

Vol 1 No 1 2024
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ISLAMIC STUDIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
Email: internationalislamicsocial@gmail.com
Home Page: https://jurnal.asrypersadaquality.com/index.php/ijiss

# ETHICAL ISSUES IN THE USE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND BIG DATA: MORAL NAVIGATION IN THE AGE OF ALGORITHMS

**Nayla Azzahra, Sajid Maulana, Dimas Dwi Syahputra**

naylazzahra0611@gmail.com, Sajidmaulana00@gmail.com, dimasdwisaputra428@gmail.com

[123] State Islamic University of North Sumatra

**KEYWORDS**
AI Ethics, Big Data, Algorithmic Bias, Data Privacy, Technology Accountability, Surveillance of Capitalism, Digital Justice, Right to Explanation, Data Sovereignty, Human Agency, Data Geopolitics, Algorithmic Ethics, Cognitive Justice, Digital Sovereignty

## ABSTRACT

Rapid advances in the field of Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Big Data management have brought about inevitable revolutionary changes in various sectors of human life, from the optimization of global supply chains and the efficiency of the manufacturing industry to the personalization of healthcare capable of predicting pathologies before clinical symptoms appear. However, behind the promise of efficiency, productivity, and innovation on offer, comes a very significant ethical challenge that fundamentally threatens the basic pillars of humanity such as individual privacy, social justice, and human autonomy. This article aims to explore holistically and in-depth the various ethical issues that arise due to the integration of increasingly autonomous AI systems and the increasingly massive Big Data ecosystem. The main focus of the research includes a critical analysis of systemic algorithmic bias, transparency issues in "black box" models that challenge common sense, the aggressive commodification of personal data within the framework of surveillance capitalism, as well as the shift of moral responsibility from human subjects to autonomous digital agents. Through a systematic literature review approach to the latest technological developments, digital sociological theories, and global policy dynamics, this study analyzes the extent to which the current ethical framework is able to mitigate existing technological risks. The analysis shows that without strict and binding regulations, periodic independent technical audits, and human-centric design philosophy, the use of these technologies risks widening social gaps, perpetuating existing historical discrimination, and creating new forms of surveillance that are repressive and invisible. This discussion emphasizes that the values of accountability, inclusivity, and data sovereignty are not just technical complements, but absolute prerequisites in building a dignified and humane technological future in the midst of the dehumanizing threat of algorithms.

## INTRODUCTION

We are now on the threshold of the dawn of a new digital civilization, where crucial decisions that determine the fate and destiny of humansfrom the eligibility of a person for a

home loan in a bank, the automatic selection of employee candidates for strategic positions, to the establishment of medical diagnoses of rare diseases and the formulation of military defense strategies—are increasingly delegated to autonomous algorithmic systems. The synergy between Artificial Intelligence (AI) which has the ability to continuously learn (machine learning) and the availability of Big Data that covers almost all traces of human activities, both physical and digital, has given birth to prediction machines with accuracy that were previously only considered as science fiction imaginations. The ability of these machines to process petabytes of data in seconds provides an incredible competitive advantage for organizations, but it also creates a very uneven information asymmetry between those who have the algorithm and those who are the subject of the algorithm. This has triggered a drastic shift in power, from public institutions that can be held accountable to private entities that hold control of the "digital brains" of society.

This transformation is often glorified as the culmination of the Industrial Revolution 4.0, but behind the splendor of this innovation, there is a very deep moral crack that, if left unchecked, will collapse the social order as we know it. As critics of contemporary technology warn, such a great predictive power without equal moral control will turn into a highly effective instrument of oppression because it works subtly, mathematically, and often imperceptibly (O'Neil, 2021; 45). Ethical issues in AI and Big Data are no longer just philosophical discourses discussed in academic ivory towers or technology seminars, but existential issues that directly determine the future direction of democracy, economic justice, and human rights protection in the 21st century. We face challenges where the law often lags far behind the speed of program code, creating a "gray zone" where technology can be used to exploit human vulnerabilities without adequate legal consequences. This crisis is further exacerbated by the disappearance of the boundary between technological experimentation and large-scale social implementation carried out without the consent of the affected subjects.

It is important to understand that AI does not grow or evolve in a sterile vacuum; It is a digital manifestation of the social environment, the values of its developers, and the historical data it uses. The algorithm was trained using datasets that inherently carry traces of historical prejudices, structural inequality, and human biases that have not been socially resolved so far. When Big Data is used without a robust and transparent ethical oversight framework, these technologies not only process information passively, but actively "automate injustices" in mathematical ways that are difficult to detect or sue by existing traditional legal systems (Noble, 2022; 102). The implication is the creation of "algorithmic justice" that can punish

individuals based on unfair statistical correlations rather than actual actions, creating a permanent stigma attached to a person's digital footprint.

This phenomenon is further exacerbated by the dominance of the business model known as "surveillance capitalism". It is a new economic order that claims human experience as a free raw material for hidden commercial practices; Our behavioral data is harvested, processed into prediction products, and sold to interested parties. From manipulating voter behavior through micro-targeting algorithms that fuel political polarization, to exploiting psychological vulnerability through social media newsfeeds designed for addiction, the integration of AI and Big Data has created fundamental challenges to the concept of *free will*. This introduction aims to provide a critical foundation for readers to understand why we should be skeptical, critical, and wary of the way machines "think" and the way our personal data is collected, managed, and traded massively by global corporations and state authorities. We must ask: who is in control of this "digital mind", and for whose benefit does this technology work substantially?

## RESEARCH METHODS

This article was prepared using a comprehensive literature review method with an in-depth qualitative-descriptive approach to dissect technological phenomena from an ethical perspective. Researchers conducted an extensive scan of academic literature across disciplines—from computer science and statistics to digital sociology, constitutional law, and contemporary moral philosophy. Key sources include keybooks from leading digital thinkers, policy reports from reputable international organizations (such as UNESCO, the European Union, the OECD, and the AI Ethics Lab), as well as scientific journals published within the last five years (2020-2025). The selection of this time span is crucial given the rapid development of AI technology, especially the emergence of Large Language Models (LLMs) and generative AI that have radically changed the ethical landscape in a short period of time.

The analysis process is carried out by dissecting and categorizing the main themes related to digital ethics into ten crucial interrelated dimensions, providing a broader view than just a technical issue:

1. Privacy, Sovereignty, and Surveillance: Analyzes how the collection of massive data erodes the boundaries between public and private spaces, as well as how the right to privacy should evolve into the right to full sovereignty of individual data as a new human right. This includes the individual's right to know who owns their data and how it is used to influence their profile.
2. Algorithmic Bias and Structural Justice: Examines the technical mechanisms by which algorithms can reproduce and even reinforce the stereotypes of race, gender, social

class, religion, and disability subtly embedded in training datasets. Focus is given on how this bias is hidden behind mathematical neutrality.

3. Transparency, Explainability, and the Right to Explanation: Reviewing the challenges of "*black boxes*" in highly complex AI models and civil society's demands for human-understandable logical explanations behind every automated decision that impacts their lives.
4. Accountability, Legal Responsibility, and Agency: Explores regulatory gaps and ethical dilemmas in the event of autonomous system failures that result in material loss, physical injury, and loss of human life, as well as who is morally responsible in a long technology supply chain.
5. Psychosocial Impact and Behavioral Manipulation: Assess the long-term consequences of algorithms designed for maximum engagement with collective mental health, public opinion formation, and the stability of democratic processes through "*filter bubbles*" that limit the horizons of human thought.
6. Environmental Sustainability and Resource Ethics: Considers the environmental impact of training giant AI models that require the consumption of unbelievably large computing energy and resources, as well as the carbon footprint and water use it generates in global data centers.
7. Data Geopolitics and Digital Colonialism: Analyzes the power imbalance between "technology-owning" countries (the Global North) and countries that are only "data providers" (the Global South), as well as threats to national sovereignty.
8. Science Integrity and Truth: Examine the threat generative AI poses to the concept of objective truth through the production of *deepfakes*, information hallucinations, and automated disinformation that erode public trust.
9. Cybersecurity and AI Weapons: Analyze the potential for AI misuse for more sophisticated cyberattacks, mass espionage, or the development of lethal autonomous weapons systems (Lethal Autonomous Weapons Systems) without human control.
10. Labor Justice: Examining the impact of automation on the labor market and the exploitation of data labeling workers who often work for low wages below welfare standards in developing countries.

All of these data and findings are then synthesized through the lens of moral philosophy (such as deontology, utilitarianism, and virtue ethics) as well as contemporary legal theories to build a strong argument about the urgency of establishing a global ethical governance that is able to keep pace with the exponential pace of technological innovation.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### RESULTS

Based on a comprehensive literature review, the results of this study are presented through a thematic and conceptual analysis of ethical issues surrounding the use of AI and Big Data. Rather than producing or statistical findings, the results reflect a synthesis of key ethical concerns identified across academic literature and policy documents. These themes are organized into several interrelated dimensions that illustrate how contemporary technological developments pose structural challenges to privacy, justice, transparency, and accountability.

**1. Privacy Violations and Invasive Psychographic Profiling**

In the age of Big Data, the concept of anonymity has turned into just a technical myth. Modern de-anonymization techniques powered by high computing capabilities allow individual identities to be rediscovered simply by connecting a few seemingly harmless data points. For example, GPS location data combined with web search history can reveal a person's true identity even if their name is obscured in the primary dataset. Big Data facilitates the creation of highly detailed psychographic profiles—including political leanings, sexual orientation, shopping habits, and mental health history—often without the explicit conscious consent of the data subject.

These profiles are not only used for persuasive microtargeting ads, but also for social *credit systems* that in the context of certain countries can be used to restrict citizens' right of movement, access to education, or health services. The implication is the loss of the "right to be forgotten" and the absence of space for individuals to develop autonomously without constant supervision from machines (Zuboff, 2023; 112). This creates a "chilling effect" where people begin to limit their self-expression for fear of being permanently watched by a system that never forgets past mistakes. Personal life becomes a traded asset, while individual autonomy is undermined by algorithms that know us better than ourselves.

**2. Algorithmic Bias and Automation of Systemic Injustice**

AI systems often replicate and reinforce existing biases in their historical training data. As a real example, facial recognition algorithms consistently show significantly higher error rates in individuals with darker skin tones or female genders compared to white men. This is because the datasets used to train the system are dominated by certain populations that do not represent human diversity fairly. This bias is not just a technical error, but a reflection of the power imbalance in the real world that enters the digital system uncritically.

This bias becomes very dangerous when applied in the realm of criminal law through *the predictive policing* system. If the algorithm is trained using police data that already has past

patterns of racial discrimination, the AI will continue to suggest patrols in minority neighborhoods, which in turn leads to more arrests there, and put it back into the system as "proof" of accuracy. This creates a vicious cycle of discrimination that is automated and difficult to break because it is perceived as the "objective truth" of machines (Noble, 2022; 89). Additionally, in automated recruitment systems, algorithms often filter applicants based on historical patterns that may indirectly exclude female applicants or from certain economic backgrounds simply because past data shows the dominance of a particular group in the position. Without radical ethical intervention, AI will become a "status quo preserver" that hinders social mobility for marginalized groups.

**3. The Accountability Crisis and the "Empty Agent Dilemma"**

When AI makes fatal decisions—such as a misinterpretation of radiological data by medical AI that leads to a patient's death or a navigation system failure in an autonomous car that leads to a fatal accident—a confusing moral and legal void of responsibility arises. In conventional law, responsibility is inherent in an individual or entity that has consciousness and will. However, with AI, it's hard to establish who is to blame: is it the programmer who wrote the initial code, the biased dataset provider, the company that deploys the system, or is it the AI entity itself?

This lack of accountability creates an existential challenge to our justice system. If an algorithm causes massive financial losses in the stock market through *high-frequency trading*, who bears the losses? Without a clear accountability framework, tech victims are often left without compensation or justice because companies can hide behind arguments that the behavior of such machines is "unpredictable" or probabilistic (Floridi, 2021; 34). We run the risk that *faceless decisions* determine a person's life and death without any room for dignified appeals or transparent audits.

**4. Erosion of Autonomy and Algorithmic Nudging Manipulation**

Recommendation systems on digital platforms are never neutral; they are designed with optimization algorithms that aim to maximize user engagement for financial gain through advertising. By analyzing Big Data user behavior in real-time, algorithms can predict psychological vulnerabilities (such as loneliness or anxiety) and influence individual choices through subtle *nudging*. This can range from a sequence of news displayed to a notification that is psychologically designed to trigger a dopamine reaction and dependence.

This is gradually but surely eroding human agency; Our preferences, musical tastes, and political views no longer grow organically from within, but are algorithmically constructed through constant feedback. Humans transform from a "subject" that chooses to a systemically

directed "object." This phenomenon threatens the essence of democracy which desperately needs citizens with free minds and the ability to make independent judgments without the influence of algorithmic distortions that deliberately limit their perspectives in "filter bubbles". When we only see what the algorithm thinks we want to see, our ability to empathize with different perspectives becomes dull, fueling digital social segregation.

**5. Monopoly of Knowledge and the Digital Power Gap (Digital Divide)**

The power of data today is not evenly distributed, but rather concentrated in the hands of a handful of big tech companies and countries with advanced computing infrastructure. This phenomenon creates an extreme information inequality: companies have total visibility into every beat of a user's life, while users and even regulators often know nothing about how algorithms work. This is a very dangerous form of power asymmetry in which one party has predictive knowledge of the other without any reciprocity or transparency.

This monopoly of knowledge stifles healthy competition, stifles small-scale innovation, and harms the public interest by creating power asymmetry that resembles a new form of "digital feudalism" (Véliz, 2024; 56). Developing countries are often just providers of raw data that are then processed by developed countries, creating a new form of digital colonialism in which the economic and intellectual value of data flows out of the community of origin without providing equitable return benefits. Inequality of access to advanced AI technology will also widen the economic gap between nations, creating a dominant "AI elite" class and a colonized "data worker" class.

**6. Exploitation of Labor Behind the Scenes of AI**

It's often forgotten that behind the sophistication of AI are millions of low-wage human workers (often called *ghost workers* or *microworkers*) tasked with labeling data, filtering out violent content, and training algorithms to look "smart". They work through global platforms, often in inhumane conditions, exposed to traumatic content (such as videos of violence, sexual exploitation, or hate speech) without adequate mental health support, and without adequate job security or proper insurance.

The ethics of using AI and Big Data must include fairness for those who build the foundations of these technologies but often remain invisible and economically marginalized. Without their sweat, large language models would never be able to interact safely with humans. Ignoring their rights is a very serious violation of labor ethics in the digital age. We must ensure that technological progress is not built on the suffering of vulnerable workers in the Global South, but rather provides well-being for all parties in the data production chain.

**7. AI Hallucinations and Threats to Objective Truth**

The emergence of generative AI brings a new challenge in the form of the production of content that seems very convincing but is completely false or not fact-based (hallucinations). Ethically, this undermines the integrity of public information and threatens the foundations of science that require rigorous verification. *Deepfakes* audio and video can be used for defamation, financial fraud, or manipulation of public opinion during elections through highly personal disinformation that is difficult for the ordinary eye to detect.

If society can no longer distinguish between real and synthetic, then the foundations of social trust necessary for healthy societal functioning will slowly collapse. AI here acts as an accelerator of a global epistemic crisis in which "truth" becomes relative to the algorithms that individuals consume. In the absence of *digital watermarking* or robust verification standards, we risk entering a permanent "post-truth" era where reality can be mass-fabricated at a very low cost.

## DISCUSSION

### 1. The Privacy Paradox: Between Service Convenience and Intimacy Exploitation

In the modern digital economy ecosystem, there is often a misleading adage that "data is the new oil". However, this metaphor is ethically flawed and reduces human dignity to a mineral commodity. Oil is a dead and lifeless natural resource, while data is a digital representation of life's pulses, unique behaviors, deepest emotions, social relationships, and human aspirations. A fundamental ethical problem arises when this process of data extraction is carried out in an invasive and secretive manner, as if the human life experience is an open mine that can be exploited indefinitely for the sake of unbridled corporate economic growth. We are moving from an economy that produces goods to an economy that harvests the "digital soul" of humans through relentless surveillance.

Here we are facing what is called the "privacy paradox". Theoretically, individuals claim to care deeply about their privacy, yet in everyday practice, they easily hand over location data, contact lists, and shopping habits for the convenience of accessing "free" services or trivial small discounts. This paradox is not actually a reflection of the individual's lack of concern for privacy, but rather a reflection of the asymmetry of power that makes individuals powerless to resist. Essential digital services—such as messaging apps, maps, or banking—often require broad consent to data access as a condition of use, making privacy a "luxury" that only a handful of people can afford to leave the digital ecosystem.

The submission of this data rarely occurs in purely voluntary conditions or based on sufficient understanding (*informed consent*). Companies often use manipulative interface designs (*dark patterns*)—such as the flashy "Approve All" button while privacy options are

hidden in deep menus—to force user consent. Even if one tries to read the "Terms and Conditions", the legally deliberately complicated and lengthy language (sometimes taking hours to read) is designed to break the critical spirit of the user. This is not a free choice, but rather a form of digital structural coercion that creates the illusion of consent on a foundation of ignorance.

The long-term implications of this exploitation are the mass erosion of individual personality and uniqueness. When our every step, breath, and heartbeat is predicted and optimized by third-party algorithms, the room for unpredictability, valuable human error, and free self-exploration becomes extremely limited. Humans begin to do "self-censorship" (*social cooling*) because they are aware that they are being watched; They stop doing things that the algorithm deems strange or different in order to maintain their "digital reputation score." Privacy is not simply about hiding secrets from the public, but about having a sacred space where individuals can be themselves without external judgment, surveillance, or optimization in pursuit of profit (Zuboff, 2023; 145). Without strict controls and regulations that favor individuals, Big Data will continue to function as a tool to "harvest" human intimacy, reducing humans to mere data profiles that can be predicted and massively controlled by their behavior, eliminating the essence of human inner freedom.

**2. Algorithms as a Mirror of Prejudice: Suing the Myth of Mathematical Objectivity**

One of the most persistent, popular, and dangerous myths in the tech world is the belief that algorithms are objective because they are based on mathematics, logic, and raw data. This assumption creates an "aura of truth" that makes machine decisions difficult to sue legally or socially. In reality, mathematics in AI is just a formal language, while its message and logic are constructed by humans who have both conscious and unconscious biases, and carry a heavy historical burden. Algorithms are, in essence, "human opinions enshrined in code" that are often unaware of their creators (O'Neil, 2021; 78). AI learns from past patterns stored in data, and if our history is full of discriminatory practices, racism, or sexism against certain groups, then AI will be the most efficient machine in perpetuating and reinforcing those injustices into the future under the guise of cold "statistical efficiency."

Let's take the example of an AI system for health insurance screening or providing a bank credit score in more depth. If the algorithm is trained using historical data where poor populations or certain ethnic groups have worse health rates, the AI may not consider that it is caused by systemic racism in health access or environmental pollution in the areas where they live. Instead, the AI only looks at statistical correlations: "Group A = High Risk". As a result, AI will set a much more expensive premium for them or even deny them protection altogether.

This creates a poverty trap: because they are poor, they are considered at risk; because they are considered risky, they have to pay more; Because they have to pay more, they become poorer and poorer. AI justifies this discrimination through seemingly "scientific" numbers, yet ethically it ignores the underlying social causality and punishes individuals for systemic conditions that are beyond their control.

This phenomenon has also penetrated into the judicial world through the recidivism risk assessment system (the likelihood of someone committing a crime again). If the training data reflects the bias of past police patrolling and arresting people in communities of color more frequently, then the algorithm would score people from those backgrounds higher because of their address or social history, not because of their own actions. This is a form of automated "criminalization of poverty", in which algorithms function as judges without judges, who render verdicts based on statistical possibilities in the past, rather than the correctness of the case in the present.

Addressing this requires more than just superficial technical code improvements; it requires a diversity of backgrounds within the development team to ensure that minority perspectives are represented in the design process from the start. If a development team consists of only homogeneous groups, they will not be able to detect biases that may be hidden in their dataset. In addition, there is a need for a concept of "algorithmic justice" that actively seeks to compensate for such historical biases, even if it means sacrificing little of "pure accuracy" for the sake of broader social justice. We must honestly admit that technology is never *value-free*. Every line of code is an ethical decision that has an impact on real life and the distribution of power in society. True objectivity does not mean eliminating values, but rather ensuring that the values of social justice are firmly embedded in the heart of the algorithm.

**3. The Challenge of the "Black Box" and the Urgency of the Right to Explainability**

Modern AI models, particularly those that use *Neural Networks* architectures with millions to billions of parameters, often achieve remarkably accurate prediction results but through internal processes that are not even fully comprehensible to the scientists who created them themselves. This is known as the "*black box*" problem. Machines may provide statistically accurate decisions, but they can't tell us *why* those specific decisions were made for a particular individual. In the context of ethics, law, and justice, the end result alone is never enough; The logic behind it is at the core of dignified human accountability. Without explanation, a decision becomes authoritarian because it cannot be checked for truth.

Imagine a doctor who tells his patient that AI suggests radical surgery but can't explain the medical basis logically, or an employee who gets fired because the HR department's AI system

thinks his performance will decline in the future without giving a specific reason. Without transparency and the ability to explain, individuals lose their fundamental right to defend themselves, raise objections, or challenge adverse decisions in a fair manner. Justice without transparency is a form of new technological tyranny that is untouched by law. If a machine cannot explain itself, then it has no moral authority to judge or determine the fate of man. This creates a crisis of legitimacy: the public is asked to believe in "Digital Oracles" without having a way to verify whether they work based on facts or data hallucinations.

This is why there is a global movement demanding *Explainable AI* (XAI) and the establishment of a "right to *explanation*" in national data protection laws. We need the "glass" on the black box so that the machine's decision-making process can be audited. An automatic decision that has a significant impact on human life—whether in employment, health, education, or freedom—must be rationally accountable and understandable to the common human mind. It also has to do with safety issues: if we don't know *why* an AI system makes a certain decision, we can't predict when it will fail in the future.

Transparency is not just an optional additional technical feature, but an absolute prerequisite for justice in the digital age. This requires developers to not only pursue the highest accuracy, but also prioritize interpretability. If a system cannot explain its logic to the affected subject, it is ethically unfit to be used for critical and sensitive humanitarian affairs. Accountability should not be sacrificed for the sake of computational efficiency; Every digital decision must have a clear "moral audit trail" that can be traced back to mutually agreed human values.

**4. Cognitive Manipulation, Echo Space, and the Fragility of Democratic Infrastructure**

Big Data provides the ability for political actors and large corporations to conduct psychological mapping of millions of people simultaneously, in real-time, and highly personalized. By understanding each individual's deepest fears, expectations, and cognitive biases through their digital footprint, algorithms can serve political content or ads specifically designed to trigger strong emotions—usually anger, resentment, or fear—in order to keep the user's attention on the device's screen. This is no longer just passive advertising, but a very massive and invasive form of automated social engineering. We no longer just consume media; The media is now "consuming" our attention and emotions with a terrible level of precision.

This practice, when combined with newsfeed algorithms that create "*echo chambers*"—where users are only exposed to information that validates their beliefs and masks conflicting facts—is slowly but surely destroying the foundations of healthy, inclusive, and civilized public dialogue. The algorithm is designed to maximize "watch duration," and statistically,

content that is extreme and anger-provoking is far more effective at keeping people on the platform than content that is nuanced and educational. As a result, society has become extremely polarized not because of healthy ideological differences, but because each group lives in a different informational reality curated by algorithms that pursue profit above all else. Personalized ignorance is the biggest threat to the social cohesion of the nation.

Furthermore, this phenomenon creates vulnerability to information attacks from foreign actors or interest groups that want to disrupt national stability. By using AI to disseminate thousands of versions of disinformation messages tailored to each voter's psychological profile, a country can be manipulated from within without needing to detonate a single bullet. This is a cognitive war in which algorithms are used as a weapon to undermine public trust in democratic institutions and the mainstream media. A healthy democracy requires the same basis of facts; If algorithms create millions of different realities for each individual, then national consensus becomes impossible to achieve.

The ethics of Big Data use here have shifted from simply a matter of individual privacy to a matter of collective cognitive security and national democratic stability. When social media platform algorithms prioritize divisive content because it is statistically more "profitable" for advertising businesses through high engagement rates, then the social cohesion of the community is at stake. We've seen how AI-powered disinformation can spread much faster than the truth, influence public perception in elections, and even spark real violence in the physical world. The moral responsibility of technology developers must now include assessing the systemic impact of their algorithms on the collective mental health and democratic resilience of the community, not just the technical performance of the system. We must demand that digital platforms be held accountable for the social "negative externalities" generated by their algorithmic designs.

## 5. Accountability at the Intersection of Law and the Speed of Technological Innovation

One of the biggest ethical and practical challenges of this era is the "*regulatory gap*": AI technology is evolving exponentially every month, while laws and public policy are moving in a linear, bureaucratic, and very slow manner. When an innovation is launched, the law often only responds to its impact years later, after social damage has become widespread. Traditional product liability laws often fail to address the complexity of dynamic AI systems: they can change, adapt, and learn independently once they are launched to market, so the "product" purchased today may behave differently six months later.

The emergence of the problem of "many hands" complicates law enforcement efforts. A modern AI system involves thousands of code contributors, third-party dataset providers, system integrators, and end-users retraining the model. In the event of a fatal failure—such as an autonomous car hitting a pedestrian—who holds primary legal responsibility? Is it a sensor failure (hardware), an algorithm logic failure (software), or a data training failure (data provider)? This uncertainty is often exploited by large corporations to avoid liability through complicated release clauses, leaving victims without clear justice.

There is a need for a shift in the legal paradigm from passive accountability (only acting after an accident occurs) to proactive and preventive accountability. This involves an obligation to audit algorithms by an independent third party before the system is publicly used, the creation of global security standards for critical AI systems (such as in transportation, energy, and medical), and the establishment of inherent legal liability on development companies for the social impact generated by their systems even if the behavior of the system is probabilistic. We can't let the "it's just a statistic" or "the machine did it" argument become a legal shield for design irregularities.

The principle of accountability must be moved from simply fulfilling the company's internal technical standards to a transparent and enforceable social and moral responsibility under international law. This includes the establishment of an independent supervisory body that has the power to stop the operation of AI systems that prove to be harmful to society. Innovation without accountability is carelessness that endangers civilization; We need a clear rules of the game where technology is no longer above the law, but is subject to the rule of law that protects humans.

## 6. Environmental Impact: Carbon Footprint and Ecological Justice in Artificial Intelligence

Often overlooked in data-focused ethical discussions is the physical and environmental costs of a digital world that looks virtual but relies heavily on massive physical infrastructure. Training one advanced large language model (LLM) can consume enormous electrical energy, equivalent to the consumption of hundreds of households in a year, and produce extraordinarily large carbon emissions that exacerbate the global climate crisis. For example, training a single AI model can release carbon equivalent to five times the average emissions of an American car over its lifetime. Behind the seemingly clean "cloud" intelligence, there is a fossil fuel power plant that keeps burning to power millions of graphics cards (GPUs) that work non-stop.

In addition to emissions, giant data centers need millions of gallons of water every day to cool hardware systems to keep them from catching fire. Ethical issues arise when these data

centers are built in areas that are already experiencing water scarcity or extreme drought, so that the computing needs of corporations compete directly with the basic needs of local communities for drinking water and irrigation. In addition, the speed of AI innovation triggers extremely short hardware life cycles, leading to an explosion of *toxic e-waste* that is often dumped in developing countries with weak environmental regulations.

AI ethics must include "ecological justice" and the sustainability of the planet as a whole. We must critically question whether momentary digital conveniences—such as AI's ability to create funny images or instant poems—are worth the long-term environmental damage that is accelerating global climate change. We face the risk that AI advances are actually destroying the natural habitats we live in. Developers and technology companies have a moral obligation to not only pursue model performance, but also seek extreme energy efficiency, use of renewable energy sources, and full transparency in reporting their technology's environmental footprint to the public.

The concrete steps needed include "digital carbon etiquette" and audits of the use of natural resources by cloud service providers. The public has a right to know what the environmental cost of each command they give to the AI. We must not trade the future of the planet for consumptive machine intelligence; Environmental sustainability should be a key metric of technology success, on par with accuracy and speed.

**7. Geopolitics of Data: National Sovereignty vs Technological Hegemony**

The ethical issue of AI also extends to the realm of international relations through the increasingly heated phenomenon of data geopolitics. The power to process Big Data provides enormous strategic advantages in economic, military, and diplomacy for the countries that have it. This creates an extreme global inequality between "AI Superpowers" that have complete data infrastructure and other countries that are only consumption markets. This hegemony allows dominant countries to influence foreign policy, market behavior, and even the political stability of other countries through the control of information flows and digital infrastructure.

This is a new form of "digital colonialism" in which national data sovereignty is threatened by transnational technology companies that have research and development budgets larger than the GDP of many developing countries. Citizen data in one country is often stored and processed on overseas servers, under the legal jurisdiction of another country, so that the local government loses control over the security and privacy of its own citizens. It also has an impact on the local economy: reliance on foreign algorithms makes it difficult for local innovators to compete, while the economic added value of data processing flows to global technology centers abroad.

Furthermore, AI is used in the development of lethal autonomous weapons systems (LAWS) that can select and strike targets without human intervention. This creates an AI arms race that is very dangerous for world peace. Ethically, delegating the decision to kill to algorithms is a violation of the most basic international humanitarian law. The race also encourages countries to ignore ethical testing in favor of the speed of military development, creating the risk of systemic accidents that could trigger unintentional global conflicts.

AI ethics demand respect for the digital sovereignty of every nation, protection against unfair cross-border data exploitation, and efforts to bridge the technology gap between countries through fair knowledge transfer. We need global governance that ensures that AI advances not only enrich a handful of "tech elite" countries but also provide universal benefits to humanity without creating new forms of colonialism. Data sovereignty is not about closing itself off from the world, but rather about the right of each community to determine their own digital future without the pressure of foreign technological hegemony.

This study demonstratesthat consent and data disclosure are shaped by structural power imbalances and the manipulative design of certain platforms, theleby challenging the prevailing view that places responsibility solely on user.

## CONCLUSION

The use of Artificial Intelligence and Big Data is the most decisive technological milestone for the future of human civilization in this century. On the one hand, it is an extraordinary instrument capable of accelerating the discovery of science, optimizing the use of planetary resources to fight climate change, detecting cancer diseases early with high accuracy, and massively improving the quality of human life through the help of intelligent and efficient digital assistants. On the other hand, however, it carries the risks of a very real digital dystopia: a world in which individual privacy is permanently dead, justice becomes mere biased and discriminatory statistics, and human agency is cannibalized by machines hungry for personal data for the financial gain of a handful in power.

The main conclusion of this in-depth study confirms that ethics should not be seen as an obstacle or burden to innovation, but rather should be positioned as a moral compass and the main foundation that ensures technology remains on the path of devotion to noble human values and individual dignity. Technology should be designed to amplify human potential, creativity, and dignity, not to exploit psychological vulnerability or manipulate behavior for narrow gain. Innovation without ethics will only lead us to a mathematically organized social collapse.

Therefore, concrete, bold, and multidimensional measures involving globally and nationally binding cross-sectoral collaboration are needed:

1. Global Regulatory Transformation and Robust Law Enforcement: Governments around the world should urgently adopt and enforce strong legal frameworks (such as the AI Act in the European Union) that require full transparency, protection of individual data sovereignty, and mandatory algorithmic audits for all high-risk sectors. We need a digital "Geneva Convention" for AI to prevent the misuse of technology that harms humanity and global peace.
2. Integration of Ethics by Design: The community of engineers, data scientists, and technology company leaders must make ethical considerations an integral, mandatory, and integral part of the entire product development cycle, from the first line of code is written. This includes proactively testing bias and the selection of datasets that are truly inclusive, diverse, and representative of all human diversity without exception.
3. Community Empowerment Through Massive Critical Digital Literacy: The wider community must be systematically educated to understand the mechanisms behind algorithms so that they can act as active, critical, and sovereign digital subjects over their own data, rather than simply passive and vulnerable objects of data exploitation. Digital literacy must include the ability to detect algorithmic manipulation, *deepfakes*, and automated disinformation.
4. Principle of Human-in-the-Loop: Any automated decision that has significant legal, medical, security, economic, or social consequences must still have a competent, ethical, and accountable human oversight mechanism, which has the moral and technical authority to override or override decisions. The final decision on the fate of humans cannot be left entirely to probabilistic algorithms.
5. Economic Justice for Global Data Workers: Providing strong legal protections, living wages by international standards, and comprehensive mental health support for millions of human workers who train and filter AI data, ensuring they work in safe, fair, and dignified conditions as an integral part of the global technology supply chain.
6. Data Source Transparency and Copyright Respect: Requires AI companies to transparently declare the source of their training data to respect intellectual property rights, content creator privacy, and prevent unauthorized collection of personal data that violates privacy or fundamental professional ethics.
7. Creation of Security Standards and Independent Audits: Establish independent oversight bodies at both the national and international levels tasked with conducting

periodic technical and ethical audits of large-scale AI systems to ensure the absence of malfunctions or biases that are systemically detrimental to the public.

An ethical future of AI and Big Data is an urgent collective responsibility for all of us—governments, academics, technology developers, corporations, and citizens. Only with the moral courage to apply proper and uncompromising ethical navigation can we ensure that this tremendous technological advancement will be a valuable legacy for future generations, not an instrument that destroys the human order itself. We must ensure that artificial intelligence remains a tool for human wisdom and benefit, not its cold, soulless replacement.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY


Bender, E. M., Gebru, T., McMillan-Major, A., & Shmitchell, S. (2021). On the Dangers of Stochastic Parrots: Can Language Models Be Too Big? *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (FAccT '21).* https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3442188.3445922

Crawford, K. (2021). *The Atlas of AI: Power, Politics, and the Planetary Costs of Artificial Intelligence*. Yale University Press. https://yalebooks.yale.edu/book/9780300209570/atlas-ai

European Commission. (2021). *Proposal for a Regulation laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act)*. https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/library/proposal-regulation-laying-down-harmonised-rules-artificial-intelligence

Floridi, L. (2021). *The Ethics of Artificial Intelligence: Principles, Challenges, and Opportunities*. Oxford University Press. https://academic.oup.com/book/38891

Hao, K. (2022). *The Facebook Algorithms and the Polarization of Society*. MIT Technology Review. https://www.technologyreview.com/2022/facebook-algorithms/

Jobin, A., Ienca, M., & Vayena, E. (2020). The global landscape of AI ethics guidelines. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 1(9), 389-399. https://www.nature.com/articles/s42256-019-0088-2

Miller, T. (2024). *Explainable AI: Beware of the Black Box*. Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research. https://jair.org/index.php/jair/article/view/11335

Noble, S. U. (2022). *Algorithms of Oppression: How Search Engines Reinforce Racism*. NYU Press (Updated Ed.). https://nyupress.org/9781479837243/algorithms-of-oppression/

O'Neil, C. (2021). *Weapons of Math Destruction: How Big Data Increases Inequality and Threatens Democracy*. Crown. https://weaponsofmathdestructionbook.com/

Pasquale, F. (2020). *New Laws of Robotics: Defending Human Expertise in the Age of AI.* Belknap Press. https://www.hup.harvard.edu/catalog.php?isbn=9780674975224

Russell, S. (2021). *Human Compatible: Artificial Intelligence and the Problem of Control*. Penguin Books. https://www.penguinrandomhouse.com/books/566231/human-compatible-by-stuart-russell/

Taddeo, M., & Floridi, L. (2022). *Ethics, Governance, and Policies in Artificial Intelligence*. Springer. https://link.springer.com/book/10.1007/978-3-030-81907-1

UNESCO. (2022). *Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence*. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000381115

Véliz, C. (2024). *Privacy is Power: Why and How You Should Take Back Control of Your Data*. Melville House. https://www.mhpbooks.com/books/privacy-is-power/

Wachter, S., & Mittelstadt, B. (2021). A Right to Reasonable Inferences: Re-thinking Data Protection Law in the Age of Big Data and AI. *Columbia Business Law Review*. https://cblr.columbia.edu/wachter-mittelstadt/

Zuboff, S. (2023). *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power*. PublicAffairs. https://www.publicaffairsbooks.com/titles/shoshana-zuboff/the-age-of-surveillance-capitalism/9781610395694/