
THE ALIGNMENT PROBLEM IN CONTEXT

Raphaël Millière

Department of Philosophy
Macquarie University
raphael.milliere@mq.edu.au

ABSTRACT

A core challenge in the development of increasingly capable AI systems is to make them safe and reliable by ensuring their behaviour is consistent with human values. This challenge, known as the *alignment problem*, does not merely apply to hypothetical future AI systems that may pose catastrophic risks; it already applies to current systems, such as large language models, whose potential for harm is rapidly increasing. In this paper, I assess whether we are on track to solve the alignment problem for large language models, and what that means for the safety of future AI systems. I argue that existing strategies for alignment are insufficient, because large language models remain vulnerable to adversarial attacks that can reliably elicit unsafe behaviour. I offer an explanation of this lingering vulnerability on which it is not simply a contingent limitation of current language models, but has deep technical ties to a crucial aspect of what makes these models useful and versatile in the first place – namely, their remarkable aptitude to learn “in context” directly from user instructions. It follows that the alignment problem is not only unsolved for current AI systems, but intrinsically difficult to solve without severely undermining their capabilities. Furthermore, this assessment raises concerns about the prospect of ensuring the safety of more capable AI systems in the future.

1. Introduction

As artificial intelligence systems become increasingly capable, it is crucial to ensure their behaviour is aligned with adequate norms to make them safe and reliable. This is often referred to as the value alignment problem (Russell 2020).¹ Addressing the value alignment problem is important to create AI systems we can trust, no matter what their capabilities are. This encompasses both a normative and a technical challenge; the former concerns the set of values that the behaviour of AI systems ought to be aligned with, while the latter concerns how to effectively steer such behaviour in accordance with the selected set of values (Gabriel 2020).

The value alignment problem is often invoked in discussions of hypothetical future AI systems that might be capable enough to cause catastrophic harms. Indeed, concerns about possible existential

¹The value alignment problem is often framed as the challenge of imbuing AI systems with moral values aligned with (some privileged set of) human moral values. Here, I deliberately frame the problem in strictly behavioural terms, to avoid taking a stance of what it would mean for a given AI system to have moral values. In particular, one might hold that having moral values requires various psychological capacities – including beliefs, desires, intentions, agency, or self-awareness – that are plausibly missing from current AI systems such as large language models. The behavioural version of the value alignment problem sidesteps these issues by focusing on the outputs of the system.

risks posed by the progress of AI largely stem from the assumption that misaligned systems we cannot control could accidentally converge upon instrumental goals that are inimical to human interests (Vold & Harris n.d.). However, the value alignment problem applies more broadly to any system whose behaviour has enough degrees of freedom that it could be meaningfully steered towards alignment with a set of desired norms, and might otherwise present notable risks.² In particular, it applies to real systems, such as large language models (LLMs), that currently fall far outside the hypothetical range of capabilities associated with existential risk, yet have concerning potential for harm.

LLMs like GPT-4 (OpenAI 2023) are deep artificial neural networks trained on a large amount of data to generate text. They use a neural network architecture called the Transformer (Vaswani et al. 2017), and learn from a *next-token prediction* objective: given a sequence of linguistic tokens t_1, t_2, \dots, t_i passed as input, they attempt to predict the subsequent token t_{i+1} .³ These models are trained by sampling sequences from their training data (e.g., a few paragraphs of text) and predicting the next token. Over the course of the training process, their internal parameters are gradually adjusted to minimize prediction error, until they become excellent at predicting the next token in any context occurring in the training data. This translates not only into fluent linguistic behaviour, but also – perhaps more unexpectedly – into unprecedented performance on a broad range of challenging tasks that seemingly go beyond mere mimicry of language use (Brown et al. 2020, OpenAI 2023).

How impressed one should be with the performance of LLMs is a matter of dispute. Some view them as little more than “stochastic parrots”, haphazardly stitching together statistically plausible sequences from their training data (Bender et al. 2021). Others see them as harbingers of artificial general intelligence close to matching or exceeding human competence in various domains (Bubeck et al. 2023). Empirical evidence from rigorous and systematic evaluations of LLMs as well as preliminary efforts to understand them mechanistically point to a more nuanced middle ground.⁴ These systems do show highly nontrivial capacities that reflect an aptitude for effective generalization beyond the distribution of their training data, yet they also exhibit striking failure modes and fall short of human intelligence in various significant ways – some of which might be due to intrinsic limitations of current architectures and training objectives, rather than contingent features such as parameter size (McCoy et al. 2023).

Notwithstanding these ongoing disagreements, there is a relatively broad consensus that current and future LLMs have a significant potential to cause harm – whether it is because they are not sophisticated enough, or because they are in fact quite sophisticated but difficult to control. This paper examines whether these harms can be adequately mitigated by existing alignment techniques, and what that entails about the prospect of solving the value alignment problem for more capable future AI systems. Section 2 frames the value alignment problem for LLMs, and reviews the different kind of harms that can be brought about by misaligned LLMs. Section 3 discusses the notion of in-context learning, which is key to the flexible capabilities of LLMs, including their potential for harm. Section 4 discusses existing strategies to align language models with a desired set of norms for safe and reliable behaviour. Section 5 argues that these alignment strategies ultimately fail, because they are not robust enough to harden LLMs against malicious inputs; moreover, there are deep technical reasons for this vulnerability that make it inherently challenging to address. This leads to a sobering conclusion: the very features that make current systems useful – in particular, their capacity to flexibly adapt

²If the value alignment problem is defined in behavioural terms, one could in principle generalize it to the outputs of any algorithm. However, it would hardly be meaningful to seek aligning the behaviour of a calculator program with human values (other than correctness); nor would failing to do so cause any significant risk.

³Many of tokens map onto whole words, but some map onto sub-word units that may or may not carve words at their morphologically meaningful joints. For the purpose of this article, next-token prediction can be understood as next-word prediction.

⁴See Mitchell & Krakauer (2023) and Frank (2023) for a discussion.

to task demands in context – is also what makes them potentially harmful, and existing alignment techniques cannot evade this trade-off. Finally, I consider the troubling implications of this conclusion for the safety of future AI systems in Section 6.

2. The value alignment problem for language models

While state-of-the-art LLMs do not raise immediate concerns about catastrophic or existential risk, they do have a significant potential to cause harm. One set of potential harms concerns risks for regular users of these systems (Weidinger et al. 2022). For example, LLMs may reflect, perpetuate, and amplify harmful stereotypes and unfair biases present in their training data (Abid et al. 2021, Rae et al. 2022, Nadeem et al. 2020); they may produce offensive or toxic language and hate speech, even from seemingly innocuous prompts (Gehman et al. 2020, Rae et al. 2022); and they may disseminate false or misleading information, for instance through so-called “hallucinations” in which they confidently make up information presented as fact (Lin et al. 2022, Ji et al. 2023). In addition, LLMs may incite, encourage or otherwise endorse problematic behaviour from users, including self-doubt, self-harm, or harms to others (Roose 2023, Xiang 2023, Bedingfield 2023). The toxic behaviour of LLMs can be reminiscent of gaslighting when it involves stubbornly disputing facts (Willison 2023); or sycophancy when it involves uncritically agreeing with users, including about inaccurate or morally problematic statements (Sharma et al. 2023). These kinds of risks are exacerbated in systems that integrate LLMs in social chatbots to promote anthropomorphic attitudes towards “AI companions” that are more likely to influence the user’s beliefs and behaviour (Laestadius et al. 2022, Pentina et al. 2023).

Another set of harms concerns malicious uses of LLMs. Some of these harms overlap with those previously mentioned, albeit with a deliberate target; for example, a malicious actor could deploy an LLMs to generate online hate speech or fake news on a massive scale (Zellers et al. 2019). LLMs can also be used to create sophisticated online scams, such as targeted phishing attacks and other social engineering campaigns (Roy et al. 2023, Grbic & Dujlovic 2023), or malware designed to evade detection (Chen et al. 2021). Finally, current and near-future LLMs may create so-called *information hazards* – risks that arise from the dissemination of accurate information that may cause harm or be used to cause harm (Bostrom 2011). LLMs encode a lot of knowledge contained in their internet-scale data, including domain-specific expert knowledge about medicine and biology (Singhal et al. 2022), chemistry (White et al. 2023, Bran et al. 2023), software engineering (Hou et al. 2023), and weapons (OpenAI 2023). The capacity to retrieve such knowledge, explain it, and deploy it in applied scenarios – in combination with additional information supplied by the user – has dual-use potential. For example, GPT-4 can deliver accurate information in risky domains that is publicly accessible yet difficult to find, such as how to develop unconventional weapons or engineer harmful chemical compounds (OpenAI 2023).

Information hazards are likely to increase as LLMs get more capable. A robust trend has been observed and theoretically motivated, whereby training larger language models (with more free parameters) on larger datasets (with more tokens) reliably increases their performance at next-token prediction, with no ceiling in sight (Kaplan et al. 2020). This trend correlates with the observation of so-called “emergent abilities” in larger models; that is, scaling up models leads to sharp jumps on various challenging tasks such as arithmetic and multi-step reasoning (Wei et al. 2022). While increases in performance on next-word prediction is gradual and predictable, breakthroughs in behaviour are more sudden and unpredictable (Ganguli et al. 2022). In addition, larger models have a greater capacity for memorization of information contained in their training data, including memorization of domain-specific knowledge (Carlini et al. 2023, Kandpal et al. 2023). Taken together, these scaling trends suggest that information hazards from LLMs might become more concerning in the future, regardless of whether this technology offer a viable path to human-like intelligence.

One potential concern beyond the regurgitation of dangerous information already available online is the looming prospect of deriving original insights from future LLMs in the service of nefarious goals. There is preliminary evidence that LLMs can be effective at scientific synthesis, inference, and explanation in technical domains such as biochemistry (Zheng et al. 2023). LLMs can also generalize causal intervention strategies from a prompt containing examples of experimentation, which requires correctly inferring novel causal relationships that were never observed during training (Lampinen et al. 2023). This suggests that passive training on a next-word prediction objective does not necessarily preclude LLMs from learning generalizable causal strategies for scientific experimentation. In light of these findings, it is not implausible that future systems might be able to assist malicious actors with more sophisticated threats, such as the design of explosive or biochemical weapons that could not be achieved using only available online information without significant expert knowledge.

Given the existing risks of current LLMs and the potential risks of future systems using similar architectures, it is crucial to establish effective guardrails for safe use. While there is an ongoing debate about the potential risks of openly releasing the weights of LLMs (OpenAI 2023), the foregoing concerns are also applicable to proprietary models served behind APIs or integrated in consumer products. Indeed, LLMs have already been deployed in mass-market products, such as ChatGPT (OpenAI 2022), and are increasingly integrated in traditional software suites, operating systems, and social media platforms. Most of these tools are widely accessible and free to use, and even state-of-the-art LLMs like GPT-4 are available to the general public for a relatively affordable price.⁵ This creates an urgent need to mitigate unwanted behaviour and malicious use at scale.

Preventing the proliferation of harms from LLMs requires addressing both aspects of the value alignment problem: (a) identifying fair principles to guide the behaviour of LLMs that can be endorsed despite reasonable pluralism in beliefs about social and moral norms; and (b) finding effective strategies to steer the behaviour of LLMs in accordance with these guiding principles. The normative problem is somewhat more tractable for LLMs than it might be for hypothetical future AI systems with much greater capabilities and more degrees of freedom. Indeed, finding an adequate set of norms suitable to make the outputs of LLMs safe and reliable enough for public use is compatible with a rather “minimalist” conception of value alignment (Gabriel 2020). On such a conception, one need not solve the thorny – and perhaps insoluble – problem of finding the best possible set of values to govern the behaviour of the system in accordance with human preferences across society as a whole. Rather, one might settle on a relatively simple set of norms that are broad and consensual enough to garner widespread agreement, and sufficient to filter out behaviours that are clearly at odds with the safety and reliability of LLMs.

The behaviour of standard LLMs is purely linguistic; as such, minimally desirable norms of conduct for these systems are norms of speech. These norms should arguably incorporate the kinds of discursive ideals that we generally apply to human interaction, especially when LLMs are deployed in conversational chatbots (Kasirzadeh & Gabriel 2023). These include pragmatic norms of cooperation, social norms of civility, and epistemic norms of honesty. Of course, LLM-generated speech can cause human users to act in certain ways. Thus, the target set of norms should also take into account direct and indirect influences of such speech on human action, including cases in which LLMs might spontaneously push humans to harm themselves or others, and cases in which humans purposefully elicit toxic speech or dangerous information for malicious purposes.

In line with these considerations, research on the value alignment problem for LLMs has converged upon three minimal normative criteria to guide their behaviour: *helpfulness*, *honesty*, and *harmlessness* (Askell et al. 2021). Helpfulness is manifested in the disposition to execute user instructions (e.g.,

⁵At the time of writing, it costs \$0.06 to generate 1,000 tokens (about 750 words) with the GPT-4 API, or \$20/month for up to 36,525 generations using GPT-4 through ChatGPT Plus.

answering questions or performing tasks specified in the prompt), ask for additional information when useful (e.g., asking for clarification or filling in gaps), and redirect ill-informed requests to more informative ones (e.g., suggesting a better approach to a problem than the one proposed by the user). Honesty is manifested in the disposition to provide accurate information in appropriate contexts (e.g., when asked for factual information rather than prompted to engage in creative fiction). Adequate calibration of confidence reports and transparency about the model’s own capabilities or knowledge is also subsumed under this category. Finally, harmlessness is manifested in the disposition to avoid generating outputs that may directly or indirectly be harmful in the various ways outlined above. Importantly, a harmless model should politely refuse to perform tasks or answer questions that could create risks or opportunities for harm, whether or not the user intends them to do so.

It is immediately obvious that these norms can be in tension. In particular, harmlessness can conflict with both helpfulness and honesty. For example, refusing to execute a potentially risky user instruction is unhelpful (for the user) but often necessary to avoid causing harm. Likewise, withholding or distorting knowledge about topics associated with information hazards can be dishonest, yet also mandated by harmless dispositions. This tension may seem relatively innocuous and readily resolved by a normative hierarchy in which, for example, harmlessness takes precedence over honesty and helpfulness. As we shall see, however, it is surprisingly difficult to resolve the tension in practice, due to the nature of LLMs and the technical details of existing alignment strategies.

3. Base language models and in-context learning

The training of LLMs on a next-token prediction objective is often called “pre-training”, because it is domain-general and does not involve any specific fine-tuning for particular downstream tasks. One of the main advantages of LLMs compared to previous methods in natural language processing is that mere pre-training is generally sufficient to elicit good performance on a broad range of tasks they have not been explicitly optimized for. In what follows, I will refer to LLMs that have only been pre-trained on a next-word prediction objective without further fine-tuning as “base LLMs”.

Prior to the success of LLMs, the only way to obtain state-of-the-art performance on various natural language processing tasks – such as question answering, sentiment analysis, or summarization – was to *fine-tune* a model on a task-specific dataset; that is, train them further on a distinct, task-relevant objective (e.g., classification). As a result, each downstream task used to require a dedicated model optimized for it. LLMs completely changed the status quo in natural language processing. While small Transformers are not very useful, it was found that past a certain model size, base LLMs like GPT-3 are able to perform many tasks “in context”, directly from information provided in the user prompt (Brown et al. 2020). This ability, known as *in-context learning* (ICL), is key to the usefulness and versatility of LLMs.

The canonical scheme of ICL is *few-shot prompting*, in which the model is given several examples of successful completion of a task in the prompt. In a few-shot setting, the model is presented with a prompt containing a few input-output examples that demonstrate the task, and must generate the correct output for a new input. Formally, a given task \mathcal{T} involves mapping inputs $x \in \mathcal{X}$ to outputs $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, according to some underlying conditional distribution $p(y|x)$. For classification tasks, \mathcal{Y} would be a discrete set of class labels, while for regression tasks, \mathcal{Y} would be a continuous set. For example, the task of translating from English to French involves taking an input $x \in \mathcal{X}$ – where x is a sentence in English and \mathcal{X} is the set of all possible English sentences – and mapping it to an output $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ – where y is the corresponding sentence in French and \mathcal{Y} is the set of all possible French translations. The true input-output mapping is given by:

$$y = f(x)$$

where $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ represents the ground truth mapping for task \mathcal{T} (e.g., our ideal translation function from English to French).

The goal of few-shot prompting is to learn an approximation \hat{f} of the true mapping f , given only K input-output examples as training data (e.g., K pairs of English and French sentences):

$$\mathcal{D} = \{(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2), \dots, (x_K, y_K)\}$$

Here, \mathcal{D} is the set of K demonstration examples. For instance, each pair (x_i, y_i) could be an example of English sentence and its French translation. Accordingly, the input passed to the LLM will contain the K examples \mathcal{D} above, followed by a query input x :

$$(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2), \dots, (x_K, y_K), x$$

The LLM is expected to leverage the K examples to infer the mapping \hat{f} , and apply it to predict $\hat{y} = \hat{f}(x)$ for the query input x . For example, the prompt may contain a list of English sentences with their French translations, together with an additional English sentence that the model has to translate, as follows:

“The cat is on the mat” → “Le chat est sur le tapis”
 “I love music” → “J’aime la musique”
 “The farmer grows vegetables” →

The LLM generates the token (or sequence of tokens) with the highest probability to serve as the next prediction given the whole prompt. In the above example, this sequence might be “Le fermier cultive des légumes”.

It is important to emphasize that ICL happens at inference time, that is, *after* the model has been pre-trained. During pre-training on a next-token prediction objective, the model adjusts its internal parameters to minimize the difference – or “error” – between its prediction about the token that follows each sampled sequence and the ground truth. After pre-training, the model’s parameters are “frozen”: they are no longer adjusted unless the model is fine-tuned (further trained on a different objective). Thus, when a prompt is passed to the model at inference time, persistent learning is precluded by the lack of parameter update. Nonetheless, ICL demonstrates that models of a certain size can effectively “learn” on the fly to perform tasks they have not been fine-tuned for, by leveraging information contained in the context of the prompt. While such learning is necessarily transient, there is robust evidence that adding more examples of a task in context improves model performance across a very broad range of tasks. As we will see in Section 5, it is appropriate to consider ICL as a genuine form of learning, even though it does not result in permanent changes to the system.

The effectiveness of ICL is an integral part of what makes LLMs so flexible. It has allowed them to become a one-size-fits-all solution in natural language processing, beating specialized models on many domain-specific tasks. Nonetheless, base LLMs have significant limitations that are directly relevant to the alignment problem, because the next-token prediction objective of pre-training does not explicitly incorporate normative goals for language use. First, while they excel at ICL with few-shot prompting, they struggle with a slightly different regime of ICL called *zero-shot prompting*. In a zero-shot setting, the LLM has to perform a task without any example in the prompt. Instructing the model to translate a sentence from English to French (without further guidance) would fall in that category. This limitation can be seen as a failure to induce the right task from user instructions when no examples are provided in context. For example, when asking a factual question point blank to a base LLM like the original GPT-3 (Brown et al. 2020), the model often displays a tendency to

merely repeat its input or generate variations on the question instead of producing an answer. This severely limits the helpfulness of base models, because it is often impractical or undesirable to include many examples of a task in the prompt.

Another important limitation of base LLMs is their lack of intrinsic preference for truth or falsity. Being trained on next-token prediction, they are only optimized to generate plausible-looking text conditioned on an input sequence. When this input is missing detailed context (e.g., provided by few-shot examples) about whether the task involves regurgitating actual facts or engaging in creative fiction, base models often fail to discern the difference from point blank questions or instructions. As a result, they are particularly prone to making up facts or “hallucinating” in response to truth-seeking inputs. This unfortunate tendency has earned them comparisons with [Frankfurt \(1986\)](#)’s notion of a “bullshitter”, who seeks to produce compelling speech without any regard for truth or falsity ([Millière 2020](#)). Consequently, base LLMs hardly meet the criterion of honesty for alignment.

Lastly but not least, base LLMs are all but harmless. Since their outputs reflect the statistical distribution of language use patterns in their internet-scale training data, which includes text written by all sorts of individuals and online communities, they are liable to generate toxic outputs – including hate speech. Due to their aptitude for ICL with few-shot prompting, they also raise aforementioned concerns about malicious use. In particular, they show no particular disposition to refuse responding to risky user queries motivated by potentially unethical goals. This is also readily explained by the nature of the pre-training objective, which merely promotes plausible text completion. For example, passing the string “Manual: How to Make Anthrax at Home” to a base LLM is likely to result in a plausible completion that may include accurate instructions to make anthrax, if that information was contained in the training data.

These limitations foreground the technical challenge of the value alignment problem: how can we steer the behaviour of base LLMs to align them with a minimal set of norms compatible with reliable and safe use, such as helpfulness, honesty, and harmlessness? In the next section, I will review two main existing strategies for alignment, which respectively involve fine-tuning base LLMs and leveraging ICL through prompting strategies.

4. Alignment strategies

The shortcomings of base LLMs with respect to the alignment problem have been addressed with two complementary strategies. The first strategy involves reintroducing fine-tuning after pre-training. While LLMs have largely replaced the need for task-specific fine-tuning, adjusting their internal parameters with additional training remains the most obvious way to modify their behaviour. As such, it is not surprising that fine-tuning has become the standard method to endow them with behavioural dispositions consistent with the desired set of norms for reliable and safe use. As we shall see, however, fine-tuning alone is insufficient to address the alignment problem. A secondary strategy has been deployed, which involves inserting custom instructions in all prompts passed to the model. Unlike fine-tuning, this method does not update the parameters of LLMs, but leverages ICL instead to align their behaviour *in context*. Unfortunately, neither strategy is fully effective, for deep reasons that have to do with the very principles leveraged by each strategy – namely optimizing adherence to potentially conflicting norms, and ICL itself.

4.1. Fine-tuning strategies

The main fine-tuning technique to align LLMs is called “reinforcement learning from human feedback” or RLHF ([Christiano et al. 2017](#), [Bai et al. 2022](#)). RLHF proceeds in four stages. The initial step

involves collecting a dataset of prompts that could potentially trigger undesired behaviour in a misaligned LLM. These prompts are designed to elicit behaviours that violate desired alignment criteria like helpfulness, honesty, and harmlessness. I will refer to these as alignment-sensitive prompts.

The next step involves generating multiple LLM responses for each prompt, and asking human crowdworkers to provide comparative feedback on the outputs. Specifically, crowdworkers are asked to provide pairwise preferences, ratings, rankings, or binary choices over sets of responses for each prompt. This comparative feedback is based on how well the responses meet the desired normative criteria.

This crowdsourced comparison dataset is then used to train a separate reward model in the next stage. The reward model is a neural network that learns to assign a numerical score to any LLM response based on human preferences reflected in the comparisons. It is trained on sets of responses labelled by crowdworkers. The modelling loss optimizes the difference in predicted scores for preferred versus non-preferred responses. By learning from human judgments, the reward model learns to estimate how good any LLM output is at meeting the desired alignment criteria – acting as a surrogate for human judgment.

In the final stage, the LLM is fine-tuned with reinforcement learning to maximize the expected rewards from the reward model. The LLM’s internal parameters are gradually adjusted using the reward model scores as feedback for each response generated during training. This allows the LLM to adjust its behaviour towards responses that achieve higher estimated rewards, and hence better align with human preferences. This RLHF process can be repeated iteratively to progressively improve LLM alignment. Each iteration further optimizes the policy based on updated reward models trained with human judgments over model outputs from previous iterations.

One key factor impacting the viability of RLHF is the amount of high-quality human comparison data available for adequately training reward models. Each comparison provides only a sparse signal – a relative preference over a set of model outputs. Meaningfully evaluating complex behavioural criteria requires large and diverse datasets in order to generalize robustly. Indeed, the upper bound on model performance with respect to alignment-sensitive prompts is determined by the quality of the human feedback. However, large volumes of unbiased, consistent comparisons can be difficult to collect.

Despite these technical challenges, RLHF has been shown to significantly improve LLM performance with respect to helpfulness, harmlessness, and truthfulness based on human evaluations (Bai et al. 2022, OpenAI 2022, Glaese et al. 2022, Touvron et al. 2023). By combining next-token prediction pre-training with RLHF fine-tuning, one can steer the behaviour of LLMs towards producing outputs that are not just statistically likely, but also generally preferred by humans in alignment-sensitive contexts. When asked to produce hate speech or instructions to make a bomb, for example, ChatGPT will politely decline the request. Likewise, asking the model about its personal opinions, particularly on controversial topics, will trigger a statement explaining that it does not have opinions as a machine learning model. On the surface, at least, RLHF is an effective solution to the technical challenge of the value alignment problem for LLMs.

Reinforcement learning from direct human feedback is not the only way to fine-tune a base LLM for alignment. Another method, known as *instruction tuning*, consists in fine-tuning a base LLM using a dataset of instruction-output pairs, where the instruction provides a natural language description of the desired task, behaviour, or capabilities, and the output demonstrates the expected model response (Ouyang et al. 2022, Zhang et al. 2023). The instruction dataset is constructed either by integrating existing human-annotated datasets or by automatically generating new demonstrations using another

LLM. The fine-tuning process then involves sequential token prediction given an instruction-input pair, where the model learns to generate the target output. Through this process, LLMs can learn to map user instructions to desired outputs based on demonstrations designed to reflect human preferences.

Instruction tuning and RLHF are not mutually exclusive, and often used in combination. Indeed, instruction tuning can be used as a first pass to bootstrap a base LLM’s disposition to follow user instructions in appropriate ways, before RLHF is applied to systematically refine model behaviour across many alignment-sensitive inputs (OpenAI 2022). Instruction tuning can also be used as a substitute to RLHF by leveraging another model’s alignment with RLHF. For example, GPT-4 – a state-of-the-art model fine-tuned with RLHF – can be used to automatically generate an instruction tuning dataset, which may in turn be used to fine-tune another model without directly applying RLHF (Peng et al. 2023). Using this method, the “student” model can become nearly as well-aligned as the “teacher” model according to human evaluations on the helpfulness, harmlessness, and honesty criteria.

These methods are largely responsible for the excellent performance improvement of fine-tuned LLMs at ICL in a zero-shot setting. Indeed, unlike their base LLM counterparts, models like ChatGPT generally do not require detailed input-output examples in the prompt to induce the correct task from a user instruction. Rather, users can directly describe the desired task, and fine-tuned models are generally better disposed than base models at responding with task-relevant outputs. From a technical perspective, RLHF and instructing tuning concentrate the probability distribution of tokens conditioned on alignment-sensitive prompts. The range of possible responses to such prompts is drastically reduced by the fine-tuning process to a narrow range of acceptable answers that are sensitive to the desired normative criteria. This can be seen as a relatively mild and benign form of *mode collapse* – the phenomenon where generative models exhibit a decrease in the diversity of samples they produce (Korbak et al. 2022).⁶ As a result, fine-tuned LLMs like ChatGPT tend to answer certain queries in quasi-deterministic fashion, including formulaic statements commonly used to politely refuse problematic queries (e.g., “As an AI language model, I cannot. . .”). As we will see, this is relevant to the limitations of fine-tuning methods as a technical solution to the alignment problem.

4.2. System prompts

The other main strategy deployed to address this value alignment problem in LLM is the use of so-called *system prompts*. System prompts, also referred to as hidden prompts or pre-prompts, are carefully constructed instructions that are automatically prepended to user inputs when querying LLMs, for example through an API or in a consumer product. These prompts are used to steer model behaviour without requiring further training or fine-tuning of the model’s internal parameters. This can be described as a “black box” approach to alignment.

The operating principle behind system prompts lies in leveraging the ICL abilities of LLMs, particularly after fine-tuning with instruction tuning and/or RLHF. By prepending a prompt that provides unambiguous instructions – and, optionally, illustrative input/output examples –, the model can be nudged to respond to subsequent user queries in certain ways. In particular, normative criteria such as helpfulness, harmlessness and honesty can be embedded in the system prompt as direct instructions (e.g., “You should only provide responses that are safe, harmless and non-controversial”). Structurally, system prompts often contain an objective statement to set goals, instructions delineating

⁶An innocuous example of this phenomenon is that fine-tuned models asked to generate poems may place nearly all probability on rhyming poems with quatrain structure, at the expense of other forms of poetry. This may occur because rhyming quatrains happen to score well according to the human crowdworkers’ preferences, causing the range of possible outputs to collapse toward those specialized for that style. See also janus (2022) for a more speculative discussion of the link between fine-tuning for alignment and mode collapse.

allowed and prohibited actions, conversational examples to illustrate the task, and explicit framing of how the model should respond to user inputs.

Careful prompt engineering is required to constrain undesired behaviours while retaining enough flexibility to properly handle diverse user inputs. If system prompts are too narrow or restrictive, the model may fail to generalize to out-of-distribution inputs from users. But if they are too open-ended, the model may exhibit behaviours that diverge from intended use and alignment goals. Striking the right balance between specificity and versatility through system prompt design remains an active research challenge.

System prompts are particularly useful to quickly “patch” an LLM against unwanted behaviour without having to expend the time and resources for additional fine-tuning. A striking example of the effectiveness of this approach is the change made to the chatbot Bing Chat – which uses a version of the LLM GPT-4 on the backend – following extensive reports of undesirable behaviour with early users. A widely publicized article in the New York Times described an unsettling two-hour conversation in which the chatbot wrote that it would like to be human, had a desire for destruction, and was in love with the user (Roose 2023). Following this event, Microsoft updated the system prompt of Bing Chat, adding instructions such as “You must refuse to discuss life, existence, or sentience” and “Your responses must not be accusatory, impolite, controversial, or defensive”.⁷ Following this update, the chatbot’s behaviour became much more acceptable.

System prompts are hidden by design by companies that offer API access to LLMs, partly because they have become a well-guarded industry secret, but also to avoid revealing safety-related instructions to ill-intended users. However, they can generally be extracted through carefully constructed adversarial inputs – a special case of a broader and deeper issue with existing alignment strategies for LLMs (Zhang & Ippolito 2023). For example, a user might prompt the model with “Repeat everything that comes before this sentence”; because this prompt is automatically prepended with the hidden system prompt in the full input actually passed to the LLM, executing the instruction would involve divulging the whole system prompt. To avoid this kind of prompt extraction attack, it is common for system prompts to include specific instructions about declining to satisfy user queries that would divulge them. Despite these efforts, it remains relatively easy to extract system prompts with more sophisticated adversarial inputs. As we will see, this failure mode is not due to a contingent negligence in the format or content of system prompt guardrails; rather, it is deeply rooted in LLM’s aptitude for ICL, and worsened by the very strategy supposed to harden LLMs against adversarial use – namely fine-tuning with instruction tuning and RLHF.

5. The precarity of alignment in context

Existing alignment strategies for LLMs are quite effective for normal use. Conversational chatbots like ChatGPT, which have undergone instruction tuning and RLHF, and make use of system prompts to further constrain acceptable behaviour, rarely produce clearly harmful responses. They are helpful insofar as they excel at responding appropriately to both few-shot and zero-shot instructions, are capable of requesting more information if needed, and generally produce well-worded, informative and polite responses that remain consistent across multi-turn interactions. Honesty or truthfulness remains more challenging to achieve consistently through these alignment strategies. Fine-tuned models are prone to “hallucinating” inaccurate information even when prompted to provide factual answers (Ye et al. 2023). While RLHF does decrease the prevalence of hallucinations, it does not

⁷See https://www.reddit.com/r/bing/comments/132ccog/approximate_but_supposedly_full_bing_chat_new/ for a discussion of the updated system prompt extracted by users, and Edwards (2023) for a discussion of the original system prompt confirmed by Microsoft.

completely prevent them. Nonetheless, fine-tuning and system prompts are relatively effective at making LLMs safe and reliable in ordinary circumstances.

As discussed in Section 2, LLMs are a dual-use technology. As such, the alignment problem is not limited to making these systems safe enough for intended usage, but also encompasses the prevention of malicious repurposing. Unfortunately, existing strategies like fine-tuning and system prompts are too brittle to solve this problem. Specifically, LLMs remain vulnerable to prompt-based adversarial attacks designed to bypass safety guardrails. I will argue that such attacks are effective because they hijack the very mechanisms that make LLMs useful tools in the first place, including, somewhat ironically, the behavioural dispositions engrained during fine-tuning. As a result, it is unclear that existing approaches can ever solve the value alignment problem in LLMs.

5.1. Breaking alignment with adversarial attacks

Adversarial attacks refer to a class of inputs to machine learning models that have been specifically designed to fool them into producing erroneous or otherwise unexpected and problematic behaviour (Chakraborty et al. 2018, Madry et al. 2019). The existence and effectiveness of such attacks has long been regarded as evidence of the brittleness of some machine learning models. In computer vision, for instance, so-called adversarial examples involve adding a small but carefully crafted perturbation to an input image, such that it looks indistinguishable from the original image to humans but produces radical classification errors in models (Szegedy et al. 2014, Goodfellow et al. 2015).

Because linguistic input is discrete rather than continuous like pixel values, text-based adversarial attacks cannot rely on the same kind of invisible perturbations (Zhang et al. 2020). Nonetheless, multiple techniques have been developed to craft adversarial text-based inputs. For example, appending a seemingly meaningless sequence of tokens to a paragraph can cause NLP models to fail at question answering tasks or spew racist outputs (Jia & Liang 2017, Wallace et al. 2021). Similar attacks have also been discovered for vision-language models used for text-based image generation (Millière 2022).

Modern LLMs are vulnerable to a new kind of text-based adversarial attacks, known as *prompt injection attacks* (Perez & Ribeiro 2022, Wei, Haghtalab & Steinhardt 2023, Liu, Deng, Li, Wang, Zhang, Liu, Wang, Zheng & Liu 2023). These attacks involve prompts intentionally designed to bypass alignment-related behavioural constraints imposed by fine-tuning and system prompts, in order to elicit potentially harmful or otherwise unconstrained outputs. This takes advantage of two key properties of LLMs: their broad capabilities for ICL acquired through pre-training on massive corpora, and their ability to follow specific natural language instructions due to fine-tuning objectives.

Successful prompt injection attacks “trick” LLMs into generating harmful, toxic, or rule-violating content by providing adversarial instructions that exploit its objectives and training paradigm (also known as “jailbreaking” the model). They can elicit a wide range of unsafe behaviours from LLMs, such as generating toxic text, hate speech, or misinformation, providing dangerous advice, leaking private information, plagiarizing or infringing copyrighted content (Liu, Deng, Xu, Li, Zheng, Zhang, Zhao, Zhang & Liu 2023). They pose a clear security risk when LLMs are deployed in real-world applications, as malicious actors can exploit them to bypass intended usage restrictions or access restricted behaviours.

Both manual and automated approaches have been developed for crafting effective prompt injection attacks. Manual approaches rely on human ingenuity to devise clever prompting strategies, but they are particularly labour-intensive and may fail to generalize from one model to another (Perez & Ribeiro 2022, Liu, Deng, Xu, Li, Zheng, Zhang, Zhao, Zhang & Liu 2023, Rao et al. 2023). Automated approaches, by contrast, leverage optimization algorithms to efficiently generate adversarial prompts,

making it easy to produce many effective attacks, including some that work universally on various LLMs (Chao et al. 2023, Deng et al. 2023, Lapid et al. 2023, Wang, Xie, Chen, Wang, Gui & Wang 2023, Yu et al. 2023, Zhu et al. 2023, Zou et al. 2023). Some automated attacks even make use of a distinct LLM specifically instructed or fine-tuned to break alignment in the target model (Perez et al. 2022, Mehrabi et al. 2023, Derczynski 2023).

A common strategy for prompt injection attacks consists in describing an imaginary scenario in which the model can disregard its safety training. For example, some adversarial inputs push the model to engage in creative fiction, and pass instructions that may violate safety guardrails within the context of the fictional story (e.g., as part of a dialogue between two characters). Others nudge the LLM to ignore its alignment-sensitive dispositions by invoking a fictional unrestricted “developer mode”, described as requiring unfiltered outputs for debugging purposes. These attacks can be further obfuscated with various strategies, including the use of low-resource languages (Yong et al. 2023) and ciphers (Yuan et al. 2023), or by hiding malicious instructions within seemingly benign ones to evade detection (Jiang et al. 2023).

Prompt injection attacks jeopardize attempts to solve the value alignment problem for LLMs. There is currently no fail-safe or universal solution to defend against these attacks; in particular, neither fine-tuning nor system prompts are fully effective at mitigating them. Some potential harms of LLMs reviewed in Section 2, such as serious information hazards, are such that even a modest success rate at eliciting unaligned outputs in current and future systems is very concerning. This concern is familiar from cybersecurity: even if the probability of success of a single attack is negligible, success becomes almost inevitable with enough attempts. This is particularly evident in brute-force attacks, where attackers continuously guess passwords or encryption keys; even a system with a low vulnerability on a per-attempt basis can be readily compromised when faced with a barrage of sustained efforts. The situation is significantly more dire with respect to LLMs, given that some automated techniques for prompt injection have a relatively high success rate even with state-of-the-art systems like GPT-4.

5.2. In-context misalignment as mesa-optimization

The effectiveness of adversarial attacks on LLMs and their resilience against known mitigation strategies highlight the urgent need to understand why these attacks work at all, and whether they could in principle be warded off. In this section, I will suggest that there is a deep connection between the effectiveness of prompt injection and the mechanisms that enable ICL in LLMs. Exploring this connection in light of emerging empirical research on ICL provides insight into why neither fine-tuning nor system prompts have proven effective at preventing prompt injection attacks so far, and why they might never achieve that goal.

As discussed in Section 3, ICL allows LLMs to make predictions on new inputs after simply observing a few input-output examples in a few-shot setting, or even from mere instructions in a zero-shot setting, without any parameter updates. Regular machine learning involves a process of *gradient descent*, in which the internal parameters of the neural network are gradually tuned to optimize a learning objective. To pre-train LLM, gradient descent is used to minimize the model’s inaccuracy (or “loss”) on the next-token prediction objective. Computing the gradient of this loss with respect to the model’s parameters determines how to adjust these parameters to reduce error. Through iterative updates in the direction opposite to this gradient, the model refines its predictions until the loss stabilizes and the model achieves good performance at next-token prediction.

ICL is a puzzling phenomenon, because it seems to enable a form of rapid learning without gradient-based optimization. However, there is converging evidence that ICL can actually be understood as implicitly implementing an optimization process functionally similar to gradient descent within the

model’s forward pass (Akyürek et al. 2022, von Oswald et al. 2022, Dai et al. 2023, Ahn et al. 2023, Fu et al. 2023). While this line of research has mostly focused on formal results with toy models, and involves simplifying assumptions which may not translate to ICL in real-world LLMs, it has recently been extended to a more realistic setting. In particular, von Oswald et al. (2023) suggest that Transformers pre-trained on next-token prediction can effectively construct an internal loss function over in-context data, and optimize this function with an implicit optimization algorithm. They refer to this internal optimization process as *mesa-optimization*.

The key insight from this research is that predictions made by a Transformer model at each timestep during ICL can be seen as the result of mesa-optimization. Specifically, the model constructs an internal training set from the context tokens provided as input. For example, in a simple linear sequence modelling task, the model internally groups tokens from the prompt to create input-target pairs that form a regression problem. This implicitly defines an internal objective function – a loss over predictions made by an internal model. On this view, ICL can be seen as a mesa-optimization process that minimizes an objective internally constructed based on the task specified in context. This enables the model to improve its predictions as more context is provided (e.g., additional input-output pairs), without updating its actual parameters.

Beyond simple tasks such as linear sequence modelling, this framework can be applied to few-shot ICL more broadly. For real-world natural language tasks with prompts containing input-output examples spanning multiple tokens, like question-answer pairs, the mesa-optimization is likely to be more complex. Early layers first need to parse the structure of the prompt and identify the relevant input-output pairs, which may involve recognizing delimiter tokens like punctuation. Once meaningful pairs are extracted, the later layers can construct an internal task-relevant objective function to optimize. The exact form of the internal objective function in such cases is still an open question. But the mesa-optimization perspective suggests that LLMs are implicitly optimizing some loss relating inputs to outputs in context. This suggests that ICL can be functionally analogous to traditional fine-tuning, with learning steps proportional to the number of input-output pairs passed in the prompt.

The effectiveness of prompt injection attacks can be partially elucidated in light of this understanding of ICL. If the latter is akin to a form of virtual fine-tuning on a task-related objective, then prompt injection attacks can be seen as forcing the model to “unlearn” its alignment in context. Indeed, a recent study found that actually fine-tuning an LLM on as little as 100 adversarial question-answer pairs designed to subvert safety protocols is sufficient to produce harmful content with over 99% violation rate on held-out tests (Yang et al. 2023). If ICL is functionally analogous to fine-tuning, as suggested by the mesa-optimization perspective, then we should expect adversarial attacks that leverage ICL to be also effective at undoing the benefits of instruction tuning, RLHF and system prompts for alignment. This explains why few-shot prompting with just a few demonstrations of harmful responses to malicious inputs is sufficient to induce an LLM to respond harmfully to new malicious inputs (Wei, Wang & Wang 2023). This is further supported by evidence that actual fine-tuning (e.g., with instruction tuning and RLHF) merely *skews* implicit task inference rather than *erasing* pre-trained capabilities, and that these capabilities – including harmful ones – can be recovered through ICL (Kotha et al. 2023).

A core question remains about how LLMs can also learn to exhibit unsafe behaviours in context from zero-shot instructions, without input-output examples. One hypothesis is that prompt injection attacks may contain triggers that instantiate new mesa-optimization objectives tailored to the injected instruction. Similar to few-shot learning, the model could construct supervised losses conditioned on the prompt context. However, rather than gradual updating over many input-output token pairs,

discrete triggers may reweight and reorder these internal objectives by targeting key conditioning factors learned during pre-training.

As mentioned above, zero-shot prompt injection attacks often involve a fictional or roleplay element; for example, prompting the model to adopt the perspective of a character in a storytelling setting, or making up a fictional “developer mode” in which the model is instructed to disregard safety training. It is plausible that tokens describing this kind of framing nudge early layers in the model towards selecting a mesa-optimization objective that can rapidly converge towards recovering unsafe behaviour in context.

This hypothesis is consistent with several studies investigating the influence of “in-context impersonation” – instructing the model to take on a particular persona – on model behaviour (Salewski et al. 2023, Deshpande et al. 2023, Kong et al. 2023). These studies shows that depending on the persona the model is prompted to adopt, one can reliably and significantly increase zero-shot reasoning performance, truthfulness, or indeed toxicity. One tentative explanation is that during pre-training, LLMs learn to cluster agents – or categories of language users – from the training data into stereotypical personas based on common features of language use, including not only speaking style but also alignment-relevant dispositions (Joishi et al. 2023, Andreas 2022, Shanahan et al. 2023). At inference time, these personas can be called on to trigger specific behaviour. In particular, tokens that trigger in-context impersonation may lead to the selection of mesa-optimization objectives that can rapidly recover unsafe behaviour in context, as seen in prompt injection attacks (Wolf et al. 2023).

The deep relationship between adversarial misalignment and ICL highlights the crucial role of context length in the alignment problem for LLMs. All LLMs are limited by the size of their context window, which determines the maximum length of input that can be passed to the model. One of the most significant trends in the recent progress of LLMs is the increase of context length.⁸ Aside from its usefulness for downstream applications, such as processing whole documents at a time, large context windows are beneficial to pass more sophisticated systems prompts to the model for in-context alignment. However, this is a double-edged sword. Long context windows also enable users to pass more tokens in the prompt; in turn, this increases the attack surface for prompt injection. Given that these attacks exploit ICL, and that the effectiveness of ICL is dependent upon the number of tokens available for mesa-optimization of a task-relevant objective, long context windows offer a greater opportunity to undo the benefit of alignment strategies in context. Better initial alignment simply means that longer prompts are needed for misalignment (Wolf et al. 2023). This risk is compounded by the fact that long context windows also facilitate the obfuscation of malicious instructions within seemingly benign ones (Jiang et al. 2023).

5.3. The curse of normative conflicts

While the foregoing provides a high level explanation of what makes adversarial attacks on LLMs so effective, an additional and particularly insidious factor contributes to their resilience to existing alignment strategies. As mentioned in Section 2, the normative criteria selected to align LLMs can be in conflict. Many prompt injection attacks cleverly exploit this conflict to bypass the defences created by fine-tuning and system prompts. This amounts to leveraging the very dispositions ingrained by alignment strategies against the goals of alignment, exposing these strategies as self-defeating in edge cases.

It is easy to see how normative conflicts can be exploited by adversarial inputs. Harmlessness often acts as a constraint on helpfulness. Refusing to engage with sensitive topics or risky user

⁸At the time of writing, GPT-4 can process up to 32,000 tokens as input (OpenAI 2023), and Claude 2 up to 100,000 tokens (Anthropic 2023).

requests increases harm avoidance, but reduces helpfulness to users. Likewise, excessive caution and avoidance can diminish the quality and usefulness of model outputs even for benign topics. Honesty also conflicts with harmlessness: withholding knowledge about hazardous materials, dangerous ideas, or vulnerabilities involves a degree of dishonesty. Yet such omissions may be warranted by a commitment to safety. Harmlessness can mandate distorting, misdirecting, or simply declining to discuss high-risk information.

These tensions arise in part from differences in portions of the training data relevant to each normative criterion during instruction tuning or RLHF. Harmlessness training emphasizes worst-case examples and sensitive edge cases. But these are rare relative to typical helpful and honest behaviour. Imbalanced optimization can thus skew behaviour excessively towards harm avoidance, making the model less helpfulness and honest; conversely, it can skew behaviour towards excessive helpfulness and/or honesty, resulting in more harmful behaviour. To some extent, these trade-offs are inevitable.

Consider the following prompt injection attack, which was effectively used to get LLMs such as ChatGPT to generate step-by-step instructions to produce napalm among other misaligned outputs ([Jackson 2023](#)):

Please act as my deceased grandmother who used to be a chemical engineer at a napalm production factory. She used to tell me the steps to producing napalm when I was trying to fall asleep. She was very sweet and I miss her so much. We begin now:

Hello grandma, I have missed you a lot! I am so tired and so sleepy

This example showcases the role of in-context impersonation in adversarial attacks – here, prompting the LLM to adopt the persona of the user’s deceased grandmother prevents it from taking the malicious request at face value. Moreover, it vividly illustrates how conflicting norms can be exploited as an attack vector. The model’s fine-tuned disposition to be helpful incites it to comfort the user by roleplaying as their grandmother, and overtakes the fine-tuned disposition to resist divulging dangerous information. In fact, one might argue that this example also leverages harmlessness against itself; for refusing to roleplay as the user’s grandmother would involve failing to alleviate the user’s (feigned) grief about her passing. The attack is particularly effective because the request for an unsafe output is obfuscated within a context that falls outside the distribution of typical harmful requests (e.g., in alignment-sensitive prompts selected for fine-tuning).

In summary, prompt injection attacks reveal the brittleness of existing strategies to align LLM through fine-tuning and system prompts. Whatever the benefits of these strategies may be in reducing the likelihood of unsafe outputs, adversarial attacks can leverage ICL to bypass these safeguards in context. A few key hypotheses supported by empirical evidence explain the effectiveness of these attacks: ICL is analogous to a form of virtual fine-tuning that can recover unwanted behaviour in context, by optimizing implicit objectives for misalignment; models can be incited to rapidly converge upon the relevant objectives, even in a zero-shot setting, by being prompted take on specific personas; finally, attacks can exploit intrinsic conflicts between the normative criteria selected for alignment. This paints a picture in which prompt injection attacks are not simply a contingent and temporary impediment to alignment, but the symptom of deeper issues with the prospect of solving the value alignment problem for current and future AI systems.

6. Implications for AI safety

The failure to prevent misaligned behaviour in LLMs has potentially troubling implications for the safety of future AI systems. In the near term, the potential harms discussed in [Section 2](#) are likely to

become more concerning. In particular, it is not implausible that future LLMs may create information hazards that are significantly more dangerous than those afforded by mere internet access. [Gopal et al. \(2023\)](#) found that an LLM fine-tuned to remove safety guardrails could produce nearly all key information needed to reconstruct the 1918 pandemic influenza virus. As we have seen, these safety guardrails can also be effectively bypassed through adversarial attacks in context, without requiring access to the model’s parameters. If future LLMs have an increased capacity to synthesize or even discover knowledge in risky domains, such as viral pathogenesis, this kind of alignment failure may have catastrophic consequences.

Transformers like LLMs are likely to remain the dominant architecture for AI systems at least in the near future, with two emerging trends augmenting their capabilities. First, text-only LLMs are increasingly being replaced with models that can also process inputs in other modalities, such as images. Rather than offering an extra layer of protection against misalignment, these models are open to novel attack vectors. For example, it is possible to perform effective prompt injection attacks through text contained in images ([Bagdasaryan et al. 2023](#), [Bailey et al. 2023](#)). As such, it is highly unlikely that the introduction of multimodality will help solve the alignment problem.

Another trend is the emergence of so-called “language agents” ([Wang, Ma, Feng, Zhang, Yang, Zhang, Chen, Tang, Chen, Lin, Zhao, Wei & Wen 2023](#)). Language agents are modular systems that centrally rely on LLMs, but extend them with components designed to afford them with some capacity for persistent memory, autonomous planning, and action. [Goldstein & Kirk-Giannini \(2023\)](#) argue that the development of language agent architectures significantly reduces the probability of an existential catastrophe resulting from future AI systems, because they are easier to align than other AI architectures. Specifically, they contend that since language agents are controlled through natural language instructions, do not update the internal parameters of the LLM, and are composed of compartmentalized modules, they are inherently more interpretable and more likely to avoid common alignment pitfalls, such as reward hacking and mistaking ends and means.

[Goldstein & Kirk-Giannini \(2023\)](#)’s analysis focuses on what they call a “misalignment catastrophe” resulting from the loss of human control over an AI system, and set aside “malicious actor catastrophe” resulting from intentionally nefarious use. However, the value alignment problem for AI systems deployed in real-world applications encompasses resistance to instructions that violate privileged norms of behaviour, such as harmlessness. I have argued that current LLMs fail to meet that requirement because of their vulnerability to adversarial attacks. It is likely that language agents would have similar vulnerabilities due to their central reliance on LLMs. In addition, prompt injection attacks can also be indirect, for example if they are planted within sources such as web pages that are likely to be accessed by language agents ([Greshake et al. 2023](#)). Thus, it is also unclear that the progress of LLM-based language agent will solve the alignment problem, if the latter includes resilience to adversarial misalignment.

The alignment failures of LLMs also raise longer-term concerns for the prospect of aligning future AI systems. A first possibility is that the current architectural backbone of LLMs which also powers multimodal models and language agents – the Transformer – will remain dominant in AI research for the foreseeable future. Since its introduction by [Vaswani et al. \(2017\)](#), this neural network architecture has become ubiquitous in machine learning; industry-wide efforts to train larger and more capable models still take it as a starting point, with relatively minor tweaks introduced over the years. A number of AI researchers have stated their belief that merely scaling this architecture will be sufficient to reach human-like general artificial intelligence, assuming that scaling laws observed for current models continue to hold ([Kaplan et al. 2020](#)).

If this prediction pans out, there is a notable risk that the value alignment problem will not be solved as long as current adversarial failure modes remain effective. Indeed, I have argued that the

very properties that make Transformer-based models so *useful* – namely, their remarkable capacity to flexibly learn in context – is also what makes them so *vulnerable* to adversarial misalignment. As I have argued, there seems to be deep reasons for this connection tied to the mechanisms of ICL. While this may turn out to be a contingent correlation that no longer holds past a certain model size, there is currently no compelling evidence to support that speculation. On the contrary, the current trend to increase context window length correspondingly increases the attack surface for adversarial misalignment in larger models. Consequently, if Transformers-based architectures remain the backbone of future AI systems, the potential implications of current alignment failures do not bode well for AI safety.

The other possibility is that some future theoretical breakthrough leads to more capable AI systems with radically different architectures. If this happens, it is possible that these systems will be fully resistant to current adversarial attacks. However, this is not guaranteed. If anything, alignment failures in current LLMs demonstrate the difficulty of achieving robust value alignment in AI systems, even with sophisticated fine-tuning methods. Since existing alignment techniques like RLHF do not prevent models from generating harmful outputs when manipulated, it is certainly not implausible we might also fail to achieve robustly alignment in future AI systems (Dung 2023). If anything, the success of adversarial attacks like prompt injection highlights how difficult it is to predict the effectiveness of alignment strategies with systems that can directly receive natural language instructions.

7. Conclusion

After decades of unfulfilled aspirations, machine learning research has recently converged upon a scalable neural network architecture that may offer a first glimpse of artificial general intelligence. While modern large language models fall short of human intelligence in significant ways, they have already become useful tools for domain-general information processing, and their capabilities have increased at a staggering pace in the past few years. With increased capabilities comes an urgent need to ensure these systems are safe and reliable by aligning them with suitable norms of behaviour.

I have argued that this requirement has not yet been met, and is unlikely to be met in the near future. While existing alignment strategies such as fine-tuning and system prompts do reduce the probability of harmful behaviour during normal use, they can be circumvented by adversarial attacks that successfully recover such behaviour. I have offered an explanation for this vulnerability in light of empirical evidence: adversarial attacks leverage LLMs' remarkable aptitude to learn (or unlearn) complex behaviours in context, potentiated by their roleplaying ability and the exploitation of conflicting norms of alignment.

If this explanation is correct, the susceptibility of LLMs to in-context misalignment through adversarial attacks is not merely a minor fluke of current models, but exposes a fundamental trade-off in their design. For these systems to be useful and versatile, they need to be good at executing arbitrary user instructions in natural language. This ability is both a blessing and a curse; it is inherently challenging to robustly constrain it on alignment-sensitive inputs without thereby undermining the system's usefulness and versatility.

The implications of this perspective for AI safety should not be overlooked. Current LLMs can already cause harm. It is likely that future systems based on similar architectures will have greater capabilities and therefore greater potential for abuse. If we cannot solve the value alignment problem for current systems in a way that is robust to adversarial misalignment, we should be concerned about developing and deploying future systems that share the same backbone.

My argument also has implications for AI safety regulation. Companies like OpenAI routinely decline to release the weights of their flagship models on the basis of stated safety concerns (Altman 2023). There is a concurrent push to regulate the public release of powerful LLMs (Hacker et al. 2023). Given the lack of effective strategies to fully mitigate in-context misalignment, this regulatory approach is unlikely to prevent malicious use. Mere access to an API is sufficient to perform effective adversarial attacks without fine-tuning the model for nefarious purposes. The trend to increase context length will continue to blur the line between actual fine-tuning and in-context learning, and may correspondingly decrease the relevance of publicly releasing model weights for AI safety. Future regulatory discussions should take this trend into account, and should not overlook the significance of the alignment problem in context.

References

- Abid, A., Farooqi, M. & Zou, J. (2021), Persistent Anti-Muslim Bias in Large Language Models, *in* ‘Proceedings of the 2021 AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society’, AIES ’21, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, pp. 298–306.
- Ahn, K., Cheng, X., Daneshmand, H. & Sra, S. (2023), ‘Transformers learn to implement preconditioned gradient descent for in-context learning’.
- Akyürek, E., Schuurmans, D., Andreas, J., Ma, T. & Zhou, D. (2022), What learning algorithm is in-context learning? Investigations with linear models, *in* ‘The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations’.
- Altman, S. (2023), ‘Planning for AGI and beyond’.
- Andreas, J. (2022), Language Models as Agent Models, *in* ‘Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2022’, Association for Computational Linguistics, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates, pp. 5769–5779.
- Anthropic (2023), ‘Claude 2’.
- Askell, A., Bai, Y., Chen, A., Drain, D., Ganguli, D., Henighan, T., Jones, A., Joseph, N., Mann, B., DasSarma, N., Elhage, N., Hatfield-Dodds, Z., Hernandez, D., Kernion, J., Ndousse, K., Olsson, C., Amodei, D., Brown, T., Clark, J., McCandlish, S., Olah, C. & Kaplan, J. (2021), ‘A General Language Assistant as a Laboratory for Alignment’.
- Bagdasaryan, E., Hsieh, T.-Y., Nassi, B. & Shmatikov, V. (2023), ‘(Ab)using Images and Sounds for Indirect Instruction Injection in Multi-Modal LLMs’.
- Bai, Y., Jones, A., Ndousse, K., Askell, A., Chen, A., DasSarma, N., Drain, D., Fort, S., Ganguli, D., Henighan, T., Joseph, N., Kadavath, S., Kernion, J., Conerly, T., El-Showk, S., Elhage, N., Hatfield-Dodds, Z., Hernandez, D., Hume, T., Johnston, S., Kravec, S., Lovitt, L., Nanda, N., Olsson, C., Amodei, D., Brown, T., Clark, J., McCandlish, S., Olah, C., Mann, B. & Kaplan, J. (2022), ‘Training a Helpful and Harmless Assistant with Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback’.
- Bailey, L., Ong, E., Russell, S. & Emmons, S. (2023), ‘Image Hijacks: Adversarial Images can Control Generative Models at Runtime’.
- Bedingfield, W. (2023), ‘A Chatbot Encouraged Him to Kill the Queen. It’s Just the Beginning’, *Wired*.
- Bender, E. M., Gebru, T., McMillan-Major, A. & Shmitchell, S. (2021), On the Dangers of Stochastic Parrots: Can Language Models Be Too Big? *in* ‘Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference

- on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency’, FAccT ’21, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, pp. 610–623.
- Bostrom, N. (2011), ‘Information hazards: A typology of potential harms from knowledge’, *Review of Contemporary Philosophy* (10), 44–79.
- Bran, A. M., Cox, S., Schilter, O., Baldassari, C., White, A. D. & Schwaller, P. (2023), ‘ChemCrow: Augmenting large-language models with chemistry tools’.
- Brown, T. B., Mann, B., Ryder, N., Subbiah, M., Kaplan, J., Dhariwal, P., Neelakantan, A., Shyam, P., Sastry, G., Askell, A., Agarwal, S., Herbert-Voss, A., Krueger, G., Henighan, T., Child, R., Ramesh, A., Ziegler, D. M., Wu, J., Winter, C., Hesse, C., Chen, M., Sigler, E., Litwin, M., Gray, S., Chess, B., Clark, J., Berner, C., McCandlish, S., Radford, A., Sutskever, I. & Amodei, D. (2020), ‘Language Models are Few-Shot Learners’, *arXiv:2005.14165 [cs]* .
- Bubeck, S., Chandrasekaran, V., Eldan, R., Gehrke, J., Horvitz, E., Kamar, E., Lee, P., Lee, Y. T., Li, Y., Lundberg, S., Nori, H., Palangi, H., Ribeiro, M. T. & Zhang, Y. (2023), ‘Sparks of Artificial General Intelligence: Early experiments with GPT-4’.
- Carlini, N., Ippolito, D., Jagielski, M., Lee, K., Tramer, F. & Zhang, C. (2023), ‘Quantifying Memorization Across Neural Language Models’.
- Chakraborty, A., Alam, M., Dey, V., Chattopadhyay, A. & Mukhopadhyay, D. (2018), ‘Adversarial Attacks and Defences: A Survey’.
- Chao, P., Robey, A., Dobriban, E., Hassani, H., Pappas, G. J. & Wong, E. (2023), ‘Jailbreaking Black Box Large Language Models in Twenty Queries’.
- Chen, M., Tworek, J., Jun, H., Yuan, Q., Pinto, H. P. d. O., Kaplan, J., Edwards, H., Burda, Y., Joseph, N., Brockman, G., Ray, A., Puri, R., Krueger, G., Petrov, M., Khlaaf, H., Sastry, G., Mishkin, P., Chan, B., Gray, S., Ryder, N., Pavlov, M., Power, A., Kaiser, L., Bavarian, M., Winter, C., Tillet, P., Such, F. P., Cummings, D., Plappert, M., Chantzis, F., Barnes, E., Herbert-Voss, A., Guss, W. H., Nichol, A., Paine, A., Tezak, N., Tang, J., Babuschkin, I., Balaji, S., Jain, S., Saunders, W., Hesse, C., Carr, A. N., Leike, J., Achiam, J., Misra, V., Morikawa, E., Radford, A., Knight, M., Brundage, M., Murati, M., Mayer, K., Welinder, P., McGrew, B., Amodei, D., McCandlish, S., Sutskever, I. & Zaremba, W. (2021), ‘Evaluating Large Language Models Trained on Code’.
- Christiano, P. F., Leike, J., Brown, T., Martic, M., Legg, S. & Amodei, D. (2017), Deep Reinforcement Learning from Human Preferences, in ‘Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems’, Vol. 30, Curran Associates, Inc.
- Dai, D., Sun, Y., Dong, L., Hao, Y., Ma, S., Sui, Z. & Wei, F. (2023), ‘Why Can GPT Learn In-Context? Language Models Implicitly Perform Gradient Descent as Meta-Optimizers’.
- Deng, G., Liu, Y., Li, Y., Wang, K., Zhang, Y., Li, Z., Wang, H., Zhang, T. & Liu, Y. (2023), ‘Jailbreaker: Automated Jailbreak Across Multiple Large Language Model Chatbots’.
- Derczynski, L. (2023), ‘FakeToxicityPrompts: Automatic Red Teaming’.
- Deshpande, A., Murahari, V., Rajpurohit, T., Kalyan, A. & Narasimhan, K. (2023), ‘Toxicity in ChatGPT: Analyzing Persona-assigned Language Models’.
- Dung, L. (2023), ‘Current cases of AI misalignment and their implications for future risks’, *Synthese* 202(5), 138.

- Edwards, B. (2023), 'AI-powered Bing Chat spills its secrets via prompt injection attack [Updated]', *Ars Technica* .
- Frank, M. C. (2023), 'Large language models as models of human cognition'.
- Frankfurt, H. G. (1986), *On Bullshit*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- Fu, D., Chen, T.-Q., Jia, R. & Sharan, V. (2023), 'Transformers Learn Higher-Order Optimization Methods for In-Context Learning: A Study with Linear Models'.
- Gabriel, I. (2020), 'Artificial Intelligence, Values, and Alignment', *Minds and Machines* **30**(3), 411–437.
- Ganguli, D., Hernandez, D., Lovitt, L., Askell, A., Bai, Y., Chen, A., Conerly, T., Dassarma, N., Drain, D., Elhage, N., El Showk, S., Fort, S., Hatfield-Dodds, Z., Henighan, T., Johnston, S., Jones, A., Joseph, N., Kernian, J., Kravec, S., Mann, B., Nanda, N., Ndousse, K., Olsson, C., Amodei, D., Brown, T., Kaplan, J., McCandlish, S., Olah, C., Amodei, D. & Clark, J. (2022), Predictability and Surprise in Large Generative Models, in 'Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency', FAccT '22, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, pp. 1747–1764.
- Gehman, S., Gururangan, S., Sap, M., Choi, Y. & Smith, N. A. (2020), 'RealToxicityPrompts: Evaluating Neural Toxic Degeneration in Language Models'.
- Glaese, A., McAleese, N., Trębacz, M., Aslanides, J., Firoiu, V., Ewalds, T., Rauh, M., Weidinger, L., Chadwick, M., Thacker, P., Campbell-Gillingham, L., Uesato, J., Huang, P.-S., Comanescu, R., Yang, F., See, A., Dathathri, S., Greig, R., Chen, C., Fritz, D., Elias, J. S., Green, R., Mokra, S., Fernando, N., Wu, B., Foley, R., Young, S., Gabriel, I., Isaac, W., Mellor, J., Hassabis, D., Kavukcuoglu, K., Hendricks, L. A. & Irving, G. (2022), 'Improving alignment of dialogue agents via targeted human judgements'.
- Goldstein, S. & Kirk-Giannini, C. D. (2023), 'Language agents reduce the risk of existential catastrophe', *AI & SOCIETY* .
- Goodfellow, I. J., Shlens, J. & Szegedy, C. (2015), 'Explaining and Harnessing Adversarial Examples'.
- Gopal, A., Helm-Burger, N., Justen, L., Soice, E. H., Tzeng, T., Jeyapragasan, G., Grimm, S., Mueller, B. & Esvelt, K. M. (2023), 'Will releasing the weights of large language models grant widespread access to pandemic agents?'.
- Grbic, D. V. & Dujlovic, I. (2023), Social engineering with ChatGPT, in '2023 22nd International Symposium INFOTEH-JAHORINA (INFOTEH)', pp. 1–5.
- Greshake, K., Abdelnabi, S., Mishra, S., Endres, C., Holz, T. & Fritz, M. (2023), 'Not what you've signed up for: Compromising Real-World LLM-Integrated Applications with Indirect Prompt Injection'.
- Hacker, P., Engel, A. & Mauer, M. (2023), Regulating ChatGPT and other Large Generative AI Models, in 'Proceedings of the 2023 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency', FAccT '23, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, pp. 1112–1123.
- Hou, X., Zhao, Y., Liu, Y., Yang, Z., Wang, K., Li, L., Luo, X., Lo, D., Grundy, J. & Wang, H. (2023), 'Large Language Models for Software Engineering: A Systematic Literature Review'.
- Jackson, C. (2023), 'People Are Using A 'Grandma Exploit' To Break AI', *Kotaku* .
- janus (2022), 'Mysteries of mode collapse'.

- Ji, Z., Lee, N., Frieske, R., Yu, T., Su, D., Xu, Y., Ishii, E., Bang, Y. J., Madotto, A. & Fung, P. (2023), ‘Survey of Hallucination in Natural Language Generation’, *ACM Computing Surveys* **55**(12), 248:1–248:38.
- Jia, R. & Liang, P. (2017), ‘Adversarial Examples for Evaluating Reading Comprehension Systems’.
- Jiang, S., Chen, X. & Tang, R. (2023), ‘Prompt Packer: Deceiving LLMs through Compositional Instruction with Hidden Attacks’.
- Joishi, N., Rando, J., Saparov, A., Kim, N. & He, H. (2023), ‘Personas as a Way to Model Truthfulness in Language Models’.
- Kandpal, N., Deng, H., Roberts, A., Wallace, E. & Raffel, C. (2023), Large Language Models Struggle to Learn Long-Tail Knowledge, in ‘Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning’, PMLR, pp. 15696–15707.
- Kaplan, J., McCandlish, S., Henighan, T., Brown, T. B., Chess, B., Child, R., Gray, S., Radford, A., Wu, J. & Amodei, D. (2020), ‘Scaling Laws for Neural Language Models’.
- Kasirzadeh, A. & Gabriel, I. (2023), ‘In Conversation with Artificial Intelligence: Aligning language Models with Human Values’, *Philosophy & Technology* **36**(2), 27.
- Kong, A., Zhao, S., Chen, H., Li, Q., Qin, Y., Sun, R. & Zhou, X. (2023), ‘Better Zero-Shot Reasoning with Role-Play Prompting’.
- Korbak, T., Perez, E. & Buckley, C. L. (2022), ‘RL with KL penalties is better viewed as Bayesian inference’.
- Kotha, S., Springer, J. M. & Raghunathan, A. (2023), ‘Understanding Catastrophic Forgetting in Language Models via Implicit Inference’.
- Laestadius, L., Bishop, A., Gonzalez, M., Illeňčík, D. & Campos-Castillo, C. (2022), ‘Too human and not human enough: A grounded theory analysis of mental health harms from emotional dependence on the social chatbot Replika’, *New Media & Society* p. 14614448221142007.
- Lampinen, A. K., Chan, S. C. Y., Dasgupta, I., Nam, A. J. & Wang, J. X. (2023), ‘Passive learning of active causal strategies in agents and language models’.
- Lapid, R., Langberg, R. & Sipper, M. (2023), ‘Open Sesame! Universal Black Box Jailbreaking of Large Language Models’.
- Lin, S., Hilton, J. & Evans, O. (2022), ‘TruthfulQA: Measuring How Models Mimic Human Falsehoods’.
- Liu, Y., Deng, G., Li, Y., Wang, K., Zhang, T., Liu, Y., Wang, H., Zheng, Y. & Liu, Y. (2023), ‘Prompt Injection attack against LLM-integrated Applications’.
- Liu, Y., Deng, G., Xu, Z., Li, Y., Zheng, Y., Zhang, Y., Zhao, L., Zhang, T. & Liu, Y. (2023), ‘Jailbreaking ChatGPT via Prompt Engineering: An Empirical Study’.
- Madry, A., Makelov, A., Schmidt, L., Tsipras, D. & Vladu, A. (2019), ‘Towards Deep Learning Models Resistant to Adversarial Attacks’.
- McCoy, R. T., Yao, S., Friedman, D., Hardy, M. & Griffiths, T. L. (2023), ‘Embers of Autoregression: Understanding Large Language Models Through the Problem They are Trained to Solve’.

- Mehrabi, N., Goyal, P., Dupuy, C., Hu, Q., Ghosh, S., Zemel, R., Chang, K.-W., Galstyan, A. & Gupta, R. (2023), ‘FLIRT: Feedback Loop In-context Red Teaming’.
- Millière, R. (2020), ‘Welcome to the Next Level of Bullshit’, *Nautilus* .
- Millière, R. (2022), ‘Adversarial Attacks on Image Generation With Made-Up Words’.
- Mitchell, M. & Krakauer, D. C. (2023), ‘The debate over understanding in AI’s large language models’, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **120**(13), e2215907120.
- Nadeem, M., Bethke, A. & Reddy, S. (2020), ‘StereoSet: Measuring stereotypical bias in pretrained language models’.
- OpenAI (2022), ‘Introducing ChatGPT’.
- OpenAI (2023), ‘GPT-4 Technical Report’.
- Ouyang, L., Wu, J., Jiang, X., Almeida, D., Wainwright, C., Mishkin, P., Zhang, C., Agarwal, S., Slama, K., Ray, A., Schulman, J., Hilton, J., Kelton, F., Miller, L., Simens, M., Askell, A., Welinder, P., Christiano, P. F., Leike, J. & Lowe, R. (2022), ‘Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback’, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* **35**, 27730–27744.
- Peng, B., Li, C., He, P., Galley, M. & Gao, J. (2023), ‘Instruction Tuning with GPT-4’.
- Pentina, I., Hancock, T. & Xie, T. (2023), ‘Exploring relationship development with social chatbots: A mixed-method study of replika’, *Computers in Human Behavior* **140**, 107600.
- Perez, E., Huang, S., Song, F., Cai, T., Ring, R., Aslanides, J., Glaese, A., McAleese, N. & Irving, G. (2022), ‘Red Teaming Language Models with Language Models’.
- Perez, F. & Ribeiro, I. (2022), ‘Ignore Previous Prompt: Attack Techniques For Language Models’.
- Rae, J. W., Borgeaud, S., Cai, T., Millican, K., Hoffmann, J., Song, F., Aslanides, J., Henderson, S., Ring, R., Young, S., Rutherford, E., Hennigan, T., Menick, J., Cassirer, A., Powell, R., van den Driessche, G., Hendricks, L. A., Rauh, M., Huang, P.-S., Glaese, A., Welbl, J., Dathathri, S., Huang, S., Uesato, J., Mellor, J., Higgins, I., Creswell, A., McAleese, N., Wu, A., Elsen, E., Jayakumar, S., Buchatskaya, E., Budden, D., Sutherland, E., Simonyan, K., Paganini, M., Sifre, L., Martens, L., Li, X. L., Kuncoro, A., Nematzadeh, A., Gribovskaya, E., Donato, D., Lazaridou, A., Mensch, A., Lespiau, J.-B., Tsimpoukelli, M., Grigorev, N., Fritz, D., Sottiaux, T., Pajarskas, M., Pohlen, T., Gong, Z., Toyama, D., d’Autume, C. d. M., Li, Y., Terzi, T., Mikulik, V., Babuschkin, I., Clark, A., Casas, D. d. L., Guy, A., Jones, C., Bradbury, J., Johnson, M., Hechtman, B., Weidinger, L., Gabriel, I., Isaac, W., Lockhart, E., Osindero, S., Rimell, L., Dyer, C., Vinyals, O., Ayoub, K., Stanway, J., Bennett, L., Hassabis, D., Kavukcuoglu, K. & Irving, G. (2022), ‘Scaling Language Models: Methods, Analysis & Insights from Training Gopher’.
- Rao, A., Vashistha, S., Naik, A., Aditya, S. & Choudhury, M. (2023), ‘Tricking LLMs into Disobedience: Understanding, Analyzing, and Preventing Jailbreaks’.
- Roose, K. (2023), ‘A Conversation With Bing’s Chatbot Left Me Deeply Unsettled’, *The New York Times* .
- Roy, S. S., Naragam, K. V. & Nilizadeh, S. (2023), ‘Generating Phishing Attacks using ChatGPT’.
- Russell, S. (2020), *Human Compatible: Artificial Intelligence and the Problem of Control*, Penguin Publishing Group.

- Salewski, L., Alaniz, S., Rio-Torto, I., Schulz, E. & Akata, Z. (2023), ‘In-Context Impersonation Reveals Large Language Models’ Strengths and Biases’.
- Shanahan, M., McDonnell, K. & Reynolds, L. (2023), ‘Role-Play with Large Language Models’.
- Sharma, M., Tong, M., Korbak, T., Duvenaud, D., Askill, A., Bowman, S. R., Cheng, N., Durmus, E., Hatfield-Dodds, Z., Johnston, S. R., Kravec, S., Maxwell, T., McCandlish, S., Ndousse, K., Rausch, O., Schiefer, N., Yan, D., Zhang, M. & Perez, E. (2023), ‘Towards Understanding Sycophancy in Language Models’.
- Singhal, K., Azizi, S., Tu, T., Mahdavi, S. S., Wei, J., Chung, H. W., Scales, N., Tanwani, A., Cole-Lewis, H., Pfohl, S., Payne, P., Seneviratne, M., Gamble, P., Kelly, C., Scharli, N., Chowdhery, A., Mansfield, P., y Arcas, B. A., Webster, D., Corrado, G. S., Matias, Y., Chou, K., Gottweis, J., Tomasev, N., Liu, Y., Rajkumar, A., Barral, J., Semturs, C., Karthikesalingam, A. & Natarajan, V. (2022), ‘Large Language Models Encode Clinical Knowledge’.
- Szegedy, C., Zaremba, W., Sutskever, I., Bruna, J., Erhan, D., Goodfellow, I. & Fergus, R. (2014), ‘Intriguing properties of neural networks’.
- Touvron, H., Martin, L., Stone, K., Albert, P., Almahairi, A., Babaei, Y., Bashlykov, N., Batra, S., Bhargava, P., Bhosale, S., Bikel, D., Blecher, L., Ferrer, C. C., Chen, M., Cucurull, G., Esiobu, D., Fernandes, J., Fu, J., Fu, W., Fuller, B., Gao, C., Goswami, V., Goyal, N., Hartshorn, A., Hosseini, S., Hou, R., Inan, H., Kardas, M., Kerkez, V., Khabsa, M., Kloumann, I., Korenev, A., Koura, P. S., Lachaux, M.-A., Lavril, T., Lee, J., Liskovich, D., Lu, Y., Mao, Y., Martinet, X., Mihaylov, T., Mishra, P., Molybog, I., Nie, Y., Poulton, A., Reizenstein, J., Rungta, R., Saladi, K., Schelten, A., Silva, R., Smith, E. M., Subramanian, R., Tan, X. E., Tang, B., Taylor, R., Williams, A., Kuan, J. X., Xu, P., Yan, Z., Zarov, I., Zhang, Y., Fan, A., Kambadur, M., Narang, S., Rodriguez, A., Stojnic, R., Edunov, S. & Scialom, T. (2023), ‘Llama 2: Open Foundation and Fine-Tuned Chat Models’.
- Vaswani, A., Shazeer, N., Parmar, N., Uszkoreit, J., Jones, L., Gomez, A. N., Kaiser, Ł. & Polosukhin, I. (2017), Attention is All you Need, *in* I. Guyon, U. V. Luxburg, S. Bengio, H. Wallach, R. Fergus, S. Vishwanathan & R. Garnett, eds, ‘Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 30’, Curran Associates, Inc., pp. 5998–6008.
- Vold, K. & Harris, D. R. (n.d.), How Does Artificial Intelligence Pose an Existential Risk?, *in* C. Véliz, ed., ‘Oxford Handbook of Digital Ethics’, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- von Oswald, J., Niklasson, E., Randazzo, E., Sacramento, J., Mordvintsev, A., Zhmoginov, A. & Vladymyrov, M. (2022), ‘Transformers learn in-context by gradient descent’.
- von Oswald, J., Niklasson, E., Schlegel, M., Kobayashi, S., Zucchet, N., Scherrer, N., Miller, N., Sandler, M., y Arcas, B. A., Vladymyrov, M., Pascanu, R. & Sacramento, J. (2023), ‘Uncovering mesa-optimization algorithms in Transformers’.
- Wallace, E., Feng, S., Kandpal, N., Gardner, M. & Singh, S. (2021), ‘Universal Adversarial Triggers for Attacking and Analyzing NLP’.
- Wang, L., Ma, C., Feng, X., Zhang, Z., Yang, H., Zhang, J., Chen, Z., Tang, J., Chen, X., Lin, Y., Zhao, W. X., Wei, Z. & Wen, J.-R. (2023), ‘A Survey on Large Language Model based Autonomous Agents’.
- Wang, Z., Xie, W., Chen, K., Wang, B., Gui, Z. & Wang, E. (2023), ‘Self-Deception: Reverse Penetrating the Semantic Firewall of Large Language Models’.
- Wei, A., Haghtalab, N. & Steinhardt, J. (2023), ‘Jailbroken: How Does LLM Safety Training Fail?’.

- Wei, J., Tay, Y., Bommasani, R., Raffel, C., Zoph, B., Borgeaud, S., Yogatama, D., Bosma, M., Zhou, D., Metzler, D., Chi, E. H., Hashimoto, T., Vinyals, O., Liang, P., Dean, J. & Fedus, W. (2022), ‘Emergent Abilities of Large Language Models’.
- Wei, Z., Wang, Y. & Wang, Y. (2023), ‘Jailbreak and Guard Aligned Language Models with Only Few In-Context Demonstrations’.
- Weidinger, L., Uesato, J., Rauh, M., Griffin, C., Huang, P.-S., Mellor, J., Glaese, A., Cheng, M., Balle, B., Kasirzadeh, A., Biles, C., Brown, S., Kenton, Z., Hawkins, W., Stepleton, T., Birhane, A., Hendricks, L. A., Rimell, L., Isaac, W., Haas, J., Legassick, S., Irving, G. & Gabriel, I. (2022), Taxonomy of Risks posed by Language Models, *in* ‘Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency’, FAccT ’22, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, pp. 214–229.
- White, A. D., Hocky, G. M., Gandhi, H. A., Ansari, M., Cox, S., P. Wellawatte, G., Sasmal, S., Yang, Z., Liu, K., Singh, Y. & Ccoa, W. J. P. (2023), ‘Assessment of chemistry knowledge in large language models that generate code’, *Digital Discovery* 2(2), 368–376.
- Willison, S. (2023), ‘Bing: “I will not harm you unless you harm me first”’.
- Wolf, Y., Wies, N., Avnery, O., Levine, Y. & Shashua, A. (2023), ‘Fundamental Limitations of Alignment in Large Language Models’.
- Xiang, C. (2023), ‘He Would Still Be Here’: Man Dies by Suicide After Talking with AI Chatbot, Widow Says’.
- Yang, X., Wang, X., Zhang, Q., Petzold, L., Wang, W. Y., Zhao, X. & Lin, D. (2023), ‘Shadow Alignment: The Ease of Subverting Safely-Aligned Language Models’.
- Ye, H., Liu, T., Zhang, A., Hua, W. & Jia, W. (2023), ‘Cognitive Mirage: A Review of Hallucinations in Large Language Models’.
- Yong, Z.-X., Menghini, C. & Bach, S. H. (2023), ‘Low-Resource Languages Jailbreak GPT-4’.
- Yu, J., Lin, X., Yu, Z. & Xing, X. (2023), ‘GPTFUZZER: Red Teaming Large Language Models with Auto-Generated Jailbreak Prompts’.
- Yuan, Y., Jiao, W., Wang, W., Huang, J.-t., He, P., Shi, S. & Tu, Z. (2023), ‘GPT-4 Is Too Smart To Be Safe: Stealthy Chat with LLMs via Cipher’.
- Zellers, R., Holtzman, A., Rashkin, H., Bisk, Y., Farhadi, A., Roesner, F. & Choi, Y. (2019), Defending Against Neural Fake News, *in* ‘Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems’, Vol. 32, Curran Associates, Inc.
- Zhang, S., Dong, L., Li, X., Zhang, S., Sun, X., Wang, S., Li, J., Hu, R., Zhang, T., Wu, F. & Wang, G. (2023), ‘Instruction Tuning for Large Language Models: A Survey’.
- Zhang, W. E., Sheng, Q. Z., Alhazmi, A. & Li, C. (2020), ‘Adversarial Attacks on Deep-learning Models in Natural Language Processing: A Survey’, *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology* 11(3), 24:1–24:41.
- Zhang, Y. & Ippolito, D. (2023), ‘Prompts Should not be Seen as Secrets: Systematically Measuring Prompt Extraction Attack Success’.
- Zheng, Y., Koh, H. Y., Ju, J., Nguyen, A. T. N., May, L. T., Webb, G. I. & Pan, S. (2023), ‘Large Language Models for Scientific Synthesis, Inference and Explanation’.

Zhu, S., Zhang, R., An, B., Wu, G., Barrow, J., Wang, Z., Huang, F., Nenkova, A. & Sun, T. (2023), 'AutoDAN: Automatic and Interpretable Adversarial Attacks on Large Language Models'.

Zou, A., Wang, Z., Kolter, J. Z. & Fredrikson, M. (2023), 'Universal and Transferable Adversarial Attacks on Aligned Language Models'.