ARTIFICIAL PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION – MYTH OR REALITY?

RICHARD POMAHAČ

Abstract: The computerization of public administration tasks is a reality. In contrast, the intelligence of public administration is shrouded in myths. For many decades, administrative science has contributed to the clarification of this distinction. Digital constitutionalism and technology-oriented administrative law doctrine have recently been added to this research. The basic regulations, proposed and adopted within individual states, in the European Union and in international organizations, whether it concerns the protection of personal data, cyber security, or artificial intelligence, do establish new tasks for public administration, but they affect methods rather than forms of administrative activity. Emerging technology raises concerns about the ability to understand artificial reasoning and its methods of classification, personalization, and prediction. It is questionable to assume that all actions can be quantified and thus everything becomes objective. Technology compounds the situation and has its own imperative.

Keywords: artificial public administration; digital constitutionalism; algorithmic processing; big data; surveillance; transparency; right to human decision

1. INTRODUCTION

The computerization of public administration tasks is not a myth. For example, it is known that in the United States, as early as 1890, census data was processed by machine (*Hollerith's Electric Tabulating System*). Half a century later, the first large vacuum-tube computers were used in the civil public sector, for example in complex meteorological calculations.[1] As pointed out by *The Encyclopedia of Digital Government*, the experiments with computers in the 1950s gave birth to the later transformation toward consumer centricity based upon service-delivery opportunities offered by emerging technologies to provide efficiency and effectiveness as well as fairness and equitability.[2]

---

[1] CHARNEY, J. G. – FJORTOFT, R. – VON NEUMANN, J. Numerical Integration of the Barotropic Vorticity Equation. *Tellus*. 1950, Vol. 2, No. 4, p. 237.
[2] ANTTIROIKO, A. V. – MALKIA, M. (eds.). *Encyclopedia of Digital Government*. London: Idea Group, 2007, pp. xxxvii (preface) and 1540.

In contrast, the intelligence of public administration is shrouded in myths. However, it is necessary to specify what is the real meaning of intelligence and myth. In this context, the aim of my contribution is to explore the phenomenon of artificial public administration.

S. Legg and M. Hutter have very convincingly demonstrated that there are several different meaningful definitions of intelligence based on philosophy, psychology, computer science, and interdisciplinary cognitive science. If researchers scan through the definitions pulling out commonly occurring features, they find that intelligence is related to the agent's ability to succeed or profit with respect to some goal or objective, and it depends on how able the agent is to adapt to different objectives and environments. According to S. Legg and M. Hutter, intelligence measures an agent's ability to achieve goals in a wide range of environments.[3]

Administrative science and to some extent also legal analysis are also very interested in the question of how public administration can realize its goals, what means are available to achieve these goals and what this causes in the social environment. There is a quality firmly built into the concept of intelligence. As aptly reminded by J. Korczak, in an increasingly "smarter world," where increasingly more areas of social life are encompassed by "smart solutions," public administration cannot remain on the outside or in opposition to this process. So, the application of the concept of smart organization should have appropriate reference to public administration, as other concepts, which arose based on ergological sciences.[4]

Public administration in the functional sense is soft technology not tied to physical arrangement and embodied process. It thus corresponds to the current trend of softening technologies and is well described by the definition developed by M. Coccia.[5] Technology is a complex system of artifact selected considering practical, technical, and economic characteristics to satisfy needs, achieve goals, and solve problems. Technology changes current modes of cognition and action to enable makers and/or users to take advantage of important opportunities or to cope with consequential environmental threats.

The intersection of public administration and information and communication technologies is a fertile field for myths. In a simplistic sense, a myth is understood as a fiction or illusion in clear contrast to what may really exist. In the administrative science, this meaning tends to be shifted. The myth represents exemplary role models and tells the story of the demise of the old regime and the arrival of a golden age. As Christensen, Lægreid and Røvik demonstrate, myths are institutionalized and widely spread norms and recipes about appropriate, legitimate organizing – such as what kinds of formal structures, technologies, processes, procedures, and ideologies a modern organization

---

3   LEGG, S. – HUTTER, M. A Collection of Definitions of Intelligence. In: *Proceedings of the 2007 conference on Advances in Artificial General Intelligence: Concepts, Architectures and Algorithms*. Amsterdam: IOS Press, 2007, pp. 17–24.
4   KORCZAK, J. Smart Administration – Really? Why Not? *Wroclaw Review of Law, Administration & Economics*. Vol. 9, No. 2, 2019, p. 4.
5   COCCIA, M. What is technology and technology change? A new conception with systemic-purposeful perspective for technology analysis. *Journal of Social and Administrative Sciences*. 2019, Vol. 6, No. 3, p. 154.

should contain. It is an idea which excites, grabs attention, and has achieved exemplary status.[6]

2. ARTIFICIAL ADMINISTRATION AND ADMINISTRATIVE SCIENCE

If we want to distinguish, from the point of view of administrative science, what is real and what is mythical in public administration dependent on information and communication technologies, it is necessary to clarify how natural and artificial administration differ.

This difference was classically defined by Woodrow Wilson when comparing the distinctive features of European-continental and North American styles of governance. It is better to be untrained and free than to be servile and systematic. Still, there is no denying that it would be better yet to be both free in spirit and proficient in practice. It is this even more reasonable preference which impels us to discover what may hinder or delay us in naturalizing this much-to-be-desired science of administration.[7]

Wilson emphasized that the object of administrative study is to rescue executive methods from the confusion and costliness of empirical experiments and set them upon foundations laid deep in stable principle. He wrote this at a time when administrators had no doubt that the results of the population census would be processed better and faster by machine than by the then usual manual method. It was assumed that the machines would make fewer mistakes and that the cost of the administrative routine would be reduced. The sociotechnical vision of the problem did not exceed the instrumental understanding of computerization. Wilson freed administrative science from unnaturalness by adapting it to the requirements of objectivity and rationality. However, in doing so, Wilson brushed aside the conflict between administrative power and American liberty, as we read in the critics of his approach.[8]

The recognition that administrative behavior deviates from the actions of purposeful and coordinated agents led to a reevaluation of the technological concept of public administration. The principle of bound rationality was developed by Herbert A. Simon as an alternative basis for mathematical modeling of decision-making. Administrative behavior is the conduct of actors who satisfy because they do not have the possibility to maximize.

According to Simon, public administration is one of those areas in which people cannot obtain or process all the information needed to make truly rational decisions. Therefore, they try instead to use the information to achieve somewhat satisfactory results. At the same time, Simon described administrators as people bound by their own cognitive limits, which from a social psychological point of view can indicate states of

---

[6] CHRISTENSEN, T. – LÆGREID, P. – RØVIK, K. A. *Organization Theory and the Public Sector: Instrument, Culture and Myth*. London: Routledge, 2020, pp. 65 ff.
[7] WILSON, W. The Study of Administration. *Political Science Quarterly*. 1887, Vol. 2, No. 2, p. 207.
[8] HAMBURGER, P. *Is Administrative Law Unlawful?* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2014, p. 459.

dissociation in which a person feels a sense of alienation in relation to themselves and the environment. The human factor is then burdened by reduced commitment, performance, and satisfaction. A depersonalized manager perceives themselves only as an external observer of life, and a depersonalized client perceives public administration only as a reflection on a mobile phone screen. To overcome bounded rationality, Simon suggested that organizations introduce procedural rationality, for example by ensuring that formal processes are followed for gathering, analyzing, and using relevant information and that due care is given before reaching a decision. Simon also distinguishes between empirical phenomena that are artificial and those that are natural. Artificial here refers to systems that acquire their form and behavior by adapting to their external environment. The interface between the external and internal environment characterizes the artificial system. The internal environment becomes important for behavior when the system reaches its limits of rationality and adaptability. The necessity that rises above the contingencies stems from the inabilities of the behavioral system to adapt perfectly to its environment from the limits of rationality. In a nutshell, the artificial world is centered precisely on interface between the inner and outer environments.[9]

Artificial administration should not be confused with technology. Public administration as a human creation is an artificial phenomenon regardless of the sophistication of the instruments it uses. Some predictions of future development sound almost uncompromising. This is how Cary Coglianese predicts that governmental use of automation in the USA driven by artificial intelligence tools will surely spread still further. It is likely to lead to the transformation of or phasing out of many jobs currently performed by government employees. The future state that administrative law will govern will be one of increasingly automated administration.[10] European comparative projects are guided by a similar idea.[11]

It can be argued that the need to identify interfaces between administrative practice and the emerging digital world is an intellectual challenge akin to that faced by experts confronted with the changing welfare state, privatization, and other such paradigm shifts. Administrative lawyers must be part of the discourse on artificial administration. But to be a part of the conversation, it will be necessary to learn the language of technologists and learn about how technology is implemented and how it operates at the front lines of public administration.[12] The question is whether administrative lawyers retrained as legal technologists can agree on the reality of artificial administration. If

9   SIMON, H. A. *The Sciences of the Artificial*. 3rd ed. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1996, pp. xii (preface) and 113.
10 COGLIANESE, C. Administrative Law in the Automated State. *Dædalus. Journal of the American Academy of Arts & Sciences*. 2021, Vol. 150, No. 3, pp. 107–108.
11 WOLSWINKEL, J. *Comparative study on administrative law and the use of AI and other algorithmic systems in Administrative Decision-Making in the member States of the Council of Europe*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing, 2022; *Model Rules on Impact Assessment of Algorithmic Decision-Making Systems Used by Public Administration*: *report of the European Law Institute* [online]. The European Law Institute, 2022 [cit. 2023-11-11]. Available at: https://www.europeanlawinstitute.eu/fileadmin/user_upload/p_eli/Publications/ELI_Model_Rules_on_Impact_Assessment_of_ADMSs_Used_by_Public_Administration.pdf.
12 HARLOW, C. (ed.). *A Research Agenda for Administrative Law*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 2023, pp. 255–256.

we know that public administration is itself an artificial and technological entity, what enables a digital or virtual transformation in the way government works?

Paul Daly pleads this definition: artificial administration is the sociotechnical ensemble of software and hardware that combines technology and process to mine a large volume of digital data to find patterns and correlations within that data, distilling the data into predictive analytics, and applying the analytics to new data.[13] Such a demarcation strongly evokes the replacement or displacement of human decision-makers by automated procedures. Daly immediately reminds that algorithms, neural nets, and predictive analytics certainly have substantial potential to improve the scale and efficiency of government in the provision of public goods and services, but clarity is needed about where and how they can properly be used. At stake is the clash of value systems that awaits us between technologists who insist on the power of correlation and lawyers who refuse to bow to the ancient principle of causation.

Defining artificial administration as an ensemble of technology and process means that we are guessing how artificial intelligence will develop, which is rather immodest. The notion that technology comprises more than artifacts has been widely accepted for more than half a century.[14] Just the new context of artificial intelligence is forcing us to consider the correlation of a computational artefact together with the human behavior and sociotechnical ensembles as combinations of artefacts, human behavior, social arrangements, and meaning.

It cannot be overlooked that Dale's definition of artificial administration targets Big Data. It is possible to agree with Cohen's reasoning that since the nineteenth century, new communications and media technologies have been portrayed as forerunners of utopia. Earlier thinkers expected electric communication technologies to annihilate space and time; today, we call upon networked digital technologies to finish that task, accomplishing what mere electricity could not.[15]

In order to deal with the futurology of public administration, it is necessary to look back. The reference points in the last century are the 1960s and 1990s. In the 1960s we see the peak of the wave that started two decades earlier with the construction of the electronic digital computer and the discovery of the principle of bounded rationality of public administration. It was also then that the field called jurimetrics began to develop. Jurimetrics is the application of quantitative methods, and often especially probability and statistics, to law. Many years ago, the development in this field was well predicted by Oliver Holmes in famous words: *"For the rational study of the law the blackletter man may be the man of the present, but the man of the future is the man of statistics and the master of economics."*[16]

[13] DALY, P. *Artificial Administration: Administrative Law in the Age of Machines* [online]. Ottawa Faculty of Law Working Paper No. 2020-03. Ottawa: University of Ottawa, Faculty of Law, 2019, p. 1 [cit. 2023-11-11]. Available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=3493381.
[14] WOODWARD, J. (ed.). *Industrial organisations: behaviour and control*. London: Oxford University Press, 1970.
[15] COHEN, J. E. *Configuring the Networked Self: Law, Code, and the Play of Everyday Practice*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012, p. 31.
[16] HOLMES, O. W. The Path of the Law. *Harvard Law Review*. 1897, Vol. 10, No. 8, p. 469.

The work of Niklas Luhmann cannot be neglected in this context. His work on automation in public administration was preceded by reflections on how administrative lawyers can be taken out of their usual composure and how computers can cause them many unexpected problems.[17] In short, automation is an important subprogram of administrative simplification. At the same time, it frees us from the illusion that administration would become easier through simplification. Luhmann somewhat provocatively wrote in 1966 that it is not advisable to confuse this process in public administration with the introduction of new office machines, better computing devices and the like, although it is not clear whether the difficulty of finding programmers is really a long-term problem. It could be that programmers will be out of work tomorrow, mourning their heyday like California gold miners, because machines will be able to program themselves. This is the uncertainty that comes with the volatility of things and the rapid pace of development.[18]

The 1960s are marked by second order cybernetics which is the recursive application of cybernetics to itself and the reflexive practice of cybernetics according to such a critique. Political and administrative cybernetics was characterized by the view that society as a whole system had become functionally differentiated. The contrast between machines and organisms was largely pushed into the background and attempts were made to make the conceptual world of machine theory or organism theory useful, and not just metaphorically, for the understanding of interpersonal forms of organization.

Next comes the period of 1970–1990. It was clear that theoretical studies had led to experimental applications of limited scope, difficult to scale in real scenarios due to the cost and complexity of representing and maintaining the necessary amount of information. Furthermore, it was clear that not all information can be represented in symbolic form. The attempts to manage sub-symbolic information, as in the case of the first connectionist models, clashed with the limits of such computational structures.

Researchers had begun to realize that achieving artificial intelligence was going to be much harder than was supposed. However, this period also saw successes in experimentation with expert systems. Relevant number of works have been carried out concerning legal reasoning based on open-textured concepts, preferences over rules in non-monotonic reasoning, and models for adversarial legal reasoning. It is also significant that at the beginning of this period Spiros Simitis authored the *Data Protection Act for the State of Hessen* which came into force on 13 October 1970 and is widely seen as the world's first statute on data protection. It was an essential reaction to the constant refinement and evolution of emerging technology.

The 1990s are mainly marked by the mastery of the phenomenon of Big Data and Big Brother. Big data usually includes data sets with sizes beyond the ability of commonly used software tools to capture, curate, manage, and process data within a tolerable elapsed time. Big Brother is a fictional character and symbol in George

---

[17] LUHMANN, N. *Recht und Automation in der öffentlichen Verwaltung*. Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1966, pp. 10–11.
[18] LUHMANN, N. Automation in der öffentlichen Verwaltung. In: LUKAS, E. – TACKE, V. (eds.). *Schriften zur Organisation*. Bd. 4. Wiesbaden: Springer VS, 2020, pp. 3–4.

Orwell's dystopian novel *Nineteen Eighty-Four* as well as the book of John Lennox *2084: Artificial Intelligence and the Future of Humanity*.

Van Dijck aptly wrote that the industry-driven datafication view resonates not only in entrepreneurs' auspicious gold rush metaphors, but also in researchers' claims hailing Big Data as the holy grail of behavioral knowledge.[19] And we can add with Karen Yeung that a so-called Big Data revolution is currently underway, which many claim will prove as disruptive to society in the 21st century as Henry Ford's system of mass production in the late 19th century.[20]

Surveillance technology is improving so much that it is becoming a common tool of public administration in certain situations. As far as surveillance is concerned, not individual decision-making, the current legislation opens the door to the data revolution wide open. A suitable example can be the provision of Article 10 of French *Law No. 380 of 19 May 2023, relating to the 2024 Olympic and Paralympic Games*: *on an experimental basis and until 31 March 2025*, for the sole purpose of ensuring the security of sporting, recreational or cultural events, images collected by means of video protection systems, or by means of cameras installed on aircraft may be subject to algorithmic processing. *Conseil constitutionnel* did not find this provision unconstitutional in principle, because the legislature has ensured that the development, implementation, and possible developments of algorithmic processing remain permanently under the control and mastery of human persons.[21]

A. Stepanov adds to this that mastery is imposed not only in terms of control but also as an obligation to understand the functioning of surveillance. The planned machine learning system won't make any individual legal decision, nor will it support or serve as evidence for future decisions. These limitations of the algorithm's contribution allowed the lawmaker to significantly limit the right to an explanation, making it nearly non-existent. The only guarantee provided by the law is that the public should be informed in advance of the use of such algorithmic processing unless circumstances dictate otherwise.[22]

3. DIGITAL CONSTITUTIONALISM AND ADMINISTRATIVE LAW

The idea of good governance in the era of global society, borderless communication networks, and artificial intelligence is linked to the need to revise and supplement our idea of legal protection of freedom of expression and privacy. However, digital constitutionalism is not only understood in the sense of reinterpreting some basic rights and freedoms. It also responds to the three carrier waves in which the foundations

---

[19] VAN DIJCK, J. Datafication, dataism and dataveillance: Big Data between scientific paradigm and ideology. *Surveillance & Society*. 2014, Vol. 12, No. 2, p. 199.

[20] YEUNG, K. Algorithmic regulation: a critical interrogation. *Regulation & Governance*. Vol. 12, No. 4, 2018, p. 505.

[21] Décision No. 2023-850 DC du 17 mai 2023.

[22] STEPANOV, A. Easy to learn, hard to master: the challenge of intelligible AI in French administration. In: *The Digital Constitutionalist* [online]. [cit. 2023-11-11]. Available at: https://digi-con.org/easy-to-learn-hard-to-master-the-challenge-of-intelligible-ai-in-french-administration.

of the current regulation of information and communication technologies were created. It was, firstly, an adjustment to the protection of privacy and personal data, secondly, the creation of cyber security and digital resilience, and thirdly, the regulation of artificial intelligence.

Ripples reacting to various aspects of the phenomenon that we still, perhaps out of inertia, call cyberspace are separated from these waves. However, it is not just about demanding activities that would be impossible without digital interaction. Even in normal practice, we thus find ourselves in the space of augmented reality connecting the physical world with the world of its digital twin. The relevant information is located somewhere, but it is also virtually present at any accessible point on the network. Therefore, we can also define virtuality as a property of phenomena that appear as if they were real.

This topic is sometimes written about rather enthusiastically. E. Celeste claims that digital constitutionalism represents the conceptual lymph of the current constitutional moment. Analogue norms are no longer able to address the full range of complexities of the virtual environment. A series of normative counteractions are emerging to implement the principles of a constitutionalism rethought for the digital age.[23]

Digital constitutionalism can help the development of digital administrative studies in a similar way as administrative law was constitutionalized in the past. Considerations about the concept of digital law go far beyond the scope of public administration. The basic regulations, proposed and adopted within individual states, in the European Union and in international organizations, whether it concerns the protection of personal data, cyber security, or artificial intelligence, do establish new tasks for public administration, but they affect methods rather than forms of administrative activity. As Giovanni De Gregorio rightly reminds, the rise of European digital constitutionalism can be described as a long process if it is compared with the rampant evolution of the digital environment in the last twenty years. The turn has not been immediate but has gradually followed a path towards the integration of economics with constitutional values, while digital technologies provided opportunities to offer cross-border services and exercise individual freedoms.[24]

The norms formed outside of statutory law, in jurisprudence and established administrative practice are also important for public administration, whether it is the sense of openness and transparency of administrative activities, the purpose of processing large volumes of data, or depersonalization in the form of contacts with administrative robots. Virtuality is inherently linked to the expansion of information and communication technologies. If we also understand public administration as a technology of governance in cyberspace, we can choose between an optimistic and a pessimistic vision. Advanced information and communication technologies can either help or harm. The reality mediated by smart machines is an image of artificial administration, which can lead to de-bureaucratization and a reduction in the complexity of public administration.

---

[23] CELESTE, E. *Digital Constitutionalism: the Role of Internet Bills of Right*. London: Routledge, 2023, p. 84.

[24] DE GREGORIO, G. *Digital Constitutionalism in Europe: reframing Rights and Powers in the Algorithmic Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2022, p. 38.

However, new technologies can also have an oppressive potential and lead to public administration becoming an intolerable control monster.

The use of artificial intelligence resources, which is gaining intensity after 2010, leads to the question of whether the standards of technologists will not surpass the standards of lawyers and whether the current legal principles in public administration can be sufficient. If we apply the principle of legality to computer discretion, does this mean that a black box of algorithms must be opened? And if we want to facilitate communication with the authorities and if we request that the authorities use the available data, are we not at the same time creating space for the authorities to know about us even what is not relevant for official activity? Do we know enough about how interoperability works and how smart data networks are being improved to assess the proportionality of administrative decisions?

Virtuality is gaining momentum as cyberspace has become a social arena that includes all public administration actors who use advanced information technologies to interact. In cyberspace, public administration communicates, makes decisions and controls as in real life. Decisions that have a significant impact on the individual or the community should be acceptable and satisfactory even regarding the required level of autonomy of the artificial interaction. If social relations are mediated by technologies based on algorithmization and artificial intelligence, not only trustworthiness is at stake, but also flexibility allowing to adapt to different situations.

The principle of virtuality in public administration is associated with the fears of losing control over key decisions. This point of view is expressed by the discussion of the right to human decision, or on the right to well-calibrated automatic decision-making. Complex technology raises concerns about the ability to understand artificial reasoning and its methods of classification, personalization, and prediction. Therefore, there is talk of the problem of the readability of artificial decision-making and the expanded scope of regulation of artificial intelligence. Legislation is guided by this intention, both in terms of the right to digital services and in relation to algorithmic rights and information security.

At the turn of the millennium, the American administrator and former adviser to the Reagan government, James Colvard, published a reflection on the fact that the main manifestations of the depersonalization and non-regulatory trend of public administration are not primarily connected with information and communication technologies, but with managerial innovations, depersonalizing the processes of governance within the bureaucracy. Colvard compared the situation in the administration to what happens in sports clubs. In the past, local sports teams would develop young players through their farm systems, and fans would become familiar with them as their careers developed. The fans would agonize over their failures and delight in their achievements. Now with free agency, players simply market themselves as a capability. Fans literally need a reference guide to know the players.[25] Public administration is also threatened with similar alienation, and one can only believe that digital constitutionalism and administrative

25 COLVARD, J. Restore the Human Touch. In: *Government Executive* [online]. January 2000 [cit. 2023-11-11]. Available at: https://www.govexec.com/magazine/2000/01/restore-the-human-touch/5898.

law can prevent this. It is questionable to assume that all actions can be quantified and thus everything becomes objective. Technology compounds the situation and has its own imperative.

4. CONCLUSION

Public administration is experiencing a turning point. Twenty years ago, there was mostly optimistic cheer about the fact that the administrative state did not fall asleep due to emerging technological and political challenges (e-government, e-democracy). Currently, caution prevails. As C. Kamper recalls, media and academia are torn between marveling at the increasing capabilities of Machine Learning algorithms and succumbing to the anxiety of their opacity and unmanageable complexity. Citizens might perceive the authority's decision as even more opaque and imponderable than the decisions of a human, despite the inscrutability of human decision-making. They will experience algorithmic decision-making to be Kafkaesque.[26]

The aim of this paper was to clarify the context of artificial public administration and to raise questions that administrative science must deal with intensively. Briefly, the opinions presented can be summarized as follows.

Human-level machine intelligence is not a myth, but its inevitability is a myth. Today's public administration can function as a virtual organization that uses digital technology and artificial intelligence to achieve its goals and tasks more than physical presence and face-to-face contact.

In cyberspace, large volumes of data can be processed, decisions can be made automatically, and intelligent behavior can be imitated. However, it is not just about demanding activities that would be impossible without digital interaction. We can hardly imagine that in routine agendas, offices could function without computers. Even in normal practice, we thus find ourselves in the space of augmented reality connecting the physical world with the world of its digital twin. The relevant information is located somewhere, but it is also virtually present at any accessible point on the network. Therefore, we can also define virtuality as a property of phenomena that appear as if they were real.

If we want things to stay the way they are, things will have to change. A witticism like this lends itself well to the administrative science. Scott, Donadelli a Merton hit the nail on the head: we may be entering a period of New Public Complexity, where administrative doctrines are blended and layered.[27] We want public administration to be both transparent and reliable, friendly and decisive, efficient and economical, legal and fair, and artificial and natural. Information and communication technologies can correspond

[26] KEMPER, C. Kafkaesque AI? Legal Decision-Making in the Era of Machine Learning. *University of San Francisco Intellectual Property and Technology Law Journal*. 2020, Vol. 24, No. 2, pp. 292–293.
[27] SCOTT, R. J. – DONADELLI, F. – MERTON, E. R. K. Administrative philosophies in the discourse and decisions of the New Zealand public service: is post-New Public Management still a myth? *International Review of Administrative Sciences*. 2022, Vol. 89, No. 4, pp. 941–957.

to all these values, but probably not consistently. Theoretical reflection is therefore not coherent and administrative doctrines can only be identified retrospectively.

All that remains to conclude is to recall what computer science professor P. M. Domingos wrote in 2015: *"People worry that computers will get too smart and take over the world, but the real problem is that they're too stupid and they've already taken over the world."*[28] And it is fitting to add, as S. Chesterman does: *"Much of the literature on AI and the law focuses on a horizon that is either so distant that it blurs the line with science fiction or so near that it plays catch-up with the technologies of today."*[29]

prof. JUDr. Richard Pomahač, CSc.
Charles University, Faculty of Law
pomahac@prf.cuni.cz
ORCID: 0000-0003-1005-7134

[28] DOMINGOS, P. *The Master Algorithm: How the Quest for the Ultimate Learning Machine Will Remake Our World*. New York: Basic Books, 2015, p. 286.
[29] CHESTERMAN, S. *We, the robots? Regulating Artificial Intelligence and the Limits of the Law*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021, p. 11.