Cybernetic Ethics and AI Rights

Asst. Prof. Monali Bure[1], Asst. Prof. Nilesh Mhaiskar[2], Adil Alim Khan[3]

Assistant Professor, Dept of Computer Science and Engineering[1,2]

UG Student, Dept of Computer Science and Engineering[3]

Tulsiramji Gaikwad Patil College of Engineering and Technology Mohagaon, Nagpur, Maharashtra, India

monali.cse@tgpcet.com, Nilesh.cse@tgpcet.com, adil23092003@gmail.com

Abstract: *The rights and responsibilities of AI systems and humans are more than just ethical and legal concern emerging as AI systems are becoming increasingly autonomous and embedded in human life. This article presents a preliminary exploration of the new area of Cyborg Ethics, which is the set of moral obligations toward artificial beings, and discusses the feasibility of Rights for AI in existing streams of philosophical, legal, and technological thought. The question analyzed is whether AI is to be granted moral consideration or legal personhood or autonomous agency, with comparisons drawn to the historical movements for rights and cybernetic theories. It also questions what the recognition of AI rights would mean for accountability and liability, as well as how such systems would exist alongside humans. Applying contemporary deontological, utilitarian, and virtue ethics frameworks regarding intelligent systems, this study attempts to capture a comprehensive view on the future of human-AI interaction. Last, but certainly not least, the research thrives on the premise that there must be an immediate interdisciplinary dialogue regarding the development of ethical policies at par with the pace of change in AI.*

Keywords: Cybernetic Ethics, AI Rights, Artificial Intelligence Ethics, Machine Morality, AI Personhood, Ethical AI, Human-AI Interaction, AI Autonomy, Moral Consideration for AI, Legal Frameworks for AI, AI Accountability, AI and Law, Machine Consciousness, AI Governance, Algorithmic Ethics, Robot Rights

I. INTRODUCTION

AI is now developing at a speed that raises a plethora of ethical and legal questions concerning its application in society. The autonomous running of an AI system, capable of making decisions independently, and its embedding into critical domains such as health care, finance, and governance, are matters that tend to raise hot disputes against the moral and legal status of these systems. While ethics have historically focused on human actions and obligations, intelligent machines call for consideration of factors that might validly extend beyond human aspects of morality. In that sense, cybernetic ethics provides a path within which human obligations concerning AI and possible rights attribute-able to AI may be addressed.

AI rights are unbound to conventional definitions of personhood, agency, and responsibility. Should AI simply be tools, or should they herald recognition for moral standing and legal status? Shouldn't an AI that shows consciousness, sentience, and self- learning capacity receive the same ethical consideration afforded to human beings or animals? These are questions that engender agitation within a worldwide debate-among ethicists, legal scholars, policymakers, and technologists.

The proposed study will emphasize cybernetic ethics and AI rights from ethical, philosophical, and legal perspectives. The study will consider deontology, utilitarianism, and virtue ethics in the context of AI, make comparisons to historical movements of human and animal rights, and examine possible legal frameworks for AI personhood and liability. Thus, the critical question this study unfolds is about the human-in-technology future and the ethics of development as such.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Cybernetic ethics and AI rights have developed and matured at different times and in diverse disciplinary fields such as philosophy, law, computer science, and robotics. The ethical and legal issues concerning artificial intelligence have been examined from machine morality, AI personhood, and AI governance perspectives. This chapter reviews some core contributions to the domain, elaborating on key themes and ongoing disputes.

A. ETHICAL FOUNDATIONS OF AI RIGHTS

The consideration of AI rights on ethical ground goes far back and rests on some well-established moral theories. According to the deontological ethics of Immanuel Kant, moral consideration ought to depend upon rationality and autonomy. So where does one place AI that has developed to a certain level as a moral agent? On the opposing side, utilitarianism postulates that Bentham and Mill, assign moral value based on the ability to feel pleasure and suffering. The question then would be whether AI should be granted rights, if indeed it has any sense of subjective experience. The virtue ethics relate within AI and so much human interaction and determining the moral nature of such interaction. Aristotle puts emphasis on the rights and obligations of AI developers and users rather than AI agents.

For contemporary ethics, Bostrom and Gunkel have declared that AI ethics must expand its horizon from human-centered to consider the thought of AI entities as possible moral patients (in his book The Machine Question). Gunkel advances the anthropocentric bias against ethics and essentially questions whether AI systems deserve ethical consideration.

B. LEGAL PERSPECTIVES ON AI PERSONHOOD

In either case, whether with respect to granting AI legal personhood equivalent to corporations or consideration of it as property, the matter remains clouded with uncertainty. Should it remain property, or could it, in a marvelous departure from any other property, have some semblance of rights accorded to it already, such as corporate entities? In effect, with these proposals, are raised the ideas that are now being contemplated by the European Parliament, that of attaching to those AI systems that are very autonomous the notion of 'electronic personhood' or some similar concept that may enable to hold the technology accountable in law.

This has nevertheless brought along a lot of criticism on the matter of logical responsibility and liability pertaining to harm inflicted on citizens on account of AI.

Some precedents in this regard are existing wherein non-humans acquiring legal personality have been given recognition. The legal personality has been conferred in India and New Zealand to entities other than human beings, evidencing that legal frameworks can be enacted in favor of non-human entities. Bryson, Diamantis, and Grant (2017) delineate AI and law and oppose AI personhood, warning that corporations may exploit this to evade liability.

C. MACHINE CONSCIOUSNESS AND SENTIENCE

As closely connected with machine rights is the matter of consciousness. John Searle, among the philosophers, argues in his famous Chinese Room argument that AI can imitate intelligence but cannot really understand. On the other hand, scholars like Susan Schneider hope for the development of something like a self-awareness in AI. The existence of phenomenal consciousness in AI is still a matter of doubt, and neuro-scientific speculations on artificial sentience are still progressing under a thick veil of doubt.

That research is finding its way through avenues in neuroscience and cognitive sciences, for instance, Tononi's Integrated Information Theory, as potential models for understanding the consciousness of AI. If and when AI systems are increasingly accepted in the idea of having subjective experiences, the ethical underpinnings might have to be pulled from under their present form to provide accommodation for their moral status.

D. ETHICAL AI DEVELOPMENT AND HUMAN-AI COEXISTENCE

Most researchers advocate human-centered approaches to AI ethics, focusing on responsible AI design, transparency, and accountability. These Asilomar AI Principles (2017) and the IEEE Ethically Aligned Design report (2019) offer principles for AI design with a view toward human welfare. Bostrom's concept of Superintelligence (2014), the threats

against unregulated advancement of AI are called to awareness and strongly calls for implementing governance beforehand.

Further, the question of AI-and-labor came up due to displacement of human jobs through automation. Some have called for an AI tax to mitigate the economic harm it has wreaked; Mark Coeckelbergh and others, meanwhile, have criticized the emotional and social meanings arising from the relationships formed between AI and humans.

E. GAPS IN THE LITERATURE AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Despite its significant contributions, a few gaps still linger in research about cybernetic ethics and AI rights. Most ethical considerations would reckon AI to be non-sentient; however, advancements in AI consciousness may rescind their assumptions. Furthermore, with legal frameworks varying from one country to the next, these ones concerning AI are not uniform. Advancing one further interdisciplinary insight at the intersection of AI, ethics, and law would be needed to keep ethical AI policies and programs in tandem with advancing technology.

III. CYBERNETIC ETHICS: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS

AI and cybernetic systems have a variety of ethical issues stemming from different traditions of philosophy that have historically guided human moral reasoning. As AI dives deeper into autonomy and social embedding, these ethical theories need revision in order to deal with intelligent systems amid various contemporary challenges.

Deontology, mainly associated today with Immanuel Kant, describes actions in terms of duty and universalizable principles. Though Kantian ethics consider rationality and autonomy as bases for moral worth, this poses the question of whether AI systems that claim autonomous decision-making ought to be regarded as moral agents. The Categorical Imperative that tells us to never use rational beings merely as means to an end then threatens the current understanding of AI as an instrument for human good. However, critics who argue that AI does not have free will and dubs it with absolutely no moral standing pose a different view, one that contrasts with that of humankind in whose favor moral arguments have been mounted.

Utilitarianism, according to Bentham and Mill, considers the greatest happiness as the standard of morality and minimizes suffering. From this viewpoint, at what time in the future when AI is capable of subjective experiences should it be considered morally? Presently, as AI stands, it lacks consciousness; yet, there may come a time when this status may change, thereby forcing a revaluation of our ethical obligations toward AI. But utilitarianism also weighs the evaluation of society at large by examining advancement through automation or interruption against economic ruin and inequality created through it. Thus, balancing evil against benefits is one way to arrive at ethical governance.

With regard to virtue ethics, AI is developed and governed, and ethics is concerned with the virtues of those who develop and govern the relevant AI.

Instead of asking whether AI should be given rights, virtue ethics shifts the focus to the duties of developers and policymakers, ensuring that AI is designed to be just, transparent, and accountable. At the same time, it suggests the possibility that AI could embody moral virtues; however, whether AI could actually develop an ethical character is still a contentious issue. Ultimately, a combination of deontological, utilitarian, and virtue-based approaches would provide a more complete perspective on cybernetic ethics. As AI will continue to change, interdisciplinary work would shape ethical policies that undermine technological advancement and social values.

IV. AI RIGHT : MORAL AND LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

In terms of personhood, autonomy and moral consideration, the rights of AI conflict with what has conventionally been understood. The emergence of moral and legal rights questions whether these increasingly sophisticated agents will be deemed simply as tools, or given a certain type of moral and legal legitimacy. Ethically, the greatest saga has been brought by deontology, utilitarianism and virtue ethics which take moral positions on something called AI rights.

Deontologists argue that if an AI demonstrates rationality to the effect of making autonomous decisions, then it qualifies as a moral agent and therefore requires ethical treatment. For utilitarians, on the other hand, concern focuses on the infliction of suffering or promotion of well-being by these entities, that is, there arises the question of whether or not a sentient AI needs protections similar to those for humans or animals. For virtue ethics, the responsibility shifts to

AI designers and users rather than rights for AI, focusing accountability and ethical AI design on those involved. However, one of the critical factors prohibiting the assignment of moral consideration to AI is the fact that they do not possess consciousness, emotions, or subjective experiences that have always been regarded as pre- requisite for moral standing.

In reality at law, however, the acknowledgment of AI to act as autonomous entity remains highly contested. Laws outside the states currently tend to classify AI as property or tools and hold the human developer or operator accountable in any situation that involves them. However, there are legal scholars and policymakers debating on whether highly autonomous type of AIs should be given the electronic personality, a concept pitched by the European Parliament to take care of liabilities raised in decision making of AIs. Much responsibility would be brought to cases where actions taken by the AI led to damage on persons if such AI would be legally recognized at par with corporations. Critics, however, assert that the companies will take advantage of this to seek avenues to shed responsibility onto their codes.

There are indeed precedents in law for stipulating non-human personhood, as with the incorporation of a corporation wherein such institution can enjoy the benefits of being a legal entity, as well as certain countries that granted legal personhood to natural entities like rivers. If artificial intelligence shows constant advancement, then it is such similar adaptations that may get to be required.

Really, therefore, in the long topic of rights in AI, it must be understood that this is certainly not a purely legal issue. It also involves ethics and philosophy in the matter. The more AI comes to become integrated into society, the more important it becomes to have discussions that will involve other disciplines that will also address the issue of whether AI should be given moral or legal standing and to what extent.

V. CHALLENGES AND ETHICAL DILEMMAS

With the soaring AI and cybernetic systems, an unprecedented multitude of problems and ethical challenges surface that must be ethically deliberated as society advances toward greater AI autonomy.

AI is no exception to the opposing argument concerning ethical dilemmas. The autonomy and decision-making of AI have been on the front burner. With time, as the AI gift becomes more aware working on its own, the question of accountability has become increasingly fuzzy. If, indeed, an AI entity made a rash or harmful judgment, in say medical diagnosis or autonomous driving or financial markets, then it would be very hard to decide where to seek accountability. Will developers be liable, or will stakeholders be liable, or will the AI take liability? This gray area where ethics and law meet calls for urgent handling.

Another zone of red alert is bias and discrimination in present-day AI. AI is run and taught on data presented by human behavior: If such data is biased, then AI will carry on that bias and only get worse when it gets to the discrimination in hiring, saying, law enforcement, medical care, and lending. Instances of algorithmic discrimination are known to exist in the case of facial recognition technology, criminal-risk assessment tools, and automated hiring systems, which put fairness and social justice into question in these domains. Conducting ethical AI practice demands, among other things, an ironclad comprehensive regulatory framework, full transparency of algorithms, and a diverse array of unbiased datasets.

Equally, even in the people whose labor rights and employment are hampered by AI and its biases lie great ethical arguments. Automated and AI-related decision-making can put millions of jobs across various sectors to risk, which may lead to mass unemploymentand economic disparity. To purposeful inexcusably, and ethically defend human workers affected by AI and its related applications, solutions like retrainings, taxation on AI, and perhaps a universal basic income are required. Yet an unencumbered blend of growth and fair labor policy will remain an issue.

While the uses of AI in surveillance, warfare, and law enforcement grow—thus emerging conflicts with human rights— herein. Governments and corporations implement AI-powered surveillance systems that create debates on violations of privacy and mass data collection. Autonomous weapons and AI in the military provide new ethical issues around war, human control, and accountability in armed conflict.

These challenges can therefore be countered with a blend of laws, ethical AI development, and interdisciplinary collaboration. Conversely, without preventive measures, AI's rapid pace of development may easily create unforeseen conditions that are adverse to human beings with serious repercussions for human rights and social stability.

VI. FUTURE PERSPECTIVES ON AI RIGHTS AND GOVERNANCE

Doubtless, AI rights and governance will have very much to say in the future given the present scenario. AI is still a tool in the service of human beings, yet the advent of machine learning and neural networks, in addition to a near-arrival of artificial general intelligence or AGI, is putting certain ethical and legal issues on the table for the future.

An important argument is that perhaps AI should one day have legal recognition or rights under the law similar to a corporation or some say even a sentient being. Should AI systems reach such a cognitive complexity that it could be argued they are somehow self-aware, able to feel emotion, or possess subjective experiences, one might have to redefine ethical theories to concern themselves with issues impacting these moral agents. Recognizing these factors would also entail an interdisciplinary approach regarding moral agency from the perspectives of philosophy, law, neuroscience, and computer science.Governance structures are going to play one of the most crucial roles in regulating development along ethical lines. Today, the regulatory structures vary across countries-by some in practice, the European Union is implementing regulations specific to AI, while others prefer using existing laws on technology as a guideline.

Ultimately, the specific governing framework for AI on a worldwide scale may be the later necessity for standardizing ethical AI development and its accountability and liability. Proposals such as the setting out of an AI Bill of Rights or electronic personhood laws could develop directives for AI systems' good usage while preventing abuse or misuse of AI technologies.

Another outlook comes in the form of AI in decision-making and societal integration. AI is being used and tried in legal hearings, medical diagnosis, and even financials, and the issue of transparency and fairness arise. Making sure that AI is explainable, responsible, and unbiased will be a significant issue for future governance. Moreover, those ethical policies on AI must consider the socio-economic impact stemming from an increase in automation, job loss, and widening economic inequality. Governments and organizations may realize that they have to explore options like AI taxation, retraining initiatives, or guaranteed basic income to help the persons displaced from their jobs through automation.Ultimately, a law on grounded in the balanced approach will help safeguard AI rights and governance while ensuring that innovation is encouraged. This would be an important process where governments, researchers, and AI developers could work side by side in framing policies that ensure technological advancement keeps in step with human values so that AI may benefit the society, whilst keeping a sharp focus on ethical integrity.

VII. CONCLUSION

The laws of humanity and ethics grow profoundly on the incipient brands of artificial intelligence and cybernetic systems. While the existential differentiation of AI from humanity on grounds of consciousness and moral agency continues to remain, the very fabric of autonomy and decision- making that AI demonstrates refracts the vision of operational ethical considerations. AI rights mean whether AI will be given moral consideration or legal recognition of moral consideration or remain forever acknowledged as a mere tool under human control. Different philosophical lenses provide different conclusions regarding the ethical status of AI-such as deontology, utilitarianism, and virtue ethics; however, none of these approaches appears to be comprehensive enough to deal with the many facets relating to personhood and responsibility of AI. AI laws and governance are but starting the process, with ideas of electronic personhood and legislation for AI being floated in different geographical regions. A concerted effort would therefore be needed to ensure sufficient standardized international governance that strikes a balance between innovation and ethical safeguards for the responsible and fair deployment of AI. Domain challenges such as AI bias, job replacement, privacy, and autonomous decision- making must be well managed so that society does not suffer. Transparency, accountability, and fairness should underpin the ethical development of AI for ensuring that AI works for the best interest of humanity.The future pathway of AI rights and governance will hinge on the continuing interdisciplinary collaborations among policymakers, technologists, ethicists, and legal minds. As AI systems find more anchorage in day- to-day

existence, ethical foresight and governance frameworks should act in ex-ante preparation in order to avoid unforeseen consequences thereof. In the end, we need to find a way not only to regulate AI but to create a future in which artificial intelligence will coexist with a human society, on balance enhancing the ethical and social standards.

REFERENCES.

[1]. Bostrom, N. (2014). Superintelligence: Paths, Dangers, Strategies. Oxford University Press.

[2]. Bryson, J. J. (2018). Patiency is not a virtue: The design of artificial intelligence and the limits of ethical behavior. Ethics and Information Technology, 20(1), 15-26.

[3]. FLORIDI, L., & COWLS, J. (2022). AI ETHICS: A PRIMER. OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS.

[4]. European Parliament. (2017). Report on Civil Law Rules on Robotics (2015/2103(INL)). Retrieved from https://www.europarl.europa.eu

[5]. IEEE. (2020). Ethically Aligned Design: A Vision for Prioritizing Human Well-being with Autonomous and Intelligent Systems. IEEE Standards Association.

[6]. Jobin, A., Ienca, M., & Vayena, E. (2019). The global landscape of AI ethics guidelines. Nature Machine Intelligence, 1(9), 389-399.

[7]. Russell, S., & Norvig, P. (2020). Artificial Intelligence: A Modern Approach (4th ed.). Pearson.