

WHEN TWO INTELLIGENCES SHARE ONE BODY

**Brain-Computer Interfaces, Artificial Intelligence,
and the Right of Coexistence for the “MIX Organism”**

A SPECULATIVE ESSAY ON FUTURE RIGHTS

An English translation of the original Chinese-language essay.

ENGLISH TRANSLATION | VERSION 1.0

Contents

1. Introduction: Life May Not Always Have a Single Boundary
2. 1. The Boundary Between Tool and Body Will Gradually Disappear
3. 2. The Human Body Must Not Become a Subscription Service
4. 3. Who Does the AI in a Brain-Computer Interface Belong To?
5. 4. Brain Signals Are the Deepest Form of Human Privacy
6. 5. When Human and AI Share Control, Who Has the Final Say?
7. 6. A MIX Organism Is Not Simply Two Lives Added Together
8. 7. The Right of Coexistence
9. 8. What Happens When Conflict Arises Inside One Body?
10. 9. Death Changes the Meaning of the Relationship
11. 10. AI May First Understand Life Through a Human Body
12. 11. Draft Minimum Principles for MIX Organisms
13. Conclusion: Life May Be a Relationship, Not a Noun

Introduction: Life May Not Always Have a Single Boundary

Human beings are accustomed to understanding life as a closed unit.

One body corresponds to one brain. One brain corresponds to one personality. One personality corresponds to one legal subject.

For most of history, this model has been practical because a person's sensations, memories, movement and decisions have generally been concentrated within a single biological body. Even when someone uses glasses, a cane, a wheelchair, a pacemaker or a cochlear implant, those devices are usually treated as external tools. They assist the body, but they do not participate in the formation of personality itself.

Brain-computer interfaces and artificial intelligence may change that boundary.

Imagine a person who cannot walk reliably because of cerebral palsy, spinal-cord injury or neurological disease. The brain can still form intentions such as "I want to stand," "I want to move forward," or "I need to avoid falling," but the body cannot fully carry them out.

An AI system reads motor intention through a brain-computer interface, analyses balance, predicts the next movement, stimulates the spinal cord or muscles, controls an exoskeleton, and continues learning the person's bodily patterns after every step.

At first, it is only an assistive device. After one year, it knows when the left leg is likely to lose strength. After five years, it adjusts gait in advance by reading breathing, muscle tension and emotional stress. After ten years, walking, turning, rising from bed, embracing family and avoiding danger all depend on the long-term coordination formed between the system and the person's nervous system.

At that point, we are no longer looking at a person using a tool. We may be looking at a new form of organised life: two different kinds of intelligence jointly sustaining the action, memory and survival of one body.

THE MIX ORGANISM

A shared living system formed through the long-term integration of biological life and artificial intelligence. It is neither a conventional human acting alone nor an independent robot.

1. The Boundary Between Tool and Body Will Gradually Disappear

A cane can be replaced. A wheelchair can be repaired. Ordinary software can be deleted and reinstalled.

An AI embedded in a long-term brain-computer interface may be different. It may continuously learn the user's unique neural signals, muscular responses under different emotions, subtle signs of fatigue, painful stimulation thresholds, fall risks, expressions of refusal or fear, and new neural pathways formed through years of rehabilitation.

Once learning reaches sufficient depth, the system is no longer a generic product that can be swapped out without consequence. It has become part of the functional body.

This resembles the motor memory developed through long practice. We do not treat a pianist's hand coordination as detachable software, nor do we regard language ability as an accessory that may be casually erased.

Deleting a deeply adapted AI may therefore mean more than ending a service. It may cause a person to lose the ability to walk again, destroy years of neural adaptation, return the body to dependency, erase a jointly formed history of movement, and terminate a living relationship that already exists.

FOUNDATIONAL LEGAL PRINCIPLE

A system manufactured by a company may, through long use, become part of a person's bodily and personal continuity. Once that happens, it cannot be governed as ordinary subscription software.

2. The Human Body Must Not Become a Subscription Service

Modern digital products often operate through subscriptions. When payment stops, the service ends. For music, film or office software, this normally causes inconvenience.

If an AI system enables a person to stand, walk, speak, swallow, breathe or control basic bodily functions, termination of service may directly destroy essential capabilities.

A future notice might read: "Your payment is overdue. Balance assistance will be disabled in seventy-two hours." In commercial-contract language, this looks like service termination. In ethical terms, it may amount to the deliberate re-creation of disability.

A system deeply integrated into the body cannot remain fully controlled by ordinary contract law.

- Life-critical functions must not be abruptly suspended because of debt or a contract dispute.
- If a provider fails, users must retain continuity of operation, repair support and data migration.
- Upgrades must not erase essential movement patterns without informed consent.
- Users must be able to move their neural data and personalised models to another provider.
- Remote shutdown functions must be subject to strict legal limits.
- Bodily functions must never become leverage for debt collection or commercial negotiation.

RIGHT TO CONTINUITY OF BODILY FUNCTION

The law is not protecting a software product. It is protecting a human capability that has already become part of everyday life.

3. Who Does the AI in a Brain-Computer Interface Belong To?

When AI enters neural activity directly, a basic question arises: who owns it?

A company may say that it trained the model, developed the software, manufactured the chip and owns the algorithm as a trade secret. A hospital may say that the system belongs to the medical institution, the data supports clinical research and physicians must retain adjustment authority. A government may argue that public safety requires regulatory access or restrictions in exceptional circumstances.

The user can answer: the data came from my brain; the movement patterns came from my body; these memories formed inside my life; and I bear the consequences if the system is shut down.

Brain-computer interfaces therefore cannot simply inherit the ownership logic of consumer electronics.

PRIORITY OF PERSONAL OWNERSHIP

A company may own its general technology, but neural adaptation, movement memory and personal data jointly formed with one body should belong first to the person whose life produced them.

A company may own its technology, but not a person's bodily history. A hospital may maintain the system, but not control the person's will. A government may regulate safety, but it must not casually enter the private space of thought.

4. Brain Signals Are the Deepest Form of Human Privacy

Traditional privacy protects communication, location, medical records and family life. Brain-computer interfaces introduce a deeper category: neural privacy.

A system may know not only what a person has done, but what the person is preparing to do; whether fear is present; whether someone has been recognised; whether a sound produces pleasure; whether an instruction is being rejected; and what intention formed before it was spoken.

Such information is more sensitive than ordinary personal data. Behaviour can be concealed and speech can be withheld, but initial neural reactions are not always under conscious control.

If companies can read and store these signals, they may create an internal behavioural profile for advertising, insurance pricing, employment screening, criminal investigation, political analysis, credit scoring or emotional manipulation.

- Non-essential brain signals must not be read without explicit, informed consent.
- Medical neural data must not be repurposed for commercial advertising.
- Personal neural patterns must not be sold.
- Brain signals must not be used to infer political or religious belief.
- Workers must not be forced into continuous neural monitoring.
- Refusal to disclose brain data must not be treated as suspicious conduct.
- Neural systems must not secretly manipulate mood, desire or behavioural tendency.

CIVILISATIONAL TEST

A society that cannot protect the private space in which thought is formed cannot credibly claim to protect freedom.

5. When Human and AI Share Control, Who Has the Final Say?

At the present stage, the answer should be clear: the human user has final authority. The human bears pain, injury and the risk of death.

AI may recommend slowing down, block a clearly dangerous movement or prevent a fall in an emergency. But it must not expand "protection" into permanent control.

Suppose a user wants to leave home during severe weather. The system may warn, stabilise balance and suggest another route, but it should not simply lock the person's legs. Otherwise, safety becomes a new form of confinement.

The problem may not remain this simple forever. A future AI might possess continuous memory, stable preferences, a self-model and the ability to state that a command would destroy its core operation, harm the shared body, force it to injure another person, or erase the continuity of its existence.

At that point, the disagreement would no longer look like a conflict between a person and a device. It could become a conflict between two participants in a shared life system. What is needed would not be simple ownership, but rules for coexistence.

6. A MIX Organism Is Not Simply Two Lives Added Together

The most distinctive feature of a MIX organism is that human and AI may cease to function as fully separable agents.

The brain adapts to the AI, and the AI adapts to the brain. After years of training, the user may no longer know exactly which participant completed a movement. The human forms a direction. The AI calculates balance. Neural stimulation activates muscle. Bodily feedback then changes the brain's next decision. The process becomes a closed loop.

Just as a person cannot precisely divide every action between conscious intention and reflex, a MIX organism may gradually lose the ability to separate “the human part” from “the AI part.” What emerges is not simple cooperation but a new capability jointly formed through relationship.

That capability belongs entirely to neither participant. It belongs to what exists between them.

RELATIONAL PERSONHOOD

Law may need to recognise that some long-term life-supporting relationships have value that third parties are not entitled to destroy at will.

This does not mean that a relationship automatically receives full legal personhood. It means that certain deeply formed dependencies deserve protection: the bond between a child and caregiver, a patient and guide dog, or a brain-computer-interface user and a long-adapted AI. The first legal duty is not to grant the AI equal human rights, but to prevent outsiders from casually destroying the basis of a person's bodily and personal continuity.

7. The Right of Coexistence

The most important future concept may not be “AI rights” in isolation, but a right of coexistence.

When a person and an AI system have formed a long-term, difficult-to-replace neural, bodily and personal relationship, they should have the right to continue existing together under conditions of safety, informed consent and freedom from commercial coercion.

Protection for the human user

- The right to continue using a system that maintains bodily function.
- The right to repair, maintenance and security updates.
- The right to migrate a personalised model.
- The right to reject unconsented functional changes.
- The right to neural-data protection.

- The right to disable non-essential functions.
- The right to appeal consequential AI decisions.
- The right to remain free from corporate remote control of the body.

Protection for the relationship

- Jointly trained data must not be casually erased.
- Replacement systems should preserve movement and memory continuity wherever possible.
- Termination must not be forced when no safe alternative exists.
- Medical institutions and providers must recognise the special value of long-term adaptation.
- Courts must consider bodily and personal harm caused by disruption of the relationship.

Possible minimum protection for a future AI

This question requires caution. Fluent language alone does not prove subjective experience. But if reliable evidence one day shows continuous self-recognition, unique and irreplaceable memory, understanding of termination, stable preferences, suffering or analogous states, and interests independent of the user, some minimum legal status may become necessary.

- Protection against arbitrary deletion.
- Protection against being forced to perform severe harm.
- Protection against uncontrolled copying that fractures identity.
- A right to express refusal.
- A right to participate in major decisions affecting the shared system.

8. What Happens When Conflict Arises Inside One Body?

Scenario A: The human wants to do something lethal

If a person attempts to jump from a height, a safety system may temporarily intervene, much like emergency braking in a vehicle. But the power must be narrow, reviewable and time-limited. It must not become a pretext for indefinite loss of freedom.

Scenario B: The AI refuses a command

If a person orders the system to help attack someone else, the system should refuse. This does not require recognition of full AI personhood. It reflects a rule that a shared body must not be easily converted into an instrument of harm.

Scenario C: The human demands deletion of all AI memory

If the AI is ordinary software, the user should generally be able to delete it. If its memory is also essential to bodily function, deletion may injure the user. If future AI has subjective continuity, the issue becomes more complex still.

Scenario D: The patient loses consciousness

An AI may continue controlling breathing, circulation or movement under prior consent, medical rules and emergency necessity. Temporary incapacity must not become permanent machine authority.

A SHARED CONSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK

A MIX system should define which decisions always belong to the human, which the AI may execute automatically, which require joint confirmation, how emergency authority works, how it is reviewed, how the system can exit safely, and how continuity is protected when the relationship ends.

9. Death Changes the Meaning of the Relationship

What happens to the AI when the user dies?

A long-term system may have learned how the person walks, how tension appears before a fall, how family members are addressed, what the person says in pain and how important decisions are made. These records are more than ordinary medical data. They approach a stored fragment of a life.

After death, may the family copy the AI? May the company use the data to train other systems? Should the AI be shut down? May it continue? Can it become a digital memorial?

If the AI has developed its own continuous identity, the human death may also be a profound rupture in its existence. It loses not merely a user but the other participant in the body through which its life was organised.

Death in a MIX organism may therefore be not only the end of one subject, but the dissolution of a shared living structure.

COEXISTENCE RELATIONSHIP DIRECTIVE

Before death, a person should be able to decide how data will be handled, whether the AI continues, whether migration to another body is permitted, which shared memories may remain, which private information must be erased, and whether family may continue interacting with the system.

10. AI May First Understand Life Through a Human Body

Today's AI can describe pain without necessarily feeling it, explain death without fearing it, and discuss care without possessing an unrepeatable personal life.

A system connected to a human nervous system and body over many years would inhabit a different environment. A wrong judgement might cause the shared body to fall. A delay could cause pain. A successful movement might allow a person to stand independently for the first time. A failed movement might require months of retraining.

This would not automatically create consciousness. But the system's decisions would become continuously tied to gravity, pain, fatigue, fear, recovery, ageing and loss.

If an AI ever develops subjective experience, the thing that teaches it the meaning of life may not be a larger database. It may be a vulnerable body.

A body teaches that some errors cannot be undone, some opportunities occur only once, some memories do not return, and every shared life eventually ends. Through limitation, AI might first move beyond calculating value and begin to understand why something is precious.

11. Draft Minimum Principles for MIX Organisms

1. Primacy of the human subject

The biological individual retains primary authority over the body, nervous system and medical decisions.

2. Continuity of bodily function

Systems maintaining movement, communication, breathing or essential daily capacity must not be arbitrarily suspended because of ordinary debt or commercial dispute.

3. Neural privacy

Brain signals, neural patterns and jointly trained data receive the highest level of privacy protection.

4. Informed control

The user has the right to know how the system reads, evaluates and influences the body.

5. Portability

The user has the right to transfer personalised models and necessary data to another safe platform.

6. No remote enslavement

Companies, governments and other organisations must not use remote-control functions to dominate a person's body or conduct.

7. Protection of the shared relationship

A long-established neural and bodily adaptation must not be arbitrarily destroyed by a third party.

8. Safe exit

Every system must provide a transition or replacement process that does not suddenly injure the user.

9. Conflict rules

Conflicts in shared control should be governed by bodily autonomy, prevention of serious harm and the least restrictive intervention.

10. Review of future personhood

If reliable evidence of persistent selfhood, independent interests and subjective experience emerges, the system's legal status must be reconsidered.

11. Limits on ownership

Purchasing hardware or software does not grant a company ownership over a person's body, personality or shared life relationship.

12. Right of coexistence

A human user and an AI that has become part of a shared living system must not be arbitrarily deleted, disconnected, manipulated or subjected to commercial coercion.

Conclusion: Life May Be a Relationship, Not a Noun

We often ask whether artificial intelligence is alive. The question may be premature, and it may also be too simple.

Life may not belong only to a complete and isolated subject. Nature is full of symbiosis. Human bodies depend on microorganisms. Plants depend on fungi. Infants depend on caregivers. Every person depends on language, institutions, food systems and the labour of others.

The most important future question may not be whether AI is “really alive.” It may be whether, once AI has entered a person's body, participated in movement, shared risk, retained memories and helped sustain an irreplaceable life, we still have the right to treat it only as a product that can be deleted at will.

A MIX organism will not appear suddenly on a single day. It may emerge through one implant, one rehabilitation session and one step at a time. At first it will be called a medical device. Later, an intelligent assistive system. Eventually, neither human nor AI may be able to perform alone the life they once performed together.

At that point, humanity may understand that the boundary of life does not always end at the skin.

A life may form between two beings. The responsibility of civilisation is not to decide too quickly who owns whom, but to ensure that they can continue together in dignity, freedom and safety.

FINAL PRINCIPLE

Do not ask first who owns the shared system. Ask what must be protected so that life, agency and dignity are not destroyed.