

# Accelerate InSite Founders Propose a Constitution for AI

*For humans to receive optimal benefits from the creation of AI applications, there must be definitions of how both can relate to each other.*



NASHVILLE, TN, UNITED STATES, June 16, 2020 /EINPresswire.com/ -- In the

US and around the world, questions of human rights in the face of the government's power to police its citizens are drawing millions of people into the streets to protest abuse. Similarly, many people question the ability of Artificial Intelligence to control human behavior and decision making. As a result, it is proper to review the needs and values of humans in relation to Artificial Intelligence.

“

Humans behaving without limits is anarchy. AI behaving without limits is autocracy. And neither serves the other very well.”

*Larry Bridgesmith*

Accelerated InSite principals, Dr. Adel Elmissary and Larry Bridgeemith have collaborated and called for the creation of a constitution of rights and remedies as AI continues to grow in power and influence. Clearly, roles and responsibilities must be established for AI to achieve its potential. For humans to receive optimal benefits from the creation of AI applications, there must be definitions of

how both can relate to each other. Humans behaving without limits is anarchy. AI behaving without limits is autocracy. And neither serves the other very well.

Interpersonal relationships thrive by balancing the concepts of identity, ownership, liability, and applicable rules. Like humans, technologists define the work of AI in terms of both behaviors and thought. And just like humans, AI functions in these two realms at less than an ideal level as well as at a minimally satisfactory level. Both humans and AI relate to others at the acceptable nexus of ideal and satisfactory. Bridgesmith and Elmessiry proposed a test for developing an AI constitution.

Just like the US Constitution defines the ideal relationship between citizens and government, an AI Constitution must provide guidelines for human and AI relationships. As a result, Dr Adel and Larry propose a conceptual model to work from. The US Constitution does not prescribe human to human interactions. Instead, it provides an enforceable framework for regulating those

interactions. Likewise, an AI Constitution would not control human to human interactions. But it would define the limits of human to AI, AI to human and AI to AI relationships.

Numerous examples of human and non-human interactions provide ample grounds to extrapolate to human and AI relationships. For example, criminal and civil liability are imposed on corporations for violating laws and regulations. Likewise, immunity limits exist for military and police behavior exceeding lawful human encounters. Governments (federal and state) and their officers are not "above the law."

"Autonomous AI" now approaches reality. An AI Constitution ensures that beneficial outcomes can be expected as it develops. As a result, AI and the humans who are affected by it will be better served. This is only a start so we ask interested parties to join us as we explore the legitimate limits of AI and human interaction.

Jay Deragon  
Accelerate InSite  
+ +1 6153068606

[email us here](#)

Visit us on social media:

[LinkedIn](#)

---

This press release can be viewed online at: <https://www.einpresswire.com/article/519465816>

EIN Presswire's priority is source transparency. We do not allow opaque clients, and our editors try to be careful about weeding out false and misleading content. As a user, if you see something we have missed, please do bring it to our attention. Your help is welcome. EIN Presswire, Everyone's Internet News Presswire™, tries to define some of the boundaries that are reasonable in today's world. Please see our Editorial Guidelines for more information.

© 1995-2020 IPD Group, Inc. All Right Reserved.