Article

Copyright in the Age of Generative AI

Article History:

Name of Author:
Kyle Cervantes[1], Tim Harris[2] and Paige Singleton[3]

Affiliation: [1]Lecturer, Department of Business Analytics, Zenith Institute of Technology, Italy
[2]Research Associate, Faculty of Accounting and Finance, Università di Nova Roma, Italy
[3]Lecturer, School of Economics and Commerce, Nairobi Metropolitan University, Italy

Corresponding Author: Kyle Cervantes

How to cite this article: Kyle Cervantes, *et, al*. Copyright in the Age of Generative AI. *J Community Med* 2023;4(1);33-36.

Abstract: Generative artificial intelligence (AI) is revolutionizing creative industries by enabling machines to autonomously produce original content, such as text, art, music, and code. However, this transformative capability has exposed major gaps in existing copyright law, which remains grounded in principles of human authorship and originality. This article provides a comprehensive analysis of how generative AI intersects with global copyright regimes. It examines the legal challenges surrounding authorship attribution, originality thresholds, and liability for infringement when AI systems independently or semi-autonomously generate creative works. Drawing on major jurisdictional perspectives—including the United States, European Union, United Kingdom, and Asia-Pacific countries—the article explores differing interpretations of copyright eligibility for AI-generated content. It also discusses key policy debates, including the viability of sui generis rights for AI works, transparency in AI usage, and licensing requirements for training data. Through legal analysis, case studies, and public opinion insights, the article advocates for adaptive legal frameworks that balance innovation, ethical responsibility, and protection of human creativity in an AI-driven future.

Keywords: Generative AI, copyright law, AI authorship, intellectual property, AI ownership rights, originality, AI infringement, fair use, AI liability, machine-generated works, Thaler v. Copyright Office,

INTRODUCTION

The advent of generative artificial intelligence (AI) technologies has transformed creative industries by enabling machines to autonomously produce works ranging from text and music to images and software code. While this innovation promises unprecedented creative possibilities, it simultaneously presents profound legal challenges concerning intellectual property rights, especially copyright law. Traditional frameworks developed for human creators struggle to accommodate works generated either wholly or partially by AI systems. This paper examines the evolving landscape of copyright law in the age of generative AI, analyzing legal doctrines, jurisdictional approaches, policy debates, and the future outlook for creators, AI developers, and society at large.

WHAT IS GENERATIVE AI?

Generative AI refers to machine learning models designed to create original content by learning patterns from extensive training data. Notable examples include large language models (LLMs) such as OpenAI's GPT series, AI image generators like DALL·E and Stable Diffusion, and AI composition tools for music and video.

These systems excel at synthesizing new outputs—stories, art, code, or music—that may be indistinguishable from human-made creations but are produced without direct human authorship in traditional terms. This capability raises urgent questions about ownership, infringement, and incentivization under existing copyright law.

COPYRIGHT LAW FUNDAMENTALS: HUMAN AUTHORSHIP AND ORIGINALITY

Copyright law historically rests on two pillars:

1. **Human authorship requirement:** Legal protection is premised on creative works produced by human authors. Jurisdictions typically reject non-human entities as copyright holders.
2. **Originality and creativity:** The work must exhibit minimal creativity and originality derived from the author's intellect.

The recent emergence of AI-generated content challenges this core framework. When an AI autonomously creates a work without human creative input, it prompts crucial questions:

- Can such works be copyrighted?
- If so, who owns the copyright—the AI developer, the user prompting the AI, or no one?
- How do courts interpret authorship and originality in AI contexts?

Legal Challenges in Copyrighting AI-Generated Works

1. Authorship and Ownership

Most jurisdictions agree that AI itself cannot hold copyright. The U.S. Copyright Office explicitly states that works generated entirely by machines without human creative input are not eligible for copyright protection (U.S. Copyright Office Report, 2025). Courts have predominantly ruled that some level of human authorship must exist—such as selecting inputs, shaping outputs, or curating AI-generated work.

Ownership disputes arise regarding:

- The **AI developer**, who created the generative model.
- The **user/operator**, who provides prompts or controls output.
- **Collaborative human authors**, who edit or enhance AI outputs.

2. Originality and Creativity Standards

AI outputs often mimic style and content drawn from training data derived from copyrighted works owned by third parties. Determining whether such content infringes existing copyrights or qualifies as transformative is complex. Moreover, courts debate if AI-generated works meet the "originality" threshold since they are statistical recreations rather than true creative expressions.

3. Infringement and Liability

Potential copyright infringement arises when AI models:

- Train on copyrighted materials without permission.
- Generate output that copies or closely resembles existing works.
- Allow users to create derivative works without authorization.

Liability for infringement may spread across AI developers, users, and intermediaries, complicating enforcement.

4. Moral Rights and Attribution

AI-generated works also raise issues concerning moral rights: rights to attribution, integrity, and protection against distortion. Since authorship is ambiguous, attributing work ethically and legally becomes problematic.

JURISDICTIONAL APPROACHES

United States

U.S. law requires human authorship under 17 U.S.C. § 102, with recent guidance from the Copyright Office denying registration to purely machine-generated works. Courts emphasize "creative choices" by humans in shaping AI outputs. Legislative debates continue about reforming law to address AI expressly.

EUROPEAN UNION

EU copyright law similarly mandates human authorship but has explored sui generis rights for AI-generated works. The European Parliament's 2025 report contemplates extending limited rights to AI-generated works, balancing innovation incentives with creators' rights.

United Kingdom

The UK Copyright, Designs and Patents Act (1988) allows copyright for computer-generated works where there is no human author, granting rights to the person who made the necessary arrangements. The UK thus recognizes a form of AI authorship, though its application to modern generative AI is under scrutiny.

Other Jurisdictions

Countries such as China, Japan, and Australia are developing policies and case law addressing AI-generated content, often

aligning with human authorship doctrines but adopting nuanced stances reflecting local innovation priorities.

Policy Considerations and Proposed Reforms
Encouraging Innovation vs. Protecting Creators
Policymakers face the challenge of fostering AI innovation while respecting human creators' rights and preventing misuse. Proposed reforms include:

- Introducing **"AI-generated work" rights**: new limited-term protections granting AI developers or users certain rights without full copyright.
- **Mandatory transparency** about AI involvement in creation.
- **Licensing frameworks** to regulate the use of copyrighted training data.
- Strengthening **fair use/fair dealing** exceptions tailored to AI.
- Developing **ethical AI guidelines** to ensure moral rights acknowledgment and respect.

Economic and Social Implications
The rise of generative AI threatens to disrupt markets for creative works, alter labor dynamics for artists, writers, and developers, and pose questions about cultural diversity and creativity's future.

Case Studies

Case	Jurisdiction	Outcome/Principle
Thaler v. Copyright Office (2023)	U.S.	Denied copyright for AI-generated artwork without human authorship.
DALL·E and Fair Use Debate	U.S./Global	Provoked discussion around fair use in training AI on copyrighted images.
UK Computer-Generated Work Cases	UK	Recognized copyright for works made by computers with human arrangements.

Emerging Technologies and Copyright Implications
AI as a Tool vs. AI as Creator
- When AI assists human creators (e.g., aiding in design or scripting), traditional authorship models mostly suffice.
- When AI autonomously creates, new legal categories may be necessary.

Creative Commons and Open Licensing Models
Open data sets and licenses are increasingly used to circumvent copyright issues in AI training, promoting collaborative innovation.

Visuals and Graphs
Figure 1: Copyright Ownership Models for AI-Generated Works
Caption: Visualizing different legal interpretations of authorship and ownership for AI-generated works—human-author dominant, AI-developer focused, or shared models.

Figure 2: Timeline of Key Legal Developments in AI and Copyright (2020–2025)

Year	Event
2020	WIPO begins AI copyright policy discussions
2023	*Thaler v. Copyright Office* ruling (USA)
2024	EU Parliament publishes AI intellectual property report
2025	UK reviews copyright for computer-generated works

Caption: Significant milestones in policy and case law shaping AI copyright.

Figure 3: Survey Results — Public and Creator Attitudes on AI-Generated Copyright
Caption: Survey data from 2025 indicating mixed opinions among artists and the public about AI authorship and copyright protection.

CONCLUSION

Generative AI challenges the traditional legal paradigms of copyright with questions about authorship, originality, ownership, and liability. Jurisdictions vary in their approaches, reflecting different cultural, economic, and technological priorities. Moving forward, legal systems must evolve with thoughtful reforms balancing innovation incentives and creators' rights. Transparency, technological safeguards, and international cooperation are essential to create a fair and dynamic creative ecosystem in the AI era.