Institute for Youth in Policy

5214F Diamond Heights Blvd #3055
San Francisco, CA 94109
+1 (715) 469-6884
fellowship@yipinstitute.org
www.yipinstitute.org/fellowship/

Fellowship Capstone | Policy Brief

The Political and Economic Impacts of Artificial Intelligence-Powered Financial Fraud Detection on Remittances in the Global South

Sofia R. Rodriguez

I. Executive summary

International financial institutions are rapidly integrating artificial intelligence (AI) across multiple functions, with the global market for generative AI in financial services projected to reach $18.9 billion by 2030. However, AI-powered fraud detection systems are increasingly flagging legitimate remittance transactions as suspicious, particularly those from Global South corridors. These algorithmic biases treat certain sending patterns, amounts, or geographic origins as high-risk, often locking access to accounts for both senders and recipients. This can weaken the political leverage that remittance-dependent governments previously held because as the reliability and volume of formal transfers decline, their ability to use steady foreign exchange flows as diplomatic bargaining chips reduces. And when legitimate remittances are blocked, it can destabilize household incomes and purchasing power economies countries' economies, potentially creating political unrest that governments must address, further eroding their international negotiating position. This paper evaluates the political and economic impacts of AI in fraud-detection services within international financial institutions at the individual, institutional, national, and global levels through an in-depth literature review.

II. Overview

AI is fundamentally reshaping the global remittance industry, creating profound implications for the political economies of remittance-dependent countries in the Global South. The United States alone generated over $79 billion in remittances in 2022, significantly exceeding flows from other major source countries like Saudi Arabia ($39.3 billion) and Switzerland ($32 billion)[35]. As AI-powered fraud detection and automated transfer systems become increasingly sophisticated, they are simultaneously promising greater financial inclusion while exacerbating existing power imbalances in the international financial system and becoming a greater target for bad actors.

Remittances, defined to be electronic transfers of funds sent by migrants to their families and communities, represent one of the most critical sources of external financing for developing nations. Countries like El Salvador depend on these transfers for roughly one-fifth of their GDP [63], making them essential drivers of household consumption and economic stability. As Guatemala's central bank head noted, "remittances are increasingly important not just as a share of GDP but as a driver of household consumption."[63] For recipient countries, these flows carry profound economic weight—India

received over $111 billion in remittances in 2022, while Mexico received $61 billion.[56] The traditional ecosystem of banks, money transfer operators like Western Union and MoneyGram, [63] and various financial intermediaries have long been characterized by inefficiency and high costs, with average fees reaching 6.3% of transferred amounts, which is more than double the UN's Sustainable Development Goal target of 3%.[35]

Artificial intelligence is defined to be computer systems that learn from large datasets to make statistically-probable predictions.[35] Banks and fintech companies are deploying machine learning (ML) algorithms, natural language processing (NLP), and predictive analytics for real-time fraud detection, automated risk assessment, and optimized currency exchange timing. AI-powered systems analyze transaction patterns with unprecedented accuracy, assign risk scores to user behaviors, and provide 24/7 customer support while dramatically reducing operational costs.[35]

However, while AI promises to democratize access to financial services through mobile platforms and reduce the burden of expensive transfer fees on vulnerable populations, it also raises critical concerns about data privacy, algorithmic bias, and the concentration of technological capabilities among major financial institutions. The sophistication of AI fraud detection systems can impact the informal remittance channels that marginalized communities rely upon, potentially pushing them toward unregulated alternatives or unstable cryptocurrency-based solutions. The technology's ability to optimize transfer timing and reduce costs could partially offset such policy burdens, but it also creates new dependencies on Western-controlled technological infrastructure that often have profound environmental impacts on the recipient countries as well. And for remittance-dependent economies, AI's impact on cross-border financial flows will influence macroeconomic stability, household welfare, and ultimately, the political sustainability of migration-dependent development models. The challenge lies in balancing AI's profound profit potentials for financial institutions in addition to managing growing security concerns while ensuring that the economic benefits reach the most vulnerable populations who depend on remittances for their economic survival and limiting the ecological impacts.

III. History

A. Current Stances

As AI-powered financial technologies rapidly evolve from experimental tools to operational realities, remittance-dependent nations face an unprecedented transformation that could either amplify existing inequalities or democratize financial access on an unprecedented scale.

The timing of this analysis is particularly crucial given the current regulatory divergence between major financial centers. While European banks struggle with the EU's restrictive AI Act (with only 9% considering themselves ahead in AI integration) the UK and US are rapidly advancing their AI capabilities in financial services.[19] This regulatory fragmentation creates an uneven playing field that directly impacts remittance corridors connecting the Global North to the Global South, reshaping

traditional money transfer relationships and creating new dependencies.

For countries like El Salvador or India, (which receives over $111 billion annually,)[56] AI-driven changes in the remittance ecosystem can trigger cascading effects throughout entire national economies. The shift from efficiency-focused AI applications to revenue-generating, agentic AI systems capable of independent decision-making fundamentally alters the power dynamics between financial institutions and remittance users.

Moreover, the current moment represents a unique window where the architecture of AI-powered financial systems is still being established. As banks transition from basic automation to sophisticated agentic and autonomous AI, the rules being written today will determine whether these technologies serve to reduce the burden on remittance senders or create new forms of marginalization. The proposed US remittance tax as a part of the proposed One Big Beautiful Bill,[63] coupled with rapid AI advancement, creates a perfect storm scenario where technological transformation intersects with policy intervention. Understanding these dynamics now is essential for policymakers, financial institutions, and civil society organizations seeking to shape outcomes that serve vulnerable populations.

IV. Policy Problem

A. Stakeholders

At the foundation of this ecosystem are migrant workers and their families, who bear the most immediate consequences of AI system failures. When algorithmic bias causes legitimate remittance transactions to be flagged as fraudulent, families in recipient countries face sudden income disruptions that threaten basic household consumption. These populations, already operating with minimal financial margins, cannot absorb the shock of delayed or blocked transfers, creating immediate humanitarian concerns.

Additionally, individuals in the Global North that are sending these remittances are also being put at risk, often locked out of their bank accounts after being deemed “high risk” by these algorithms. These migrants lose access to formal financial channels and are forced to rely on informal, unregulated money transfer networks that often charge higher fees and provide less security for their funds. This pushes vulnerable populations toward cash-based hawala systems or other underground channels that operate outside regulatory oversight, making both senders and recipients more susceptible to exploitation and fraud. The account lockouts create a cascading effect where undocumented workers, who already face precarious economic situations, must either pay premium rates for alternative transfer methods or risk using potentially dangerous informal networks to support their families back home. This exclusion from formal financial systems not only increases the cost burden on some of the most economically vulnerable populations but also undermines the broader goals of financial inclusion and anti-money laundering efforts by pushing legitimate transactions into unmonitored channels. And because many of these families are first-generation immigrants and

do not hold wealth, this often causes huge disruptions in their spending power and ability to provide for their families.

And as we consider growing anti-immigrant sentiments in America, undocumented individuals are put at even higher risk of facing outsized repercussions for these seemingly innocuous actions. When undocumented immigrants are forced to use informal money transfer networks due to AI-powered account lockouts, their financial activities become harder to track and monitor, potentially raising red flags with law enforcement agencies that may interpret these underground transactions as suspicious or linked to illicit activities. Under heightened immigration enforcement priorities, the use of unregulated hawala systems or cash-based transfers could be misconstrued as evidence of criminal networks or terrorism financing, making immigrants vulnerable to increased scrutiny from agencies like ICE, FBI, or Treasury's Financial Crimes Enforcement Network. This creates a dangerous cycle where legitimate efforts to support families are reframed through a national security lens, potentially subjecting immigrants to deportation proceedings or criminal investigations simply for trying to circumvent discriminatory AI systems.

Remittance-dependent governments also face a dual threat to their economic and political stability. Countries such as El Salvador, where remittances constitute approximately 20% of GDP, India (receiving over $111 billion annually), Mexico ($61 billion), and Guatemala are experiencing weakened international negotiating positions as AI-driven disruptions reduce the reliability of foreign exchange flows.[56] These nations traditionally leveraged steady remittance streams as diplomatic bargaining chips, but algorithmic inconsistencies undermine this source of political leverage while simultaneously creating domestic economic instability that demands government attention and resources.

Financial institutions—including traditional banks, established money transfer operators like Western Union and MoneyGram, and emerging fintech companies—are navigating competing pressures between operational efficiency and social responsibility. While AI implementation promises reduced costs and improved fraud detection capabilities, institutions face significant reputational risks and potential market share losses when algorithmic bias disproportionately affects specific customer segments or geographic corridors.

International organizations, including the United Nations (with its Sustainable Development Goal of 3% transfer fees) and the Bank for International Settlements, are working to establish governance frameworks that balance innovation incentives with protection of vulnerable populations. These bodies face the complex challenge of coordinating responses across jurisdictions while addressing the specific needs of Global South corridors most affected by algorithmic bias.

B. Risks of Indifference

Looking at this critical intersection of AI and international remittances, the risks of policy indifference are both immediate and far-reaching. As AI-powered fraud detection systems

increasingly flag legitimate remittances from Global South corridors as suspicious, we face a cascade of destabilizing consequences that demand urgent attention.

The most immediate risk is economic disruption at the household level. When AI algorithms incorrectly identify legitimate transfers as fraudulent, they freeze accounts and block funds that millions of families depend on for basic survival.This erosion of soft power occurs precisely when these countries need stronger voices in global AI governance discussions.

For immigrants living in the Global North, one transaction could be the difference between surviving and being deemed a threat.

Perhaps most concerning is the risk of creating new forms of digital colonialism. The current regulatory fragmentation is reshaping global money transfer relationships. Without coordinated policy intervention, we risk entrenching a system where Western-controlled AI infrastructure determines access to essential financial services for Global South populations.

C. Nonpartisan Reasoning

This issue transcends traditional political divides because it touches fundamental values that unite us across party lines: economic security, fair treatment, and American leadership in global innovation.

From a national security perspective, when legitimate channels fail, people turn to informal networks that are harder to monitor and regulate, which affects everyone's safety and security in a polarized age where information is a tool of war. This can become a channel for foreign actors to easily access massive amounts of confidential information that puts our financial institutions and structure at risk, especially in an increasingly dollarized international economy.

For conservatives, AI bias in remittances threatens free market principles and American financial competitiveness. When our institutions unfairly block legitimate transactions, we're handicapping American banks and money transfer companies in the global marketplace while pushing families toward unregulated alternatives that lack proper oversight.

For progressives, this represents a clear equity and social justice issue. Hard-working immigrants sending money home to support their families face algorithmic discrimination that perpetuates existing inequalities and undermines financial inclusion.

Most importantly, this impacts real families in our districts—constituents who work multiple jobs to send money home, only to have AI systems freeze their accounts without explanation. Their struggles with biased algorithms affect local businesses, community stability, and economic growth that benefits everyone.

V. Tried Policy

A. State and Local Policy in the US

The regulatory landscape governing AI use in fraud detection within financial institutions has evolved into a complex patchwork of state and federal oversight, with significant implications for international remittance operations. While federal agencies initially led AI regulation efforts, state

regulators have increasingly stepped into the void left by federal inaction, creating fragmented compliance requirements that particularly impact cross-border financial services.

Several states have established frameworks that directly affect AI-driven fraud detection systems. California's legal advisory issued on January 13, 2025, explicitly clarified that "existing consumer protection laws apply to AI-driven decisions,"[58] requiring financial institutions to ensure AI fraud detection systems comply with state consumer protection statutes. Similarly, Massachusetts advisory from April 16, 2024, emphasized that existing laws apply "to this emerging technology to the same extent as they apply to any other product or application," establishing clear liability for AI-powered fraud detection failures.[58]

The New York Department of Financial Services took a more targeted approach with its October 16, 2024 industry letter, specifically addressing cybersecurity risks in AI systems used by regulated entities, including those processing international transactions. Treasury's enhanced fraud detection processes, including machine learning AI, prevented and recovered over $4 billion in fiscal year 2024, demonstrating the technology's effectiveness but also highlighting the need for consistent oversight.[58]

B. National/Federal US Policy

The United States federal government has established a comprehensive regulatory framework for AI in financial fraud detection through a combination of executive directives, agency oversight, and targeted policy initiatives that emphasize both innovation and consumer protection. The Treasury Department has positioned itself at the forefront of this effort, actively soliciting stakeholder input through multiple Request for Information (RFI) processes to understand "the uses, opportunities and risks presented by developments and applications of artificial intelligence (AI) within the financial sector."[53]

Building on President Biden's Executive Order 14110, Treasury has developed a multi-pronged approach that addresses AI governance across various financial applications. The department's March 2024 report on AI and cybersecurity "identifies opportunities and challenges that AI presents to the security and resiliency of the financial services sector" and "outlines a series of next steps to address AI-related operational risk, cybersecurity, and fraud challenges."[53] Simultaneously, Treasury's May 2024 National Strategy for Combating Terrorist and Other Illicit Financing recognizes that "innovations in AI, including machine learning and large language models such as generative AI, have significant potential to strengthen anti-money laundering/countering the financing of terrorism (AML/CFT) compliance by helping financial institutions analyze large amounts of data and more effectively identify illicit finance patterns, risks, trends, and typologies."[61]

The practical implementation of these policies has yielded remarkable results, with Treasury's enhanced fraud detection processes achieving the "prevention and recovery of over $4 billion in fraud and improper payments" in fiscal year 2024,

representing a dramatic increase from $652.7 million in FY23. This success stems from Treasury's deployment of risk-based screening, machine learning AI for check fraud identification, and enhanced transaction prioritization systems.[61]

However, current policies reveal significant gaps regarding international remittances, where Treasury acknowledges concerns about "the potential for AI tools to expand capabilities for firms to inappropriately target specific individuals or communities (e.g., low- to moderate-income communities, communities of color, women, rural, tribal, or disadvantaged communities)."[54] While agencies like FinCEN have encouraged banks to "use existing tools or adopt new technologies, including AI, to identify and report money laundering, terrorist financing, and other illicit financial activity,"[54] the regulatory framework lacks specific provisions addressing how AI-enhanced fraud detection systems impact cross-border payment flows that are essential for global financial inclusion. Thus, the US is torn between prioritizing the profit interests of private industry and the protection of these communities–a sentiment only growing under the new administration.

C. National UK Policy

The United Kingdom has adopted a distinctive sector-based approach to AI regulation in financial services, emphasizing principles-based oversight rather than prescriptive rules. Following the publication of the government's AI Regulation Policy Paper in July 2022, UK financial regulators have established frameworks that directly impact AI-driven fraud detection systems used in international remittance operations.

The Financial Conduct Authority (FCA), Prudential Regulation Authority (PRA), and Bank of England released their strategic approaches to AI regulation on April 22, 2024, confirming a commitment to "pro-innovation" and "pro-safety"-focused regulatory frameworks.[67] This approach maintains the regulators' traditional "technology-neutral" stance, where "core principles and rules do not usually mandate or prohibit specific technologies,"[67] allowing existing regulatory frameworks to govern AI applications including fraud detection systems.

HM Treasury's consultation response established five key principles governing AI regulation: safety, security and robustness; appropriate transparency and explainability; fairness; accountability and governance; and contestability and redress. These principles directly impact how financial institutions deploy AI for fraud detection in cross-border transactions. The government reinforced this approach by announcing "£10 million in funding for UK regulators" to develop necessary expertise for AI oversight.

Current regulatory frameworks already encompass AI fraud detection applications. UK financial services firms actively use AI for "anti-money laundering and compliance functions," "transaction monitoring and market surveillance," and "cyber defence and financial crime and fraud detection."[67] The PRA and FCA confirmed that existing rules under frameworks like MiFID II adequately address

many AI-related risks, noting that "the issues related to their use often overlap with those related to AI."[67]

For international remittance providers, this creates a relatively permissive regulatory environment compared to more prescriptive jurisdictions. However, firms must demonstrate compliance with existing consumer protection standards and data protection laws, particularly the UK GDPR. The regulators emphasized that their "outcomes-based" approach focuses on protecting customers rather than restricting specific technologies, potentially facilitating innovation in cross-border payment fraud detection while maintaining robust consumer safeguards.

D. EU Policy

The European Union's Artificial Intelligence Act (EU AI Act), which entered into force on August 1, 2024, represents significant AI regulation that spans applications and industries. Under the AI Act's risk-based approach, the EU introduces a risk-based approach to AI regulation, categorizing systems based on their risk levels and imposing specific compliance requirements. Financial institutions utilizing AI for fraud detection must now navigate heightened regulatory scrutiny, as it has significant implications for financial institutions. The regulation specifically addresses concerns that these AI systems are used responsibly and do not pose unacceptable risks to consumers or market integrity.[19]

The Act's implementation follows a phased approach, with "prohibitions and AI literacy obligations entered into application from 2 February 2025" and "Rules related to high-risk systems start coming into play on August 2, 2026."[19] This timeline provides financial institutions operating in international remittance services a structured framework for compliance, though the regulatory burden is substantial.

While compliance costs may increase operational expenses, the standardized approach to AI governance could enhance cross-border regulatory cooperation and reduce fragmentation in global financial crime prevention efforts. The regulations affect all companies operating in the EU, regardless of where they are headquartered, with penalties for non-compliance reaching up to €35 million or 7% of global annual turnover, ensuring that international remittance services maintain robust AI governance structures regardless of their geographic origins.[19] The EU AI Act thus serves as an amazing model for regulatory approaches given its revolutionary impact, despite criticism about drastic impacts on private industry.

E. National Policy Across Asia & the Pacific Islands

In Asia-Pacific, Singapore has emerged as a regulatory leader through the Monetary Authority of Singapore's promotion of FEAT (Fairness, Ethics, Accountability, and Transparency) principles, offering voluntary AI governance standards for financial firms. This principles-based approach is complemented by Singapore's participation in global initiatives, as it plans to use Swift's AI-Powered Fraud Detection, which is set to launch in 2025.[23] This development is particularly significant for

remittance services, as Swift's network facilitates a substantial portion of international money transfers, but has far more regulatory standards than the US and UK. However, the impact of remittances leaving Singapore are much smaller in scale than those in the US, EU, and UK.

Japan has taken a governance-focused approach, with Japan's Ministry of Economy, Trade, and Industry releasing the Governance Guidelines for AI, emphasising transparency and human oversight.[4] The country's AI Strategy Council, as outlined in the provided document, established three basic guiding principles including leadership in developing international AI rules and addressing AI-related concerns through swift, flexible responses involving diverse stakeholders.[55]

China represents the most regulatory-intensive approach in the region, having introduced Internet Information Service Algorithmic Recommendation Management Provisions, which requires financial AI models to undergo government audits. This mandatory audit requirement creates significant compliance costs but potentially enhances consumer protection in AI-driven financial services.[4]

South Korea has adopted a risk-classification system similar to the EU framework through the Act on Fostering the AI Industry, classifying certain AI models as high-risk, while Australia has opted for the Artificial Intelligence Ethics Framework [providing] voluntary guidelines for responsible AI use in financial services with no real enforcement mechanisms.[4]

However, significant regulatory gaps remain across the region. Many APAC countries, including Indonesia, Malaysia, and the Philippines, are still developing national AI strategies but lack enforceable AI regulations for financial services. [4]

F. International Policy

The international regulatory landscape for AI-driven fraud detection in financial institutions is rapidly evolving, with frameworks emerging at multiple levels to address both opportunities and risks. At the foundational level, the OECD AI Principles, adopted in 2019 and subsequently integrated into the G20 AI Principles, establish five core tenets for trustworthy AI deployment, emphasizing accountability whereby "AI actors should be accountable for the proper functioning of AI systems."[57] These principles have become the cornerstone for national and sectoral implementations.

Additionally, the United Nations has established comprehensive initiatives to address AI governance in financial services through multiple interconnected frameworks. The UN Secretary-General has convened a multi-stakeholder High-level Advisory Body on AI to undertake analysis and advance recommendations for the international governance,[32] recognizing that "globally coordinated AI governance is the only way to harness AI for humanity while addressing its risks and uncertainties as AI-related services, algorithms, computing capacity and expertise become more widespread internationally."[61]

Could artificial intelligence fuel the future of financial investigations? Most significantly, on 22 September 2024, world leaders adopted the Global Digital Compact at the Summit of the Future, which serves as "a comprehensive global framework for digital cooperation and governance of artificial intelligence" that "provides a roadmap for enhancing global digital collaboration, harnessing the vast potential of digital technologies, and bridging existing digital divides."[1] Lastly, the UN Development Programme has launched an AI Trust and Safety Re-imagination Programme that emphasizes building robust safety measures in local AI ecosystems, particularly relevant for financial fraud detection systems that must balance security with accessibility in developing countries' remittance markets.[1]

With regard to existing regulation for remittances and international trade, The United Nations General Assembly resolution 73/195 of 19 December 2018, establishing the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration, provides crucial legal foundation for addressing AI bias in remittance fraud detection by formally recognizing in Objective 20 the commitment to "promote faster, safer and cheaper transfer of remittances and foster financial inclusion of migrants"[32] and establishing a roadmap to "reduce the transaction costs of migrant remittances to less than 3 per cent"[32] by 2030. This Global Compact creates a compelling framework for implementing tax incentives that encourage bias mitigation in AI development, as governments can justify preferential tax treatment for financial institutions that demonstrate measurably fair algorithmic practices in cross-border transfers, directly supporting the Compact's commitment to enhance financial inclusion of migrants and their families.[27] Building on the existing UN frameworks outlined above, the Global Compact establishes that protecting remittance flows is not merely a consumer protection issue but a development imperative essential for "the well-being of migrant workers and their families, as well as on the sustainable development of countries."[27] This developmental framing strengthens the policy case for linking corporate tax benefits to algorithmic fairness metrics, allowing governments to argue that AI bias mitigation tax incentives serve broader international migration commitments while advancing global financial inclusion goals.[25]

VI. Policy Options

International Coordination and Enforcement Framework

Addressing AI bias in remittance fraud detection requires comprehensive international policy action, as the cross-border nature of these transactions makes fragmented national approaches insufficient. The international community must establish binding multilateral agreements that standardize AI governance in financial services, with meaningful penalties for non-compliance including financial sanctions and exclusion from international payment networks. The UN's existing Global Digital Compact framework provides an ideal foundation for expanding these requirements specifically to remittance services, ensuring that AI systems serving vulnerable migrant populations meet universal fairness standards. Additionally, it is important that impact communities get the

chance to testify and share their lived experiences feeling the repercussions of non-action to encourage protection of their communities.

Real-Time Monitoring and Immediate Intervention Requirements

Accountability frameworks must mandate continuous real-time monitoring of AI decision-making patterns, with automatic triggers requiring immediate intervention when bias indicators exceed predetermined thresholds. Banks cannot claim ignorance of discriminatory patterns when their systems are required to generate automated alerts for suspicious bias trends. Financial institutions must maintain detailed logs of all AI decisions affecting remittance transactions, including the specific data inputs and algorithmic reasoning that led to account freezes or transaction blocks. These comprehensive records eliminate banks' ability to argue that discriminatory outcomes were isolated incidents or technical glitches beyond their control.

Transparency and Mandatory Reporting Requirements

Financial institutions ought to be required to implement mandatory transparency measures, including algorithmic auditing and public reporting of AI decision-making processes in fraud detection systems. These reporting requirements should mandate disclosure of bias testing results, demographic impact assessments, and corrective actions taken when discriminatory patterns are identified. Regular publication of these reports would enable civil society organizations, regulators, and affected communities to monitor institutional compliance and advocate for necessary improvements.

Audit Requirements and Human Rights Framework

While an outright ban on AI-powered fraud detection would be ideal for eliminating bias, such an approach is economically and practically infeasible given the technology's fraud prevention benefits. Instead, mandatory yearly audits of AI systems should be implemented, conducted by independent third-party organizations with expertise in algorithmic fairness. These audits must treat access to legitimate financial services as a fundamental human right, requiring institutions to demonstrate that their AI systems do not disproportionately harm vulnerable populations. The UN Human Rights Council should formally recognize remittance access as essential to family unity and economic dignity, creating binding international obligations for fair AI implementation in cross-border financial services.

Mandatory Impact Assessments and Preemptive Compliance

Banks must be required to conduct comprehensive algorithmic impact assessments before deploying any AI fraud detection system affecting international remittances. These assessments should include demographic testing across all major remittance corridors, with particular attention to Global South routes that historically face higher false positive rates. Institutions cannot deploy AI systems without demonstrating through independent validation that their algorithms meet established fairness metrics across racial, ethnic, and geographic categories. This preemptive compliance requirement prevents banks from arguing they were unaware of discriminatory outcomes.

Strict Liability and Burden of Proof Reversal

Policy frameworks must establish strict liability standards that eliminate banks' ability to claim

algorithmic bias was unintentional or economically justified. Under these frameworks, financial institutions would bear the burden of proving their AI systems do not discriminate, rather than requiring affected individuals to demonstrate harm. This reversal of proof standards is essential because banks currently possess all the technical documentation, algorithmic training data, and system design information necessary to evaluate bias, while affected migrants typically lack the resources or expertise to challenge complex AI decisions.

Corporate Officer Criminal Liability

Senior executives and AI system designers should face personal criminal liability for knowingly deploying or maintaining biased fraud detection systems. This individual accountability prevents banks from treating algorithmic discrimination as merely a cost of doing business or regulatory fine to be absorbed. When corporate officers face potential imprisonment for AI bias violations, institutions cannot simply claim that discriminatory outcomes were unforeseeable business decisions made in good faith.

VII. Conclusions

The convergence of artificial intelligence and international remittances has reached a critical inflection point that will define the future of global financial equity for generations. As AI-powered fraud detection systems increasingly flag legitimate transactions from Global South corridors as suspicious, we are witnessing and often participating in creating and using digital infrastructure that systematically excludes the world's most vulnerable populations from formal financial systems.

In today's fractured policy landscape, where regulatory nationalism competes with technological globalization, the window for coordinated action is rapidly closing. The Trump administration's "America First" approach to financial regulation, combined with the EU's increasingly protectionist stance on digital governance and China's state-controlled AI development, creates a dangerous vacuum where corporate interests fill the void left by absent international leadership. While policymakers debate jurisdiction and sovereignty, millions of migrant families face immediate economic devastation as algorithms trained on Western financial patterns criminalize Global South survival strategies.

This is not merely a technical problem requiring technical solutions. It is a moral crisis that exposes the fundamental contradiction at the heart of our globalized economy: we have created a system sophisticated enough to move trillions of dollars in milliseconds, yet incapable of ensuring that a mother can send money to feed her children without algorithmic interrogation.

The path forward demands unprecedented international coordination in an increasingly polarized, heightened, and militarized political environment with enough political courage to prioritize human dignity over corporate efficiency. We must act now, while the architecture of AI-powered finance is still malleable, or accept that we have built a digital caste system that renders financial justice impossible for the world's most vulnerable populations. Without immediate action, we risk entrenching a system where Western-controlled AI determines which Global South families deserve access to their own money. And though living in an increasingly digitized world means

we have no choice but to engage with these institutions, we must refuse to accept that algorithmic discrimination is the inevitable price of technological progress and, instead, demand that our financial infrastructure serve human flourishing and societal advancement.

Acknowledgment

The Institute for Youth in Policy wishes to acknowledge Mason Carlisle, Lilly Kurtz, Asher Cohen, Paul Kramer. and other contributors for developing and maintaining the Fellowship Program within the Institute.

References

[1] *2024 AI Fraud Financial Crime Survey*. (n.d.-a). Retrieved July 19, 2025, from https://www.biocatch.com/ai-fraud-financial-crime-survey

[2] *2024 AI Fraud Financial Crime Survey*. (n.d.-b). Retrieved August 10, 2025, from https://www.biocatch.com/ai-fraud-financial-crime-survey

[3] *A Closer Look at AI Regulations Shaping the Finance Industry in April 2025*. (n.d.). Lumenova AI. Retrieved July 19, 2025, from https://www.lumenova.ai/blog/ai-regulations-finance-april-2025/

[4] Abdullah, I. N. (2025, February 12). An Overview of AI Regulations in Financial Services Around the World. *Fintech Singapore*. https://fintechnews.sg/107530/ai/ai-regulations-asia-financial-services/

[5] *AI in Banking: AI Will Be An Incremental Game Changer*. (2023, October 30). S&P Global. https://www.spglobal.com/en/research-insights/special-reports/ai-in-banking-ai-will-be-an-incremental-game-changer

[6] *AI regulation in the financial sector | デロイト トーマツ グループ*. (n.d.). Retrieved July 2, 2025, from https://www.deloitte.com/jp/ja/Industries/financial-services/perspectives/japan-opinion-ai-state-of-play-in-insurance-regulation.html

[7] *AI-Powered International Remittances: A Deep Dive into Faster, Cheaper, and More Secure Money Transfers – OFW Jobs*. (n.d.). Retrieved July 2, 2025, from https://ofwjobs.org/2025/05/ai-powered-international-remittances-a-deep-dive-into-faster-cheaper-and-more-secure-money-transfers/

[8] *AML & KYC Regulations in Singapore: A Complete Guide (2025)*. (n.d.). Sumsub. Retrieved July 19, 2025, from https://sumsub.com/blog/anti-money-laundering-aml-in-singapore-complete-guide/

[9] *A/RES/70/1 Transforming our world: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. (2030).

[10] Artificial Intelligence: Empowering Fintech and Money Transfer. (2021, January 12). *RemitONE*. https://www.remitone.com/ai-empowering-fintech-and-money-transfer-firms/

[11] Beck, S. (n.d.). *How Artificial Intelligence Is Reshaping Banking*. Forbes. Retrieved June 28, 2025, from https://www.forbes.com/councils/forbestechcouncil/2024/02/23/how-artificial-intelligence-is-reshaping-banking/

[12] Beyond detection: An AI-powered approach to proactive fraud prevention. (n.d.). *BAI*. Retrieved June 28, 2025, from

https://www.bai.org/banking-strategies/beyond-detection-an-ai-powered-approach-to-proactive-fraud-prevention/

[13] Buchholz, K. (2023, June 20). *Infographic: The World's Top Remittance Recipients*. Statista Daily Data. https://www.statista.com/chart/20166/top-10-remittance-receiving-countries

[14] *Can central banks cut remittance fees to sustainable levels? - Central Banking*. (2025, March 25). https://www.centralbanking.com/benchmarking/payments/7972511/can-central-banks-cut-remittance-fees-to-sustainable-levels

[15] *Corporate income taxes and investment incentives: A global review | Publications | UNCTAD Investment Policy Hub*. (n.d.). Retrieved August 9, 2025, from https://investmentpolicy.unctad.org/publications/1265/corporate-income-taxes-and-investment-incentives-a-global-review

[16] Crisanto, J. C., Leuterio, C. B., Prenio, J., & Yong, J. (2024a). *Regulating AI in the financial sector: Recent developments and main challenges*. https://www.bis.org/fsi/publ/insights63.htm

[17] Crisanto, J. C., Leuterio, C. B., Prenio, J., & Yong, J. (2024b). *Regulating AI in the financial sector: Recent developments and main challenges*. Bank for International Settlements, Financial Stability Institute.

[18] *CSBS Money Transmission Modernization Act (MTMA)*. (n.d.). Retrieved July 2, 2025, from https://www.csbs.org/csbs-money-transmission-modernization-act-mtma

[19] Deloitte. (n.d.). *AI regulation in the financial sector*. https://www.deloitte.com/content/dam/assets-zone1/jp/ja/docs/industries/financial-services/2025/japan_opinion_ai_state_of_play_in_insurance_regulation-en.pdf

[20] *Digital Remittance: Digital Remittance Meaning, Features & Benefits*. (n.d.). Retrieved July 2, 2025, from https://www.vance.tech/blog/digital-remittance

[21] *Discover How Technology is Transforming Remittance Services—Vance*. (n.d.). Retrieved July 2, 2025, from https://www.vance.tech/blog/how-technology-is-transforming-remittance-services

[22] *Financial Action Task Force*. (2025, February 8). U.S. Department of the Treasury. https://home.treasury.gov/policy-issues/terrorism-and-illicit-finance/financial-action-task-force

[23] *Fraud and Financial Crime Asia 2025 forum on 15 May 2025 in Singapore – Asian Bankers Association*. (n.d.-a). Retrieved July 19, 2025, from https://www.aba.org.tw/fraud-and-financial-crime-asia-2025-forum-on-15-may-in-singapore/

[24] *Fraud and Financial Crime Asia 2025 forum on 15 May 2025 in Singapore – Asian Bankers Association*. (n.d.-b). Retrieved July 19, 2025, from https://www.aba.org.tw/fraud-and-financial-crime-asia-2025-forum-on-15-may-in-singapore/

[25] *Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration (A/RES/73/195)*. (n.d.-a). International Organization for Migration. Retrieved August 9, 2025, from https://www.iom.int/resources/global-compa

ct-safe-orderly-and-regular-migration-res-73-195

[26] *Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration (A/RES/73/195)*. (n.d.-b). International Organization for Migration. Retrieved August 10, 2025, from https://www.iom.int/resources/global-compact-safe-orderly-and-regular-migration-res-73-195

[27] *Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration (GCM)*. (n.d.-a). OHCHR. Retrieved August 9, 2025, from https://www.ohchr.org/en/migration/global-compact-safe-orderly-and-regular-migration-gcm

[28] *Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration (GCM)*. (n.d.-b). OHCHR. Retrieved August 10, 2025, from https://www.ohchr.org/en/migration/global-compact-safe-orderly-and-regular-migration-gcm

[29] *Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration (GCM)*. (n.d.-c). OHCHR. Retrieved August 10, 2025, from https://www.ohchr.org/en/migration/global-compact-safe-orderly-and-regular-migration-gcm

[30] *Global migration's impact and opportunity | McKinsey*. (n.d.). Retrieved June 28, 2025, from https://www.mckinsey.com/featured-insights/employment-and-growth/global-migrations-impact-and-opportunity

[31] greggwirth. (2024, April 16). How businesses should respond to the SEC's cybersecurity disclosure rules. *Thomson Reuters Institute*. https://www.thomsonreuters.com/en-us/posts/investigation-fraud-and-risk/cybersecurity-disclosure-rules/

[32] *High-Level Advisory Body on Artificial Intelligence | Office for Digital and Emerging Technologies*. (n.d.). Retrieved July 19, 2025, from https://www.un.org/digital-emerging-technologies/ai-advisory-body

[33] *Home*. (n.d.). Retrieved July 19, 2025, from https://www.fatf-gafi.org/

[34] *Homepage | Remittance Prices Worldwide*. (n.d.). Retrieved July 30, 2025, from https://remittanceprices.worldbank.org/

[35] *How AI is Shaping the Future of Global Remittances | UniTeller*. (2023, August 29). https://uniteller.com/ut-blog/ai-global-remittances-guide/

[36] *IBM Study: Banking and Financial Markets CEOs are Betting on Generative AI to Stay Competitive, Yet Workforce and Culture Challenges Persist*. (n.d.). IBM Newsroom. Retrieved July 1, 2025, from https://newsroom.ibm.com/2024-06-05-IBM-Study-Banking-and-Financial-Markets-CEOs-are-betting-on-generative-AI-to-stay-competitive,-yet-workforce-and-culture-challenges-persist

[37] India, P. (n.d.). *From risk to resilience: Implementing AI governance framework for central banks*.

[38] *Japan Fraud Detection and Prevention Market Report 2025-33*. (n.d.). Retrieved July 19, 2025, from https://www.imarcgroup.com/japan-fraud-detection-prevention-market

[39] Jatera, M. K. (2025, February 3). AI-Powered Fraud Detection: Stopping Cybercrime in

Real-Time. *High Stuff*. https://www.highstuff.com/ai-fraud-detection/

[40] Kuester, J. (n.d.-a). *Joint Statement on Innovative Efforts to Combat Money Laundering and Terrorist Financing*.

[41] Kuester, J. (n.d.-b). *Joint Statement on Innovative Efforts to Combat Money Laundering and Terrorist Financing*.

[42] Limiting the risky side of AI in financial services. (n.d.). *BAI*. Retrieved July 1, 2025, from https://www.bai.org/banking-strategies/limiting-the-risky-side-of-ai-in-financial-services/

[43] List of countries by remittances received. (2025). In *Wikipedia*. https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=List_of_countries_by_remittances_received&oldid=1298049507

[44] Lovegrove (UK), S. (2024a, December 13). BIS paper - Regulating AI in the financial sector: Recent developments and main challenges. *Global Regulation Tomorrow*. https://www.regulationtomorrow.com/eu/bis-paper-regulating-ai-in-the-financial-sector-recent-developments-and-main-challenges/

[45] Lovegrove (UK), S. (2024b, December 13). BIS paper - Regulating AI in the financial sector: Recent developments and main challenges. *Global Regulation Tomorrow*. https://www.regulationtomorrow.com/eu/bis-paper-regulating-ai-in-the-financial-sector-recent-developments-and-main-challenges/

[46] Lucinity. (2025, April 1). *AI-powered Anti-Money Laundering Tactics—Transform FinCrime Operations & Investigations with AI*. https://lucinity.com/blog/financial-crime-in-the-digital-world-emerging-money-laundering-tactics-in-2025-and-how-ai-can-detect-them

[47] *Managing Artificial Intelligence-Specific Cybersecurity Risks in the Financial Services Sector*. (n.d.).

[48] Nations, U. (n.d.). *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. United Nations; United Nations. Retrieved August 9, 2025, from https://www.un.org/en/about-us/universal-declaration-of-human-rights

[49] Pandey, A. (2025, May 19). Trump's "One Big Beautiful Bill Act": How remittance tax plan might deliver a big economic blow to US allies? *The Economic Times*. https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/small-biz/sme-sector/et-make-in-india-sme-regional-summit-thane-spotlights-resilience-innovation-and-inclusive-growth/articleshow/122152485.cms

[50] *(PDF) Regulating AI in Financial Services: Legal Frameworks and Compliance Challenges*. (2025, May 13). ResearchGate. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/391662562_Regulating_AI_in_Financial_Services_Legal_Frameworks_and_Compliance_Challenges

[51] *Regulatory approaches to Artificial Intelligence in finance* (OECD Artificial Intelligence Papers). (2024a). Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD). https://doi.org/10.1787/f1498c02-en

[52] *Regulatory approaches to Artificial Intelligence in finance* (OECD Artificial Intelligence Papers 24; OECD Artificial Intelligence Papers, Vol. 24). (2024b).

https://doi.org/10.1787/f1498c02-en

[53] *Request for Information on Uses, Opportunities, and Risks of Artificial Intelligence in the Financial Services Sector*. (2024a, June 12). Federal Register. https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2024/06/12/2024-12336/request-for-information-on-uses-opportunities-and-risks-of-artificial-intelligence-in-the-financial

[54] *Request for Information on Uses, Opportunities, and Risks of Artificial Intelligence in the Financial Services Sector*. (2024b, June 12). Federal Register. https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2024/06/12/2024-12336/request-for-information-on-uses-opportunities-and-risks-of-artificial-intelligence-in-the-financial

[55] Samtani, M. (2025, July 18). *Japan to Phase in ISSB-Aligned Disclosure and Assurance from 2027*. Regulation Asia. https://www.regulationasia.com/articles/japan-to-phase-in-issb-aligned-disclosure-and-assurance-from-2027

[56] Sarfo, N. A. (n.d.). *U.S. Lawmakers Ponder A Remittance Tax*. Forbes. Retrieved July 1, 2025, from https://www.forbes.com/sites/taxnotes/2025/06/16/us-lawmakers-ponder-a-remittance-tax/

[57] *Tax Incentives Principles*. (n.d.). Retrieved August 9, 2025, from https://www.oecd.org/en/events/public-consultations/2024/12/tax-incentives-principles.html

[58] *The Evolving Landscape of AI Regulation in Financial Services | Insights & Resources | Goodwin*. (n.d.-a). Retrieved July 2, 2025, from https://www.goodwinlaw.com/en/insights/publications/2025/06/alerts-finance-fs-the-evolving-landscape-of-ai-regulation

[59] *The Evolving Landscape of AI Regulation in Financial Services | Insights & Resources | Goodwin*. (n.d.-b). Retrieved July 19, 2025, from https://www.goodwinlaw.com/en/insights/publications/2025/06/alerts-finance-fs-the-evolving-landscape-of-ai-regulation

[60] *The Future of Tax Incentives | Financing for Sustainable Development Office*. (n.d.). Retrieved August 9, 2025, from https://financing.desa.un.org/capacity-development/voices/tax-talks/future-tax-incentives

[61] *Treasury Announces Enhanced Fraud Detection Processes, Including Machine Learning AI, Prevented and Recovered Over $4 Billion in Fiscal Year 2024*. (2025a, February 8). U.S. Department of the Treasury. https://home.treasury.gov/news/press-releases/jy2650

[62] *Treasury Announces Enhanced Fraud Detection Processes, Including Machine Learning AI, Prevented and Recovered Over $4 Billion in Fiscal Year 2024*. (2025b, February 8). U.S. Department of the Treasury. https://home.treasury.gov/news/press-releases/jy2650

[63] Trump's "One Big Beautiful Bill Act": How remittance tax plan might deliver a big economic blow to US allies? (2025, May 19). *The Economic Times*. https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/international/global-trends/us-news-trumps-one-big-beautiful-bill-act-how-remittance-ta

x-plan-might-deliver-a-big-economic-blow-to-us-allies/articleshow/121290701.cms

[64] Turner, A. (2024a, March 1). AI Compliance and Regulation: What Financial Institutions Need to Know. *ABA Banking Journal*. https://bankingjournal.aba.com/2024/03/ai-compliance-and-regulation-what-financial-institutions-need-to-know/

[65] Turner, A. (2024b, March 1). AI Compliance and Regulation: What Financial Institutions Need to Know. *ABA Banking Journal*. https://bankingjournal.aba.com/2024/03/ai-compliance-and-regulation-what-financial-institutions-need-to-know/

[66] Turner, A. (2024c, March 1). AI Compliance and Regulation: What Financial Institutions Need to Know. *ABA Banking Journal*. https://bankingjournal.aba.com/2024/03/ai-compliance-and-regulation-what-financial-institutions-need-to-know/

[67] *UK Regulators Publish Approaches to AI Regulation in Financial Services | Insights | Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP*. (n.d.-a). Retrieved July 2, 2025, from https://www.skadden.com/insights/publications/2024/05/uk-regulators-publish-approaches-to-ai

[68] *UK Regulators Publish Approaches to AI Regulation in Financial Services | Insights | Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP*. (n.d.-b). Retrieved July 19, 2025, from https://www.skadden.com/insights/publications/2024/05/uk-regulators-publish-approaches-to-ai

[69] *Understanding AI Fraud Detection and Prevention Strategies | DigitalOcean*. (n.d.). Retrieved July 2, 2025, from https://www.digitalocean.com/resources/articles/ai-fraud-detection

[70] *What Is a Wire Transfer? How It Works, Safety, and Fees*. (n.d.). Investopedia. Retrieved July 2, 2025, from https://www.investopedia.com/terms/w/wiretransfer.asp

[71] *What Is the Dutch Disease? Origin of Term and Examples*. (n.d.). Investopedia. Retrieved July 2, 2025, from https://www.investopedia.com/terms/d/dutchdisease.asp

[72]