

AI4people – an ethical framework for a good AI society: the Ghana (Ga) perspective

Laud Nii Attoh Ammah

*Institute for Ethics in Artificial Intelligence, Technical University of Munich,
Munich, Germany and Responsible Artificial Intelligence Network – Africa,
Munich, Germany*

Christoph Lütge and Alexander Kriebitz

*Institute for Ethics in Artificial Intelligence, Technical University of Munich,
Munich, Germany, and*

Lavina Ramkissoon

Responsible Artificial Intelligence Network – Africa, Munich, Germany

Journal of
Information,
Communication
and Ethics in
Society

453

Received 12 June 2024
Revised 20 September 2024
Accepted 24 September 2024

Abstract

Purpose – The introduction of artificial intelligence (AI) applications in the Global South brings tremendous potential for both good and harm. This paper aims to highlight the guiding ethical principles and normative frameworks for the ethical use of AI in the lens of the traditional Ga (a tribe in Ghana) philosophy and add to the academic literature and research on AI and ethics within the African context.

Design/methodology/approach – Literature overview on the African philosophy of Ga tradition as applied to AI and application of it to the AI4people ethical framework for a good AI society.

Findings – Existing principles in AI are based on and mostly influenced by western principles, which may give rise to biases in AI outcomes and design implications in Africa. The research finds a high degree of overlap in the AI4People ethical framework for a good AI society and the Ga philosophy.

Research limitations/implications – There are a few existing literatures on AI ethics in Africa and on Ga philosophy.

Originality/value – This research offers valuable contribution to the ongoing discourse of Africa's adoption of AI and widens the debate on AI and ethics beyond the western ethical approaches.

Keywords Artificial intelligence, Beneficence, Culture, Ethics, Explicability, Ga outdoor, Ga philosophy, Justice, Non-Maleficence

Paper type Conceptual paper

1. Introduction

In the realm of artificial intelligence (AI), the discourse often gravitates towards technological advancements, ethical considerations and global applications. Though the implications of



© Laud Nii Attoh Ammah, Christoph Lütge, Alexander Kriebitz and Lavina Ramkissoon. Published by Emerald Publishing Limited. This article is published under the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) licence. Anyone may reproduce, distribute, translate and create derivative works of this article (for both commercial and non-commercial purposes), subject to full attribution to the original publication and authors. The full terms of this licence may be seen at <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/legalcode>

Journal of Information,
Communication and Ethics in
Society
Vol. 22 No. 4, 2024
pp. 453-465
Emerald Publishing Limited
1477-996X
DOI 10.1108/JICES-06-2024-0072

digitization for Africa are being discussed, this is often not from an African philosophical vantage point (Oritsetimeyin *et al.*, 2024). Cultural aspects are also brought in with the import of technology, but African cultural values need to be considered when defining a framework for AI on the continent” (Van Norren, 2020). However, amidst this discussion, there is a growing recognition of the need to ground the implementation of AI in local values and ethics, particularly in regions like Africa where unique cultural perspectives shape societal norms and expectations.

In the absence of regulatory frameworks in Africa, AI stakeholders in Africa and the diaspora have made some contributions to raise awareness and put systems in place for responsible AI (Kiemde and Kora, 2022). In Gwagwa *et al.* (2022) explores the inclusion of African population in the global AI ethics discourse through the values of Ubuntu. Vernon (2019) discusses not just the opportunities of artificial automations and robotics but also the strategies to offset the threat posed by global factors. Carman and Rosman (2021) discuss whether the principle of explicability should be adopted in an Africa research context and can also tackle some of the computational challenges in machine learning research.

Drawing inspiration from the rich cultural heritage of the Ga people in Ghana, as an example, this paper explores the intersection of the unified AI principles framework (Florida *et al.*, 2018) and traditional Ga philosophy (Ammah and Kilson, 2016). The Ga people, belonging to the Ga-Damgbe ethnic group, inhabit the vibrant capital city of Accra, where their cultural practices and societal structures reflect a deep connection to their historical roots and communal values.

Central to the Ga ethos is the concept of Ubuntu, a philosophy emphasizing interconnectedness, communal harmony and the recognition of individual identity within the broader tapestry of society (Ramose, 2005). While Ubuntu has gained prominence in certain parts of Africa, including South and East Africa, the Ga ethics offer additional insights into West African ethical traditions, enriching the discourse on AI ethics with diverse perspectives.

One of the focal points of this exploration is the Kpodziemɔ, an ancient Ga ritual performed during infant outdoorings ceremonies. Embedded within this ritual are profound ethical principles that resonate with contemporary discussions on AI governance and responsible innovation. The benediction (Dzɔɔmɔ) recited during the Kpodziemɔ encapsulates aspirations for peace, prosperity and communal well-being, offering valuable insights into the societal implications of AI technologies.

As we delve deeper into the ethical dimensions of AI, it becomes evident that principles such as beneficence, non-maleficence, justice and explainability are not only universal ideals but also resonate deeply with the core values of the Ga community. The Ga ethics underscore the importance of equitable distribution of benefits, mitigating harm and fostering solidarity within society, principles that find resonance in contemporary AI ethics frameworks.

Furthermore, the notion of explainability in AI aligns closely with Ga philosophical perspectives on transparency and collective decision-making. The emphasis on unity of voices and the preservation of social cohesion echo through the call for AI systems to be just, accountable, interpretable and inclusive.

In navigating the complex landscape of AI ethics, it is imperative to embrace a holistic approach that incorporates diverse cultural perspectives, including those rooted in traditions like the Ga ethics. By bridging the gap between technological innovation and cultural heritage, we can pave the way for AI systems that not only reflect global ethical norms but also honour the rich tapestry of human experience.

In this paper, we can find that the analysis of AI4people ethical AI framework overlaps with some moral principles in the Ga society. The unified framework of ethical principles are vividly expressed in the central prayer (Dzɔɔmɔ) of the rite which “touches every aspect of

the life of an infant – its health and happiness, its relationship with others, its responsibilities and its success.

2. African culture overview

- *Yoruba Ifa divination (Nigeria)*: In Yoruba culture, Ifa divination is a spiritual practice deeply rooted in the belief in interconnectedness and the wisdom of ancestors. Ifa priests use divination tools and oral literature to provide guidance and solutions to complex problems. This tradition highlights the importance of wisdom, consultation and community consensus, which can inform discussions on ethical decision-making and algorithmic transparency in AI systems (UNESCO Intangible Cultural Heritage).
- *Maasai community bonding (Kenya and Tanzania)*: The Maasai people of East Africa place a strong emphasis on community cohesion and collective responsibility. Their cultural practices, such as communal herding and ceremonies like the Eunoto (coming of age) and Enkipaata (circumcision), foster solidarity and mutual support. This communal ethos can offer insights into the importance of inclusivity, fairness and social impact assessment in AI development and deployment (UNESCO Intangible Cultural Heritage).
- *Amazigh Imazighen (North Africa)*: The Amazigh, also known as Berbers, are indigenous peoples of North Africa with a rich cultural heritage. Their traditions, including oral storytelling, music and communal governance structures, emphasize respect for nature, cultural preservation and intergenerational knowledge transfer. These values can inform discussions on AI sustainability, cultural sensitivity and the preservation of indigenous knowledge in technological innovation (UNESCO Intangible Cultural Heritage).
- *Ubuntu philosophy (Southern Africa)*: Ubuntu, a philosophy prevalent in Southern Africa, emphasizes the interconnectedness of humanity and the importance of compassion, empathy and communal well-being. This ethos promotes a holistic understanding of ethics, where individual actions are viewed in relation to their impact on the broader community. Ubuntu principles can guide the development of AI systems that prioritize human dignity, social cohesion and inclusive decision-making processes (Amugongo *et al.*, 2023).

By incorporating diverse cultural perspectives from across Africa, we can enrich and ground ourselves and our understanding of AI ethics and governance, ensuring that technological innovation aligns with the values, aspirations and collective wisdom of diverse communities on the continent. More so now than ever before.

3. Ghana and Ga people

The Ga people belong to the Ga-Damgbe ethnic group of Kwa people, they live primarily in Accra, the capital of Ghana. It is bounded on the west by the Densu River, on the east the Chemu lagoon, on the south by the Atlantic Ocean and on the north by the Akwapim hills. Debates persist about the origins of the Ga people, one school of thought suggests that Ga people migrated from Nigeria, while another suggests that they were part of Israel that migrated southward through present day Uganda, then along the Congo River, westward through Camerouns, Nigeria, Benin, Togo and finally to Greater Accra. The Ga-Adangbe people live in six different independent towns known as Ga Mashi (Accra), Osu, Labadi, Teshi, Nungua and Tema (Henderson-Quartey, 2002/2001).

The economic activity of the Ga displays a mixture of rural and urban characteristics and had already advanced beyond the primitive communal stage before the arrival of the Europeans productive activities. The Ga population is centred around farming, livestock rearing, salt making and trading. People engaged in more than one occupation; their economic activities usually depend on the season (Odotei, 1995). That is, some may farm during the rainy season and become fishermen during the off season. Traditional and documentary sources indicate that the Ga's also depended on their neighbour (Akans) before the arrival of the Europeans in the 15th century. They traded for some of their food requirements and their neighbours in turn needed salt, meat, fish, etc. The need for these essential food requirements enabled them to exchange goods with each other. They exploited their living at the coast for additional opportunities like becoming middlemen between the inland states and the Europeans in the trade in gold, slaves and ivories (Odotei, 1995).

4. Ga ethics

Ga culture has been influenced by the intensive and lengthy interaction of Ga-speaking peoples with other cultural traditions. Nevertheless, much contemporary Ga culture may owe to external influences, Ga perceives their culture as distinct from other African and western cultural traditions (Kilson, 1970).

Dzɔɔmɔ – benediction is a rite performed during the Outdoor ceremony (*Kpodziemɔ*). In this article, we will describe in a manner that can allow for an accurate use in impacting the governance of AI in Africa, in the hope that Ga philosophical thought may be appreciated by AI ethical experts (Ammah, 1958).

The economic, political and social structure that can shape a trustworthy AI are indicated in the infant outdoor ceremony (*Kpodziemɔ*) in Ga society. The social preferable outcomes of AI are vividly expressed in the central prayer (*Dzɔɔmɔ*) of the rite which touches the quality of being a person, its relationship with others and all other interdependent parts, its responsibilities and the success through its challenges (Ammah and Kilson, 2016).

To explain the prayer, we first need to understand the intentions behind *Kpodziemɔ* etymology. *Kpo-dzie-mɔ* is made up of three words *Kpo* is “yard” *dzie* is from *dze* which is “come-out” or “appear” *mɔ* is associated with “humanity: person and culture”. Therefore, it means to take or bring a person/child-out into the yard. In this case, it will mean to take or bring AI into the society.

The ritual is divided into three main parts: (1) Showing the child, (2) Benediction – (*Dzɔɔmɔ*) and (3) Receiving the child. The focus of the paper will largely be on the second part of the rite which will provide the foundation for the implication and application of Ga ethics (Kilson, 1968).

The foundation of a good AI society we can all share will give a scientific value to the ritual acts performed in the GA rite of infant outdoor. These ethical principles identified in the central prayer of the Ga outdoor should be embedded in the default practise of AI in the region. These concepts or principles can be found in the central ritual central prayer which is the benediction.

The outdoor prayer:

- strike, strike, strike, may there be peace;
- strike, strike, may there be peace;
- strike, may there be peace;
- may our seats be thick;
- may our brooms be thick;

- may our circle be intact;
- may we find water when we sink a well;
- may the water when drunk give our shoulders ease;
- to the father of the new-comer, long life;
- to its mother, long life;
- its back is dark;
- may its front be clear;
- may it respect the world;
- may its kinsmen be enabled to provide its needs;
- may it work for us to enjoy;
- may its back be fruitful;
- may some survive that others may come;
- it came with black hair;
- may it return hoary; and
- strike, strike, strike, may there be peace.

The benediction (Dzɔɔmɔ) is divided into four parts:

- (1) supplication for the blessing of the region;
- (2) supplication for the blessing of the individuals connected to the person/item in the society;
- (3) supplication for blessing of the individual; and
- (4) invoke evil.

The lines 1, 2, 3 and 20 talk about the positive impact the person or product could bring to the area (environment). Lines 4–10 and 14 also touch on the positive impact it should create in relation to its connections to other individuals in the society (supply chain). 11–13 and 15–19 blessing of the child (Ammah and Kilson, 2016).

5. Ethics of artificial intelligence and Ga ethics

The discussion of the relationship between Ga and AI requires an examination of the properties of AI. This serves the purpose to present the problem structure in a holistic way. The question is therefore not so much what AI is, but rather what makes AI different from conventional technologies. The idea of AI is much based on the capability of a machine to imitate intelligent human behaviour. A major distinction is made, which concerns different levels of Artificial Intelligence: Is it possible to create “strong AI” (genuine intelligence of the same kind and level of generality as human intelligence that has the capacity to understand or learn any intellectual task that a human being can) as opposed to “weak AI” (intelligence that only mimics human intelligence and is able to perform a limited number of specific defined tasks)?

It is important to have a structural understanding of the principles behind AI regulation. The way to evaluate human actions and technologies depends largely on the criteria used for judging human actions. In the western ideology, human right and protection is based on an individual person, whereas for the Ga culture human dignity is based on our social cohesion.

6. Principles of AI regulation and application to Ga philosophy

We identify the minimum consensus on AI ethics, which we will use in turn to develop implications of AI ethics in Africa. Based on this, we will discuss the different implications and ethical dilemmas; “An Ethical Framework for Good AI Society”, developed by AI4People. This conceptual framework outlines the principles and challenges of AI. AI4People AI framework identified five principles as a result of an analysis and assessment of different AI guidelines from these high profile initiatives: the Montreal Declaration for Responsible Development of Artificial Intelligence (Montreal), the Asilomar Principles, the UK House of Lords Artificial Intelligence Committee’s Report, The Tenets of the Partnership on AI (Partnership), European Commission’s European Group on Ethics in Science and New Technologies (EGE) and Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers (IEEE) (Floridi *et al.*, 2018). So, we compared the Ga moral ethics to the guiding principles for good AI developed by AI4People.

6.1 *Beneficence*

AI technology should be developed for the good and benefit of the whole society. Most of the AI principles all acknowledge that AI technology should be beneficial to humanity although expressed in different ways. Montreal cited that, the development of AI should ultimately promote the well-being of all sentient creatures, IEEE beneficence principle states that AI applications prioritize human well-being as an outcome in all system designs and the UK House of Lord characterized this principle as AI should be developed for the common good and benefit of humanity.

This principle related to the Ga outdoor prayer and moral responsibility for the community of the individual, implies we develop AI for the benefits of the whole society. This can be found in the benediction of the Ga outdoor which touched on population and economic increase. They say “may our seats be thick; may our brooms be thick” which stipulates that human beings are entitled to the benefits of scientific progress, that is any new social concept is an improvement on a previous one.

Another striking contribution of the Ga outdoor benediction to beneficence is their idea of role of the mass followed by the productivity and economic development of an organized society. “May we find water when we sink well; may the water when drunk give our shoulders ease”. As expressed in Dr Nkrumah speech in the opening of the fifth session of parliament in 1965 where he said among other things “Automation...has for its fundamental aim the promotion of efficiency through the elimination of drudgery, and the enhancement of progress and development for all (Ammah and Kilson, 2016)”. This indicates that AI should amount to significant opportunities like improving health care, education, food security and poverty reduction rather than pose significant risk such as inequality or power concentration.

As mentioned in EGE principle of “sustainability” documents that “AI technology must be in line with human responsibility to ensure the basic preconditions for life on our planet, continued prospering for mankind and the preservation of a good environment for future generations.

This underlines the central importance of promoting the well-being of people and planet. The Ga outdoor ceremony also acknowledges the EGE principle of sustainability, this constitutes the permanent aspects of Ga society in which one leaves the world a better place than one met it. This is depressed in the benediction as – “May its back be fruitful; may some survive that others may come”.

Therefore, “African relational ontology suggests that any technological development, whether it be a ‘soft’ or a ‘concrete’ technological development, should be subject to the

principles of true humanness and Kosmic harmony as expressed in Ubuntu. [...] Thus, no technology that is developed should exploit persons or the wider creation for individual enrichment or gain” (Forster, 2006).

6.2 *Non-maleficence*

As indicated in the preceding section, AI applications have the potential to support positive economic and social change, however achieving these positive results is challenging and may not come without risk. Although, most of the AI principles encourage the potential benefits of AI, they also caution against the many potential risk of social outcomes stemming from the deployment of AI (Cowls *et al.*, 2018). Almost all the notable AI principle framework talks about the avoiding the misuse of AI applications (Floridi *et al.*, 2018). Asilomar Principles report on the threats of an AI arms race, safety of AI throughout its operational lifetime and of the recursive self-improvement of AI. The PartnershipAI similarly asserts that AI technologies should not violate international conventions or human rights. The IEEE cites the need to guide against all potential misuses and risk in operation, while Montreal argues that those developing AI should work against the risks arising from their technological innovations. EGE echoed a similar need for responsibility, that is AI application should not pose unacceptable risks of harm to human beings.

Ga philosophers also developed a similar notion for an inclusive society, they advance the view that society should expect to see increased inequality alongside economic disruption, social unrest and in some cases, political instability, with the technologically disadvantaged and underrepresented faring the worst if we continue to work without respecting humanity. This point is expressed in the benediction as “May it respect the world”, this moral principle is not limited to the Ga kinship group but also embraces humanity. This indicates that, AI technology should incorporate development programmes that respect and promote human rights, including privacy, equality and freedom of expression.

Moreover, in the view of Ga philosophers, we should not only be concern about “do only good” but we should also use our goodness to support others rather than harm or create inequality. This was emphasized: “May its kinsmen be enabled to provide for its needs. May it work for us to enjoy”, with this conception the Ga’s should not only seek his/her personal interest but also contribute to the development of the society, the strong helping the weak, the rich enabling the poor. In summary, the aim of Ga principles is to achieve an equal distribution of wealth and happiness for the most in the society (Kilson, 1968).

6.3 *Justice*

In Friedman and Nissenbaum (1996), biased computer systems are defined as those that “systematically and unfairly discriminate against certain individuals or groups of individuals in favour of others”. This definition remains appropriate for AI applications. This is not surprising since some applications of AI has discriminated some individual access to services, employment and financial support. Most AI frameworks recognize the importance of justice in AI application, testifying to the negative impact biased AI can bring to our unfair and unjust society.

As stated in Floridi *et al.* (2018), Montreal argues that the development of AI should reduce social inequalities and vulnerability and seek not to create, reinforce or reproduce discrimination, while the Asilomar Principles documented the need for both “shared benefit” and “shared prosperity” from AI. In the EGE under the principle “Justice, equity and solidarity”, they argue that AI should contribute to global justice and equal access to the benefits of AI technologies. It also warns against the risk of accumulation of data sets which may give rise to individualism and undermine social cohesion. Hence, putting pressure on

the idea of solidarity, example systems of mutual assistance such as in social insurance and health care.

Ga's were of the view that thriving societies begin with social cohesion and justice. They, therefore, supplicated "May our circle be intact (*Wɔbɔle kutu wɔ kpe*)". The circle of man and woman particularly in social development is a very important contribution of Ga thinkers to the notion of social cause or economic development in general. For Ga's, the circle of man and woman provides the glue for people to live healthy and economically secure lives supported by just institutions. The Ga's believe that for an organized society and a just institution you will need the input of both men and women. Moreover, the idea of social cohesion and justice is a mark of the "feeling of class solidarity" and "unites and organizes people and stimulates definite practical action". When Ga's are empowered to address what divides them, uphold what unites them and act together for stronger, healthier and more just social ties, they are better able to achieve their recovery and development priorities.

Explicability. Explicability as defined in the unified framework of principle by AI4People incorporates both the epistemological sense of "intelligibility" (as an answer to the question "how does it work?") and in the ethical sense of "accountability" (as an answer to the question "who is responsible for the way it works?") (Floridi *et al.*, 2018). Transparency, accountability, understandable and interpretable are not lost in most of the AI principles. All AI principles refer to the need to understand and hold to account the decision-making processes of AI, although expressed in different terms, example "Failure transparency" in Asilomar, "Transparency and accountability" in IEEE and "explainable" in PartnershipAI. Floridi also highlights how explicability complements the other three principles mentioned: for AI to be beneficent and non-maleficent, we must be able to understand the good or harm it is actually doing to society, for AI to be just, we must know whom to hold accountable in the event of a serious, negative outcome (Floridi *et al.*, 2018).

The Ga form of intelligibility is expressed "May its kinsmen (Authority figures) be enabled to provide for our needs". This answers the question about the intelligibility and fairness of the Ga society. The Kinsmen ensures that decision-making is just fair and intelligible and are aligned with the Ga values and lines of accountability are clear. They ensure the welfare of the society and individual not seeking their personal interest but must also contribute to the development of the society. The kinsmen ensure their knowledge and wisdom is passed down through generations via songs, rituals and dancing.

This perspective of transparency and accountability is also acknowledged by the Ga's through opening and closing words of the benediction Strike, Strike, Strike let there be peace. This line expresses the notion of unity of opposites or of contradictions to ensure that outcomes are transparent and unbiased. Ga philosophers advanced the practical view that any progressive struggle requires the agreement of people, hence the emphasis expressed in the prayer by the line "Is our voice not one" (*dzee wɔgbee kome*).

6.4 Autonomy

AI4People ethical framework for good AI society was established within a western context. Acknowledging that these principles may benefit and differ from the perspective of region and cultures that are un-or-underrepresented in their sample. So, these AI guidelines may not automatically apply in Africa without adjustment, as they are based on western theories and philosophies (Carman and Rosman, 2021).

The AI4People principle of autonomy highlights the focus on the individual: "individuals have a right to make decisions for themselves" (Floridi *et al.*, 2018). When applied to AI, Floridi *et al.*(2018) stated "we willingly cede some of our decision-making power to

machines” emphasizing on the need to “striking a balance between the decision-making power we retain for ourselves and that which we delegate to artificial agents”. This principle of autonomy which advocates respect to individual rights may conflict with some African cultural values and norms (Akpa-Inyang and Chima, 2021; Gwagwa *et al.*, 2022) as in the case of Ga cultural values.

In a Ga society, “May our circle be intact (*Wɔbɔle kutu wɔ kpe*)” indicates that people engage in joint decision-making or refer to the kinsmen for guidance as part of their decision-making, expressed in the saying “May its kinsmen be enabled to provide for our needs”, thereby legitimately including others in a normal process (Ammah and Kilson, 2016). This is in stark contrast to a typical western worldview that tend to emphasize individual rights rather than collective well-being.

This individualistic approach challenges the relevance of the AI4People framework within a Ga society context, or any cultural context that differs from the western background from which it originated. Ga society cannot adopt these principles without thorough critical engagement, as doing so might lead to ineffective processes or even cause moral harm. It is essential to first evaluate whether these principles can be effectively applied in the specific context we are examining.

Ga ethics can promote a care-driven AI development by encouraging inclusivity in AI development. The proposed moral ethics of harmony and consensus in the Ga ethics would have the potential to have a significant influence on AI ethics and policies. Ga ethics can address some moral issues in AI application and embed the spirit of “May our circle be intact (*wɔbɔle kutu wɔ kpe*)” followed by “May we find water when we sink a well (*wɔdze bu wɔdze nu*)” which translates to “May our coming together be profitable” (Ammah and Kilson, 2016).

7. Conclusion

In examining the intersection of cultural ethics and AI in Africa, it becomes evident that leveraging indigenous knowledge and traditional values can profoundly enrich the discourse on AI governance, ethical frameworks and technological innovation. Across diverse African tribes and communities, shared principles of communal solidarity, environmental stewardship and intergenerational wisdom offer valuable insights into the development and deployment of AI technologies that are both culturally sensitive and socially responsible.

Moving forward, it is imperative to bridge the gap between traditional cultural norms and contemporary AI ethics, fostering dialogue and collaboration between indigenous communities, policymakers, technologists and ethicists. This requires a multifaceted approach that integrates diverse perspectives, promotes inclusivity and prioritizes the voices of marginalized groups.

By embracing this, Africa can position itself as a global leader in culturally grounded AI ethics, fostering innovation that not only addresses local challenges but also contributes to the advancement of responsible and inclusive AI technologies on a global scale. Together, we can build a future where AI serves as a tool for positive social transformation, guided by the principles of cultural diversity, ethical integrity and human dignity.

While African tribes and AI may seem like disparate subjects, there are indeed several commonalities that can be identified, highlighting them seems noticeable at this point across these domains:

- *Community-centric values:* Many African tribes place a strong emphasis on community cohesion, collective decision-making and shared responsibility. Similarly, ethical frameworks in AI often prioritize societal well-being, inclusivity

and considerations of the broader community impact of AI technologies. Both emphasize the importance of collective welfare over individual interests.

- *Oral tradition and knowledge transmission:* African tribes have a rich tradition of oral storytelling and knowledge transmission, where wisdom is passed down through generations via spoken word, songs and rituals. Similarly, AI systems rely on vast amounts of data and knowledge for learning and decision-making, often drawing parallels to the concept of cultural memory and collective intelligence.
- *Adaptability and resilience:* African tribes have historically demonstrated adaptability and resilience in diverse environmental and social contexts, navigating challenges through innovation and community cooperation. Similarly, AI technologies exhibit adaptability and resilience through machine learning algorithms that can evolve and improve over time, reflecting a form of artificial adaptation to changing conditions.
- *Harmonizing nature and technology:* Many African tribes have deep connections to nature, with cultural practices rooted in environmental stewardship and sustainable living. Similarly, ethical considerations in AI increasingly emphasize the importance of aligning technological development with ecological sustainability and ethical use of resources. Both domains seek to harmonize human activities with the natural world.
- *Rituals and symbolism:* Rituals and symbolism play significant roles in African tribal cultures, serving as mechanisms for social cohesion, identity formation and spiritual expression. In a parallel manner, AI systems often rely on symbolic representations, algorithms and computational rituals to process information, make decisions and interact with humans. Both involve complex systems of meaning and interpretation.
- *Collective wisdom and intergenerational learning:* African tribes value collective wisdom and the sharing of knowledge across generations, recognizing the importance of learning from elders and preserving cultural heritage. Similarly, AI research draws upon interdisciplinary collaboration and builds upon the accumulated knowledge of previous generations of scientists and engineers, reflecting a form of technological lineage and intergenerational learning.

By recognizing these commonalities, we can foster greater dialogue and collaboration between African cultures and the global AI community, leveraging shared principles and insights to develop AI technologies that are ethically grounded, culturally sensitive and socially beneficial. All towards a balanced African world with man and machine side by side.

References

- Akpa-Inyang, F. and Chima, S.C. (2021), "South African traditional values and beliefs regarding informed consent and limitations of the principle of respect for autonomy in African communities: a cross-cultural qualitative study", *BMC Medical Ethics*, Vol. 22 No. 1, p. 111, doi: [10.1186/s12910-021-00678-4](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12910-021-00678-4).
- Ammah, E.A. (1958), *Infant Outdooring in Ga Society: bi Kpodziemo*, Presbyterian Church Press, Accra.
- Ammah, E.A. and Kilson, M. (2016), "Kings, priests and kinsmen", *Essays on Ga Culture and Society*, Sub-Saharan Publishers, Legon Accra Ghana.
- Carman, M. and Rosman, B. (2021), "Applying a principle of explicability to AI research in Africa: should we do it?", *In Ethics Inf Technol*, Vol. 23 No. 2, pp. 107-117, doi: [10.1007/s10676-020-09534-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10676-020-09534-2).

- Cowls, J., Floridi, L. and Taddeo, M. (2018), "The challenges and opportunities of ethical AI", Artificially Intelligent, available at: https://digitransglasgow.github.io/ArtificiallyIntelligent/contributions/04_Alan_Turing_Institute.html
- Floridi, L., Cowls, J., Beltrametti, M., Chatila, R., Chazerand, P., Dignum, V., Luetge, C., Madelin, R., Pagallo, U., Rossi, F., Schafer, B., Valcke, P. and Vayena, E. (2018), "AI4People-An ethical framework for a good AI society: opportunities, risks, principles, and recommendations", *In Minds and Machines*, Vol. 28 No. 4, pp. 689-707, doi: [10.1007/s11023-018-9482-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-018-9482-5).
- Forster, D.A. (2006), "Validation of individual consciousness in strong artificial intelligence. An African theological contribution", Doctor of Theology. Faculty of Theology, University of South Africa (accessed March 2024).
- Friedman, B. and Nissenbaum, H. (1996), "Bias in computer systems", *In ACM Trans. Inf. Syst.*, Vol. 14 No. 3, pp. 330-347, doi: [10.1145/230538.230561](https://doi.org/10.1145/230538.230561).
- Gwagwa, A., Kazim, E. and Hilliard, A. (2022), "The role of the African value of Ubuntu in global AI inclusion discourse: a normative ethics perspective", *Patterns*, Vol. 3 No. 4, p. 100462, doi: [10.1016/j.patter.2022.100462](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.patter.2022.100462).
- Henderson-Quartey, D.K. (2002/2001), "The Ga of Ghana", *History and Culture of a West African People*, D.K. Henderson-Quartey, London.
- Kiemde, S.M.A. and Kora, A.D. (2022), "Towards an ethics of AI in Africa: rule of education", *AI and Ethics*, Vol. 2 No. 1, pp. 35-40, doi: [10.1007/s43681-021-00106-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-021-00106-8).
- Kilson, M. (1968), "The Ga naming rite", *Anthropos*, Vols 63/64 Nos 5/6, pp. 904-920, available at: www.jstor.org/stable/40457233
- Kilson, M. (1970), "Taxonomy and form in Ga ritual", *Journal of Religion in Africa*, Vol. 3 No. 1, p. 45, doi: [10.2307/1594814](https://doi.org/10.2307/1594814).
- Odotei, I. (1995), "Pre-colonial economic activities of Ga", *Research in Review*, Vol. 11, pp. 60-74.
- Oritsetimeyin, A., Damiete, O.L. and Helena, W. (2024), "Navigating Afrocentric human-computer interaction research: a scoping review and proposition of Afro-Postmodernism for Decolonial Praxis", Extended Abstracts of the 2024 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI EA '24), Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, Article 560, pp. 1-14, doi: [10.1145/3613905.3644072](https://doi.org/10.1145/3613905.3644072).
- Ramose, M.B. (2005), *African Philosophy through Ubuntu*, Revised edition, Mond Books, Harare.
- van Norren, D.E. (2020), "The sustainable development goals viewed through Gross National Happiness, Ubuntu, and Buen Vivir", *International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics*, Vol. 20 No. 3, pp. 431-458, doi: [10.1007/s10784-020-09487-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10784-020-09487-3).
- Vernon, D. (2019), "Robotics and artificial intelligence in Africa [regional]", *IEEE Robotics and Automation Magazine*, Vol. 26 No. 4, pp. 131-135, doi: [10.1109/MRA.2019.2946107](https://doi.org/10.1109/MRA.2019.2946107).

Further reading

- Amugongo, L.M., Bidwell, N.J. and Corrigan, C.C. (Eds) (2023), "Invigorating Ubuntu ethics in AI for health care: enabling equitable care", Proceedings of the 2023 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency. FAccT '23, Chicago, IL, USA, June 12-15, 2023, New York, NY: Association for Computing Machinery (ICPS), doi: [10.1145/3593013.3594024](https://doi.org/10.1145/3593013.3594024), (accessed March 2024).
- Baladas, J.R. (2024), "Ga/Ga-Adangme/Adangbe. 101LastTribes", available at: www.101lasttribes.com/tribes/ga.html (accessed March 2024).
- Barnes, S.T. and Kilson, M. (1977), "African urban kinsmen: the Ga of Central Accra", *ASA Review of Books*, Vol. 3, p. 13, doi: [10.2307/532548](https://doi.org/10.2307/532548).
- Bartneck, C., Lütge, C., Wagner, A. and Welsh, S. (2021), *An Introduction to Ethics in Robotics and AI*, Springer International Publishing, Cham.

- European Group on Ethics in Science and New Technologies (2018), “Statement on artificial intelligence, robotics and ‘autonomous’ systems”, European Commission, available at: https://research-and-innovation.ec.europa.eu/news/all-research-and-innovation-news/ethics-artificial-intelligence-statement-ege-released-2018-03-09_en (accessed March 2024).
- Floridi, L. and Cowls, J. (2019), “A unified framework of five principles for AI in society”, *Harvard Data Science Review*, doi: [10.1162/99608f92.8cd550d1](https://doi.org/10.1162/99608f92.8cd550d1).
- Future of Life Institute (2017), (Ed.) “Asilomar AI principles”, Beneficial AI 2017, Jan 5 –8, 2017, The Future of Life Institute, available at: <https://futureoflife.org/open-letter/ai-principles/> (accessed March 2024).
- Hao, K. (2019), “The future of AI research is in Africa”, MIT Technology Review, available at: www.technologyreview.com/2019/06/21/134820/ai-africa-machine-learning-ibm-google/ (accessed March 2024).
- House of The Lords Artificial Intelligence Committee (2017), “AI in the UK: ready, willing and able”, available at: <https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/ld201719/ldselect/ldai/100/10002.htm> (accessed March 2024).
- IEEE (2017), “The IEEE Global Initiative on Ethics of Autonomous and Intelligent Systems”, Ethically Aligned Design: A Vision for Prioritizing Human Well-being with Autonomous and Intelligent Systems, Version 2, available at: http://standards.ieee.org/develop/indconn/ec/autonomous_systems.html (accessed March 2024).
- Kriebitz, A. and Ammah, L. (2020), “Statistical capacity, human rights and FDI in Sub-Saharan Africa patterns of FDI attraction in Sub-Saharan Africa”, *Journal of Management and Sustainability*, Vol. 10 No. 1, p. 162, doi: [10.5539/jms.v10n1p162](https://doi.org/10.5539/jms.v10n1p162).
- Kriebitz, A. and Lütge, C. (2020), “Artificial intelligence and human rights: a business ethical assessment”, *Business and Human Rights Journal*, Vol. 5 No. 1, pp. 84-104, doi: [10.1017/bhj.2019.28](https://doi.org/10.1017/bhj.2019.28).
- Mhlambi, S. (2020), “From rationality to relationality: Ubuntu as an ethical and human rights framework for artificial intelligence governance”, Carr Center Discussion Paper Series 009.
- Partnership on AI (2018), “Our tenets: partnership on AI”, available at: <https://partnershiponai.org/about/#tenets> (accessed March 2024).
- Smith, M.L. and Neupane, S. (2024), “Artificial intelligence and human development: toward a research agenda”, International Development Research Centre, available at: <https://idl-bnc-idrc.dspace.direct.org/items/6ba8a490-db87-4992-8813-9bea0c7e8e28> (accessed March 2024).
- Tetteh Osabu-Kle, D. “The Ga people and Homowo festival Daniel Tetteh”, Carleton University, available at: <https://carleton.ca/africanstudies/wp-content/uploads/Ga-People-and-Homowo-Festival.pdf> (accessed March 2024).
- Travaly, Y. and Muvunyi, K. (2020), “The future is intelligent: harnessing the potential of artificial intelligence in Africa”, The Brookings Institution, available at: www.brookings.edu/articles/the-future-is-intelligent-harnessing-the-potential-of-artificial-intelligence-in-africa/ (accessed March 2024).
- UNESCO Intangible Cultural Heritage (Danson Siminyu) (2017), “Enkipaata, Eunoto and Olng’esherr, three male rites of passage of the Maasai community”, UNESCO Intangible Cultural Heritage, Kenya, available at: <https://ich.unesco.org/en/USL/enkipaata-eunoto-and-olng-esherr-three-male-rites-of-passage-of-the-masai-community-01390> (accessed March 2024).
- UNESCO Intangible Cultural Heritage (Wande Abimbola) (2008), “Ifa divination system”, UNESCO Intangible Cultural Heritage, Nigeria, available at: <https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/ifa-divination-system-00146> (accessed March 2024).
- Université de Montréal (2017), “Montréal declaration for a responsible development of artificial intelligence”, available at: <https://montrealdeclaration-responsibleai.com/the-declaration/> (accessed March 2024).

van Norren, D.E. (2022), “The ethics of artificial intelligence, UNESCO and the African Ubuntu perspective”, *Journal of Information, Communication and Ethics in Society*, Vol. 21 No. 1, pp. 112-128, doi: [10.1108/JICES-04-2022-0037](https://doi.org/10.1108/JICES-04-2022-0037).

Veale, M. and Binns, R. (2017), “Fairer machine learning in the real world: mitigating discrimination without collecting sensitive data”, *Big Data and Society*, Vol. 4 No. 2, p. 205395171774353, doi: [10.1177/2053951717743530](https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951717743530).

Corresponding author

Laud Nii Attoh Ammah can be contacted at: laud.ammah@tum.de