Exploding AI Bills Without Measured Responsibility

Across the United States, state legislatures are suddenly filled with proposals attempting to regulate artificial intelligence. New bills are appearing at a remarkable pace—targeting deepfakes in elections, AI systems used in hiring, automated healthcare decisions, consumer chatbots, and synthetic media disclosures. Lawmakers clearly recognize that AI is no longer a distant technology sitting in research labs. It is now being embedded into the systems that shape everyday life.

On the surface, this surge in legislation might seem reassuring. It signals that policymakers understand the stakes and are trying to respond before the technology moves even further ahead. Yet when you step back and look across the growing landscape of proposals, a deeper problem becomes visible.

Nearly every bill is designed to address a specific risk. One focuses on political deepfakes. Another attempts to control algorithmic bias in employment. Others require disclosure when AI is interacting with consumers or seek to limit how AI is used in healthcare decisions. Each law is trying to solve an individual concern that has emerged as AI capabilities expand.

But collectively they reveal something more troubling.

Despite the explosion of legislative activity, there is still no consistent way to determine whether an organization is deploying artificial intelligence responsibly in the first place.

Let’s be clear: the danger is not the technology. The danger is the intelligent misuse of the most transformative technology in modern history.

Throughout history, every powerful technology has eventually attracted people willing to use it for their own advantage. Artificial intelligence will be no different. The systems being built today are extraordinarily capable—and the people who may choose to misuse them are often just as capable.

We are building rules around the edges of the problem without yet establishing a clear way to measure the center of it.

The result is a rapidly forming patchwork. Companies operating nationally may soon face dozens of overlapping state requirements, each addressing a different risk category, each

written with slightly different definitions and expectations. Yet even as the rulebooks multiply, none of them answer the most fundamental question society will increasingly ask:

Is this organization developing and deploying AI in a way that is aligned with human interests?

This is the gap quietly emerging beneath the headlines about AI regulation. Governments are attempting to control specific harms, but there is still no broadly accepted framework that evaluates how companies approach AI governance, accountability, transparency, safety, and impact as a whole. Without that foundation, legislation risks becoming reactive—responding to incidents after they appear rather than helping organizations demonstrate responsible practices before problems arise.

Transformative technologies eventually reach a point where society demands more than fragmented rules. Financial markets developed independent credit ratings so investors could understand risk. Cybersecurity evolved standardized frameworks so organizations could verify how they protect data. Environmental construction introduced certification systems to measure sustainable design.

Artificial intelligence is approaching a similar moment.

As AI becomes embedded in healthcare systems, financial markets, national infrastructure, education, and defense, the question will become increasingly unavoidable:

How do we know whether these systems are being built and deployed responsibly?

The rapid rise of AI legislation is an early signal that society recognizes the stakes.

The next challenge will not simply be writing more rules. It will be developing credible ways to measure responsibility itself.

Without measurement, responsible AI is just an assumption.