Jessica Navarro
ITAI 2372
AI Abuse Case

https://www.leewayhertz.com/ai-use-cases-and-applications/#AI-use-cases-in-major-industries

https://gkc.himss.org/resources/impact-ai-healthcare-workforce-balancing-opportunities-and-challenges

Case Study Analysis: The Abuse of AI in the Law Enforcement Industry – The Use of Predictive Policing by PredPol

Industry: Law Enforcement
Technology: Predictive Policing Algorithm (PredPol)

Overview of Predictive Policing:

Predictive policing is an AI-driven technology designed to help law enforcement agencies predict and prevent crime by analyzing historical crime data. The idea behind predictive policing is to identify areas and times where crimes are more likely to occur, allowing officers to allocate resources effectively and possibly prevent criminal activity before it happens.

One of the most notable tools in predictive policing is **PredPol**, an AI system developed by a company called **PredPol Inc.** PredPol analyzes past crime data, such as the locations, times, and types of crimes, and uses machine learning algorithms to predict where future crimes are likely to happen. It was marketed as a way to help police departments address crime more efficiently, without the need for increased manpower.

Implementation of PredPol:

PredPol was implemented by numerous police departments across the United States, including departments in Los Angeles, Atlanta, and Richmond, California. It was used to **predict crime hotspots**, essentially telling law enforcement where they should focus their patrols. Officers were given daily maps that identified areas where crimes (especially property crimes and violent crimes) were most likely to occur.

The predictive algorithm was designed to be "data-driven" and was based on the assumption that crime follows predictable patterns. The system used historical crime data, primarily from police reports, and analyzed this data to create predictions about when and where crimes were likely to take place.

Challenges and Negative Outcomes:

1. **Reinforcement of Racial Bias:** One of the most significant criticisms of PredPol is that it **reinforced racial bias** in law enforcement. The algorithm used historical crime data to make predictions, and this data was often skewed by systemic biases in policing. For example, police departments historically concentrated on policing minority communities, especially Black and Latino neighborhoods, which meant there were more police reports and arrests from these areas. As a result, PredPol's algorithm learned from this biased data, predicting that crimes were more likely to occur in these same neighborhoods.

This created a **feedback loop**, where more police were deployed to minority communities based on the algorithm's predictions, resulting in more arrests and reported crimes, which in turn fed into the system's future predictions. Critics argued that this practice unfairly targeted minority groups, perpetuating racial disparities in the criminal justice system.

2. **Lack of Transparency and Accountability:** PredPol was criticized for being a **"black box" system**, meaning that the inner workings of the algorithm were not transparent to the public, law enforcement officers, or even the police departments that used it. The system's predictions were based on complex algorithms and data processing techniques that were not fully explained to users or scrutinized by outside experts.

Because of the lack of transparency, it was difficult for the public or policymakers to evaluate how PredPol was making its predictions, what data it was using, and whether there were any inherent biases. This lack of accountability contributed to growing concerns about the ethical implications of using AI in such high-stakes, public-facing roles like law enforcement.

3. **Over-policing and Infringement on Civil Liberties:** By focusing police resources on specific **predicted hotspots**, PredPol led to an **over-policing** of certain neighborhoods, particularly those already burdened by systemic issues. Officers were sent to specific areas that were flagged by the algorithm, regardless of whether actual crimes had been committed. This resulted in increased **stop-and-frisk** incidents, surveillance, and other police interventions that disproportionately affected minority communities.

The use of PredPol also raised concerns about **infringements on civil liberties**. Critics argued that using AI to determine where to police could lead to excessive surveillance and an erosion of privacy rights, as entire neighborhoods could be unfairly targeted based on biased algorithmic predictions.

4. **Ineffective Crime Prevention:** Despite its promise, there is limited evidence that **predictive policing tools like PredPol significantly reduced crime rates**. Many studies have shown that the algorithm often failed to accurately predict crimes and, in some cases, was no better than random chance in predicting where crimes would occur. The focus on certain neighborhoods, especially those already over-policed, often meant that police presence was concentrated in areas where crime rates were already low, leading to **ineffective resource allocation**.

Furthermore, the lack of predictive accuracy raised concerns about whether resources were being wasted on tactics that didn't lead to tangible improvements in crime prevention or public safety.

5. **Legal and Ethical Implications:** Predictive policing raises significant legal and ethical issues related to fairness, privacy, and human rights. The **over-reliance on AI predictions** could lead to constitutional concerns, particularly around the **Fourth Amendment**, which protects against unreasonable searches and seizures. The practice of sending police to certain areas based on AI predictions could be viewed as a violation of individuals' rights to be free from unwarranted police presence or searches.

Moreover, the use of AI to inform criminal investigations and enforcement actions without adequate checks could be seen as a form of **government surveillance** that undermines the rights of citizens. There is also the issue of **due process**—if predictive policing leads to more arrests or surveillance

without evidence of actual wrongdoing, it could undermine the fairness of the criminal justice system.

Outcome and Reactions:

In 2020, amid mounting criticism and growing awareness of the dangers of biased policing, **PredPol ceased selling its predictive policing software** to law enforcement agencies. The company behind PredPol, after years of being a key player in the predictive policing space, rebranded itself as **Geolitica**, focusing on less controversial uses of AI in policing.

However, by then, the damage had already been done. The use of PredPol and similar AI systems had already drawn attention to the potential dangers of AI being used in ways that could perpetuate systemic inequalities and harm vulnerable populations. Various civil rights groups and advocacy organizations, such as the **American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU)**, were vocal in their opposition to predictive policing technologies, calling for greater scrutiny, regulation, and, in some cases, the complete cessation of such tools.

Takeaways:

1. **AI Systems Can Perpetuate Biases**: PredPol is a powerful example of how AI, when trained on biased data, can reinforce and even exacerbate existing social inequalities. The system's reliance on historical crime data, which was itself shaped by biased law enforcement practices, led to discriminatory outcomes that disproportionately affected minority communities.
2. **The Need for Transparency in AI**: AI systems used in critical applications, such as law enforcement, must be **transparent** and **accountable**. Without transparency into how algorithms make decisions, it's impossible to ensure that AI systems are operating fairly, ethically, and in the best interests of society.
3. **Ethical Oversight in AI Deployment**: Predictive policing tools like PredPol raise important ethical questions about the use of technology in government functions, particularly when it comes to **civil liberties** and **human rights**. There is a growing need for legal and ethical oversight to ensure that AI systems in law enforcement do not violate individuals' rights or perpetuate injustices.
4. **Human Judgment Remains Crucial**: AI tools should be viewed as assistants, not replacements, for human judgment in law enforcement. While AI can help with data analysis, human expertise is needed to ensure decisions are made fairly, justly, and with consideration for broader societal impacts.

Conclusion:

The case of PredPol is a stark example of the **abuse of AI** in a high-stakes industry, where flawed algorithms can lead to unfair, biased outcomes and undermine public trust in government institutions. It highlights the dangers of relying too heavily on AI in decision-making processes, especially when the systems are opaque and based on problematic data. As AI continues to be

integrated into sensitive areas like law enforcement, it’s crucial to ensure that such technologies are deployed with rigorous oversight, ethical considerations, and a commitment to fairness.