.edu/news/results-first-global-deliberative-poll-announced-stanfords-deliberative-democracy-lab>.

<sup>2</sup> Other authors have considered the broader (popular) agenda of ‘democratising’ AI [44, 67, 85]. Our interest here is specifically in the use of LLMs to enhance democratic or quasi-democratic procedures.

elaborate on each of these approaches in turn.<sup>3</sup>

The prospect of using LLMs to summarise public submissions to government consultations has been more widely-touted by ministers than by researchers, and while several active projects are exploring whether and how this can succeed [1, 4, 59, 88], few results have been published so far.<sup>4</sup> The basic theory, however, is very simple: public consultation is a key input to democratic decision-making; if consultations are to be inclusive they will involve the production of a vast amount of text; democratic governments, therefore, must process that text and extract insights from it. This is extremely labour-intensive; civil servant analysis of these documents is also (plausibly) lossy and biased, simply in virtue of our inability to reliably process very large amounts of information [3]. LLMs have been trained for the task of summarisation [75] and in general perform well at it [101]. It is an obvious thought, then, that we can enhance government responsiveness to public consultations by extracting insights using LLMs.

This basic capability of LLMs has been used more imaginatively in the ‘Recursive Public’ project, which built on vTaiwan, the ~6 year old scheme for channelling public input into Taiwan’s political system led by Audrey Tang, until recently Taiwan’s digital minister [30]. The project uses Polis—an online platform that allows users to make short statements and to indicate their support (anonymously) for statements made by others—to gather participants’ inputs to set the agenda for policy discussion concerning AI. Then they used AI in two ways to summarise those discussions—first, they used an LLM to summarise key arguments and points from the discussion, and to cluster similar arguments and topics; then they used a further tool (‘Talk to the City’) to convert that data into a ‘a two dimensional space where semantically similar arguments are positioned close to each other’ [30]. The end result of this deliberative agenda-setting exercise was a list of priorities concerning AI. They then did a deep-dive deliberation on one of these priorities using the same deliberative-and-AI-summarization process, with the end result a set of guidelines for policy on that topic.

Summarisation involves selection and aggregation—similar views are clumped together. At the limit, summarisation is a decision procedure whereby a diverse array of inputs are converted into a single output. Several recent research projects have explored positions along this spectrum, aiming to identify a larger or smaller set of statements which to some extent represent the views of the deliberators. In these examples, the LLM plays the role in relation to text-based descriptions of preferences and values that an aggregation function plays in relation to numerically-represented preferences in social choice theory. Notably, however, where social choice theory can only determine support for a fixed list of policy positions over which participants have expressed preferences, LLMs can remove this constraint, allowing us not only to identify statements that receive optimal support against some measure, but to generate new statements that will be even more widely endorsed.

This is most rigorously explored in ‘Generative Social Choice’ [35]. Focusing on

---

<sup>3</sup> Mark Warren [94] has identified three core functions of democratic institutions and procedures: ‘empowered inclusion’, collective agenda and will-formation, and collective decision-making. Our linguistic functions cut across these.

<sup>4</sup> Though for a very early discussion of this approach, pre-AI, see [84].

participants’ preferences over norms for personalising chatbots, the authors first elicit statements from the participants about what those norms should be. These are the options. They also gather participants’ preferences over those options. Classical social choice would stop here, and simply aggregate, according to some function, their preferences over those options to identify which if any were socially optimal. Generative social choice goes further. First, it elicits further information from participants about their values and opinions. Then they use all of these inputs – statements, preferences, and additional data – as material with which to prompt GPT-4 to propose *new* statements that it predicts will attract more support than those that are extant, and in addition ‘to act as a proxy for the participant, predicting their preferences over any alternative, whether foreseen or newly generated’ [35]. The authors show that their approach can be used to generate new statements that better fulfil quantitative criteria of representativeness than the existing statements.<sup>5</sup> They also validate the predictions of people’s preferences by exposing participants to the slate of generated statements after the fact, finding that ‘93% of participants indicate that a statement in our slate captures their opinion [...] “mostly” (18%) or “perfectly” (75%)’ [35].

Where ‘Generative Social Choice’ uses LLMs to help find consensus among disaggregated participants who engage with each other only asynchronously, ‘Democratic Policy Development Using Collective Dialogues and AI’ [51] involves live deliberation but ultimately uses LLMs for a similar purpose. In this project, researchers invited participants to first read a discussion guide prepared by the facilitation team, and then to engage with one another on Remesh, another text-based online deliberation platform. They also made statements, proposed policies, and evaluated each other’s statements and opinions via pairwise ranking and binary agree/disagree voting. These rankings over the subset of statements that a user sees are then used to extrapolate their preferences over all other statements. Then the LLM is called to create a summary of the statements that exhibit the lowest amount of disagreement (‘bridging responses’); this is further used as an input for a new set of policy proposals, which also draw on the list of bridging responses and two further examples. The resulting policies are then given ‘justification scores’, reflecting how close they are to the bridging responses, through combining semantic similarity measurement and the LLMs’ own quantitative similarity rating. Again, the role of the LLM is to not just summarise and select among the statements that were actually produced by the participants, but to use those statements (and other data from the deliberation) as inputs to generate statements that (according to some measure) are preferable to those that participants actually proposed.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> Their principal representation criterion, Balanced Justified Representation, is informally described as follows: ‘[I]f there is a coalition of agents that is (i) large enough to “deserve” a statement on the slate by proportionality and (ii) has cohesive preferences (i.e., there is a statement for which all these agents have utility at least  $\theta$ ), then (iii) the coalition must not be “ignored”’. [35]

<sup>6</sup> Unlike with ‘Generative Social Choice’, however, this wasn’t the final step. Next, the facilitation team selects a further subset of policy responses to form an initial slate of policies, which is elaborated on by experts chosen by the facilitation team, to refine the policies for clarity and to capture edge cases. Then participant input is used to refine the policies by giving reasons for and against supporting given policies in the slate. The policies are then refined in light of that feedback to make them more representative. Finally, a third phase is run such that the public can deliberate and vote on each policy and the slate as a whole [51].

A number of papers rely at some point on using LLMs to *represent* individuals, by predicting their preferences over unseen policy options. This includes, tangentially, ‘Generative Social Choice’ and ‘Democratic Policy Development’. But the approach is much more central in others, which explicitly consider whether we can train LLMs to be representatives, proxy agents acting on a principal’s behalf in a democratic process. In ‘LLMs as Agents for Augmented Democracy’, the authors try to train LLMs to predict an individual’s political preferences (using survey data from the 2022 Brazilian election), with a view to those LLMs then standing in for the person they represent in a collective decision-making procedure [40]. The same approach is taken in ‘Language agents as digital representatives in collective decision-making’ [46]. Whereas the other examples in this category involve LLMs facilitating judgment aggregation, this approach uses the LLM to represent individual agents’ inputs into the final decision procedure.

The foregoing methods involve either human-mediated deliberation, or asynchronous collection of statements and opinions from participants. Other projects also sought to use LLMs to *facilitate* the process of deliberation itself. Rappler’s initiative [73] involved creating an AI-moderated chatroom (called aiDialogue), in which participants in focus groups chat with an LLM that asks them questions, including follow-ups, and then generates summaries from their inputs. Then, as with the other projects above, the LLM is prompted to generate policy ideas based on the conversation and summaries, which participants are asked to vote on individually. ‘Common Ground’ [2] used LLMs to seed and moderate synchronous deliberation among participants, as a means of keeping discussion on-topic and also moderating the conversation.

‘Democratic Fine-Tuning’ [33, 34] takes a similar, albeit less social approach. Participants engage in 1:1 deliberation with an LLM-based chatbot about a given topic. The chatbot prompts them to give information about the values they think are at stake concerning the given topic. It then synthesizes the conversation into a few key values that (in its view) the participant considers important (notice that this involves some very lossy compression – transforming whole conversations into a few characteristic values).<sup>7</sup>

Each of these methods involves relying on the narrowly linguistic capabilities of LLMs – their ability to summarise text; to generate new statements that reflect the underlying principles expressed in a piece of text; and to facilitate conversation so as to elicit people’s values. The last approach we’ll consider relies on something a little harder to express in narrowly linguistic terms: the model’s ability to interpret and *implement* principles on which it has been trained. In ‘Collective Constitutional AI’ – a collaboration between Anthropic and civil society organisation the Collective Intelligence Project – a values-elicitation and synthesisation process (again using Polis) was conducted to identify a set of principles for governing chatbot behaviour that drew broad support [45]. These principles were then used to train a version of Anthropic’s frontier AI model, Claude, and that model was then evaluated.

---

<sup>7</sup> From that point, the approach implements an ethical theory according to which our objective should be to act according to the ‘wisest’ values, where value A is wiser than value B if A ‘contains’ B. They then generate a ‘moral graph’ depicting these relationships, which can in principle be used for fine-tuning other LLMs.

Where the other projects all involved LLMs in the process of reaching democratic agreement on what to do, this project uses other methods to decide what to do, and then relies on the LLM to implement that decision. Importantly, this involves a non-trivial amount of interpretation. The Constitutional AI (CAI) process is essentially a version of Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback that uses AI instead of human feedback [11]. It involves two models: one that produces prompt completions, and another that evaluates them. The evaluator receives two completions given by the producer, as well as a randomly sampled principle from the constitution. The evaluator determines which of the two completions better complies with that principle. Thousands of these judgments are used to produce a reward model (essentially, a predictor that can extend those judgments to new cases), and the LLM then learns that reward model using reinforcement learning. Importantly, the LLM is given no guidance on how to apply multiple principles to a given completion; indeed, we do not know how it handles such cases – whether it implicitly sorts each prompt that it is given so that it is governed by one principle, or whether it has some ‘intuitive’ weighting of principles that it uses. The execution and interpretation of the constitution is left to the model – it is as though the model is both the executive and judicial branch of government.

Project	Summarisation	Aggregation	Representation	Facilitation	Implementation
Generative Social Choice [18]	✓	✓	✓		
Democratic Policy Development Using Collective Dialogues [27]	✓	✓	✓		
Common Ground [26]				✓	
Recursive Public [22]	✓				
Rappler [28]	✓			✓	
Democratic Fine-Tuning [23]	✓			✓	
LLMs as Agents for Augmented Democracy [25]		✓	✓		
Language Agents as Digital Representatives in Collective Decision-Making [40]			✓		
Collective Constitutional AI [20, 41]					✓

Table 1: Functions of LLMs and LLM-Utilizing Democratic Projects

### III. WHAT IS THE POINT OF DEMOCRACY?

What values does democracy serve – and would weaving LLMs into its weft advance or hinder them? In this section, we obviously cannot offer a definitive account of the point of democracy, nor can we offer a robust defence of the values that we do identify. However, we don’t need to identify and defend *every* democratic value, only a list that is comprehensive and familiar enough to form a balanced judgment of the democratic credentials of these different approaches. As long as we hit the major values recognised by a good range of democratic theories, we should be in business. For ease of exposition, we will distinguish between non-

instrumental and instrumental goods of democracy [10].

The pragmatics of politics and the societal division of labour mean that *actual* influence over societal outcomes can never be equally distributed. Some people seek and hold positions of executive authority that ineliminably place them, in that respect, ‘above’ others. Democratic decision procedures affirm in spite of these pragmatic realities the equal standing of all those who have a say [29]. They establish that all exercises of political power – all uses of the resources and normative authority of the state – are ultimately subject to the control of a decision-making mechanism into which every democratic citizen contributes equally [6, 50].

This control matters not only because it affirms the basic equality of all those who contribute to it. It is also constitutive of accountability for particular decisions, and authorisation for the broader exercise of power by those who act on our behalf [23, 92]. This is both a necessary kind of counter-power that counterbalances the power those who act on our behalf have over us [78], and the means by which we collectively exert *positive* control over the institutions that serve us [61].

The third key non-instrumental value of democratic politics is the opportunity it provides for the exercise of civic virtue [71]. This notion has deep roots in Aristotelian political philosophy [96], but it was repurposed for the era of political liberalism in the 1990s [53], and in addition has republican adherents [28]. On these views, active political participation is a non-instrumental good – part of what it means for a life to go well – and democratic institutions are necessary for this to be a realisable good for everyone.

Turn next to the pragmatic virtues of democracy – the goods it helps us to realise. The first is the hard-nosed advantage that democracy provides to the realisation of stable government in the presence of divergent interests [65, 74]. This is in part because transparent democratic procedures are the best means available for providing those who lose a political contest with clear and obviously justified reasons for them to accept defeat [9]. This is true even in regular collective decision-making. Everyone can understand the legitimacy of majority vote, and if you have just seen the procedure play out, and seen that you lost, then that gives you a strong (though obviously not decisive, especially if you are in a persistent minority) reason to accept the outcome. But democracy is also an excellent means of identifying possible compromises between competing interests. By creating scope for veto players in collective decision-making [90], democratic procedures induce us to search for and identify compromise positions that can evade those vetoes.

As well as enabling us to achieve a *modus vivendi* [80], democracy can be the imperfect means whereby we approach something that better approximates a general will [81], or at the very least enable our political preferences to be transformed through deliberation and dialogue [99]. When the democratic process enables us through engagement with the other to actually move closer to them in our values and political preferences, then this *transformation* not only quells instability and unrest, it enables a genuine form of collective self-determination [70].

Finally, one of the most popular arguments for democracy is that it enables us to make better decisions – it draws on our collective intelligence to make epistemically better choices [57]. Some arguments to this end are descriptive –

showing that democracies have in fact yielded more stable and prosperous societies [79]. Others are pragmatic, asserting that societies should aim at justice, and only political institutions that empower everyone to assert their interests will realise that goal [6]. Others focus on theoretical results, such as the Condorcet theorem, and broader work on the wisdom of crowds [25, 37].

For brevity, let's call these values respectively equality, authorisation, civic virtue, conciliation, transformation and collective intelligence. Democratic practices and procedures no doubt have other virtues too, but these six are a foundational and representative cohort. Now, obviously these values matter *much more* in the kinds of high-stakes decisions for which we typically mobilise democratic procedures. We should care much more about equality and authorisation, for example, when thinking about the deployment of the coercive power of the state than when pondering conversational norms for chatbots. However, each of the authors of the papers discussed in Section II is offering their innovations in the democratic spirit, and so it is fair to consider how well they might realise these six goods.

#### IV. SCORING LLMs FOR DEMOCRACY

Rather than giving each project a score against these six values, we'll continue to divide them up according to the key ways in which they use LLMs – for summarisation, aggregation, representation, facilitation, and implementation.

Using LLMs to summarise responses to public consultations, or long and complex deliberations, or even policy debates more generally, is perfectly consistent with the non-instrumental goods of democracy, and perhaps positively supports participation and authorisation because it promises to lower the burdens to participation, and could potentially thereby also provide for more robust accountability. Modern communication technologies have made it extremely easy for political institutions to solicit input from the public, but the sheer volume of that input is hard to effectively process. Better means to that end are clearly a plus. And the same basic analysis works for the instrumental goods of democracy – more efficient information processing should support conciliation, as well as the transformation of preferences and ultimately the surfacing of a wider variety of views, supporting collective intelligence. This is simply because each of these goods is advanced by creating better systems for collecting and interpreting public inputs to consultations. If you believe that you had a real opportunity to contribute to shaping public policy, and if you can see the reasons given by those who took the other side of a debate, then that should make you more inclined to accept an outcome that is not in your favour. If 'public opinion' is being accurately recorded and processed, then we should be better able to see what the 'general will' is. And if we have efficient and effective means for processing these public inputs, we can better identify and make use of the wisdom of the crowd.

However, the foregoing is all plausible only if we are confident that the summarisation process is neither excessively lossy, nor ideologically skewed, nor indeed hallucinatory. If instead the use of LLMs to summarise collective inputs, or deliberations, or individual conversations with a chatbot are inadequately tethered to their source material, then that is clearly a problem – it might undermine equality insofar as some voices might be amplified above others; it threatens authorisation if key details are missed or hallucinated; civic virtue is hardly enhanced by participating in a charade; and inaccurate summaries cannot support



conciliation (why should we accept the outcome of a flawed process?), preference transformation, or collective intelligence (except accidentally).

The problem, of course, is that LLMs' record at summarisation is somewhat mixed. They excel at some tasks, such as summarising short news articles [101]. However, they perform less well when summarising long inputs. They both have a propensity to make things up [48], and do a poor job of integrating insights that are widely distributed around the input source [22]. Researchers at AI startup Imbue used LLMs to attempt a summarisation and analysis of an NTIA call for public comments, and found that the LLMs would often introduce subtle but significant changes of meaning [16]. LLMs also display well-documented political biases, which are likely to interfere with a summarisation that should be politically neutral [68]. Based on our own work with LLMs as well as on recent work concerning "generative monoculture", there's evidence to suggest that LLMs' summaries too often do a decent job of summarising the highest frequency but lowest signal content from a dataset, but perform much worse at drawing out high signal, low frequency content [59, 97]. That is, when summarising text inputs they have trouble picking out outliers in data that could convey potentially important information. This might mean failing to notice the one or two brilliant ideas in the public consultation, undermining collective intelligence. Or it could mean ignoring the minority of voices raising deep concern about how a proposed policy will seriously harm them, thus undermining equality and conciliation. For a simple demonstration of this problem, just look at the summaries of product reviews provided by Amazon's AI.

Of course, the humans that currently summarise responses to public consultations also have many cognitive and moral biases. And LLMs hardly need to be perfect to constitute an improvement. Our claim here is not that LLMs *could never* be competent enough summarisers for this function to contribute valuably to democratic decision-making. But we should expect a higher standard from a computational means of democratic information processing than from humans. Human summarisers can be held accountable for their errors, and their biases are likely to cancel one another out over enough trials due to any given individual's limited ability to process information. LLMs for summarisation obviously cannot be held accountable, moreover they can be applied to vastly more cases, and as such their biases can ramify much more widely [15]. In addition, our ability to intervene directly on LLMs' summarisation abilities should allow us to aim higher.

Moreover, the deeper problem is that we are not at present measuring the right things to know whether LLMs can play this information processing role in democracy. The papers discussed in Section II are too ready to take their summaries at face value—or else to simply rely on ex post ratification of the summaries by the participants. If information processing tools are going to be used to support democratic deliberation and decision-making, we should insist on high standards, in part because otherwise the conciliation function of democracy is undermined. Any given summary is likely to provide more support to one side or other of a competing set of interests. If the veracity of the summary can easily be challenged, then the disfavoured side has a ready-made reason not to accept the weight of this apparent evidence against them.

What about the projects that made substantial use of LLMs to support aggregation of judgments, both to identify measures of support and to generate new statements

that might better achieve consensus? This again seems to be a dangerously double-edged sword. The ability to support dialogues over policy development, and to identify areas of potential common ground, can clearly help the project of conciliation, by helping us find points of compromise where they didn't previously appear. But two concerns arise.

First, is what's holding back public discourse on policy really an incomplete universe of available alternatives? It's nice that they show that the models can produce statements that command more attachment than the existing corpus, in these specific controlled settings, but one can also ask whether those statements genuinely constitute an advance on the status quo ante, and whether the attachment they command is a function of the narrowly pro-social, apolitical setting of the conversations, and the low stakes of the policy debate in play. If the policy debate were more contentious and higher stakes, and if the participants were not independently motivated by the experimental setting to be open-minded and willing to compromise, we suspect these generated statements would be implicitly ideologically sorted [18] much faster, and would be less relevant to reaching a compromise between competing interests. Put differently, we suggest that in realistic political settings with a sufficiently open debate we can be reasonably confident that a wide enough range of policy proposals will be made. Democratic politics is probably not being held back by a lack of imagination. Whether compromise proposals will attract support is likely to depend on strategic facts about the nature of the competing interests from which these experiments all abstract away. As a result, using LLMs to aggregate judgments and suggest novel policy proposals is unlikely to do much to enhance real-world democratic decision-making and deliberation.

Second, there's a big difference between *generative* social choice and computational social choice more generally. When computational social choice theorists apply some aggregation function over a set of numerical preferences they are applying a transparent, mathematically verifiable algorithm to reach a decision [17]. Obviously the numerical representation of preferences is its own kind of artifice, but the decision procedure is reproducible and amenable to inspection and challenge. When the LLM produces some consensus statement based on its interpretation of the existing statements and people's preferences – and when the LLM is used to score similarity between statements – there is no explicit and deterministic aggregation algorithm being applied, the decision is entirely opaque and is likely not reproducible. This is, of course, a long-standing and familiar problem with deep learning-based decision-making tools [20, 62, 86, 93]. But it is an especially acute problem here, with respect to the value of conciliation.

Suppose you are in the minority that is not favoured by the verdict delivered by the LLM. What reason do you have to accept that verdict? With computational social choice we can at least show there is some function from everyone's preferences to the outcome. And this is even simpler for a majoritarian voting procedure. But when the outcome is decided by an LLM, we cannot reproduce or inspect the decision-making function. Indeed, we cannot even guarantee that it wasn't materially affected by some exogenous influence. We cannot provide guarantees of security, or absence of the LLM's own bias. In higher stakes decision-making settings, there would be an obvious incentive to steer the mediating LLM by using adversarial techniques like prompt injection and jailbreaking [38, 87]. The authors of 'Generative Social Choice' anticipate this concern somewhat by having

participants ratify the model’s restatements of theirs and others’ views, but one might again think that if the stakes were higher people would be more discriminating (and in any case 25% of people saw some divergence between the generated statements and the inputs that led to it); moreover there might be some other slate of statements that they would endorse more.

The next set of concerns arise both for papers using LLMs to aggregate collective judgments and for those aiming to use LLMs as representatives for individual voters. Now, the most obvious objection here is one of performance – at present it is simply infeasible to design LLM representatives that reliably predict and track a principal’s judgments. But let’s set that concern aside for the moment, and try to come up with a positive democratic case for these kinds of AI agents as proxies/representatives. Our existing approaches to political representation involve a big principal-agent problem: politicians sometimes do a poor job of actually representing those who elect them [14]. If we imagine AI agents along the lines envisaged in [40, 46] then we could surely make them so that they more faithfully represent the preferences of their principal; if we could then come up with a fair decision rule for how to aggregate the judgments of those agents, we could potentially have a version of democratic politics that had some of the virtues of participatory democracy with no more and even less effort on citizens’ part than representative democracy. At least, the experiment is worth running.

But we should proceed with eyes open. Any use of LLM agents to represent voters must apply a decision rule of some kind, and as just argued it’s hard to see how those whom the decision disfavors could be reasonably expected to accept those decisions. This approach also obviously undermines the *participatory* reasons to value democracy. One cannot develop civic virtue by delegating politics to an AI agent. And it can also undermine the democratic value of *preference transformation* and collective preference formation. Projects that rely extensively on training LLMs to represent the participants fail on two counts [35, 40, 46] (more deliberative projects like Recursive Public might avoid these objections). First, they cannot afford space for preference transformation: they extrapolate from the participants’ preferences in an initial survey; this deprives participants the opportunity to determine whether, confronted with some apparent entailment of their earlier preferences, they might make some revision. Second, they deprive participants of the opportunity to have their preferences changed in particular through their engagement with others. This is valuable not only because it yields an outcome that represents their better-considered preferences, but because engaging with the other directly, seeing the matter under contention from their point of view, and coming to adjust your preferences through a process that you associate with that exchange, is valuable in its own right (in part for conciliation, and in part for the formation of a general will) [81, 99].

We probably also shouldn’t take for granted that this delegation to proxy agents would preserve the epistemic benefits of democracy – we are not sure how the Condorcet jury theorem is affected by having Language Model Agents replace the people they represent or if the resulting agents would really have the same overarching cognitive diversity as the people they represent [56, 57], but it does seem that the adversarial political process helps surface information relevant to collective decision-making that would otherwise remain submerged; and by (at least some people) actively participating in public life, they are inspired to come up with novel policy proposals that don’t just triangulate among the things that

people already believe, but offer genuinely innovative solutions to pressing practical problems. In other words, democratic procedures (1) pool knowledge that is normally distributed and (2) force different kinds of knowledge to interact with each other, leading to corrections, the surfacing of more reasons and proposals, and so on [55]. AI agents perhaps could offer both of these epistemic benefits, but it remains to be shown that they can do so.<sup>8</sup>

The facilitative role of LLMs in online deliberation processes seems on the whole much more benign (though for some scepticism see [8, 72]). On the other hand, the availability of human moderators and facilitators does not seem as important a bottleneck for deliberative democracy as is actual voters' unwillingness to participate in intensive, time-consuming deliberation. Moreover, we suspect that much of the benefit of successful deliberative democratic procedures depends on the fact that they are held in person, and involve people facing and seeing one another as whole people, to whom they are to some degree accountable.<sup>9</sup> We suspect that the appetite for reaching meaningful consensus, or making progress towards it, will be much greater for in-person convenings than for virtual ones [43]. Put another way, successful democratic procedures might necessarily be embodied. So the relative success of LLMs at facilitating some kinds of online deliberation might be only a modest count in their favour.

And the problems with relying on LLMs to implement the general will (decided by other means) are probably quite obvious. Collective constitutional AI raises real questions about just how much control the participants in the mini 'constitutional convention' really have over the resulting model. Basic political equality isn't satisfied when we are all equally powerless – for political equality to have value, we must all be equal, and we must jointly actually be in charge. And the independence with which Claude applies its own constitution raises obvious questions of authorisation [62]. Claude has basically been given carte blanche to act under its own authority. Because the stakes here are very low, this is genuinely not a moral concern when it comes to Claude itself – and to repeat, we think this is an innovative approach to participatory design in this setting – but it should clearly short-circuit the aspiration to use this as a test case for broader interventions into (or inspiration of) the democratic process.

## V. (HOW) CAN LLMs HELP DEMOCRACIES?

The projects under discussion mostly adopted a justifiably narrow focus on the question of whether LLMs can be used to support the participatory design of chatbots and the norms that govern them. Their authors were not trying to 'fix' democracy. However, some clearly do think that LLMs have the potential to significantly transform and reinvigorate democratic institutions, and the foregoing critique should offer some grounds for caution. In particular, we want to highlight

---

<sup>8</sup> One possible avenue for development is multi-agent frameworks. Frameworks that deploy multiple LLM agents have yielded promising results on a number of metrics [21, 98]. That being said, even multi-agent frameworks using state-of-the-art LLMs still underperform humans on complex tasks that require coordination [5]. Considering that deliberation and other forms of democratic decision-making are exactly such tasks, we don't think multi-agent frameworks currently offer the kind of technical ability needed to instantiate the epistemic virtues that can justify democratic governance.

<sup>9</sup> This is contentious; some proponents of online deliberation think that we can realise as good results from deliberation online as in person.

three broad lessons about whether and how LLMs can support the instrumental goals of democracy, which we think can offer an instructive practical guide to those who are tempted to build on these initial results in more ambitious ways, focused more directly on reimagining democratic institutions.

Democracies aim to realise many different goals, but perhaps foremost among them is to enable people with often radically conflicting values and directly competing interests to live together in relative harmony. LLMs are simply the wrong kind of tool to reconcile competing interests and values. Procedures for that purpose need to be fair, simple, secure, transparent and contestable. A majority vote, with some constitutional constraints to protect persistent minorities and basic rights, meets those criteria. Any attempt to use AI to support fair procedures for resolving competing claims must take these criteria as constraints. LLMs in particular, and deep neural networks in general, cannot at present satisfy these criteria and arguably will never be able to do so.

Despite some promising attempts to use LLMs to facilitate deliberation, they are unlikely, in the end, to contribute much to the process of preference transformation whereby polities aim at more than just a *modus vivendi* or transactional compromise, and seek to resolve their disagreements by arriving at something like a general will. Real democratic institutions must operate in a world riven by background inequality of power and resources, as well as deep ideological disagreement, where citizens are not able to avoid pressure and constraint (and in particular where partisan groups dominate political discussion), where decisions affect their material and cultural interests very closely, and where competing interests and values place people in an adversarial relationship with one another [69]. By contrast, each of the discussed projects places participants in a privileged, jury-like position where they engage in unfettered, unmanipulated, dispassionate debate over a set of problems that do not, for the most part, directly concern them. They are as close to the Habermasian ‘ideal speech situation’ [42] as is practically feasible. In these advantageous conditions, we suspect that *any* methods of democratic deliberation and decision-making would look attractive. LLM-supported deliberation might work well, but frankly traditional representative democracy would too if we bracketed all of politics and economics. Under realistic conditions, however, LLM-supported democratic deliberation is no more likely to make a difference than other versions of deliberative democracy. Moreover, insofar as using LLMs for facilitation steers us towards an online-only version of deliberation, we think that it foregoes one of the key virtues of deliberation, namely that by bringing people together, face to face, it does induce some willingness to give ground and reach compromise – we suspect, as argued above, that this will only robustly happen due to in-person interaction.

However, while we caution against using LLMs to replace fair decision procedures, or to facilitate democratic deliberation, we think they can still make important contributions to renewing democracy. While we do not think that integrating LLMs into the formal public sphere of executive decision-making is likely to advance the epistemic aims of democracy, we *do* think that deploying LLMs in the *informal* public sphere can help provide some of the epistemic preconditions for democracies to flourish.

Healthy democracies rely on a healthy informal public sphere, to hold the powerful to account and to set a positive forward direction for society by

facilitating informal collective deliberation [26, 41, 60, 99]. Our existing digital infrastructure for the public sphere is doing a bad job [26]. LLMs to date have only harmed the public sphere through the generation of SEO'd slop that supercharges the work of content farms. Their positive benefits in this domain are only just being fully explored.

Early work suggests that frontier LLMs can be used to radically improve automated approaches to content moderation; they have also been shown to be excellent at reranking social media feeds in line with broader societal values [13, 47]. LLMs can probably offer a new way to use the internet in general, serving as an alternative to existing recommender systems that contribute to societal dysfunction, enabling us to navigate the digital public sphere in ways that discourage polarisation and extremism, and spare us from surveillance and manipulation (for a proof of concept see [13, 47], for a comprehensive moral defence see [63]; and for an overview of the technical literature see [66, 91]). Obviously no technological solution is going to fix the public sphere, but a novel technique for filtering and recommending content opens up valuable new possibilities for amelioration. And LLMs' information retrieval capabilities, and their capacity to either translate or simplify text and speech, could provide valuable democratic resources for citizens who struggle to speak the national language, or who need complex personalised advice that they cannot effectively get from just searching government websites.

Beyond just filtering, recommendation, and retrieval, we do think that some of the deliberative forums defended in these projects could offer an additional useful contribution to the public sphere. Recursive Public's iterative forum for deliberation and the Democratic Policy Development project could provide democratic citizens with novel ways of interacting with their co-citizens, discovering what they believe and value, and forming their preferences and values together. Provided their role is confined to this informal setting, without affecting to offer a procedure for settling disagreements and so on, this could be a useful addition to the toolkit of the democratic society.

Of course, just as with summarisation above, the fact that democracies would benefit from functional LLMs performing this role does not entail that they can do so *now*. Today's LLMs cannot be trusted in these roles. However, these are roles for which LLMs can be meaningfully trained and evaluated. With the right kind of collaborative approach—integrating AI science with political science—these limitations are very likely to be surmountable, resulting in genuine democratic benefits.

## VI. CONCLUSION

2024 has been an unprecedented year for democracy, with more citizens voting than has ever before been the case. Recent advances in AI have been equally unprecedented—whatever the shortcomings of large language models, it is imperative to recognise that they constitute a radical expansion of the technological horizon. Saliency bias alone would be sufficient to ensure that LLMs' prospective usefulness for democratic deliberation and decision-making would be explored; but there is clearly more potential here than just that. Democracy is a fundamentally communicative practice, and it is therefore also a linguistic practice. New tools for analysing and producing linguistic content are sure to be useful at

some point in the democratic pipeline. However, communication is ultimately not reducible to language alone — democracy is also fundamentally social. It is a way of surfacing and attending to interests, reaching compromise, and engaging in a kind of transformative experience [77]. While there is little harm in using LLMs to support innovative approaches to the participatory design of chatbots, these experiments cannot offer much inspiration for broader democratic innovation. LLMs are too opaque to provide a legitimate democratic decision procedure. And we cannot outsource the social aspects of democratic communication to language models — we have *participatory* reasons that we ourselves should engage. More can undoubtedly be said about the idea of having AI agents act as our political representatives [19], but on first principles it seems a bad idea. Nor are democratic values consistent with having LLMs operate as our executive branch and judiciary, applying a constitution that we have democratically selected. LLMs are not going to fix democracy. However, they can potentially foster healthier democracies — not by introducing novel methods of judgment aggregation or algorithmic representation, but by helping us better navigate the information glut that we face online. A healthy informal public sphere is a necessary precondition for a healthy democracy. LLMs’ contribution to the former has so far been decidedly equivocal; there is not only room for improvement, but real potential to do so. We encourage AI scientists motivated to use LLMs to enhance democracy to shift their focus away from attempts to build alternative decision procedures to resolve competing interests and values, and from related efforts to supplement formal forms of democratic deliberation, and to focus instead on using the information retrieval and presentation capabilities of LLMs to give democratic citizens the wherewithal to navigate and improve our informal public sphere.

1. 'Automating bureaucracy'. *The Alan Turing Institute*.
2. *First Report: Democratic Inputs to AI*. 2023: Dembrane.
3. 'Lab Long Read: Policy Consultations – Part 2: A role for data science? – Policy Lab'. 2019.
4. 'RebootDemocracy.AI Blog | Artificial Intelligence can help us create a more efficient government'.
5. Abdelnabi, S., et al., 'Cooperation, Competition, and Maliciousness: LLM-Stakeholders Interactive Negotiation'. *arXiv*, 2024.
6. Allen, D., 'Justice by means of democracy', in *Justice by Means of Democracy*. 2023, University of Chicago Press.
7. Allen, D. and E.G. Weyl, 'The Real Dangers of Generative AI'. *Journal of Democracy*, 2024. **35**(1): 147-162.
8. Alnemr, N., 'Emancipation cannot be programmed: blind spots of algorithmic facilitation in online deliberation'. *Contemporary Politics*, 2020. **26**(5): 531-552.
9. Anderson, C., *Losers' consent : elections and democratic legitimacy*. 2005, Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press.
10. Anderson, E., 'Democracy: Instrumental vs. non-instrumental value', in *Contemporary Debates in Political Philosophy*, T. Christiano and J. Christman, Editors. 2009, Wiley. p. 213-227.
11. Bai, Y., et al., 'Constitutional AI: Harmlessness from AI feedback'. *arXiv preprint*, 2022: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2212.08073>.
12. Bakker, M.A., et al., *Fine-tuning language models to find agreement among humans with diverse preferences*. 2022, arXiv.
13. Bernstein, M., et al., 'Embedding Societal Values into Social Media Algorithms'. *Journal of Online Trust and Safety*, 2023. **2**(1).
14. Besley, T., *Principled agents? : the political economy of good government*. The Lindahl lectures. 2006, Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press.
15. Bommasani, R., et al., 'Picking on the Same Person: Does Algorithmic Monoculture lead to Outcome Homogenization?'. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022. **35**: 3663-3678.
16. Boulos, M., et al., *The need for trust: Analyzing the individual comments to the NTIA's AI RFC*. 2023, imbue.
17. Brandt, F., et al., *Handbook of computational social choice*. 2016: Cambridge University Press.
18. Bullock, J.G. and G.S. Lenz, 'Partisan Bias in Surveys'. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 2019.
19. Burgess, P., 'Algorithmic augmentation of democracy: considering whether technology can enhance the concepts of democracy and the rule of law through four hypotheticals'. *AI & SOCIETY*, 2022. **37**(1): 97-112.
20. Burrell, J., 'How the machine 'thinks': Understanding opacity in machine learning algorithms'. *Big Data & Society*, 2016. **3**(1): 1-12.
21. Chan, C.-M., et al., 'ChatEval: Towards Better LLM-based Evaluators through Multi-Agent Debate'. *arXiv*, 2023.
22. Cheng-Ping, H., et al., 'RULER: What's the Real Context Size of Your Long-Context Language Models?'. *arXiv preprint*, 2024: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.06654>.
23. Christiano, T., 'The authority of democracy'. *Journal of Political Philosophy*, 2004. **12**(3): 266–290.
24. Coeckelbergh, M., *Why AI Undermines Democracy and What To Do About It*. 2024: John Wiley & Sons.
25. Cohen, J., 'An Epistemic Conception of Democracy'. *Ethics*, 1986. **97**(1): 26-38.
26. Cohen, J. and A. Fung, 'Democracy and the Digital Public Sphere', in *Digital Technology and Democratic Theory*, L. Bernholz, H. Landemore, and R. Reich, Editors. 2021, The University of Chicago Press: Chicago. p. 23-61.
27. Crawford, K., *Atlas of AI: power, politics, and the planetary costs of artificial intelligence*. 2021, New Haven: Yale University Press.



28. Dagger, R., *Civic virtues: rights, citizenship, and republican liberalism*. 1997, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
29. Dahl, R.A., *Democracy and its critics*. 1989, New Haven: Yale University Press.
30. Devine, F., et al., *Recursive Public: Piloting Connected Democratic Engagement with AI Governance*. 2023, Recursive Public.
31. Diamond, L., 'Breaking Out of the Democratic Slump'. *Journal of Democracy*, 2020. **31**(1): 36-50.
32. Divya, S., *How AI and Democracy Can Fix Each Other*. 2024.
33. Edelman, J., *Democratic Fine-Tuning*, in *Lesswrong*. 2023.
34. Edelman, J. and O. Klingefjord, *OpenAI x DFT: The First Moral Graph*, in *Meaning Alignment Institute*. 2023.
35. Fish, S., et al., 'Generative Social Choice'. *arXiv preprint*, 2023: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.01291>.
36. Fukuyama, F., 'The End of History?', in *The New Social Theory Reader*. 2020, Routledge. p. 298-304.
37. Goodin, R.E. and K. Spiekermann, *An epistemic theory of democracy*. 2018: Oxford University Press.
38. Greshake, K., et al. *Not what you've signed up for: Compromising Real-World LLM-Integrated Applications with Indirect Prompt Injection*. 2023. arXiv:2302.12173 DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2302.12173.
39. Grumbach, J.M., 'Laboratories of Democratic Backsliding'. *American Political Science Review*, 2023. **117**(3): 967-984.
40. Gudiño-Rosero, J., U. Grandi, and C.A. Hidalgo, *Large Language Models (LLMs) as Agents for Augmented Democracy*. 2024, arXiv.
41. Habermas, J., *Between Facts and Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy*. Reprint edition ed. 1998, Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.
42. Habermas, J., *The theory of communicative action*. 1984, Boston: Beacon Press.
43. Hartz-Karp, J. and B. Sullivan, 'The Unfulfilled Promise of Online Deliberation'. *Journal of Public Deliberation*, 2014. **10**: 16.
44. Himmelreich, J., 'Against "Democratizing AI"'. *AI & SOCIETY*, 2023. **38**(4): 1333-1346.
45. Huang, S., et al. 'Collective Constitutional AI: Aligning a Language Model with Public Input'. in *The 2024 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*. 2024.
46. Jarrett, D., et al. 'Language agents as digital representatives in collective decision-making'. in *NeurIPS 2023 Foundation Models for Decision Making Workshop*. 2023.
47. Jia, C., et al., 'Embedding democratic values into social media AIs via societal objective functions'. *arXiv preprint*, 2023: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.13912>.
48. Kim, Y., et al., 'Fables: Evaluating faithfulness and content selection in book-length summarization'. *arXiv preprint*, 2024: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.01261.pdf>.
49. Kingzette, J., et al., 'How Affective Polarization Undermines Support for Democratic Norms'. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 2021. **85**(2): 663-677.
50. Kolodny, N., *The pecking order: Social hierarchy as a philosophical problem*. 2023: Harvard University Press.
51. Konya, A., et al., *Democratic Policy Development using Collective Dialogues and AI*. 2023, OpenAI Foundation.
52. Kreps, S. and D. Kriner, 'How AI threatens democracy'. *Journal of Democracy*, 2023. **34**(4): 122-131.
53. Kristjánsson, K., 'The Primacy of Civic Virtue in Aristotle's Politics and Its Educational Implications'. *History of Political Thought*, 2022. **43**(4): 607-636.
54. Landemore, H., 'Can Artificial Intelligence Bring Deliberation to the Masses?', in *Conversations in Philosophy, Law, and Politics*, R. Chang and A. Srinivasan, Editors. 2023, Oxford University Press: Oxford. p. 39-69.
55. Landemore, H., *Democratic Reason: Politics, Collective Intelligence, and the Rule of the Many*. 2012, Princeton, NJ Oxford: Princeton University Press.
56. Landemore, H., 'An Epistemic Argument for Democracy', in *The Routledge Handbook of Political Epistemology*, M. Hannon and J. de Ridder, Editors. 2021, Routledge. p. 363-373.
57. Landemore, H., 'Why the many are smarter than the few and why it matters'. *Journal of*

- Deliberative Democracy*, 2012. 8(1).
58. Lazar, S., 'Automatic Authorities: Power and AI', in *Collaborative Intelligence: How Humans and AI are Transforming our World*, A. Sethumadhavan and M. Lane, Editors. 2024, MIT Press: Cambridge, MA. p. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.05990>.
  59. Lazar, S., 'Can we really trust AI to channel the public's voice for ministers?', in *The Guardian*. 2024.
  60. Lazar, S., 'Communicative Justice and the Distribution of Attention'. *Knight First Amendment Institute*, 2023: <http://knightcolumbia.tierradev.com/content/communicative-justice-and-the-distribution-of-attention>.
  61. Lazar, S., *Connected by Code: Algorithmic Intermediaries and Political Philosophy*. Forthcoming, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
  62. Lazar, S., 'Legitimacy, Authority, and Democratic Duties of Explanation'. *Oxford Studies in Political Philosophy*, 2024.
  63. Lazar, S., et al., 'The Moral Case for Using Language Model Agents for Recommendation'. *Unpublished MS.*, 2024.
  64. Lehdonvirta, V., *Cloud Empires: How Digital Platforms Are Overtaking the State and How We Can Regain Control*. 2022: MIT Press.
  65. Lijphart, A., *Democracy in Plural Societies: A Comparative Exploration*. 1977: Yale University Press.
  66. Lin, J., et al., 'How can recommender systems benefit from large language models: A survey'. *arXiv preprint*, 2023: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.05817>.
  67. Lin, T.-a., "'Democratizing AI" and the Concern of Algorithmic Injustice'. *Philosophy & Technology*, 2024. 37(3): 103.
  68. Liu, R., et al., 'Quantifying and alleviating political bias in language models'. *Artificial Intelligence*, 2022. 304: 103654.
  69. Lovett, A., *Democratic failures and the ethics of democracy*. Democracy, citizenship, and constitutionalism. 2024, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
  70. Lovett, A. and J. Zuehl, 'The Possibility of Democratic Autonomy'. *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, 2022. 50(4): 467-498.
  71. Macedo, S., *Liberal virtues: citizenship, virtue, and community in liberal constitutionalism*. 1990, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
  72. Malkin, C. and N. Alnemr, *Big Tech-driven deliberative projects*. 2024, Global Citizens' Assembly Network.
  73. Mendoza, G.B., 'Can we use AI to enrich democratic consultations?', in *Rappler*. 2023.
  74. Miller, N.R., 'Pluralism and social choice'. *American Political Science Review*, 1983. 77(3): 734-747.
  75. Ouyang, L., et al., 'Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback'. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022. 35: 27730-27744.
  76. Ovadya, A., 'Reimagining Democracy for AI'. *Journal of Democracy*, 2023. 34(4): 162-170.
  77. Paul, L.A., *Transformative experience*. 1st ed. 2014, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
  78. Pettit, P., *On the People's Terms: A Republican Theory and Model of Democracy*. 2012, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
  79. Quinn, D.P. and J.T. Woolley. 'An Alternative View : Democracy Reflects the Preferences of Voters for Both Stability And Growth'. 2001.
  80. Rawls, J., *Political Liberalism*. 1993, New York: Columbia University Press.
  81. Rousseau, J.-J., *Du contract social; ou principes du droit politique*. 1762, Amsterdam: Chez Marc Michel Rey.
  82. Scheppele, K.L., 'Autocratic Legalism'. *The University of Chicago Law Review*, 2018. 85(2): 545-584.
  83. Scheppele, K.L., 'How Viktor Orbán Wins'. *Journal of Democracy*, 2022. 33(3): 45-61.
  84. Schlosberg, D., S. Zavestoski, and S.W. Shulman, 'Democracy and e-rulemaking: Web-based technologies, participation, and the potential for deliberation'. *Journal of Information Technology & Politics*, 2008. 4(1): 37-55.
  85. Seger, E., et al. 'Democratizing AI: Multiple meanings, goals, and methods'. in *Proceedings of the 2023 AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society*. 2023.

86. Selbst, A.D. and S. Barocas, 'The intuitive appeal of explainable machines'. *Fordham Law Review*, 2018. **87**: 1085-1139.
87. Shah, R., et al., 'Scalable and Transferable Black-Box Jailbreaks for Language Models via Persona Modulation'. *arXiv preprint*, 2023: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.03348>.
88. Small, C.T., et al., 'Opportunities and Risks of LLMs for Scalable Deliberation with Polis'. *arXiv preprint*, 2023:
89. Susskind, J., *The Digital Republic: On freedom and democracy in the 21st century*. 2022: Bloomsbury Publishing.
90. Tsebelis, G., 'Veto players and law production in parliamentary democracies: An empirical analysis'. *American political science review*, 1999. **93**(3): 591-608.
91. Vats, A., et al., 'Exploring the Impact of Large Language Models on Recommender Systems: An Extensive Review'. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.18590*, 2024.
92. Viehoff, D., 'Democratic Equality and Political Authority'. *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, 2014. **42**(4): 337-375.
93. Vredenburg, K., 'The right to explanation'. *Journal of Political Philosophy*, 2022. **30**(2): 209-229.
94. Warren, M.E., 'A Problem-Based Approach to Democratic Theory'. *American Political Science Review*, 2017. **111**(1): 39-53.
95. Weyl, E.G., A. Tang, and Community,  數位 Plurality: The Future of Collaborative Technology and Democracy. 2024: Independently published.
96. Winthrop, D., 'Aristotle on participatory democracy'. *Polity*, 1978. **11**(2): 151-171.
97. Wu, F., E. Black, and V. Chandrasekaran, 'Generative Monoculture in Large Language Models'. *arXiv*, 2024.
98. Wu, Q., et al., 'Autogen: Enabling next-gen llm applications via multi-agent conversation framework'. *arXiv preprint*, 2023.
99. Young, I.M., *Inclusion and democracy*. 2000, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
100. Zaremba, W., et al., *Democratic inputs to AI*, in *OpenAI*. 2023.
101. Zhang, T., et al., 'Benchmarking Large Language Models for News Summarization'. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2024. **12**: 39-57.