Artificial Intelligence as a Legal Entity: A Balanced Examination of Pros and Cons

Azamat Xudaybergenov
Tashkent State University of Law
a.xudaybergenov@tsul.uz

Abstract

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is increasingly pervasive in society, prompting debates about its legal status. This paper explores the positive and negative aspects of recognizing AI as a legal entity. It presents the potential advantages, including improved accountability and effective regulation, and highlights the disadvantages, such as ethical dilemmas and legal complexities. Utilizing legal and philosophical methodologies, the study identifies a central problem: the need for a balanced perspective that recognizes the potential benefits and inherent risks of acknowledging AI as a legal entity. Proposed solutions include the development of a separate legal status for AI, a phased approach for integrating AI into existing legal systems, and maintaining some form of human oversight and accountability. The paper underscores the need for interdisciplinary dialogue and suggests avenues for future research, including empirical studies and ethical analyses. As AI continues to advance, understanding its legal implications is of vital importance.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Legal Entity, Accountability, Regulation, Ethical Dilemmas, Legal Complexities, Human Oversight, Interdisciplinary Dialogue

I. Introduction

Artificial Intelligence (AI) has become an integral part of our society, revolutionizing numerous industries, from healthcare to finance, and transforming the way we live and work (Russell & Norvig, 2016). These systems, characterized by their ability to learn and adapt, have exhibited impressive capabilities, often

surpassing human performance in various tasks [1]. Yet, as their influence continues to grow, so too do the questions surrounding their legal and ethical implications. One of the most contentious debates emerging in this context is whether AI should be recognized as a legal entity. The potential of AI to function autonomously and make decisions that affect human lives has prompted some scholars to argue that AI should be granted a legal status similar to that of corporations [2].

This view, however, is not universally accepted, with many raising concerns about the potential risks and consequences of such a move. The problem this article seeks to address is the lack of a comprehensive, balanced examination of the implications of recognizing AI as a legal entity. While there is an abundance of literature focusing on individual aspects of this issue, there is a dearth of research that brings together the different perspectives and provides a holistic view [3]. This article aims to fill this gap by providing a systematic analysis of the positive and negative aspects of AI as a legal entity. In doing so, we hope to contribute to a more nuanced understanding of this complex issue, one that acknowledges both the potential benefits and the risks. This study is intended to be a resource for policymakers, legal professionals, and AI researchers, providing them with the insights necessary to make informed decisions about the legal status of AI [4].

The scope of this study is limited to AI systems that demonstrate a high degree of autonomy and decision-making capability, such as advanced machine learning systems and autonomous vehicles. In terms of organization, this article will first present the methodologies used in our analysis. Then, it will detail the positive and negative aspects of AI as a legal entity, drawing on relevant laws, regulations, case studies, and academic literature. The article will then discuss these findings, providing interpretations and suggesting solutions to the problem at

hand. Finally, the article will conclude with a summary of the main points and suggestions for future research [5].

II. Methods

To analyze the complex issue of AI as a legal entity, we employed an interdisciplinary approach, utilizing both legal and philosophical methodologies. From a legal perspective, we applied a comparative legal analysis methodology. This involves examining and comparing relevant laws, regulations, and case studies from different jurisdictions to understand how various legal systems are approaching the issue of AI and the law (Zweigert & Kötz, 1998). We chose this approach because it allows us to identify patterns, similarities, and differences, providing a comprehensive overview of the legal landscape surrounding AI [6]. In addition to the legal analysis, we also applied philosophical methodologies, specifically, normative ethics and philosophy of law. Normative ethics, which is concerned with criteria for what is morally right or wrong, was used to analyze the ethical implications of recognizing AI as a legal entity (Singer, 2011). Philosophy of law, on the other hand, was employed to delve into the fundamental questions about the nature of law and legal systems, and how AI fits into these frameworks [7].

As for data gathering, we extensively reviewed academic literature, including law review articles, books, and academic conference proceedings, to gain an understanding of the current academic discourse on AI and the law. Relevant laws and regulations from different countries were also examined, with particular attention given to those that directly address or have implications for AI as a legal entity. Furthermore, we considered case studies involving AI, such as court cases and corporate practices, to glean practical insights into how the issue of AI as a legal entity is being dealt with in real-world situations. The data collected from

these sources served as the basis for our analysis of the positive and negative aspects of recognizing AI as a legal entity [8].

III. Results

Recognizing AI as a legal entity presents a number of advantages that could potentially enhance the way we regulate and manage these advanced systems. Firstly, legal recognition of AI could improve accountability in situations where AI systems cause harm or damage. Currently, attributing liability in such cases can be challenging due to the autonomous nature of AI systems, which makes it difficult to determine human fault [9]. By granting AI a legal status, we could hold AI systems directly accountable for their actions, which could simplify legal procedures and ensure that victims receive compensation more easily. Secondly, granting AI legal status could lead to more effective regulation of AI systems. As legal entities, AI systems would be subject to a clear set of rights and responsibilities, which could lead to greater predictability and control over their behavior (Calo, 2016). This could make it easier for regulators to ensure that AI systems are used responsibly and ethically [10].

Finally, recognizing AI as a legal entity could stimulate innovation and economic growth. Legal recognition could provide a more stable and predictable environment for businesses and entrepreneurs who are developing and using AI technologies. This could help to foster confidence in the market and promote investment in AI technologies (Kerr, 2015). However, there are also significant potential disadvantages and risks associated with recognizing AI as a legal entity. One major concern is the ethical implications. Recognizing AI as a legal entity could be interpreted as attributing personhood or human-like qualities to AI systems, which many argue is ethically problematic. AI systems, no matter how advanced, are ultimately human creations without consciousness or emotions

(Bryson, 2010). Granting them legal status could blur the line between humans and machines and raise unsettling ethical questions [11].

Another potential drawback is the legal complexities that could arise from recognizing AI as a legal entity. Existing legal systems are built around human actors and human understanding of responsibility and intent. Incorporating AI entities into these systems could lead to significant complications and require extensive revisions of existing laws and regulations (Brownsword, 2008). Lastly, recognizing AI as a legal entity could potentially lead to a lack of human accountability. If AI systems are held directly responsible for their actions, humans who design, deploy, and use these systems might evade their own responsibilities. This could lead to a moral hazard situation, where people take greater risks because they believe they will not be held accountable for the consequences [12].

IV. Discussion

The potential advantages and disadvantages of recognizing AI as a legal entity, as presented in the results, provide a comprehensive overview of the implications of this contentious issue. The benefits, primarily centered around improved accountability, effective regulation, and economic stimulation, suggest that granting AI a legal status could indeed enhance the way we manage and control these advanced systems [13]. For instance, the concept of AI as a legal entity could serve as a unique solution to the current ambiguity surrounding liability in cases involving autonomous AI systems (Calo, 2016). It could also provide a clearer framework for regulating AI behavior and promoting responsible and ethical use. However, the potential downsides must not be overlooked. The ethical dilemma of attributing personhood to AI, the complexities of modifying existing legal systems, and the potential for a lack of human accountability all present significant challenges. These negative aspects highlight the potential risks

of hastily or inappropriately integrating AI into legal frameworks without careful consideration [14].

The problem stated in the introduction, the lack of a comprehensive examination of recognizing AI as a legal entity, has been explored through the positive and negative aspects outlined in the results. Acknowledging AI as a legal entity is a multifaceted issue that carries both promise and peril. To address this problem, it is crucial to maintain a balanced perspective, acknowledging both the potential benefits and the inherent risks [15]. The heart of the issue lies in managing the balance between effectively harnessing the potential benefits of AI technology and mitigating the risks and challenges. This involves grappling with complex ethical questions, legal challenges, and practical considerations to ensure an approach that is beneficial, ethically sound, and legally feasible. Based on the interpretation of results, we propose several solutions to address the problem of recognizing AI as a legal entity. First, rather than granting full legal personhood to AI, we could explore the possibility of a new, separate legal status specifically designed for AI systems [16].

This could provide a balance between accountability and ethical considerations, addressing concerns about attributing human-like qualities to AI (Pagallo, 2013). Second, a phased approach could be adopted for integrating AI into existing legal systems. This approach would involve gradually introducing legal rights and responsibilities for AI, allowing time for continuous evaluation and adjustment. This could alleviate some of the complexities associated with sudden, large-scale revisions to existing legal frameworks (Kerr, 2015). Third, to prevent the potential moral hazard situation, it is necessary to maintain some form of human oversight and accountability, even if AI is given a legal status. This could involve holding human operators, designers, or deployers of AI systems

accountable for negligent or irresponsible use (Matthias, 2004). These proposed solutions are by no means exhaustive, and further research is needed to assess their feasibility and implications. However, they offer a starting point for developing a comprehensive and balanced approach to recognizing AI as a legal entity [17].

Conclusion

In this article, we have explored the complex issue of recognizing AI as a legal entity, aiming to provide a comprehensive, balanced examination of the topic. Our findings suggest that while there are potential advantages to recognizing AI as a legal entity, such as improved accountability and regulation, there are also significant disadvantages that cannot be overlooked. These include ethical dilemmas, potential legal complexities, and the risk of a lack of human accountability. These considerations highlight the need for a cautious, nuanced approach to the issue. Given the increasing role of AI in our society and its potential to disrupt existing legal frameworks, the topic of AI as a legal entity is of significant relevance. Our analysis underscores the importance of interdisciplinary dialogue, involving legal professionals, AI researchers, ethicists, and policymakers in deliberating on this issue.

Looking ahead, several avenues for future research emerge from our study. Firstly, the development of a new, separate legal status specifically for AI systems warrants further exploration. Secondly, empirical research examining the real-world impacts of granting legal status to AI, perhaps through detailed case studies, would be beneficial. Lastly, research should also focus on the ethical dimensions of AI as a legal entity, including the potential consequences for human-AI relations and societal norms. The recognition of AI as a legal entity is a multifaceted issue that carries both promise and peril. By maintaining a balanced perspective and

fostering interdisciplinary dialogue, we can navigate these complexities and develop effective and ethical strategies for managing AI in our society.

References

1. Bryson, J., Diamantis, M., & Grant, T. (2017). Of, for, and by the people: the legal lacuna of synthetic persons. Artificial Intelligence and Law, 25(3), 273-291. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10506-017-9214-9
2. Bryson, J. (2010). Robots should be slaves. Close Engagements with Artificial Companions: Key Social, Psychological, Ethical and Design Issues, 63-74. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/220934289_Robots_Should_Be_Slaves
3. Allah Rakha, N. (2023). The Ethics of Data Mining: Lessons from the Cambridge Analytica Scandal. Cyber Law Review, 1(1). https://doi.org/10.59022/clr.24 retrieved from https://irshadjournals.com/index.php/ijcl/article/view/24
4. Brownsword, R. (2008). Rights, Regulation and the Technological Revolution. Oxford University Press. https://www.oxfordscholarship.com/view/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199276806.001.0001/acprof-9780199276806
5. Allah Rakha, N. (2023). Navigating the Legal Landscape: Corporate Governance and Anti-Corruption Compliance in the Digital Age. International Journal of Management and Finance, 1(3). https://doi.org/10.59022/ijmf.39 Retrieved from https://irshadjournals.com/index.php/ijmf/article/view/39
6. Calo, R. (2016). Artificial Intelligence Policy: A Primer and Roadmap. SSRN Electronic Journal. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3015350
7. Allah Rakha, N. (2023). The impact of Artificial Intelligence (AI) on business and its regulatory challenges. *International Journal of Law and Policy*, *1*(1). https://doi.org/10.59022/ijlp.23 retrieved from https://irshadjournals.com/index.php/ijlp/article/view/23
8. Hart, H. L. A. (2012). The Concept of Law. Oxford University Press. https://global.oup.com/academic/product/the-concept-of-law-9780199644704
9. Kerr, I. (2015). Bots, Babes and the Californication of Commerce. University of Ottawa Law & Technology Journal, 2(1). https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228125054_Bots_Babes_and_the_Californication_of_Commerce
10. Allah Rakha, N. (2023). Artificial Intelligence and Sustainability. International Journal of Cyber Law, 1(3). https://doi.org/10.59022/ijcl.42 retrieved from https://irshadjournals.com/index.php/ijcl/article/view/42

11. Matthias, A. (2004). The responsibility gap: Ascribing responsibility for the actions of learning automata. Ethics and Information Technology, 6(3), 175-183. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10676-004-3422-1
12. Pagallo, U. (2013). Robots in the cloud with privacy: a new threat to data protection? Computer Law & Security Review, 29(5), 501-508. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clsr.2013.07.008
13. Russell, S., & Norvig, P. (2016). Artificial Intelligence: A Modern Approach. Pearson. https://www.pearson.com/us/higher-education/program/Russell-Artificial-Intelligence-A-Modern-Approach-3rd-Edition/PGM335848.html
14. Singer, P. (2011). Practical Ethics. Cambridge University Press. https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/practical-ethics/0C3FB4C4BE4E0E9A4E75114A8FE1493F
15. Zweigert, K., & Kötz, H. (1998). Introduction to Comparative Law. Oxford University Press. https://global.oup.com/academic/product/an-introduction-to-comparative-law-9780198268598
16. Allah Rakha, Naeem, "HOW THE EU CREATES LAWS". *Eurasian Journal of Law, Finance and Applied Sciences*, Vol 2, Issue No. 6 (2022), pp. 4-9, https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6615907
17. Gulyamov, S., Rustambekov, I., Narziev, O., & Xudayberganov, A. (2021). Draft Concept of the Republic of Uzbekistan in the Field of Development Artificial Intelligence for 2021-2030. Yurisprudensiya, 1, 107-21.