

## CRITIQUE & COMMENTARY

# STATELESSNESS STUDIES IN AN AGE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE: CHALLENGES, OPPORTUNITIES & SETTING A FUTURE AGENDA

JASON TUCKER\*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I	Introduction .....	50
II	A Brief Overview of Artificial Intelligence, Digitisation & Datafication.....	51
III	Why AI Should be a Matter of Interest (or Concern) in Statelessness Studies .....	51
	A Transparency in AI-Supported Decision Making on Citizenship and Statelessness.....	51
	B Perpetrating and Amplifying Discrimination Against People who are Stateless.....	53
	C The Legacy of Statelessness in Data: ‘The Citizenship-Bias’ .....	54
	D Engaging with Emerging AI Governance .....	55
	E AI Supported Research and Advocacy on Statelessness.....	57
IV	Conclusion.....	57

## I INTRODUCTION

Since 2010, there has been enormous social and political hype around artificial intelligence (‘AI’) and how it has, and will, continue to impact society. This is not just puffery, and there is growing recognition across a range of fields that there is an urgent need to further explore the use, scope and impact of AI in relation to digital forms of citizenship and the datafication of societies. Concern arises as the adoption of these technologies has led to significant changes in how citizenship is not only experienced and performed, but also how states regulate citizenship. Despite this growing recognition, most notably within citizenship studies,<sup>1</sup> statelessness studies have remained largely silent on AI. In this piece, I argue that this lack of engagement is very problematic. I do so by highlighting five areas where AI should be a matter of interest (or concern) in statelessness studies: 1) transparency in AI supported decision making on citizenship and statelessness,

---

\* Researcher, Institute for Futures Studies, Sweden. Adjunct Associate Professor, AI Policy Lab, Department of Computing Science, Umeå University. Jason.tucker@iffs.se; This paper was made possible due to funding from the Wallenberg AI, Autonomous Systems and Software Program — Humanity and Society (WASP-HS) funded by the Marianne and Marcus Wallenberg Foundation and the Marcus and Amalia Wallenberg Foundation.

© 2025 The Author. This is an open-access article licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International Licence, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence and indicate if changes were made. See <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

1 For example, see Arne Hintz, ‘Digital Citizenship in the Age of Datafication’ in Simeon J Yates and Ronald E Rice (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Digital Technology and Society* (Oxford Handbooks 2020) 526, 526–7.

2) perpetrating and amplifying discrimination against people who are stateless, 3) the legacy of statelessness in data: ‘The citizenship-bias’, 4) engaging with emerging AI governance and 5) AI-supported research and advocacy on statelessness.

These five areas only begin to scratch the surface of a much-needed research and engagement agenda on AI in statelessness studies. However, it is hoped that this piece can act as a catalyst for further discussion on how we can advance our understanding and use of AI in the field. Doing so is essential if we are to be able to manage the risks as well as capitalise on the opportunities of this technology in relation to statelessness.

## II A BRIEF OVERVIEW OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE, DIGITISATION & DATAFICATION

As a family of ever-evolving technologies and with so many competing notions of what AI is or should be, providing a definition is tricky. However, the updated Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (‘OECD’) definition provides a good foundation for this piece:

An AI system is a machine-based system that for explicit or implicit objectives, infers, from the input it receives, how to generate outputs such as predictions, content, recommendations, or decisions that can influence physical or virtual environments. Different AI systems vary in their levels of autonomy and adaptiveness after deployment.<sup>2</sup>

While a distinct concept, AI does overlap with the concepts of digitalisation and datafication. Digitalisation can be understood as ‘the way many domains of social life are restructured around digital communication and media infrastructures’.<sup>3</sup> Whereas datafication ‘...combines two processes: the transformation of human life into data through processes of quantification, and the generation of different kinds of value from data’.<sup>4</sup> Regarding the digitalisation of society, this is a phenomenon whereby digital technology is used to transform our physical or analogue actions, as individuals or groups, into digital data systems. AI, datafication and the digitalisations of society mutually reinforce one another.

## III WHY AI SHOULD BE A MATTER OF INTEREST (OR CONCERN) IN STATELESSNESS STUDIES

### A *Transparency in AI-Supported Decision Making on Citizenship and Statelessness*

States are increasingly turning to AI to automate aspects of their digitalised bureaucracy. For example, in decision making, data analysis and the optimisation

---

2 Stuart Russel, Karine Perset and Marko Grobelnik, ‘Updates to the OECD’s Definition of an AI System Explained’, *OECD-AI Policy Observatory* (online, 2023) <<https://oecd.ai/en/wonk/ai-system-definition-update>>, archived at <[perma.cc/CET9-WXAJ](https://perma.cc/CET9-WXAJ)>.

3 J Scott Brennen and Daniel Kreiss, ‘Digitalisation’ in Robert T Craig, Eric W Rothenbuhler, Klaus Bruhn Jensen and Jefferson D Pooley (eds), *The International Encyclopedia of Communication Theory and Philosophy* (Wiley-Blackwell 2016) 1.

4 Ulises A Mejias and Nick Couldry, ‘Datafication’ (2019) 8(4) *Internet Policy Review* 1, 3.

of digital systems. With the promise of reduced costs and increased efficiency, this is understandable. However, there are complications in doing so with transparency and accountability. AI systems are often opaque in how they arrive at an outcome.<sup>5</sup> It requires a high degree of technical and domain-specific competence to run algorithmic audits, which are approaches to review algorithmic processing systems.<sup>6</sup> This can include checking that the system functions as it should, assessing the decision-making process or ensuring that governance documents are in line with relevant laws and regulations.

Further to this, those developing the AI systems are often not experts in the field in which the technology will be used. Even if they approach their work with care, algorithmic bias occurs. This is because AI system developers create AI systems based on their own understanding of the problem their system is meant to solve, the processes they think are needed to solve the problem, their envisaged desired outcomes as well as their beliefs as to how it will be used. This is problematic as AI systems are often repurposed and built upon, and as such, layers of biases and misunderstandings can be embedded in the systems. An example of this is the lack of a 'stateless' option in drop-down menus on digital platforms under the question of nationality or citizenship. This is a frequent problem stemming from the bias of the designers and/or those who ordered the system, who assume everyone has a citizenship or simply copy a list of nationalities from external sources. This initial oversight has a legacy, as these systems are repurposed and sold to multiple actors who then use them in other domains, including those where having a stateless option can be vital, ie travel or employment systems. This is a simple example, but it is considerably more worrying with AI systems as it also occurs in very obscure ways. This not only relates to a lack of knowledge around how AI systems are designed and trained, but also what previous systems the new systems are built upon. This lack of transparency can make bias difficult to identify, let alone address.<sup>7</sup>

The use of AI systems in the processing of citizenship applications, renewal of passports, migration management and other areas that impact statelessness determination procedures is therefore very troubling.<sup>8</sup> There is a real danger that these systems could create cases of statelessness through human error, bias or lack

5 This is also referred to as the 'black box' problem, whereby the decision-making process of some AI systems is not understandable or explainable. See Vikas Hassija et al, 'Interpreting Black-Box Models: A Review on Explainable Artificial Intelligence' (2024) 16 *Cognition and Computation* 45, 47.

6 This is not always the case, and an interesting area of research is emerging whereby algorithmic audits are undertaken by end users. This allows affected communities, who have minimal technical skills or resources, to be able to assess and monitor algorithms that impact them. See Katharine Miller, 'A DIY Approach to Algorithmic Audits', *Stanford University Human Centered Artificial Intelligence* (online, 2022) <<https://hai.stanford.edu/news/diy-approach-algorithmic-audits>>, archived at <[perma.cc/DX5K-8LME](https://perma.cc/DX5K-8LME)>.

7 There are however ways to overcome this. See Almira Al-Khulaidy Stine and Hamdin Kavak, 'Bias, Fairness, and Assurance in AI: Overview and Synthesis' in Feras A Batarseh and Laura J Freeman (eds), *AI Assurance: Towards Trustworthy, Explainable, Safe, and Ethical AI* (Academic Press 2023).

8 Britain Eakin, 'U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services Pressed to Unveil How It Uses AI in Asylum Cases', *Clinic Stories Harvard Law School* (online, 13 January 2025) <<https://hls.harvard.edu/clinic-stories/u-s-citizenship-and-immigration-services-pressed-to-unveil-how-it-uses-ai-in-asylum-cases/>>, archived at <[perma.cc/MM9L-A6LF](https://perma.cc/MM9L-A6LF)>; European Migration Network, *The Use of Digitalization and Artificial Intelligence in Migration Management* (Report, February 2022) 12–3; 'Automation to Help Process Adult Passport Renewal Applications', *Government of Canada* (online, 25 April 2024) <<https://www.canada.ca/en/immigration-refugees-citizenship/news/notices/passport-renewal-automation.html>>, archived at <[perma.cc/8MTM-AGZ9](https://perma.cc/8MTM-AGZ9)>.

of interoperability (the ability of different systems to work together). To mitigate this, there is a need for human-centred and responsible AI design, as well as careful human oversight and management of AI systems.<sup>9</sup> When it comes to the former, these actors would need an awareness of statelessness and how the AI system functions to be able to best mitigate these risks.

On the other hand, if AI systems are carefully and responsibly crafted and deployed, they could be an invaluable tool to identify possible cases of statelessness for authorities, map statelessness trends or identify those at risk of statelessness.<sup>10</sup> However, to achieve this, there would need to be transparency in how and when AI is being used by states where it relates to citizenship and migration, as well as transparency in the decision-making process of the technology and the human oversight, which is currently not the case.<sup>11</sup> What makes this more problematic is that it is not states but private sector actors who are the most prolific and proficient collectors and traders of data. Given proprietary concerns, datasets used to train the AI systems and the AI systems themselves are often not available for public scrutiny.

## B *Perpetrating and Amplifying Discrimination Against People who are Stateless*

Algorithmic bias, as well as bias in the collection and labelling of data, can lead to AI systems reinforcing discrimination against certain groups. As Simon Friis & James Riley explain:

Algorithmic bias occurs when algorithms make decisions that systematically disadvantage certain groups of people... Algorithmic bias often occurs because certain populations are under-represented in the data used to train AI algorithms or because pre-existing societal prejudices are baked into the data itself.<sup>12</sup>

When exploring how data encodes systemic racism, Deborah Raji argues that technology is not apolitical, neutral or independent of us, and that care should be taken not to use toxic datasets in research.<sup>13</sup> These datasets have real life impacts for some disadvantaged groups when it is used to train AI. This includes areas such as access to state services, accuracy of medical diagnoses, the setting of individual insurance rates, decisions of length of incarcerations, etc. When it comes to designing and training AI, statelessness studies must recognise the technology is not neutral and that the politicisation of statelessness will infiltrate datasets used to train AI unless care is taken to address this.

Consequently, we need to better understand how AI systems are perpetuating or even amplifying discrimination against stateless people. Some of these are more

---

9 Virginia Dignum, *Responsible Artificial Intelligence: How to Develop and Use AI in a Responsible Way* (Springer 2019) 47–70, 93–106.

10 Jason Tucker, ‘Artificial Intelligence, Datafication and Exploring the Minimum Content of Nationality’ (2024) 6(1) *Statelessness & Citizenship Review* 124, 127–9 (‘Artificial Intelligence’).

11 Derya Ozkul, *Automating Immigration and Asylum: The Uses of New Technologies in Migration and Asylum Governance in Europe* (Report, 2023) 6–7, 53–4, 65.

12 Simon Friis and James Riley, ‘Eliminating Algorithmic Bias Is Just the Beginning of Equitable AI’, *Harvard Business Review* (online, 29 September 2023) <<https://hbr.org/2023/09/eliminating-algorithmic-bias-is-just-the-beginning-of-equitable-ai>>, archived at <[perma.cc/B9M4-CQR7](https://perma.cc/B9M4-CQR7)>.

13 Deborah Raji, ‘How Our Data Encodes Systemic Racism’, *MIT Technology Review* (online, 10 December 2020) <<https://www.technologyreview.com/2020/12/10/1013617/racism-data-science-artificial-intelligence-ai-opinion/>>, archived at <[perma.cc/F5SL-TKVY](https://perma.cc/F5SL-TKVY)>.

obvious than others, such as how facial recognition technology is being used to track and target ethnic minority groups.<sup>14</sup> Others are less obvious, mundane, everyday and hard to identify.<sup>15</sup> Given the interconnected nature of AI systems used by states, errors or bias in one system can be carried over to others. As the case of the Dutch child benefits scandal highlighted, the analytical power of AI means that information previously siloed in different state authorities can be combined and repurposed in ways that are problematic.<sup>16</sup> In the Dutch case, this was to identify profiles at risk of child benefit fraud, with the Dutch Tax Agency demanding repayment from tens of thousands of people who were identified by the AI system as being at risk of committing fraud.<sup>17</sup> This highlighted how bias is baked into AI systems, as those with lower incomes and ethnic minorities were disproportionately targeted and impacted. Amnesty International noted that ‘[t]housands of lives were ruined by a disgraceful process which included a xenophobic algorithm based on racial profiling’.<sup>18</sup>

With most states automating or looking to automate a vast range of state services, there is significant danger that the vulnerability of persons who are stateless will be exacerbated due to increasing discrimination in access to state services. From a statelessness studies perspective, one must recognise that there are new digital spaces where discrimination can be created, perpetuated and amplified against persons who are stateless, and that there are new artificial actors at play in decision making processes. Ensuring that we can navigate the changing nature and spaces of discrimination requires a recasting of our understanding of actors, agency and decision making, as well as the development of new analytical skill and frameworks to capture these.

### C *The Legacy of Statelessness in Data: ‘The Citizenship-Bias’*

Statelessness, even when resolved, can have an impact on the formerly stateless individuals and communities through data legacies. This relates to how the global data markets work and the datafication of our lives. Data which has already been collected has enormous economic value and is sold, blended, repurposed and used to train a range of AI systems. Thus, there already exists vast datasets on people

14 Paul Mozur, ‘One Month 500,000 Face Scans: How China Is Using AI to Profile a Minority’, *The New York Times* (online, 14 April 2019) <<https://www.nytimes.com/2019/04/14/technology/china-surveillance-artificial-intelligence-racial-profiling.html>>, archived at <[perma.cc/G4D3-STPQ](https://perma.cc/G4D3-STPQ)>.

15 There is a growing body of work looking at how we can understand the everyday and mundane interactions of people with AI technologies, and how this relates to the global political economy of AI more generally. See for example Sarah Pink, Martin Berg, Deborah Lupton and Minna Ruckenstein, *Everyday Automation: Experiencing and Anticipating Emerging Technologies* (Taylor & Francis, 2022); Michael Strange and Jason Tucker, ‘AI and the Everyday Political Economy of Global Health’ in Simon Lindgren (ed), *Handbook of Critical Studies of Artificial Intelligence* (Edward Elgar Publishing 2023) 367.

16 Jon Henley and Robert Booth, ‘Welfare Surveillance System Violates Human Rights, Dutch Court Rules’, *The Guardian* (online, 6 February 2020) <<https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2020/feb/05/welfare-surveillance-system-violates-human-rights-dutch-court-rules>>, archived at <[perma.cc/3C96-KFUR](https://perma.cc/3C96-KFUR)>.

17 Melissa Heikkilä, ‘Dutch Scandal Serves as a Warning for Europe Over Risks of Using Algorithms’, *Politico* (online, 29 March 2022) <<https://www.politico.eu/article/dutch-scandal-serves-as-a-warning-for-europe-over-risks-of-using-algorithms/>>, archived at <[perma.cc/5ZAR-AE84](https://perma.cc/5ZAR-AE84)>.

18 Merel Koning, ‘Dutch Childcare Benefit Scandal an Urgent Wake-Up Call to Ban Racist Algorithms’, *Amnesty International* (online, 25 October 2021) <<https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2021/10/xenophobic-machines-dutch-child-benefit-scandal/>>, archived at <[perma.cc/7SNM-NTMY](https://perma.cc/7SNM-NTMY)>.

who are stateless, which is (most often) not linked to them as an individual. Nonetheless, these datasets quantify a range of past lived experiences of statelessness.<sup>19</sup> When one gains a citizenship, this data is not altered or deleted. This legacy data is in the global data market, and it has enormous value and will be continued to be used to train AI systems. This is how as Karoline Laarmann notes, ‘data holds a legacy of discrimination’,<sup>20</sup> a legacy that will live on even after citizenship has been acquired.

To ground this point with an example, we can turn to work on the lack of data collected on women, and the bias in what was collected, in the field of medicine. As Caroline Criado-Pérez argues, for millennia medicine has always been based on the idea that male bodies represent all humanity.<sup>21</sup> As such, there is an enormous gap in data and research on female bodies as compared to males, negatively impacting women’s health. Criado-Pérez’s work on the male bias in, amongst other areas, the collection of medical data, is useful to reflect upon in statelessness studies. This is because the field has been grappling with the challenge created by the lack of, or poor-quality of, data as a result of ‘the citizenship-bias’, a concept adapted from Criado-Pérez’s seminal work on the ‘male bias’ in a datafied world.<sup>22</sup> For example, if a stateless community who had been granted citizenship has been previously excluded from accessing state services, an AI system assessing who should be granted access to these services will likely continue to exclude them unless it is trained not to do so.<sup>23</sup> This could be based on either the legacy of discrimination, ie certain groups have historically faced discriminatory access to state services, or that there is no data on them (the citizenship-bias) and so AI systems and those developing them may not include them as potential users.

#### D *Engaging with Emerging AI Governance*

There is currently somewhat of a regulatory turn in the AI world. Some states and international organisations are realising that checks and balances are needed if they are to maintain control over the impact of current and future AI systems (and those deploying them) on society. While AI is not placeless,<sup>24</sup> there are opaque and fluid transnational relations which do not align with nation-states. This has led to shifting power relations in the global political economy.<sup>25</sup> As such, we have

---

19 Tucker, *Artificial Intelligence* (n 10) 127.

20 Karoline Laarmann, ‘Preprogrammed Bias? AI and the Gender Gap: Data Holds a Legacy of Discrimination’, *Healthcare in Europe* (online, 2 July 2021) <<https://healthcare-in-europe.com/en/news/ai-the-gender-gap-data-holds-a-legacy-of-discrimination.html>>, archived at <[perma.cc/54QC-E2AA](https://perma.cc/54QC-E2AA)>.

21 Caroline Criado-Pérez, *Invisible Women: Exposing Data Bias in a World Designed for Men* (Chatto & Windus 2019) 215–6.

22 *ibid.*

23 This could also support the research on the legacy of statelessness in general, see, eg, Elena Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, ‘On the Threshold of Statelessness: Palestinian Narratives of Loss and Erasure’ (2016) 39(2) *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 301; Jason Tucker and Haqqi Bahram, ‘“I must be from somewhere. I’m not from the moon”: Navigating the Politics of Labelling for Stateless Palestinian Refugees from Syria’ (2021) 3(2) *Statelessness & Citizenship Review* 330, 342; Timnit Gebru, ‘Race and Gender’ in Marcus D Dubber, Frank Pasquale and Sunit Das (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Ethics of AI* (Oxford University Press 2020) 256–7.

24 For work looking at the grounded geographies of AI, see Kate Crawford, *The Atlas of AI: Power, Politics, and the Planetary Costs of Artificial Intelligence* (Yale University Press 2021).

25 Jonas Tallberg et al, ‘The Global Governance of Artificial Intelligence: Next Steps for Empirical and Normative Research’ (2023) 25(3) *International Studies Review* 1, 2.

seen an increase in states trying to claim digital sovereignty and maintain their autonomy to be able to shape their future options.<sup>26</sup>

There is a need for statelessness studies to engage with emerging AI governance in order to ensure that this disruption of the relationship between states and citizenship, as well as international relations, does not result in new cases of statelessness. For example, AI systems are prone to errors,<sup>27</sup> which given their role in state functions related to acquisition or confirmation of citizenship could lead to people's citizenship status being incorrectly classified.<sup>28</sup> Further, placing AI on top of dysfunctional systems and structures of power, as well as biased datasets related to citizenship and statelessness, will only exacerbate pre-existing problems.<sup>29</sup> The technology can also be used by states to undertake algorithmic profiling of the population, for the purpose of identifying certain groups and rendering them stateless. Lastly, with states and citizenship being increasingly digitalised including the creation of new digital state spaces,<sup>30</sup> those who are left out or excluded risk having their citizenship called into question.<sup>31</sup> There are numerous examples of where people and communities have been rendered stateless due to not being included in registries, censuses or mappings:<sup>32</sup> the digital state poses another space where this could occur.

On the other hand, engaging with the emerging AI governance can be an opportunity. It could be a platform to raise awareness of statelessness and address existing cases by closing the gaps between states which perpetuate statelessness. However, as it stands, the agenda on the governance of AI is currently adopting a familiar state-centric and citizenship-biased approach. This needs to be addressed in a timely manner. For example, with a large stateless population in Europe, it is essential that those in statelessness studies engage with the operationalisation of the European Union ('EU') *AI Act* and the EU AI Office (who will enforce the *Act*) to ensure they are aware of statelessness. At a basic level, the EU AI Office should know that there is a large and protracted stateless situation in Europe, especially with regard to the *Act's* prohibition of the use of AI systems that exploit

---

26 Huw Roberts et al, 'Safeguarding European Values with Digital Sovereignty: An Analysis of Statements and Policies' (2021) 10(3) *Internet Policy Review* 1, 8–9, 12, 15–6.

27 See, eg, Meredith Broussard, *Artificial Unintelligence: How Computers Misunderstand the World* (MIT Press 2018) 49–148.

28 This danger is further compounded by the 'black box' problem, see Fn 5. This relates to the situation where some AI systems are so complex that even its creators are sometimes unable to ascertain how it arrived at a certain decision.

29 For details on these dangers regarding the public sector more generally, see Digital Future Society, *Governing Algorithms: Perils and Powers of AI in the Public Sector* (Report, 2021).

30 Jannick Schou and Morten Hjelholt, 'Digital State Spaces: State Rescaling and Advanced Digitalization' (2018) 7(4) *Territory, Politics, Governance* 438, 438–9, 450.

31 Grace Mutung'u and Isaac Rutenberg, 'Digital ID and Risk of Statelessness' (2020) 2(2) *The Statelessness & Citizenship Review* 352–4.

32 Zahra Al Barazi and Jason Tucker, 'Challenging the Disunity of Statelessness in the Middle East and North Africa' in Tendayi Bloom, Katherine Tonkiss and Phillip Cole (eds), *Understanding Statelessness* (Routledge 2017) 87, 88; Zahra Al Barazi and Jason Tucker, 'Citizenship as a Political Tool: The Recent Turmoil in the MENA and the Creation and Resolution of Statelessness' (2014) *Social Science Research Network* 1, 5–7; Jason Tucker, 'Statelessness in Central Asia: From Succession to Solutions' in Lauren Van Waas and Melanie Khanna (eds), *Solving Statelessness* (Wolf Legal Publishers 2016) 317, 322–3; Jason Tucker, 'Challenging the Tyranny of Citizenship: Statelessness in Lebanon' (PhD Thesis, University of Bath, 2014) 25–6.

individuals' or groups' vulnerabilities, of which statelessness *could* be one.<sup>33</sup> This should be mainstreamed into their operations, especially the use of AI systems in key state functions in states where statelessness is known to be prevalent. Many states, non-government organisations and international organisations are also developing strategies on AI where statelessness should be raised as an issue of concern.

#### E *AI Supported Research and Advocacy on Statelessness*

While there should be significant worry about the impact of AI on statelessness, the technology also creates opportunities for the field. Previously, I have discussed how datafied societies and digital forms of citizenship could provide new useful insights to help us narrow in on the minimum content of nationality.<sup>34</sup> Additionally, Armstrong mapped out some of the possible areas where AI could be used in statelessness advocacy.<sup>35</sup> The concept of 'digital statelessness' or how the effectiveness of citizenship can be eroded by the digitalisation of society has also been the subject of research.<sup>36</sup> This list is by no means exhaustive, though examples are few and far between and more work is needed to grasp these opportunities.

To help us do so, we can draw inspiration from refugee studies, where there has been a higher level of engagement with AI systems to better predict forced migration patterns and support those in need.<sup>37</sup> There is no reason that such applications could not be modified, say, to allow for early warning systems for the potential creation of statelessness. AI systems could also be used to provide a cost and time efficient way to draft legal cases to address statelessness — with sufficient human oversight, of course. These are but a few reflections on a broad range of applications of AI which statelessness studies should explore.

#### IV CONCLUSION

We are at a pivotal moment where statelessness studies must engage with research and advocacy on the impact of AI on the field, as well as how it could assist in better understanding and addressing the phenomenon. There are numerous pressing opportunities and challenges that statelessness studies are currently failing to meet. To seize these opportunities and overcome some of the challenges,

---

33 European Commission, Directorate-General for Communications, Networks, Content and Technology, *Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council: Laying Down Harmonised Rules on Artificial Intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act) and Amending Certain Union Legislative Acts* (Procedure No 2021/0106/COD, Doc No 52021PC0206, 21 April 2021) 12–3, 21 <<https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A52021PC0206>>, archived at <[perma.cc/TMP2-V8Y5](https://perma.cc/TMP2-V8Y5)>.

34 Tucker, *Artificial Intelligence* (n 10).

35 Charlotte Armstrong, 'How Can AI Contribute to the Fight to End Statelessness?', *European Network on Statelessness* (Blog Post, 2023) <<https://www.statelessness.eu/updates/editorial/how-can-ai-contribute-fight-end-statelessness-0>>, archived at <[perma.cc/ET6D-MY2P](https://perma.cc/ET6D-MY2P)>.

36 Jaine Cristina Suzin, Cesar Albenes Zeferino and Valderi Reis Quietinho Leithardt, 'Digital Statelessness' in Jua F de Paz Santana, Daniel H de la Iglesia and Alfonso José López Rivero (eds) *New Trends in Disruptive Technologies, Tech Ethics and Artificial Intelligence* (Springer 2022) 178, 184–5, 187.

37 Katherine Hoffmann Pham and Miguel Luengo-Oroz, 'Predictive Modelling of Movements of Refugees and Internally Displaced People: Towards a Computational Framework' (2023) 49(2) *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 408, 409–11.

I recommend the following non-exhaustive and non-prioritised actions for those in statelessness studies:

- Consolidate the existing knowledge about the relationship between statelessness and AI.
- Introduce AI into research and teaching agendas on statelessness to further increase knowledge and awareness, initially drawing on the work in citizenship and refugee studies.
- Identify gaps in our capacity building on statelessness, ie non-traditional key stakeholders involved in the development of AI systems that are used to regulate citizenship and statelessness.
- Develop capacity for algorithmic audits on systems where AI plays a role in automated decision-making on citizenship or statelessness.
- Develop the tools and capacity to address algorithmic bias related to statelessness.
- Advocate that sensitivity towards statelessness is on the agenda during the development and implementation of governance and regulation on AI.