Great Britain Journals Press

London Journal of Humanities and Social Science
General Section

RESEARCH FINGERPRINT

IDENTIFIER
LJRHSS-226163

PEER REVIEW
Double Blind

SIMILARITY CHECK
Perplexity AI and iThenticate

ACCESS
Open Access

LANGUAGE
English

PRINT ISSN
2515-5784

ONLINE ISSN
2515-5792

EDITION

ABBREVIATION
LJRHSS

VOLUME
26

ISSUE
5

YEAR
2026

KEY DATES

RECEIVED
2026-03-01

CATALOGING

LCC CLASS
K487.C65, K237, JC423

JEL CLASS
K10, O38

ACM CLASS
K.4.1, K.3.2

Article Record

A New Approach to Lawmaking and Legal Education in the AI Era: Rome's Legacy, Nobel Ideas, and the Digital State of the Future

CORRESPONDENCE

AUTHORS & AFFILIATIONS

Oleg Pavlov ¶*

¶ Taganrog Institute of Management and Economics, Russian

ABSTRACT

The article proposes an interdisciplinary model of lawmaking and legal education for the state of the future, based on a synthesis of classical philosophical-legal heritage and modern data-driven approaches. As a normative foundation, it considers the ideas of the Roman legal tradition and Stoicism (Cicero, Seneca, Marcus Aurelius), emphasizing the priority of the common good, the rule of law, and the moral legitimacy of norms. Using the historical material of Rome's transition from Republic to Empire, it substantiates the need for an experimental, step-by-step design of reforms through "clusters of advanced legal development" and legal sandboxes. A central place is occupied by the "quantitative turn" in jurisprudence: the use of big data, modeling, and AI agents for evidence-based legislation, forecasting the effects of norms, and optimizing the goals of public policy (prosperity, security, subjective well-being). The economic block relies on the ideas of Nobel Prize laureates: the institutional theory of inclusive institutions (Acemoglu, Robinson), behavioral economics and "nudges" (Thaler), experimental methods of impact evaluation (Banerjee, Duflo, Kremer; Angrist, Imbens), studies of financial stability (Bernanke, Diamond, Dybvig), and long-term risks of sustainable development (Nordhaus). The political-philosophical framework links meritocracy with liberal constraints on power and digital rights, proposing the principles of "human-in-the-loop," algorithmic explainability, and legal accountability of automated decisions. Using examples from the United Kingdom, Singapore, the UAE, Hong Kong, and Taiwan, the article demonstrates the practical feasibility of a symbiotic state in which technologies

Index Terms: lawmaking of the future • quantitative jurisprudence • evidence-based legislation • artificial intelligence in law • legal big data • symbiotic state • meritocracy • inclusive institutions • behavioral regulation (nudge) • regulatory sandboxes

FUNDING
No external funding was declared for this work.

CONFLICTS
The authors declare no conflict of interest.

AI USAGE
No generative AI was used for analysis or results.

HOW TO CITE
Pavlov (2026). A New Approach to Lawmaking and Legal Education in the AI Era: Rome's Legacy, Nobel Ideas, and the Digital State of the Future. London Journal of Humanities and Social Science, 26(5), 1-15.

ACCESS ONLINE

RESEARCH ARTICLE

A New Approach to Lawmaking and Legal Education in the AI Era: Rome's Legacy, Nobel Ideas, and the Digital State of the Future

Oleg Pavlov[¶*]

¶ Taganrog Institute of Management and Economics, Russian

Abstract

The article proposes an interdisciplinary model of lawmaking and legal education for the state of the future, based on a synthesis of classical philosophical-legal heritage and modern data-driven approaches. As a normative foundation, it considers the ideas of the Roman legal tradition and Stoicism (Cicero, Seneca, Marcus Aurelius), emphasizing the priority of the common good, the rule of law, and the moral legitimacy of norms. Using the historical material of Rome's transition from Republic to Empire, it substantiates the need for an experimental, step-by-step design of reforms through "clusters of advanced legal development" and legal sandboxes. A central place is occupied by the "quantitative turn" in jurisprudence: the use of big data, modeling, and AI agents for evidence-based legislation, forecasting the effects of norms, and optimizing the goals of public policy (prosperity, security, subjective well-being). The economic block relies on the ideas of Nobel Prize laureates: the institutional theory of inclusive institutions (Acemoglu, Robinson), behavioral economics and "nudges" (Thaler), experimental methods of impact evaluation (Banerjee, Duflo, Kremer; Angrist, Imbens), studies of financial stability (Bernanke, Diamond, Dybvig), and long-term risks of sustainable development (Nordhaus). The political-philosophical framework links meritocracy with liberal constraints on power and digital rights, proposing the principles of "human-in-the-loop," algorithmic explainability, and legal accountability of automated decisions. Using examples from the United Kingdom, Singapore, the UAE, Hong Kong, and Taiwan, the article demonstrates the practical feasibility of a symbiotic state in which technologies enhance freedoms and efficiency, while law preserves the human being as the highest value.

Keywords: *lawmaking of the future, quantitative jurisprudence, evidence-based legislation, artificial intelligence in law, legal big data, symbiotic state, meritocracy, inclusive institutions, behavioral regulation (nudge), regulatory sandboxes, regulatory impact assessment (ex ante/ex post), digital rights, human-in-the-loop, blockchain and smart contracts, digital legal education, happiness and well-being index*

Correspondence: Oleg Pavlov

1 Introduction

Modern legal scholarship and the practice of public administration are undergoing a stage of dynamic change under the influence of technology. Artificial intelligence (AI), big data, and digital platforms are transforming the ways laws are created and law is taught. Lawmaking is ceasing to be the exclusive prerogative of a narrow circle of persons and is becoming an interdisciplinary science, relying simultaneously on timeless philosophical and legal principles and the latest achievements of economics, sociology, and computer science. The key challenge is to combine the classical legacy (for example, the Stoic wisdom of Cicero and Seneca) with the ideas of Nobel Prize laureates of recent years and the potential of AI agents in order to build a meritocratic, entrepreneurially oriented state of the future. The goal of such a state is to maximize prosperity, the level of awareness, and the happiness of citizens, achieving high indicators in development rankings. This article proposes a new approach to lawmaking and legal education based on the principles of symbiosis between humans and AI, drawing on historical lessons, modern scientific theories, and examples of successful jurisdictions (the United Kingdom, Singapore, the UAE, Hong Kong, Taiwan). First, we will consider jurisprudence—the philosophical and historical foundations of law (including the reception of Roman law and the ideas of Stoicism) as a basis for the legal design of the future. Next, we will analyze economic insights—from behavioral economics to institutional theory—which, having been recognized by Nobel Prizes, can form the basis of "formulas" for a successful state. Then we will turn to issues of political philosophy (meritocracy, liberal values, the views of Kant, and even the provocations of Nietzsche) and their role in rethinking public administration. Finally, we will discuss digital governance: how AI and related technologies (big data, blockchain, algorithmic systems) can increase the efficiency of lawmaking and democratize legal education. The text provides cases and examples from the experience of the mentioned countries, and also proposes tables and diagrams illustrating the key ideas.

2 The Legacy of Roman Law and Stoic Philosophy

The ancient Roman legal tradition laid a strong foundation for the principle of the rule of law and civic responsibility. Thinkers of the Roman era—such as Marcus Tullius Cicero, Seneca, and the philosopher-emperor Marcus Aurelius—in their works viewed law as a derivative of

reason and nature. Cicero, in the dialogue *On the Laws*, defined true law as "right reason, in agreement with nature, universal, unchangeable, and eternal," which guides us toward duty and turns us away from wrongdoing. In Cicero's view, the purpose of legal norms is to ensure morality and the happiness of the people; the first lawmakers convinced citizens that they adopted laws solely for the sake of common virtue and well-being. Unjust and vicious decrees are "anything but laws" from the standpoint of true law. Thus, according to classical Roman thought, *salus populi suprema lex*—the highest law is the welfare of the people. This principle remains relevant: in the state of the future, the success of law will be measured by the extent to which it contributes to the real well-being of citizens. Stoic philosophy emphasized the unity of the moral law with the cosmic order. Marcus Aurelius, in his *Meditations*, insisted that justice and the good of society are the primary guidelines for the ruler; what is useful for the hive is useful for the bee. Similarly, Seneca, in the treatise *On Mercy*, drew attention to the duty of the strong (the emperor) to show humanity and indulgence toward human beings, making justice an instrument not of revenge, but of the common good. These Stoic ideas of virtue, duty, and subordinating private interest to the public good resonate with modern conceptions of state ethics. The reception of Roman law (especially in Europe) demonstrated the viability of these principles. Medieval and early modern jurists revived the corpus of Roman law (*Corpus Juris Civilis*), laying the foundation for continental civil codes. Roman maxims—for example, "*Fiat justitia, et pereat mundus*" (let justice be done, though the world perish)—reflect the idea of the priority of justice. Of course, blind adherence to the letter of the law without regard to its spirit was criticized even in antiquity. Thus, the historian Cornelius Tacitus noted: "the more corrupt the state, the more laws it has." The paradox from his *Annals* (Ann. 3.27) warns that excessive complication of legislation is a sign of hidden disorder and a decline of morals. Indeed, an excess of convoluted norms often serves not the welfare of citizens, but the masking of arbitrariness by the authorities. Hence the lesson: it is necessary to strive not for the quantity of laws, but for their quality and justice, otherwise the legal system loses legitimacy. **Conclusion 1.1:** The historical and philosophical legacy teaches us to view law as an instrument for ensuring the common good, justice, and order. The principles of Roman jurists and Stoics—the rule of law, the correspondence of laws to moral natural law, and the priority of public welfare—should become the ideological foundation for modern reformers of law. Relying on these principles, it is possible to create new legal norms without losing connection with fundamental values.

3 From Republic to Empire: Historical Lessons of Lawmaking

The dynamics of the development of the Roman state—from Republic to Empire—provide valuable material for analyzing the adaptability of legal institutions. In the late Roman Republic, the Gracchi brothers (Tiberius and Gaius) attempted to carry out social reforms (land distribution, expansion of the rights of ordinary citizens) through legislation. Their tragic fate (both were killed for attempting change) demonstrates how acute the issue of updating laws to meet the needs of the time was. Nevertheless, the ideas of the Gracchi anticipated subsequent reforms (for example, the policies of Julius Caesar and Augustus on distributing land to veterans, legislation on pre-trial procedures, etc.). History teaches that law is not static; it must respond to the challenges of socio-economic change, otherwise a crisis grows. The period of the Principate (Octavian Augustus and his successors) was characterized by the centralization of lawmaking—through the issuance of edicts and governmental decrees alongside laws. Roman law demonstrated flexibility: senatus consulta and imperial constitutions supplemented or replaced outdated republican laws. Within the Empire, "legal regimes of accelerated development" also emerged—somewhat prototypes of modern special economic zones. For example, colonial cities could receive a special legal status (Latin rights, immunities from certain taxes), which stimulated their growth. This ancient experience has parallels today, when states create free economic zones or pilot territories with eased business regulation (such as Hong Kong or the special economic zones of the UAE) to test liberal measures. The idea of "testing a hypothesis in a limited territory" was in fact applied already by the Romans, although in other forms. Another lesson of Roman history is the importance of legal continuity when the political regime changes. When the Republic was replaced by monarchy, jurists (for example, Papinian and Ulpian in the 2nd–3rd centuries) continued to develop jurisprudence on the basis of previously accuminated principles, adapting them to new realities. Precedent and codification (from the Law of the Twelve Tables to the Code of Justinian) ensured the stability of law. A modern reformer of the legal system must take both aspects into account: the continuity of fundamental principles and the flexibility of application. Analyzing transitional eras (whether Ancient Rome or, for example, the transformation of the British legal system during the Industrial Revolution), we see that success comes from a combination of respect for legal tradition and readiness for innovation. **Conclusion 1.2:** The history of the state and law shows the need for an experimental and step-by-step approach to reforms. The creation of "clusters of advanced legal development"—territories or spheres where innovations are introduced (tax holidays, deregulation of entrepreneurship, digital regulatory sandboxes)—makes it possible to test the effects of laws before scaling them to the whole country. This reduces risks and provides empirical data for evaluating innovations. This approach—from pilot to codification—corresponds both to the spirit of Roman pragmatism and to modern requirements of evidence in policymaking.

4 Law as Science and Art: From Physics to "Quantum" Jurisprudence

Law has traditionally been classified as a humanities-based sphere, yet in the twenty-first century it is increasingly becoming an interdisciplinary science using quantitative methods. The idea arises of building a kind of "physics of lawmaking." If physics operates with the laws of nature, then lawmaking seeks to identify the laws of social development, formalize them, and on this basis derive optimal norms. The exponential growth of AI computing power makes it possible to process gigantic arrays of legal and socio-economic information (so-called Law Big Data). This opens the way to modeling law as a complex adaptive system. Let us imagine that the goals of the state—high prosperity, security, and citizens' life satisfaction—are variables that can be quantitatively assessed (through indicators such as GDP per capita, the happiness index, the Human Development Index, etc.). A non-trivial question arises: is it possible to "reverse-calculate" law—that is, to select such a set of legal institutions and norms that maximizes target indicators? In other words, to solve a kind of optimization problem: given a goal (maximum public welfare), to find the optimal parameters of the legal system. Methodologically, this resembles the approach in engineering and computer science—using optimization algorithms and machine learning. Modern large language models of AI are already capable of generating coherent texts of laws based on the analysis of millions of documents. Moreover, AI is already beginning to participate in lawmaking in practice. In 2023, a municipality in Brazil adopted the world's first law whose text was written by a neural network. In the United States, a number of lawmakers are experimenting with generative AI to prepare draft bills and analytical reviews. These examples are only the first steps. In the future, AI agents will be able to model the consequences of

introducing one norm or another by analyzing statistical correlations and cause-and-effect relationships on big data. For example, it will be possible to predict how the repeal of a certain tax will affect economic activity in a special zone, or how changing a licensing procedure will affect the number of new startups. It is important to note that turning lawmaking into a "technological discipline" does not eliminate value-based questions. Algorithms can find correlations (for example, that a reduction in regulations by X% is associated with an increase in GDP by Y%), but the decision about which goals to prioritize remains with the human being. Here the Kantian tradion is useful: law must not violate the categorical imperative of morality and must respect human dignity and freedom. Immanuel Kant introduced the concept of the *Rechtsstaat*—a state governed by law, where power is limited by law protecting citizens from arbitrariness. He believed that a stable legal order is a condition for long-term peace, happiness, and prosperity of the people. This postulate must also be embedded in algorithmic models: the optimization of prosperity must not occur at the cost of violating freedom or justice. In other words, ethical constraints must be "wired into" the objective functions of AI in order not to turn society into a dystopia for the sake of momentary benefits. Nevertheless, the quantitative turn in jurisprudence promises tremendous progress. Already now, states use behavioral models from economics in the development of norms—the so-called legal engineering. Relying on Richard Thaler's theory of "nudging," governments introduce small behavioral incentives instead of strict prescriptions in order to achieve policy goals. Special "behavioral insight teams" have been created in a number of countries, dealing with the search for optimal regulatory methods at the intersection of law and psychology. This approach combines scientific rigor (experiments, the collection of data on people's reactions) with the art of lawmaking (the search for norms acceptable to society). **Conclusion 1.3:** Lawmaking in the twenty-first century is becoming increasingly evidence-based—grounded in empirical data and modeling. It requires teamwork of lawyers, economists, programmers, and sociologists. In this sense, the lawyer of the future is simultaneously a philosopher and an engineer, mastering both the principles of law and data analysis technologies. The symbiosis of classical legal thinking with mathematical modeling is capable of turning lawmaking into a precise discipline similar to applied science, without losing its humanistic orientation. Thus we will come to "quantum jurisprudence," operating with probabilistic forecasts and big data, but grounded in unchanging constants—the values of justice and the good.

5 Institutions, Inclusiveness, and Prosperity (the Ideas of Acemoglu and Robinson)

Modern research in economics and related fields has significantly enriched our understanding of why some countries are rich and others are poor, and how institutions (including legal ones) influence development. Many of these studies have been awarded Nobel Prizes, and their findings are extremely valuable for developing new strategies for a state's legal development. In this section, we will consider the key ideas of Nobel laureates of the last decade and their significance for lawmaking and public administration.

In 2012, the book by economists Daron Acemoglu and James Robinson *Why Nations Fail* was published. Its central thesis is that political and economic institutions are of decisive importance. Inclusive institutions—that is, those that include broad segments of the population in political and economic life, protect property rights, ensure the rule of law and equality of opportunity—lead to sustainable growth and prosperity. Extractive institutions, serving a narrow elite and restricting the rights of the majority, are doomed to generate stagnation or short-term growth followed by crisis. The significance of this theory is confirmed by the fact that in 2024 Acemoglu and Robinson (together with S. Johnson) were awarded the Nobel Prize in Economics for comparative research on the prosperity of nations. For lawmaking, the conclusion is clear: laws must build inclusive institutions. In practice, this means strengthening judicial independence, protecting the property rights of all social groups, simplifying access to entrepreneurial activity, and preventing privileges for narrow groups. States that have successfully implemented these principles have achieved impressive results. For example, Singapore—a small country with limited resources—over several decades became one of the most developed economies in the world precisely thanks to its emphasis on meritocracy and effective governance institutions. Singapore's reforms of education and the civil service eliminated nepotism and put professionalism at the forefront, which ensured high productivity and citizens' trust. Researchers call the "secret ingredient" of Singapore's success precisely meritocracy—a system that prioritizes merit in hiring and promotion. For the legal system, this means selecting judges and officials based on competence rather than origin or loyalty, as well as a constant fight against corruption and the "cheapening" of access to justice (reducing costs for citizens and businesses when interacting with the legal system). No less instructive is the experience of certain city-states and territories with strong institutions. Hong Kong and Taiwan—despite different political destinies—demonstrate how the rule of law, protection of contracts, and openness to the global market make it possible to achieve prosperity. Hong Kong traditionally led economic freedom rankings, attracting investment and talent from around the world. Taiwan, having built democratic institutions after an authoritarian period, is today famous for a high level of education and technological innovation (for example, the Taiwanese company TSMC is a global leader in microelectronics)—this is a direct result of investment in human capital and the legally guaranteed freedom of entrepreneurship. These examples confirm the thesis: good institutions stimulate creative destruction (in Schumpeter's sense)—the constant renewal of the economy through competition—whereas bad ones stifle initiative. To build the state of the future, one should rely on the formula of inclusiveness: as Aristotle already stated, a polity (a mixture of oligarchy and democracy) is stable if it takes into account the interests of the majority while protecting the rights of minorities. Translating this into the language of modern law—laws must guarantee equal "rules of the game." Then talents (wherever they come from) will unfold for the benefit of society.

6 Behavioral Economics: From Theory to "Soft" Law (Thaler, Shiller, and Others)

Traditional economic theory assumed a "rational person," but the research of Richard Thaler (Nobel 2017) and other behavioral economists showed systematic deviations of real behavior from the rational model. People are subject to cognitive biases, emotions, and framing effects. Thaler and Cass Sunstein, in the book *Nudge* (2008), proposed the concept of "nudging"—a gentle intervention that helps people make better decisions without coercion. For example, automatic enrollment of employees in pension plans (with the right to opt out) significantly increases the level of savings—this is a "nudging" rule later implemented legislatively in many countries. The creation of "nudge units" within governments has become a global trend. Such units analyze data on citizens' behavior and propose changes in regulation—often small adjustments that improve compliance with laws. The behavioral approach is extremely fruitful for lawmaking: instead of relying on abstract dogmas, legislators began testing norms in the same way marketers test interface changes. For example, in the United Kingdom the Behavioural Insights Team experimentally found out which

wordings of tax notices increase timely payment—it turned out that the phrase that "most of your neighbors have already paid their tax" significantly increases collection (an appeal to a social norm). Such changes are subsequently enshrined as new regulatory standards. Nobel laureate Robert Shiller (2013)—a prominent representative of behavioral financial theory—also made a contribution important for lawmaking. Shiller showed that markets are subject to irrational moods (his term "irrational exuberance" explained bubbles in stock markets). In his later work *Narrative Economics* (2019), Shiller emphasized the role of spreading stories (narratives) in economic events. Economic crises and booms are often caused by the widespread dissemination of a certain idea or memes (surges of optimism or panic). This thesis is important for lawmakers: laws live in people's minds as stories. For a legal norm to work, people must "believe" in it, perceive it as fair or useful. Otherwise, the formal rule will be sabotaged or ignored. Thus, one of the tasks of the modern lawmaker is the management of narratives. Here both classical knowledge (Cicero's rhetoric, the art of persuading citizens) and modern technologies (social networks, media) are useful. By the way, successful states pay attention to this: thus, the UAE not only introduces innovations, but also markets the idea of happiness—the establishment of the post of Minister of Happiness and campaigns to improve quality of life created a positive image, contributing to public support for reforms. Returning to behavioral economics, another laureate—Daniel Kahneman (Nobel 2002, for integrating psychological research into economics)—substantiated the need for simple and understandable rules. A complex law that does not take into account the bounded rationality of citizens is doomed to work poorly. Therefore, legal design should strive to simplify the interface for people—whether it is clear language of laws, one-stop service windows, or automatic algorithms for compliance with requirements. As noted above, an abundance of laws can be a symptom of ill-being. The behavioral approach calls for: fewer norms, but clear and psychologically well-designed. **Conclusion 2.2:** Nobel discoveries in behavioral economics teach that a human being is not an abstract "homo juridicus," but a living being with its own cognitive features. Rules that take these features into account (softer, more flexible, intuitively understandable) can, paradoxically, be more effective than strict prohibitions. The state of the future will apply "regulatory prompts" (nudges) everywhere—from increasing fiscal discipline to encouraging environmentally responsible behavior—reinforcing them with AI technologies of personalized recommendations. However, it is important to preserve the transparency and ethics of such measures so as not to slide into manipulation. Ultimately, the behavioral approach is about respect for real human nature when creating laws.

7 Experiments and Empirics: Development Economics as a Model for Law (Duflo, Banerjee, Kremer)

The 2019 laureates Abhijit Banerjee, Esther Duflo, and Michael Kremer were recognized for applying an experimental approach in the development of economics. They introduced the practice of field randomized controlled trials (RCTs) to evaluate the effectiveness of anti-poverty programs—an analogue of medical trials, but for social interventions. Their approach—to divide a big problem into a number of smaller ones and test solutions—fits lawmaking perfectly. Instead of adopting "big reforms" blindly, one can test elements of reforms on limited samples. This correlates with the already discussed idea of pilot legal regimes (legal "sandboxes"). For example, before reforming the entire education system, it is possible in several regions to launch different models (increasing teachers' salaries, changing the curriculum, introducing AI assistants) and collect data on performance, satisfaction, and costs. The methods of analysis developed by the 2021 laureates J. Angrist and G. Imbens (Nobel Prize for methods of deriving causal relationships) will help correctly evaluate the results of experiments, separating the effect of the reform from background factors. Then the most successful option is scaled up. Such an iterative, science-intensive approach to reforms increases the chances of success and reduces the cost of mistakes. The application of this method is especially promising in the sphere of regulating entrepreneurship—which is critically important for an entrepreneurially oriented state. One can experiment with different variants of deregulation: say, one group of regions switches to a notification procedure for opening a business, another preserves licensing, and a third introduces full digitalization of procedures. After a year, indicators are measured: the number of new firms, survival rates, the level of the shadow economy, and consumer complaints. Statistical analysis will reveal which regime better promotes innovation without harming society. Such an approach—essentially Randomized Regulation Trials—can become a standard for the work of ministries of economy and justice. Economists have also found that often "small" changes give a large cumulative effect—whether it is the installation of water filters in poor countries (greatly reducing morbidity) or the distribution of textbooks. For lawmakers, the lesson is that a grand reform is not always needed; sometimes a targeted change (for example, the abolition of an outdated bureaucratic procedure) noticeably improves the overall picture if a bottleneck has been identified. Nobel laureates in development economics taught us humility and pragmatism: it is important to test and measure, rather than build doctrinaire schemes. **Conclusion 2.3:** Lawmaking should adopt from modern economics a taste for empirics and experiment. It is necessary to cultivate in state bodies the practice of "policy pilots," regulatory "A/B tests," and careful data collection on the implementation of laws. This requires monitoring institutions and analytical centers (perhaps based in universives or with the participation of independent experts) evaluating the impact of norms. In the future, specialized "AI simulators" of legislation may appear, where thousands of virtual models of agents' behavior under certain rules can be run to identify potential problems. This is like crash tests for a law—testing on virtual societies. Of course, a model will not replace reality, but it will screen out ideas that are obviously unworkable. Thus, Seneca's foresight comes true: "laws are established for people, not people for laws"—and therefore their effectiveness should be measured by human experience, not by abstract logic.

8 Financial Stability and Long-Term Risks (Bernanke, Diamond, Dybvig, Nordhaus)

One cannot ignore the contribution of Nobel laureates associated with ensuring the stability of the economy and taking long-term factors into account. In 2022, Ben Bernanke, Douglas Diamond, and Philip Dybvig received the prize for research on banks and financial crises. Their works explained how bank panics can have a destructive effect on the economy and how proper regulation (for example, deposit insurance, the central bank as lender of last resort) prevents self-destructive runs by depositors. Translating this into the language of law: financial legislation is a critical part of the "formula of prosperity." Laws that guarantee transparency of banks, regulate risks, and protect investors are a necessary condition for business confidence. Entrepreneurial initiative flourishes where there is confidence in the safety of funds and the predictability of rules. Otherwise, even the most talented people will avoid innovation, fearing a sudden loss of what they have accumulated. It is also worth mentioning the contribution of Nobel laureate William Nordhaus (2018)—his research linked economics with ecology, introducing the climate change factor into models. It would seem that this is far from a legal topic, but in fact it emphasizes that the modern state must think in categories of sustainability. Environmental law, emissions regulation, and balancing the interests of the economy

and the environment—all these are also elements of the formula of success in the twenty-first century. Citizens increasingly value quality of life, not only income, and welcome states that are able to ensure both growth and environmental responsibility. In international rankings of competitiveness and happiness, countries with a clean environment and low corruption score highly. Therefore, lawmakers need to embed these long-term factors into normative acts (for example, New Zealand, Iceland, where they introduce the well-being of future generations as a criterion for evaluating draft laws). Summarizing the economic insights: the formula for a state's prosperity is interdisciplinary. It is impossible to achieve sustainable high GDP without implementing high-quality institutions (Acemoglu), without taking into account human psychology (Thaler), without testing solutions (Duflo), without insuring the system against crises (Bernanke), and without thinking about the planet's resources (Nordhaus). Lawmaking must absorb the best of these ideas, synthesizing "laws of success." For clarity, let us present a brief table of the ideas of Nobel laureates and their significance for law:

Idea of the Laureates (Year)	Key Message	Implications for Law and Public Administration
Inclusive Institutions (Acemoglu & Robinson, Nobel 2024)	Institutions determine the wealth of nations; inclusiveness leads to prosperity.	Laws must ensure broad participation and equal rules of the game; strengthening property rights, judicial independence.
Nudge, Behavioral Economics (Thaler, Nobel 2017)	People are irrational; gentle "nudges" are more effective than strict norms.	Use behavioral approaches in regulation: an opt-out option instead of a ban, psychologically well-designed notices and public-service interfaces.
Development Experiments (Duflo, Banerjee, Kremer, Nobel 2019)	Small RCT experiments provide knowledge of what works in social policy.	Introduce pilot legislation, test reforms on a limited scale; collect empirical evidence before scaling.
Financial Stability (Bernanke, Diamond, Dybvig, 2022)	Banking crises are prevented by institutions (deposit insurance, etc.).	Adopt well-designed financial regulation: laws on banks, exchanges, and investor protection as the foundation of trust and the investment climate.
The Role of Narratives (Shiller, 2013)	Economic events depend on mass stories/ideas.	Take into account the communication of laws: create positive reform narratives, explain the goals of norms to citizens, combat disinformation.
Climate and Sustainability (Nordhaus, 2018)	GDP growth is meaningless without accounting for environmental constraints.	Integrate sustainable development norms into law: environmental regulation, impact assessment on future generations in lawmaking.

(Note: Daron Acemoglu and J. Robinson are mentioned with reference to the 2024 prize according to Wikipedia.)

This table illustrates how diverse scientific discoveries are converted into specific principles for legal construction.

9 Meritocracy as a Discipline of State Consciousness

As we have seen from the example of Singapore and other countries, meritocracy—a system in which people's advancement is based on abilities and achievements—is a powerful driver of success. But meritocracy is not only a personnel policy; it is an entire philosophy of state legal consciousness. It implies that society values knowledge, professionalism, and honest labor, while the state creates equal starting conditions for the competition of talents. In the information age, meritocracy gains a new tool—artificial intelligence, capable of reducing the influence of prejudices. For example, in Singapore universities and companies are beginning to apply AI systems for selecting candidates, helping to eliminate discrimination and assess abilities more "transparently." In the UAE, the startup X0PA AI contributes to the implementation of the national AI strategy: its recruitment platforms use algorithms that find the most suitable specialists, reducing hiring time by 50% and costs by 30%. At the same time, the emphasis is placed precisely on the ethical use of AI to achieve fairness and diversification. Thus, the UAE AI 2031 strategy proclaims the creation of a digital, yet meritocratic workforce of the future. Meritocracy is closely connected with the idea of a "society of opportunity." Classical liberalism (J. Locke, A. Smith) affirmed individual freedom; meritocracy clarifies that freedom is realized in practice when talent has a chance to manifest itself. Law in a meritocratic state must eliminate feudal or clan privileges, "uberize" access to services (by analogy with how Uber removed intermediaries in transportation). Hence the concept of "Uber-law": legal knowledge and assistance become available at the click of a button for any citizen, regardless of their connections or wealth. An element of meritocratic legal consciousness is also transparency and accountability of power. After all, if it is declared that the best occupy positions, society has the right to see the criteria of assessments. Digital platforms provide the possibility of rating-based voting, 360-degree evaluations of officials' performance, and so on. Of course, here the danger of ochlocracy or distortion of indicators arises, but with proper design (possibly using blockchain technologies to ensure the immutability of data) this will strengthen trust. Ancient echoes of the idea of meritocracy can be traced in Plato (the idea of a state ruled by philosophers possessing knowledge) and among the Romans—the system of *cursus honorum*, which required passing certain stages of public service before occupying a high office. Modernity has democratized these approaches: everyone can obtain an education and advance on merit. The task of law is to enshrine mechanisms against discrimination and ensure inclusive education. Thus, Singapore has legislatively built one of the fairest education systems (no elite tracks, strong emphasis on the school level). The United Kingdom attracts talent through "highly skilled worker visa" programs and other immigration laws that simplify the arrival of valuable workers. The UAE grants outstanding foreigners "Golden Visas" and resident legal status, recognizing their contribution. All these measures are elements of the meritocratic paradigm. However, meritocracy requires constant self-reflection: does it turn into oligarchy? Here it is appropriate to recall Nietzsche's criticism. Friedrich Nietzsche was skeptical of the morality of the crowd and mediocrity, praising the strength of an outstanding individual ("superman"). In essence, he warned against the egalitarian principle that suppresses the best. Meritocracy, if it turns into a justification of a caste of "experts," is also dangerous—it can produce technocratic arrogance and the alienation of the elite from the people. To prevent this, social elevators must constantly work, and fresh talents must replenish the elite. Legal guarantees—term limits, rotation of posts, competitive procedures—help prevent the stagnation of meritocracy.

Conclusion 3.1: Meritocracy is a discipline of the state's way of thinking, requiring rulers to constantly confirm legitimacy through their skills and results. The digital era provides tools for implementing meritocracy: from AI-based personnel selection systems to transparent electronic evaluation systems. However, without proper legal and moral culture, meritocracy can degrade. Therefore, balance is important—as Kant said, "the constitution of the state is based on the morality of citizens, which, in turn, depends on the goodness of this constitution." In other words, not only laws that select the best are needed, but also public support for the principle of fair competition.

10 Freedom, the Rule of Law, and Digital Rights

Any state, striving for prosperity, must respect fundamental freedoms. Kant warned about this already, indicating that a truly law-governed state is limited by law and cannot violate individual freedom for the sake of the will of the majority. This is the foundation of liberal democracy and human rights. Without political and civil freedoms, meritocracy is incomplete, and the economy often turns into predatory capitalism. Practice shows that countries combining a market economy with freedom of speech, an independent judiciary, and freedom of information achieve more sustainable and comprehensive progress (for example, Taiwan: a dynamic economy plus free elections and media). In the digital age, new dimensions of freedom arise: citizens' digital rights, such as the right to the inviolability of personal data, freedom on the internet, and protection from arbitrary algorithmic decisions. Digital governance is a trend of recent years and assumes that many state functions are transferred to the electronic environment. This is convenient and efficient, but it carries the risk that unsupervised algorithms will interfere in people's lives. Therefore, the development of AI legislation is necessary: the establishment of responsibility frameworks, transparency requirements (for example, that significant AI-assisted decisions can be explainable), and mechanisms for appealing automated actions. The European Union is ahead here—the AI Act regulation is being developed, introducing a classification of AI risks and rules for their application. In Singapore and the UAE, ethical codes for AI in the public sector are also being formed. In particular, Singapore's Ministry of Education in its framework document requires that "AI systems preserve the possibility of choice and control over important decisions by humans"—that is, human participation must not be eliminated. This "Human-in-the-loop" principle is supported by the OECD and expert communities as well. The rule of law remains the cornerstone. No technological experiments should undermine trust in justice. The judicial system may use AI for analytics (for example, predicting court workloads), but it should not blindly rely on machine conclusions when delivering a verdict. Experiments with "virtual judges" are being conducted in China and Estonia—but the consensus is that the final decision affecting human rights must be made by a human being. Separately, blockchain and smart contracts must be considered—technologies that decentralize trust. They can significantly reduce the transaction costs of the state: blockchain-based registries, identity tokenization, automatic execution of contracts—all this reduces bureaucracy and corruption opportunities. For example, Dubai (UAE) is actively implementing blockchain into state registries in order to move to a fully paperless government. Smart contracts allow certain relationships (especially in finance) to self-execute without courts—code acts as "law" for the parties. Of course, smart contracts also require legal conceptualization: amendments are needed in civil codes recognizing their legal force, and mechanisms for resolving conflicts if the code fails. But in the future, this is a path toward decentralizing a number of state functions—what theorists (for example, V. Buterin, the creator of Ethereum) call a movement toward "code institutions." If traditionally the state is a centralized intermediary of trust, then blockchain complements it with a network of distributed trust. This can make the system more resilient (anti-fragile in Taleb's sense) to individual failures or abuses. Finally, one must not forget the political philosophy of freedom. We mentioned Kant; let us add classics such as J. Stuart Mill—his principle: the freedom of the individual is limited only by the need not to harm another. Lawmakers must constantly check: is each restriction of rights truly justified by the need to prevent harm? If not, such a law is unnecessary. This liberal presumption makes it possible not to overload society with rules (again a reference to Tacitus: fewer bad laws means fewer reasons to violate them). Interestingly, even the Stoics said: "bad morals produce good laws" (a late Roman aphorism: *leges bonae ex malis moribus procreantur*—"good laws are born from bad morals"). This means that the legislator responds to problems; but it is important not to overdo it, otherwise in a generation morals will become even worse from hyper-care (as confirmed by another quotation: *leges sine moribus vanae*—"laws without morals are empty").
Conclusion 3.2: The state of the future must be a digital democracy in which high technologies strengthen freedoms rather than suppress them. Law stands guard over traditional human rights in new forms—from freedom of self-expression on the internet to the right to algorithmic explainability. In such a system, AI and blockchain serve public goals: they accelerate judicial proceedings, make administration transparent, and give citizens new tools of participation (for example, electronic referenda). However, people retain sovereignty over machines—a principle that probably should even be enshrined constitutionally in order to exclude scenarios from science fiction about the omnipotence of artificial intelligence. In the synergy of liberal values and technological achievements, "digital humanism" is born—an ideology according to which the goal of the state is to unlock the maximum potential of every person, using the power of AI, but without diminishing human dignity.

11 The Symbiotic State: Humans and AI Hand in Hand

Drawing a line under philosophical and managerial reflections, let us present a model of a symbiotic state in which humans and artificial agents interact for the common good. In such a state, AI plays the role of an "enhancer" of human intelligence in all spheres: from analyzing draft laws to personal assistance for citizens (digital assistants, navigators of rights and services). The human being sets normative goals and creatively directs development—it is not for nothing that people speak of the era of "augmented government," the augmented intelligence of power. Philosophically, this returns us to Nietzsche and Kant. From Nietzsche—the idea of overcoming current limitations, creating new values (in this context—new, more perfect state institutions). The symbiotic state is a kind of "Über-Governance," going beyond the traditional forms of government, where the fusion of human intuition and machine rationality gives a qualitative leap in efficiency. From Kant—the demand for moral self-restraint: possessing enormous computing power, the state must remain under the control of the principles of law and morality (what Kant would call the "kingdom of ends," where each person is an end, not a means). Practically, elements of symbiosis already exist: for example, the governments of the United Kingdom and Estonia use chatbots and AI systems to consult citizens on legal issues. This reduces barriers and makes legal assistance more accessible—the "uberization" of jurisprudence in action. Short videos, memes, and other formats of "light education" on social media (we spoke of the #LawTok phenomenon—the popularization of law through TikTok) are changing young people's attitude to legal knowledge. Legal education becomes less hierarchical: bloggers-"lawfluencers" turn into new "teachers" alongside professors. Ideally, a symbiotic system means that every law student teaches AI, and AI teaches every student. Training on huge corpora of legal data, AI can provide hints to the student, accelerating their progress; and the student, asking questions and checking AI answers, improves the model. This is a kind of cycle of knowledge. In lawmaking, symbiosis will manifest itself in the fact that decisions will be made on the basis of data, but with regard to social values identified, among other things, through online feedback from citizens. Classical institutions of democracy (elections, parliaments) adapt: "digital referenda" on specific issues and consultative polls with instant opinion analytics may emerge. AI could

help citizens understand complex draft laws by summarizing them and showing the impact on each individual (similar to how algorithms now recommend personalized news). Then public participation will become more conscious—because one of the problems of modern democracy is that laws are too complex, and voters often vote emotionally. The symbiosis of AI and humans can increase citizens' awareness—one of the goals declared as a desirable characteristic of the future state at the beginning of the article. The symbiotic state, in theory, strives to be a magnet for talent from all over the world. If it successfully integrates all the described elements—strong institutions, high quality of life, meritocracy, technological advancement, and respect for freedoms—it becomes attractive. People will want to come and stay, as they now gravitate to Silicon Valley or Singapore. For example, the UAE already sees the effect—the country rose to 21st place in the world in terms of happiness, surpassing the United Kingdom, the United States, and France in this indicator. This was achieved through targeted policy: the UAE was one of the first to embed the happiness indicator into public administration and established a Minister for Happiness and Well-Being. In combination with economic successes (a diversified economy, free zones without taxes), this approach forms the image of a "dream country." Adding to this the active implementation of AI (Dubai plans to transfer 25% of government decisions to AI by 2030) and a tolerant environment for expats, the UAE becomes an example of the symbiosis of traditions and the future. **Conclusion 3.3:** The symbiotic connection between humans and AI can transform the state as radically as the Industrial Revolution once changed monarchies. The result should be a hybrid system combining the best of democracy, technocracy, and possibly elements of direct citizen participation. One may recall the words of Marcus Aurelius: "often, one who has done nothing unjust is guilty of injustice, allowing lawlessness through inaction." In the context of our discussion, this means that inaction in an era of change is also guilt. States that respond slowly to technological and social shifts risk being left behind, "missing" talent, and facing an outflow of active citizens. On the contrary, those who boldly take the best from AI and science will remain the avant-garde. Thus, the symbiotic state is not fantasy, but an evolutionary step in the development of institutions. It continues the line begun by ancient thinkers (the reasonableness of laws), the Enlightenment (respect for rights), the industrial era (rational bureaucracy), and the information age (data and technology). If it manages to keep the human being as the primary value, such a state system can become the "physics of society"—that is, a predictable, harmonious, and beneficial system in which happiness and prosperity cease to be utopia and become a measurable and achievable goal of policy.

12 Conclusion

The world is entering an era in which law, economics, technology, and philosophy are intertwined inseparably. The new approach to lawmaking and legal education that we have examined implies an interdisciplinary synthesis: reliance on historical wisdom (Roman law, Stoicism), integration of the best contemporary scientific ideas (from Nobel-winning economic theories to behavioral sciences), and active use of the capabilities of the digital revolution (AI, Big Data, blockchain). Such an approach is capable of providing a breakthrough in the effectiveness of public administration and the well-being of citizens. Several key principles can be formulated, following from the analysis conducted:

The principle of scientific grounding of laws: Laws should be adopted on the basis of data and experiments, not intuition or the pressure of interest groups. An institution of impact assessments (ex ante and ex post) is required for each significant regulatory act. This turns lawmaking into a continuous learning process—"a state that learns," as Oxford researchers noted when discussing experiences of mass AI training in Singapore and the UAE. A state that learns at the same speed as society is a guarantee of competitiveness.

The principle of meritocratic legitimism: Power must prove its legitimacy through competence and results. Mechanisms for selecting and controlling personnel—competitive examinations, KPIs, public evaluation—must be integrated into the legal system. An ethical code of public service, based on the ideals of duty (here one recalls Marcus Aurelius' "Duty" and Stoic service to the common good), will provide a moral framework. And AI technologies will help monitor compliance with these standards.

The principle of digital inclusiveness in education: Legal education and mass legal enlightenment must proceed in forms adequate to the twenty-first century. Short videos, interactive platforms, gamification of learning the history of state and law—all this ceases to be unserious or a "low genre." On the contrary, as the #LawTok phenomenon shows, this approach democratizes access to knowledge and dismantles the monopoly of narrow elites. The state should invest in creating open educational legal resources, possibly even in the format of massive online courses or integration of legally significant content into popular media. This will raise the overall level of the people's legal consciousness—and therefore the quality of feedback for power.

The principle of symbiosis and reliability: Introducing AI and automation, one must not forget about cybersecurity and system resilience. A "smart" state is vulnerable to smart threats (hacking, data manipulation). Therefore, legal frameworks must cover these aspects as well: laws on cybersecurity, on the protection of critical information infrastructure, protocols in case of AI failures. At the same time, distributed technologies such as blockchain help create antifragile institutions where a local failure does not paralyze the entire system. Legislation should encourage the use of such solutions, open-source standards, and so on, in order to reduce dependence on single vendors and increase trust.

The principle of human orientation: Finally, as all these systems become more complex, it is important never to lose sight of the ultimate goal—human development and happiness. As Cicero said, true laws are those that make people better and happier. In our time, the UN and other organizations call for shifting the focus from purely economic indicators (GDP) to complex well-being indices. Lawmakers should follow this trend—institutionalize the measurement of citizens' satisfaction, involve them through open government. If citizens feel heard and see improvements in life, they support initiatives and trust the state.

Such an interdisciplinary, human-centered, and technologically advanced approach may seem ambitious. However, the examples presented in the article show that many elements are already being implemented in individual countries. The United Kingdom seeks to preserve the rule of law and attract innovations (London remains the legal and financial capital of the world, although reforms such as the non-dom regime are undergoing changes). Singapore and the UAE are actively implementing AI at the state level, without forgetting about residents' happiness. Hong Kong and Taiwan show the value of openness and investment in education. Now the task is to combine these successes into a single model and continue to develop it scientifically. It is quite likely that in the next decade we will see the emergence of the first states that openly announce the use of AI in the legislative process on a permanent basis, the transition of education predominantly to online/micro formats, and the introduction of indicators of happiness and awareness into the official list of goals of ministries. Such states

will become laboratories of humanity, paving the way for others. And, as once Athens or Rome did, they will attract the boldest and smartest from all over the world.

In summary, the new approach to lawmaking and legal education is not a negation of the old, but its organic development. Roman Stoics, Enlightenment thinkers, outstanding economists of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries—all of them, in essence, spoke about one thing: how to make people's lives better with the help of reason and justice. Now we have in our hands both reason (enhanced by machines) and a chance to realize justice more fully than ever before. Let us use this chance, armed with knowledge and imagination, to build states where "the welfare of the people is the supreme law" (Cicero), and technology serves this noble goal. Such a symbiosis of ancient wisdom and modern innovations is capable of generating an unprecedented quality of legislation—flexible, scientifically grounded, understandable, and, most importantly, aimed at the comprehensive flourishing of the human being in harmony with society. Thus, the concept of the lawmaking of the future is physics + ethics + AI, united under the aegis of law. And, perhaps, it is precisely behind such ideas that the future lies, worthy of prestigious world journals, Nobel Prizes, and, more importantly, the grateful memory of descendants.

REFERENCES

[1] Kishore Mahbubani, "The Secret Sauce of Singapore," *Dubai Policy Review* (2019) – meritocracy as the basis of an effective state.

[2] Marcus Tullius Cicero, "De Legibus (On the Laws)," ~52 BCE – on true law as reason consistent with nature; the welfare of the people is the supreme law.

[3] Cornelius Tacitus, "Annales," ~110 CE – the aphorism that the more depraved a state, the more laws it has.

[4] Washington State Bar Association, "#LawTok U: How TikTok is Revolutionizing the Pathway to Practice," (2025) – on the democratization of legal education through social networks.

[5] Nathan Sanders & Bruce Schneier, "AI Will Write Complex Laws," *Lawfare* (2025) – examples of AI use in lawmaking, the first law written by AI (Brazil, 2023).

[6] "World Happiness Report 2025: UAE ranks 21st globally," *The National News* (20 March 2025) – integration of happiness into UAE policy, comparison of countries' positions.

[7] Wikipedia, "Why Nations Fail," (accessed 2026) – the central role of institutions in prosperity, Nobel 2024 to the authors for research on institutions.

[8] Cass R. Sunstein, interview "Nudges, Behavioral Economics, Law, and Liberalism," *Hoover Institution* (2025) – discussion of nudge units and regulatory prompts in public administration.

[9] Robert J. Shiller, "Narrative Economics," *American Economic Review* (2017) – the influence of mass narratives on economic (and political-legal) events.

[10] X0PA AI Blog, "Accelerating the UAE's Vision of a Meritocratic Workforce Through Ethical AI," (21 May 2025) – on using AI to ensure meritocratic hiring in the UAE and Singapore.