ACADEMIA International Journal for Social Sciences
Volume 4, Issue 3, 2025 ISSN-L (Online): 3006-6638

Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Copyright Law: Challenges and Prospects

Najam ud Din Arbkan
Najam.arbkan@yahoo.com
Master of Laws, School of Law and Policy, University of Management and Technology, Lahore

Dr. Abida Hassan
dr.abidahassan@gcu.edu.pk
Assistant Professor of Law, Government College University (GCU) Lahore
Corresponding Author: * Najam ud Din Arbkan Najam.arbkan@yahoo.com

Received: 09-04-2025 **Revised:** 10-05-2025 **Accepted:** 15-06-2025 **Published:** 21-07-2025

ABSTRACT

Artificial Intelligence's (AI) technology growing rapidly has caused the newly added layer of complexity to copyright. It makes humans the essentials of the law swooshing in almost impossible,Who is the one who is going to be liable for posting? The paper describes the AI-produced content which has been available to the user like never before and it gives an in-depth analysis of the matter where the examples of legal uncertainties include authorship, ownership, infringement, and moral rights. The article is a comparative study of the legal systems in the US, the UK, and the European Union in the context of their AI works regulations and exposes the non-conformities and gaps in the existing rules on AI-generated works. The work is a discussion about the new approaches that are being implemented and the worldwide perspectives that are being explored in connection with computerized content phenomena, both from a regulatory aspect and through the new business model. The study is about the suggestions for the intellectual property field that is both open and supportive of the argument that the innovation should still be protected humanly and is capable of dealing with the existing AI-related problems up till now along with the chances that can arise in the future.

Keywords: *Artificial Intelligence, technology, UK*

INTRODUCTION

Brief Overview of AI's Growing Influence in Creative Industries

The rapid evolution of many industries due to artificial intelligence (AI) has had a profound impact on the creative industries. The outputs that AI systems are increasingly capable of producing include self-coded software, machine-generated poetry, AI-generated artwork, and algorithmically produced music. It used to be believed that these products represented the pinnacle of human innovation. Robots can mimic, improve, and sometimes even surpass human creativity, as demonstrated by tools like Google's DeepMind, OpenAI's ChatGPT, and a number of generative adversarial networks (GANs). The rise of AI-produced work has generated a lot of debate regarding authorship, originality, and ownership in the legal and academic spheres.

Definition and Scope of Copyright Law

Authors of creative works are granted the sole right to use, reproduce, distribute, and make money off of their creations by copyright laws, which are a subset of intellectual property (IP) law. As long as they are unique and established in some tangible form, these safeguards are the standard practice for preserving literary, artistic, musical, and theatrical works, among others.

In order to maintain a copyright, which is being challenged by the idea of human authorship and similar concepts of non-human producers, copyright law aims to strike a balance between the objectives of compensating artists and promoting the dissemination of knowledge and culture.

The rise of autonomous and semi-independent AI systems raises several important legal and philosophical issues, one of which is how AI affects existing copyright laws. In this study, we will investigate whether artificial intelligence-generated works should be protected by copyright, identify the legal author, if any, and assess how well existing laws take into account these technical realities.

Goals

Through analysis, a review of the legal concerns highlighted by AI-generated content, and the identification of possible legislative revisions, this study aims to investigate the evolving link between artificial intelligence and copyright law.

A survey of scholarly perspectives, court rulings, and international legislative reactions are all part of the analysis. More specifically, the document is structured as follows: The historical background and conceptual foundation of copyright law are given in the second section. Examined is the technological context of art produced by artificial intelligence. The comparative jurisdictional analysis that is included is used to analyse legal difficulties. The paper discusses the future and potential reforms. The essay concludes with a summary of the key findings and recommendations.

Research Question

Understanding AI-Generated Content

Types of AI Systems Involved in Creative Processes

Machine learning algorithms, especially generative models and deep learning have taken a central position in the development of modern creative artificial intelligence systems. Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs), Variational Autoencoders (VAEs) and transformer-based models (e.g., GPT, DALL·E) are some examples of generative models. These models can create new content by finding patterns in a large dataset.[1] Their purpose is to generate new words, images, music, or code through human-like operations such as understanding the language and recognizing visual elements. One form of machine learning which uses deep learning is responsible for the driving forces of these models[2]. Neural networks are employed in deep learning so that machines can learn and process without the necessary of set up rules of human.

Real-Life Instances of What Artificial Intelligence Can Do

Artificial intelligence (AI) technologies have pervaded the field of art in several instances. Some of the major use cases are enumerated below:

The portrait of Edmond de Belamy, an artificial neural network (GAN) was used to create, which later was sold at Christie's auction house for $432,500 in 2018.

Artificial Intelligence Virtual Artist (AIVA) can produce music for computer games and movies which is in the form of symphonies and orchestral pieces.

Literature: ChatGPT and other artificial intelligence models have been enabled to produce poems, essays, and news articles with human intervention being kept to the minimum for them.

The software known as GitHub's Copilot, which functions with OpenAI Codex, has the ability to produce code in numerous programming languages just by reading a naturally written instruction.It has been demonstrated by these experiments that AI can create content that is of the same quality as humans.

Distinction Between Human-Assisted and Fully Autonomous Creations

One of the crucial distinctions to establish is between human-assisted AI creations and entirely autonomous productions. In assisted processes, AI functions as a tool that supplements human creativity, as seen with the use of Photoshop's AI filters or word processor linguistic recommendations[3]. By contrast, fully autonomous AI systems have the capability to create content without the use of human input in the creative process, and they pose essential issues on authorship, purpose, and liability. This difference is significant in legal arguments relating to the eligibility of such works for copyright protection and, as relevant, ownership of rights.

Copyright Law: Traditional Framework

Concepts of Originality and Authorship

The basis of copyright law is authorship and originality. Originality requires that a work be the result of the intellectual toil of the author, with some amount of originality. Authorship has traditionally assumed the presence of a natural person who authored the work. Courts and legislatures of different jurisdictions have interpreted these words differently, but the general presupposition has been that copyright is an incentive for human intellectual work. This presumption is undermined when the "creator" is an AI[4].

Historical Basis for Copyright Protection

Copyright law has historically attempted to stimulate creativity by ensuring creators receive sole rights over their work, enabling them to sell and sell out. The law, grounded in Enlightenment concepts of autonomy and intellectual property, is a social compact where authors contribute to public knowledge in return for limited monopolies. This account presumes a human creator with economic and moral interests, directly contradicted by AI authorship.

Requirements for Copyright Ability

In general, for a work to be eligible for copyright protection, it must fulfil certain requirements:

a) A work must be expressed through a physical medium, such text, music, or a digital file, in order to qualify as fixation.

b) To be considered original, one must possess both independent creation and a minimum degree of originality.

Human Authorship: The majority of legal systems demand that the author be a real person. This is demonstrated by rulings such as the US Protection Office's decision to refuse protection for works particularly produced by artificial intelligence (such as Zarya of the Dawn, 2023).

These rules need to be re-examined because they now prevent the majority of content produced by artificial intelligence from being recognized by the law. These specifications serve as copyright protection's gatekeepers.

Legal Challenges Posed by AI to Copyright Law

Authorship Dilemma: Can AI Be an Author?

Perhaps the most controversial issue at the intersection of copyright and AI is the authorship dilemma. The foundation of traditional copyright agreements is the notion that authors are human. However, the question of whether a work may be protected at all and, if so, who can be regarded as the author arises when an artificial intelligence (AI) produces it completely without any human creative involvement. Is it the company that runs the AI, the individual who wrote the program, the person who provoked the AI, or nobody?
Some methods that vary from one jurisdiction to another are as follows:

The United States Copyright Office states that only human-written works are deemed eligible for protection.

The Copyright, Designs and Patents Act of 1988 is the sole statute in the United Kingdom that expressly deals with the protection of computer-generated works. The statute gives authorship to "the person by whom the arrangements necessary for the creation of the work are undertaken[5]."

The lack of a comprehensive worldwide response is shown by the fact that several countries still lack legislative consistency or clarity on this issue.

Standards of Originality and Creativity

These rules need to be re-examined because they now prevent the majority of content produced by artificial intelligence from being recognized by the law. These specifications serve as copyright protection's gatekeepers.

Legal Challenges Posed by AI to Copyright Law

Authorship Dilemma: Can AI Be an Author?

Perhaps the most controversial issue at the intersection of copyright and AI is the authorship dilemma. The foundation of traditional copyright agreements is the notion that authors are human. However, the question of whether a work may be protected at all and, if so, who can be regarded as the author arises when an artificial intelligence (AI) produces it completely without any human creative involvement. Is it the company that runs the AI, the individual who wrote the program, the person who provoked the AI, or nobody?
Some methods that vary from one jurisdiction to another are as follows:
The United States Copyright Office states that only human-written works are deemed eligible for protection.

The Copyright, Designs and Patents Act of 1988 is the sole statute in the United Kingdom that expressly deals with the protection of computer-generated works. The statute gives authorship to "the person by whom the arrangements necessary for the creation of the work are undertaken[5]."

The lack of a comprehensive worldwide response is shown by the fact that several countries still lack legislative consistency or clarity on this issue.

Standards of Originality and Creativity

In particular, artificial intelligence undermines the conventional norms of originality and creativity when works are produced by machines that have been taught on available data. Critics contend that works created by artificial intelligence lack the "glow of creativity" that distinguishes works written by humans. Additionally, the fact that artificial intelligence systems frequently remix or recombine preexisting materials raises questions about whether the data these systems produce is actually "original" or merely derivative. The threshold of uniqueness comes in various forms:

The courts in the United States just require a minimum level of originality. A work should be considered the author's "own intellectual creation" in order to determine if it is original in the EU.

Because AI-generated works lack the subjective intent, emotional investment, and intellectual effort of a human being—qualities most typically associated with artistic production—both interpretations are called into question.

Ownership and Rights Attribution

Even when AI-generated works qualify for protection, the issue of copyright ownership is still up for debate. Can the user provide input prompts? Who developed the artificial intelligence that made use of it? Or the company that funds and trains the artificial intelligence?

The responses to such concerns become much more complex in cases that promote collaboration or open-source development of artificial intelligence, where multiple entities make inputs to the end product. There is no obvious statutory guidance in most jurisdictions, leading to legal uncertainty, differences over ownership, and challenging licensing issues.

Issues with Infringement and Legal Duties

Artificial intelligence can potentially infringe on existing copyrights either by reproducing the protected works based on its own training material or creating something that closely resembles the original work. Several questions are raised by this:

a) Which party should bear responsibility for infringement: the artificial intelligence itself, its user, or its creator?

b) Does using content protected by intellectual property rights constitute fair use, transformative use, or infringement in the context of artificial intelligence training?

Courts have only begun to consider these questions at this stage. In the current legal cases regarding artificial intelligence-generated art and code (e.g., lawsuits against Stability AI and GitHub Copilot), plaintiffs argue that AI models replicate protected works in an unauthorized way[6]. The outcomes of these cases will set the future standard for artificial intelligence training and the responsibility of its output.

Emerging Legal and Policy Responses

Judicial Responses and Landmark Cases

Courts throughout the world are starting to consider the legal ramifications of content produced by artificial intelligence. Despite the lack of a clear precedent, a number of noteworthy instances are influencing the law:

a) Thaler v. US and UK Comptroller-General of Patents: Stephen Thaler claimed that the AI system DABUS was the real author of AI-generated works and sought copyright and patent protection for them. This was rejected by U.S. and U.K. courts, which reiterated that authorship must be human[7].

b) Getty photos v. Stability AI (UK/US): Getty claimed that Stability AI trained its model using its copyrighted photos without authorisation. The ruling in this case could establish legal limits on the use of datasets and address whether training AI on copyrighted material amounts to infringement.

These cases reflect judicial caution and underscore the **gap between emerging technologies and current copyright doctrine**.

Legislative Initiatives Around the World

Initiatives in the Legislative Branch Around the World Reactions to the spread of artificial intelligence have seen various jurisdictions begin to adapt their copyright

regulations. The European Union has been cautious yet proactive in its approach, emphasizing openness and accountability through the application of legislation such as the Artificial Intelligence Act and the Copyright Directive[9].

The aim of these frameworks is to regulate the creation and employment of artificial intelligence systems, along with the interaction with intellectual property, although not yet providing any rights to the works generated through AI software[10]. Conversely, the United Kingdom already has statutory provisions for computer-generated works and copyright. These provisions ascribe authorship to the individual who is burdened with providing the necessary preparations for creation, even though the law remains vague and underdeveloped.

Under the most recent guidance provided by the United States Copyright Office, the United States still maintains the view that copyright protection requires the existence of a human creator. While this is going on, China is conducting experiments with limited recognition of rights for content generated by artificial intelligence, particularly for commercial purposes. This indicates that China is taking a more utilitarian attitude on the problem.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Several alternative legal reforms have been suggested by scholars and policymakers in an effort to close the gap between conventional copyright law and the potential offered by contemporary artificial intelligence. One strategy is introducing sui generis rights, which are reserved solely for artificial intelligence-produced works[11]. These rights would offer limited protection but not equate them with human-authored works. Another option is to adopt a tiered model of authorship that distinguishes between works that were written by humans, works that were written with the aid of AI, and works that were fully autonomous by AI. This could provide for personalised legal treatment. Furthermore, there has been an increasingly large number of voices calling for the notion that mandating the disclosure or marking of content generated by artificial intelligence as a mechanism for encouraging transparency and accountability to be adopted. There is also debate regarding the reformation of dataset use through the implementation of open licensing standards and practices, especially considering that training data often consists of copyrighted material.

A tiered or hybrid authorship framework that differentiates between (i) human-created works, (ii) human-AI collaborative works, and (iii) completely autonomous AI-generated works offers another intriguing framework. This model allow varying treatment based on the extent of human involvement in the creative process[12].

A fully machine-generated product, like such a music piece created by an unsupervised generative model, could be in the sui generis or public domain category; a book written in assistance with a large language model could enjoy copyright protection for the credit of the human who supervised and curated the material[13].More transparent decision-making in enforcement and licencing contexts would be the outcome of end users, courts, and authorities being aware of whether a work was created by a human or AI. Transparency systems would also assist in resolving ethical and trust issues in media and journalism, where it is crucial to distinguish between real and synthetic content. The European Union's draft AI Act even proposes requirements for openness with regard to some high-risk AI systems, something that could in the future be applied creatively.

Further, compulsory labelling or disclosure of AI-generated content has also gained traction as a means to ensure transparency and accountability. This would assist end-users, courts, and regulators to determine whether a work was created by a human or AI, allowing for better decision-making in enforcement and licensing matters[14].

Transparency mechanisms might also assist with solving ethical and trust problems in media and journalism, where separating real from artificial content is of paramount importance. The European Union's draft AI Act even puts forward transparency requirements for some high-risk AI systems, which might be pushed to creative uses of AI in the future.

International Harmonization Efforts

The worldwide nature of artificial intelligence development and the flow of digital content is making the globalisation of copyright rules increasingly significant. In an effort to align additional member nations on authorship definitions, originality metrics, and training data laws, the World Intellectual Property Organisation (WIPO) has been conducting consultations worldwide. 15. All of these initiatives are extremely important in an attempt to guarantee legal uniformity and clarity across borders, especially given the fact that AI-generated content is being consumed everywhere in the world16. The fact that different cultures have different legal traditions, different economic interests, and different values continues to be a barrier to the creation of a uniform worldwide system. In order to close these gaps and create legal frameworks that are adaptable and ready for the future as artificial intelligence technologies continue to advance, continued international dialogue and collaboration will be crucial.

CONCLUSION

The advent of artificial intelligence as a creative entity has completely upended the traditional copyright paradigms. The conventional ideas of authorship, ownership, and intellectual property have been called into question by this. The growing prevalence of artificial intelligence-generated material in a variety of fields, including software, music, art, and writing, is exposing the flaws in the current legal frameworks. Since the current copyright laws are predicated on human purpose and creation, they are ill-suited to handle works produced by autonomous or semi-independent artificial intelligence algorithms. Historical instances like Getty Images and Stability AI demonstrate the court's hesitancy to categorize the moral rights, fair use, and violation of machine-generated content.

The copyright legislation needs to evolve to ensure legal certainty and fair innovation as we move into a future where robots play an increasingly significant role in the production of cultural works. The aim is not to exclude the impact of artificial intelligence, but to have legal frameworks that mirror the complex reality of the co-operation between machines and human beings in the creative process.

As we approach an era when machines will be used to produce cultural works on a large scale, it is essential that copyright law be amended to ensure legal certainty as well as fair innovation. The aim is to establish legal provisions that capture the complex realities of human-machine collaboration in the creative process and do not underestimate the influence of AI.

REFERENCES

[1] David Foster, *Generative Deep Learning: Teaching Machines to Paint, Write, Compose, and Play*

(O'Reilly Media 2019)

[2] Yann LeCun, Yoshua Bengio and Geoffrey Hinton, 'Deep Learning' (2015) 521 *Nature* 436

[3] Ahmed Elgammal and others, 'CAN: Creative Adversarial Networks, Generating "Art" by Learning About Styles and Deviating from Style Norms' (2017) arXiv:1706.07068 https://arxiv.org/abs/1706.07068 accessed 7 May 2025

[4] Andres Guadamuz, 'Artificial Intelligence and Copyright' (2017) 21 *WIPO Magazine*

https://www.wipo.int/wipo_magazine/en/2017/05/article_0003.html accessed 7 May 2025

[5] Stephen Marche, 'A Robot Wrote This Book Review' *The New Yorker* (New York, 5 October 2020) https://www.newyorker.com/culture/cultural-comment/a-robot-wrote-this-book-review accessed 7 May 2025

[6] UK IPO, *Guidance on Copyright and Artificial Intelligence* (March 2021) https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/copyright-and-artificial-intelligence accessed 7 May 2025.

[7] Thaler v Comptroller-General of Patents, Designs and Trade Marks [2021] EWCA Civ 1374.

[8] Getty Images (US), Inc. v Stability AI, Inc., No. 1:23-cv-00135 (D Del filed 3 February 2023).

[9] Directive (EU) 2019/790 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 April 2019 on copyright and related rights in the Digital Single Market [2019] OJ L130/92.

[10] US Copyright Office Review Board, *Zarya of the Dawn* Decision (21 February 2023) https://www.copyright.gov/rulings/zarya-of-the-dawn.pdf accessed 7 May 2025.

[11] WIPO, *Revised Issues Paper on Intellectual Property Policy and Artificial Intelligence* (WIPO, 2020) https://www.wipo.int/edocs/mdocs/mdocs/en/wipo_ip_ai_ge_20/wipo_ip_ai_ge_20_1_rev.pdf accessed 7

May 2025

[12] Annemarie Bridy, 'AI and Creativity: Why We're Asking the Wrong Questions about Copyright Law' (2016) 5(2) *Stanford Technology Law Review* 1

[13] UK Intellectual Property Office, *Artificial Intelligence and Intellectual Property: Copyright and Patents*

(2021)

https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/artificial-intelligence-and-intellectual-property-call-for-views accessed 7 May 2025

[14] European Commission, *Proposal for a Regulation Laying Down Harmonised Rules on Artificial Intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act)* COM(2021) 206 final

[15] US Copyright Office, *Policy Statement on Works Containing AI-Generated Material* (16 March 2023) 88 Fed Reg 16190.

[16] WIPO, *Revised Issues Paper on Intellectual Property Policy and Artificial Intelligence* (WIPO, 2020) https://www.wipo.int/edocs/mdocs/mdocs/en/wipo_ip_ai_ge_20/wipo_ip_ai_ge_20_1_rev.pdf accessed 7

May 2025

BIBLOGRAPHY

Bertram, I. (1992). *How to Negotiate a Good Result*. Victoria University of Wellington Law Review, 22(3), 237–257.

Fisher, R., Ury, W., & Patton, B. (2011). *Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In* (3rd ed.). Penguin Books.

Mnookin, R. H., Peppet, S. R., & Tulumello, A. S. (2000). *Beyond Winning: Negotiating to Create Value in Deals and Disputes*. Harvard University Press.

Menkel-Meadow, C. (1995). The Lawyer as Problem Solver and Third-Party Neutral: Creativity and Non-Partisanship in Lawyering. *Temple Law Review*, 72, 785.

Shell, G. R. (2006). *Bargaining for Advantage: Negotiation Strategies for Reasonable People* (2nd ed.). Penguin.

Walton, R. E., & McKersie, R. B. (1991). *A Behavioral Theory of Labor Negotiations: An Analysis of a Social Interaction System*. ILR Press.

Lewicki, R. J., Barry, B., & Saunders, D. M. (2015). *Negotiation* (7th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.

Brett, J. M. (2007). *Negotiating Globally: How to Negotiate Deals, Resolve Disputes, and Make Decisions Across Cultural Boundaries* (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Bazerman, M. H., & Neale, M. A. (1992). *Negotiating Rationally*. Free Press.

Ury, W. (1991). *Getting Past No: Negotiating with Difficult People*. Bantam Books.

Goldberg, S. B., Sander, F. E. A., Rogers, N. H., & Cole, S. R. (2012). *Dispute Resolution: Negotiation, Mediation, and Other Processes* (6th ed.). Aspen Publishers.

Lax, D. A., & Sebenius, J. K. (1986). *The Manager as Negotiator: Bargaining for Cooperation and Competitive Gain*. Free Press.

Thompson, L. (2005). *The Mind and Heart of the Negotiator* (3rd ed.). Pearson Prentice Hall.