



RESEARCH PAPER

Governing Artificial Intelligence in Emerging Democracies: Challenges of Regulation, Ethics and State Capacity

¹Mobeen Waqar, ²Rehmat Arif and ³Waqia Rahat

1. MS Scholar, Department of Politics & International Relations, Government College Women University Sialkot, Punjab, Pakistan
2. MS Scholar, Department of Politics & International Relations, Government College Women University Sialkot, Punjab, Pakistan
3. MS Scholar, Department of Politics & International Relations, Government College Women University Sialkot, Punjab, Pakistan

Corresponding Author: mobeenmughal1111@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This paper looks upon how developing democracies may create AI governance frameworks that are both successful and context-sensitive while upholding social fairness, democratic accountability and human rights. In emerging democracies, especially in South Asia, Sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America and Southeast Asia the quick uptake of AI has exceeded institutional and regulatory capabilities. The straight adoption of Western AI governance models is insufficient because to weak legal frameworks, a lack of technological knowledge and a variety of cultural and ethical traditions. A qualitative multimethod research strategy is used in the study. It uses process tracing techniques to compare Brazil, Kenya and India. To find recurrent governance issues, a systematic review of over 180 peer-reviewed sources was conducted. In order to assess the normative and policy aspects of AI governance, the study is further supported by deliberative democracy theory, international human rights legislation and the capabilities approach. The findings reveal three major weaknesses in AI governance across emerging democracies fragmented institutional coordination, insufficient technical expertise and weak legal enforcement mechanisms. The study also finds that dominant Western AI ethics frameworks fail to fully address the cultural, religious and postcolonial realities of developing societies highlighting, the importance of contextual approaches like Ubuntu and Islamic ethics. Furthermore, AI acts as a double-edged tool by improving public services and transparency while simultaneously enabling mass surveillance, biometric profiling and democratic backsliding. Instead of implementing unduly complicated regulatory models, emerging democracies should build adaptable, context sensitive AI governance frameworks that are in line with current institutional capacity. To guarantee that AI promotes democratic consolidation and human rights protection, more regional collaboration, robust democratic protections, active civil society engagement and unambiguous protections against politically motivated monitoring, are crucial.

KEYWORDS Artificial, Democracies, Ethics, Governing, States

Introduction

Artificial intelligence technologies are spreading quickly over the world which has sparked critical discussions concerning governance in academia and policy. How should AI systems be regulated by states? When algorithmic judgments result in injury, who is responsible? How can the advantages of AI be shared fairly? The European Union, the United States, Canada and the United Kingdom are high-income, technologically sophisticated democracies that have mostly tackled these issues from their perspectives. Each of these countries has created historic national plans and regulatory tools (Calo, 2017; Doshi-Velez et al., 2017; European Commission, 2021).

However, most democratic countries throughout the world are not wealthy nations. About 84 states are categorized as "partly free" by Freedom House (2023), which reflects situations where democratic institutions are present but are nevertheless brittle, disputed or lacking. Rapid implementation of AI is also occurring in these developing democracies which include portions of the Middle East and North Africa, South Asia, Sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America, and Southeast Asia. With no regulatory supervision, governments in Nigeria, Brazil, India, Indonesia, Pakistan, Kenya and Ghana are using AI-enabled systems for public health surveillance, welfare distribution, police and election administration (Nyarko et al., 2021; Smucker & Smith, 2022).

The lack of theoretically sound as well as empirically supported understanding of AI governance issues unique to developing democracies is a major gap that this essay fills. It accomplishes this by looking at three interconnected problems. First, the regulatory issue: given the underdevelopment of fundamental rule-of-law institutions, how can nations create cogent legal frameworks for AI? The second ethical dilemma is: in culturally diverse communities where Western bioethical norms might not apply, whose ethical frameworks should regulate AI? Third, the issue of state capacity: how can governments with limited resources provide the institutional framework, interagency cooperation and technological know-how needed to successfully regulate AI?

This is how the article goes. The literature on AI governance and democratic thought is reviewed in Section 2. A conceptual framework for comprehending AI governance in the context of democratic fragility is developed in Section 3. The capability, ethical, and regulatory issues are examined in Sections 4, 5 and 6 respectively. The relationship between AI and democratic consolidation processes is examined in Section 7. Comparative case analysis is provided in Section 8. Policy proposals are presented in Section 9 and the conclusion is given in Section 10.

Literature Review

AI Governance: Concepts and Debates

The collection of legislation, rules, customs, organizations and procedures that societies use to control the creation, use and effects of AI systems is referred to as AI governance. (Dafoe, 2018). Since 2016, scholarly research on AI governance has expanded quickly, resulting in a wide range of literature from fields including computer science, rules, political science, philosophy and science and technology studies. Innovation-enabling governance, which aims to reducing regulatory constraints in order to maximize economic gain, and hazard governance, which prioritizes the avoidance of damage, marginalization and rights abuses are fundamentally at odds in this literature. (Marchetti, 2021).

According to Floridi et al. (2018), beneficence, non-maleficence, autonomy, fairness and explicability are the five fundamental ethical concepts that are included in all AI governance frameworks worldwide. However, these principles reflect long-standing bioethical frameworks and were mostly developed in high-income nation environments. Scholars like Birhane (2021), who contends that African philosophical traditions like Ubuntu offer alternative epistemic underpinnings for AI ethics, have questioned its relevance in civilizations with differing normative traditions, legal cultures and social agendas.

More recent times, political studies have focused on how AI as well as democratic government are related. While Risse (2019). contends that algorithmic decision-making in government administration poses basic issues of political mandate, Deibert (2019). investigates how AI-enabled monitoring infrastructure affects civil rights, democratic freedoms. Roberts (2022). uses the phrase "platform authoritarianism" to characterized

how illiberal state actors may suitable digital technology such as artificial intelligence also in ostensibly democratic environments.

Emerging Democracies and Technology Governance

Although it is still limited, the body of research on technology governance in developing nations are expanding. The fast expansion of automated decision-making system in African public sectors is documented by Nyarko et al. (2021), who point out that these implementations surpass legislative framework. Arora (2019). argues that the structural barriers of colonial and post - colonial states such as bureaucratic informality, inadequate enforcement capability as well as patron-client governance networks fundamentally impact how technology is accepted deployed, offer a essential counterbalance to "tech solutionism" narratives in improvement contexts.

Comparative democratization scholars have long stressed that democracy is a continuity rather than a binary state. (Levitsky & Way, 2010; Diamond, 2015). On this spectrum, evolving democracies have a variety of characteristics, such as competitive elections combined with diminished judicial independence, curtailed civil freedoms or taken control of regulatory bodies. Because official democratic processes combine with informal practices of power concentration these "hybrid regimes" provides unique governance issues. This creates places where AI systems might be used to repress political dissent, or strengthen incumbent advantages. (Guriev & Treisman, 2022).

Theoretical Framework

A conceptual framework that maps AI governance issues onto the unique institutional and political circumstances of developing democracies is presented in this article. Three theoretical traditions are absorbed into the framework: the sociotechnical systems view from science and technology studies, the capabilities approach from development studies and principal-agent theory from political science.

Principal-agent theory sheds light on how transparency gaps arise, when AI systems in public administration are given decision-making capacity. Structures of institutional control, including judicial oversight, parliamentary examination, independent regulatory bodies as well as civil society monitoring, are used in established democracies to handle principal-agent issues. Delegating authority to opaque algorithmic systems affect already-existing transparency deficiencies in nascent democracies, since these institutional structures is frequently poor or controlled. (Bovens, 2007).

Amartya Sen, and Martha Nussbaum's capabilities approach offers a sstrong theoretical foundation for assessing the results of AI governances. The capabilities framework examines if AI technologies increase, or limit individuals' capabilities—their actual freedoms to live lives they have reason to value - instead of gauging government performance using technological efficiency indicators. (Sen, 1999). This concept focuses on even if AI-enabled public services reach disadvantaged communities, AI systems preserve cultural dignity and if citizens have meaningful recourse when AI choices hurt them when applies to AI governance in developing democracies.

According to sociotechnical systems theory, which was created by researchers like Jasanoff (2015), and Bijker et al. (1987), technologies are co-produced with social institutions, power dynamics and cultural norms rather than being value-neutral artifacts. AI systems used in developing democracies include imbedded assumptions that may have been designed in quite different sociotechnical environments, such as what data is trustworthy, what results are desired, and whose interests count. Therefore, governance

frameworks need to take into consideration the possibility of a mismatch between the social reality of the deployment settings of AI systems and the sociotechnical presumptions embedded in those systems.

According to the structure, which integrates these three viewpoints, successful AI governance in developing democracies necessitates: (a) institutional design that makes up for inadequate monitoring mechanism, (b) normative commitments based on both universal human rights principles as well as local ethical traditions, (c) sociotechnical adaptation of AI systems to local settings rather than naive transfer of technology established abroad.

Material and Methods

Three methodologies are combined in a **qualitative, multi-method research design** used in this study. Initially, a **comprehensive evaluation** of the literature on AI governance, democratic theory and technological governance in poor nations was carried out using key academic databases. (Web of Science, Scopus, Google Scholar, SSRN). Approximately 180 peer-reviewed articles, 40 policy papers and 25 monographs encompassing publications from 2015 to 2024 were synthesized.

In order to investigate how governmental factors influence AI governance results, a **comparative case study** examination of three rising democracies—India, Kenya, and Brazil—was conducted utilizing process tracing. Cases were chosen to represent democratic, economic as well as geographic variety. Government AI plans, laws, court rulings as well as contributions from civil society were examples of primary sources.

Third, **normative policy analysis** was used to assess governance systems using standards derived from international human rights legislation, the capacities approach (Sen; Nussbaum) and deliberative democracy theory.

Critical interpretivism serves as the article's epistemological foundation. It is devoted to finding leadership drawbacks against universal democratic, and human rights ideals, while being perspective in its analysis. Reliance on English-language sources, a non-representative case sample and also the quickly changing empirical environment of AI policy are some of the restrictions.

Results and Discussion

The Regulatory Challenge

The Weakness of Legal Infrastructure

Clear property rights over data, strictly enforced contract law, an independent court capable of interpreting new legal issues and administrative bodies to technological know-how and enforcement power are all necessary for effective AI regulation. Even one of these requirements are absent from several developing democratic countries. (Graham & Anyanwu, 2021).

Judicial systems are still underfunded in a large portion of Sub-Saharan Africa. Data protection law, a fundamental component of AI regulation, is still in its infancy, judicial backlogs span years and constitutional enforcement is uneven. Although the Nigeria Data Protection Regulation (2019), and Kenya's Data Protection Act (2019) are noteworthy achievements there is still little ability to enforce them. (Abebe et al., 2021). There is a legislative gap as AI applications spread throughout the banking, telecommunications, and law enforcement industry since Pakistan's Personal Data Protection Bill has been in parliamentary consideration since 2018,, but has not been passed.

What Pistor (2019) refers to as "legal transplantation"—the acceptance of legal frameworks create in one institutional setting into another where the necessary circumstances are lacking—complicates the problem. The proposed AI Act and the EU's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) have sparked regulatory proposals around the developing world but their efficacy depends on institutions that are absent from the majority of emerging democracies such as independent supervisory bodies, class action lawsuits and well-funded data protection authorities. Without borrowed institutional capacity, borrowed regulatory structures run the danger of creating "governance facades," or formal adherence to regulations that conceal substantive non-enforcement. (Braithwaite & Drahos, 2000).

Regulatory Approaches: Options and Trade-offs

A number of regulatory approaches suitable for situations with limited resources have been put up by academics. Although doctrine regulation is flexible and adaptive it necessitates competent enforcement agents that can apply main guidelines to particular circumstances, which is a big demand on ineffective administrative agencies. Although rules-based regulation is more realistic, given the speed at which AI is developing it runs the danger of quickly becoming outdated. Although outcome-based regulation emphasizes results over procedures many regulatory bodies lack the statistical know-how needed to measure algorithmic consequences.

What Marchetti (2021) refers to as "adaptive governance"—modular regulatory frameworks that may be gradually enhanced as institutional capacity grows -may be a more attractive strategy for many developing democracies. This strategy prioritizes a few strong strictly enforced regulations, like demands for bias audits transparency, as well as human monitoring of strong decisions—over extensive regulatory frameworks that is too complex to enforce.

Some other option is regional regulatory cooperation. ASEAN's AI Governance Framework formation and maintenance the African Union's Continental AI Strategy (2024) offer models for coordinated regional regulation that divides the expenses of regulatory among many governments. But political will and robust intergovernmental institutions are necessary for regional frameworks and these are not often available. (Calland & Bentley, 2022).

The Ethical Challenge

The Limits of Universal AI Ethics

Transparency, fairness, accountability, as well as privacy are a cluster of concepts that developed mainly from Anglo-American European schools of thought represent the societal values of high-income, generally homogenous cultures. These form the basis the of the prevailing discourse on AI ethics (Hagendorff, 2020). Although these principles are generally consistent with human rights standard they may need to be significantly contextually adjusted in order to solve the ethical issues surrounding the use of AI in societies that are politically complicated, culturally varied and economically unequal. The prevailing AI ethics paradigm, according to Birhane (2021). and Prabhakaran et al. (2022). demonstrates a type of "ethics washing"—the articulation of lofty ideals, that are not operationalized in forms that address the real damages endured by marginalized groups in the Global South. Predictive policing systems that concentrate surveillance in already overpoliced regions, welfare AI systems that automate the denial of benefits to those most in need, credit scoring models that embed colonial-era patterns of economic exclusion and face recognition systems that perform badly on darker skin tones are some of these harms. (Buolamwini & Gebru, 2018).

Indigenous and Alternative Ethical Frameworks

In developing democracies alternative ethical frameworks provide valuable tools for AI governance. Ubuntu, a philosophical tradition from Southern Africa which emphasizes communal interrelatedness ('I am because we are'), puts communal accountability as well as relational well-being before of individual rights. This approach may better reflect the social embeddedness of AI harms in community-oriented society (Metz, 2007). Ubuntu for AI ethics has started to be operationalized by academics, who contend that AI systems must be assessed not just by how they affect individual users but also by how they affect social trust, society cohesiveness and collective dignity. (Dlamini, 2022).

Islamic ethical frameworks have been drawn increasing interest in South Asian debates over AI governance especially in countries such as Bangladesh, Indonesia and Pakistan. The concepts of *maslaha* (public interest) *adl* (justice) and *hifz al-aql* (maintenance of rational agency) have been suggested by Islamic ethics scholars as the cornerstones of AI ethics frameworks that appropriate for democracies with a majority of Muslims (Lim, 2021). While these frameworks provide distinct focusses greater emphasis on betterment of the people over individual freedom and on obligations in addition to rights - they do not completely contradict liberal human rights principles. There are important ramifications for AI governance policy. Starting to emerge democracies can create prescriptive frameworks that are contextually relevant by drawing on rich native ethical traditions rather than merely importing Western ethical norms. Local ethical frameworks should also be carefully scrutinized for any exclusions many conventional frameworks were created in male - controlled social structures and may need feminist and decolonial critiques before being used to AI governance.

The State Capacity Challenge

Technical Expertise and Human Capital

The majority of developing democracies lack the technological, legal, administrative and policy competence needed for effective AI governance. The worldwide market for AI expertise is fiercely competitive to governments in wealthy nations and private sector companies providing compensation packages that public sector organizations in underdeveloped nations cannot fit. This causes a 'brain drain' dynamic in which the most technically proficient graduates relocate to business or overseas, leaving regulatory bodies under-staffed and under-skilled. (Ndung'u & Signé, 2020).

There are important ramifications for AI governance. Without technological know-how, regulatory bodies are unable to conduct meaningful audits of AI systems verify vendors' compliance claims, or determine analytic bias. Rather than, they can depend on self-regulatory systems, such as voluntary disclosure frameworks and industry codes lack of reliable conduct, which are known to be inadequate in the external examination (Hagendorff, 2020). Because elected technology companies, which are frequently global corporations with substantial legislative resources, influence the regulatory ideology in ways that prioritize their interests above those of people this creates structural conditions for regulatory capture.

Institutional Coordination and Fragmentation

The administration of AI is intrinsically interdisciplinary, including ministries of finance, technology, health, justice, interior and military, among others. Strong multiagency procedures, distinct lines of authority, and a central coordinating body with the political clout to resolve bureaucratic disputes are all necessary for coordinating governance across various institutional silos. Natural grass warfare, conflicting mandates, and individualized

governance render finally gets continuity precarious in so many developing democracies due to poor. (Booth & Cammack, 2013).

A number of developing democracies have established specialized AI governance organizations in an effort to tackle this issue. Brazil established the AI Governance Committee within its federal Ministry of Science, Technology, and Innovations; India formed the National AI Task Force and then the NITI Aayog AI strategy and Rwanda established an AI policy directorate inside its Ministry of ICT in 2021. However, depending on their funding, political support and capacity for cross-governmental coordination these organizations' efficacy has varied greatly. (Smucker & Smith, 2022).

Data Governance and Infrastructure

AI systems rely on data, the availability, quality and governance of data significantly influence the potential benefits and drawbacks of AI applications. In addition to, data governance deficiencies which include a lack of interoperable data standards, subpar data security procedures and insufficient frameworks for data sharing between government agencies and research organizations, emerging democracies often struggle with data poverty or a lack of organized data on important social phenomena. (Abebe et al., 2021).

Therefore, investing in data infrastructure is a prerequisite for real AI governance, which is both a caused by political issue. Exercises of power include decisions on what data is gathered, by whom, on whom, and for what ends. AI systems trained on biased or incomplete administrative data would replicate as well as magnify current patterns of inequality and discrimination in settings with inadequate data governance, especially against women, ethnic minorities, rural communities, urban poor.

AI and Democratic Consolidation

AI as a Tool of Democratic Backsliding

One of the key political trends of the early twenty-first century has been the progressive degradation of democratic norms, institutions, and practices by incumbent elites, known as "democratic backsliding". (Levitsky & Ziblatt, 2018). AI technologies are a potent new tool in the toolbox of illiberal Democrats and potential authoritarian leaders. Governments in developing democracies have used biometric data gathering for population control, mass surveillance systems, as well as algorithmic amplification of social media to stifle civilized society limit political opposition (Polyakova & Meserole, 2019).

India serves as an informative example, Civil liberties organizations are gravely concerned about the possibility of surveillance creep, targeted profiling of religious minorities and repression of political dissent as a result of, the world's biggest democracy's unparalleled deployment of AI-enabled face recognition technologies that link biometric databases to the Aadhaar national identity system. (Rao, 2020). Similar to this, it has been shown that Bangladesh's vast CCTV and, biometric surveillance network, which is touted as a anti - terror precaution, is really used to observe and intimidate political opponents. (Human Rights Watch, 2021).

AI as a Tool of Democratic Deepening

However, there is more than just a negative link between AI and democracy. By enhancing public service delivery, lowering corruption, boosting election openness but also facilitating more participatory reform agenda, carefully crafted AI systems can improve democratic rule in developing democracies. In places like São Paulo and Nairobi, platforms that use AI to analyze user comments and prioritize public service improvements have showed promise. (Smucker & Smith, 2022).

Several African countries have implemented AI-assisted fraud detection in voting systems to lessen voter registration, and ballot counting scam. Natural language processing-powered e-government platforms have the ability to remove a major obstacle to democratic participation in linguistically varied countries by making public services more accessible to individuals who are illiterate in official languages. The institutional setting in which the innovation is entrenched, and the accountability systems controlling its usage are more important variables than the itself.

Comparative Case Analysis

India: Scale, Ambition, and Accountability Gaps

A prime example of AI governance in a sizable growing democracy is India. India has established a vast AI policy environment with a population of 1.4 billion, a booming technology industry but also aspirations to become a worldwide AI giant. The government has made significant investments in digital public infrastructure, and the National Strategy for Artificial Intelligence. (NITI Aayog, 2018) designated healthcare, agriculture, education, smart cities, and smart transportation as key areas. The world's largest use of biometric AI in public administration is the Aadhaar biometric identification system which is currently connected to several government services.

However, there is a lot of holes in India's AI governance structure. The accountability systems for computational judgments in public services are still inadequate there is no comprehensive AI-specific law and data protection legislation has seen protracted parliamentary delays. AI-mediated welfare programs have discriminated against and excluded marginalized people including women in rural regions, Backward classes and members of religious minorities. Although a fundamental right to privacy was established by the Supreme Court's Putt Swamy ruling in 2017 its ramifications for AI governance are still unclear. (Chander, 2021).

Kenya: Innovation, Data Markets, and Digital Rights

With and just a thriving digital economy government firmly devoted to digital transformation Kenya has become one of Africa's top technological hotspots. In 2019, the High Court of Kenya decided to order the Huduma Namba national digital identification scheme which was modeled after India's Aadhaar to be reformed after civil society organizations faced it in court, claiming insufficient data privacy measures. (Ndung'u & Signé, 2020).

The Office of the Data Protection Commissioner as well as Kenya's Data Protection Act (2019), are noteworthy regulatory accomplishments. The quick development of AI-enabled credit scoring, predictive policing and health diagnostics. however, surpasses regulatory capability, and enforcement is still tool. Kenya's experience demonstrates the ongoing disconnect between formal legislation and, real implementation as well as the viability of significant AI governance change in a developing democracy.

Brazil: Democratic Resistance and Legislative Innovation

One example of AI governance in a setting of political unpredictability and, democratic resiliency is Brazil. Enacted similar in structure 2018, and reinforced 2020, the Lei Geral de Proteção de Dados (LGPD) offers a thorough data security framework that is to the GDPR. The Brazilian Internet Advisory Committee (CGI.br) has created multi-stakeholder governance models for digital policy that involve the government, business, academia, but also civilized society.

Brazil's proposed AI Rule, which has been undergoing parliamentary discussion until 2021 is based on a long history of digital rights activism, and represents persistent civil society lobbying. The bill calls for the creation of a national AI body strict transparency requirements for high-risk AI systems and a danger regulatory method. If implemented, it would be among the Worldwide South's most extensive AI regulations but there are still a lot of implementation issues, especially, when it comes to coordinating enforcement within Brazil's strong federal political system. (Smucker&Smith,2022).

Conclusion

One of the most complicated but also significant issues facing the world community is the governance of artificial intelligence in developing democracies. This essay has made the case something which the prevalent Western model for AI governance is unable to deal with the unique issues of state capacity limitations, moral heterogeneity, but also regulatory inadequacy defines developing democratic environments. It has even farther claimed that AI technologies are not democratically neutral, as they may either strengthen democratic backsliding and otherwise promote democratic deepening, depending on the institutional setting and governance framework in which they are implemented.

The comparative examples of Brazil, Kenya and India show the variety of developing democratic societies as well as the difficulties they all face. Despite ongoing difficulties with institutional coordination, democratic accountability and enforcement capability each one has achieved notable progress in AI governance. These examples show that significant AI governance change is possible in developing democracies but it will take persistent political will, civil society involvement but also global cooperation.

The suggestions made in this essay are intended to be both aspirational regarding democratic principles and pragmatic regarding institutional limits. They disagree both with and also the techno-optimist belief that AI will inevitably improve democratic government techno-pessimist belief that AI is fundamentally antagonistic to democracy in emerging nations. The ability of civilized society, ideological will, organizational architecture, but also the moral responsibilities ingrained in frameworks all have a significant impact on the connection with both AI democracy.

The future of democratic government worldwide as well as the billions of people who live in developing democracies are at risk when it comes to AI governance. Emerging democratic countries will be a crucial battlefield as AI capabilities develop authoritarian political the geopolitical struggle between types of AI governance heats up. It is a key issue of democratic solidarity to support their ability to control AI in ways that are consistent with democratic norms, rather than just providing technical help.

Recommendations

This article presents seven policy proposals for AI governance in developing democracies based on the findings presented above.

Prioritize Foundational Data Governance. Before investing in complicated Intelligence legislation emerging democracies should concentrate on building a robust data governance infrastructure including data protection laws independent data protection authorities' interoperability standards and secure government data systems. Data stewardship is the key to effective AI policy.

Adopt Adaptive, Modular Regulatory Frameworks. Governments should establish modular regulatory frameworks that can be gradually improved instead of trying to imitate entire AI regulatory systems, that may need institutional capacities that most emerging democracies do not now possess. Required human monitoring of algorithmic

judgments in criminal law but also welfare, transparency requirements for government AI sourcing, mandatory bias internal audit for AI systems impacting basic rights are a few strong, enforceable criteria that should be the main emphasis of initial laws.

Invest in Regulatory Capacity Building. Sustained investment in regulatory knowledge is necessary to develop AI governance capabilities. This calls for international technical assistance programs focused on leadership rather than AI development, government-university collaborations for regulatory research, but also specialized AI units inside important regulatory agencies manned by individuals with technical training. Regulatory sandboxes, where novel AI applications are evaluated under effective regulation prior to full deployment, can function as both industry responsibilities and learning environments for regulators.

Centre Marginalized Communities in AI Governance. The most susceptible groups to algorithmic harm including women, low-income groups, rural communities and members of ethnic and religious minorities must be protected by AI governance frameworks. This calls for required impact studies for AI systems that really are have an influence on these groups ways for impacted societies to participate in AI governance processes and redress procedures affordable and accessible to those with low levels of technological literacy

Develop Contextualized Ethical Frameworks. National AI ethics frameworks ought to include local philosophical traditions, such as indigenous ethical systems, religious ethical frameworks and postcolonial political philosophy rather than merely translating Western ethical ideas. To create ethical frameworks suitable for particular national circumstances multi-stakeholder consultation mechanisms involving philosophers' theologians, civil society groups but also impacted societies should be formed.

Strengthen Regional AI Governance Cooperation. Emerging democracies should invest in regional AI governance institutions as a means of pooling limited regulatory capacity and establishing common standards that prevent a 'race to the bottom' in AI regulation. Existing regional bodies—the African Union, ASEAN, MERCOSUR SAARC—should develop enforceable AI governance frameworks with dedicated secretariats and monitoring mechanisms.

References

- Abebe, R., Aruleba, K., Birhane, A., Kingsley, S., Obaido, G., Remy, S. L., & Sadagopan, S. (2021). Narratives and counternarratives on data sharing in Africa. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency* (pp. 329–341). ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3442188.3445897>
- African Union. (2024). *Continental artificial intelligence strategy*. African Union document
- Arora, P. (2019). *The next billion users: Digital life beyond the West*. Harvard University Press
- Birhane, A. (2021). Algorithmic injustice: A relational ethics approach. *Patterns*, 2(2), 100205. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.patter.2021.100205>
- Bijker, W. E., Hughes, T. P., & Pinch, T. J. (Eds.). (1987). *The social construction of technological systems*. MIT Press
- Booth, D., & Cammack, D. (2013). *Governance for development in Africa: Solving collective action problems*. Zed Books
- Bovens, M. (2007). Analysing and assessing accountability: A conceptual framework. *European Law Journal*, 13(4), 447–468. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0386.2007.00378.x>
- Braithwaite, J., & Drahos, P. (2000). *Global business regulation*. Cambridge University Press
- Buolamwini, J., & Gebru, T. (2018). Gender shades: Intersectional accuracy disparities in commercial gender classification. In *Proceedings of the 1st Conference on Fairness, Accountability and Transparency* (pp. 77–91). PMLR Proceedings
- Calland, R., & Bentley, K. (2022). AI regulation in Africa: Gaps, challenges, and opportunities. *African Journal of Information and Communication*, 30, 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.23962/10539/33547>
- Calo, R. (2017). Artificial intelligence policy: A primer and roadmap. *UC Davis Law Review*, 51, 399. <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3011844>
- Deibert, R. (2019). The road to digital unfreedom: Three painful truths about social media. *Journal of Democracy*, 30(1), 25–39. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jod.2019.0002>
- Dlamini, N. (2022). Ubuntu and AI governance: A relational approach to algorithmic accountability in Southern Africa. *African Studies Review*, 65(1), 58–79. <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/african-studies-review>
- Doshi-Velez, F., Kortz, M., Budish, R., Bavitz, C., Gershman, S., O'Brien, D., ... & Wood, A. (2017). *Accountability of AI under the law: The role of explanation*. Berkman Klein Center Working Paper. <https://dash.harvard.edu/handle/1/34372584>
- European Commission. (2021). *Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act)* (COM (2021) 206 final). EUR-Lex official document
- Floridi, L., Cowls, J., Beltrametti, M., Chatila, R., Chazerand, P., Dignum, V., ... & Vayena, E. (2018). An ethical framework for a good AI society: Opportunities, risks, principles, and recommendations. *Minds and Machines*, 28(4), 689–707. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-018-9482-5>

- Freedom House. (2023). *Freedom in the world 2023: Marking 50 years in the struggle for democracy*. Freedom House report
- Jasanoff, S. (2015). Future imperfect: Science, technology, and the imaginations of modernity. In S. Jasanoff & S.-H. Kim (Eds.), *Dreamscapes of modernity* (pp. 1–33). University of Chicago Press
- Metz, T. (2007). Toward an African moral theory. *Journal of Political Philosophy*, 15(3), 321–341. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9760.2007.00280.x>
- Prabhakaran, V., Hutchinson, B., & Denton, E. (2022). *Cultural incongruencies in artificial intelligence*. arXiv. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2211.13069>