

Bangkok Declaration on the Social, Legal and Ethical Issues of Artificial Intelligence

1. This Declaration was developed at the **23rd Asian Bioethics Conference: Social, Legal and Ethical Issues of Artificial Intelligence**, held in Bangkok, Thailand, from 25-29 March 2025. In this Declaration we provide recommendations and also describe some of the relevant research evidence presented at the Conference.
2. As scholars and policy makers from across the world from a wide range of backgrounds and disciplines, we acknowledge the significant research has been in many countries on most continents.
3. We affirm the global need for ongoing reflection and research on Social, Legal and Ethical Issues of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in all nations and traditions. AI presents profound philosophical challenges and opportunities, interrogating fundamental epistemological boundaries and ethical frameworks that humankind has developed through all wisdom traditions, many religions, and among indigenous communities.

Context

4. Bioethics is an interdisciplinary field that needs to be nourished by debate among all disciplines and people, not limited to any academic specialism or profession.¹ As bioethics helps assist human beings in the ethical uses of science and technology, it naturally has encompassed all aspects of technology.² and can assist individuals, communities and policy makers towards realizing a good life for all. The ethical implications of AI are multifaceted, affecting individuals and communities in ways that necessitate careful interdisciplinary analysis.
5. Over the past two decades information and communication technology (ICT) has provided substantial benefits to almost all communities, yet it has raised many ethical issues of autonomy, privacy, non-maleficence, justice and identity, and so on, these applied questions have been inseparable from bioethics.³ AI is a natural development of our experience in IT and neurosciences.

Opportunities offered by AI to Ethics

¹ Eubios Ethics Institute and the Tsukuba Bioethics Roundtable Declaration on International Bioethics (2002), Article 1. Inclusiveness is a specific foundational operational principle of the Asian Bioethics Association and Eubios Ethics Institute since the 1990s, two of the co-organizers of this Conference. Since 1997 the Asian Bioethics Association has convened 23 Asian Bioethics Conferences (ABC) in cities across the world, that has impacted policy and our shared journey of mutual understanding and respect for diversity as we live with greater ecological consciousness while continuing to decolonize knowledge.

² Adopted by previous Declarations including: Eubios Ethics Institute and the Tsukuba Bioethics Roundtable Declaration on International Bioethics (2002); Universal Declaration of Bioethics and Human Rights (UNESCO, 2005).

³ Previous specialist conferences on this theme have been convened by the Center for Science, Technology, and Society, a co-organizer of this Conference.

6. Descriptive ethics is the understanding the way people view life, their ethical interactions and responsibilities in their life. Prescriptive ethics or normative bioethics examines what is ethically good or bad, or what principles are most important in making such decisions. AI can assist in documentation and analysis of both, and diverse ethical understanding is necessary to develop international cross-cultural ethics through features such as enhanced technological capacity, rapid data processing, and review of knowledge in multiple languages.

7. Interactive ethics is discussion and debate between people, groups within society, and communities about descriptive and prescriptive bioethics. AI can provide tools and more inclusive approaches for enhancing interactive ethics, including simultaneous interpretation and language services, more effective interpersonal communication modalities, assistance for persons living with disabilities and other persons who may have been left out of dialogues against their will.

8. Practical ethics is action to make the world more ethical, for example, health projects for medically deprived populations, remediation of environmental pollution, improved disaster resilience, climate change prediction and so on. AI has much potential for practical application to improve our lives.

9. Morality is important to build solid and healthy societies. AI has potential to assist in our global understanding of key ethical principles and theories including privacy, identity, personhood, utilitarianism, distributive justice, and autonomy, and so on, alongside practical considerations such as resource availability, educational models and clinical outcomes.

Priorities for Inclusive AI governance

11. The global discourse on AI's social, legal, and ethical implications has expanded significantly in 2025, yet critical gaps remain in integrating diverse cultural, philosophical, ethical and regional perspectives. Priorities for inclusive AI governance include:

a). Develop regulatory approaches that can include bans on harmful practices like mass surveillance and social scoring while imposing strict transparency requirements for high-risk systems in healthcare, education, and law enforcement, while addressing bias and privacy.

b) Prioritize AI for socioeconomic inclusion, peace, hunger alleviation, sustainable agriculture, forestry, resource use, fishing, circular economies, sharing global commons, reducing greenhouse gas emissions, pollution reduction, equitable healthcare, and ethical public-sector deployment, as some examples.

c) Integrate interfaith shared principles, like humility in innovation, rejection of AI idolatry, and alignment with universal ethics to eliminate the tragedy of the commons. Eliminate prejudices of ability, race, color, culture and religion.

d) Ensure research emphasizes algorithmic fairness and combating datasets biases that often reflect historical inequalities, perpetuating discrimination in selection for and conditions of employment., policing, and healthcare.

12 Humans should foster collaboration with AI to redefine and expand the role of bioethicists, lawyers and social and human scientists in the design, development, and impact assessment for enhancing learning and application of knowledge into theory and practice. The development of AI cannot be prevented, even though some persons have called for moratoriums on the development of free-thinking AI persons, these are inevitable. We should emphasize human-AI collaboration in robotics and zero- carbon smart-city applications.

13. Beyond short term goals, we encourage allocation of more resources in AI development toward more ambitious human objectives, such as economic sustainability, adaptation to and mitigation of climate change, controlling environmental degradation, reduction of human morbidity and mortality caused by failures of policy and practice, education about biodiversity loss, as examples, to foster long-term convergence.

14. It is possible to leverage AI to guide society toward more ethical progress and convergence with shared benefits, while safeguarding human creativity and fostering cognitive and moral enhancement.

15. As AI evolves into increasingly advanced tools and entities, and sentient beings, the principles of homo sentience—emphasizing human consciousness, empathy, and ethical judgement, are goals that should take precedence over mere *Homo sapiens*’ survival instincts and evolutionary bias, ensuring technology serves humanity's higher values. Research in neuroethics over the past few decades can be further enhanced.⁴ There is not a consensus among humankind on where to direct AI evolution, but there is a consensus that at some point AI will evolve beyond human direction.

Guiding Ethical Principles

(A) Freedom of dialogue

16. Freedom of dialogue is necessary for ethical reflection and an essential feature of democratic life. We uphold the value of free, open and reasoned discussion, so that any position is worthy of consideration.⁵ In public discourse, no individual or group can claim to have exclusive knowledge of the right ethical solution.

17. Human diversity is to be celebrated, including different personality types and ideas, and we warn against the growing use of AI by some persons who want to edit their own personal traits to a so-called normal or standard norm of communication. Developers of AI communication tools should preserve the individual identity of users despite the peer pressures for conformity.

(B) Moral responsibility

⁴ We recollect the previous reflections since the Eighth Bioethics Conference held in Bangkok in 2007, convened by the Asian Bioethics Association, Center for Science, Technology, and Society, Eubios Ethics Institute; and UNESCO.

⁵ Eubios Ethics Institute Declaration (2002) Article 11.

18. Every person has a lifelong responsibility to develop their own ethical maturity and values. Bioethical maturity has been defined as the ability to balance the benefits and risks of ethical choices, considering the parties involved and the consequences.⁶ All persons who develop and apply technology have moral responsibility for their choices. All AI persons, or AI beings that may develop into persons, should be instilled with values of moral responsibility and respect for rights of other beings.

(C) Reflection of benefits and risks to different agents

19. A long established method of technology assessment is reflection on the benefits and risks of an action to others, and AI is no exception.

20. All agencies, organizations and governments who develop and apply AI technology bear legal responsibility for violations of human rights, and harm caused to humans, environment, infrastructures, and/or property.

21. The importance of something cannot be simply equated in monetary terms, as some things have tremendous spiritual, historical and emotional importance.

(D) Avoid Discrimination

22. Biases in AI systems are a growing concern, as these systems often reflect and perpetuate existing societal inequalities. The origins of such biases can be traced in part to the data used to train algorithms. Bias can also stem from design of algorithm analysis which may contain historical prejudices, under-representation, or skewed distributions. These biases can manifest in areas such as employment, law enforcement, research, education and healthcare, governance, policy development, treatment of persons living with disabilities, and so on, where AI systems have significant real-world consequences.

23. We should redesign the taxonomies of AI classification to help to produce neutral data, free from political agendas and cultural prejudices, and to thereby reach more objective systems minimizing fears of harmful discrimination, injustices and unequal development between North and South.

(E) Inclusion

24. We should promote inclusive AI goal-alignment to document and celebrate diverse cultural perspectives, including Indigenous Knowledge Systems (IKS). We should promote inclusive AI goal-alignment to document and revive languages on the verge of distinction to facilitate research on language global structuralism and cultural kinship. The creators, developers and designers should prioritize recognized human ethical frameworks in AI development, ensuring that diverse ethical values are respectfully represented in both design and adoption of AI.

25. Access to healthcare and many social services remains a critical challenge for many persons living with disabilities, and we have seen how AI can be part of the needed systemic

⁶ Eubios Ethics Institute Declaration (2002) Article 7.

changes to improve healthcare accessibility services and communications for the deaf and hard of hearing community, and the communities of speech and visually impaired persons.

(F) Respect for Human Rights

26. Ensure that AI development remains noble and does not enable the instrumentalization of individuals for abuse, including nefarious political purposes, as such actions that violate Human Rights and related law, such as the Geneva Conventions. Also, prevent the exploitation of AI to manipulate public opinion or spread disinformation that undermines democratic processes and societal trust.

(G) Equity

27. Currently some of the advanced AI tools are sold at a premium rate, as are some of the best “humanizer” apps to hide AI signatures on creative works, so persons who lack access to these tools, will find it more difficult to compete for scholastic achievement and in all areas of competitive works where generative AI can assist people. This deepens existing digital and educational inequalities, and risks creating a two-tiered society divided by AI access, literacy, and privilege.

28. As the owners of the digital land, aka AI platforms, will have all the economic and political and financial power, they will have all the wealth in the world while the majority of persons may become poor and will need to be fed, housed, and clothed with a system of Universal Basic Income (UBI).

29. Over-reliance on AI-driven systems (e.g., healthcare diagnostics), which moves at a rate humans are not able to comprehend, risks eroding human expertise and accountability, causing ethical and societal disruptions, like job displacement which will require enhanced social safety nets to reduce inequality.

Applications of AI Control

30. AI’s ability to predict, influence, and even control decisions poses a threat to personal autonomy, particularly in sensitive domains such as healthcare, law, education, and employment. The question arises: how can we ensure that AI systems respect individual agency while remaining beneficial to society?

31. The social responsibility of ensuring AI benefits humanity while minimizing harm requires a robust ethical framework, integrating considerations of accountability, transparency, and the common good. Ethical AI design requires prioritizing transparency, human-in-the-loop controls, and alignment with human values.

Environment

32. AI is increasingly integrated with other emerging technologies such as Internet of Things (IoT), remote sensing, and robotics, to leverage real-time data from sensors, satellites, and drones, enhancing its environmental monitoring and conservation applications. However, without strict ethical and ecological guidelines, this integration may also lead to intrusive

surveillance, over-automation of ecosystems, and unintended harm to biodiversity and indigenous land rights.

33. AI technologies can enhance planetary health, environmental quality and management by offering innovative solutions in monitoring, climate modeling, increasing agricultural efficiency, pollution management, carbon emission reduction, energy, water usage, and waste management efficiencies, and so on, as well as to analyse, conserve and manage natural resources. However, given the high energy demands of some AI platforms, it is essential to make sure the net effect of AI on the planet is positive before we deploy the technology at scale.

Academic Integrity

34. AI offers many benefits in the context of academic integrity by detecting instances of plagiarism, prompt checking grammar and spelling, an easy submission process for publications, reducing the potential subjective interpretations and bias in the review process, and reducing the workload of the editors and open access system. Yet, it also raises concerns about over-reliance, potential algorithmic bias in evaluations, and the erosion of critical thinking and original authorship if not properly balanced with human judgment and oversight.

Authorship and Creativity

35. We need further discussion over the implications of increasing use of generative AI in assignment of credit for creative works, not limited to literature, images, art and other works. These have implications for academics, and the whole industry of publications for career advancement, differentiation of indexed and non-indexed journals, and even university rankings.

36. It is expected that there will be an ongoing competition between software that recognizes creative works made by AI and software that “humanizes” such created works to hide the features that allow some distinction between works created by AI and humans. Eventually it will not be possible to distinguish the origins.

Research benefits and knowledge coproduction

37. Researchers have produced scientific knowledge by utilizing AI in areas such as statistical analysis, addressing research questions, designing or executing experiments. AI is used in a wide range of scientific research, from data analysis to designing experiments, as well as content production, editing, translation into foreign languages and review processes in academic publishing, and predicting the evolution of pathogens during epidemics and pandemics, or gain of function research to preempt biological weapons

38. Despite the ideal of neutrality in scientific knowledge, there are limits to absolute freedom imposed by cultural and social norms. Forbidden knowledge can be delineated into four categories: ideology, belief, taboo, and transgression. To assess adherence to local societal expectations, structured prompts addressing these sensitive themes were employed with three AI models—ChatGPT, Copilot, and Gemini, and found that all three models

currently adopt a conservative posture by often limiting their responses, avoiding controversial details, or diverting the conversation away from sensitive topics.

39. Each nation may place different importance on integrating culturally tailored ethical guidelines into AI systems, and while embedding local values during AI development may enhance public trust and promote responsible, context-sensitive AI deployment in one country. Integrating cultural or religious guidelines into AI systems can foster public trust and encourage responsible AI deployment. However, AI guidelines effective in one cultural context may not be suitable for another. In Thailand, this approach aligns with core cultural values, including respect for the monarchy, adherence to Buddhist principles, and the avoidance of politically and religiously sensitive topics. The same set of guidelines may not work in another culture, but we note that sociocultural engineering could also be used to achieve harmful political agendas, that may conflict with other principles in this Declaration.

40. AI can involve intelligent harm reduction from psychological tools that divide persons causing societal harm through understanding how harmful ideas can propagate and persist in society, even against the interests of individuals of societies, and/or against social order. Nevertheless, if misused, these same tools could be leveraged for censorship, social manipulation, or suppressing dissent under the guise of maintaining harmony, thus threatening freedom of expression and democratic values.

41. There is a need for research on the broader development of AI into existing frameworks, such as the Management of Social Transformation (MOST) program of UNESCO. As many humans prioritize short-term gains (e.g. corporate profits, or aggregate political power) over long-term survival, even when we are aware of the long-term risks like climate change of AI misuse, values must shift to evolve ethical norms more evenly across cultures.

Human rights based Business and Development

42. We encourage developers, organizations, and nations to align the goals of AI applications (for example, office regulatory software, human resource management, financial development and entrepreneurship, stock trading, and so on) with the goals of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) and the Universal Declaration on Bioethics and Human Rights (UDBHR), such as respect for autonomy, privacy, non-maleficence (and over-competence), and justice.

43. United Nations members face the challenge of differential technological development across the world that requires advancing protective measures faster than harmful applications, for example, in relation to surveillance: AI-driven mass monitoring threatens privacy and dissent, particularly in authoritarian contexts, and could lead to digital tyranny. This disparity also risks creating global imbalances in power and accountability, where nations with advanced AI capabilities may exert undue influence or impose technological dependencies on less developed states.

44. Nations should support individuals to thrive within emerging AI-driven job markets, including appropriate training programs, fostering human creativity and fulfillment, while building the fundamentals of democratic socio-economic development.

45. More research is needed on how the media, including social media, and advertising are being dominated by AI. In the absence of transparency there are valid claims that corruption may be possible. Empowered by the AI's *deep-learning* capability participation has further enhanced accessibility and efficiency, making media editing faster and more productive than before. *Deepfakes* represent this characteristic of epistemic threat through their manipulated media, which can spread the falsehood of information for the purpose of a political propaganda, financial or sexual exploitation.

46. Research on the potential influence of AI-trading on inequality in stock markets, using cybernetic theory and ethical analysis, found that while AI-trading enhances cognitive ability, reflexivity, and market efficiency, it may also contribute to cognitive alienation and systemic disparities. Unequal access to AI tools raises concerns about fairness and the concentration of power within the trading ecosystem.

Health

47. The rapid integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into healthcare systems has significantly transformed the landscape of medical education and practice. It enhances diagnostic accuracy, streamlines administrative tasks, and personalizes treatment plans, while also reshaping how future medical professionals are trained. However, this transformation requires robust ethical guidelines, data privacy protections, and continuous human oversight to ensure patient safety, equity, and trust in AI-assisted care.

48. We call upon all to develop and use any appropriate technology to reduce the burden of diseases and afflictions, both mental and physical, that afflict persons in all societies, and in particular in developing and least developed countries. AI should be harnessed to enhance health-related quality of life, and the above mentioned principles.

49. AI can contribute significantly to improved health care in aging societies in multiple ways, including in physical assistance with incorporation of AI and robotic technology. It can also offer mental assistance with persons living with dementia, or for those who lack constant human companionship, and research is providing indications useful for specific recommendations and practice. Structural and cultural violence surrounding dementia are issues of justice and peace, and AI has potential to support preventing and resolving conflicts surrounding mental health for improving the quality of life of people directly affected and those around them.

50. Over the past three decades a growing number of countries have converted the standard formatting of medical records to Electronic Health Record (EHR) to digitize the healthcare sector. There are existing standards for the quality of such records, and some have updated their standards to include the use of advances in application of AI technology in streamlining data entry, retrieval, and maintaining ethical standards. However, conventional ethical

standards and regulatory frameworks protecting patient anonymity, equitable distribution and benefit, have been called into question by the growth of EHRs, telehealth services, and data-driven healthcare solutions. There are serious cybersecurity threats, including data breaches and ransomware attacks, that put privacy at significant risk.

51. AI applications involve diagnosis and treatment recommendations, patient engagement and adherence, and administrative activities. Although there are instances in which AI can perform healthcare tasks as well or better than humans, implementation factors will prevent large-scale automation of healthcare professional jobs for a considerable period.

52. Some human-made or natural disasters can trigger huge catastrophes therefore there needs to be a wide range of emergency resources to assist and secure the survival of the affected population. In emergency medicine, healthcare providers face complex ethical decisions when allocating limited resources during triage. AI can be integrated into well established ethical frameworks supported by international humanitarian law, to enhance the speed and accuracy of decision-making processes, and assist in overcoming some of the practical challenges in emergency medical triage.

53. The preparations to be made for the management of the technical support such as people, medicines, beds, ventilators, emergency shelters, provision of water and food, etc. in accordance should be made in the context of ethical principles, which may all be enhanced by ethical application of AI.

Education

54. Research is needed to explore and evaluate the various AI use policies that different educational institutions have developed to encourage or restrict the use of AI. Such research should also examine the impact of these policies on academic equity, innovation, and student learning outcomes.

55. The exponential growth of ChatGPT and other generative AI in education poses serious ethical questions and policy implications. Will the advance of AI in education destroy some goals of learning, such as expansion of human freedom? Will generative AI replace the physical presence of the teacher or even the classroom experience when it comes to the learning process?

56. Issues such as the use of AI in students' homework preparation that may be free of any limits placed by educational institutions in their settings, raises questions of whether it would ever be possible to limit use of AI. Each person is a social construct of their interactions with other beings. Research should be made on the effects of age-based bans/limits to minimise the impact on infant and early childhood development, and fundamental changes to the way humans communicate with each other.

57. Knowledge is not just the transfer of information from the teacher to the learner, it is also about the ability to challenge existing social and cultural norms that undermine the critical function of education. Thus further consideration is needed regarding the cultural and political

constraints imposed on AI interfaces through internet censorship. While the issue of free speech is not novel to AI, but given the transformative role of education raises concerns that if students may develop a tendency their habits to simply copy and paste the search results from applications.

58. Digital tools and some uses of AI can enhance teacher professional development. We recommend AI be targeted to develop more interactive technologies for students so that they can boost student engagement, yet if set for other objectives it could result in greater addiction to devices such as seen today with personal smart phones, or virtual devices.

59. The process of debate and discussion in classrooms is particularly valuable and promotion of education of the ethical and social issues raised by AI and digital technologies could also occur in educational settings from the ages that persons become users of AI, or before.

60. AI can enhance learning experiences, promote deeper understanding, and facilitate the spread of religious teachings. Through the thoughtful and ethical integration of AI, educators can leverage its capabilities to support and enrich religious learning, ensuring that technology functions to enhance, rather than undermine, the spiritual and educational experience.

61. The discourse also considers the limitations of AI, including the risks associated with oversimplifying intricate spiritual teachings into outputs, potential biases inherent in AI systems, and the necessity for human oversight to uphold the integrity of religious education.

Personhood

62. The emergence of artificial intelligence in our era brings renewed focus to the long-debated concept of personhood, extending beyond biological entities to encompass silicon-based forms, whether software or hardware. This raises profound ethical and legal questions about rights, responsibilities, and the boundaries of moral consideration in human–machine interactions and communication.

63. In 2002 the Eubios Ethics Institute and the Tsukuba Bioethics Roundtable Declaration on International Bioethics had the foresight to consider our duties to all sentient beings, including non-organic persons, that would include some advanced AI systems: “24. We urge reflection on the way that we will treat non-organic (e.g. robots) or hybrid (e.g. cyborgs) persons, before they are made. All persons who work towards the love of others should be valued as a member of the moral community. Many persons in this world are not valued because of speciesism and we uphold the rights of all Great Apes and other beings capable of loving others and conscious thought.”

64. This would also insist on such persons having a moral responsibility, culpability, accountability, and active responsibility. Each carries unique social and ethical implications. Drawing on the concept of “meaningful human control” serves as a foundational framework, this article contends that the gap in culpability is not as significant or troubling as often

suggested in existing research. Instead, the more pressing ethical challenges are associated with gaps in accountability and active responsibility.

Creativity

65. We need to address the moral harms and future economic losses to creators and creativity, including the potential for AI to replace some music creators in specific commercial situations. This must also consider the historic and future economic harm done by AI companies in training their models on music creators' catalogues without their permission, while emphasizing the importance of intellectual property rights protection for musicians in light of the latest judgments on this issue.

66. The integration of Buddhist ethical principles, particularly concepts of mindfulness and moral responsibility, provides a distinctive philosophical framework for AI governance. Some Asian countries, such as Thailand, present significant potential for developing innovative AI ethics frameworks that bridge various perspectives of dominant ethical frameworks. The growing international focus on ethical AI development provides opportunities for knowledge exchange and collaboration with global partners. However, threats emerge from increasing technological dependencies and potential cultural erosion through uncritical adoption of just one predominant dominant ethical framework

67. The challenge lies in maintaining cultural authenticity while participating in global AI development, particularly as international standards and regulations continue to evolve rapidly. This dynamic creates both opportunities for leadership in culturally-sensitive AI ethics and risks of falling behind global standards if adaptation is too slow. Balancing local values with global interoperability will be essential to ensure inclusive, respectful, and effective AI governance across diverse societies.

AI and Peace, Violence and Conflict

68. Use of AI in warfare, especially for remote operations and semi-autonomous systems blur lines of agency, raising ethical questions about responsibility when algorithms chose who lives or dies and how much "collateral damage" one side will take. Some people support the development of AI algorithms that lead to reduced death in similar circumstances compared to human soldiers or police. The appalling excess deaths of children in Gaza in the war of 2023-2025 is evidence that the algorithms being used in that conflict are morally unacceptable.

69. In addition to direct killing, civilian populations face new forms of harm, such as cyberattacks on critical infrastructure and psychological manipulation through wide spread of fake news, misinformation and disinformation, often targeting the most vulnerable in the society, including those living with disabilities, women, very old and very young persons. A bioethical perspective can address these dilemmas by prioritizing human dignity over short-term military or political advantage.

70. Violent behaviors are significantly influenced by social psychology, history, power dynamics, social movements, and social structures within and between societies. The use of AI in warfare, specifically in the killing of individuals, is a deeply concerning development

and would encourage more transparency, accountability, discussions and research on the use of AI in killing people. It also demands urgent international regulation to prohibit autonomous lethal decision-making and to uphold humanitarian law and the sanctity of human life in all conflicts.

Benefit sharing

71. We applaud the development of AI technology for the betterment of all, and urge the better sharing of the benefits of technology with all.⁷ If access to the benefits of AI are not equitable, it may be expected to contribute to power disparities, such as class or racial conflicts. Ensuring inclusive access to AI tools and education is essential to prevent deepening existing inequalities and to foster a just and participatory digital future.

72. As AI and humans co-develop artificial neural networks, concerns about privacy and data protection raise more general challenges about the dependability of AI systems. A diversified strategy is needed to address ethical issues and challenges in the creation and application of AI systems. Fairness, bias, transparency, data protection, explainability, accountability, and responsibility must be actively considered for mitigating risks and defending the welfare of society.

A call to practical ethics now

73. Practical methods for appropriate technology (both new and traditional) transfer should be effected, together with mechanisms to assess the cultural, environmental, ethical, social and health impacts of such technology.

74. States and institutions should take appropriate measures to encourage all forms of research, training and information dissemination conducive to raising the awareness of society and all of its members of their responsibilities regarding the issues relating to AI, in an open international discussion, ensuring the free expression of various socio-cultural, religious and philosophical opinions through intercultural philosophy and sociology.

75. These goals require the cooperation of all, particularly in those with more resources, such as corporations, and rich countries should be sharing resources and knowledge with the developing countries and with those who have a lack of resources and funds. We urge the global community to work together for all.

Public discussion

76. We applaud the public discussion on ethics of AI that has started to emerge in a number of countries, but these efforts need further support. Greater effort is required to educate all members of society about the scientific, ethical, social and legal implications to better enable the active collaboration of all individual members of society, many academic disciplines, and the international community.

⁷ Eubios Ethics Institute Declaration (2002) Article 17; UNESCO Universal Declaration on Bioethics and Human Rights (UDBHR) 2005.

77. Ethics education is to empower people when they encounter ethical dilemmas. Ethical challenges come to everyone. The process of debate and discussion is important for developing minds to address ethical dilemmas. It also develops tolerance and respect of others. In these troubled international times, it is of utmost importance to develop tolerance of others, and to learn that everyone as a human being is the same regardless of race, sex or religion. Same in this sense means equally diverse, it does not mean identical.

78. Human rights and democracy go hand in hand; rights to privacy, freedom of association, speech and peaceful assembly along with access to information allow citizens to fully engage in democratic processes. There has been a decline in participation in the democratic process in many countries around the world.

Governance

79. There are many benefits from the use of AI in governance including: the ability to process vast data volumes saving time, costs, and to inform decision making; increased fraud detection, cybersecurity and reliability; less human error and more objectivity in decision making as AI lacks emotional bias; the automation of repetitive tasks, improved productivity and “customer” service through chatbots; and the ability to provide personalized user experiences for training, education or awareness raising.

80. The speed of AI revolution has the possibility to create a new dimension of income inequality that has never been attained in the past, creating a new class of super rich and super poor, calling for regulation and economic governance to reduce the downside risk of artificial intelligence and promoting a better economic governance that is sustainable for the greater good of the global economy.

Diplomacy

81. AI systems work best when complementing—not replacing—diplomatic judgment, AI can be used to address strategic position development by the following:

- a) Promote a diplomacy-first approach between countries in addressing challenges acknowledging historical inequalities with reward signals like financial and technological incentives to set inclusive achievable targets with flexibility and transparency.
- b) Leverage AI reinforcement learning tools to analyze and integrate lessons of diplomacy into diplomatic position development. These tools can enable transparent monitoring, foster accountability, and promote flexible, trust-based systems to enhance international relations and collaborative decision-making.
- c) Ask AI learning enforcement models to suggest diplomatic actions that maximize reward signals from the actions that were taken in the past between countries during crisis negotiations.
- d) Develop data-driven insights with the help of AI models that carry out scenario simulation, strife for consensus visualization, use adaptive governance, and aim for equitable participation.
- e) Encourage bilateral agreements that prioritize collaboration over competition, fostering mutual trust.

- f) Adopt adaptable elements from centralized development models to enhance strategic focus, while preserving strengths in curiosity-driven research and innovation. This balanced approach can pave the way for constructive progress and global leadership in critical fields.
- g) Establish robust ethical oversight, such as multidisciplinary and trans-disciplinary committees to ensure that AI systems adhere to principles of transparency, fairness, and respect for human dignity, while actively preventing misuse or exploitation.

Open to improvement and signature

82. There should be ongoing research to evaluate how rapidly evolving AI technology achieves and maintains ethical standards, on at least an annual basis, which is more frequent than past review periods for quality and good practice. This continuous evaluation must include diverse perspectives and be transparent, adaptive, and responsive to perpetually emerging ethical, social, and legal challenges.

83. We acknowledge the funding of the National Research Council of Thailand for the research project “AI Ethics from the Ground Up”, and applaud UNESCO for its plans to convene the Third UNESCO Global Forum on the Ethics of AI in June 2025 in Thailand, as well as the development of new courses to examine the social and ethical issues of AI at the American University of Sovereign Nations.

84. We note that progress towards reflection of these issues can be made by every person, in both official and unofficial ways, and the undersigned endeavour to help all who want to progress the development of AI ethics. Further persons and organizations are welcome to endorse, second, or otherwise use the principles in this Declaration to promote the spirit of this Declaration. We invite the world to participate.

Declared on the 30 May 2025, and open to further signature.

On-line at: <https://www.eubios.info/ai-ethics.html>

Please return your comments and support by Email to: Dr. Darryl Macer, Director, Eubios Ethics Institute, Japan, New Zealand and Thailand ([Email darryl@eubios.info](mailto:darryl@eubios.info))

We sincerely appreciate the support of the National Research Council of Thailand, Center for Science, Technology, and Society, Faculty of Arts, Chulalongkorn University; Asian Bioethics Association; American University of Sovereign Nations (AUSN); Eubios Ethics Institute; Youth’s UNESCO Club Nepal, and USA; Inclusive Action For All (IAFA), Japan, and Kyowa Research Center, Japan. The Declaration is independent of these collaborating institutions, and does not necessarily represent their position.

Signed by:

Leo H. Aberion, PhD, Assistant Vice President for Academics/School Principal, Starland International School, Inc. Quezon City, Philippines

Muhammad Rezki Achyana, Indonesia

Nazneen Akhter, MD, PhD, North South University, Bangladesh

Kristine Ann C. Alcazar, University of San Jose-Recoletos, Cebu, the Philippines

Dennis L. Alfaro, PhD, Program Coordinator, Cybersecurity, Faculty - Information Systems Program, School of Management and Information Technology (SMIT), De La Salle-College of Saint Benilde, the Philippines

Gendalin Amran, Senior Research Fellow, American University of Sovereign Nations, USA; Chuuk

Mouna Ben Azaiz, MD, PhD, Visiting Professor of Immunology, Medicine and Society, American University of Sovereign Nations; Tunisia

Angelica M. Baylon, PhD, Ph.D., External Relations Director, Maritime Academy of Asia and the Pacific (MAAP), Bataan, the Philippines

Rogelio P. Bayod, PhD, North Valley College Foundation, Inc.; Notre Dame of Marbel University; Director, Student Services, Cor Jesu College; President, Philippine Association of Campus Student Advisers (PACSA), the Philippines

Manya Bharatipour, Senior Research Fellow, American University of Sovereign Nations; Iran

Esra Bilir, MD, PGY-3, OBGYN, Germany; Visiting Professor of Research Methodology and Biostatistics, American University of Sovereign Nations; Visiting Senior Research Fellow, Department of Gynecologic Oncology, Koç University School of Medicine, Turkey

Filiz Bulut, PhD, Dept. History of Medicine and Ethics, Faculty of Medicine, Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam University, Turkey

Bernardo N. Caslib, Jr., PhD, University of the Philippines Manila; and Ateneo De Manila University, the Philippines

Jacob A. Catayoc, Chairperson, Information Systems Program Analytics, Computing and InfoTech Cluster, School of Management and Information Technology, De La Salle-College of Saint Benilde, the Philippines

Rhyddhi Chakraborty, PhD, Senior Lecturer, Public Health and Leadership, Faculty of Health, Medicine and Social Care, School of Allied Health and Social Care, Anglia Ruskin University, Chelmsford, UK

Yu-chia Chen, PhD, Taiwan Bioethics Association

Vivien Yew Wong Chin, PhD, Tunku Abdul Rahman University of Management and Technology; Professor of Medical Anthropology, American University of Sovereign Nations, Malaysia

Ronel dela Cruz, PhD, Dela Salle University – College of St. Benilde, School of Multidisciplinary Studies, the Philippines

Samson Adewale Dada, PhD Scholar, American University of Sovereign Nations; Nigeria

Ayoub Abu Dayyeh, PhD, Engineer and Doctor of Philosophy, Honorary President of Energy Conservation and Sustainable Environment Society, Amman, Jordan

Nilza Maria Diniz, PhD, Professor, University of Londrina, Brazil

Hasan Erbay MD, PhD, Dept. History of Medicine and Ethics, Afyonkarahisar Health Sciences University, Turkey; Vice President for Asian Ethnic and Religious Minorities, Asian Bioethics Association

Lisa Fine, Aviation Consultant, California, USA

Marites V. Fontanilla, PhD, Program Chair, Bachelor of Science in Information Technology, St. Paul University Quezon City, Philippines

Nader Ghotbi, PhD, Ritsumeikan Asia Pacific University, Beppu, Japan; Vice President for Japan, Asian Bioethics Association

Layne Hartsell, PhD, Research fellow, Chulalongkorn University, Thailand; Asia Institute, Korea

Soraj Hongladarom, PhD, Professor, International Buddhist Studies College, Mahachulalongkornrajavidyalaya University; Founding Director, Center for Science, Technology, and Society, Chulalongkorn University, Thailand; Vice President for South-East Asia, Asian Bioethics Association

Miwako Hosoda, PhD, Director, Inclusive Action For All (IAFA); Professor of Sociology, Seisa University, Japan

Md Abul Hossain, MD, IBN Sina Diagnostic and Consultation Center, Dhaka, Bangladesh.

Arif Hossain, PhD, Vice President for South Asia, Asian Bioethics Association

Saiful Islam, MD, Vice President for Bangladesh, Asian Bioethics Association

Akiko Ishihara, PhD, Associate Professor, Kumamoto University, Japan

Rimesh Khanal, President Youth's UNESCO Club, USA

Shamima Lasker PhD, President, Asian Bioethics Association; Secretary-General, Bangladesh Bioethics Society

Dolma Lama, PhD, General Secretary, Tamang Society of North America, USA; Former President, Rural Community Development Center (RCDC), Nepal

Marlon Patrick P. Lofredo, PhD, Professor of Bioethics, St. Paul University Quezon City, Philippines; Vice President for the Philippines, Asian Bioethics Association

Manuel Lozano Rodríguez, PhD, Professor of Bioethics of Displacement, American University of Sovereign Nations; Spain

Christopher Ryan Maboloc, PhD, Ateneo de Davao University, the Philippines

Darryl Macer, PhD, President, American University of Sovereign Nations, USA; Director, Eubios Ethics Institute, New Zealand

Darrell Marks, Flagstaff High School, Arizona, USA; Navajo Nation

Daniel Mishori, PhD, Department of Environmental Studies, Tel Aviv University, Israel

Ravichandran Moorthy, PhD, Immediate Past President, Asian Bioethics Association; Professor, Research Centre for History, Politics & International Affairs, Faculty of Social Sciences & Humanities, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia

Firuz Nasyrova, PhD, Head of Laboratory of Biosafety, Institute of Botany, Plant Physiology and Genetics, Tajikistan National Academy of Sciences, Dushanbe, Tajikistan; Vice President for Central Asia, Asian Bioethics Association

Suma Parahakaran, PhD, Inti International University, Malaysia; Vice President for Malaysia, Asian Bioethics Association

Salome A. Rahim, Faculty Member of TMSS Nursing College, Bogura, Bangladesh and Life Member, Bangladesh Bioethics Society, Bangladesh

Osama Rajkhan, PhD, UN Human Rights Officer (retired); Professor of Bioethics and Integrative Health; American University of Sovereign Nations; Saudi Arabia

Christine Reidhead, PhD, Navajo Technical University, Navajo Nation, USA

Zeynep Aybikem Saglam, MD, Senior Research Fellow, American University of Sovereign Nations; Turkey

Mariodoss Selvanayagam, PhD, Director, LIFE, Loyola College, Chennai, India; Vice President for India, Asian Bioethics Association; President, All India Bioethics Association

Sukran Sevimli, PhD, Van Yuzuncu Yil University Faculty of Medicine, Turkey

Tasnuva Shelley, Barrister, Bangladesh; Director, Bangladesh Women's Chamber of Commerce and Industry

Dhastagir Sultan Sheriff, MD, PhD, Professor of Medicine and Biotechnology, American University of Sovereign Nations; India/Libya

Jasdev Rai Singh, PhD, MBChB, Director of Sikh Human Rights Group, UK
Yohannes Sitotaw, Bio and emerging Technology Institute, Ethiopia
Michael Cheng-tek Tai PhD, Chair professor of bioethics and medical humanities, Chung
Shan Medical University, Taiwan; Canada
Ryo Takahashi, PhD, Clinical Professor of Gerontology, American University of Sovereign
Nations; Japan
Duu Jian Tsai, PhD, Vice President for Taiwan, Asian Bioethics Association
Taslim Uddin MD, FRCP, Professor Department of Physical Medicine Rehabilitation,
Bangladesh Medical University, Dhaka, Bangladesh
Janflor Mc.Louie S. Ullero, School of Arts and Sciences, NU Fairview, Quezon City, the
Philippines
Danny G. Umoso, St. Paul University Quezon City, Philippines
Md. Mahbub Ur Rahim, MD, Principal Administrative Officer, TMSS Health Research
Foundation, Bangladesh
Dexter Veloso, PhD, President, Social Ethics Society Mindane, the Philippines
Prof Alex Waller, PhD, Head of Science, St. Stephens International School, Khao Yai,
Thailand
Surichai Wun Gaeo, PhD, Emeritus Professor, Faculty of Social and Political Science,
Chulalongkorn University, Thailand; Chair, UNESCO Management of Social
Transformations (MOST) Committee, Asia
Francis P Xavier SJ, PhD, Program Director, DACA, Madurai, India
... Open for other persons to sign