Law for AI and AI for Law

Ugyen Tshering[1]

Introduction

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is often perceived as a modern breakthrough, but its theoretical foundations were established nearly a century ago. In the 1930s, Alonzo Church and Alan Turing laid the seeds for Computer and AI by developing a theoretical model of the Turing machine, which proposed that any effectively calculable function can be computed (Haenlein & Kaplan, 2019). In 1955, John McCarthy coined the term "Artificial Intelligence" to describe the ability of a machine to think intelligently like a human (Mucci, 2024), and the rest is history.

Laws are generally enacted or adopted to create new systems or regulate existing ones. Although the intersection of AI and law is not a new topic, it took about two decades for laws to respond to the development of AI. As the title suggests, this essay focuses on two primary domains: Law for AI and AI for Law. "Law for AI" refers to the laws that regulate the use of AI, while the latter delves into how AI can assist in the efficient delivery of justice.

Predicaments of Blessing

Before addressing the regulation of AI, it is important to understand why its use must be regulated. Law and order exist not merely because of the fear that you will be penalised but because people respect the law. Respect for the law germinates from understanding the purpose behind the law. Identifying the existing and foreseeable mischief in future is the first step towards legislation, which lays down its "legislative intent".

Black Box and Lack of Accountability

The end-to-end deep learning model was developed decades ago where a user is simply required to input raw data and the machine produces

1 Ugyen Tshering is a Court Registrar at the Supreme Court of Bhutan. He was previously a Registrar in the Thimphu District Court. He has a BA LLB from KIIT University in Odisha, India, and a Post Graduate Diploma in National Law.

the output. For instance, Waymo's automatic driving car in the USA has achieved 90 percent fewer serious injuries, 82 percent fewer airbag deployment crashes in any vehicle, and 81 per cent fewer injuries compared with human drivers (Bright, 2026).

Similarly, many AI systems developed for the hospital can diagnose disease far better than human doctors. However, nobody, including the developer, knows exactly how the result is produced; hence, it is referred to as "black box". A black box refers to an AI model where a user inputs data and receives an output, but the internal reasoning and complex calculations used to produce that answer are hidden from human understanding.

The problem with an AI result without explanation or reason is "automation complacency" (Parasuraman & Manzey, 2010), where users find the system so reliable that they stop monitoring it or verifying its result. When a user fails to verify the result of AI, it leads to "automation bias", where individuals accept the result of AI purely because it was generated by an AI system. When people trust the result of AI without questioning the black box, we no longer use AI as a tool - instead, we are being monitored by AI.

Deep Fakes

I recall a time when my friends in the village, who owned smart phones with limited digital literacy, were dumbfounded by a photoshopped image of eggs growing on trees, believing science has really done the impossible. Now, Generative AI has made the situation even worse. Synthetic media, which creates voice, image or videos algorithmically, offers benefits to movie industries, educational media, games and entertainment, health care, and e-commerce (Westerlund, 2019).

However, using synthetic media to generate deepfakes with ill intention is a catastrophe. Borthwick (2018) describes it as "the evil twin of synthetic media". The most acute risk of deepfakes is electoral interference, which may undermine the very foundation of democracy. AI can be weaponised to discredit and ridicule political opponents (Chesney & Citron, 2019) and manipulate voters.

A well-known case occurred in the United States on January 21, 2024, just two days before the New Hampshire presidential primary. Steven

Kramer, a Democratic political consultant, orchestrated an automated robocall mimicking the voice of the then-President Joe Biden to instruct voters of the Democratic party to skip the primary and "save their votes" for November (Folk, 2024).

In India, during the election in 2024, there was widespread dissemination of deepfake videos of Bollywood actors Ranveer Singh and Aamir Khan criticising Prime Minister Narendra Modi on social media.

Data Security and Privacy

Every photo, video, and piece of information we upload online becomes the data that feeds AI systems. AI systems are data-hungry and opaque; hence, people lack control over what private information is collected and how it is used. This freely available data becomes a valuable resource, and those who own and control data are predicted to become a new superpower in the world (Bremmer, 2023).

For instance, Clearview AI is a facial recognition technology used both by government agencies and non-governmental organisations. Clearview has mass-scraped billions of photos from cyberspace without any consent (Kundaliya, 2021), leading to erosion of the right to privacy.

Anyone using this system can easily identify anyone from a single photo or video. When combined with CCTV surveillance, which live streams people's activities, the government or corporation can conduct mass surveillance, leaving individuals with no privacy.

Being constantly watched creates a "chilling effect" preventing people from freely exercising their fundamental rights (Calabrese, 2025) such as right to expression, peaceful assembly, and freedom of thought.

Social Score and Algorithmic Bias

The personal data available in cyberspace can be processed and analysed to examine and define an individual's character, abilities and weaknesses, known as "social scoring". China has already implemented its Social Credit System, a data sharing network managed by government institutions that tracks businesses and individuals for regulatory violations (Creemers, 2018).

Algorithmic systems are not devoid of bias. Research reveals that "algorithmic bias" in AI systems systematically and unfairly discriminates against certain individuals or groups (Friedman & Nissenbaum, 1996).

A prominent example is COMPAS, an AI system that predicts a defendant's likelihood of recidivism in a case. Research revealed that COMPAS predicts black defendants to be at a higher risk of recidivism than white defendants (Angwin et al., 2022) without any other credible or logical reasons.

Law for AI

In the world of technology, when Bhutan introduced television in 1999, the rest of the world was already on a progressive journey of AI development. Bhutan stepped into the AI world as seven students started their first AI business, *NoMind Bhutan* (Quendren & Bhattacharya, 2024).

Bhutanese are using different AI platforms for many purposes. For instance, 15.9% of Bhutanese were using ChatGPT in 2024, following its launch in 2022 (Dema, 2024).

While AI is driven by motives of efficiency, cost reduction and increased profit, His Majesty The King has a grand vision to use AI for sovereignty, happiness and abundance for his people (Krohn, 2026).

Bhutan's AI ecosystem is in its "active maturity" stage with an aim to reach Level 4 of Gartner's AI Maturity Model (GovTech, 2025), where AI becomes systematic, enabling AI-powered applications to interact productively within the organisation and broadly across the AI ecosystem. To achieve this, the government is aligning the use of AI with Gross National Happiness.

However, tech entrepreneur Elon Musk and an ingenious scientist like Stephen Hawking warned about the risk of unregulated AI systems. Prime Minister Tshering Tobgay also pointed out that AI development must not be allowed to run "unbridled" (Poonia & Yang, 2026). With the rise of AI system developers, importers and users, it is very important that AI is regulated.

AI Law in Bhutan may reflect the following framework:

1. ***Objective***
   Bhutan cannot take a Luddite stance; we must learn to coexist with AI. Firstly, law should nurture AI as a progressive tool and provide a safe space for its growth. Secondly, law should aim to curtail and mitigate the existing and foreseeable risks associated with AI.

2. ***Regulatory Authority***
   Every AI system must be thoroughly investigated and formally licensed by a regulatory authority prior to public deployment or adoption, to ensure public safety and accountability.

3. ***Transparency and Explainability***
   Humans should not accept AI-generated results blindly, without understanding, just because the system's average accuracy is high. AI systems built for national sovereignty, security, health and law enforcement should never be deployed without making algorithmic decision-making processes transparent and understandable.

4. ***Data Protection***
   The law should protect data, but it cannot completely prohibit AI systems from processing data, as an AI system cannot function without data. The legislation should categorise and segregate data to restrict data exploitation without the consent of concerned individuals.

5. ***Protection of Culture***
   While GovTech is strategising the alignment of AI with a GNH overview, the unregulated use of AI poses a risk to our culture and heritage, a pillar of GNH. Research reveals that large language models like ChatGPT and Gemini are not just reflecting existing culture but are actively shaping it (Daryani et al., 2026). An AI system has become a non-human agency actively intervening in the cultural construction process (Sanchez-Veras, 2025).

   Researchers found that AI systems possess a WHELM (Western, high-income, educated, liberal and male) perspective and deprioritises tradition, community and collective harmony.

Law should establish a robust statutory framework to safeguard pristine culture and heritage from digital dilution. On social media platforms, AI-generated videos often show Bhutanese gho and kira that are improperly rendered, resulting in distortions that undermine Bhutan's values and culture.

Furthermore, sacred Buddhist symbols, ritual objects and architectural designs are often used out of context because the algorithm finds them aesthetically pleasing.

6. ***Intellectual Property and Algorithmic Pastiche***
The law should determine whether the music, art and literature created by AI are capable of being protected as intellectual property. However, the law should prohibit *algorithmic pastiche* where traditional art and literature are closely imitated and replicated by an AI system, eroding the spiritual sanctity of art. Currently, many well-known songs by legendary singers are being published as AI-generated parodies without the consent of rights holders.

7. ***AI Watermark***
The law should require that developers of AI systems embed digital provenance data and inject an indelible watermark into AI-generated output to differentiate deepfakes from content created by humans. Furthermore, it should impose a statutory duty on users to declare that the content is AI-generated.

8. ***Human-in-the-Loop***
To keep AI as a tool and avoid *automation bias*, the law should necessitate the human-in-the-loop (HITL) framework wherein humans verify the AI-generated output and make independent decisions. The fate of human life must rest on human judgement and not on algorithmic calculation.

The law must ensure that human supervisors retain meaningful, independent control over the AI system rather than blindly authenticating or rubber-stamping algorithmic outputs (Laux & Ruschemeier, 2025).

9. Sand-Box

Bhutan should establish a regulatory sandbox to advance AI development. However, this sandbox should be governed strictly to ensure that a safe testing space does not spill over into society, thereby threatening life, liberty, security and sovereignty. What happens in the sandbox must stay in the sandbox, until the relevant authority proves it safe for general use.

10. Liability

Though AI systems and machines have the capability to surpass human cognitive limits, their criminal and civil liability must ultimately fall on a natural or legal person.

In law, a "natural person" refers to a human being, whereas a "legal person" is an entity, such as a corporation, civil society organisation, or other institution that possesses legal rights and duties similar to a human being.

This principle is illustrated in the case of *Moffatt v. Air Canada*, where a passenger relied on an automated website chatbot that incorrectly stated bereavement refunds could be claimed retroactively. When Air Canada denied the refund based on its actual policy, the court held that the chatbot was an extension of the company, finding the airline liable for negligent misrepresentation.

Imposing AI systems with liability would inadvertently grant the rights, elevating AI to human status. If natural or legal persons are held legally liable for an AI system, developers will design AI systems ethically and responsibly out of fear of the legal consequences should the system fail.

Categorical Liability

To establish an effective regulatory framework, natural and legal persons must be categorised into four distinct groups - developers, operators, importers and users. Law should impose distinct duties and liability on a developer and operator of an AI system.

Bhutan must strictly monitor and impose stringent duties on importers as Bhutan is highly likely to import AI technologies, and the end-user must also be assigned specific duties of vigilance to avoid negligent usage.

Direct-End User Liability

The AI regulation should also regulate the use of publicly accessible AI platforms like ChatGPT, Gemini, and Kimi, where users can misuse the technology to create deepfakes, engage in cyber-bullying and forgery.

For these AI systems, it will be difficult to impose duties on developers, and there may not be a local operator or importer because the tool is directly accessed by the end-user. Therefore, the regulation should carefully lay down the principles for the ethical use of publicly accessible AI systems and impose liability directly on the end-user.

AI for Law

Historian and philosopher Yuval Noah Harari (2016) predicts that judges and lawyers will be replaced by AI systems. He argues that the human lawyer depends upon an "organic algorithm", where AI can store vast data of legal history and process it to produce more accurate results.

Robo-Judge and AI Usage

The proponents of Robo-Judge (an AI system or robot judge) argue that it is cheaper, more efficient, and free from human bias. American law professor Eugene Volokh (2019), a proponent of the Robo-Judge, maintains that if an AI's judicial output is sound and of higher quality, it should be accepted even without humanlike reasoning.

He proposes the "ordinary schlub criterion", arguing that AI need not have to outperform the best - just the average human professional. Ultimately, Volokh contends that if AI can draft a consistent, persuasive legal opinion, it should be granted ultimate decision-making power.

Whether human judges can be replaced by a Robo-Judge is a contemporary debate argued from various legal, ethical and scientific angles.

However, AI has already found its comfortable seat in the courtrooms of many jurisdictions.

For example, the judiciary of Argentina has adopted an AI system called Prometea, which is trained to propose solutions based on precedent. It is reported to have 96% accuracy and produced 1000 judgements in 26 days, which would take hundreds of days for human judges (Corvalán & Cervini, 2020).

The Colombian Constitutional Courts use PretorIA to increase the efficiency of the case selection process for the judicial protection of fundamental rights (Saavedra & Upegui, 2021). Chinese courts have adopted AI systems - like the 206 AI system, Xiao Zhi AI and the Intelligent Adjudication system - which recommend and assist in drafting judgements (Sabra, 2026). Indian courts are using AI to transcribe oral arguments, translate judgements, identify defects in e-filing, conduct legal research and extract metadata (Press Information Bureau, 2026).

Robo-Judge and Its Risks

Robo-Judge may correct the mistakes of human judgement but it also possesses its own set of Gordian knots. Using AI to recommend the result of adjudication is a grave violation of judicial independence. Judges cannot be immune to automation bias, and moreover, judges will face public and media scrutiny for not following the AI recommendations. Ultimately, it will be the AI system deciding the case.

Secondly, Bhutan does not face an unmanageable case backlog which requires an AI rescue.

Third, adjudication is not a mechanical application of law in Bhutan; rather, it requires the careful unwinding of tangled strings. Litigants appear before the court not just to seek the result of right and wrong; for many, justice simply means being heard by a sympathetic and empathetic judge. Declaring right or wrong is only a single thread in the larger objective of law in creating a peaceful, harmonious and orderly society – a feat that a Robo-Judge splitting and dissecting facts and legal principles can never achieve.

Fourth, an AI system is also not bias-free, as seen in the existence of algorithmic bias. Fifth, the Moravec Paradox explains that AI can perform difficult human tasks easily, while finding it difficult to solve simple human tasks.

Sixth, brittleness in AI produces hugely different results when faced with minor changes (Eliot, 2024).

Seventh, adjudication is not only the application of statutes and precedents, but a living and evolving process. However, the AI system just analyses the existing data and does not possess the evolving features, which result in legal stasis (Buckland, 2023).

Finally, the eighth reason is that human judges possess a natural drive to succeed and exercise thoroughness to avoid the shame or penalties associated with rendering an unjust judgement. Conversely, AI lacks any motivation or fear of consequence. The fear of failure and desire for success is a vital impetus that ensures thoughtful, reasonable and just decisions.

AI for the Bhutanese Court

Whether the Bhutanese judiciary welcomes it or not, the "algorithmic brother" will inevitably enter the courtroom. The Bhutanese Court can currently employ this powerful tool to assist in the justice delivery system without compromising its human core.

Access to Justice

In the post-COVID era, Bhutanese courts have endeavoured to conduct virtual hearings, but the poor network infrastructure and lack of standardised video-conferencing infrastructure have constantly hindered efforts to allow litigants to seek justice comfortably from home. AI-driven optimisation tools can stabilise low-bandwidth video feeds, automate scheduling, and streamline remote court access.

Translation of Order

The Judiciary of Bhutan uses Dzongkha as the court language. However, legal Dzongkha can be notoriously difficult to understand, even for a fluent

Dzongkha reader, as it contains terminology derived from older legislation. Deploying AI to translate judgements into Bhutan's various dialects in an audio format would immensely support illiterate litigants.

Live Transcription

Live-transcribing court submissions, oral arguments and judicial remarks would enhance transparency and accountability in the Court system.

Accommodations for Differently Abled Litigants

Developing an AI system for litigants with disabilities would significantly enhance the justice delivery process in Bhutan, where parties usually appear before the court themselves rather than being represented by legal counsel.

Imminent Risk of AI in Courtrooms

Before experiencing the benefit of the AI in justice delivery, the Bhutanese judiciary must anticipate its immediate risks which could hijack the judicial process by exploiting the current lack of comprehensive AI legislation.

Deepfake Evidence

While images, videos and audios are admissible forms of digital evidence, there is a risk of an AI-generated deepfake being submitted before the court as evidence. Due to the country's current limitations in AI infrastructure, courts may be forced to send disputed evidence abroad for verification, which will be expensive and can delay the delivery of justice.

Liar's Dividend

As society begins to doubt all media, authentic evidence may be dismissed. This is often weaponised in the court through the phenomenon known as the "Liar's Dividend" (Schiff et al., 2025). Litigants exploit this by falsely claiming that genuine, incriminating digital evidence against them is AI-generated, thereby jeopardising the integrity of judicial proceedings.

Algorithmic Hallucination

Courts of many jurisdictions are experiencing AI-produced case law presented before the Court, sometimes citing cases that do not exist. AI may have surpassed the data retention capacity and analytical power of humans, but unfortunately, it has developed human-like flaws - it confidently makes things up on its own. When an AI system makes things up that do not actually exist, it is called an algorithmic hallucination.

Citation of Foreign Law and Principles

Bhutan has no AI system developed specifically for Bhutanese legislation or case laws. The lawyers or parties may consult freely available AI systems and, using that advice, plead before the court. Since those LLM systems are trained on general data sets, they may mislead the litigants with foreign law or principles that do not exist in, or are contradictory to Bhutanese laws.

Conclusion

The Bhutanese government is strategically trying to invest in AI technology in its developing economy, thoughtfully integrating it with the GNH framework. While AI technology offers immeasurable benefits, it also poses a risk to a country like Bhutan, which proudly celebrates a unique identity and rich cultural heritage.

The government must take meticulous steps to maximise these benefits while preventing the risks. This also requires Bhutanese citizens to remain vigilant, using AI responsibly to preserve the nation's core values of GNH.

It is time for legislators to adopt comprehensive legislation that provides a guided pathway towards a GNH-driven AI ecosystem. With the advent of AI, the judiciary will inevitably face unprecedented challenges involving deepfakes, privacy violation, the Liar's Dividend, algorithmic hallucination, and AI-induced misguidance of litigants.

However, because Bhutanese jurisprudence historically originated from and remains focused on amicable dispute resolution, the numerical dissection of cases by AI is not feasible.

The Bhutanese legal system requires sympathetic and empathetic human judges. Sympathy and empathy are not disruptive. They give strength to judges, enabling them to understand not just the strict legality of a dispute, but the human being behind every case file. Ultimately, justice requires people to be treated humanely, looking beyond a simple declaration of right and wrong to restore societal harmony.

AI Use Declaration: The author used *Gemini* to check the readability of the text and *Grammarly* to verify the grammar. All generated content was thoroughly reviewed, verified for factual accuracy, and edited by the author. The final output remains the sole responsibility of the author.

References

Angwin, J., Larson, J., Mattu, S., & Kirchner, L. (2022). Machine bias. In *Ethics of data and analytics* (pp. 254-264). Auerbach Publications.

Borthwick, J. (2018). *Synthetic Media*. *Betaworks.* https://www.betaworks.com/writing/ synthetic-media

Bremmer, I. (2023). *The Next Global Superpower Isn't Who You Think*. (Video) TED. https://youtu.be/uiUPD-z9DTg?si=7YjRphu0SpExpSs6

Bright, B. (2026). 2026 Waymo Safety Impact Compared with Human Driver (in Waymo Operating Cities). *Fifth Level Consulting.* https://fifthlevelconsulting.com/waymo-safety-impact/

Buckland, R. (2023). AI, Judges and Judgment: Setting the Scene. *Harvard Kennedy School.* https://dash.harvard.edu/server/api/core/bitstreams/98187fff-8a7a-4ca6-8123-3049e417f088/content.

Calabrese, A. (2025). *Public Surveillance and Human Rights: The Chilling Effect of Surveillance Technologies and Legal Debates in Europe.* https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/cgi/ viewcontent.cgi?article=1044&context=gsis_studentconference

Chesney, B., & Citron, D. (2019). Deep fakes: A looming challenge for privacy, democracy, and national security. *California Law Review*, 107, 1753-1819.

Corvalán, J. G., & Cervini, E. M. L. F. (2020). *Prometea experience. Using AI to optimize public institutions.* https://ceridap.eu/prometea-experience-using-ai-to-optimize-public-institutions/ ?lng=en

Creemers, R. (2018). China's Social Credit System: an evolving practice of control. https://ssrn.com/abstract=3175792

Daryani, Y., Sourati, Z., & Dehghani, M. (2026). The Homogenizing Engine: AI's Role in Standardizing Culture and the Path to Policy. *Policy Insights from the Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 13 (1), 14-27.

Dema, T. (2024). The World of AI and Augmented Reality: Can Bhutan Benefit? *The Bhutanese.* https://thebhutanese.bt/the-world-of-ai-and-augmented-reality-can-bhutan-benefit/

Eliot, L. (2024, Feb. 25). Exposing the Brittleness Generative AI as Exemplified by the Recent Gibberish Meltdown of ChatGPT. *Forbes.* https://www.forbes.com/sites/lanceeliot/2024/ 02/25/exposing-the-brittleness-of-generative-ai-as-exemplified-by-the-recent-gibberish-meltdown-of-chatgpt/

Folk, Z. (2024). Magician Created AI-Generated Biden Robocall in New Hampshire for Democratic Consultant, Report Says. *Forbes.* https://www.forbes.com/sites/zacharyfolk/ 2024/02/23/magician-created-ai-generated-biden-robocall-in-new-hampshire-for-democratic-consultant-report-says/

Friedman, B., & Nissenbaum, H. (1996). Bias in computer systems. *ACM Transactions on information systems (TOIS)*, *14*(3), 330-347.

Haenlein, M. & Kaplan, A. (2019). A Brief History of Artificial Intelligence: On the Past, Present, and Future of Artificial Intelligence. *California Management Review.* 61(4), 5-14.

Harari, Y.N. (2016). *Homo Deus: A Brief History of Tomorrow.* Harvill Secker.

Krohn, K. (2026). *I had the privilege to sit down with the King of Bhutan this week.* LinkedIn. https://www.linkedin.com/posts/kierankrohn_ i-had-the-privilege-to-sit-down-with-the-activity-7457564792459988992_ nk4?utm_source=share&utm_medium=member _android&rcm= ACoAAGkIYeMBZj5MXgGtuS5kEzXGx3ydWL9tlZU

Kundaliya, D. (2021). 'Clearview AI has scraped 10 billion photos from the web. *Computing.* https://www.computing.co.uk/news/ 4038

Laux, J. & Ruschemeier, H. (2025). Automation Bias in the AI Act: On the Legal Implication of Attempting to De-Bias Human Oversight of AI. *European Journal of Risk Regulation.* 16(4), 1519-1534.

Mucci, T. (2024). The History of AI. *IBM. https://www.ibm.com/think/topics/history-of-artificial-intelligence*

Parasuraman, R., & Manzey, D. H. (2010). Complacency and bias in human use of automation: An attentional integration. *Human factors*, *52*(3), 381-410.

Press Information Bureau. (2026, February 11). *From Digitisation to Intelligence: How AI is Enhancing Access to Justice in India* [Press Release].

Poonia, N. & Yang, C. (2026). Bhutan PM warns against 'unbridled' AI development, urge stronger guardrails. *CNA.* https://www.channelnewsasia.com/world/bhutan-tshering-tobgay-happiness-artificial-intelligence-technology-development-safety-guardrails-ai-summit-5942071

Quendren, L. & Bhattacharya, A. (2024, July 17). Bhutan's First AI Startup is Seven College Kids in A Dorm. *Rest of world: Reporting Global Tech Stories*. https://restofworld.org/2024/bhutan-first-ai-startup/

Roy, M. (2021). An Exploratory Study on Origin of AI: Journey Through the Ancient Indian Texts & Other Technological Descriptions, Its Past, Present & Future. *Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry.* 12 (7).

Sabra, I. (2026). AI in Global Majority Judicial System. *Stimson.* https://www.stimson.org /2026/ai-in-global-majority-judicial-systems/#:~:text=Furthermore%2C%20in%20China %2C%20 Shanghai's%20206,requirements%2C%20and%20identifying%20 sentencing%20severity.

Sanchez-Vera, F. (2025). Critical Algorithmic Mediation: Rethinking Cultural Transmission and Education in the Age of Artificial Intelligence. *Societies.* 15(7).

Saavedra, V. & Upegui, J.C. (2021). PretorIA and automating the processing of human rights cases. *Dejusticia.* https://www.derechosdigitales.org/wp-content/uploads/05_Informe-Colombia-EN_180222.pdf

Schiff, K. J., Schiff, D. S., & Bueno, N. S. (2025). The liar's dividend: Can politicians claim misinformation to evade accountability? *American Political Science Review*, 119(1), 71-90.

Volokh, E. (2019). Chief justice robots. *Duke law journal*, *68*(6), 1135-1192.

Westerlund, M. (2019). The emergence of deepfake technology: A review. *Technology innovation management review*, *9* (11), 39-52. https://timreview.ca/article/1282