Legislative and Ethical Foundations for Future Artificial Intelligence

Assistant. Teacher : Mohammed Hasan Hadi (1)
Ministry of Education
Open Educational College
07716166564
Email:mohammed.almaawi.iq@gmail.com
Assistant. Teacher : Asmaa Ali Jasim (2)
Ministry of Education
Open Educational College
07742249891
Email:a0740551@gmail.com

Abstract

The effective Regulation and Ethical of Artificial Intelligence is an urgent policy concern. Legislatures and regulators do not possess the specialized technical expertise necessary to effectively convert popular requests into legislative mandates. The excessive dependence on industry self-regulation results in a lack of accountability for AI ethical system and users in meeting democratic requirements. The concept of Ethical Frameworks involves governments mandating the entities subject to regulation to get regulatory assistance from a private regulator. This AI Ethical Frameworks has the potential to address the shortcomings of both command-and-control regulation and self-regulation. Most of advanced states provide governments the opportunity to set policy priorities for AI Ethical Frameworks, while using market forces and industry research and development (R&D) to develop the most effective ways of regulation to set up Ethical Frameworks that align with policymakers' goals.

Keywords : AI Governance, Ethical Frameworks, Ethical Foundations, Legislative Foundations, Future AI Governance.

1. Introduction

In recent years, Artificial Intelligence (AI) has been making inroads into many different sectors of the global economy and society. Experts predict that this trend will only accelerate in the years to come. With the proliferation of digital technology, AI is finding more and more ways to integrate into our daily live (Kubilevičius & Berkmanas, 2023:61).

However, this comes with concerns about potentially harmful AI applications or even AI making bad decisions, particularly in industries like the military, healthcare, and law enforcement. As a result of these changes, many are wondering whether the development of AI systems will follow ethical guidelines (Asif et al., 2023:97).

A number of stakeholders from a variety of nations and industries have responded to these worries by releasing AI ethics and governance projects and standards, sparking a worldwide discussion on AI ethics. Based on our study in this research, which combines our international and multidisciplinary knowledge. We provide a glimpse into the present moment in several nations, including China, Australia, Europe, India, as well as the US. (Ashraf & Islam, 2024:219).

There is a new subject in computer science known as Artificial Intelligence (AI). Various terms used synonymously to refer to Artificial Intelligence (AI) in both academic and popular settings include supervised and unsupervised, artificial intelligence, "deep neural networks", algorithmic, profiling, automation, and others (Hamilton, 2013:39).

One broad definition of Artificial Intelligence is software that can automatically spot patterns in data and use those patterns to generate predictions. According to Schreurs et al. (2018), it is an inferential analytic approach that finds correlations in datasets. Correlations may be used to categories subjects as representatives of a category or group in profiling (Ford, 2022:219).

"Narrow" AI is defined broadly in contrast to "generic" or "wide" AI. Artificial Intelligence (AI) may be either narrowly focused on solving a specific problem or broadly applicable, with the former reflecting the vast majority of AI applications in use today and the latter reflecting the adaptability of human intellect. Throughout this study, we will be using a restricted definition of AI whenever we talk about it (Garcia, 2023:192).

2. The Aim of The study

The research seeks to provide a concise summary of the necessity for governance of Artificial Intelligence (AI) and elucidates the extensively debated risks of harm in the field of AI governance, such as bias and polarization. Additionally, it highlights the frequently disregarded disruptions that AI could potentially cause in various established regulatory systems, including legal and ethical frameworks.

3. Artificial Intelligence and Ethics

During the early stages of AI's research , the question has arisen about the adherence of "AI to ethical standards" and the adequacy of current laws in governing AI. This problem is crucial in determining the future development, deployment, and implementation of AI. The topic of governing AI, which was previously limited to theoretical, technical, and academic discussions, has now become a prominent issue in mainstream discourse (Asaro, 2020:212).

3.1 The meaning of AI Ethics

Ethics is often understood as a philosophical framework that explores the nature of morality and the pursuit of a fulfilling and virtuous life. Foundational ethics may be distinguished from applied ethics based on their respective emphasis. Foundational ethics primarily deals with abstract moral notions, whereas applied ethics pertains to the practical application of ethical principles. The latter also encompasses the ethical considerations related to technology, specifically including AI ethics as a subclass (Knell & Rüther, 2023:210).

AI ethics is primarily concerned with the introspection and critical analysis of computer and technical disciplines involved in the study and advancement of "AI or machine learning ". Within this framework, one may analyze dynamics such as particular initiatives focused on technological development. Similarly, the causal processes and roles of technologies may be examined via a more static examination (Schultz & Seele, 2022:102).

 Common subjects include autonomous vehicles, AI-driven political manipulation, automated weapon systems, face recognition technology, algorithmic bias, chatbots, social categorization via ranking algorithms, and several more (Lauer, 2020:21).

Moreover, AI ethics falls under the domain of metaethics, which investigates the effectiveness of normative imperatives. Ethical discourses may be done

either in close proximity to their target topic or in an opposite approach (Nyholm & Rüther, 2023:41).

The connection between ethical discourses and an organization engaging with AI offers the benefit of a tangible influence on the organization's course of action. However, a drawback of this kind of ethical contemplation is that it must be limited in scope and focused on practical considerations. Expressing more extreme demands is only justified when it aligns with ethical principles (Wörsdörfer, 2023:85).

3.2 Ethical Discourses and Effect in Practice.

Expressing more extreme requests is only meaningful when ethical discussions maintain a certain level of detachment from their intended subject. However, these ethical discussions are often ineffective and have little impact on real-world situations. AI ethics also include the level of normativity associated with it (Anderson & Anderson, 2020:27).

In this context, ethics might fluctuate between causing annoyance and providing guidance. Irritation is equivalent to a lack of strong normativity. This implies a refraining from making assertive statements that strongly dictate what should or should not be done. Instead, ethics reveals previously unnoticed areas or explains previously overlooked difficulties (O'Hara, 2023:413).

Orientation, however, refers to a high degree of normativity. Making strong normative assertions may have a drawback since it often leads to backfire or boomerang effects. This means that when individuals sense external limits on their actions, they prefer to respond by engaging in the same activity they are trying to avoid (Reinhardt, 2022:735).

Accordingly, it should use a kind of normativity that lacks strength and does not provide definitive standards for determining what is morally correct or incorrect in a universal sense. Furthermore, AI ethics should strive to maintain a close connection to its intended subject. This suggests that ethics is seen as a topic of study that spans several disciplines, such as computer sciences or industrial organizations, and actively engages with these subjects (Sahlgren, 2024:219).

4. The AI governance landscape in last decades

This research integrates the diverse expertise and global perspectives of scholars specializing in "AI policy ", "ethics, and governance ". Its purpose is to provide an overview of the methods taken by various nations and regions regarding the issue of AI and ethics. Our objective is to provide a concise

overview of how some nations and regions, particularly prominent ones such as " India, China, Europe and the United States ", are approaching or neglecting the subject matte (Galavotti, 2022:86).

4.1International organizations

There has also been discussion over the topic of Artificial Intelligence (AI) inside the Council that is located within Europe. In 2018, as part of the 40th Annual Conference of the International Council of the Data Protection and Privacy Commissioners (ICDPPC), which took place in Brussels, officials from a number of national data protection and privacy agencies collaborated to create a document outlining the principles and guidelines for ethical conduct and safeguarding of data in the field of Artificial Intelligence. (Boháč & Jahnova, 2014:410).

4.1.1 Technical initiatives

One of the most noteworthy efforts made by the technical community in the realm of Artificial Intelligence is the Global Initiative towards Ethics of Autonomous as well as Intelligent Systems, which is being led by the IEEE. The Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers (IEEE) has solicited the participation of its members, who are technical experts, and has also issued invitations to those who are not members of the IEEE to help in the implementation of this effort. Up to this point, the programmer has been responsible for the development of two different versions of Ethically Aligned Design, with the involvement of hundreds of people from six different continents (IEEE 2018) (Hagendorff, 2021:863).

 For the purpose of assuring the ethical development, design, and deployment of autonomous and intelligent systems, the second edition includes five essential principles that serve as a framework. As part of the broader activities of the IEEE, the Global Initiative is working towards the establishment of technological standards concerning ethics (Knell & Rüther, 2023:153).

4.1.2 International multistakeholder projects.

Some large firms have issued their own ethical declarations. Because many of these firms are based in the United States, they are mentioned later in the US section. The Partnership on AI is an organization that can be accurately described as both worldwide and multistakeholder in its membership (Lauer, 2020:323).

The Partnership on " Artificial Intelligence " has just presented its eight "Tenets" " Partnership on AI ". Specifically via its Centre for the "Fourth

Industrial Revolution" in " San Francisco ", the Global Economic Forum has launched a number of Artificial Intelligence (AI) initiatives. These projects have received support from big businesses all over the globe. It is the responsibility of this Centre to work in conjunction with various companies and governments in order to create and test various policy and governance frameworks, particularly those that pertain to artificial intelligence. 2019 saw the publication of a white paper on Artificial Intelligence governance by the World Economic Forum (WEF). (Nyholm & Rüther, 2023:12).

4.1.3 Technical initiatives in European Union

The European Union has been establishing itself as a leader in the worldwide discussion on the regulation and moral principles surrounding artificial intelligence. The General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR)، a significant legislative measure, became enforceable in 2018. It applies to select businesses outside the European Union under certain conditions (Wadhwa & Wright, 2012: 162).

Although the Resolution lacks legal force, it conveys the viewpoint of the Parliament and urges the European Commission to undertake more efforts on the subject. The Resolution acknowledged the need to update and enhance the current Union legislative framework with guiding ethical standards, where necessary. This aligns with the intricate nature of robotics & its many social, medical, and bioethical ramifications (Ford, 2022:119).

The Parliament has called on the European Commission to provide a 'legislative instrument proposal' addressing legal issues related to the development and use of robotics and Artificial Intelligence that are expected to arise in the next 10 to 15 years (Ashraf & Islam, 2023:331).

This is complemented by non legislative documents, such as guidelines and standards of behavior, as mentioned in the suggestions outlined in the Annex. Currently, the Commission has not yet issued a proposal. Additional actions have taken place after the adoption of this European Parliament Resolution. In March 2018, the European Commission released a Communication on Artificial Intelligence for Europe, with the primary objective of enhancing the economic and technical capabilities of the European Union. This paper delineated a comprehensive European policy on Artificial Intelligence (AI) (Garcia, 2023:192).

4.1.4 The Council of Europe

In December 2018, the European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice (CEPEJ) approved the European Ethical Charter for the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in judicial systems and its surroundings. The charter comprises five principles that provide guidelines for the development of AI technologies (Karim & Vyas, 2023:180).

This statement refers to the adherence to the Guidelines on Big Data that were published in 2017, as well as the updates made to Convention 108 to include measures specifically targeting algorithmic decision-making. Convention 108 has been signed by countries such as Mauritius, Mexico, and Senegal, who are not members of the Council of Europe (Onzivu, 2013:235).

4.2 Ethical Discourses in Several Countries

Many countries have witnessed remarkable development in AI Governance especially Legal and Ethical Frameworks. In the following paragraphs, we will discuss the most important of these developments in some important global countries.

4.2.1 Legal and Ethical Frameworks in Austria

In Austria, AI is considered to provide a significant edge in terms of competition for the country. In order to ensure that all of the necessary parties are included, the process of building a "Artificial Intelligence Mission Austria 2030" has begun, which includes holding a series of discussions with various stakeholders (George et al., 2012:19).

Austria has demonstrated a significant interest in European cooperation in this field, striving to secure the establishment of a European "Algorithms Rating Agency" or "AI Ethics Authority" in Vienna. This initiative is inspired by the ongoing discussions in European policy circles about creating an institution similar to the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). Austria serves as the headquarters for many significant international institutions, including UN bodies, OSCE, and the IAEA. Austria considers this position as a logical extension of its previous involvement in this field (Nikolinakos, 2023:116).

Simultaneously, Austrian government officials have publicly shown interest in establishing a substantial national data repository, where data belonging to Austrian individuals would be auctioned off to the highest bidder, with the aim of attracting advanced data-driven studies to Austria. Although there is clear contradiction with the GDPR and other established data protection

regulations, this concept continues to be well-received among relevant policy circles (Sulkowski, 2018:63).

The underlying premise is that Austria recognizes its status as a tiny nation, which therefore limits its ability to compete on a global scale across all fields. The data-pooling technique is considered a crucial competitive advantage for Austria to effectively participate in the global market as a small nation (Lupo, 2022:619).

4.2.2 Legal and Ethical Frameworks in United States

The United States is commonly seen as a prominent nation, with China, in the field of domestic research and development of Artificial Intelligence (AI). Nevertheless, the United States has shown less engagement in tackling ethical, governance, and regulatory concerns in comparison to China and the European Union. This was altered by the recent Executive Order on Maintaining American Leadership in Artificial Intelligence, which was issued by the Trump Administration in February 2019.

The American Artificial Intelligence Initiative is established by this Order, which has legal power and is governed by five primary ideas. The implementation of this initiative will be carried out by the Select Committee on Artificial Intelligence, which is a part of the National Technology and Science Council (NSTC).

To fully leverage the potential of Artificial Intelligence (AI) for the American populace, the principles encompass the leadership of the United States in driving the advancement of technological protecting civil American values in the deployment of AI applications. The ultimate goal is to fully leverage the potential of AI for the American populace. The purpose of internationalization is to expand the reach of US AI technology into global markets while safeguarding it from being acquired by strategic rivals and antagonistic states..

 The goals include the preservation of American technology, financial and national security, civil liberties, privacy, and values. Additionally, they include the task of guaranteeing that technological standards for AI are designed to minimize vulnerability to assaults by malevolent persons and are in line with government objectives for fostering innovation, cultivating public trust, and instilling confidence in AI systems. Furthermore, these departments and agencies are expected to contribute to the development of international standards that promote and protect these priorities.

The Order provides directives for the regulation of AI applications. Within a period of 180 days, agencies will be issued a memorandum by the Office of Budget and Management. This memorandum will provide guidance on how to approach the artificial intelligence, both in regulatory and non-regulatory contexts. These approaches should promote American innovation while also protecting civil liberties, privacy, and American values.

The Executive Order assigned the National Institute of Standards and Technology, or NIST, the responsibility of devising a strategy for the federal government's involvement in the establishment of technical standards for AI systems that are dependable, resilient, and trustworthy. In May 2019, the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) released a Request For Information (RFI) about this matter.

 The Strategy explicitly recognizes that China and Russia are aggressively allocating resources to develop military Artificial Intelligence (AI), particularly in domains that may give rise to apprehensions about international standards and human rights.

4.2.3 Legal and Ethical Frameworks in United Kingdom

The United- Kingdom Government has explicitly associated the advancement of AI with its industrial strategy, perceiving it as a potential advantage for the UK, especially in light of the ongoing Brexit process and the uncertainty surrounding the country's future in terms of politics, economy, and society. The UK Government, in its 2017 Industrial Strategy, made it a priority to establish the nation as a frontrunner in the data revolution. This was seen as one of the four primary obstacles facing the nation (Zenil, 2018:328).

In order to tackle this problem, the government made a commitment to provide funds towards the investment in UK firms, research, and education. In 2018, a Sector Deal for Artificial Intelligence was initiated as a component of this undertaking. The UK government has expressed its ambition to become a global leader in the responsible and ethical use of data and Artificial Intelligence (Ashraf & Islam, 2023:336).

The government asserts that this programmer is an innovative endeavor, yet it has similarities with Germany's previously described method. The Centre has been founded, but, it has not yet yielded any substantial results as now (Ford, 2022:228).

The research from the Select Committee reaffirmed that the UK is one of the top locations globally for academics and enterprises involved in the development of Artificial Intelligence (AI). However, it was recognized that the UK could struggle to match the magnitude of wide range of investments in AI currently being invested by China and the US (George et al., 2012:17). Nevertheless, it might perhaps find more suitable benchmarks in countries such as Canada and Germany. The United Kingdom has the capacity to use its acknowledged areas of expertise as a frontrunner in the ethical progress of artificial intelligence.. The Select Committee deemed it unnecessary to implement AI-specific legislation now. Nevertheless, they advised doing more assessments to see whether modifications to existing regulatory and legal structures are necessary to tackle AI in the future.

The Committee proposed 5 broad principles that are not legally enforceable. The committee proposed that the Institute for either Data Ethics and Innovation should establish and develop a prospective cross-sector AI Code based on these principles (Ghose et al., 2024:173).

There would be a number of different stakeholder groups present at the summit, and its goal would be to construct a collaborative framework for the ethical development and use of technology related to artificial intelligence. The structure need to be in accordance with the global governance frameworks that are already in place. There is still some uncertainty over the possibility of holding such an event before the year 2019 comes to a close (Hamilton, 2013:46).

The UK's imminent withdrawal from the European Union and the uncertainties surrounding its future after leaving the EU are complicating issues, particularly in the fields of AI and other areas. Some stakeholder organizations have attacked the UK Government for insufficient investment in this field compared with other Western European nations, as well as for making misguided investments (Kubilevičius & Berkmanas, 2023:116).

Furthermore, it is probable that the UK will no longer have access to EU funding for research and development in the fields of AI and robots, which it has previously received a significant amount of . The EU is outpacing domestic UK efforts in the creation of ethical AI, which raises doubts about the UK's ability to become a global leader in ethical AI development, particularly in a post-Brexit scenario (Lupo, 2022:643).

4.2.4 Legal and Ethical Frameworks China

China and the European Union are the two nations that have undertaken the most significant government-supported or government-led programs for Artificial Intelligence governance and ethics, among the primarily researched countries in this article. 2017 saw the unveiling of The New-Generation AI Research Plan by the State Council of China. This plan outlined China's intention to make significant investments in the Artificial Intelligence field over the next several years, as well as its desire to position itself as the leading global force in AI innovation (FLIA 2017) (Momanyi, 2016:78).

By 2025, a short-term objective is to establish new legislation, rules, and ethical standards and policies concerning the development of Artificial Intelligence in China. This includes engaging in international standard establishing and even assuming a leadership role in such endeavors, as well as enhancing international collaboration in the development of laws and regulations pertaining to Artificial Intelligence (Nikolinakos, 2023:134).

Following that, there have been more efforts made in the field of AI governance and ethics. In May 2019, the Beijing Academy of Artificial Intelligence released the Beijing AI Principles, which state that the main goal of their AI research is to create AI that benefits both humans and the environment (Onzivu, 2013:239). The principles also address several important considerations :

1 .The potential risk of human unemployment is acknowledged, and there is a focus on promoting research on how humans and AI can effectively work together.

2. The negative consequences of a competitive race to develop malicious AI are to be avoided through the promotion of cooperation, both at a global level.

3 . AI policy is to be integrated with the rapid development of AI in a flexible and responsive manner, with specific guidelines tailored to different sectors.

4 . There is a dedication to consistently enhance proactive and predictive strategies in the far future, considering the hazards linked to (AGI) and 'Superintelligence' .

The 'principles' have received endorsement from prestigious Chinese institutions and corporations, such as Baidu, Alibaba, and Tencent. In May 2019, the Artificial Intelligence Industry Alliance (AIIA), which is led by the China Academy of Information and Communications Technology under the Ministry of Industry and Information Technology (MIIT), released its "

Collective Pledge on Self Discipline in the Artificial Intelligence Industries " (Pasupuleti, 2024:72).

The Joint Pledge is now accepting feedback from " AIIA members & the general public" until June 30, 2019. Although the phrasing may seem general in comparison to other ethical and governance declarations, Webster (2019) highlights that the use of terms such as 'safe and controlled' and "self-discipline" aligns with the larger patterns seen in Chinese digital governance (Sulkowski, 2018:315).

Kai-Fu Lee and other experts, including Laskai and Webster (2019), have submitted written researches to the committee at the earliest phases of their study. Through the Partnership on Artificial Intelligence, Chinese technology corporations have been actively involved in initiatives pertaining to the ethics and governance of artificial intelligence, both inside China and on a worldwide scale (Tzimas, 2021:118).

Additionally, these businesses are displaying an increasing emphasis on integrating ethical issues into their own Artificial Intelligence activities, which is a positive development (Wadhwa & Wright, 2019:63).

4.2.5 Legal and Ethical Frameworks in India

There are three major national initiatives in India that shape the country's AI strategy. The second endeavor is the "Make in India" programmer, whereby the Indian government is offering precedence to AI technology that is originated and cultivated inside India. The third endeavor is the Smart Cities Mission (Páez, 2022:1456).

 In addition, the Union Government is making substantial investments in research, development, and training specifically focused on new technologies. In 2017, the Ministry of Commerce and Industry formed an AI Task Force to examine how AI might effectively address socio-economic challenges on a large scale. A 2018 report by the Indian government's Ministry of Commerce and Industry titled "Research on Artificial Intelligence" identified ten sectors that might benefit from AI implementation. (Wadhwa & Wright, 2012:196).

 The fields of agriculture, industry, national security, and financial technology are just a few examples. The National Strategy to supply Artificial Intelligence, published in 2018, analyzed the potential of AI to stimulate economic growth and foster social development. India was recognized as a prospective center for AI applications (Theodorou & Dignum, 2020:12).

Although both agreements make reference to ethics, they do not effectively address important issues about basic rights, equity, inclusivity, and the boundaries of data for decision making. Private entities are using Artificial Intelligence (AI) across several industries, including manufacturing, healthcare, and finance (Momanyi, 2016:39).

Despite positive advancements, the present lack of data privacy laws in India poses important concerns around the handling and sharing of sensitive personal data. The existing Personal Data Protection law lacks sufficient consideration of inferred data, which is especially crucial in the framework of machine learning. India's Aadhaar, a biometric identification project, has the potential to serve as a central hub for future AI applications (Nikolinakos, 2023:132).

There have been several recommendations for incorporating face recognition into Aadhaar in the last year, however this is not yet implemented. Currently, the Government has not released any official ethical framework or principles. It is probable that ethical standards will arise soon, in response to the increased public focus on data protection legislation. The current mentions of AI often pertain to data protection legislation, which is a growing phenomenon seen in several countries (Pasupuleti, 2024:128).

4.2.6 Australia's legal and ethical frameworks

Australia is unique among Western democracies in that it does not have comprehensive and legally binding measures to protect human rights, such as a bill of rights or full "constitutional protection of rights". However, there is an increasing emphasis in Australia , on the impact of technology on human rights, in addition to the establishment of a moral framework for artificial intelligence..

In addition, the Victorian Information Commissioner's Office released a policy document about privacy and Artificial Intelligence in 2018., Data 61 and CSIRO are now working on a significant development: the Australian Ethical Framework.

The discussion paper begins by analyzing the current ethical frameworks, concepts, and standards. The paper contains a variety of case studies, most of which are from foreign or US sources, which diminishes the significance of the distinct Australian (such as socio-political) setting.

The research included a segment on 'data governance' that focuses primarily on privacy and data security. This component has faced substantial criticism from a collective of Australian privacy specialists. According to Salinger

(2019), they contend that the study indicates a notable deficiency in understanding Australian privacy laws. Furthermore, there is a focus on subjects related to 'authorization' that 'may not be relevant in current or future data processing contexts'.

The report included a section on automated choices, but, it omits any discussion or reference to legislative approaches for managing or regulating automated decision making, preparation, or profiling. Specifically, it does not make any reference to Article 22 of the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR).

Additionally, it is important to take into account the intricacies of handling and analyzing extensive datasets, as well as the requirement to separate sensitive conclusions from the facts, as previously noted. The research further examines instances of AI implementation and subsequently presents a suggested ethical paradigm.

5. Conclusion

An important issue to consider in future research on "AI governance" and ethics is the inspection of the specific individuals participating in the development of these efforts, whether at the international or national level. To what extent are researchers and "civil society groups" actively involved, and to what extent are their opinions and contributions taken into account? Do civil society groups mainly represent the broader public or certain subsets of the general population? Which organizations and other entities offer financial assistance to different groups and initiatives? Is the level of actual public engagement sufficient to provide Artificial Intelligence a social license to operate inside a certain jurisdiction or for specific applications? Does the development of Artificial Intelligence ethics and governance emphasis the use of technocratic procedures? To what extent do "participants in AI" and its governance, ethical considerations, and activities correctly represent the demographic composition of the whole population? Hagendorff (2019) has voiced dissatisfaction with the limited representation of various genders in the field of artificial intelligence, seeing it as an example of ethical ideals not being completely fulfilled.

We identified prospects for more research on AI ethics and global governance in earlier lines in this study. This came up during our discussion of the study's limitations. Additional research may be conducted to regularly monitor and investigate emerging and new AI governance and ethical activities, as well as to assess the execution of present programs. In addition

to the fact that we, as a group and as individual researchers, may be able to finish a portion of our assignment on our own, we also rely on others to do more research. Please contact us if you are interested in working with any of us, or all of us.

References

1. Kubilevičius, K. and Berkmanas, T. (2023) 'Political science: AI governance', Future Law, Ethics, and Smart Technologies, pp. 60–71. doi:10.1163/9789004682900_007.

2. Asif, R., Hassan, S. R., & Parr, G. (2023). Integrating a blockchain-based governance framework for responsible AI. Future Internet, 15(3), 97. https://doi.org/10.3390/fi15030097

3. Ashraf, S. B., & Islam, M. M. (2024). Ai and the future of human rights in Bangladesh: A call for robust legal and ethical frameworks. International Journal of Law and Information Technology. https://doi.org/10.1093/ijlit/eaae002

4. Hamilton, C. (2013). The Ethical Foundations of Climate Engineering. Climate Change Geoengineering, 39–58. https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9781139161824.004

5. Ford, J. (2022). Ethical AI frameworks: The missing governance piece. Regulatory Insights on Artificial Intelligence, 219–239. https://doi.org/10.4337/9781800880788.00018

6. Garcia, D. (2023). Legal and political frameworks. The AI Military Race, 192–234. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780192864604.003.0005

7. Asaro, P. (2020). Autonomous weapons and the ethics of Artificial Intelligence. Ethics of Artificial Intelligence, 212–236. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190905033.003.0008

8. Russell, S. (2020). Artificial Intelligence. Ethics of Artificial Intelligence, 327–341. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190905033.003.0012

9. Liao, S. M. (2020). A short introduction to the ethics of Artificial Intelligence. Ethics of Artificial Intelligence, 1–42. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190905033.003.0001

10. Lee, H. R. (2023). Development of Artificial Intelligence Ethics Awareness Scale for elementary school students. The Korean Society for Artificial Intelligence Ethics, 2(1), 98–127. https://doi.org/10.59728/jaie.2023.2.1.98

11.Knell, S., & Rüther, M. (2023). Artificial Intelligence, superefficiency and the end of work: A humanistic perspective on meaning in life. AI and Ethics. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-023-00273-w

12.Schultz, M. D., & Seele, P. (2022). Towards ai ethics' institutionalization: Knowledge bridges from business ethics to advance organizational AI ethics. AI and Ethics, 3(1), 99–111. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-022-00150-y

13.Lauer, D. (2020). You cannot have AI ethics without ethics. AI and Ethics, 1(1), 21–25. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-020-00013-4

14.Hagendorff, T. (2021). Blind spots in AI ethics. AI and Ethics, 2(4), 851–867. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-021-00122-8

15.Nyholm, S., & Rüther, M. (2023). Meaning in life in AI ethics—some trends and perspectives. Philosophy & Technology, 36(2). https://doi.org/10.1007/s13347-023-00620-z

16.Wörsdörfer, M. (2023). Ai Ethics and ordoliberalism 2.0: Towards a 'digital bill of rights.' AI and Ethics. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-023-00367-5

17.Anderson, S. L., & Anderson, M. (2020). Ai and Ethics. AI and Ethics, 1(1), 27–31. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-020-00003-6

18. O'Hara, N. (2023). Primary recognition, morality and ai. AI and Ethics. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-023-00340-2

19.Reinhardt, K. (2022). Trust and trustworthiness in AI Ethics. AI and Ethics, 3(3), 735–744. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-022-00200-5

20.Sahlgren, O. (2024). Action-guidance and ai ethics: The case of fair machine learning. AI and Ethics. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-024-00437-2

21.Galavotti, I. (2022). Family ownership and M&AS: A systematic review of the last two decades. Corporate Governance: Theory and Practice. https://doi.org/10.22495/cgtapp16

22.Schmitt, L. (2021). Mapping global AI governance: A nascent regime in a fragmented landscape. AI and Ethics, 2(2), 303–314. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-021-00083-y

23.Boháč, J., & Jahnova, Z. (2014). Land use changes and landscape degradation in central and Eastern Europe in the last decades: Epigeic invertebrates as bioindicators of landscape changes. Environmental Indicators, 395–420. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-9499-2_24

24.Satoshi, M. (2015). The last two decades in Japanese politics. Examining Japan's Lost Decades, 135–157. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315715223-8

25.Wadhwa, K., & Wright, D. (2012). EHealth: Frameworks for assessing ethical impacts. eHealth: Legal, Ethical and Governance Challenges, 183–210. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-22474-4_8

26.Hamilton, C. (2013). The Ethical Foundations of Climate Engineering. Climate Change Geoengineering, 39–58. https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9781139161824.004

27.Ford, J. (2022). Ethical AI frameworks: The missing governance piece. Regulatory Insights on Artificial Intelligence, 219–239. https://doi.org/10.4337/9781800880788.00018

28.Ashraf, S. B., & Islam, Md. M. (2023). Ai and the future of human rights in Bangladesh: A call for robust legal and ethical frameworks. International Journal of Law and Information Technology, 31(4), 331–348. https://doi.org/10.1093/ijlit/eaae002

29.Garcia, D. (2023). Legal and political frameworks. The AI Military Race, 192–234. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780192864604.003.0005

30.Pasupuleti, M. K. (2024). Ethical AI governance: A global blueprint. AI Governance: Innovating with Integrity, 60–77. https://doi.org/10.62311/nesx/97832

31.Wadhwa, K., & Wright, D. (2012). EHealth: Frameworks for assessing ethical impacts. eHealth: Legal, Ethical and Governance Challenges, 183–210. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-22474-4_8

32.Karim, R., & Vyas, S. (2023). Legal and ethical implications of edge-ai-enabled IOT Healthcare Monitoring Systems. Edge-AI in Healthcare, 197–212. https://doi.org/10.1201/9781003244592-14

33.Theodorou, A., & Dignum, V. (2020). Towards ethical and socio-legal governance in AI. Nature Machine Intelligence, 2(1), 10–12. https://doi.org/10.1038/s42256-019-0136-y

34.Ghose, A., Ali, S. M., & Deshmukh, S. (2024). Navigating the legal and Ethical Framework for generative AI. Advances in Computational Intelligence and Robotics, 168–184. https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-1565-1.ch010

35.Onzivu, W. (2013). Reinforcing Global Health Normative Frameworks and legal obligations. Global Health and International Community, 233–248. https://doi.org/10.5040/9781472544582.ch-014

36.George, C., Whitehouse, D., & Duquenoy, P. (2012). Assessing legal, ethical and governance challenges in eHealth. eHealth: Legal, Ethical and Governance Challenges, 3–22. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-22474-4_1

37.Momanyi, A. (2016). Governance: Legal and Institutional Frameworks. https://doi.org/10.18356/19fd272c-en

38.Nikolinakos, N. Th. (2023). Ethical principles for trustworthy ai. Law, Governance and Technology Series, 101–166. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-27953-9_3

39.Sulkowski, A. J. (2018). Blockchain, business supply chains, sustainability, and Law: The future of governance, legal frameworks, and lawyers? SSRN Electronic Journal. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3262291

40.Lupo, G. (2022). The Ethics of Artificial Intelligence: An analysis of ethical frameworks disciplining AI in Justice and other contexts of application. Oñati Socio-Legal Series, 12(3), 616–655. https://doi.org/10.35295/osls.iisl/0000-0000-0000-1273

41.Tzimas, T. (2021). AI governance and the Fundamental Principles of International Law. Law, Governance and Technology Series, 103–129. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-78585-7_5

42.Zenil, H. (2018). Digital and Computational Aspects of Human and AI Ethical Frameworks. https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints201811.0054.v1

الأسس التشريعية والأخلاقية للذكاء الاصطناعي المستقبلي

المدرس المساعد : محمد حسن هادي (1)
وزارة التربية والتعليم
الكلية التربوية المفتوحة
07716166564
mohammed.almaawi.iq@gmail.com

المدرس المساعد : أسماء علي جاسم (2)
وزارة التربية والتعليم
الكلية التربوية المفتوحة
07742249891
a0740551@gmail.com

مستخلص البحث:

إن التنظيم الفعال والأخلاقي للذكاء الاصطناعي يشكلان مصدر قلق سياسي عاجل. فالهيئات التشريعية والجهات التنظيمية لا تمتلك الخبرة الفنية المتخصصة اللازمة لتحويل الطلبات الشعبية إلى تفويضات تشريعية بشكل فعال. ويؤدي الاعتماد المفرط على التنظيم الذاتي للصناعة إلى نقص المساءلة عن النظام الأخلاقي للذكاء الاصطناعي والمستخدمين في تلبية المتطلبات الديمقراطية. وينطوي مفهوم الأطر الأخلاقية على إلزام الحكومات للكيانات الخاضعة للتنظيم بالحصول على مساعدة تنظيمية من جهة تنظيمية خاصة. وتتمتع هذه الأطر الأخلاقية للذكاء الاصطناعي بالقدرة على معالجة أوجه القصور القائم من كل من التنظيم القائم على القيادة والتحكم والتنظيم الذاتي. وتوفر معظم الدول المتقدمة للحكومات الفرصة لتحديد أولويات السياسة للأطر الأخلاقية للذكاء الاصطناعي، مع استخدام قوى السوق والبحث والتطوير في الصناعة لتطوير أكثر طرق التنظيم فعالية لإنشاء الأطر الأخلاقية التي تتوافق مع أهداف صناع السياسات.

الكلمات المفتاحية: حوكمة الذكاء الاصطناعي، الأطر الأخلاقية، الأسس الأخلاقية، الأسس التشريعية، حوكمة الذكاء الاصطناعي في المستقبل.