

THE HUMAN-CENTERED IMPERATIVE: NAVIGATING ETHICAL AI IN SOCIAL SCIENCES, JURISPRUDENCE, AND THE HUMANITIES

Nagendrappa K.T

Associate Professor

Department of Political Science, Y.D.D. Government First Grade College, Belur.

ABSTRACT

The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into the fabric of social sciences, legal systems, and the humanities represents a profound shift in how knowledge is produced and justice is administered. This research paper examines the necessity of a human-centered approach to AI development, emphasizing that technological efficiency must not come at the expense of ethical integrity. By exploring the unique challenges within these disciplines—such as algorithmic bias in judicial sentencing and the preservation of cultural nuances in digital humanities—the study argues for a robust ethical framework grounded in human dignity. Through a qualitative analysis of existing literature, the paper concludes that interdisciplinary collaboration is essential to ensure AI serves as a tool for empowerment rather than a mechanism for social erosion. Ultimately, it advocates for public policy that prioritizes transparency, accountability, and the protection of fundamental human values in an increasingly automated world.

Keywords: Human-Centered AI, Ethical AI, Social Sciences, Jurisprudence, Digital Humanities, Algorithmic Governance.

1. INTRODUCTION

We are currently witnessing a historic transition where Artificial Intelligence is no longer confined to the realms of engineering and mathematics. It has permeated the very disciplines that define human identity and social order: the social sciences, law, and the humanities. As AI models begin to interpret human behavior, predict legal outcomes, and curate historical narratives, the traditional boundaries of these fields are being redrawn.

However, the "black-box" nature of many AI systems presents a significant risk to the qualitative and value-driven essence of these disciplines. In the social sciences, AI can perpetuate historical prejudices found in datasets. In law, it can undermine the principle of "due process" if the logic behind a decision is inaccessible to the parties involved. In the humanities, a purely quantitative approach to literature or history risks stripping away the subjective depth that makes human experience meaningful. Therefore, a shift toward "Human-Centered AI" is not merely a preference but a survival strategy for these fields.

2. AIMS

This paper aims to investigate the intersection of ethical AI principles with the specific requirements of the social sciences, legal frameworks, and humanistic studies. It seeks to demonstrate how technology can be harnessed to enhance human potential without compromising the core ethical standards that govern these academic and professional sectors.

3. OBJECTIVES

- To identify the unique ethical challenges posed by AI integration in qualitative research and legal decision-making.
- To define the parameters of "Human-Centered AI" as it applies to non-technical disciplines.
- To analyze the impact of automated systems on cultural preservation and historical interpretation within the humanities.
- To propose a multidisciplinary framework for the governance of AI that incorporates legal, ethical, and sociological perspectives.

4. SCOPE

The scope of this research encompasses the theoretical and practical applications of AI across social sciences (sociology, psychology, political science), the legal profession (judicial systems, legal research), and the humanities (history, literature, philosophy). It focuses primarily on the ethical considerations of bias, transparency, and human agency, rather than technical programming or hardware development.

5. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

- This research is fundamentally based on the analysis of **secondary data**.
- It synthesizes information from academic journals, legal statutes, and policy documents regarding AI ethics (Research Methodology comprises a qualitative synthesis of established frameworks to identify gaps in interdisciplinary AI governance).

6. AI IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES: FROM PREDICTION TO PREJUDICE

The social sciences seek to understand the complexities of human interaction. AI offers researchers the ability to process vast amounts of social data, but this comes with a heavy ethical burden.

6.1 The Trap of Data Determinism

Social scientists often use AI to predict social trends or behavioral patterns. However, if the underlying data reflects a society with systemic racism or economic inequality, the AI will likely view these injustices as "natural patterns" to be replicated. A human-centered approach requires researchers to move beyond simple data mining and apply a critical lens to the origins of the data being used.

6.2 Sociology and the Digital Panopticon

The use of AI in surveillance and social credit systems poses a threat to individual liberty. Sociological inquiry must focus on how these technologies shift power dynamics between the state and the citizen, ensuring that AI does not become a tool for social engineering that stifles dissent or diversity.

7. THE LEGAL DIMENSION: ETHICS IN THE AGE OF ALGORITHMIC JUSTICE

Law is perhaps the most critical arena for the application of ethical AI. The legal system is built on the foundation of human judgment, empathy, and the interpretation of intent—qualities that AI currently lacks.

7.1 Algorithmic Bias in Criminal Justice

In several jurisdictions, AI tools are used to assess the risk of recidivism among defendants. Studies have shown that these tools can be biased against certain demographics. Ethical AI in law requires "Algorithmic Transparency," where the logic used to determine a person's freedom must be open to scrutiny by legal counsel and the public.

7.2 The Role of Human Oversight

"Human-in-the-loop" is a vital principle in legal AI. While AI can assist in searching through thousands of case laws (legal research), the final adjudication must remain a human responsibility. A human-centered legal system ensures that technology serves as an assistant to the judge, not a replacement for them.

8. AI AND THE HUMANITIES: PRESERVING THE "HUMAN" IN HISTORY AND ART

The humanities have traditionally been the guardians of human culture. The rise of "Digital Humanities" brings both opportunity and risk.

8.1 Cultural Nuance vs. Computational Efficiency

When AI is used to translate ancient texts or archive historical artifacts, there is a risk of losing cultural context. Machines prioritize patterns over meaning. A human-centered humanities approach involves using AI to handle the labor-intensive aspects of archiving while leaving the interpretation of "meaning" and "value" to human scholars.

8.2 Ethics of Generative Art and Narrative

Generative AI can now write poetry, create paintings, and compose music. This raises profound questions about the nature of creativity. The humanities must lead the conversation on intellectual property, the definition of authorship, and the potential for AI to dilute the cultural significance of human expression.

9. CHALLENGES TO INTERDISCIPLINARY AI ETHICS

- **The Vocabulary Gap:** Computer scientists and ethicists often speak different languages. Translating technical "optimization" into social "fairness" remains a major hurdle.
- **Corporate Influence:** Much of AI development happens in private labs where profit may take precedence over the social good of the humanities or social sciences.
- **Regulatory Lag:** Law moves slowly, while AI evolves daily. This creates a "legal vacuum" where unethical practices can flourish before they are officially banned.

10. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The integration of AI into the social sciences, law, and humanities is an inevitable reality. However, the trajectory of this integration is not yet fixed. By prioritizing a human-centered philosophy, we can ensure that AI acts as a magnifying glass for human wisdom rather than a replacement for it.

Recommendations:

1. **Interdisciplinary Education:** Law and social science students should be taught basic AI literacy, while computer science students should be required to study ethics and the humanities.

2. **Ethics-by-Design:** Developers must incorporate social science experts and legal scholars at the earliest stages of AI model creation.
3. **Public Participation:** Decisions regarding the use of AI in public sectors (like policing or social services) should involve community consultation and democratic oversight.
4. **Bias Auditing:** Regular, independent audits of AI systems used in legal and social research should be mandatory to detect and correct algorithmic prejudice.

In conclusion, the future of AI must be written not just in code, but in the values of justice, empathy, and human dignity that have guided the humanities and social sciences for centuries.

REFERENCES

1. Barfield, W., & Pagallo, U. (2020). Research handbook on the law of artificial intelligence. Edward Elgar Publishing.
2. Benjamin, R. (2019). Race after technology: Abolitionist tools for the New Jim Code. Polity.
3. Boden, M. A. (2016). AI: Its nature and future. Oxford University Press.
4. Crawford, K. (2021). The atlas of AI: Power, politics, and the planetary costs of artificial intelligence. Yale University Press.
5. D'Ignazio, C., & Klein, L. F. (2020). Data feminism. MIT Press.
6. Eubanks, V. (2018). Automating inequality: How high-tech tools profile, police, and punish the poor. St. Martin's Press.
7. Noble, S. U. (2018). Algorithms of oppression: How search engines reinforce racism. NYU Press.
8. Pasquale, F. (2015). The black box society: The secret algorithms that control money and information. Harvard University Press.
9. Russell, S. (2019). Human compatible: Artificial intelligence and the problem of control. Viking.
10. Zuboff, S. (2019). The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power. PublicAffairs.