



South Australian Debating Association Inc

Senior B, Round One

TOPIC: *that if a panel of experts cannot distinguish an artificially intelligent agent from a human, it should be granted legal personhood.*

1. Type of Topic

This is a normative/model debate.

This means that the affirmative should propose a 'model' (a policy on how this idea would be implemented). This model should be clearly described to outline what changes the affirmative team will make to the status quo (the current world), and how these changes will be enacted. The negative team can either support the status quo or propose a counter-model. This counter-model must be different from the status quo, but also different from the model the affirmative team is suggesting. The negative team should ensure they clearly identify whether they are supporting the status quo or proposing a counter-model. The debate then depends on both teams arguing about why their model/decision leads to a better world than the opposition's.

Assuming the affirmative and negative both provide reasonable models, neither team can argue the opposition's model is infeasible or would not be able to be implemented; each team is allowed to implement their model without questions of feasibility so long as they clearly explain their model and it is not completely unreasonable.

2. Background / Context

The last decade has seen a great rise in the production and use of artificial intelligence models such as ChatGPT or LaMDA, and it has been integrated into society's everyday use at a pace that is often difficult to keep up with. Yet the idea of forms of "artificial general intelligence" which can act and behave like humans in diverse ways has existed for almost a century often in a theoretical and philosophical scope; what makes humans different from machines?

Since AI has concreted itself as apart of everyday life in the modern world, the question of whether AI should be legally granted personhood for example has become more relevant than ever, and legal systems around the world have already had to make interesting decisions on AI. Though eventually overturned, a judge in the Federal Court of Australia initially ruled that AI could be credited as an inventor and be granted patents for inventions. ChatGPT has been tested on, and passed, many university tests and examinations.

So then, if a panel of experts is not able to distinguish between humans and artificial intelligence, the question then becomes whether it is justified to, or whether there are good reasons to, grant such agents legal personhood.

3. Questions for Consideration

- Broadly speaking, how does artificial intelligence work? How and by whom is it currently being researched, developed, or produced?
- What are some examples of artificially intelligent agents or artificial general intelligence?
- What may a 'panel of experts' on this subject may look like? Who may be on such a panel and why might this matter?
- What is legal personhood, how does it work, and what does such a status grant an agent?
- What current tests or processes exist for measuring the performance or humanlike nature of AI?
- Are there moral reasons why AI which succeeds in acting like a human should or should not be legally treated as such?
- Remember: this is a model debate; how might this process work if it did exist, and what would be the *practical* impacts and outcomes?

© The South Australian Debating Association, Inc. 2024 This work is copyright. Apart from any use as permitted under the Copyright Act 1968, no part may be reproduced by any process without prior written permission from the South Australian Debating Association, Inc. Requests and inquiries concerning reproduction and rights should be directed to the President, The South Australian Debating Association, Inc., GPO Box 906, Adelaide, SA 5001.