



Welcome to *Emory University's AI Regulation Ban Expert Insights.*

Our media relations team has identified several Emory experts to share insights as national policymakers consider banning states from regulating artificial intelligence. You are welcome to use all materials listed. A full list of experts can be found at experts.emory.edu. If you would like to be connected for an interview, contact the media relations team at news@emory.edu.

Federalism and AI policy innovation: [Andra Gillespie](#), professor of political science and director of the James Weldon Johnson Institute, says: The biggest issue here relates to how federalism operates in these circumstances. The budget bill is taking an interesting approach to preemption here. Typically, national laws supersede state and local laws if there is a conflict, but states are allowed to pass and enforce more stringent law to federal laws if they have overlapping authority. Take minimum wage laws—every state has to follow the national minimum wage laws, but they are free to pass higher minimum wages for their states if they choose.

The risk with a moratorium is that the federal government is accepting the burden of having to keep up with changes in AI to regulate it. Typically, states are the sites of new policy innovation—we call them “laboratories of democracy.” If a policy works in one state, others adopt it; and the federal government may eventually make the policy national (think speed limits). By assuming responsibility for keeping up with AI changes, the federal government is foreclosing an opportunity for a state to come up with a better policy that can be adopted nationally. That’s a lot to ask the federal government, which has many other things to do.

Then there’s the question of motivation. Ostensibly, President Trump and his allies in Congress believe that national policies are in the best interest to help American AI development outpace our competitors. But, as the Brookings Institution points out, we would be remiss if we did not ask whether this proposed moratorium might also be motivated by a desire to prevent states from adopting more anti-AI discrimination laws. The question here is, if this provision remains in the budget bill, will it create unforeseen problems because 1) state officials were better positioned to foresee problems and provide regulatory oversight for AI; and 2) there is no mechanism to tailor AI regulations to local needs that may arise in the future?

Public safety, civil rights, and health care: [Jessica Roberts](#), law professor and expert in AI bias, civil rights, and health law, says: Famously, states act as laboratories of democracy that allow law and policymakers to experiment and innovate. State legislation has played a crucial role in paving the way for future federal statutes and regulations. AI and related technologies are a new frontier, where our existing law can be a poor fit. With the current congressional gridlock, disempowering states will effectively leave AI unregulated for a decade. And this lack of regulation will leave Americans vulnerable to bias, invasions of privacy, and misinformation.

Unregulated AI and related technologies are particularly dangerous in health care, where bias, inaccuracies, and hallucinations can have life and death consequences for patients. Regulation can help ensure that health technology is safe and reliable without compromising data security and privacy.

Policy motivations and political dynamics: [Zachary Peskowitz](#), professor of political science, studies how institutions and electoral politics shape public policy. He can speak to the political motivations behind the federal push to restrict states. Peskowitz's research helps contextualize how partisanship, industry lobbying, and federal-state tensions intersect in shaping major regulatory decisions—including in emerging fields like AI.

####