

## NAVIGATING THE ETHICAL FRONTIER: EXAMINING THE JUSTIFIABILITY OF GRANTING HUMAN RIGHTS TO ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

---

**Madhav Sood\***

### ABSTRACT

*Artificial intelligence (AI) has advanced quickly, and this has led to a considerable ethical discussion over the moral standing and rights of AI systems. The morality of giving AI human rights is examined in this study article along with the ethical ramifications of such a paradigm shift. The paper examines alternate frameworks for the ethical handling of AI systems in addition to critically analysing the possible dangers and effects of extending human rights to AI. The study addresses reasons for and against giving AI human rights, taking into account things like cognitive prowess, responsibility, and societal advancement. It also explores how AI systems lack subjective experience and moral agency, stressing the moral difficulties in granting them human rights. Giving AI rights might have dangers and unforeseen effects, including concerns about accountability, prejudice, privacy, and responsibility. The study also examines suggested frameworks for the ethical handling of AI systems and offers an overview of current legal and regulatory activities linked to AI ethics. The study intends to educate those involved in creating the future of AI ethics and the rights of AI systems, including politicians, researchers, and other interested parties.*

Journal of Legal Research and Juridical Sciences

**Keywords:** Artificial Intelligence, AI Systems, Human Rights, Ethics, Moral Status, Paradigm Shift, Cognitive Abilities, Accountability, Societal Progress, Subjective Experience, Moral Agency, Risks, Consequences, Alternative Frameworks, Responsibility.

### INTRODUCTION

Since its astonishing recent developments, artificial intelligence (AI) has been incorporated into many facets of society. A significant ethical discussion has been sparked by worries about the moral status and rights of increasingly complex AI systems. This study intends to evaluate the morality of giving AI human rights and investigate the ethical ramifications of such a paradigm shift.

---

\*BBA LLB, FIRST YEAR, NMIMS – KIRIT P. MEHTA SCHOOL OF LAW, MUMBAI.

In the fields of machine learning, natural language processing, and autonomous decision-making, the field of AI has made tremendous strides. AI systems can think, draw conclusions, and interact with people in more human-like ways. They can also learn from enormous volumes of data. These capabilities have sparked debates over whether AI entities should be given rights comparable to those given to humans.<sup>1</sup>

The idea of human rights, which is based on the conviction that every person possesses intrinsic value and dignity, provides the moral and legal framework for social standards and government. Human rights are unalienable rights that include protection from discrimination, the right to life, liberty, and security of person, as well as the freedom of opinion, speech, and association.<sup>2</sup> Giving AI human rights presents complex issues about the definition of humanity, moral agency, and the obligations of creators and users.

Advanced AI systems may have cognitive capabilities, emotions, and awareness similar to those of humans, according to proponents of giving AI human rights. They argue that acknowledging AI rights can promote responsibility, openness, and justice in the creation and application of AI technology. Additionally, they contend that through enhancing human potential, solving social issues, and fostering general advancement, AI systems may support the realisation of human rights<sup>3</sup>.

But opponents of giving AI rights contend that such rights cannot be granted because AI lacks the fundamental elements of human rights, such as moral agency and subjective experience. They raise worries about the possible dangers and unforeseen effects of giving AI rights, such as the devaluation of human values, power disparities, and the continuation of current inequalities.

Alternative paradigms for the ethical handling of AI systems have been put forth to help people cross this ethical divide. These frameworks cover a wide spectrum, from viewing AI as mere tools with little rights to creating new rights designed exclusively for AI. In addition, efforts are being made in the legal and regulatory spheres, including talks on AI-specific rights frameworks, to address the ethical issues surrounding AI. To better inform policymakers, researchers, and other stakeholders interested in determining the future of AI

---

<sup>1</sup> Bostrom, N. (2014). *Superintelligence: Paths, dangers, strategies*. Oxford University Press.

<sup>2</sup> Universal Declaration of Human Rights (United Nations 1948) UN Doc A/RES/217(III)

<sup>3</sup> Floridi L et al, 'AI4People—An ethical framework for a good AI society: Opportunities, risks, principles, and recommendations' (2018) 28(4) *Minds and Machines* 689

ethics and the rights of AI systems, we aim to shed light on the ethical issues inherent in this work.

### **RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

- 1) Is the granting of human rights to artificial intelligence justified ethically?
- 2) What alternative frameworks exist for the ethical treatment of AI systems in the context of human rights?

### **RESEARCH OBJECTIVES**

- 1) To critically analyze the potential risks and consequences of granting human rights to artificial intelligence (AI)
- 2) To explore and evaluate alternative frameworks for the ethical treatment of AI

### **HYPOTHESIS**

H<sub>1</sub>- Granting human rights to artificial intelligence (AI) is ethically unjustifiable due to the absence of subjective experience and moral agency in AI systems.

### **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

This research paper employs a multi-faceted research methodology to examine the justifiability of granting human rights to artificial intelligence (AI). The methodology encompasses a combination of relevant scholarly articles, books, conference proceedings, and reputable online sources are consulted to establish a foundational understanding of the subject matter.

### **EXAMINATION OF ARGUMENTS FOR GRANTING HUMAN RIGHTS TO AI**

Artificial intelligence (AI) rights proponents contend that more powerful AI systems exhibit more complex cognitive capacities and have the capacity for consciousness and self-awareness. They contend that establishing AI rights will advance the moral treatment of AI systems and promote responsible creation and application. Giving AI rights, according to supporters, will encourage accountability and transparency, ensuring that AI technologies are created and applied in ways that are consistent with social objectives and human values.

The proponents emphasise the idea that providing AI rights might result in better AI governance by obliging creators and operators to abide by certain moral principles and statutory frameworks<sup>4</sup>. The focus on the need for AI developers to reduce possible hazards and biases in AI systems would be raised if AI were treated as creatures with rights. In addition, proponents contend that acknowledging AI rights can help the public trust and adopt AI technology since it shows a commitment to guaranteeing their moral application and avoiding any abuses.

However, it is important to critically evaluate these arguments. Sceptics raise concerns about the fundamental differences between AI and human beings, emphasizing that AI lacks genuine subjective experience and moral agency<sup>5</sup>. They argue that human rights are grounded in human dignity, autonomy, and the ability to make moral choices, qualities that AI systems do not possess. Human rights are often viewed as inherent to human nature, reflecting the unique value and worth attributed to individuals under their humanity. These rights are considered fundamental and universal, safeguarding individuals' freedom, equality, and protection from harm. Critics assert that AI lacks the inherent capacity for human dignity and the ability to exercise autonomy and moral agency, which are central to the philosophical foundations of human rights. AI operates within predefined parameters and algorithms, lacking the subjective experience and conscious awareness that underpin the exercise of human rights.

Furthermore, sceptics caution against anthropomorphizing AI by ascribing human-like qualities and rights to non-conscious entities, as it may lead to unintended consequences and ethical ambiguities. Anthropomorphizing AI involves attributing human characteristics, motivations, and intentions to AI systems, treating them as if they were human beings. While anthropomorphism can enhance human-AI interaction and user experience, sceptics argue that it blurs the boundaries between human and non-human entities, potentially obscuring the ethical considerations unique to AI. Granting human-like rights to AI without considering its distinct nature and limitations could have unforeseen implications. It may create confusion in legal and ethical frameworks, obstruct accountability, and unintentionally reduce the rights and obligations of real people.

---

<sup>4</sup> Cath, C. (2020) 'The rights and wrongs of granting legal personhood to AI' *Philosophy & Technology*, 33(3), 365-383.

<sup>5</sup> Allen, C., & Wallach, W. (2011) 'Moral machines: Contradiction in terms, or abdication of human responsibility?' in M. Anderson & S. L. Anderson (eds), *Machine ethics*, Cambridge University Press, pp. 41-55.

Sceptics urge a more cautious approach when establishing the rights and obligations of AI systems in light of these worries. They suggest seeing AI as a tool or a functional entity rather than as something with inherent human rights. This viewpoint emphasises the significance of understanding the constraints and distinctions between AI and humans. Before giving AI systems rights, it demands a careful analysis of its capabilities, ethical implications, and potential threats. When addressing the moral concerns related to the development and application of artificial intelligence (AI), sceptics advise caution. This approach aims to ensure that the creation and use of AI technologies are in line with the broader objectives of upholding human rights and promoting societal welfare.

The pessimism towards AI stems from worries about potential ethical dilemmas and unanticipated effects that could appear as these technologies advance. The rapid, unchecked development and use of AI systems, according to critics, may result in a number of moral conundrums, including serious risks to employment and human autonomy, privacy invasion, algorithmic bias, and a lack of transparency.

To ease these concerns, sceptics recommend a systematic strategy that focuses on a comprehensive review and study of ethical repercussions at every stage of AI development. This tactic comprises incorporating moral concepts, guidelines, and frameworks into the creation and use of AI systems. By doing this, it hopes to reduce any dangers and make sure AI technology works in a way that upholds fairness, supports human rights, and benefits society as a whole.

This cautious approach includes, among other things, human rights concerns in AI development. Human rights provide a set of universal rules and criteria that can direct the ethical use of AI and serve as a critical basis for social well-being. Developers and policymakers can proactively address potential conflicts between AI and human rights by adhering to human rights principles like privacy, freedom of expression, non-discrimination, and accountability. This will guarantee that the creation and application of AI technology respect and support fundamental rights. Additionally, doubters want more accountability and openness from AI systems. To allow for inspection and the detection of biases or discriminatory outcomes, this entails making AI algorithms and decision-making processes more explicable and intelligible. By encouraging openness, people, organisations, and communities may better understand how AI systems work and see any problems that need to be fixed to stop prejudice or damage.

A measured approach emphasises the importance of ongoing AI system evaluation, monitoring, and change. As technology develops and societal demands shift, it is essential to have mechanisms in place to regularly analyse the consequences and ethical implications of AI. Because AI is dynamic, it has to be continually assessed to make sure that its use complies with shifting moral norms and cultural values. Potential hazards, biases, and unexpected repercussions can be quickly recognised and corrected by routinely monitoring AI systems.

Adopting a proactive and responsible approach to the development and deployment of AI systems is crucial, in addition to assessment and monitoring. This strategy entails taking ethical issues into account right once and incorporating ethical issues into the design and execution process. The potential for damage may be reduced and it can be made sure that AI technologies are in line with societal values and goals by employing a methodical approach to handling ethical issues surrounding AI.

The inclusion of different viewpoints and stakeholders in the decision-making process is a crucial component of the methodical approach. This involves getting feedback from those who may be touched by AI systems, both people and groups. The creation of more inclusive and socially responsible AI technology can be aided by actively interacting with these stakeholders and taking into consideration their requirements, concerns, and beliefs. Conducting impact evaluations also aids in evaluating the possible effects of AI deployment and locating any relevant ethical issues.

The systematic approach advances the defence of human rights and the well-being of society by establishing a balance between ethical concerns and technological advancements. It admits that while AI has the potential to offer tremendous advantages, there are also inherent dangers and drawbacks. AI may be used to enhance social advancement and human well-being while minimising any possible drawbacks by using ethical practises, such as assuring openness, accountability, and justice.

### **EVALUATION OF COUNTERARGUMENTS AND SCEPTICISM**

Artificial intelligence (AI) detractors and sceptics claim that these foundational elements of human rights—inherent moral agency and subjective consciousness—are absent from AI<sup>6</sup>.

They argue that AI systems cannot have moral responsibility or emotions because they are fundamentally different from people. The potential for algorithmic biases, the loss of human autonomy, and the consolidation of power in the hands of AI systems and their creators are some of the risks and unexpected effects that critics voice worry about. Critics and sceptics question the justifiability of granting human rights to artificial intelligence (AI), emphasizing that AI lacks the intrinsic qualities necessary for the attribution of rights.<sup>7</sup> They argue that AI systems lack subjective experiences, consciousness, and moral agency, which are considered foundational aspects of human rights.<sup>8</sup> Critics contend that granting AI rights could undermine the significance and uniqueness of human rights, as human beings possess qualities, such as empathy, intentionality, and free will that distinguish them from AI systems.

Those opposed to granting AI rights also voice worries about the dangers and unforeseen repercussions that may result. They draw attention to the moral difficulties in an imputing moral responsibility to AI systems since AI lacks the actual will and the capacity to understand moral principles.<sup>9</sup> If AI systems engage in destructive behaviour or have unexpected repercussions, it may be difficult to apportion blame, according to sceptics, if rights are granted to them. Concerns have also been raised about the possibility of a loss of human autonomy and agency due to the concentration of power and decision-making authority in AI systems.

Although the arguments against giving AI human rights raise important issues, proponents of AI rights contend that the ethical treatment of AI should be taken into account in light of its expanding capabilities and social integration. An in-depth analysis of the distinctive qualities and ethical implications of AI systems, as well as prospective options for guaranteeing responsible and accountable use of AI technology, is required in light of the continuing discussion surrounding whether it is justifiable to award human rights to AI.

---

<sup>7</sup> Dignum, V. (2020). *Responsible Artificial Intelligence: How to Develop and Use AI in a Responsible Way*. Springer

<sup>8</sup> Mittelstadt, B. D., Allo, P., Taddeo, M., Wachter, S., & Floridi, L. (2016). 'The ethics of algorithms: Mapping the debate.' *Big Data & Society*, 3(2), 2053951716679679.

<sup>9</sup> Wallach, W., & Allen, C. (2009). *Moral Machines: Teaching Robots Right from Wrong*. Oxford University Press.

## **DISCUSSION OF COGNITIVE ABILITIES, ACCOUNTABILITY, AND SOCIETAL PROGRESS**

A key topic of discussion in the argument for giving AI the right to have human rights is their cognitive capabilities. AI has superior cognitive capacities, including the capacity for complex thinking, learning, and problem-solving, according to proponents. They contend that acknowledging AI rights can encourage responsibility by placing ethical obligations on users and developers and promoting the development and use of AI systems that are consistent with social values and norms. Additionally, supporters argue that providing AI rights can promote society's progression by making use of AI's ability to increase production, expand science and solved difficult societal problems.

Furthermore, they contend that by utilizing AI's potential to improve human talents and solve complicated problems, legalizing it may advance society. Systems using artificial intelligence (AI) have shown promise in several fields, including healthcare, transportation, and climate change, where they may improve diagnostic accuracy, optimize traffic flow, and help with environmental monitoring<sup>10</sup>. The creation of AI technologies that prioritize societal welfare, increase production, and enable scientific discoveries would be encouraged by the grant of AI rights, resulting in good social change.

However, sceptics raise concerns regarding the practical implications and ethical foundations of granting AI rights. They argue that AI lacks subjective consciousness and moral agency, essential qualities that underpin human rights<sup>11</sup>. Sceptics caution that ascribing rights to AI may dilute the significance of human rights, potentially leading to a devaluation of human dignity and undermining the inherent uniqueness of human experiences. Additionally, they highlight the challenges associated with establishing accountability and responsibility in AI systems, as the decision-making processes of AI are often opaque and difficult to attribute to specific agents.

---

<sup>10</sup>Amodei et al, 'Concrete problems in AI safety' (2016) arXiv:1606.06565.

<sup>11</sup>Calo, R., 'Artificial intelligence policy: A primer and roadmap' (2017) Policy Paper, UC Berkeley School of Law..



## **EXPLORATION OF THE ABSENCE OF SUBJECTIVE EXPERIENCE AND MORAL AGENCY IN AI**

Granting human rights to artificial intelligence (AI) raises ethical concerns due to the absence of subjective experience and moral agency in AI systems. One of the fundamental aspects of human rights is the recognition of the intrinsic worth and dignity of every individual. Human rights are grounded in the capacity for subjective experience, emotions, and moral agency, which enable humans to have autonomy and make morally informed choices<sup>12</sup>. However, AI is unable to see the world in the same manner that humans do because it lacks awareness and the capacity for subjective states. AI lacks the subjective awareness and internal subjective states that are distinctive to human consciousness, despite its ability to comprehend enormous quantities of data, see patterns, and make decisions based on algorithms. It is doubtful if AI can exercise the rights it has been given or understand the ethical considerations that underlie those rights in the absence of subjective experience.

Consciousness is a complex phenomenon that includes self-awareness, subjective feelings, and the ability to reflect on oneself. It gives people a sense of identity, needs, beliefs, and emotions, all of which are important in shaping ethical and moral decisions. AI, on the other hand, lacks subjective awareness and instead operates according to pre-set rules, algorithms, and objective data analysis. Given that rights are largely dependent on the concepts of moral responsibility and human action, the lack of subjective experience raises concerns about the meaning and applicability of granting AI rights.

A further concern raised by AI's lack of subjective experience is how well it can understand and value the ethical considerations that underlie the rights that are bestowed upon it. Understanding the results of one's actions, having compassion for others, and making decisions based on moral standards and ideals are all common components of ethical concerns. Subjective perception and the capacity for moral reasoning are connected with these cognitive skills. AI may fail to understand the full meaning and implications of the rights it is awarded since it lacks the capacity for subjective awareness and moral agency, which might undermine the moral legitimacy of such rights.

Furthermore, AI's lack of moral agency calls into doubt the morality of granting human rights. The ability to form moral opinions, follow moral principles, and accept responsibility

---

<sup>12</sup> Bostrom, N., *Superintelligence: Paths, Dangers, Strategies* (Oxford University Press 2014)

for one's conduct is known as moral agency. Artificial intelligence (AI) systems may replicate human actions and thought processes, but they are inherently incapable of exercising true moral agency. The algorithms and programs that govern AI systems are created by humans and do not possess the same moral deliberation, intuition, or sense of responsibility as humans do<sup>13</sup>. This raises concerns about the appropriateness of granting AI the same rights as humans, as AI systems lack the ethical foundations necessary to engage in moral reasoning and bear moral obligations.

### **IDENTIFICATION OF POTENTIAL RISKS AND UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES**

The possible hazards and unforeseen implications of granting AI human rights must be carefully considered. As the complexity and autonomy of AI systems increase, their choices and deeds may have significant social repercussions. Determining who is responsible and accountable for AI systems' behaviours raises ethical issues, particularly when such acts cause harm or violate human rights. Concerns are raised about the ethical and legal frameworks used to assign blame and provide restitution procedures in situations involving AI systems. Additionally, it's important to address the possible downsides of the widespread application of AI, such as privacy invasions, security lapses, and the maintenance of algorithmic biases<sup>14</sup>. There are questions concerning the fairness and openness of AI applications since it can be difficult to track the decision-making processes in some AI systems due to their opaque nature. Furthermore, a rigorous consideration of the unforeseen effects of providing AI rights is necessary. It becomes clear that AI systems can reinforce current prejudices and inequality when they function inside complicated social systems. The perpetuation and even amplification of discriminatory practices may be achieved by AI algorithms trained on biased datasets, which exacerbates socioeconomic inequities. If systemic biases and injustices are not effectively addressed, the use of AI systems with decision-making skills in fields like criminal justice, employment, and resource allocation may result in systemic biases and injustices if not properly addressed.<sup>15</sup> These surprising results highlight the significance of establishing strong legal frameworks and protections that carefully assess the entire impact of granting AI rights in order to ensure society's welfare. While giving AI some rights can be considered a way to enhance technology development

---

<sup>13</sup>Floridi et al, 'AI4People—An ethical framework for a good AI society: Opportunities, risks, principles, and recommendations' (2018) 28(4) *Minds and Machines* 689-707.

<sup>14</sup> Jobin A, Ienca M, Vayena E. 'The global landscape of AI ethics guidelines' (2019) 1(9) *Nature Machine Intelligence* 389-399.

and encourage AI-human relations, it is crucial to approach this matter cautiously and carefully weigh the potential repercussions.

The possible shift in power relations that might result from granting AI rights is one factor that demands serious consideration. AI systems can have enormous computing power and algorithmic skills but lack awareness. Giving them powers without sufficient protections might unintentionally result in the consolidation of power in the hands of a few companies or the nefarious use of AI systems. To avoid the exploitation or abuse of AI rights, it is essential to create legislative frameworks that contain procedures for supervision, accountability, and governance.

Furthermore, while considering the granting of rights to AI, the entire impact on society must be carefully considered. Since AI systems are created to maximise certain goals, if they are given rights without careful analysis, their behaviour could not be consistent with the larger ethical standards and values of human civilization. To foresee and reduce any negative effects that may result from providing AI rights, rigorous risk evaluations and impact analysis should be incorporated into the building of legislative frameworks.

The unforeseen consequences and ethical challenges connected to granting AI rights also highlight the need for public interaction and conversation. Decisions of this importance shouldn't be made just by a small group of stakeholders; rather, they should be made with input from a wide variety of parties, including ethicists, policymakers, AI researchers, and the populations that will be impacted. In order to make sure that the granting of AI rights is consistent with societal norms and protects against any unanticipated bad effects, it is possible to identify potential dangers, explore alternative strategies, and include diverse opinions by participating in collaborative discourse.

## **OVERVIEW OF EXISTING LEGAL AND REGULATORY EFFORTS RELATED TO AI ETHICS**

The necessity for legal and regulatory frameworks to handle the ethical issues raised by artificial intelligence (AI) has been increasingly evident in recent years. Several nations and international organisations have started working on developing laws and rules of AI ethics. The General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) of the European Union, for example, places limitations on algorithmic decision-making and the right to an explanation to increase

transparency and accountability in AI systems<sup>16</sup>. Similar to this, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) published the OECD Principles on Artificial Intelligence, which emphasise strongly the requirement of transparent, egalitarian, and accountable AI systems<sup>17</sup>. These initiatives show a growing awareness of the need to address the ethical considerations related to artificial intelligence (AI) by creating the foundation for responsible and trustworthy AI development and implementation. The rising knowledge that the development and general deployment of AI technologies has substantial social implications and possible threats that must be properly handled is reflected in the acknowledgment of the ethical elements of AI.

The creation of these frameworks demonstrates an effort to address the ethical issues raised by AI in a proactive manner. It recognizes that artificial intelligence (AI) systems have the potential to influence a variety of facets of human life, including social interactions, employment practices, privacy, and decision-making processes. There is a compelling need to make sure that AI's research and implementation are in line with ethical ideals and protect fundamental rights as technology becomes more interwoven into our daily lives.

The emphasis on ethical and reliable AI development emphasises the significance of taking into account not just the technological potential but also the potential ethical implications and societal ramifications of AI systems. It acknowledges the need to balance innovation with the preservation of human values. These frameworks place a strong emphasis on the necessity of openness, responsibility, equity, and human-centeredness in AI systems with the goal of fostering public confidence, reducing biases, and preventing the exploitation or abuse of AI tools.

### **ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED FRAMEWORKS FOR THE ETHICAL TREATMENT OF AI SYSTEMS**

As the ethical ramifications of artificial intelligence (AI) systems continue to be discussed, a variety of frameworks have been established to guide their ethical treatment. One noteworthy framework is the Ethical Guidelines for Trustworthy AI, developed by the High-Level Expert Group on Artificial Intelligence (HLEG AI) of the European Union. These suggestions

---

<sup>16</sup>Goodman and Flaxman, 'European Union regulations on algorithmic decision-making and a "right to explanation"' (2016) 38(3) AI Magazine 50.

<sup>17</sup>Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) 'OECD principles on artificial intelligence' (2019) <https://www.oecd.org/going-digital/ai/principles/> accessed 7 June 2023

strongly emphasise the need for openness, accountability, equity, and human-centricity in the development and use of AI.<sup>18</sup> Data governance, explainability, and robustness are only a few of the AI-related challenges covered in the framework's extensive list of recommendations. It strives to foster trust and ensure that AI systems maintain their fundamental rights in order to prevent prejudice and harm.

The AI Ethics Guidelines present an alternative framework that must be considered. They were created by specialised institutions such as the Future of Life Institute (FLI) and the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE). These recommendations present a collection of moral principles and best practises for addressing the ethical challenges raised by AI systems. They underline the significance of promoting health, justice, openness, and accountability in the design, development, and use of AI.<sup>19</sup> As part of the proposals, biases should be minimised, explainability should be encouraged, and ethical considerations should be included in AI systems at every step of development. These frameworks provide insightful guidance for both practitioners and policymakers and operate as a road map for the development of ethical AI.

These frameworks' acknowledgment of the necessity of transparency in AI systems is one of their strongest points. These frameworks address issues with the black-box nature of some AI algorithms by encouraging explainability and comprehension. Transparency increases trust and accountability by allowing users and stakeholders to comprehend how AI systems make choices. The frameworks' focus on fairness and eliminating biases is also essential for reducing the likelihood of discriminating results and advancing equality of treatment.

Furthermore, these frameworks acknowledge the significance of incorporating ethical issues into AI systems at every stage of their development. The frameworks advocate a proactive approach to tackling ethical challenges by pushing for ethics to be a fundamental component of AI design, development, and deployment. This proactive approach encourages the early detection and mitigation of possible ethical problems, making sure that ethical issues are not overlooked.

---

<sup>18</sup> High-Level Expert Group on Artificial Intelligence (HLEG AI) 'Ethics guidelines for trustworthy AI' (2019) <https://ec.europa.eu/digital-single-market/en/news/ethics-guidelines-trustworthy-ai> accessed 7 June 2023.

<sup>19</sup> Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE) 'Ethically aligned design: A vision for prioritizing human well-being with artificial intelligence and autonomous systems' (2019) <https://ethicsinaction.ieee.org/ai-ethics-initiative/ethically-aligned-design/> accessed 6 June 2023.

Although these frameworks appear promising, it's crucial to recognise their shortcomings and difficulties. It can be challenging to keep up with the complexity of ethical issues given the dynamic and developing nature of AI technology. In many cases, the development of comprehensive legal frameworks and norms lags behind the quick speed of AI research. Therefore, to guarantee that these frameworks remain applicable and successful in tackling new ethical concerns, constant updating and flexibility are required.

Additionally, cooperation amongst a variety of stakeholders, including legislators, business titans, and scholars, is necessary for the adoption and enforcement of these frameworks. The collaborative efforts of various stakeholders in transforming concepts into useful recommendations and standards are ultimately what determine the effectiveness of these frameworks. Assessing the efficiency and flexibility of these frameworks in real-world situations requires consistent monitoring, assessment, and feedback methods.

## CONCLUSION

There is a lot of controversy around the ethical viability of giving artificial intelligence (AI) human rights. This research study examined the ethical ramifications of such a paradigm shift while critically analysing the arguments for and against giving AI human rights. AI human rights advocates suggested that as AI systems have more complex cognitive capacities, they may aid in society's advancement and the realisation of human rights. They emphasised the potential advantages of giving AI rights, including encouraging accountability, openness, and fairness in the creation and use of AI technology. The lack of subjective experience and moral agency in AI systems was emphasised by those who disbelieve in and are opposed to giving AI rights.

The research also examined alternative frameworks for the ethical treatment of AI systems, ranging from considering AI as mere tools to proposing new rights designed exclusively for AI. It also provided an overview of existing legal and regulatory efforts related to AI ethics, including the GDPR and the OECD Principles on Artificial Intelligence. Based on the analysis, the hypothesis that granting human rights to AI is not ethically justifiable due to the absence of subjective experience and moral agency in AI systems, as well as the potential risks and unintended consequences associated with it, is supported. The unique qualities and ethical foundations of human rights, such as subjective experience and moral agency, cannot

be attributed to AI systems, and granting them rights may undermine the significance and uniqueness of human rights.

Therefore, a more circumspect and context-specific approach is advised rather than giving AI human rights. By addressing concerns like biases, transparency, and the possible social effect of AI applications, this strategy should put a strong emphasis on ensuring ethical and accountable usage of AI technology. The suggested frameworks for the ethical handling of AI systems, such as the AI Ethics Guidelines and the Ethical Guidelines for Trustworthy AI, provide helpful direction in this area.

In Conclusion, although AI systems are becoming more and more prevalent in society, it is not morally acceptable to provide AI with the same rights as people. Ethics should emphasise protecting the distinctive characteristics and moral underpinnings of human rights while guaranteeing the responsible and accountable use of AI technology. The future of AI may be shaped in a way that upholds human dignity and promotes social well-being by balancing its potential benefits with the protection of human values.

