

Maaz Saad

Dr. Theresa Miedema

MBAI 5200G

20 November 2022

Major Case Study – Case Outline

For the purposes of the outline, I have decided to frame it as a conversation with the professor as opposed to writing a literature review. There will be parts of this outline where my tone might come across as informal, and that is because I am taking this outline not as an assignment but rather as a stepping stone towards the final case study. And after reading the instructions, I am hoping that you are not looking for this outline to be a write-up fit for publication, but to check in with us to see how we are progressing. With that said, let's dig in.

I have read and re-read your comments on my case summary and have incorporated your suggestions into my game plan for tackling the case study. In my case summary, I toyed with the idea of exploring autonomy, transparency, and trust as the basis for my argument surrounding algorithmic policing. At that time, I really thought that I could explore all three aspects and did not fully grasp why you kept emphasizing that we should pick one topic to explore. Now, I understand that it is better to write a paper with a specific focus rather than try to touch upon everything.

After much deliberation, I have decided to develop my ideas about algorithmic policing around the notion of trust, especially trust in government. For the final paper, my strategy is to first explore, review, and summarize the work of Tom Tyler. Then, I hope to explore questions like, how can a person trust the government when they know that the government does not trust them? "[Tom Tyler's](#) classic study concludes that people obey the law if they believe it's legitimate, not because they fear punishment". For one of my arguments, I want to approach this one-line summary from the following angle: let's assume that a group of good people who follow the law because they think it is the right thing to do, are subjected to algorithmic policing. Over time, they realize that the AI-powered tools are way too severe, and they do not deserve to be treated like potential criminals at all times. And as a way to fight back, they come up with ways to outsmart the AI. Does this mean that by using technology, we are turning decent people into mischievous individuals? Are people losing their true selves and turning into potential criminals so as not to be treated as potential criminals? I will do my best to base all my arguments around trusting your government, but it is possible that, in my excitement, I might touch upon questions that don't strictly fit under this theme.

Here are a few questions that I have thought about and could use your input as to whether I should explore them in my paper or not. To what extent are we willing to allow AI-powered policing to take control? Is a drone only allowed to conduct surveillance on a person of interest, or should it have the capability to maim someone? If people knew that they could get shot down in the street by a drone, what type of society are we living in? Is the government (of Canada?) willing to publicly acknowledge that we now live in a police state where the public needs to be

afraid of the government, or are we still living in a democracy? Would it be plausible to explore a fictional narrative like this: Imagine a person of color being shot and killed by an AI-powered drone due to a false positive. I want to delve into the possible consequences of such an act for the government and the people and link it back to the ethical concept of trust.

Shifting gears, this [article](#) by Shawn Singh, published in the Manitoba Law Journal, discusses in detail the kind and type of “algorithmic technologies” that are currently being used to identify individuals in Canada. Moreover, it goes on to state that Canada’s courts have yet to make any official decisions regarding algorithmic decision-making in police processes. However, the Supreme Court of Canada has allowed the use of “broader surveillance technologies under the common law ancillary powers doctrine.” I am not sure what this exactly means, but what I am sure of is that this article can kickstart my discussion on the subject of the law.

I have a very sound understanding and a clear sense of direction for the ‘ethics’ section of the paper. However, I am a little unclear about how to approach the legal aspect of it. With ethics, I can work with previous research on the need for trust between people and government and then build my own arguments from my own thought process. But for the law, I could use your guidance on how to build my own arguments. I can review the article by Shawn and similar articles to discuss how the law currently operates when it comes to algorithmic policing, but I am not sure what I can contribute from my own thinking.

The last thing I want to mention is that I have written many papers during my studies, but I honestly do not think I have ever worked on a paper that has got me this excited. These topics and the way I am thinking about them aren't ideas I've considered in recent weeks. In fact, I have been passionate about these conundrums for years, and I am glad I finally have a chance to work on them in a professional setting. I look forward to your comments on my thoughts and some direction on how to approach the law in terms of the requirements for the case study assignment.