



ORIGINAL RESEARCH PAPER

Political Science

DIGITAL CONSTITUTIONALISM: PROTECTING FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS IN THE AGE OF SURVEILLANCE, ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND GOVERNANCE

KEY WORDS: Digital Constitutionalism, Fundamental Rights, Artificial Intelligence, Surveillance, Privacy, Democracy, Data Governance.

Mr. Parmesh Singh

Assistant Professor Sri Guru Granth Sahib World University Fatehgarh

ABSTRACT

The Rapid digital technology development has affected constitutional democracies, social relationships, and political institutions globally. Governments increasingly use data-driven governance, biometric identification systems, surveillance technologies, and AI to manage administration, security, welfare distribution, and public services. Modern technologies make things easier and more efficient, but they also create human rights and constitutional issues. Algorithmic discrimination, mass monitoring, and privacy breaches threaten expression, equality, liberty, and privacy. The new theoretical paradigm "digital constitutionalism" seeks to integrate democracy, human rights, and constitutional principles into digital governance. This study examines constitutional protections in the information era using doctrinal, analytical, and qualitative methods. It explores global regulatory models including the GDPR and the EU's AI Act, constitutional requirements, landmark court cases, policy frameworks, and more. This includes parallels with other democratic regimes like India's. The results indicate that current legal frameworks often lag behind rapid technology advancements. AI-driven governance and digital surveillance sometimes exhibit deficiencies in transparency, accountability, and ethical protections, leading to constitutional problems. The paper asserts that enhanced judicial supervision, robust data protection laws, ethical AI governance, and constitutional responsibility are essential for safeguarding democratic principles and protecting individuals in the digital era.

INTRODUCTION

The digital revolution has transformed state-citizen-government relations. Governments are using AI, big data analytics, biometric identification systems, and online governance platforms to improve administrative efficiency and policy implementation in the 21st century. Digital India, Aadhaar, e-governance, and digital payment systems demonstrate the growing use of technology in public administration. Advances may make services simpler to supply and access. They raise important constitutional questions concerning privacy, liberty, equality, and accountability.

Digital constitutionalism is essential for tackling these issues. It involves constitutional, democratic, and human rights implementation in digital government institutions and online environments. Constitutionalism has protected individual rights and limited governmental authority. In the digital age, global technology businesses, algorithmic systems, and surveillance infrastructures hold power alongside governments. Thus, digital constitutionalism ensures that technology governance follows the rule of law, transparency, accountability, and constitutional morality.

The rise of AI and monitoring has raised constitutional rights concerns. Governments and corporations collect massive amounts of personal data via facial recognition, predictive policing, social media monitoring, and biometric databases. National security, public safety, and administrative efficiency may justify these technologies. But they also raise worries about digital tyranny, extensive surveillance, and human liberty loss. In surveillance capitalism, firms profit from personal data, threatening democratic freedoms and privacy rights.

Discrimination by algorithms is another concern. Social inequality dataset-trained AI systems may bias in employment, criminal justice, welfare, healthcare, and finance. These actions contravene constitutional equality and non-discrimination. Thus, legal and ethical precautions in digital constitutionalism balance technological innovation with constitutional protections and democratic accountability.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Several studies have examined digital governance, constitutionalism, surveillance, and AI. Kuner (2020) showed

that the EU's GDPR provides better privacy and accountability than some emerging countries' solutions. Digital India surveillance technologies like unmanaged biometric systems and facial recognition threaten privacy and free expression, according to Saxena and Gupta (2021).

According to Belli and Zingales (2022), digital constitutionalism seeks to integrate constitutional concepts into online society and government. Zuboff (2023) claims that algorithmic technologies allow firms to manipulate behaviour, weakening democratic rights. AI-assisted governance might compromise transparency and due process without proper regulation (Patel and Rao, 2024). Khan and Verma (2025) say excessive surveillance cause anxiety, self-censorship, and democratic disengagement. Digital constitutionalism is needed to balance technology advancement, democratic values, and human rights, according to Roy (2026).

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. What are the implications of digital governance for constitutional rights?
2. How does artificial intelligence affect privacy, liberty, and equality?
3. To what extent can constitutional frameworks regulate digital surveillance and AI governance effectively?

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study uses an approach that is both analytical and qualitative, with a focus on doctrine. Issues of digital governance, AI, and surveillance technology's impact on the constitution and the law are examined critically. The doctrinal approach is used to examine privacy, digital rights, and governance-related constitutional provisions, court judgments, legislative actions, and international legal frameworks. Important court decisions, official government policy, committee reports, international agreements, and the Indian Constitution are all considered primary sources. Highlighted in particular is the Supreme Court's recognition of privacy as a basic right under Article 21 in Justice K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India. Digital constitutionalism and artificial intelligence (AI) governance-related books, journals, articles, reports, and studies are examples of secondary sources. In addition, we look at international frameworks like the GDPR and the EU's AI Act side by side to find the best practices that apply to India.

CONSTITUTIONAL PROTECTION OF FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS IN THE DIGITAL AGE

Digital constitutionalism defends constitutional rights against monitoring, AI, and digital government. Data-driven governance and algorithmic decision-making threaten privacy, liberty, dignity, equality, and free expression. The historic Justice K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India ruling upheld Article 21's right to privacy. This ruling upheld digital constitutional protections and emphasized informational privacy and personal liberty. Bhandari (2021) and Celeste (2019) argue that digital governance must balance security and civil liberties via the constitutional responsibilities.

A. Freedom of Speech and Expression

Digital monitoring and algorithmic restriction may profoundly impact freedom of speech and expression. Ongoing surveillance of digital activity instills apprehension and inhibits democratic engagement. In Shreya Singhal v. Union of India, the Supreme Court annulled Section 66A of the Information Technology Act, therefore enhancing online freedom of speech. Julie E. Cohen (2019) underscored that digital monitoring jeopardizes democratic engagement and freedom of expression.

B. Equality and Non-Discrimination

Inaccessible algorithms and biased datasets make AI systems prone to perpetuating societal prejudices. This might lead to discrimination based on factors such as gender, religion, socioeconomic status, or caste. Digital monitoring endangers civil liberties and constitutional equality, as pointed out by Bhatia (2022). In a similar vein, Zuboff (2019) contended that data-driven government promotes technical dominance and social inequity.

C. Right to Dignity and Liberty

Mass surveillance, data profiling and automated decision-making systems put human dignity and liberty at risk. Surveillance capitalism and unceasing data extraction are eroding human autonomy and democratic freedom. Cohen (2019) and Zuboff (2019) argue that constitutional safeguards are needed to maintain human dignity in a digital era.

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND GOVERNANCE

Modern governance has been revolutionized by the implementation of artificial intelligence, which has enhanced the efficacy of administration, welfare distribution, law enforcement, and decision-making. Nevertheless, constitutional challenges regarding transparency, accountability, privacy, and equality are also generated by AI-driven governance.

A. AI in Public Administration

Governments are progressively using AI for predictive policing, automated welfare programs, public data administration, and monitoring. Although these technologies enhance productivity, they also introduce hazards of misuse and a deficiency in accountability. Hoffmann-Riem (2020) contended that artificial intelligence poses significant difficulties to legal and constitutional governance. Kettemann (2022) emphasized the need of safeguarding human rights under digital governance frameworks.

B. Algorithmic Bias and Discrimination

Many in the field of artificial intelligence (AI) are worried about algorithmic bias. In the fields of finance, healthcare, law enforcement, and employment, automated technologies have the potential to exacerbate existing socioeconomic disparities. Due to imperfect datasets and opaque computational systems, algorithms often perpetuate racial and social prejudices, as Noble (2018) and O'Neil (2016) showed. Therefore, it is crucial to have ethical control and constitutional protections.

C. Transparency and Accountability

Digital constitutionalism emphasizes transparency and accountability. Citizens must understand data collection, processing, and utilization. Governments and companies should be held liable for digital abuse. To regulate AI-driven governance systems, Chen (2021) and Creemers (2022) stressed constitutional rights and legal responsibility.

D. Ethical Challenges

The expanding use of AI and surveillance technology raises severe ethical issues around privacy, dignity and autonomy. The abuse of personal information may lead to the usage of digital profiling, bulk data collecting and face recognition technologies. Ramanathan (2014) and Prakash (2019) highlight ethical supervision and constitutional responsibility in digital government.

DIGITAL GOVERNANCE AND DATA PROTECTION LAWS

Data protection regulations safeguard constitutional rights in the digital age. The rise of biometric identity, AI-driven governance, and digital platforms need better legal protections.

A. Information Technology Act, 2000

The Indian Information Technology Act regulates cybercrime, electronic governance, and digital data management. It provides digital governance; nonetheless, concerns remain over surveillance capabilities, data misuse, and the safeguarding of privacy and free speech. According to Rouvroy (2016) and Delmas-Marty (2013), mass surveillance undermines democratic accountability and constitutional freedoms.

B. Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023

India's Digital Personal Data Protection Act takes informational privacy forward. The Act stresses the processing of data on the basis of consent, accountability and protection of personal data. The statute is inspired by Justice K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India to dovetail technology development with constitutional values such as privacy, dignity and liberty. Scholars debate whether the Act safeguards against government surveillance and misuse of businesses' data.

C. European Union's AI Act

A major worldwide AI regulation framework is the EU's AI Act. The Act targets risky AI activities including discriminatory algorithms and biometric surveillance. Transparency, accountability, and ethical AI governance are stressed. Comparative study demonstrates that such frameworks may assist constitutional democracies balance innovation and human rights.

CONCLUSION

Digital governance, AI, and surveillance technologies have rapidly expanded, affecting constitutional democracy and basic rights, according to the report. AI-driven governance, biometric databases, face recognition, and mass monitoring threaten privacy, liberty, equality, dignity, and free speech. According to studies, algorithmic systems lack transparency and accountability, resulting in prejudice and democratic freedom loss.

Digital constitutionalism is needed to protect constitutional values in the digital era. While technological advances increase the efficiency of governance and public administration, they also increase the potential for abuse of power by governments and corporations. Technology often progresses faster than the law, resulting in gaps in AI oversight, monitoring and data security.

A comparative analysis of the GDPR and the EU AI Act highlights the significance of legislative safeguards, judicial oversight, ethical governance of AI, transparency, and

accountability. Digital rights are safeguarded by the Indian Constitution, particularly after the ruling in Justice K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India. Nevertheless, enhanced execution and accountability are necessary.

Technological innovation must be balanced with constitutional ideals to preserve democracy, individual liberty, and human dignity, the research finds. Constitutional democracies must enhance digital rights jurisprudence, pass data protection legislation, control spying, and oversee AI ethically. Society can only assure that technology advancement improves democratic accountability and protects basic rights via proactive constitutional protections.

REFERENCES

1. Baxi, U. (2013). *The future of human rights* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.
2. Baxi, U. (2021). Human rights and constitutionalism in the digital age. *Journal of Indian Law and Society*, 12(1), 1–15.
3. Belli, L., & Zingales, N. (2022). Digital constitutionalism: Mapping the constitutionalization of the digital society. *International Communication Gazette*, 84(4), 321–340.
4. Bhandari, V. (2021). Digital governance and constitutional accountability in India. *Indian Journal of Constitutional Law*, 14(2), 45–58.
5. Bhatia, G. (2022). *The transformative constitution and digital governance in India*. Oxford University Press.
6. Celeste, E. (2019). Digital constitutionalism: The role of internet bills of rights. *International Review of Law, Computers & Technology*, 33(1), 76–93.
7. Cohen, J. E. (2019). *Between truth and power: The legal constructions of informational capitalism*. Oxford University Press.
8. Creemers, R. (2022). China's emerging data protection framework and digital governance. *China Law and Society Review*, 7(2), 145–162.
9. Eubanks, V. (2018). *Automating inequality: How high-tech tools profile, police, and punish the poor*. St. Martin's Press.
10. European Union. (2024). *Artificial Intelligence Act*. Official Journal of the European Union.
11. Hoffmann-Riem, W. (2020). *Artificial Intelligence as a challenge for law and regulation*. Springer.
12. Khan, A., & Verma, R. (2025). Digital surveillance and constitutional democracy: A comparative analysis. *Journal of Constitutional Studies*, 18(2), 145–162.
13. Noble, S. U. (2018). *Algorithms of oppression: How search engines reinforce racism*. New York University Press.
14. O'Neil, C. (2016). *Weapons of math destruction: How big data increases inequality and threatens democracy*. Crown Publishing Group.
15. Patel, S., & Rao, M. (2024). AI governance and constitutional accountability in public administration. *International Journal of Constitutional Law*, 22(1), 89–107.
16. Prakash, P. (2019). Artificial intelligence, surveillance and privacy concerns in India. *Internet Freedom Foundation Journal*, 4(2), 22–29.
17. Ramanathan, U. (2014). Privacy, security and the Aadhaar project. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 49(50), 35–40.
18. Rouvroy, A. (2016). *The end(s) of critique: Data-behaviourism versus due-process*. Routledge.
19. Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. PublicAffairs.