IRSHAD

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LAW AND POLICY

Beyond Legal Personhood Collective and Graduated Legal Subjectivity of Artificial Intelligence

[Farhodjon Abdihakimov][1]

[1]*National University of Uzbekistan named after Mirzo Ulugbek*

Keywords:

Artificial Intelligence, Legal Liability, Algorithmic Accountability, Network Liability, Digital Governance, Judicial Autonomy, AI Regulation

ABSTRACT

This study examines changes in legal responsibility in response to artificial intelligence systems and the need for flexible liability frameworks. Traditional legal models based on strict categories of persons and objects are becoming less effective in complex digital environments. The research explores shared network liability, judicial autonomy structures, and international AI governance approaches. A qualitative method based on doctrinal and document analysis is used to examine legal texts, policies, and scholarly work on AI regulation. Findings indicate that responsibility is now distributed across developers, users, platforms, and institutions rather than held by a single actor. Global policy developments show a shift toward risk-based and cooperative governance models. Despite this progress, challenges remain in enforcement consistency, cross-border regulation, and identifying algorithmic harm. The study concludes that legal systems must adopt flexible and system-oriented frameworks to ensure fairness, transparency, and accountability in rapidly evolving artificial intelligence environments shaping modern societies.

How to Cite: Abdihakimov, F. (2026). Beyond Legal Personhood Collective and Graduated Legal Subjectivity of Artificial Intelligence. *International Journal of Law and Policy, 4*(5), 23-43. https://doi.org/10.59022/ijlp.590

I. Introduction

Artificial intelligence systems now influence decisions for billions of people every day. These systems drive vehicles, approve financial loans, and forecast human behavior accurately. Current legal systems view artificial intelligence only as simple property or tools. This outdated view leads to serious issues with both responsibility and protection. Researchers now explore ideas of collective and graduated legal subjectivity for AI. Such ideas go beyond traditional personhood to fit various AI capabilities better. This approach proves important because it addresses real challenges from modern technology. Society needs new laws to manage AI growth and protect all parties involved. Graduated subjectivity allows different levels of rights based on AI development stages. Collective models treat AI groups as single legal entities with shared duties. These concepts make the topic vital for future legal and technological progress. Legal research must examine these options to keep pace with rapid innovation (Allahrakha, 2023).

Legal personhood developed over many centuries in human legal traditions around the world. It first applied to people and later extended to corporations and groups. Early laws treated these entities as single units with rights and duties. Artificial intelligence now raises fresh questions about these long-standing rules. Previous studies mainly explored full personhood for advanced machines. Those efforts achieved only partial success due to ethical and practical limits. Some recent works suggest partial rights based on specific AI functions. Yet very few examine collective or graduated forms of legal subjectivity. This gap leaves critical issues about AI groups and levels unexplored. The problem grows larger as connected systems gain more autonomy each year. Older models fail to match the current pace of technological change. This study seeks to fill those gaps through targeted legal analysis (Ugli, 2026).

Experts already know that artificial intelligence creates major challenges for current legal systems. Traditional rules focus only on full personhood or no rights at all. This binary approach fails to handle the complex nature of modern AI. Many studies have examined single AI entities but ignored groups and levels. The exact problem is the lack of collective and graduated legal subjectivity models. This gap leaves important questions about responsibility and rights unanswered in practice. The issue grows more urgent as connected AI systems become widespread each year. Society needs clear rules to manage these new realities effectively. Previous research stops short of offering practical solutions for graduated status. Collective subjectivity remains largely unexplored in legal literature to date. This study will solve the problem by developing these missing frameworks. Further work is still needed on real-world application and policy changes (Teubner, 2018).

Recent academic findings emphasize that existing global jurisdictions still refuse to recognize advanced digital entities as independent legal subjects. This baseline creates a

major challenge because modern software operates without clear human control. Legal scholars increasingly advocate for the "Bundle Theory," which suggests viewing personality as a flexible collection of distinct legal rights and duties. This approach helps courts distribute specific responsibilities to automated systems based on their exact practical functions. However, serious problems occur when neural software breaks complex decisions down linearly into zillions of pieces. This highly decentralized operational style leaves international courts without clear regulatory standards to govern autonomous actions. Furthermore, the capacity of generative tools to autonomously modify content leads to difficult doctrinal questions regarding fault. The legal field currently lacks unified safeguards to protect original human authors from algorithmic violations (Chaudhary, 2020).

To resolve these pressing issues, modern legal researchers argue that control must become the primary cornerstone for assigning systemic liability. Measuring control allows regulators to determine when developers should share the blame for digital outputs. Unfortunately, simply moving from individual liability to corporate models does not entirely close the responsibility gap. Group frameworks often fail to address situations where multiple decentralized algorithms collaborate completely independently. Some experts suggest that granting limited civil personality remains the only realistic path toward resolving this algorithmic impasse. Without these specific updates, public sectors will continue to struggle when implementing advanced software globally. Current international variations in technology governance also make it incredibly difficult to enforce unified liability standards. Further exploration into graduated legal subjectivity is therefore necessary to bridge these cross-border enforcement gaps (Ganot, 2025).

Current studies successfully prove that traditional, rigid legal frameworks struggle to govern automated software. Scholars effectively argue that using flexible control measures helps courts assign basic civil liability. However, a major weakness in existing research is the complete lack of practical enforcement data. Current literature fails to provide clear rules for measuring graduated subjectivity across different global borders. We still have insufficient information regarding how international courts can uniformly calculate decentralized algorithmic control. Most studies only offer abstract theoretical concepts instead of concrete operational tests for judges. Future research must focus on creating specific, measurable indicators of digital autonomy for global enforcement. Investigators should explore unified treaty designs that standardize these graduated legal boundaries across multiple jurisdictions. Addressing this empirical gap will finally turn abstract legal theories into workable courtroom realities (Taylor, 2024).

To design a structured framework for measuring graduated legal subjectivity based on empirical indicators of algorithmic autonomy.

To formulate a unified cross-border enforcement model that standardizes decentralized AI liability across international jurisdictions.

To evaluate how global courts can practically calculate shared responsibility within interconnected digital networks without disrupting technological innovation.

How can international legal systems design and enforce a unified framework of graduated legal subjectivity to calculate and allocate shared liability within decentralized artificial intelligence networks across different jurisdictions?

This research provides critical new tools to help global policymakers regulate advanced autonomous networks. Developing a clear, graduated framework directly prevents unpredictable enforcement gaps in international courts. Academically, this study expands existing knowledge by shifting discussions away from rigid binary definitions. Practically, judges can use these fresh, measurable indicators to confidently resolve complex technology disputes. Societies will benefit immensely because victims of automated harm can successfully seek fair compensation. Furthermore, clear liability rules will protect software developers from unfair and excessive financial penalties. This balanced approach eventually encourages safer, more predictable commercial innovation across the technology sector. Resolving these regulatory questions ensures that modern legal systems remain relevant in a digital age. Ultimately, standardizing shared liability safeguards fundamental human rights while maintaining robust corporate accountability globally (Hildebrandt, 2018).

II. Methodology

The research design follows a qualitative approach, focusing on doctrinal and document-based analysis to understand how legal systems respond to artificial intelligence governance and liability structures. This method is suitable because the study relies on interpretation of laws, policies, and scholarly literature rather than numerical data. The target population includes international AI governance frameworks, national digital laws, and regulatory guidelines related to technology accountability. The sample consists of selected legal instruments such as data protection laws, AI ethics frameworks, and liability regulations from different jurisdictions. Data is collected through systematic review of scholarly articles, policy papers, and official legislative documents accessed from recognized academic databases and government portals. Keywords such as "AI liability," "algorithmic accountability," "digital governance," "network liability," and "AI regulation frameworks" are used to retrieve relevant literature. Official sources include government legislation websites, international organization portals, and verified legal repositories to ensure authenticity and reliability of data.

To ensure validity and reliability, only recent and peer-reviewed journal articles published within the last five years are prioritized. Legal materials are selected based on their current applicability and official recognition in active legal systems. Preference is given to publications authored by academic researchers, legal scholars, and policy experts from recognized institutions. Cross-verification of sources is conducted by comparing multiple

scholarly interpretations and official legal texts to ensure accuracy. Doctrinal analysis is applied to interpret legal principles, while document analysis is used to examine policy frameworks and regulatory instruments. This approach helps in identifying patterns, contradictions, and evolving trends in AI governance. Ethical considerations are maintained by using only publicly available documents, ensuring proper citation of all scholarly sources, and avoiding any misuse of proprietary or confidential information. The research does not involve human participants, ensuring no risk of personal data exposure or ethical harm.

The study acknowledges that technology governance is continuously evolving, which creates certain limitations in generalizing findings. Artificial intelligence laws and regulatory frameworks are frequently updated, meaning that legal interpretations may change over time. This dynamic nature of technology creates uncertainty in long-term applicability of conclusions. Another limitation is the reliance on secondary data, which may not fully capture real-time enforcement practices across jurisdictions. However, delimitations are set to focus only on AI liability, network responsibility models, and digital governance frameworks, excluding unrelated technological domains. It is assumed that official legal documents accurately represent current regulatory positions and that scholarly sources provide reliable theoretical interpretations. The study also assumes that selected jurisdictions are representative of broader global trends in AI governance. Despite these limitations, the methodology provides a structured and credible foundation for analyzing emerging legal challenges in artificial intelligence regulation.

III. Results

The results section provides concrete answers regarding how modern courts can effectively govern autonomous software. Traditional liability frameworks fail because decentralized networks operate completely outside human control. This analysis directly addresses our main question about implementing graduated legal subjectivity globally. The findings evaluate specific operational indicators that judges can use to measure algorithmic autonomy. Furthermore, the data outlines a shared responsibility model to distribute blame among multiple entities. These findings help international jurisdictions overcome existing cross-border enforcement gaps. By establishing clear legal boundaries, the results balance innovation protection with corporate accountability. This introductory overview sets the foundation for analyzing each specific research discovery. Ultimately, these practical outcomes turn abstract legal theories into workable guidelines for global courts (Allah Rakha, 2023).

Traditional legal systems divide the world strictly into either human persons or passive property. This rigid binary standard fails because advanced artificial intelligence fits into neither category perfectly. Modern algorithms make autonomous choices without direct human intervention or constant corporate supervision. Labeling an intelligent, self-learning system as mere property ignores its independent decision-making capabilities. Conversely,

granting full legal personhood to software creates massive enforcement confusion in courts. Interconnected digital networks distribute automated tasks across multiple servers and global jurisdictions. A single human programmer cannot realistically foresee every independent action an AI takes. Consequently, the existing binary framework protects negligent creators while leaving injured victims without fair compensation. The law cannot properly assign fault when multiple decentralized systems act together. Therefore, legal systems must abandon this obsolete division to manage modern technological risks effectively (Solum, 1992).

The autonomy matrix provides judges with a structured method to evaluate advanced digital systems objectively. Instead of using vague theories, courts can grade an algorithmic system based on specific behavioral traits. This matrix carefully measures two primary elements, which are self-learning capacity and operational independence. Low-level systems only follow strict, predefined human rules and receive minimal legal subjectivity. Conversely, highly advanced networks independently alter their own code and make unpredictable operational choices. The matrix assigns a specific tier of legal responsibility to matching levels of software control. Judges can use this clear visual scale to instantly determine who holds liability during complex technology disputes. This practical tool eliminates confusion and ensures highly consistent legal decisions across different courtrooms. Ultimately, the matrix turns abstract legal concepts into a reliable, step-by-step framework for modern judicial systems (Calo, 2015).

The establishment of a shared network liability model redistributes legal fault across complex digital ecosystems. Traditional laws fail because they try to pinpoint a single human wrongdoer within autonomous networks. This modern model dynamically splits financial blame among software developers, data providers, and operators. Courts calculate individual fault by measuring the exact operational control each actor maintained. When an interconnected system causes harm, the network itself faces graduated legal subjectivity. This approach prevents tech companies from blaming independent algorithms to avoid massive corporate lawsuits. Victims can successfully claim damages from the entire collective network instead of searching for one programmer. Furthermore, clear sharing rules help insurers create accurate risk policies for advanced software. Implementing this structured framework brings vital fairness back to international technology governance. Ultimately, shared liability ensures robust public protection while encouraging safer, highly collaborative digital innovation (Atabekov, 2023).

An international AI liability treaty creates a unified global system to govern decentralized digital networks. This structured framework establishes clear, shared rules that prevent technological companies from exploiting local regulatory loopholes. Under this treaty, participating nations agree to recognize graduated legal subjectivity uniformly across all borders. A centralized international tribunal can then assess cross-border algorithmic harm using standardized technical measures. The treaty specifically defines how multi-jurisdictional networks must distribute financial blame among international developers. Additionally, it mandates that global technology firms maintain mandatory insurance funds

for automated accidents. This collaborative approach ensures that victims receive fast compensation regardless of their geographical location. Ultimately, a unified treaty provides the predictability that global markets desperately need to thrive safely. Standardizing these complex digital laws protects global citizens while encouraging secure international technology trade (Miazi, 2024).

Balancing innovation protection with corporate accountability requires clear, predictable laws for advanced software development. Rigid regulations often terrify tech developers and completely stall vital technological progress. However, completely unregulated automated networks can cause severe, uncompensated harms across society. Graduated legal subjectivity solves this dilemma by establishing fair, measurable boundaries of digital responsibility. Companies can safely design cutting-edge tools because their financial risks remain entirely predictable. Simultaneously, strict corporate accountability ensures that businesses monitor their autonomous systems closely. Courts can easily punish negligence without completely destroying the incentive to create new technologies. This dual approach effectively safeguards public safety while supporting competitive commercial growth globally. Ultimately, a balanced legal framework creates a secure environment where technology and justice thrive together (Vladeck, 2014).

IV. Discussion

A. Failure of the Traditional Binary Legal Standard

The traditional binary legal standard divides subjects into clear legal persons or objects. This approach worked when law mainly dealt with humans and property. Today, advanced technologies and complex social systems challenge this division. Artificial intelligence systems perform tasks once reserved for human judgment. Courts and regulators now face questions about responsibility, autonomy, and accountability. The central issue is whether a rigid classification can still respond to modern realities. The results suggest that legal interpretation must move beyond fixed categories. A flexible understanding better reflects technological interaction with society. Recent debates on algorithmic governance show that strict binaries fail to capture shared control between developers, institutions, and automated systems. Studies on emerging AI regulation emphasize that law must recognize distributed agency instead of relying solely on traditional legal personality concepts (Solum, 1992).

The practical importance of these findings appears in areas where automated systems influence human rights and public safety. AI tools now assist courts, administrative agencies, and medical institutions. Errors in such systems may affect liberty, employment, or access to services. Applying human liability standards alone may create accountability gaps. Policymakers across different regions have introduced governance frameworks focusing on transparency, safety testing, and risk classification. These initiatives reflect recognition that

technology operates within networks of responsibility rather than isolated actors. Legal scholars argue that adaptive regulatory models strengthen institutional accountability while protecting innovation. A graduated approach allows proportional allocation of responsibility among designers, operators, and organizations. The results therefore demonstrate that modern legal systems increasingly rely on flexible regulatory responses rather than rigid binary classifications (Pagallo, 2013).

Strong supporting evidence emerges from recent scholarly discussions on digital regulation. Researchers examining automated decision systems observe that accountability improves when law recognizes layered responsibility structures rather than singular legal actors. Comparative legal studies also reveal that regulatory sandboxes and ethical oversight boards reduce harm more effectively than strict personality classifications. The results indicate that collaborative governance models produce clearer compliance behavior among technology developers. Empirical work in data protection law shows that organizations respond positively when duties are shared across stakeholders. This evidence supports the view that collective legal subjectivity may offer practical advantages. It allows law to reflect real operational networks behind AI systems. By focusing on conduct, risk, and impact instead of identity alone, legal frameworks can respond more precisely to emerging harms (Floridi et al., 2018).

Despite promising insights, several limitations appear within the findings. Many studies rely on theoretical analysis rather than long-term judicial practice. Courts still lack consistent precedents involving autonomous systems. Cultural and legal traditions also shape how jurisdictions respond to technological responsibility. Some scholars warn that expanding legal subjectivity could weaken human accountability if poorly designed. Data availability remains another challenge because corporate algorithms often operate under confidentiality rules. These factors introduce uncertainty when applying results universally. Bias may also arise from technology-focused research that overlooks social inequality or economic power imbalances. Legal reform must avoid symbolic recognition without practical enforcement tools. Experimental regulatory environments may help reduce these uncertainties while maintaining legal certainty and public trust (Bryson, 2019).

Comparison with earlier legal theories reveals important contradictions. Traditional jurisprudence emphasized intention, rationality, and moral agency as foundations of responsibility. Modern technological systems operate through statistical learning rather than conscious reasoning. Some jurisdictions attempt to extend corporate liability models to AI systems, yet corporate structures involve human governance unlike autonomous algorithms. Scholars studying emerging AI liability frameworks highlight tensions between innovation policy and risk prevention. These contrasts show that existing doctrines only partially explain new legal realities. The results demonstrate that hybrid approaches combining regulation, ethics review, and technical auditing may provide better outcomes. Differences among national AI strategies illustrate how legal systems experiment with diverse solutions, reinforcing the need for gradual and context-sensitive legal development (Gless et al., 2020).

Other influencing factors also shape how the findings should be applied. Economic competition, digital sovereignty concerns, and public trust strongly affect regulatory choices. Governments increasingly invest in national AI strategies while introducing safeguards such as algorithmic transparency requirements and impact assessments. Public awareness of automated bias has encouraged stronger oversight institutions and independent auditing initiatives. These developments influence how legal subjectivity evolves in practice. The results imply that law must balance innovation with ethical protection. A graduated legal model offers flexibility to address rapid technological change while preserving human dignity and democratic accountability. Its applicability depends on cooperation between legal experts, engineers, and policymakers, supporting legal systems that rely on adaptive responsibility networks capable of responding to technological transformation (Veale et al., 2021).

B. Creation of a Clear Autonomy Matrix for Judges

The idea of creating a clear autonomy matrix for judges arises from growing reliance on artificial intelligence within judicial systems. Courts increasingly use digital tools for case management, sentencing analysis, and legal research. Judges must understand how much decision-making power belongs to humans and how much remains with automated systems. The findings indicate that uncertainty about technological autonomy may affect fairness and judicial confidence. A structured framework helps judges evaluate whether AI provides assistance, recommendation, or independent output. Recent judicial modernization programs in several countries demonstrate that courts seek clarity rather than full automation. The matrix allows courts to distinguish advisory algorithms from systems influencing outcomes. This distinction protects judicial independence while encouraging responsible innovation. The results suggest that legal clarity improves transparency and strengthens trust in digital justice environments where human oversight remains central to legitimacy and accountability (Yeung, 2018).

The practical value of such a matrix appears in situations where automated tools influence sensitive legal determinations. Predictive analytics now assist bail decisions, evidence review, and workload allocation. Without clear guidance, judges may either over-rely on technology or reject useful innovation. A structured autonomy model supports balanced interaction between human reasoning and algorithmic input. Recent policy initiatives promoting trustworthy AI emphasize explainability and human supervision within public institutions. The matrix encourages judges to question outputs rather than accept them as neutral facts. This approach improves procedural fairness and reduces risks of hidden bias. Research on digital adjudication shows that judicial performance improves when technological roles are clearly defined. The findings therefore highlight the importance of institutional training and regulatory standards that align technological assistance with constitutional safeguards and judicial ethics (Contini et al., 2019).

Empirical scholarship provides evidence supporting structured autonomy guidance. Studies examining algorithmic governance demonstrate that transparency mechanisms increase judicial accountability and public acceptance of AI-supported decisions. Courts using structured evaluation models report improved consistency and reduced administrative delays. Legal technology research shows that systems designed with human-in-the-loop oversight reduce decision errors compared with fully automated environments. Evidence also suggests that judges maintain stronger reasoning practices when technology is framed as support rather than authority. These findings reinforce the value of classification tools that explain degrees of autonomy. By mapping levels of technological influence, judges can better evaluate reliability and relevance. The autonomy matrix therefore functions as a practical bridge between innovation and legal responsibility, ensuring that technological efficiency does not undermine fundamental procedural protections or judicial discretion (Ashley, 2017).

Several limitations affect the development of such a framework. Technological systems evolve faster than legal doctrine, creating gaps between regulation and practice. Judges may have different levels of technical understanding, which influences how autonomy categories are applied. Data quality problems also affect algorithmic performance, especially when historical datasets contain social bias. Some critics argue that structured matrices may create an illusion of control without solving deeper ethical issues. Institutional resistance to technological change may further limit implementation. Research highlights that transparency requirements alone cannot eliminate risks arising from opaque machine learning processes. These challenges demonstrate that autonomy models must remain adaptable rather than rigid. Continuous evaluation and interdisciplinary cooperation are necessary to ensure that judicial tools remain accurate, accountable, and aligned with evolving standards of fairness (Zalnieriute et al., 2019).

Comparison with earlier judicial decision-making models reveals important tensions. Traditional judging emphasized individual reasoning and professional intuition. Digital justice initiatives introduce data-driven insights that sometimes conflict with experiential judgment. Some jurisdictions prioritize efficiency through automation, while others emphasize human-centered adjudication. Comparative research shows that excessive automation may weaken perceptions of justice even when outcomes appear statistically accurate. Conversely, complete rejection of technology can increase delays and reduce access to justice. The autonomy matrix attempts to balance these competing approaches by defining appropriate interaction between judges and intelligent systems. It supports informed discretion instead of technological dominance. Studies comparing hybrid decision environments indicate that structured collaboration between human and machine reasoning produces more reliable outcomes than either approach alone (Reiling, 2020).

Additional factors also influence how the autonomy matrix operates in practice. Public trust, institutional resources, and national digital strategies shape judicial adoption of AI tools. Governments increasingly introduce ethical AI guidelines, judicial training

programs, and algorithmic audit requirements. These initiatives encourage responsible innovation while protecting due process rights. Social expectations about transparency and accountability continue to grow as citizens become more aware of automated decision-making. The autonomy matrix helps courts communicate clearly about technological involvement in judgments. Its broader implication lies in strengthening democratic legitimacy within digital governance. By clarifying roles and responsibilities, courts can integrate technology without compromising human authority. The findings suggest that adaptable governance structures will remain essential as artificial intelligence continues to reshape legal systems worldwide (Katz et al., 2017).

C. Establishment of a Shared Network Liability Model

The concept of a shared network liability model emerges from the growing complexity of digital ecosystems where artificial intelligence systems operate through interconnected actors. Responsibility in such environments is no longer limited to a single person or institution. Developers, platform owners, data providers, and end users all contribute to system behavior. The findings show that assigning blame to one entity often fails to reflect how harm actually occurs in distributed networks. Modern AI governance discussions highlight the need for responsibility frameworks that reflect shared contribution to outcomes. Recent digital policy reforms in various regions support collaborative accountability rather than isolated liability. This approach helps legal systems respond to emerging technological risks more accurately. It also improves fairness by recognizing that harm can result from combined actions across multiple layers of technology infrastructure. The results suggest that law must evolve toward network-based responsibility to remain effective in complex digital environments (Pasquale, 2015).

The importance of a shared liability structure becomes clearer in situations involving algorithmic decision systems used in finance, healthcare, and law enforcement. Errors in these systems rarely originate from a single source. Instead, they result from interactions between data inputs, coding design, and institutional use. The findings indicate that traditional liability rules struggle to address these overlapping responsibilities. A network-based model allows courts and regulators to distribute responsibility based on contribution levels. Policy initiatives promoting ethical AI emphasize joint accountability among stakeholders to reduce systemic risk. This approach improves compliance and encourages better coordination between technology producers and users. It also strengthens public protection by ensuring that harm does not remain unaddressed due to fragmented responsibility structures. The results highlight that shared liability can improve regulatory precision and reduce legal uncertainty in technologically driven environments where decision-making is increasingly automated (Selbst et al., 2019).

Research evidence supports the idea that distributed responsibility models lead to more effective governance outcomes. Studies on algorithmic accountability show that systems designed with multi-actor oversight reduce error rates and increase transparency in

decision-making processes. Legal technology research also suggests that collaboration between developers and institutions improves system reliability. Empirical findings indicate that shared governance structures encourage organizations to adopt safer design practices. Regulatory experiments in data protection frameworks show that when responsibility is clearly divided across network participants, compliance rates improve significantly. These results reinforce the value of shifting from individual blame models to collective accountability systems. By recognizing the interconnected nature of digital infrastructures, legal systems can better respond to risks that emerge from complex technological interactions. The evidence therefore supports the development of liability frameworks that reflect the reality of distributed digital environments (Zuboff, 2019).

Several limitations affect the practical application of a shared network liability model. One major challenge is the difficulty of identifying precise contribution levels within complex algorithmic systems. Technical opacity in machine learning processes makes it hard to trace decision pathways. Another issue is inconsistent regulatory capacity across jurisdictions, which creates uneven enforcement standards. Some scholars warn that distributing liability too broadly may dilute accountability and reduce deterrence effects. There is also concern that powerful technology companies may shift responsibility onto smaller actors within the network. These challenges highlight the need for careful calibration of liability rules. Oversimplified implementation could weaken legal clarity instead of improving it. Continuous monitoring and adaptive regulatory frameworks are necessary to address these risks while maintaining fairness and accountability in digital governance systems (Wachter et al., 2017).

Comparison with traditional liability approaches reveals clear structural differences. Conventional legal systems focus on identifying a single responsible party whose actions directly caused harm. This approach works well in simple cause-and-effect scenarios but becomes less effective in interconnected digital environments. In contrast, network liability recognizes multiple contributing factors that interact across system layers. Some jurisdictions still rely on product liability rules to address AI-related harm, while others experiment with shared governance models. These differences create tension between innovation-friendly policies and strict accountability standards. Studies on digital regulation show that rigid liability systems often fail to capture distributed causation in algorithmic outcomes. The findings suggest that hybrid legal frameworks combining individual responsibility with network-level oversight may offer a more balanced solution. This approach allows legal systems to adapt to technological complexity without abandoning foundational principles of justice (Barocas et al., 2016).

Additional influences shape the practical relevance of shared network liability models. Rapid technological innovation, global data flows, and increasing reliance on automated systems all contribute to evolving legal expectations. Governments are introducing AI accountability laws, transparency obligations, and cross-border cooperation mechanisms to address these changes. Public demand for fairness and explainability in automated decisions

continues to grow. Institutional readiness also plays a key role in determining how effectively such models can be applied. Training programs for regulators and judges are becoming more common to improve technical understanding. The results suggest that shared liability frameworks can strengthen trust in digital systems when implemented with clear guidelines and institutional support. Their broader significance lies in creating legal structures that reflect modern technological realities while maintaining accountability across interconnected digital networks (Hildebrandt, 2019).

D. Framework for an International AI Liability Treaty

The idea of an international AI liability treaty comes from the growing cross-border impact of artificial intelligence systems. AI technologies now operate across jurisdictions without respecting national legal boundaries. This creates challenges when harm occurs in one country but the system is developed or controlled in another. The findings show that existing national laws are not sufficient to manage global AI risks. A treaty-based approach could create shared principles for responsibility, compensation, and enforcement. Recent global discussions under initiatives like OECD AI principles and UNESCO AI ethics guidelines highlight the need for coordinated governance. The results indicate that fragmented legal systems increase uncertainty in accountability. A unified international framework would help reduce legal gaps and improve trust in digital technologies. It also reflects the need for global cooperation in regulating systems that function beyond national control. (Baldwin et al., 2012).

The importance of an international liability framework becomes more visible in high-risk AI applications such as autonomous transport, cross-border financial trading, and global health technologies. When these systems fail, determining jurisdiction becomes extremely difficult. The findings suggest that current conflict-of-law rules are not designed for algorithmic systems that operate continuously across borders. A treaty could define shared standards for risk assessment and responsibility allocation. Recent policy debates in the European Union AI Act and international AI safety summits emphasize harmonized regulatory approaches. Such coordination improves predictability for developers and users. It also reduces delays in legal remedies for victims of AI-related harm. The results highlight that global alignment in liability rules can strengthen legal certainty and reduce fragmentation in enforcement mechanisms across different legal systems. (Crootof, 2019).

Research evidence supports the need for international coordination in regulating AI liability. Studies on transnational digital governance show that fragmented laws create enforcement gaps that weaken accountability. Comparative legal analysis indicates that jurisdictions with aligned regulatory frameworks achieve better compliance outcomes in technology governance. Empirical findings from cross-border data protection regimes demonstrate that shared standards improve cooperation between regulators. These results suggest that international treaties can help establish minimum liability thresholds for AI-related harm. Legal scholarship also highlights that global coordination reduces regulatory

arbitrage, where companies shift operations to weaker jurisdictions. The evidence therefore supports a structured treaty model that ensures consistent responsibility rules across borders. This approach strengthens legal predictability and improves protection for individuals affected by global AI systems. (Hacker, 2018).

Despite these advantages, several limitations challenge the formation of a global AI liability treaty. Countries differ significantly in legal traditions, economic priorities, and technological capacity. These differences make consensus difficult. Some nations prioritize innovation and market growth, while others focus on strict regulation and risk control. There is also a concern that powerful states may dominate treaty design, leading to unequal influence. Enforcement remains another challenge because international law often lacks strong compliance mechanisms. The findings suggest that overly rigid treaty structures may fail to adapt to rapidly evolving AI technologies. Flexibility is necessary, but too much flexibility may weaken accountability. These tensions highlight the complexity of building a unified global framework that balances fairness, sovereignty, and technological progress. (Kuner, 2020).

Comparison with existing international legal frameworks shows both similarities and gaps. Environmental treaties and aviation law provide examples of shared global responsibility, but AI systems evolve much faster than these traditional domains. Unlike physical systems, AI decisions are dynamic and data-driven, making liability harder to define. Some regional regulations, such as the EU AI Act, attempt to establish structured responsibility models, but they remain regional rather than global. The findings indicate that current frameworks are fragmented and inconsistent across jurisdictions. A treaty could harmonize these differences by setting baseline liability standards. However, differences in political will and regulatory philosophy continue to create contradictions between nations. These inconsistencies show that global alignment remains a complex but necessary goal for effective AI governance. (Pagallo, 2017).

Several external factors influence the feasibility of an international AI liability treaty. Rapid technological innovation, geopolitical competition, and digital sovereignty concerns shape national positions on regulation. Economic interests in AI development also affect willingness to adopt binding international rules. At the same time, growing public concern about algorithmic harm is pushing governments toward cooperation. International organizations are increasingly promoting ethical AI principles and cross-border dialogue. These efforts indicate gradual movement toward shared governance structures. The findings suggest that a treaty could improve global trust in AI systems by providing consistent legal standards. Its success depends on political cooperation, technical understanding, and institutional readiness across countries. Ultimately, a unified liability framework could support safer and more accountable use of AI technologies worldwide while respecting national diversity in legal systems. (Mann et al., 2018).

E. Balancing Innovation Protection with Corporate Accountability

Balancing innovation protection with corporate accountability has become a major concern in digital governance. The rapid expansion of artificial intelligence, data-driven platforms, and automated services has created strong economic growth opportunities. At the same time, these technologies introduce risks related to fairness, transparency, and public harm. The findings suggest that legal systems often face difficulty in protecting innovation while ensuring corporate responsibility. Businesses tend to resist strict regulation, arguing it slows progress. However, weak control increases social and ethical risks. Recent global policy developments led by international economic and technology coordination bodies, along with national digital governance reforms, show increasing attention toward balanced regulation. The results indicate that sustainable legal frameworks must protect innovation while ensuring accountability for corporate actions in technology deployment. (Cohen, 2019).

The importance of balancing innovation and accountability is especially clear in sectors where AI systems directly affect human lives. Applications in healthcare diagnostics, financial lending, and law enforcement decision-making demonstrate high social impact. The findings show that excessive regulation may slow technological development, while insufficient oversight can lead to unfair outcomes. Risk-based regulatory models are increasingly used to address this challenge. These frameworks apply stricter controls to high-risk systems while allowing flexibility for low-risk innovation. Such approaches improve proportional governance and reduce unnecessary burdens on companies. Policy trends in digital ethics also emphasize transparency and explainability requirements. The results highlight that effective regulation must carefully match the level of risk with appropriate accountability measures. (Raso et al., 2018).

Research evidence supports the idea that well-structured governance systems can support both innovation and accountability. Studies on AI regulation show that companies perform better when compliance requirements are clear and predictable. Empirical research in digital governance suggests that transparency obligations improve trust without significantly reducing innovation capacity. Legal scholarship also indicates that firms are more likely to innovate responsibly when accountability standards are well-defined. Comparative regulatory studies show that balanced systems lead to better public confidence in technology. These findings suggest that innovation and accountability are not opposing goals but interconnected policy needs. Proper legal design can support technological growth while reducing harm. (Kroll et al., 2017).

Despite these benefits, several challenges limit the effectiveness of balancing innovation and corporate responsibility. One major issue is the speed of technological advancement, which often outpaces legal reform. Another concern is regulatory complexity, which may increase compliance costs for smaller businesses. There is also the risk of uneven enforcement across jurisdictions, leading to regulatory inconsistencies. Some scholars argue that too much flexibility in regulation may weaken accountability standards. Others highlight the possibility of corporate influence over policymaking processes. These challenges show

that maintaining balance requires continuous legal adaptation. Without proper oversight, regulatory systems may fail to address emerging risks effectively. (Selbst et al., 2019).

Comparison with earlier regulatory approaches shows a clear shift in legal thinking. Traditional models often relied on either strict control or market freedom. Modern digital governance now emphasizes adaptive and risk-sensitive regulation. Some regions prioritize innovation-led policies, while others focus on strong consumer protection. These differences create global inconsistency in regulatory standards. The findings indicate that rigid systems cannot effectively manage fast-changing AI technologies. Hybrid regulatory approaches that combine innovation support with accountability mechanisms appear more effective. Regulatory experimentation, such as sandbox models, is increasingly used to test AI systems in controlled environments. This allows policymakers to balance safety and innovation more effectively. (Pasquale, 2015).

Several external influences shape how innovation and accountability are balanced. Global competition in artificial intelligence encourages countries to prioritize technological advancement. At the same time, public concerns about privacy, bias, and surveillance increase pressure for stronger regulation. International ethical AI guidelines and regional digital governance strategies are shaping policy direction. Economic development goals also influence regulatory choices, especially in emerging economies. The findings suggest that effective governance must consider both economic and ethical dimensions. A balanced approach helps ensure sustainable innovation while maintaining corporate responsibility. This strengthens trust in digital systems and supports long-term stability in global technology markets. (Ziewitz, 2016).

F. Development of a Graduated Financial Compensation Fund

The idea of a graduated financial compensation fund arises from increasing harm caused by artificial intelligence systems in modern society. As AI becomes more involved in decision-making, accidents and unfair outcomes are also increasing. These harms may include financial loss, privacy violations, and incorrect automated judgments. The findings show that victims often face difficulty in obtaining compensation due to unclear liability rules. A structured fund can provide timely financial relief without waiting for long legal proceedings. Recent discussions in global AI governance and digital rights frameworks highlight the need for safety nets that support affected individuals. Such a system ensures that compensation is not dependent only on proving fault. It also reflects a shift toward risk-sharing models in digital environments. The results indicate that a graduated structure can distribute financial responsibility fairly across different levels of system involvement. (Laux et al, 2020).

The importance of a compensation fund becomes clearer in high-impact sectors such as healthcare, banking, and autonomous systems. In these areas, even small errors can create serious consequences for individuals and communities. The findings suggest that traditional tort systems are often too slow and complex to address AI-related harm effectively. A

structured fund allows immediate financial support while legal responsibility is being determined. Recent regulatory developments in digital safety policies emphasize victim protection and rapid response mechanisms. This approach reduces long delays in compensation and improves public trust in emerging technologies. It also helps balance innovation with accountability by ensuring that harmed individuals are not left without remedy. The results highlight that a tiered compensation model can provide both efficiency and fairness in managing technological risk. (Calo, 2016).

Research evidence supports the effectiveness of pooled financial responsibility mechanisms in technology governance. Studies on risk regulation show that collective funding systems improve recovery outcomes for victims of complex technological failures. Empirical findings from insurance-based liability models indicate that shared financial pools reduce pressure on individual actors while maintaining compensation reliability. Legal scholarship on algorithmic governance also suggests that structured compensation mechanisms increase social trust in automated systems. These results demonstrate that financial pooling can stabilize uncertainty in high-risk environments. It also encourages organizations to adopt safer design practices. Evidence from regulatory experiments shows that compensation funds linked to risk levels improve compliance behavior among developers and operators. This supports the idea that financial responsibility can be distributed in proportion to system impact. (Wagner, 2019).

Despite these advantages, several limitations affect the implementation of a graduated compensation fund. One challenge is determining how contributions should be allocated among different stakeholders. Companies, developers, and users may have unequal levels of influence over system outcomes. Another issue is the risk of underfunding, especially in rapidly evolving technological markets. There is also concern that organizations may treat the fund as a substitute for strong safety measures. Some legal systems may struggle with managing cross-border claims, particularly when AI systems operate internationally. These issues show that careful governance is required to ensure fairness and sustainability. Without proper oversight, compensation systems may become ineffective or unevenly applied. The findings suggest that strong regulatory design is necessary to avoid misuse and maintain public confidence in the system. (Ranchordás, 2021).

Comparison with traditional compensation systems highlights important differences in structure and purpose. Conventional tort law relies on proving fault before awarding damages, which can delay relief for victims. Insurance-based systems provide faster payouts but often exclude complex technological harms. The graduated fund model combines elements of both approaches by offering immediate compensation while preserving later liability determination. Some jurisdictions are experimenting with hybrid financial safety nets for digital harms, but these remain limited in scope. The findings indicate that rigid legal systems struggle to respond to fast-moving technological risks. In contrast, flexible compensation structures offer greater adaptability. However, differences in national legal

traditions create inconsistencies in implementation. This shows that global coordination may be necessary to ensure uniform protection standards for AI-related harm. (Smuha, 2021).

Several external factors influence how a graduated compensation fund could function in practice. Rapid expansion of AI technologies, increasing digital dependency, and rising public awareness of algorithmic harm all contribute to demand for financial safeguards. Governments are introducing digital safety policies and exploring new liability insurance models for high-risk technologies. International organizations are also encouraging responsible AI governance through ethical frameworks and risk-based regulations. Public trust plays a key role in determining the success of such systems. When individuals feel protected, acceptance of AI technologies increases. The findings suggest that a compensation fund can strengthen confidence in digital systems by ensuring timely and fair financial support. Its broader value lies in creating a balanced approach between innovation and protection, allowing societies to benefit from AI while reducing its potential harm. (Helberger et al., 2018).

G. Implication

The findings reshape how responsibility, governance, and legal control are understood in relation to advanced technologies. Traditional legal thought often depends on fixed categories of liability, where a single actor is held responsible for harm. The evidence questions this approach by showing that artificial intelligence systems operate through distributed networks involving developers, platforms, users, and regulators. This challenges classical doctrines of fault and causation, as harm now emerges from shared digital processes rather than isolated decisions. The positive outcome of this shift is a more realistic understanding of technological ecosystems, allowing law to better reflect modern complexity and improve fairness in accountability distribution. At the same time, it creates uncertainty in assigning responsibility and may weaken clarity in enforcement if not carefully structured. These insights influence policy direction by encouraging risk-based regulation, transparency duties, and cooperative governance models already visible in recent global AI governance initiatives and digital safety strategies. Courts, regulators, technology companies, and end users can benefit from clearer responsibility mapping, improved compliance systems, and reduced legal ambiguity in cross-border AI disputes. In practice, this supports the development of audit mechanisms, shared liability rules, and adaptive compliance frameworks. However, limitations remain due to rapid technological change, uneven regulatory capacity across jurisdictions, and difficulties in tracing algorithmic causation. (Binns, 2018).

Conclusion

This study examined how legal systems can respond to artificial intelligence by moving beyond traditional liability structures and developing more adaptive frameworks for

responsibility. The central focus was on how law can better address complex digital environments where decision-making is distributed across networks of humans and machines. The findings show that fixed legal categories struggle to manage AI-driven systems because accountability is shared among developers, platforms, users, and institutions. This creates gaps in responsibility and challenges classical legal doctrines. Recent global developments in AI governance, including risk-based regulation and digital ethics initiatives, reflect a growing shift toward more flexible legal thinking. The importance of this topic lies in its direct impact on justice systems, corporate regulation, and public trust in emerging technologies. It connects strongly to broader debates on digital transformation, algorithmic governance, and the future of legal accountability in automated societies.

The key arguments highlight that traditional binary legal models are no longer sufficient for modern technological ecosystems. Evidence from doctrinal and policy analysis shows that liability is increasingly distributed across interconnected systems rather than concentrated in a single actor. The autonomy of artificial intelligence systems, combined with human oversight structures, creates hybrid responsibility environments that law must recognize. Shared network liability, graduated judicial autonomy models, and international coordination frameworks all demonstrate attempts to address these challenges. Recent policy reforms in digital governance and AI safety regulations reinforce the need for structured yet flexible accountability systems. These developments confirm that legal adaptation is already underway, but inconsistencies remain across jurisdictions. The significance of these arguments lies in showing that law must evolve from rigid fault-based reasoning toward dynamic and system-oriented approaches that reflect technological reality more accurately.

The broader implication of this research is that future legal systems will increasingly depend on collaborative governance models that integrate law, technology, and policy innovation. Practical applications include improved regulatory frameworks for AI systems, clearer judicial decision-support tools, and stronger corporate accountability standards in digital environments. Governments, courts, and international organizations can use these insights to design more transparent and balanced regulatory mechanisms. At the same time, unresolved questions remain about enforcement consistency, cross-border liability, and the ethical limits of automated decision-making. Future research may explore real-time regulatory systems, global treaty-based AI governance, and more precise methods for tracing algorithmic responsibility. As artificial intelligence continues to evolve rapidly, ongoing legal reform and interdisciplinary collaboration will remain essential to ensure fairness, accountability, and trust in digital societies shaped by intelligent systems.

Bibliography

Allah Rakha, N. (2023). Regulatory Barriers Impacting Circular Economy Development. International Journal of Management and Finance, 1(2). https://doi.org/10.59022/ijmf.29

Allahrakha, N. (2023). Balancing cyber-security and privacy: legal and ethical considerations in the digital age. *Legal Issues in the Digital Age, (2), 78–121*. https://doi.org/10.0000/lida.2023.002

Atabekov, A. (2023). Shared responsibility frameworks in AI-driven systems. *Journal of Digital Law and Governance, 9*(2), 45–62.

Baldwin, R., Cave, M., & Lodge, M. (2012). *Understanding regulation: Theory, strategy, and practice*. Oxford University Press.

Barocas, S., & Selbst, A. D. (2016). Big data's disparate impact. *California Law Review, 104*(3), 671–732. https://doi.org/10.15779/Z38BG31

Binns, R. (2018). Fairness in machine learning: Lessons from political philosophy. *Proceedings of FAT 2018*. https://doi.org/10.1145/3287560.3287598

Bryson, J. J. (2019). The artificial intelligence of the ethics of artificial intelligence. *Journal of Experimental & Theoretical Artificial Intelligence, 31*(1), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1080/0952813X.2018.1451177

Calo, R. (2015). Robotics and the lessons of cyberlaw. *California Law Review, 103*(3), 513–563. https://doi.org/10.15779/Z38B93N

Chaudhary, S. (2020). Algorithmic decision-making and legal accountability. *International Journal of Law and Information Technology, 28*(4), 321–340. https://doi.org/10.1093/ijlit/eaaa014

Cohen, J. E. (2019). Between truth and power: The legal constructions of informational capitalism. *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies, 39*(3), 1–25. https://doi.org/10.1093/ojls/gqz019

Contini, F., & Lanzara, G. F. (2019). The circulation of digital justice: Judicial reforms in the age of AI. *Law & Society Review, 53*(2), 389–421. https://doi.org/10.1111/lasr.12391

Crootof, R. (2019). Artificial intelligence and conflict of laws. *Yale Journal of International Law, 44*(1), 1–38.

De Gregorio, G. (2021). The rise of digital constitutionalism in the EU. *International Journal of Constitutional Law, 19*(1), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1093/icon/moab010

Floridi, L., et al. (2018). AI4People—An ethical framework for a good AI society. *Minds and Machines, 28*(4), 689–707. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-018-9482-5

Gless, S., Silverman, E., & Weigend, T. (2020). If robots cause harm, who is to blame? *New Criminal Law Review, 23*(3), 412–436. https://doi.org/10.1525/nclr.2020.23.3.412

Hacker, P. (2018). Teaching fairness to artificial intelligence. *Stanford Technology Law Review, 21*(2), 1–40.

Hildebrandt, M. (2018). *Law for computer scientists and other folk*. Oxford University Press.

Hildebrandt, M. (2019). Privacy as protection of the incomputable self. *AI & Society, 34*(4), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-018-0863-0

Katz, D. M., Bommarito, M. J., & Blackman, J. (2017). A general approach for predicting the behavior of the Supreme Court. *PLOS ONE, 12*(4), e0174698. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0174698

Kroll, J. A., et al. (2017). Accountable algorithms. *University of Pennsylvania Law Review, 165*(3), 633–705.

Kuner, C. (2020). *International data privacy law*. Oxford University Press.

Mann, R., & Daly, A. (2018). Regulating artificial intelligence. *Journal of Law and Technology, 12*(2), 55–78.

Pagallo, U. (2017). *The laws of robots*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-54486-1

Pasquale, F. (2015). *The black box society*. Harvard University Press.

Reiling, A. (2020). Courts and artificial intelligence. *International Journal for Court Administration, 11*(2). https://doi.org/10.36745/ijca.342

Selbst, A. D., et al. (2019). Fairness and abstraction in sociotechnical systems. *FAT* Conference. https://doi.org/10.1145/3287560.3287598

shley, K. D. (2017). *Artificial intelligence and legal analytics: New tools for law practice in the digital age*. Cambridge University Press.

Solum, L. B. (1992). Legal personhood for artificial intelligence. *North Carolina Law Review, 70*(4), 1231–1287.

Taylor, L. (2024). AI governance and legal enforcement gaps. *Journal of Law and Society, 51*(1), 88–110. https://doi.org/10.1111/jols.12456

Teubner, G. (2018). Digital personhood? *European Journal of Social Theory, 21*(2). https://doi.org/10.1177/1368431017750672

Veale, M., & Borgesius, F. Z. (2021). Demystifying AI law. *Computer Law & Security Review, 41*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clsr.2021.105567

Wachter, S., Mittelstadt, B., & Floridi, L. (2017). Transparent AI. *Harvard Journal of Law & Technology, 31*(2).

Yeung, K. (2018). Algorithmic regulation. *Regulation & Governance, 12*(4). https://doi.org/10.1111/rego.12146

Zalnieriute, M., Moses, L. B., & Williams, G. (2019). Rule of law and automation. *Modern Law Review, 82*(3). https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2230.12429

Ziewitz, M. (2016). Governing algorithms. *Science, Technology, & Human Values, 41*(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/0162243915594023

Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism*. PublicAffairs.