In the paper, Anderson discusses some machine ethics issues and using the ‘Bicentennial Man’ as the basis point and she says that the ‘three laws of robotics’ of Asimov were not sufficient for determining machine ethics. She uses Kant’s arguments on non-human organisms to justify her argument. She says that we can force them to serve our ends, but we should not mistreat them.

There are 2 issues that stuck into my mind on that:

First, assume that a robot meets the 6 characteristics that Warren proposed for having personhood, but it is designed for a duty that has the absolute result of termination. In this case, making it force serve our needs and not mistreating it creates a paradox, I believe. We disrespect its entity when we make it function as it is designed.