Negative Proof of ChatGPT's Legal Subjectivity and Jurisprudential Risk Analysis

Yuan Gao

International School of Law and Finance, East China University of Political Science and Law, Shanghai 200000, China.

Isabellagao99@gmail.com

Abstract

Recently, the artificial intelligence chatbot ChatGPT wildly popular all over the Internet. "More and more like a person" of artificial intelligence makes people produce subjective worry, artificial intelligence will replace, rule human speech is very clamouring. The author believes that ChatGPT and other artificial intelligence does not have autonomous consciousness, moral ability, judgement, can not take responsibility, so it can not become a legal personality, to give it the status of the subject of the proposed also has no legal basis. Only after clarifying the "meta-issue" can we rationally examine the opportunities and challenges brought by its rapid development. In the face of ChatGPT and other powerful artificial intelligence, on the one hand, it is necessary to adhere to "anthropocentrism", on the other hand, we should see that it will certainly promote the industry change in the field of law, so as to conform to the trend, and keep pace with the times.

Keywords

ChatGPT, Legal Subject, Negative Proof, Jurisprudential Risk.

1. Introduction

Since its release, ChatGPT has swept across the world with the momentum of lightning, becoming the fastest-growing programme in history in terms of active users. The rising user scale and fewer bad reviews show that AI is transforming from "working" to "good" , ChatGPT has become a phenomenal event in the development of AI. On 30 January 2023, a Colombian court recognised the use of ChatGPT in its judgement. On 30 January 2023, a Colombian court acknowledged the use of ChatGPT in its judgement, thus giving birth to the "world's first judgement made using ChatGPT" . It is foreseeable that ChatGPT and similar AI applications will be indispensable to the future development of the judicial adjudication field and even the entire legal industry. At the same time as ChatGPT is "advancing", the anxiety and even fear that it will replace human work has been rising, and has set off a heated discussion on the Internet.

The concept of "Artificial Intelligence" was first proposed by the American computer scientist McCarthy in 1956, and now according to the degree of AI imitating human autonomous consciousness can be divided into three types of weak AI, strong AI, and super AI. The key technology of weak AI is the machine's deep learning and natural language processing and understanding, which is still essentially dominated and controlled by humans. The key technology of weak AI is the machine's deep learning and natural language processing and understanding, which is still essentially dominated and controlled by human beings, and it only imitates human beings in a certain part of the process and replaces human beings in their work; strong AI means that the machine can act like human beings, and this kind of AI has already fully mastered human beings' ability of thinking, sensing, judging, comprehending, and reasoning; and super AI means that AI has already surpassed human beings in all aspects and

even replaced human beings. It can be said that the emergence of ChatGPT has sounded the horn of AI technology stage from the weak AI era to the strong AI era.

2022 is undoubtedly the year of the explosion of generative AI, the rise of ChatGPT means the second renaissance of the AI era, as a strong AI language model with deep learning power is destined to become a milestone in the history of science and technology, and is able to "speak more like a human being", getting rid of the obvious "machine talk" of the previous generation of AI. "Machine talk", won the favour of the industry and global buzz . Tesla CEO Musk publicly stated that ChatGPT is "so powerful it's scary" ; Bill Gates believes that ChatGPT's introduction is historically significant, and that the birth of this AI technology is no less important than the birth of the Internet or the personal computer .

Of course, there are some scholars with a cautious attitude that the technical "blind spot" of ChatGPT itself and the legal dilemma of artificial intelligence triggered by it are worthy of attention, and that in the general heated discussion inspired by ChatGPT, we should maintain a kind of professional cognitive ability and academic integrity of cold thinking. At present, the legal profession has different views on whether ChatGPT and other strong artificial intelligence can become the subject of law. From the perspective of jurisprudence, we can trace the root of the problem in order to grasp the subjectivity of this issue in order to better analyse and respond to the challenges that ChatGPT's explosion may bring to the legal field.

2. Jurisprudential Debate on the Legal Subjectivity of Strong Artificial Intelligence such as ChatGPT

The concept of subjectivity is a product of the dualistic worldview, and philosophical subjectivity is mainly derived from human self-consciousness and subjective initiative, reflecting the self-activity, self-consciousness and freedom of human beings as subjects. Since the beginning of Kant, the subjectivity of continental philosophy is usually closely related to human free will and rationality, and the "man legislates for nature" in Kant's philosophy establishes the principle of human "subjectivity". A legal subject is a person who has rights or obligations in a legal relationship, also known as a subject of rights and obligations. Juridical subjectivity is based on philosophical subjectivity, so subjective meaning plays a decisive role in legal relations, and civil law is based on the expression of subjective meaning, and the institutional construction of the subject of the law is generally based on the considerations of free will and the assumption of responsibility.

Throughout the development of artificial intelligence, whenever its technical level makes a major leap, will be in all walks of life in the community on whether AI will replace human beings and even whether it will rule the earth's big discussion, the rise of ChatGPT naturally is no exception, and in the field of jurisprudence, this is embodied in the recognition of the artificial intelligence has a "personality" debate. In the field of jurisprudence, this is reflected in the debate on whether artificial intelligence can be recognised as a "personality", which is not purely derived from moral or ethical values, but based on the theoretical analysis of whether artificial intelligence can have the qualification of a legal subject from the perspective of jurisprudence. This issue has become a "meta-issue" in the study of artificial intelligence, which is directly related to the exercise of legal rights, the fulfilment of legal obligations and the assumption of legal responsibilities.

At present, many scholars in the academic community have been focusing on exploring the jurisprudential issues that may be raised by artificial intelligence, including the impact of artificial intelligence on personality rights, the assumption of tort liability of artificial intelligence, and the rights of artificial intelligence. From the current research results, the weak artificial intelligence can only be used as an instrumental attribute of the object of the general consensus of the academic community, while the strong artificial intelligence similar to

ChatGPT can be given the legal subject qualification of the views of a variety of views, can be summarised into three, namely, affirmative, compromise and negative.

2.1. Affirmation.

Scholars who hold the affirmative view believe that artificial intelligence should be given the qualification of legal subject in order to solve social conflicts and disputes, so that artificial intelligence can better serve human beings: Guo Shaofei (2018) proposes that artificial intelligence has the characteristics of autonomy and initiative, and is not completely subject to the domination of the main body, and therefore it should be given the status of "electronic human being" in the law. Zheng Wenge (2022) argues for the responsibility path of the construction of the legal subject of artificial intelligence, which indicates that the construction of the legal subject of artificial intelligence should be centred on strong artificial intelligence, and the essence of its subjectivity is responsibility, and it is necessary to construct a kind of special property legal subject based on the assumption of responsibility for artificial intelligence. As for the hidden risks of granting AI legal subject status, Xu Huili (2020) believes that the dangers brought by AI to society can be avoided as long as it is reasonably designed and the ethical norms of AI are improved.

The examination of extraterritorial legal practice on the legal attributes of artificial intelligence, there is no lack of countries that recognise the legal subjectivity of artificial intelligence, has taken a more forward-looking "innovation": for example, in 2007, the South Korean government formulated the "Robotics Ethics Charter", the document's original intention is still to protect human beings, but in addition to the considerations of utilitarianism For example, in 2007, the South Korean government formulated the Charter of Robot Ethics, which is still intended to protect human beings, but in addition to utilitarian considerations, its provisions preventing human beings from "mistreating" robots also contain a kind of ultimate humanistic concern, which demonstrates a tendency to recognise the "personality" of intelligent robots; in 2016, the European Union's Committee on Legal Affairs submitted a motion to the European Commission advocating for the positioning of the most In 2016, the EU's Legal Affairs Committee submitted a motion to the European Commission advocating that the most advanced automated robots be positioned as "electronic persons" and be given "specific rights and obligations" as human beings, and the Legal Affairs Committee also recommended that intelligent automated robots be registered and that separate fund accounts be set up for them to handle matters such as taxes, contributions, and pensions. On 28 October 2017, at the Future Investment Initiative (FII) conference in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, the Saudi government formally granted Sofia, a "female" robot, Saudi citizenship, making her the first robot in the world to be granted legal subject status. Sofia became the first robot in the world to be granted legal subject status.

2.2. Compromise.

Those who hold the compromise view neither affirm nor deny the status of AI's legal subject qualification, but believe that it is in an "intermediate state", i.e., limited personality, but due to the limited capacity of AI's behaviours, special legal norms should be applied, which mainly include: Yuan Zeng (2017) believes that AI should be given a "quasi-legal personality", which is his conclusion based on the nature of AI and the concept of facilitating the arrangement of the tort liability system. "quasi-legal personality", which is his conclusion based on the nature of AI and the concept of facilitating the arrangement of tort liability system ; Si Xiao and Cao Jianfeng (2017) from the perspective of balance of interests, put forward to give AI the status of legal subject is only a way to solve the problem, and to achieve the balance of legal interests is the fundamental purpose . In fact, the compromise statement is only a typological design for the qualification of strong and weak AI legal subjects, which is still essentially an affirmative statement.

2.3. Negation.

The scholars who hold a negative view believe that although the current artificial intelligence in many aspects of the views of close to human beings, and even some aspects beyond human beings, but it does not have free will, moral feelings and other characteristics inherent in human beings, but can only be a legal object, only a tool to serve human beings and the existence of the legal level, for this reason, AI can not be used as a human being, just beyond the scope of the object: Zheng Gao (2017)) argues that at the legal level, AI, as a tool, cannot be given subject qualification. Wu Xi Yu (2018) suggests that the effectiveness of artificial intelligence behaviour, does not require a detailed interpretation of its legal subject qualification, so the legal rules of the intelligent body itself will not have a direct impact on the behaviour of the intelligent body, and for this reason the legal personality created loses its significance, based on which it is necessary to adopt a legal system to restrain and manage the creator of the intelligent body, in order to avoid the risks that may arise and the problems that arise. Pi Yong (2018) argues that artificial intelligence does not have independent subjectivity and is not regulated by existing laws, and that granting it the status of a legal subject is very likely to produce a "reaction of exclusion" with the existing legal system. Feng Jie (2019) argues that from the perspective of legal theory, the legal "person" should have the legal qualification to enjoy rights and fulfil obligations on the one hand, and the ability to enjoy rights and fulfil obligations on the other hand, and if it cannot satisfy these two conditions, then it cannot enjoy the status of a legal subject . Liu Honghua (2019) argues that the current AI does not have rational consciousness and cannot be given legal subject status, i.e., the proposed legal personality has no practical significance for the solution of social problems. Liu Xianquan (2021) pointed out in "The Attribution and Determination of the Nature of Criminal Responsibility for Crimes Involving Artificial Intelligence Products" that if the person who carries out the operation of an artificial intelligence product does not operate it in accordance with certain procedures and product descriptions, the negligence crime brought about by the artificial intelligence needs to be borne by the production unit of which it is the corresponding responsibility.

3. The Negative Proof of the Qualification of Strong AI Legal Subjects such as ChatGPT

3.1. Lack of legal relationships to be regulated.

The function of the law is to help mankind to realise justice in their common life, i.e. the law is oriented towards justice and regulates interpersonal relations, consisting of countless interests, attributable to the interests of different subjects, which, due to the differences between the subjects, naturally lead to the formation of conflicts, which threaten the peace of the common life and which have to be oriented towards justice, and which have to be balanced through trade-offs.

The purpose of law is to settle disputes, and legal norms maintain social order by setting rights and obligations and legal consequences. And only between people there will be disputes, the essence of the dispute is the collision and contradiction between different selves, is the interests of the entanglement and conflict. Legal person as a legal system of a subject, is composed of natural persons with the will of the group, because of social and economic development needs to be created, with the increase of interest disputes between the group and the group, also has as an independent subject of the existence of the necessity of the law to adjust the essence of the person to achieve the purpose of assisting the person. chatGPT similar artificial intelligence is only a tool invented by human beings, and does not have self-consciousness, and does not have individuality. It does not have self-awareness, and does not have the possibility of conflict of interest between individuals, in the final analysis, there will be no disputes between people

and artificial intelligence or artificial intelligence and artificial intelligence, there is no need to adjust the legal relationship, so there is no need to give it the status of the subject.

3.2. Lack of autonomous will.

ChatGPT's position on its "dehumanisation" is clear: "I have no emotions, consciousness or personality, I'm just a tool for answering questions". It does not have the ability to think and make moral choices of a human being, and for AI, the difference between good and evil in human society is just a binary algorithm in programming . ChatGPT is unable to achieve "I think, therefore I am" in terms of subjectivity, and its answers within the scope of its data cognition are dialectical questions that have the meaning of "what you see is what you get". Although ChatGPT can be as smart as a human being or speak like a human being, which is close to the state of "complete artificial intelligence", the so-called "thinking power" that it has been trained by OpenAI is still the same as the so-called "thinking power" of a human being that includes all human beings, but it is still the same as the so-called "thinking power" of a human being. "is still a large language model pre-trained on a database of information about various topics and knowledge domains or on a huge text corpus.

The algorithms contained in ChatGPT are undoubtedly the stuff of human design, whether it's AI writing AI code or complex neural network algorithms, all done under human control and teaching. Even if there is an algorithmic black box that even programmers may not be able to say much about, the algorithms are not out of control and remain within human control. In fact, the values of the designers and operators are inevitably embedded in everything from data cleaning and labelling, to mapping knowledge, to algorithm modelling and code writing.

ChatGPT is no longer powerful, it is only a more perfect imitation of human beings, imitation does not need to go through thinking, analysis and judgement, and there is a world of difference between human autonomy and consciousness. In addition, ChatGPT does not have emotions, the birth of artificial intelligence is to make up for the rationality of human beings, but ignored the emotions and morality, so only IQ without IQ can not be said to be the real will, at best, it is a mechanical will.

3.3. Lack of moral and value judgement.

ChatGPT is highly trained in technological ethics and can verify that a user's questions are legally compliant or in accordance with moral and ethical rules, and when asked questions about ethical codes or violations of the law, it can be found to be very politically correct and morally ethical, and may even outright refuse to answer: "Please follow the appropriate code of conduct and be responsible for your words and actions. "I am strictly bound to answer only questions that are legal and morally correct, and will not answer questions that are offensive, defamatory, racially discriminatory, religiously biased, pornographic content, or otherwise unethical. However, the rudimentary "moral judgement" is essentially just deep learning, processing and application of the database, technically speaking, ChatGPT links ethical value judgement questions by matching its already stored knowledge information through the various layers and weights in the model, which in turn generates answers that meet ethical value standards.

For example, due to its lack of moral and value judgement, ChatGPT will never be able to solve the classic dilemma, the "Trolley Problem". The "Trolley Dilemma" was formulated by Philippa Foote, a contemporary British philosopher, and since its inception, it has sparked numerous ethical and jurisprudential discussions. Utilitarianism and libertarianism are in constant dispute, but in the end, all parties reach a consensus on the conclusion that "people are responsible for their own choices". In reality, if a person is faced with a similar dilemma, no matter what his final choice is, others or his own conscience will unconsciously ask the reasons for his value judgement and choice. Therefore, from that perspective, people are responsible

for their own choices, and only people can be responsible for their own choices. The reason why many higher-order judgement issues, such as those related to ethics, morality and aesthetics, cannot be automated is that there is no fixed right or wrong, and it is only when human beings are faced with such scenarios and make judgements on their own that the "right answer" belonging to different individuals will be chosen.

This problem also exists in a wide range of AI applications such as autonomous driving. For example, many traffic accidents occur in the vehicle high-speed exercise process, the front suddenly appeared people or animals crossing the road. In this case, many drivers will subconsciously hit the steering wheel, and the result will sometimes be the vehicle stalled rollover, he wants to avoid the safety of people, but the driver and his friends and family car crash. So if AI were to replace humans in car driving, it would be difficult to make judgements and choices about such scenarios. The AI might be able to calculate through simulation that the probability of survival of pedestrians on the road increases and the probability of survival of the driver plummets after an evasive manoeuvre is made. The opposite is true if no evasive manoeuvre is made. But artificial intelligence obviously can not be done for the purpose of protecting the driver to "drive straight through" such a choice, otherwise it will bring a series of legal and ethical issues.

4. Jurisprudential Risks of ChatGPT's Application

ChatGPT's excellent language understanding and generating ability has been widely praised at the same time, but also to the academic community and all walks of life to bring "ethical trepidation", the future of ChatGPT as a representative of the algorithmic decision-making provided by artificial intelligence will become an indispensable and important aid and reference to the judicial handling of the case: on the one hand, a high degree of consistency, objectivity On the one hand, the highly consistent and objective ChatGPT-assisted decision-making can help improve judicial efficiency and limit judges' discretionary power, thus promoting judicial justice; on the other hand, there are certain legal risks in using ChatGPT for decision-making.

4.1. Lack of moral and value judgement may fall into the conceptual jurisprudential fallacy.

First of all, from the nature, AI has no moral and value judgement ability, just "instilled with the code written by programmers to achieve a specific purpose", the core of the judge lies in its judgement, no moral ability and judgement ability of ChatGPT can never be a substitute for the judge to judge the case. Justice is a spiritual activity and judicial power is the power of judgement. Mencius said, "Good deeds are not enough to govern, and the law is not enough to govern itself." In terms of the relationship between the law and people, China's tradition of valuing the human factor is not dissimilar to the Western experience of the rule of law. In his Methodology of Jurisprudence, Larenz points out that "the key to the application of the law does not really lie in the final stage of its incorporation, but in the prior evaluation of that incorporation: the fact of life is characterized by that which the constituent element alleges. This prior judgement may be made on the basis of the judge's observations of the senses, the interpretation of human behavior, the interpretation of natural facts, and the criterion of value.

The court's task in the exploration of the purpose of the law, and will be applied to specific cases, in order to achieve justice to the common life of mankind, the exploration of the purpose of the law is the modern methodology of jurisprudence known as the search for the law activities, usually can be distinguished as legal interpretation and legal supplementation, and the concept of jurisprudence will be equal to the application of the law, the "trilogy of law". ", that it is only a concrete case in the abstract provisions of the law of the logical process, during which not only on the major premise (legal provisions) of the invocation, do not take into account the

rights and wrongs, emphasis on the law in the law, but also on the minor premise (legal facts) of the appropriateness of the determination of the specific characteristics of the individual legal facts of the trade-offs, ignoring the value of its judgement of the character, that is, no longer according to the individual This is considered to be the decisive fallacy of conceptual jurisprudence, whereby the law or its application, if disconnected from its values, is transformed into a brute force claim that "bad law is also law", and that the law or its application, if disconnected from the norms or treatments that it is intended to regulate or deal with, is not a law. If the law or its application is disconnected from the nature of the type of life it is intended to regulate or deal with (the facts), it becomes a "deer in the headlights" argument.

4.2. The "algorithmic black box" may lead to a return to the age of divine judgement.

Secondly, the application of AI such as ChatGPT in the legal field may face technical bottlenecks such as overfitting and underfitting of algorithms, algorithmic bias and algorithmic discrimination, etc. In particular, the use of deep learning algorithms in intelligent systems such as case pushing, sentencing assistance, judgement prediction, and automated generation of adjudicative documents is bound to create the "algorithmic black box" or the problem of non-interpretability. " or the problem of non-interpretability. This means that the consistency and objectivity of algorithmic decision-making is relative, and once an algorithmic bias or algorithmic error occurs, it mechanises and routinises this bias and error, "and the consequences of this are likely to be appalling" . If the decisions of AIs such as ChatGPT are taken as the result of a final adjudication, then there will be consequences similar to those of ancient divine adjudication. Legend has it that the earliest judicial official in China was Gaotao in the Yao and Shun eras, who appeared as a half-god, half-human, and brought out the mythical beast Xiezhi to adjudicate whenever two parties to a lawsuit could not agree on a point, and Xiezhi "touched it without straightening it out", whose results were random and unpredictable, and whose outcome would be similar to the outcome of an algorithmic black box such as ChatGPT, if it relied on the existence of such a black box. Once you rely entirely on artificial intelligence such as ChatGPT, which has an "algorithmic black box," to adjudicate, the results can be out of control and impossible to estimate, and then the authority of the court and the certainty of the law will be gone.

4.3. Inability to make legal additions.

In addition, once a judge encounters an unavailability or a loophole in the law, the ChatGPT is likely to "fold his arms and refuse to adjudicate on the grounds that the 'law' in the narrow sense of the word does not tell him how to adjudicate, or that it is beyond the scope of his learning". This is where discretionary experience and intuition have to be resorted to in order to achieve "creative justice" . Larenz affirms the complementary legal competence of the judge, and goes so far as to say that, under the right conditions, the judge should have complementary competence that goes beyond the law of the law, and that the judge, who may not refuse to adjudicate, is obliged, in any case, to interpret the law and, if there is a loophole in the law, to add to it.

The task of legal supplementation is to eliminate systemic violations in the legal order so that the values pursued by the law can be more fully realised in the common life of human beings through appropriate methods that can be understood and verified afterwards. In order to achieve this task successfully, law enforcement agencies, especially the courts, should be oriented to values on the one hand in determining the existence or otherwise of loopholes in the law, and on the other hand, in the operation of their supplementation. On the one hand, it should be orientated towards the common life of human beings.

5. Conclusion

ChatGPT's flexibility and human qualities are important reasons for its AI milestone. It is also due to the rapid development of this type of artificial intelligence, leaving people with the impression that "machines are becoming more and more like human beings, and human beings are becoming more and more like machines", and academics have begun to have divergent views on its legal positioning, discussing whether it should be granted the status of legal subject. In analyzing this issue, it is necessary to go through the appearance of "anthropomorphism" and start from the essence that it still belongs to the human-made objects, and the essence of ChatGPT's "creativity" is the super arithmetic power, and the essence of the seemingly spontaneous "creative ability" is the "creative ability" of ChatGPT. The essence of ChatGPT's "creativity" is the support of super computing power, and the essence of its seemingly spontaneous "innovation ability" is the pre-programmed human intelligence. In the imagination, "human-type AI" machines are exactly like human beings in both appearance and thinking mode, and even have human emotional ability, and completely exceed human beings in terms of work efficiency and ability, but in reality, even the strong AI represented by ChatGPT does not have autonomous consciousness, moral ability, The reality is that even the strong artificial intelligence represented by ChatGPT does not have autonomous consciousness, moral ability, judgement, and cannot take responsibility, so it cannot become a legal "personality", and it is meaningless to give it the status of the subject of the proposed, because there is no need to adjust the legal relationship. After clarifying the core issue that artificial intelligence such as ChatGPT cannot be used as a legal subject but only as an object for human use, it is more rational to examine the hidden opportunities and challenges of its mushrooming development.

In the face of ChatGPT such strong artificial intelligence, on the one hand, we must adhere to anthropocentrism, and all technological innovation and development must be subject to, and serve the common welfare of mankind, on the one hand, we must see that the artificial intelligence represented by ChatGPT will certainly promote industry changes in the legal field as the technology continues to improve.

Facts have shown that any emerging technology application is both creative and destructive. The use of ChatGPT can enable practitioners to process and analyses data more efficiently, achieve access to specialized information more quickly, improve judicial efficiency, and reduce the problem of different judgments in the same case; but at the same time the lack of judgement, "algorithmic black box", "algorithmic discrimination " and other issues are also behind it cannot be ignored risks that require the response of legal theory. To sum up, it is necessary to carefully consider the changes at all levels of society, including academic ethics, brought about by the new round of AI technology represented by ChatGPT, and on the basis of fully understanding the new round of AI technology represented by ChatGPT, to combine it with better human actions and better ways of social organization, and to shape a better picture of the future intelligence of mankind. Only in this way can we effectively resolve the rule of law paradox of "machines ruling over humans" and actively build a governance system that is good for science and technology, thus providing the core impetus for the construction of the rule of law in our country, laying a solid foundation, and realizing the major mission of science and technology empowerment.

References

[1] Huang Shaomin: Jurisprudential Proof and Expansion of Rules for the Qualification of Legal Subjects of Artificial Intelligence under the Perspective of Special Physical Character, Sino-Arabian Science and Technology Forum, Vol. 12 (2022).

[2] Larenz: Methodology of Jurisprudence (Commercial Press 2003).

[3] John C. Havens: Runaway Future (CITIC Publishing House 2017).

[4] Sun Xiaowan: Jurisprudence of Procedure (Commercial Press 2010).

[5] Marvin Minsky: The Emotion Machine (Zhejiang People's Publishing House 2016).

[6] Ma Changshan: The Rule of Law Paradox of Digital Intelligence Governance, Oriental Law Journal, (2022)No. 4.

[7] Huang Maorong: Basic Problems of Legal Interpretation, NTU Law Series, Vol. 5 (2015) No.2.

[8] Wang Ying: Research on the Legal Status of Artificial Intelligence, Yunnan University of Finance and Economics, Vol. 3(2022).

[9] Wu Xi Yu: On the Legal Subject Qualification of Artificial Intelligence, Zhejiang Social Science, (2018) No. 6.

[10] Si Xiao and Cao Jianfeng: On the Civil Liability of Artificial Intelligence: Taking Self-Driving Cars and Intelligent Robots as an Entry Point, Legal Science (Journal of Northwestern University of Political Science and Law), Vol. 5(2017).

[11] Luan Qun, Wang Chang, and Chen Quansi: Jurisprudential Analysis of Whether Artificial Intelligence Has a "Personality"", China Computer News, (2022) No. 126.

[12] Zheng Wengge: The Responsibility Path of the Construction of the Legal Subject of Artificial Intelligence, China Applied Law, (2022)No. 5.

[13] Yan Fuping and Wu Zhen: On the Critical Subjectivity Epistemology of Kant's Philosophy, Academic Exchange, (2012)No. 10.

[14] Jielin Li and Meiyan Gao: Research on the Application and Limits of Artificial Intelligence in the Field of Judicial Adjudication, Journal of Changchun University of Science and Technology (Social Science Edition), (2022) No. 5.