International Journal of Environmental Sciences
ISSN: 2229-7359
Vol. 11 No. 16s,2025
https://theaspd.com/index.php

Ownership Of AI-Generated Works: Rethinking Copyright In The 21st Century

Nishtha Agrawal[1], Dr. Anchal Mittal Aggarwal[2], Baisakhi Dasgupta[3], Dr. Prodipta Barman[4], Ummey Safia Begum[5], Preeti Uttam[6]
[1]Assistant Professor, AURO University, Surat
[2]Associate Professor, SGT University
[3]Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce, Brainware University
[4]Assistant Professor, Brainware University
[5]Guest Faculty, Department of Law, Cotton University
[6]Research scholar, CMP Degree College,

Abstract
Artificial intelligence (AI) has changed the world of traditional law and particularly in the intellectual property law. In this paper, the issue of rights to ownership of works generated with the help of AI is analyzed, where it is asked whether the current copyright doctrines are adequate in the era of autonomous creation. It examines the way jurisdictions currently approach the issues, the consequences this may have on creators and developers and what potential mechanisms may exist to be used as a basis of change. This paper presents such a multidisciplinary viewing of authorship and suggests a mixed legal approach that will satisfy both incentive innovation and an acceptable use of AI.
Keywords: *artificial intelligence, copyright, authorship, intellectual property, AI-generated content*

INTRODUCTION

Artificial intelligence (AI) has revolutionized the artistic scene as it generated poems and paintings to music and even scientific texts. These creations are making it an easy task to distinguish and prove it simply as AI technology because they are most of the time indistinguishable to human-made works. Whether it is the GPT-based texts of OpenAI or generative arts produced by DALL-E and musical pieces created by AIVA, machines are not the passive participants of the creative process anymore.

The widespread adoption of AI systems in the creative sphere puts the essential principles of copyright legislation, which always relied on human creation and uniqueness, into question (Gervais, 2020). The divide between human-driven assumptions in intellectual property systems and machine-based, learning, iterating and content production without the direct involvement of human creativity is also now in question. There is a legal vacuum of such works creating very urgent questions as; Is content created by AI subject to copyright protection? Assuming that it is a case, then who has the rights? What are the implication to the traditional creators, content industries and access to the public?

This paper discusses the relevance of the present copyright systems to deal with AI-generated works, and provides the critical analysis of how the legal notion of authorship can and should change in the 21 st century. It reviews the irregularities between jurisdictions, and it gives a balanced, prospective-strategic model of intellectual property protection, which balances itself with technological innovation and morality.

The Concept of Authorship in Copyright Law

Authorship is often seen as something that pertains to humans under copyright regimes. Example: the US Copyright Act of 1976 states that in order to be protected, "original works of authorship fixed in a tangible medium" must be present. The Indian Copyright Act of 1957 also suggests that creators have some say in the final product. All intellectual production was presumed to originate from a sentient mind capable of volition, labor, and responsibility when these frameworks were formed. At the time, non-human creativity was inconceivable.

The foundational premise in copyright law is that the author is a natural person, or at most, a legal entity that directs or employs a human creator. This premise presupposes an emotional, intellectual, or cultural imprint that is identifiably human. In contrast, AI operates on algorithms, training data, and probability models that mimic—but do not originate—creative intent. AI does not feel, think, or interpret in the human sense. As a result, attributing authorship to AI disrupts the very notion of authorship as tied to personality, moral rights, and individual identity.

Today, AI systems such as OpenAI's GPT models, DeepMind's AlphaCode, or Google's MusicLM can generate complex, expressive content autonomously (Elgammal et al., 2017). These AI models are capable of producing original-seeming content without requiring continual human oversight. In some instances, human involvement is limited to inputting prompts or setting initial parameters, raising questions about whether such minimal interaction qualifies for authorship.

The traditional criteria for copyright—originality and fixation—are problematic when applied to AI. Originality assumes the existence of human intellectual effort, creativity, and intent. While AI-generated works may be novel and surprising, they result from statistical processes and large-scale data correlations rather than subjective human experience or creative labor. Artificial intelligence naturally satisfies fixation, which calls for the storage or capture of a work in a perceivable form. However, without a human creator, focus is inadequate on its own.

When AI functions autonomously, important legal concerns arise: Could you please tell me who the author is who is legally binding? Which was the code writer, the programmer? Who acted as the initiator of generation? Does the company or is it under license using the AI system? Perhaps, it may turn out that such AI may be considered as a legitimate author without actually having mind or identity institutionally. Each option is complicated.

It might not be necessary to accord the programmers authorship due to the nature of their tasks which are largely wide-ranged and therefore not relevant to the specific product'. The user as the author might misrepresent his/her input on the work especially when it is minimal. AI is an entity that legally cannot own a piece of property nor can it exercise rights due to which authorship cannot be given to the AI under the majority of modern laws. Accordingly, how to correctly attribute copyright to work produced by artificial intelligence can be viewed as one of the most severe issues in the field of intellectual property law today.

The ambiguity in unfixed attribution of something is not only a problem in the law but it generates economical and ethical implications too. Avoiding infringement, assigning royalties and enforcement of rights turn out to be a lot more troublesome when no apparent creator has been observed. The qualities of content and innovation in the creative industries produced by artificial intelligence (AI) can also lack transparency of the credit.

Legal Approaches to AI-Generated Works

United States

The copyright office in the United States has precedence to reject the application of the works that have not been signed by a human being. The 2022 Thaler v. case affirmed this position by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. In a decision by Perlmutter, the court held that only works created by humans enjoy a copyright protection. The case involved actually Stephen Thaler who attempted to have registered a piece of visual art created independently by his artificial intelligence system, DABUS. Entities that are not humans are not covered by copyright protection according to the court analysis of the statutory and historical precedence. Moreover, the current regulations published by the U.S. Copyright Office prohibit registering any AI-generated work as a copyright that solely contains the product of an AI tool, without any substantial human input. This fairly Uhmann human-authorship test brings to the fore an everlasting legal principle that links human consciousness to originality of expression.

United Kingdom

The United Kingdom offers a more subtle and not less vague approach. Under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 in Section 9(3), the author is deemed to be the person who takes the arrangements to be made in regard to the creation of the work in the case of computer-generated work where there is no human in charge. This is because this kind of provision is a reflection of coordinating role of the producer and it allows certain forms of legal credit even in the absence of human inventiveness. The fact that what constitutes the necessary arrangements, to what extent one is to participate in such arrangements is a question whose interpretation is very faulty. Although it is among the few legislations that attempt to deal with the issue of authorship in AI, critics argue that the clause is outdated and too little to help resolve the issue of autonomy of modern AI systems.

India

In the Copyright Act of 1957, there is no particular language to deal with AI created work in India. The law continues to operate on the assumption that human minds hold the key factor of creativity. This theory was echoed by the court in its seminal rulings, including Eastern Book Company v. D.B. Modak (2008), when it held that copyright protection requires a minimum amount of human creativity, which re-emphasises that Indian law has always placed major emphasis on human authorship and originality. The whole drive of artificial intelligence is now in a legal pickle. It is necessary to make legal changes in this field to ensure the safety of innovation and citizen protection at the time when India wants to become a global leader in the sphere of artificial intelligence.

Australia and the European Union

With copyright matters, Australia has begin to encounter the challenges that AI poses. The Australian government was looking to find out the opinion of people, as to whether they believed any AI-generated work was to be given some protection and in case, how this work should be partitioned among the writers as part of their 2021 Consultation Paper. Even though there been no official changes yet, the fact that it is willing to entertain the idea of reform shows that it is proactive.

Although the 2021 offer by the European Union on AI Act does not specifically target IP rights, it also emphasizes risks evaluation, ethical application, as well as transparency with regard to the use of AI. However, in 2020 the European Parliament proposed a resolution stating that AI-generated content needs to be taken into consideration of a special right. The resolution recognizes that AI cannot be legally recognized as a person or an author, but it suggests that there could be value in creating a new class of rights to safeguard the investment and creativity in AI-generated work, without interfering with copyright that is centered on humans.

Legal developments in these nations are nevertheless influenced by the ongoing struggle between promoting AI innovation and preserving the fundamental foundations of copyright law. It is clear that there has to be international conversation and harmonization due to the different methods.

Philosophical and Ethical Dimensions

The greater query behind the copyright controversy is not simply a legal justice, but ontological: Can a non-human being such as AI have or carry some rights? The AI cannot have consciousness, sentience, free will, and moral responsibility compared to human beings (Boden, 2016). These attributes have been the basis of human legal entitlement to personhood and rights including intellectual property rights. The decision to assign the right of authorship to AI would be a wild departure of this framework and could imply the destruction of the well-established idea that creativity is an exclusively human attribute.

AI works conceptualise their output by using statistical learning and pattern recognition, and they have no subjective experience or an intention. Creatively attributing AI in this way can therefore not only erode the value of authorship but also conceal any sense of its role on the ethical and the labor parts of the various stakeholders in the design, training and use of AI models. Philosophically, this raises concerns about reducing creative endeavor to algorithmic computation, thereby commodifying human expression.

Conversely, denying any form of protection to AI-generated works poses its own set of ethical and economic challenges. Without legal safeguards, companies and developers might refrain from investing in AI systems designed for creative applications. This could stifle innovation and restrict the development of technologies that could enhance education, accessibility, and artistic expression. From a utilitarian perspective, the function of copyright is to promote the progress of science and the useful arts by incentivizing creation. If that creation now includes non-human agents, should the incentive structure adapt accordingly? (McCutcheon, 2022).

There is also the issue of fairness and exploitation. Many AI systems are trained on vast datasets comprising human-created works, often without consent, compensation, or acknowledgment. This raises moral questions about the legitimacy of AI-generated outputs and whether they constitute derivative works or unauthorized reproductions. Ethical frameworks must address whether current practices respect the rights of the original creators whose intellectual labor is embedded in the training data.

Further, the question arises as to who bears responsibility for AI outputs that are defamatory, biased, or infringing. Without legal personhood, AI cannot be held accountable. Putting the blame on either the developers or the users means a problem of foreseeability and control. The law has to provide a compromise between the two competing moral demands of promoting technological advancement and respect of human dignity, creativity and responsibility.

After all, the AI authorship debate has the same characteristics of philosophical inquiry as it does of legal inquiry regarding the nature of creativity, agency and responsibility. With AI playing an increasingly active role in cultural outputs, the questions of credit and responsibility we accord others will come to define not only law but a whole culture.

Toward a Hybrid Legal Framework

Traditional copyright theories are becoming more and more unsustainable due to these difficulties. A number of lawmakers and legal experts have called for a multi-level framework to account for the different levels of human intervention in AI content production (Gervais, 2020; Samuelson, 2021). This paradigm provides a middle ground, protecting the value of human writers but also making room for autonomous technology to play an ever larger role in both cultural and economic output.

Here is an example of a possible structure:

1. **Human-AI Collaboration:** example is human-AI collaboration. When AI is used as a tool under human supervision, like when a writer uses AI to help with drafting or an artist uses generative AI to improve sketches, the work is still protected by conventional copyright laws, and the human contributor is acknowledged as the author. That way, everything will stay in sync with the current frameworks and the importance of human creativity will be maintained.
2. **Autonomous AI Generation:** A new kind of intellectual property might be created for works that are created mostly or totally by AI without any human involvement. The organization or individual responsible for developing and releasing the AI system may be bestowed with a limited, non-renewable right known as a sui generis right. This safeguard would not equate machine activity with human authorship but would instead recognize the effort and ingenuity that went into the AI.
3. **Public Domain Option:**Designating completely AI-generated works as part of the public domain is an alternate strategy that is gaining popularity in policy circles. As a result, open innovation would flourish, cultural equity would be guaranteed, and the monopolization of non-human creativity would be averted. As an additional regulatory incentive, public domain default regulations might encourage developers to include substantial human monitoring in order to achieve copyright protection**.**

In light of the ever-changing nature of technology, this tripartite structure guarantees the continued legal protection of human innovation. It would encourage open and equitable usage of machine-generated work while protecting conventional artists' incentive structures and preventing the legal monopolization of AI.

A strong legal definition, including criteria for determining a "substantial human contribution" and procedures for recording sui generis rights, is essential for such a system to succeed. To further guarantee uniformity and legal clarity across countries, a unified worldwide model may be developed, maybe with the help of the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO).

Policy Recommendations

A specific reform agenda is required to keep copyright law relevant in the AI era. Finding a middle ground between creativity, clarity of law, and moral responsibility is the goal of the following policy suggestions:

1. **Revise Law:** Legislators are advised to change the meaning of nothingness to cover hybrid man made products. This would bring clarity in works in which human interaction is key or working with AI tools. The human-AI partnership should be acknowledged, so that the laws can capture the subtlety of the currently implemented creative procedures.
2. **Create Sui Generis Rights:** Sui Generis rights should be created as a separate, purpose-built category of intellectual property concerning self-generated AI material. Such sui generis rights would be both time-limited and scope-limited, and would preserve the concerns of the public domain and conventional copyright standards, though safeguarding the commercial interests of AI developers or deployers.
3. **Establish Ethical Standards:** Industry groups and policymakers must consider creating ethical guidelines and good practice. This must cover publishing training datasets to avoid copyright violation and bias in the algorithms, consent by data providers, and explicit guidelines of attribution.
4. **International Harmonization:** Since the development of AI and its spread is international, it requires international coordination. Treaties or frameworks harmonizing the standards of copyright applicable to AI-created content across jurisdictions should be enabled by organizations like the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO). This would lead to legal predictability of cross border trade and innovation.

Introducing such policy measures, governments will be able to future-proof the intellectual property system, stimulate innovation, and enforce ethical and equitable principles in the creative ecosystem.

CONCLUSION

Generative works created with the help of artificial intelligence cease to be hypothetical, they are already creating the future of content creation not only in art, but also in science, literature, and media. These developments blur the principles of the copyright laws, which are initially built under a humanistic model of creativity. The more established structures, being as they are sturdy in their own historical settings, will be notoriously unprepared to deal with the specifics and the connotations of non-human authorship.

There is an urgent need to embrace an effective yet balanced and innovative approach that can be viewed as a legal solution to the demand of human-AI collaboration while at the same time preserving a common cultural commons that has been borne out of it. This design should include both economic motivation of developers and those who create resources, and the application of ethical layers of protection of data usage, fairness, and references.

As the society reconsiders the definition of creativity in the internet era, then the legal infrastructure that describes authorship and ownership should also be advanced. Such a dynamic, progressive approach toward the concept of the copyright law will assure the positive concomitant development of innovation and human dignity in the age of artificial intelligence.

REFERENCES

1. Boden, M. A. (2016). *AI: Its nature and future*. Oxford University Press.
2. Elgammal, A., Liu, B., Elhoseiny, M., & Mazzone, M. (2017). CAN: Creative adversarial networks, generating “art” by learning about styles and deviating from style norms. *arXiv preprint* arXiv:1706.07068. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1706.07068
3. European Parliament. (2020). *Intellectual property rights for the development of artificial intelligence technologies*. European Parliament Resolution.https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/TA-9-2020-0277_EN.html
4. Gervais, D. J. (2020). The machine as author. *Iowa Law Review, 105*(5), 2053–2085. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3359524

5. McCutcheon, J. (2022). Artificial intelligence and copyright: An Australian perspective. *University of New South Wales Law Journal, 45*(1), 124–157. https://doi.org/10.53637/JM23100
6. Samuelson, P. (2021). Allocating ownership rights in computer-generated works. *Columbia Journal of Law & the Arts, 44*(2), 153–192. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3602329
7. Thaler v. Perlmutter, No. 1:22-cv-01564 (D.D.C. Aug. 18, 2023). https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/64842448/thaler-v-perlmutter/
8. UK Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988. (1988). https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1988/48/contents
9. U.S. Copyright Office. (2023). *Copyright registration guidance: Works containing material generated by artificial intelligence*. https://www.copyright.gov/ai/
10. World Intellectual Property Organization. (2021). *Revised issues paper on intellectual property policy and artificial intelligence*. https://www.wipo.int/edocs/mdocs/mdocs/en/wipo_ip_ai_2_21/wipo_ip_ai_2_21.pdf