

## THE LEGAL PERSONALITY OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND ITS IMPACT ON INTERNATIONAL LAW

**Dr. Tamara Kobalia, PhD. Candidate Aiakóz Hanetova, Abdulatif Nuredin, PhD. Candidate**

### ABSTRACT

This article analyzes the far-reaching implications of granting legal personality to artificial intelligence (AI) technologies within the context of international law. The rapid development of AI raises the question of whether these technologies, beyond being mere tools, could be recognized as independent actors in the international legal order. In this context, the potential effects of recognizing AI as legal persons on various domains such as inter-state relations, the structure of international organizations, the law of war, cybersecurity, and ethical responsibilities are thoroughly examined.

The initial sections of the article explore the impact of granting legal personality to AI on inter-state relations. The recognition of AI as an actor in international relations could significantly influence state sovereignty and the decision-making processes of international organizations. It is emphasized that states' decisions on whether to grant legal personality to AI systems should involve a process of international cooperation and consensus. Moreover, it is suggested that international organizations, particularly entities like the United Nations and the European Union, should take a decisive stance on the role AI will play within the framework of international law.

The article also addresses the need to reassess the principles of liability law. The autonomous operation of AI systems raises critical questions about how responsibility for actions taken by these systems should be allocated. Traditional liability regimes may be inadequate for determining who should be held accountable for damages caused by AI, underscoring the necessity for updates to international law in this regard.

Other critical areas discussed in the article include the laws of war and cybersecurity. The use of AI in wartime scenarios may necessitate new regulations to ensure compatibility with the fundamental principles of the law of war. Similarly, the use of AI systems in cyber-attacks highlights the importance of regulating these systems' security protocols within the framework of international law.

Finally, the article offers several proposals for adapting international law to AI technologies. These proposals include strengthening global cooperation, updating international legal norms, and establishing a universal ethical framework. Additionally, the article advocates for granting AI systems specific legal statuses that clearly define their rights and responsibilities.

This article provides a comprehensive examination of the impact of AI technologies on international law and offers an in-depth analysis of the legal reforms needed to address these emerging challenges. Central to the discussion are the questions of how AI will be positioned within international law and how this process will be shaped.

**Keywords:** Legal Personality, Artificial Intelligence, International Law.

**Dr. Tamara KOBALIA**  
*Tbilisi State University, Faculty of Law*

**e-mail:**  
kobalia1972@yahoo.com

**PhD. Candidate Aiakóz HANETOVA**  
*Kazakh-British Technical University*

**e-mail:**  
ayakozx@gmail.com

**Abdulatif NUREDIN, PhD. Candidate**  
*International Vision University - Gostivar*

**e-mail:** abdulatif.nuredin@vision.edu.mk

**UDK: 004.8:341**

**Declaration of interest:**  
The authors reported no conflict of interest related to this article.

## **1.Introduction**

The rapid development of artificial intelligence (AI) technologies, coupled with their autonomous capabilities and ability to make decisions without human intervention, has ushered in a significant transformation within the realm of international law. This transformation necessitates not only the reassessment of technological innovations but also the reevaluation of legal and ethical frameworks. Notably, the concept of granting legal personality to AI has emerged as a new paradigm in international law (Boden et al., 2017; Gasser & Almeida, 2017).

### **1.1.The Historical Development of Legal Personality**

Legal personality is a fundamental concept in international law with a long-established history. Traditionally, legal personality has been granted to entities such as states, international organizations, and, in certain circumstances, individuals (Shaw, 2017). Legal personality endows these actors with specific rights and obligations, enabling them to be recognized and effective within the framework of international legal regulations. The legal personality of states is grounded in the core principles of sovereignty and independence, while that of international organizations is based on their mandate to perform certain functions and represent the collective interests of the international community (Brownlie, 2008).

Throughout history, the concept of legal personality has evolved to adapt to changing needs. For instance, international human rights law has made it possible for individuals to acquire legal personality and seek justice in international courts (Clapham, 2015). Similarly, in the latter half of the 20th century, commercial entities such as multinational corporations gained international legal personality, becoming integral to international trade and investment law (Muchlinski, 2007). However, the idea of granting legal personality to non-human and autonomous entities such as AI introduces an unprecedented dimension to this concept (Calverley, 2008).

### **1.2.The Place of Artificial Intelligence in International Law**

Artificial intelligence technologies are not yet fully defined or regulated within international law (Katz & Bommarito, 2017). Nonetheless, AI's autonomous decision-making capabilities are directly related to fundamental legal concepts such as responsibility and accountability. For

example, who would be held liable for damages caused by an AI system? Could these systems be parties to international treaties? Recognizing AI as a subject in the international arena would require a legal personality status that addresses these questions (Pagallo, 2013).

Should AI technologies be granted legal personality, it would necessitate a reexamination of existing norms and principles within international law. Significant changes might be required in areas such as state responsibility law, cybersecurity, the law of war, and human rights (Calo, 2015). For instance, the regulation of autonomous weapon systems within international law is a topic of intense ethical and legal debate (Asaro, 2012). In this context, granting legal personality to AI systems could compel the introduction of new regulations in international law.

### **1.3. Artificial Intelligence and Autonomy**

The autonomous capabilities of AI systems enable these entities to make complex decisions independently of human intervention. This strengthens the argument for recognizing AI as a legal person (Bryson et al., 2017). If an AI system can make decisions and be held accountable for the outcomes of those decisions, it may be considered necessary to recognize such a system as a legal subject. However, this would require a profound transformation in international law and provoke extensive debate on how to align this new legal status with existing legal structures (Parker et al., 2016).

The development of artificial intelligence technologies has brought to the forefront the question of how these systems will be positioned within international law. Granting legal personality to AI would necessitate the reconsideration of existing norms and the introduction of new regulations within international law (Schroeder, 2018).

## **2. The Concept of Legal Personality in International Law**

The concept of legal personality in international law has historically been a fundamental status granted to states, international organizations, and individuals. Legal personality allows these entities to possess rights and obligations under the norms of international law. This status enables recognized actors in international law to make independent decisions, become parties to international agreements, and engage in legal transactions (Shaw, 2017; Brownlie, 2008).

## **2.1. The Argument Against Recognizing AI as a “Person” and the Insurance Mechanism Proposal**

Many legal scholars argue that entities possessing artificial intelligence (AI) should not be regarded as "persons" under the law (Calo, 2015). According to this view, legal personality requires an entity to possess autonomy, consciousness, and moral values (Gunkel, 2018). AI systems, however, lack these qualities and are merely capable of executing programmed tasks. In this context, rather than granting legal personality to AI systems, a proposal has been made to establish an insurance mechanism to cover the damages these systems might cause (Bryson et al., 2017). Under this proposal, the owners or developers of AI systems would not be directly responsible for damages caused by these systems; instead, compensation would be provi

## **2.2. Perspectives Advocating for Legal Status and “Personhood” for AI**

In contrast, several perspectives advocate for granting legal personality to AI. These views argue that the autonomous decision-making capabilities of AI systems and their impact on society necessitate the recognition of a specific legal status for these entities (Schroeder, 2018).

□ **Slavery Perspective:** This perspective argues that AI systems, created to serve humans, should be granted a status akin to that of slaves. In this scenario, the owners of AI entities would be responsible for all actions performed by these systems, and AI would not be recognized as an independent legal subject (Boden et al., 2017).

□ **Natural Person Perspective:** The natural person perspective suggests that in certain circumstances, AI systems could be granted a legal status similar to that of humans. (Nuredin, A., 2023a) According to this view, if an AI system can independently make decisions and be held accountable for the outcomes, it should be recognized as a legal person akin to a human. However, this perspective is highly controversial and has not gained widespread acceptance (Gunkel, 2018).

□ **Legal Entity Perspective:** The legal entity perspective posits that AI systems could acquire legal personality similar to corporations. In this case, AI systems would be granted specific rights and obligations, though these would not be equivalent to human rights. Such a framework would

allow AI systems to participate more effectively in legal and commercial transactions (Pagallo, 2013).

□ **Electronic Personality Proposal:** Proposed by the European Parliament in 2017, this perspective suggests granting "electronic personality" to AI systems. This status would endow AI systems with specific rights and obligations while recognizing them as independent legal subjects. The concept of electronic personality was developed to establish a legal framework for determining AI systems' responsibilities (European Parliament, 2017).

### **2.3. Legal Foundations of Granting Legal Personality to AI in International Law**

Granting legal personality to AI represents a significant shift in international law. Traditional concepts of legal personality have been designed primarily for entities that possess autonomy, consciousness, and moral values (Shaw, 2017). AI systems, however, lack these attributes, making their integration into existing legal frameworks challenging (Calverley, 2008).

Should international law recognize legal personality for AI, it would be necessary to define the systems' ability to engage in international legal transactions, determine their responsibilities, and establish their rights (Schroeder, 2018). Questions such as whether AI systems can be parties to international treaties or appear as parties in international courts must be addressed (Pagallo, 2013).

Therefore, integrating AI systems into international law will require both the definition of a new legal status and the reevaluation of existing international legal norms. The electronic personality proposal may serve as a starting point for this endeavor; however, the application of this status within international law remains unclear (European Parliament, 2017).

Granting legal personality to AI has the potential to create a new paradigm in international law. While various views and proposals exist on this matter, a comprehensive legal framework must be established to accommodate AI systems within international law. This framework should aim to clarify the rights and responsibilities of AI systems and achieve acceptance within the international community (Bryson et al., 2017).

### **3. The Potential Impacts of Granting Legal Personality to Artificial Intelligence**

Granting legal personality to artificial intelligence (AI) systems would necessitate a profound transformation of the international legal order and require the reinterpretation of existing legal norms (Bryson et al., 2017). This section delves into the potential impacts of recognizing AI as legal persons, with a focus on various branches of law, including liability, property rights, the law of war, maritime law, and cybersecurity (Pagallo, 2013; Gunkel, 2018).

#### **3.1. Liability Law**

The recognition of AI systems as legal persons could significantly alter the field of liability law. Traditionally, legal responsibility is attributed to the person who performs an action (Calo, 2015). However, since AI systems are designed to operate autonomously and make certain decisions independently, the question arises as to how liability should be determined (Bryson et al., 2017). If AI is granted legal personality, it remains contentious whether an AI system could be held liable for damages resulting from its actions, or whether this liability would instead rest with the system's owner, developer, or manufacturer (Gunkel, 2018). This scenario may require a restructuring of international liability regimes (Pagallo, 2013). Alternative solutions, such as insurance mechanisms or special compensation funds for AI, could be explored in this context (Calo, 2015).

#### **3.2. Property Rights**

Property rights represent another significant area that would need to be revisited in light of AI gaining legal personality (Pagallo, 2013). Traditionally, property rights are recognized for natural and legal persons (Gunkel, 2018). However, granting legal personality to AI raises the question of whether these entities could hold property rights themselves (Bryson et al., 2017). For example, could an AI system claim intellectual property rights over something it has created? Or could an AI assert ownership over a product it has produced? Such questions could necessitate the restructuring of international property law (Pagallo, 2013).

### **3.3. Law of War**

The law of war, particularly in the context of autonomous weapon systems, is one of the areas that would be most affected by the recognition of AI's legal personality (Asaro, 2012). Autonomous weapon systems can identify targets and execute attacks without human intervention. In this case, the legal personality of such systems raises new questions about who would be held accountable for crimes committed under the law of war (Calo, 2015). Who would be responsible for damages resulting from an attack carried out by an autonomous system? Would this responsibility lie with the AI system itself, or with the state that developed or deployed it? Such issues could require a reassessment of international war law, particularly international treaties such as the Geneva Conventions (Asaro, 2012).

### **3.4. Maritime Law**

Maritime law is another area that might require reformation in the wake of AI being granted legal personality (Gunkel, 2018). Autonomous ships and marine vessels, managed and controlled by AI, are increasingly being used in the maritime domain (Pagallo, 2013). If these systems were granted legal personality, how would their rights, obligations, and responsibilities be regulated under maritime law? How would liability be determined in the event of a maritime accident involving an autonomous ship? Such questions could necessitate the restructuring of maritime law and the establishment of regulations specific to AI systems (Calo, 2015).

### **3.5. Cybersecurity**

Cybersecurity has become an increasingly critical area as AI systems proliferate (Schroeder, 2018). The recognition of AI's legal personality could lead to new regulations in cybersecurity law (Bryson et al., 2017). AI systems could be both the target and the source of cyber-attacks (Calo, 2015). In such cases, how would liability for a cyber-attack carried out by an AI system be determined? The granting of legal personality to AI could necessitate the reshaping of cybersecurity norms and the creation of international regulations to address the security vulnerabilities of these systems (Gunkel, 2018).

Granting legal personality to AI would require profound and wide-reaching changes in international law (Schroeder, 2018). This process

would not only involve the reinterpretation of existing legal norms but also the creation of new legal frameworks. Key areas such as liability law, property rights, the law of war, maritime law, and cybersecurity would be directly impacted, and extensive discussions would be necessary to determine how the international community should approach these issues (Pagallo, 2013). The recognition of AI's legal personality could mark the beginning of a new era in international law, with the steps taken in this direction shaping the future of legal regulations (Bryson et al., 2017).

#### **4. The Role of States and International Organizations**

The recognition of legal personality for artificial intelligence (AI) has the potential to generate profound effects not only on national legal systems but also on the overall structure of international law. In this context, states and international organizations will play a critical role in defining the legal and ethical framework for this technological transformation (Gasser & Almeida, 2017). This section examines the potential impacts of granting legal personality to AI on states and international organizations, and explores how entities such as the United Nations (UN), the European Union (EU), and other international bodies might develop policies and shape international cooperation in this area (European Parliament, 2017; Cath et al., 2018).

##### **4.1. The Role of States**

As the primary actors in international law, states bear the primary responsibility for decisions regarding the recognition of legal personality for AI (Gunkel, 2018). Each state must address this issue within its domestic legal system while ensuring alignment with international legal norms (Shaw, 2017). In this regard, it is crucial that states promote international cooperation and develop a shared understanding when deciding whether to grant legal personality to AI systems (Pagallo, 2013). States must also enact the necessary legal frameworks to ensure that AI systems operate in compliance with international law, focusing on liability, security, and ethical principles (Boden et al., 2017).

Furthermore, states must consider the potential impacts of recognizing legal personality for AI on their national sovereignty, security, and economic interests (Gasser & Almeida, 2017). Therefore, harmonization between national legal frameworks and international agreements is

essential. In this process, states should develop strategies to protect their national interests against the legal, economic, and social changes that such recognition may bring (Bryson et al., 2017).

#### **4.2. The United Nations and International Law**

The United Nations (UN) plays a central role in regulating the recognition of legal personality for AI within international law (Cath et al., 2018). As a global authority in the maintenance of international peace and security and the promotion of human rights, the UN can establish a normative framework on this issue (UNESCO, 2021). In this context, the UN might consider drafting an international treaty on AI, which member states could sign to establish how legal personality for AI should be regulated within international law (Asaro, 2012). Additionally, the UN must develop global oversight and regulatory mechanisms to ensure that AI systems do not pose a threat to international peace and security (Cath et al., 2018).

Various UN bodies, particularly the International Court of Justice (ICJ) and the Human Rights Council, could oversee the implementation of legal personality for AI in accordance with international law (Shaw, 2017). The ICJ could intervene as a competent body in resolving disputes between states and ensuring that AI systems comply with international legal norms (Bryson et al., 2017). The Human Rights Council could assume a supervisory role to monitor the impact of AI systems on human rights and ensure that these systems act in accordance with human rights principles (UNESCO, 2021).

#### **4.3. The European Union and Regional Regulations**

As a global leader in technological innovation and digitalization, the European Union (EU) could play a pioneering role in recognizing legal personality for AI (European Parliament, 2017). Through its existing digital strategies and legal frameworks, the EU could develop comprehensive policies for AI. The concept of "Electronic Personality," proposed by the European Parliament in 2017, could serve as the foundation for a regional approach to granting legal personality to AI (European Parliament, 2017).

The steps taken by the EU in this regard could set a precedent not only for its member states but also for global regulations, given the EU's influence on the international stage (Gunkel, 2018). The EU could develop legal

frameworks regulating the security, ethical compliance, and liability regimes of AI systems (Pagallo, 2013). Moreover, the EU's regulations on the integration and use of AI technologies within its internal market could serve as a model for other regional and international actors (European Parliament, 2017).

#### **4.4. Other International Organizations and Global Cooperation**

Beyond the United Nations and the European Union, other international organizations could also play significant roles in the recognition of legal personality for AI (UNESCO, 2021). Organizations such as the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), the World Trade Organization (WTO), and the International Telecommunication Union (ITU) could develop specific norms to regulate the impact of AI systems on international trade, economic development, and global communication (Cath et al., 2018).

In this context, strengthening cooperation among international organizations could ensure a more coordinated and effective management of the process of granting legal personality to AI (Shaw, 2017). International cooperation would enable states and international organizations to coordinate the legal regulation of AI technologies at a global level and ensure that these technologies contribute to international peace, security, and development (Gunkel, 2018).

The recognition of legal personality for AI presents both opportunities and challenges for states and international organizations (Bryson et al., 2017). This process requires the harmonious development of national and international law, as well as enhanced global cooperation (Shaw, 2017).

#### **5. International Law and AI Ethics**

The recognition of legal personality for artificial intelligence (AI) raises not only legal and technical challenges but also profound ethical issues. These concerns revolve around critical topics such as AI's autonomy, its relationship with human rights, accountability, and responsibility (Gunkel, 2018). The capacity of AI systems to act independently of human decisions necessitates the development of new ethical principles to guide how these systems should be addressed within the framework of international law (Boden et al., 2017). This section explores how existing ethical principles in international law might be applied to AI and examines

the need to update international legal norms in this context (Bryson et al., 2017).

### **5.1. AI and Ethics: Conceptual Framework**

The development of AI systems has brought fundamental ethical questions to the forefront. (Nuredin, A., & Inan, T. C., 2024) The autonomy of these systems in decision-making processes raises concerns about how they can be aligned with universal ethical principles such as human rights, human dignity, and freedoms (Cath et al., 2018). The autonomy of AI creates uncertainties regarding who should be held accountable for its actions and how these actions should be ethically evaluated (Floridi et al., 2018).

In international law, ethics traditionally plays a central role in areas such as human rights norms, humanitarian law, and environmental protection. However, if AI is granted legal personality, these ethical norms will need to be reassessed (Gunkel, 2018). For example, if an AI system engages in actions that violate human rights, who will be held accountable? Such questions necessitate a new evaluation process at the intersection of AI ethics and international legal norms (Asaro, 2012).

### **5.2. The Applicability of Ethical Principles to AI**

The ethical principles in international law generally apply to humans and states (Bryson et al., 2017). The question of how these principles can be applied to AI depends on how AI's ethical and legal status is defined (Floridi et al., 2018). For instance, recognizing AI's legal personality might require these systems to assume certain ethical responsibilities. However, given that AI is not a conscious entity like humans, significant challenges arise in defining such ethical responsibility (Gunkel, 2018).

In this context, the applicability of international legal norms to AI should be discussed around the following questions:

- **AI's Responsibility in Human Rights Violations:** If an AI system violates human rights, who will be held accountable? Does recognizing AI's legal personality necessitate that these systems also respect human rights? (Bryson et al., 2017).
- **AI's Responsibility Under the Law of War:** Should AI applications, such as autonomous weapon systems, be required to comply

with the laws of war? How will AI's ethical obligations be defined in this context? (Asaro, 2012).

These questions play a critical role in determining the boundaries of the applicability of ethical principles to AI and understanding how these systems should be evaluated within the framework of international law (Gunkel, 2018).

### **5.3. The Need to Update International Legal Norms**

It is evident that recognizing AI's legal personality requires fundamental changes in international law. This process involves not only reassessing existing legal norms but also updating them to make them applicable to AI (Floridi et al., 2018). Particularly in terms of ethical principles, new regulations are needed to address how AI's actions should be legally addressed and how the outcomes of these actions should be evaluated (Nuredin, A., & Nuredin, M., 2023).

The applicability of ethical principles in international law to AI highlights the need to update norms in the following areas:

- **Legal Responsibility Norms:** Norms regarding who will be held accountable for damages caused by AI systems should be redefined within a new ethical framework (Bryson et al., 2017).
- **Humanitarian Law Rules:** AI's role in war situations and the humanitarian law rules it must adhere to should be updated under new ethical norms (Asaro, 2012).
- **Environmental and Sustainability Concerns:** The environmental impact of AI and its ethical responsibilities should be reexamined as part of international environmental law (Floridi et al., 2018).

### **5.4. The Need for a Global Ethical Framework**

In the process of adapting international law to AI (Nuredin, A. 2023b), developing a global ethical framework is of critical importance (Gunkel, 2018). This framework should be established through extensive collaboration among states, international organizations, technology firms, and civil society organizations (Cath et al., 2018). A global ethical framework should aim to create universal ethical standards to govern AI's

actions and determine its responsibilities if AI is granted legal personality (Floridi et al., 2018).

In this process, it is essential that international legal norms are not limited to states and humans but are also made applicable to new technologies like AI (Bryson et al., 2017). In this context, it is crucial to develop binding international norms on AI ethics under the leadership of the United Nations and other international organizations (Cath et al., 2018).

The recognition of legal personality for AI necessitates a reevaluation of ethical issues in international law. In this context, how existing ethical principles will be applied to AI and how international legal norms should be updated will be decisive in shaping future international legal regulations (Gunkel, 2018). A global ethical framework will play a vital role in ensuring that AI technologies are integrated into international law in a manner that aligns with ethical standards (Floridi et al., 2018).

## **6. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The development of artificial intelligence (AI) technologies necessitates fundamental changes in international law. Granting legal personality to AI requires the development of new legal frameworks to determine the place and impact of these technologies within international law (Bryson et al., 2017). In this context, international legal systems must be restructured to address the ethical, legal, and social challenges posed by autonomous technologies like AI (Gunkel, 2018).

### **6.1. Impact of Granting Legal Personality to AI on Inter-State Relations and International Organizations**

Recognizing AI as a legal person could have profound effects on inter-state relations and the structure of international organizations (Gasser & Almeida, 2017). States will need to reach a consensus on how AI systems will be integrated into international legal norms. Accepting AI as an actor in international relations could significantly alter state sovereignty and the decision-making processes within international organizations (Cath et al., 2018). For instance, can an AI system be a party to an international agreement? Answering this question may require a new approach in inter-state negotiations and international legal frameworks (Nuredin, A. 2022).

International organizations, particularly entities such as the United Nations and the European Union, must take a decisive position on the role

AI will play on the international stage. These organizations could establish norms and standards that dictate how AI systems are regulated within the framework of international law (Cath et al., 2018). Additionally, the question of whether AI can be represented within international organizations and how such representation would be carried out must also be addressed (European Parliament, 2017).

## **6.2. Regulating Liability for Actions Committed by AI**

The liability for actions committed by AI systems under international law requires a reassessment of existing liability regimes (Bryson et al., 2017). Traditionally, the compensation for damages resulting from an act is attributed to the individual or legal entity that committed the act. However, the autonomous nature of AI systems necessitates a redefinition of the concept of liability (Gunkel, 2018).

In this context, international law must introduce new regulations to address how damages caused by AI will be compensated and who will be held responsible for such liability (Asaro, 2012). An international consensus should be reached on whether this responsibility lies with the owner, developer, user, or the AI system itself (Pagallo, 2013). Additionally, alternative solutions such as special insurance mechanisms and compensation funds for AI should be considered as part of these regulations (Cath et al., 2018).

## **6.3. Impact of Granting Legal Personality to AI on the Law of War and Cybersecurity**

Granting legal personality to AI requires significant innovations in critical areas such as the law of war and cybersecurity (Gasser & Almeida, 2017). Autonomous weapon systems must operate in accordance with fundamental principles of the law of war, such as civilian protection, proportionality, and distinction. New regulations are needed to address how these systems will be used in wartime and how their use will be integrated into international humanitarian law (Asaro, 2012).

In the field of cybersecurity, the issue of how to address liability and security vulnerabilities if AI systems are used in cyberattacks is of great importance (Floridi et al., 2018). Given that AI can be both the target and source of cyberattacks, it is crucial to determine how the security protocols of these systems will be regulated within the framework of international

law (Cath et al., 2018). International law must be updated to prevent and effectively address the cyber threats that AI may pose (Bryson et al., 2017).

#### **6.4. Recommendations: Adapting International Law to AI Technologies**

International law needs various reforms to keep pace with the development of AI technologies. These reforms should include the following recommendations to determine AI's role in international law:

- **Global Cooperation:** Strong cooperation between states and international organizations is essential to reach an international consensus on granting legal personality to AI. This cooperation should lead to the establishment of binding norms that define the international legal status of AI (Gasser & Almeida, 2017).
- **Updating Norms:** International legal norms should be updated to address the new ethical and legal challenges posed by AI. In particular, AI-specific regulations should be developed in areas such as liability, property rights, and human rights (Pagallo, 2013).
- **Universal Ethical Framework:** The development of a universal ethical framework is critical in the process of integrating AI technologies into international law. This framework should include global standards that define the ethical and legal responsibilities of AI's actions (Floridi et al., 2018).
- **Special Legal Status:** Granting AI systems a special legal status could allow them to be recognized as independent actors within international law. However, if such status is granted, the rights and responsibilities of AI must be clearly defined (Gunkel, 2018).

In conclusion, the development of AI technologies requires a reassessment and updating of international law. The steps taken in this process will determine AI's place in international law and shape the legal regulations of the future (Bryson et al., 2017).

## REFERENCES

- Asaro, P. M. (2012). On banning autonomous weapon systems: Human rights, automation, and the dehumanization of lethal decision-making. *International Review of the Red Cross*, 94(886), 687-709.
- Boden, M. A., Bryson, J., Caldwell, D. G., Fox, M. S., Kapsner, A., & Winfield, A. F. (2017). Principles of robotics: Regulating robots in the real world. *Connection Science*, 29(2), 124-129.
- Brownlie, I. (2008). *Principles of Public International Law* (7th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Bryson, J. J., Diamantis, M. E., & Grant, T. D. (2017). Of, for, and by the people: The legal lacuna of synthetic persons. *Artificial Intelligence and Law*, 25(3), 273-291.
- Calverley, D. J. (2008). Imagining a non-biological machine as a legal person. *Artificial Intelligence and Law*, 16(1), 45-61.
- Calo, R. (2015). Robotics and the lessons of cyberlaw. *California Law Review*, 103(3), 513-563.
- Cath, C., Wachter, S., Mittelstadt, B., Taddeo, M., & Floridi, L. (2018). Artificial intelligence and the 'good society': The US, EU, and UK approach. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, 24(2), 505-528.
- European Parliament. (2017). Resolution with recommendations to the Commission on Civil Law Rules on Robotics (2015/2103(INL)). Retrieved from [https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/TA-8-2017-0051\\_EN.pdf](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/TA-8-2017-0051_EN.pdf)
- Floridi, L., Cowls, J., Beltrametti, M., Chatila, R., Chazerand, P., Dignum, V., ... & Vayena, E. (2018). AI4People—An ethical framework for a good AI society: Opportunities, risks, principles, and recommendations. *Minds and Machines*, 28(4), 689-707.
- Gasser, U., & Almeida, V. A. (2017). A layered model for AI governance. *IEEE Internet Computing*, 21(6), 58-62.
- Gunkel, D. J. (2018). *Robot rights*. MIT Press.

Katz, D. M., & Bommarito, M. J. (2017). Measuring the complexity of the law: The United States Code. *Artificial Intelligence and Law*, 25(4), 341-371.

Muchlinski, P. (2007). *Multinational Enterprises and the Law* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.

Nuredin, A., & Nuredin, M. (2023). *Farklı Alanlarda Etik.*, International Vision University Press.

Nuredin, A. (2023a). Legal Status of Artificial Intelligence and the Violation of Human Rights. *Sui Generis*, 2(1), 7-28.

Nuredin, A. (2023b). Fourth-Generation Human Rights and the Violation of the Concept of Privacy. *International Scientific Journal Vision*, 8(1), 9-23.

Nuredin, A. (2022). *Uluslararası İnsan Hakları Hukuku*. International Vision University.

Nuredin, A., & Inan, T. C. (2024). THE IMPACT OF AI-BASED DECISION-MAKING SYSTEMS ON JUSTICE AND EQUALITY. *International Scientific Journal Vision*, 9-33.

Pagallo, U. (2013). *The Laws of Robots: Crimes, Contracts, and Torts*. Springer.

Parker, L., Vermaas, P., & Kroes, P. (2016). *Ethics and Engineering: An Introduction*. Cambridge University Press.

Schroeder, F. (2018). *Artificial Intelligence and the End of Work*. Polity Press.

Shaw, M. N. (2017). *International Law* (8th ed.). Cambridge University Press.