Annals of Human and Social Sciences
www.ahss.org.pk

RESEARCH PAPER

Critical Analysis on the Intersection of Technology and Human Rights: Emerging Obstacles to Justice and Accountability"

[1]Humaira Aslam*   [2]Rana Zaheer -ud -din Ahmed, [3]Sidra Awan

1. Lecture, Political Science, Government Nawaz Sharif Associate College (Girls) Sialkot, Punjab, Pakistan.
2. Student of LLM, school of Law, Government college university Faisalabad, Punjab, Pakistan.
3. PhD Scholar, Department of political science, Government college women university Sialkot, Punjab, Pakistan

| ***Corresponding Author** | merrie.aslam.zia@gmail.com |

ABSTRACT

This review examines the current issues surrounding the intersection of technology and human rights. The growing reliance on artificial intelligence (AI) in decision-making processes across various sectors such as criminal justice, employment, public services, and finance brings forth significant risks to human rights. The use of AI complicates and diminishes accountability for harmful outcomes, undermining established mechanisms for holding responsible parties answerable. Furthermore, technologies that were initially envisioned to enhance human rights fact-finding have now been weaponized by both state and non-state actors. These technologies are employed for citizen surveillance, tracking, and the dissemination of disinformation, eroding public trust in information sources. Effectively addressing these challenges necessitates ensuring that the development and implementation of new technologies adhere to and uphold human rights principles. Conventional differentiations between the public and private sectors must be re-evaluated to remain relevant in the face of interconnected state and corporate activities associated with technological advancements.

| **Keywords:** | The digital state, harassment, surveillance, and social media |

Introduction

Technology has a significant impact on the exercise of human rights. Calculations utilized by state run administrations and organizations in dynamic cycles concerning law enforcement, business, social administrations, and credit access frequently display racial and orientation predispositions. State run administrations are using new devices to screen and scare common freedoms activists, columnists, judges, and attorneys deliberately. Additionally, government agencies' use of technology to provide services, which is supposed to increase efficiency, may unintentionally exacerbate economic inequality. In these circumstances, technology's effects go beyond merely posing rights-related threats; they fundamentally challenge the mechanisms of accountability. Traditional methods of holding people accountable for actions that violate human rights are undermined by the utilization of cutting-edge technologies, which make it more difficult to assign blame for rights violations and make it harder to do so. Expanding upon the hypothetical system laid out in our past work, "New Advancements for Basic liberties Regulation and Practice", this survey looks at the contemporary difficulties at the convergence of innovation and common freedoms. Here, innovation is comprehensively characterized as strategies, cycles, or articles empowering human activity and creation. Technologies are systems with material and social components that are interconnected and rely on various forms of knowledge and human input to function effectively. We argue that a fundamental shift in our approach to technology and private actions is necessary to address the impact of emerging technologies like artificial intelligence (AI), spyware, and the digital state. Late grant features the

significance of proactive endeavors to guarantee that the turn of events and execution of new advancements focus on and maintain common freedoms. Additionally, customary qualifications between general society and confidential domains should be reconsidered to stay relevant despite broad association by both state and corporate entertainers in mechanical advancement. The introduction of the review provides a summary of the main points made in our book about how technology affects power dynamics, accountability mechanisms, and private authority in human rights law and practice. After that, it looks at the new problems that come up when technology and human rights intersect, specifically how AI, spyware, and the digital state affect people. The goal of the review is to figure out how human rights law and practice can best address these issues. (Land and Aronson, 2018)

Literature Review

New Technologies in the Law And Practice of Human Rights

We argue that new technologies have a significant impact on human rights law and practice. There are three main ways these technologies are influencing this field, which we identify. First and foremost, they complicatedly insert inconsistent power elements inside the actual innovation. Second, they make traditional methods of holding those accountable for upholding human rights harder and less effective. Finally, they move expanding liability and power to private entertainers who are not regularly limited by basic liberties regulation. A brief description of each of these impact modes is provided in this section. (Cozzens &Thakur, 2014)

The Relationship between Power and Inequality

Technology is frequently viewed as a tool for redistributing power and causing power dynamics to shift. According to Land, technology has the potential to democratize fact-finding and advocacy for human rights, including open-source investigations. Be that as it may, while open-source examinations can be instrumental in advancing responsibility, the emancipatory capability of innovation in the more extensive setting of common liberties backing has not been completely acknowledged in useful terms. Tufekci (2017) looks at how social media played a role in movements like the Arab Spring and Occupy Wall Street. He emphasizes that while technology makes it possible for social movements to gain momentum quickly, it also makes it difficult for them to build and maintain long-term power and authority. Recent protests demonstrate that the full scope of technology's potential remains complex and multifaceted, even though technology does contribute to democratization in a variety of ways. Notwithstanding the signs of innovation assuming a part in fair developments, for example, those saw in Hong Kong, it is fundamental to perceive that the requirement for long haul promotion for change remains. Technological advancements frequently exhibit inherent biases that perpetuate inequality, in contrast to practices that democratize human rights. Science and innovation concentrates on hypothesis has long recognized that without conscious endeavors, traditional science and development strategies will often fuel imbalances. This stems from the advantaged position of innovation fashioners and the frameworks where innovation is made and carried out. Advancement frameworks driven by market motivators, like protected innovation structures or the reconnaissance free enterprise model molding our virtual entertainment environment, intrinsically favor the interests of those generally in worthwhile positions. Abiba Birhane, a cognitive scientist, argues that technology serves as a mirror that reflects societal biases, unfairness, and injustice (2019). Technology is never neutral or objective. Our book's case studies show a variety of ways power imbalances can become ingrained in technological systems. The implementation of technology frequently reproduces and reinforces existing inequalities and power dynamics, such as water meter systems that assume household size or the disparity in affordability of new climate adaptation technology and data analysis tools for those who may have the greatest need for them. (Kapczynski, 2012)

The Accountability

The second way to think about the connection between technology and human rights is how technology affects our ability to hold those in authority responsible for rights violations. Technology operates in a nuanced manner, often exhibiting biases against transparency and accountability in addition to being inherently good or bad. Human rights advocates and civil society organizations' efforts to promote accountability are undermined by its use, which can obscure and fragment authority (Zuboff, 2019).

By obscuring the identity of those who break the law, technology makes it harder to hold accountable those in positions of authority. Mechanized processes, for example, may give the impression of certainty, in any event, when they come from choices that reflect emotionally worth decisions. In addition, innovation can deliver infringement themselves less apparent, normalizing exercises that sound perceived as unsafe. A functional model is the execution of water meters that require prepayment before water is apportioned, which can successfully liken to water detachment. In any case, these two types of water guideline (prepayment and disengagement) are dealt with distinctively practically speaking, with legitimate shields set up to forestall unjust hardship in the last option yet missing such assurances in the previous (Shaver, 2018).

In addition, the diluted nature of violations that result from automated decision-making undermines mechanisms that contribute to the respect for rights, such as socialization or shaming. Since they were not directly responsible for the harm, actors who merely initiated the technology may feel less responsible for its consequences. It becomes more difficult to exert pressure on a municipality that has installed water meters, which could result in future deprivation. According to Roth (2004), there is no identifiable perpetrator to shame when actual water disconnection occurs.

Private Dominance

The rise and execution of novel innovative headways regularly involves significant contributions from the confidential area. These organizations employ huge power as key caretakers of data and the private sector often plays a significant role in the creation and implementation of new technological innovations. Our freedom of speech, social interactions, and access to information are all impacted by these businesses, which serve as influential gatekeepers of information (Gillespie, 2018).

In many cases, privately owned businesses are progressively expecting jobs as specialists of administration and guideline (Bloch-Wehba, 2019). State run administrations delegate position to private elements to manage online expressive exercises (Land, 2020). These businesses have the authority to ascertain whether their platforms contain evidence of human rights violations. They create algorithms and weapons systems that can have an impact on situations where life or death is at stake, comply with or deny government requests to monitor activists or dissidents, and market technologies that enable or hinder surveillance. According to Jorgensen (2018), rather than considering the public good or human rights, these decisions are frequently driven by commercial interests.

Notwithstanding, the current system for tending to common freedoms infringement executed by organizations depends on recognizing public power practiced by the state (with restricting commitments to regard and safeguard privileges) and confidential authority practiced by organizations (with moral obligations to regard privileges) (Callamard, 2019 Land, 2019). As a result, activities that blur this distinction are less covered by human rights law. (Data, 2019)

When public and private authority are inseparably intertwined, the appropriate framework is in question. According to Mazzucato (2014), public actors play a significant

role in funding, acquiring, and establishing innovation systems for private technology. Should non-state actors only bear moral responsibility for respecting freedom of expression when governments compel them to regulate user speech? Will organizations be considered responsible for the common liberties hurts coming about because of man-made intelligence frameworks that sustain racial or orientation predispositions in discourse guideline? Who ought to be held accountable for the harm brought on by a private company-built system that the government uses to screen job applicants and set bail? We are distracted from the more important issues of accountability and remedies by the outdated distinction between what is considered public and private.

Conceptual Framework

Challenges of the Modern Era

This section examines three important breakthroughs in the interface of technology and human rights that have emerged in recent years. The escalation of government monitoring and harassment, the implications of artificial intelligence (AI) in automated decision making and the creation of deep fakes, and the expanding power of the digital state are among these trends. (Akinola, et al. 2022)

Harassment and State Spy

The days when technology was viewed as a threat to state power are long gone. Technology is increasingly being used to strengthen and consolidate state power in today's world. Sam Gregory (2019), Chief Overseer of the non-legislative association WITNESS, features that advance, for example, cell phones and web-based entertainment, which were once viewed as instruments for freedom, have to a great extent been co-picked by state entertainers. To restrict the activities of activists, journalists, and other members of civil society, governments and state-aligned entities use powerful spyware and other advanced tools to control the information space. There are two groups that include these tools: tools for stalking and harassing people. In addition, Megiddo (2020) contends that government surveillance and disinformation pose such a serious threat to civil society and the rule of law that they ought to be conceived of as novel forms of control. The damages caused by these "computerized control measures" stretch out past security infringement and envelop critical dangers to opportunity and law and order, justifying acknowledgment as a type of government mistreatment. (Kang, 2022)

Harassment

To begin, powerful actors are using social media platforms more and more to launch attacks and weaken their opponents. In Guatemala, endlessly state adjusted entertainers are utilizing virtual entertainment stages to hassle and threaten common freedoms safeguards, as recorded in a report by one of the creators for the American Bar Affiliation's Middle for Basic liberties (Abbas et al. 2019). Individual defenders are stifled by these coordinated attacks, which also reduce public support for their work. Through strategies like trolling, disinformation campaigns, and threats to the well-being of citizens and activists, state actors actively work to discredit their content (Gregory, 2019).

Governments have learned to discredit opposing information sources by utilizing social media's strengths. Tufekci's work (2017) represents how government disseminators exploit the decentralized nature and restricted gatekeeping of online stages to sabotage the validity of elective data sources. Even for those who have access to resources for verification, it becomes difficult to determine the truth in a world filled with troll farms and fake news (Tufekci, 2017)

Thus, although many accepted that the multiplication of media sources would make restriction more troublesome, states have adjusted their oversight strategies. As opposed to hindering discourse through and through, they currently center on undermining it (Tufekci 2017). The discredited information's accuracy is frequently of little consequence. The objective is to sabotage public assembly by ruining all wellsprings of data. People tend to believe nothing and do nothing when they are unsure of their beliefs. Proselytizers dissolve the thought of truth, blocking aggregate association around it (Tufekci 2017).

According to Kelly et al., environments with low levels of technological and social media literacy as well as a lack of independent media pose a greater threat to disinformation and misinformation spread by governments. 2017). In Myanmar, for example, government promulgation was especially viable on the grounds that many believed Facebook to be their essential wellspring of information and data (Indep. Int. Reality Finding Mission Myanmar 2018). A perfect storm was created by the government's reliance on Facebook for information dissemination, as well as Facebook's free basic services and low technological and social media literacy. (Davis, 2020)

The use of artificial intelligence (AI) systems to synthesize entirely fabricated content is becoming an increasingly important component in the propagation of false information. Chesney and Citron (2019) have talked about the dangers presented by profound fakes, which incorporate different damages to people and society at large. Gregory (2019) cautions that these profound fakes will probably be used for validity assaults, ruining examinations, and instigating savagery against writers and basic freedoms safeguards. Gregory argues that the search engines and platforms used to locate content for these AI systems' training have a duty to make it more difficult for such content to be exploited in a harmful way. He emphasizes the importance of considering the potential negative effects of AI technologies early in product design rather than reacting to negative effects after a product has already been used. In addition, it is the responsibility of governments to establish a regulatory framework that protects citizens from potential harm, particularly in the run-up to elections (Barrett, 2019).

In addition to posing a threat to activists, journalists, and others, disinformation and misinformation are also designed to undermine their efforts to hold the state accountable for violations of human rights and other forms of harm. As a result, Cope et al. use these technological tools to limit what 2018) allude to as "strengthening freedoms" and can be utilized as retaliations. In addition to posing a threat to individuals exercising their rights, the use of misinformation as a tool of surveillance and harassment also serves the larger goal of preventing challengers from mobilizing and organizing against the state. As a feature, mechanical progressions in data and correspondences have made it progressively practical for states to carry out far reaching preventive constraint. Thus, the rise of new observation and badgering apparatuses makes critical difficulties in considering the state responsible, making the undertaking more laborious than any time in recent memory. (Adapt et al. 2018)

Spy Tools

For surveillance are being used by governments to increase their control and power. Reprieve (Worldwide, 2019) has given proof of state-run administrations, including Morocco, utilizing Pegasus spyware created by NSO Gathering, an Israeli firm, to watch and target common liberties protectors. When introduced on a gadget, Pegasus can remove different kinds of information, for example, instant messages, contacts, area data, messages, program history, and even record sound and video through the gadget's mouthpiece and camera (Hopkins and Sabbagh 2019). Biometric data, restrictions on encryption and online anonymity, public space cameras, and facial recognition are also used by governments like China to keep an eye on their citizens (Megiddo, 2020).

According to Gregory (2019), the owners of technology platforms and technology manufacturers collect a lot of data, which enables precise tracking of individuals' activities, movements, communication, and information consumption. The accessibility of computer-based intelligence, distributed computing, and the shortfall of hearty protection guidelines work with constant reconnaissance across open and confidential spaces, every minute of every day (Gregory 2019). By prohibiting VPNs that protect users' identities and locations, restricting access to encryption technologies, and resorting to threats and violence against individuals recording state actors in public, states further reinforce their surveillance efforts (Kelly et al. 2017).

Individuals' rights to privacy are not only violated but also hindered by these state-driven surveillance practices. In addition, arbitrary detention, torture, and even extrajudicial executions have been linked to targeted surveillance of specific individuals, such as journalists, activists, opposition figures, and critics exercising their freedom of expression (Kaye, 2019). The interactions between public and private actions are intricate in both harassment and surveillance. For instance, private systems of coordinated activity like troll farms or net centers frequently produce online propaganda (Abbas et al. 2019). Spyware like Pegasus is created and sold by privately owned businesses. UN Special Rapporteur Kaye (2019) has urged these businesses to stop making and selling surveillance technologies because she is aware of the negative effects. UN Special Rapporteur Kaye (2019) has called for a halt to the production and sale of surveillance technology by private businesses to address the issue of surveillance technologies being used for human rights abuses. These organizations ought to just resume their exercises in the wake of giving persuading proof that they have carried out satisfactory measures concerning an expected level of effort, straightforwardness, and responsibility to forestall or relieve denials of basic liberties. This approach means to guarantee that these innovations are not used to disregard common freedoms. Megiddo (2020) also points out that the collaboration between private and public actors in the field of digital oppression reveals a different kind of partnership than the relationship between governments and private commercial entities, which is more commonly recognized.

Automation and AI

Human rights implications of algorithm-based decision-making have raised concerns in recent years (Angwin & Larson, 2016). Robotized choice frameworks, as characterized by the computer-based intelligence Presently Establishment, are information driven advancements used to mechanize human-focused techniques, fully intent on anticipating, recognizing, surveilling, identifying, and focusing on people or networks (Richardson et al. 2019). These systems are utilized in a variety of contexts, including the allocation of government resources, the prediction and prevention of risks, the removal of human discretion, and the provision of extensive analysis that is beyond the capabilities of human beings.

According to Miller (2018) and Tucker (2016), proponents of automated decision-making systems contend that they can eliminate human bias from intricate social and political issues. These systems can process more data in a short amount of time than a human can. AI systems theoretically do not Based on "racially associated" names, it was discovered in a 2013 investigation that Google AdSense produced distinct advertising outcomes. In over 80% of cases on one website and over 90% of cases on another, searches for names like "DeShawn," "Darnell," or "Jermaine" that are typically associated with Black Americans led to advertisements that suggested an arrest. On the other hand, searches for names that are mostly associated with White Americans, like Geoffrey, Jill, or Emma, led to ads that were more neutral. The word "arrest" was found in less than 30% of searches on one site and less than 60% of searches on the other, and some names didn't even bring up any ads about arrests.

Today, simulated intelligence assumes an immediate part in molding how individuals impart, share sentiments, participate in political activity, and access data on the web (Artic, 2018). Ad placement, product/service recommendations, and post visibility are all controlled by AI algorithms on social media platforms and online search engines. Concerns about freedom of speech, privacy, and assembly can be raised if content removal or priority is not transparent. When artificial intelligence is used to control speech and communication, it may intentionally or unintentionally block words, images, or topics that have legitimate public value.

People who are categorized as having disabilities or conditions also have significant effects from AI systems. As artificial intelligence is progressively used to decide work qualification, admittance to social administrations, spatial plan, and the designation of citizenship benefits, incapacitated people are especially impacted by how these frameworks characterize standards and contrasts. For instance, it is possible that people who use scooters or wheelchairs will not be recognized as pedestrians by pedestrian recognition systems used in autonomous vehicles. This was clear when an autonomous Uber vehicle struck and killed a pedestrian pushing a bicycle in Arizona. Due to the unfamiliarity of the situation, the system struggled to correctly classify the victim and failed to recognize pedestrians outside of crosswalks. (Whittaker et al. 2019)

In recent years, advocates and practitioners of human rights have become increasingly concerned about facial recognition systems. These frameworks are widely utilized for mass reconnaissance in China, focusing on both the larger part populace and minority bunches like the Uighurs in Xinjiang. In addition, officials in charge of counterterrorism and law enforcement in nations like the United Kingdom and the United States employ them. Tests have uncovered disturbing paces of misleading up-sides, including a test directed at the 2017 Association of European Football Affiliations Champions Association Last, where more than 92% of individuals recognized as potential miscreants were erroneously hailed. Another test that was carried out by the American Civil Liberties Union and made use of Amazon's Rekognition technology failed to match 28 members of the United States Congress with photos in a large database of mugshots, demonstrating that there were biases based on a variety of demographics. (Schippers 2018)

Man-made intelligence driven facial acknowledgment frameworks have exhibited predispositions, especially against ladies and people with more obscure appearances. Two Black people were mistakenly identified as gorillas by Google's early facial recognition system in the Google Photos app, which resulted in the system's deactivation of gorilla and chimpanzee classifiers. However, nearly three years later, this temporary solution remained in place. Inadequate implementation of facial recognition technology by law enforcement has also contributed to a high rate of incorrect identifications.face the same limitations as humans, who rely on heuristics that are culturally conditioned to make up for information gaps. They are already being used by law enforcement to find crime hotspots, control traffic flow, assess the risk posed by people awaiting trial, evaluate school learning, find financial fraud, evaluate job suitability, personalize online ads, enforce community standards on social media platforms, and create facial and biometric identification systems for legal and security purposes. (Neil, 2017)

However, academic analysts and AI critics have demonstrated that these supposedly neutral or objective systems either encode ways of thinking or replicate the biases in the data they are trained on. The opinions that are encoded in code that make up algorithms are not inherently scientific or objective. Aimlessly believing huge information can prompt critical issues. Studies have featured the likely predispositions and negative ramifications of artificial intelligence in different areas, including the law enforcement framework (bail, condemning, policing, parole), employing choices, work environment elements, medical services, facial acknowledgment frameworks, weapons frameworks, and independent vehicles.

For years, it has been known that AI systems used in internet infrastructure have bias. For instance, Sweeney (2013) showed in 2013 that Google AdSense delivered different publicizing results in view of "racially related" names, explicitly names normally connected with Dark people. When applied to minority communities, which already face issues with over policing, the use of AI and technology designed in a biased way poses significant risks to human rights. Late headways in computer-based intelligence have prompted claims that these frameworks can go past straightforward distinguishing proof and recognize characteristics like feelings, influence, guiltiness, and even sexuality. The security ramifications of such abilities, no matter what their precision, are unsettling. Although some beneficial applications, like automated visual screening for mental health conditions, can be envisioned, the privacy implications remain severe.

Because of worries regarding predisposition and security influences, a few moderate urban communities in the US, including Oakland, Berkeley, San Francisco, Somerville, and Portland, have prohibited the utilization of facial acknowledgment frameworks. It's interesting to note how many people and businesses are working on these systems in these cities. Activists, academics, and developers of technology worry that facial recognition systems could be used to restrict freedom of speech and assembly, disproportionately affecting minority groups that are already at risk, going beyond traditional public safety and policing, and resulting in wrongfully arrested or convicted individuals.

Activists have expressed concern about the use of AI and automation rhetoric to restrict labor rights, in addition to privacy and bias concerns. Some argue that the hype surrounding the AI revolution primarily aims to intimidate workers into not demanding their rights out of fear that machines will replace them. "Fauxtomation" refers to the practice of presenting work as performed by AI when it is performed by low-paid workers through platforms like Amazon's Mechanical Turk. Fauxtomation is viewed as a strategy for preventing workers from defending their fundamental rights.

Additionally, AI technologies aid in the development of data markets that exacerbate global inequality. The rush to introduce AI to the Global South could lead to algorithmic colonization, in which data from marginalized and disenfranchised populations is extracted for its value, to the advantage of powerful global businesses and institutions at the expense of the individuals from whom the data was extracted.

Human rights, privacy, labor rights, and global inequality are all gravely impacted using biased AI systems, particularly in facial recognition and other surveillance technologies. To guarantee the use of AI technologies in an ethical and fair manner, it is essential to address these issues through transparent and accountable procedures.

The Digital Era

Philip Alston, the former UN Special Rapporteur on Extreme Poverty and Human Rights, focused on the rise of the "digital welfare state" in a recent report that was presented to the UN General Assembly. This idea is about how the use of technology to provide social protection and assistance influences the human rights of the most vulnerable people. To achieve goals like efficiency and good governance, governments around the world are increasingly relying on biometric identification and algorithms to control access to benefits and determine who is eligible for social assistance. Alston, on the other hand, contends that even though these technologies are portrayed as "scientific" and impartial, they may embody values and assumptions that are in direct opposition to human rights principles.

Notwithstanding the Coronavirus pandemic, with the conclusion of schools, workplaces, organizations, and state offices, it has become progressively basic to address the current holes in responsibility. As per a new UNESCO report, school terminations have been carried out in 191 nations as a reaction to the pandemic (UN News 2020). A troubling

statistic is highlighted in the report: A lack of computer access affects nearly 830 million students worldwide, or half of all students unable to attend traditional classrooms now. Besides, more than 40% of these understudies have no Web access at home. It is essential to address these huge abberations in web-based schooling conveyance and admittance to taxpayer driven organizations, both during the prompt emergency and in the long haul.

Reconceiving Power and Law

Despite the depiction frequently seen in mainstream society and sci-fi, the present-day danger to basic freedoms through innovation doesn't emerge from machines acquiring independent control. All things considered, the danger lies in the customary ways innovation will in general solidify information and power in the possession of the people who as of now have it, while further minimizing and weakening the individuals who need access (as expressed by computer-based intelligence Currently Foundation fellow benefactor Meredith Whittaker, cited in Boran 2019). To deal with these threats, we offer two specific strategies in this section: one revolved around the standards of innovation plan and the other established in lawful measures.

Design

Taking proactive steps to decentralize the knowledge and power structures inherent in technology development is the first strategy for addressing these threats. The legal and technical communities have been having long-running discussions about participatory design and alternative technology approaches like the open-source movement (Berners-Lee 2019). However, the concerns of privileged actors in the Global North have dominated these discussions. In arrangement with the standards of plan equity (Costanza-Chock 2020), it is basic that people from weak populaces and specialists from the Worldwide South are effectively associated with forming the fate of these advances (West et al. 2019). Features the gamble of examining consideration without really consolidating the voices of underestimated people who are probably going to bear the best effect in a computer-based intelligence biological system that dismisses their viewpoints during its plan. (Benkler, 2017)

Working with practitioners to ensure that technology meets their privacy, security, and safety requirements is another aspect of participatory design. In a New York Times op-ed, Al-Sharif (2018) emphasized that activists require open, decentralized platforms that do not archive or sell user information to the highest bidder. Inability to integrate these highlights puts activists, legal counselors, columnists, and other weak people in danger of being focused on and hassled by noxious entertainers who exploit the information gathered by such stages. (Piracés, 2018)

According to (Birhane, 2019), to avoid further marginalization of individuals, both within local communities and in the larger global context, decisions regarding the implementation of technologies in African nations ought to be made locally. She emphasizes that the issue of digitalization and technologization also involves the kind of society that people want to live in. Birhane cautions against blindly importing cutting-edge AI tools and machine learning systems without first examining their purpose, the people who stand to gain from their use, and the potential disadvantages of doing so.

There is a developing African-drove development pointed toward safeguarding nations on the landmass from double-dealing by Western organizations and mentalities while cultivating nearby skill and business venture. This network can be seen prominently in the Deep Learning Indaba. To foster learning, teaching, and the creation of systems that address technical challenges and social issues of mutual interest, the organization organizes gatherings that are country specific as well as continent-wide. The Indaba aspires to be a venue where African voices, not those from America, Europe, or Asia, take center stage.

Transparency is a crucial issue that must be addressed in addition to encouraging participative processes. People who are affected by automated decision-making technologies typically do not currently could review the data that was used for training or analysis, the code that underlies it, or the assumptions and value judgments that are embedded within it (Ram 2018, Wexler 2018, and others). Non-programmers often have a hard time understanding these aspects, and businesses often protect their code as trade secrets, making it hard to evaluate AI systems' accuracy or learn more about their limitations. Law professors Natalie Ram (2018) and Rebecca Wexler emphasized that this lack of transparency becomes especially problematic when automated systems are involved in making crucial decisions that could affect a person's life or death. The capacity to have oversight and admittance to such data is urgent in guaranteeing responsibility and alleviating possible damage.

Law

The traditional distinction between the public and private must be reconsidered if human rights law is to remain relevant in the face of intertwined public and private actions in the field of technological innovation. This calls for the evolution of the law in a way that closes the accountability gaps caused using new technologies rather than making it irrelevant.

One such responsibility hole emerges when states sidestep minds their power by assigning position to private elements to control content that they, at the end of the day, wouldn't have the option to straightforwardly blue pencil. Additionally, public actors may be unable to offer solutions to problems brought on by automated systems that they are unaware of. Human rights law's fundamental goals of accountability and remedy are not served by a strict distinction between public and private authority in these situations.

In any case, rules administering state activities at both the global and homegrown levels can be modernized and carried out to guarantee that states can't avoid responsibility for hurts related with the utilization of arising advances, as exhibited by late turns of events (Land 2020; 2019) Crawford and Schultz

States must fulfill their obligation to protect individuals from harm caused by non-state actors to address the potential harms posed by new technology. States could, for instance, mandate private businesses to incorporate technology impact assessments into their operations while also incorporating these procedures into their own frameworks. Human rights risks can be identified and addressed before they become locked in by incorporating risk assessment into technological development and design systems. The obligation of states to foster technological progress in a manner that upholds and supports the enjoyment of human rights must be taken into consideration in addition to their obligation to promote technological innovation and access (Karanicolas, 2019–2020).

Conclusion

Even though projects that use technology for social good have gained a lot of popularity, it's important to understand that technology can't solve complex social problems on its own. In a 2019 WIRED op-ed, Mark Latonero warned against the trend of relying solely on AI for social good because it frequently represents a form of "tech solutionism" that overlooks underlying causes and the dangers of experimenting on vulnerable populations without adequate safeguards. Latonero contends that fantastic cultural difficulties can't be sufficiently tended to by essentially collaborating with unmistakable tech specialists and worldwide associations.

Green (2018) also rejects the idea that algorithmic or app-based solutions can simplify complicated political and social issues. Engineers and scientists should not be the

only ones responsible for identifying and defining social issues; rather, citizens should actively participate.

In addition, for technology to have a transformative effect, we need to pay close attention to the people who create it, their goals, and the power structures and privileges that are incorporated into the technology. While guaranteeing evenhanded admittance to innovation is a significant beginning stage, it isn't adequate. Advances don't work in confinement; they depend on complex organizations of aptitude, upkeep, and administration that can propagate existing primary imbalances. When introducing new technologies, critical questions about power should be asked, such as who benefits from the changes they bring about and how these benefits are not shared equally. Furthermore, innovations should be straightforward and open to outside oversight and investigation, especially by the people who bear the most elevated chances related with them.

Although technology has the potential to improve decision-making processes, it is essential to maintain skepticism regarding its ability to effectively challenge global power structures. It is unlikely that innovation's benefits and risks are shared equally. To guarantee that innovation serves common liberties targets, we should foster it with a dream for the world we want, as opposed to sustaining the norm.

References

Akinola, O., Tunbosun, O. A., & Oladapo, B. (2022). *Comparative Analysis Regulatory of AI and Algorithm in UK, EU, and USA*. EU and USA

Anderson, M., Perrin, A., Jiang, J., & Kumar, M. (2019). *10% of Americans don't use the internet. Who are they?* Pew Research Center.

Angwin, J., & Larson, J. (2016). Bias in criminal risk scores is mathematically inevitable, researchers say. In Ethics of data and analytics (pp. 265-267). Auerbach Publications.

Angwin, J., Larson, J., Mattu, S., & Kirchner, L. (2016). *Machine bias. In Ethics of data and analytics*, Auerbach Publications.

Anoop, K., Gangan, M. P., Deepak, P., & Lajish, V. L. (2022). Towards an Enhanced Understanding of Bias in Pre-trained Neural Language Models: A Survey with Special Emphasis on Affective Bias. In *Responsible Data Science: Select Proceedings of ICDSE* 2021 (pp. 13-45). Singapore: Springer Nature Singapore.

Barrett, P. M. (2019). *Disinformation and the 2020 election: how the social media industry should prepare.* Center for Business and Human Rights, New York University STERN.

Barrett, P. M. (2019*). Disinformation and the 2020 Election: How the social media industry should prepare. White paper. Center for Business and Human Rights*, New York University.

Barry-Jester, A. M., Casselman, B., & Goldstein, D. (2015). *Should prison sentences be based on crimes that haven't been committed yet*. FiveThirtyEight.

Benkler, Y. (2017). Law, innovation, and collaboration in networked economy and society. Annual Review of Law and Social Science, 13, 231-250.

Berners-Lee, T. (2019). *Years On, What's Next# ForTheWeb?"* Web Foundation,

Bloch-Wehba, H. (2019). Global platform governance: private power in the shadow of the state. *SMU L. Rev., 72*, 27.

Bond, P., & Dugard, J. (2008). The case of Johannesburg water: What really happened at the pre-paid'Parish pump'. *Law, Democracy & Development, 12*(1), 1-28.

Buolamwini, J., & Gebru, T. (2018, January). Gender shades: Intersectional accuracy disparities in commercial gender classification. In Conference on fairness, accountability, and transparency (pp. 77-91). PMLR.

Burdick, A. (2017). *The AI "Gaydar" study and the real dangers of big data.* The New Yorker.

Data, R. (2019). *Open letter to WFP re: Palantir agreement*. Responsible Data.

Davis, S. L. (2020). The Trojan Horse: Digital Health, human rights, and global health governance. *Health and Human Rights, 22*(2), 41.

Kang, H. (2020). Hong Kong and China: Building Bridges between Two Systems in One Country. *Am. J. Mediation, 13*, 93.

Land, M. K., & Aronson, J. D. (2020). Human rights and technology: new challenges for justice and accountability. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, 16, 223-240.