Science of Law Journal (2024)
Clausius Scientific Press, Canada

DOI: 10.23977/law.2024.030802
ISSN 2616-2296 Vol. 3 Num. 8

Legal and Ethical Implications of AI-Generated Content in Intellectual Property Law

Haolong Wen

Law School, Guilin University of Electronic Technology, Guilin, Guangxi, 541004, China

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Intellectual Property, AI-generated Works, the DABUS Case, Legal Reform and Ethics in AI

Abstract: The relationship between AI and IP law is analytic emerging challenges regarding AI-generated content under copyright, trademark, and patent laws. The tremendous input that AI systems make to creative and innovative processes means that traditional IP laws do not capture the many limitations under which they were originally designed to cover human authorship and inventorship. This paper looks into authorship, ownership, and infringement issues relating to works generated by AI so as to highlight the gaps in the present legal frameworks. It brings forward major case studies regarding DABUS and copyright eligibility findings highlighting the facial anachronism of using contemporary laws in respect of AI-generated content. Addressing some ethical issues around what AI may mean for the turning tide in traditional creative industries and why we need to hold on to specific functions within work created by AI will be among the various concerns placed before the audience. Ends of the paper contain propositions for IP legal reforms to accommodate the singular demands posed by AI, with international perspectives and future scopes for research highlighted. An analysis in this paper will include legal, ethical, and practical implications for policymakers and legal practitioners in better understanding the landscape of change that is happening under AI and IP law.

1. Introduction

1.1 Background of Artificial Intelligence and Intellectual Property

Today, AI is viewed as one of the most disruptive technologies in virtually every industry, especially healthcare, finance, manufacturing, and even the creative arts. An average AI system consists of a mix of machine learning algorithms, neural machine networks, and natural language processing, which overall inscribes the functions that human intelligence can perform. This ranges from invention and creation of an artistic work to designing brands by way of logos and slogans. The further development of AI will also broaden its scope in terms of creation and invention, leading to a range of implications for the legal protection of intellectual property.

Historically, IP law dealt with copyrights, patents trademarks, and others which endeavored to address a system constructed with human authors and inventors in mind. Almost all IP law rests upon the definition of authorship, which determines the rights of the owner about the conceived or created work or an invention of full text.[1] But with the advance of AI systems and their abilities to

autonomously engineer content, the extent current legal systems can be bent is finding closer limits. Ownership, authorship, and inventorship are some of the areas that are hotly contested in legal regimes, with the noted attention aimed at how better, or if at all, should these developments be addressed by IP law .[2]

1.2 Purpose of the Study

This study aims to investigate the advantages and drawbacks posed by AI content creation through the lens of intellectual property law. Given that AI systems are being further incorporated into the processes of creativity and invention, there is a need to establish the applicability of current IP laws to issues generated by AI and whether those laws need reform to address the specific challenges that AI poses. Further, the present research studies how copyright, trademark, and patent laws including issues of authorship, ownership, and inventor ship interact with the use of AI.

This research study will explore the current incidents and legal landscape as well and it will make specific suggestions to politicians and legal professionals about how to act when AI-generated materials present obstacles. In doing so, the paper will attempt to respond to the question of how the law can cope with the rapid evolution of AI in the creative and innovative processes from the regulation and ethics of AI in IP law. In the final analysis, the study endeavors to join discussions on the prospects of IP law in a technologically advanced society that anticipates more use of artificial intelligence and therefore would like to help provide useful information for legal reform and policy-making processes that will come after the research.

1.3 Structure of the Paper

This paper is organized into sections, each addressing a particular aspect of the interaction of AI with IP law. In Section 4, the prevailing state of copyright legislation especially focused on works originating from artificial intelligence is examined, such as the relevance of any tests applied for both human authorship and originality followed by the impact of new litigation cases concerning AI-generated works.

In Section 5, the scope of trademark legislation is discussed, more so the instances whereby trademarks and logos emerge from AI thereby infringing and augmenting the protections offered of rights such as trademarks.

Section 6 explores the area of existing patents where it questions the position of whether AI can be regarded as an inventor and legal issues that are related to ownership of creations developed artificially by AI.

Section 7 deals with matters of ethics: here, it discusses the requirements of human intervention, the ethical dilemma stemming from questions of attribution and ownership, and possible changes that may come upon traditional creative industries.

Section 8 concludes by considering the future of possible legal reform and various international approaches to the regulation of AI-created content. It also identifies areas of future research and legal development. The paper then concludes by summarizing some of the key findings and recommendations for policymakers and legal practitioners on how to navigate the evolving landscape of AI and IP law.[3]

2. Understanding Generative AI and Its Applications

2.1 What is Generative AI?

Generative AI is a subclass of AI intended to create new content, images, videos, music, and even

code by learning from the existing data. Unlike traditional AI, in which all efforts are made to let it recognize patterns and solve problems with pre-defined rules, generative AI uses advanced machine learning techniques, namely, deep learning and neural networks, to create novel outputs similar to human creativity. This kind of AI is particularly powerful because it creates content with minimal interference from a human agent; therefore, new ways for imagination and innovation are opened.

It is highly personified by Generative Adversarial Networks, a class of machine learning models that Ian Goodfellow introduced back in 2014. A GAN consists of two neural networks: the generator and the discriminator. Both are used in generating new content. The generator would make data that resembles real examples. A discriminator checks how much this generated data looks like real data. Through the process of iteration, the generator gets improved outputs to generate highly realistic content from it.

At the same time, Generative AI has rapidly been adopted across various industries due to its versatility. For example, GPT-3 from OpenAI generates human-like text while DALL-E generates human-like images, with other systems generating music or designing new products. However, with these newer capabilities, generative AI also brought a host of significant legal concerns, largely relating to IP. Who owns the rights to content created by AI, and how should existing IP laws adapt to accommodate these new forms of creation? These questions are central to the ongoing debate about the legal implications of AI-generated content.

2.2 Current Applications of Generative AI

The scope of use within these industries varies greatly going from the entertainment field through to the healthcare sector, each of which presents varying challenges and prospects to the intellectual property law. One of the main uses of AI technologies in art and design is the use of tools like DALL-E and MidJourney that create original artworks using a digital medium with the help of only textual descriptions.[4] These AI-generated artworks are sometimes so real that it becomes difficult to tell them apart from those made by an artist, which raises issues regarding the ownership and copyrightability of such works.

In the same vein, creating written articles, marketing copies, and even entire novels with the help of an AI system like GPT or Jasper has started to gain traction. The fact that works can now be produced with the aid of an AI system has raised interesting dilemmas for the world of journalism and publishing.[5] Precariousness mostly evolves when the generated output resembles the work that has already been in existence and may therefore give rise to an infringement of copyright disputes.[5]

When it comes to music artistry, there are platforms powered by AI that facilitate the composing of a completely original soundtrack without or with minimal human input, amperes music and AIVA being noted examples. Due to the unending need for fresh and excellent music for instance in the film and advertising industries, such tools have been adopted.[1] Nevertheless, the incorporation of artificial intelligence in music production raises critical considerations regarding copyright issues in the sense of how one can claim ownership of such works and the suitability of existing laws dealing with ownership of musical works for artificial intelligence-composed music.[6]

In more advanced areas particularly in engineering and drug development, artificial intelligence software is employed for creating new products as well as processes. This is especially true regarding the application of AI to drug discovery, which has produced imaginative molecules that could be the foundation of novel treatments.[2] Such innovations advanced by AI, however, stir controversy in the field of patenting, given that under normal circumstances, a physical person is required to be indicated as the inventor in the submitted patent application.

2.3 AI-Generated Content and Intellectual Property Challenges

The boom of generative AI has brought a variety of issues in the field, and one of the most contentious is that of authorship and ownership. Conventional laws of Intellectual Property were meant to safeguard works made by human beings; nevertheless, materials can be generated by systems of generative artificial intelligence with little or no human intervention. This raises the issue of whether AI-generated creations can be recognized and protected by laws of intellectual property as they exist today, and if so, who is the author or owner.

As an illustration, the restriction in copyright law enunciated prohibits any work that is not the product of human creativity from being afforded protection. AI systems, however, can also achieve exceedingly creative works, like art and music, with which debates arise over their protection and who should own them. Similarly, patent law requires that a human inventor be named on patent applications, which complicates matters when AI systems contribute to the development of new inventions.

The threats are higher because of the potential infringement.[5] AI systems trained on copyrighted material can inadvertently generate content almost identical to existing material, which raises concerns about plagiarism and infringement of copyright.

3. Legal Framework of Intellectual Property

3.1 Overview of Intellectual Property Law

The branch of law that deals with the protection of these intellectual creations is known as the law of intellectual property. This law also provides the authors of the original work, the innovators, and the brands, the rights to those works on an exclusive basis. The intellectual property laws can be classified mainly into three categories depending on the subjects dealt with; they include, copyright law, trademark law, and patent law. Each of these areas has its own set of laws that govern them stipulating how protection is obtained, the benefits that accrue to the authors, and the duration of protection.

Copyright legislations cover literature, music, ads, drama, art, software, and the like. Copyright in most cases entitles the author to several rights about the multimedia work for a set number of years, including rights to reproduce, publish, and exhibit the work.

This area of the law also focuses on the protection of brand elements such as logos, tag-lines, brand names, and in general any marque associated with a particular service or product in a way that helps reduce the level of guesswork on where the product originates from in the market.

Without patent laws granting protection for their inventions most of the inventors would invent or develop mainly their works. Typically, a patent protects items that are new, not obvious, and are functional.

These conventional models, however, face tensions as a result of the emergence of AI-created material, which is not always easily classifiable within the present taxonomy of creativity and innovation.[7]

3.2 Copyright Law and AI-Generated Works

Without a doubt, the field of intellectual property that faces the most pressure from content produced by artificial intelligence is copyright. Existing legal systems do not recognize non-person-authored works for copyright protection in most cases. For example, the US Copyright Act states that copyright concerns original works of authorship fixed in any tangible medium of expression. Hence, this definition would preclude completely machine-generated content from being considered, which

implies that content created by AI will probably be unprotected by any existing copyright law.

This, of course, makes for quite fundamental questions regarding works that emanate from those AI systems, be it DALL-E or ChatGPT. Should a work of digital art, or an article, be considered for copyright protection if autonomously created by an AI system? And who should be recognized as the author in the case of creation by this kind of AI: the developer, the user, or the AI itself? Some legal scholars argue that AI-generated works should be treated as public domain material, while others suggest that new laws are needed to address the unique challenges posed by AI-generated content.

3.3 Trademark Law and AI-Generated Branding

The trademark law aims to shield identifiers of a brand, such as logos, taglines, and brand names, which distinguish the goods or services from others in the market. In a world enabled by generative AI, this implies that businesses are free to design any kind of marketing including logos and brand names using an AI system. Several significant legal concerns are raised.

Ownership is the first, but not least, of these issues. When an AI system creates a company's logo, who is said to own that logo? Quite often, companies using AI systems stand a great chance of owning it, but then questions will surely be raised regarding how far into the creative process an AI system might be. In addition, trademark infringement could be done unconsciously with AI-generated content. Examples include when an AI system could generate a logo or brand name similar to an already registered trademark, which might raise potential legal disputes around trademark infringement.

AI is also being used to enforce trademark rights. It is increasingly used by companies to monitor the marketplace for potential trademark infringements, thus offering faster and more efficient protection of their intellectual property.[8] How the courts will sort out how AI-generated content and enforcement tools fit within the existing trademark laws remains to be seen.

3.4 Patent Law and AI Innovations

Patent law grants the inventor exclusivity in respect of new inventions for the duration, usually 20 years from the date of filing. The grant of a patent requires the invention to be new, nonobvious, and industrially useful. However, the increasing number of AI-generated inventions has brought about fresh challenges to patent law, specifically related to the issue of inventorship.

Presently, under the current patent laws, only human inventors may be named on patent applications. This provides several severe problems when AI systems are used to create new technologies. For example, already AI systems have been utilized to discover chemical compounds for the pharmaceutical industry as well as form designs for engineering problems. In such scenarios, would that AI be considered credited with the invention, or would the respective agent or entities developing or utilizing this particular AI system get the credit?

Legal disputes such as Thaler v. Comptroller General of Patents[9] have raised questions on the applicability of patent laws to AI systems. The court held that it is not possible to attribute the inventorship of an AI under UK patent law, and this decision shows the issues of legislation concerning inventions that employ AI and the lack thereof.

4. Copyright Law and AI-Generated Content

4.1 Copyright Ownership

The authorship of AI-themed content is one of the contentious problems in the disciplines that concern the use of AI. The traditional copyright law will normally assume that the work done is owned by the one who created it and gets the right to control the use, sharing, and making money from that

particular work produced. Concerning the works that are produced by computers or AI in short, I believe a question arises who should be referred to as the owner of that particular work?

If an artwork or a text is produced by an AI application, is the owner of the AI application, the one who should hold the copyright? Perhaps it is the AI developer, the end-user who provided the prompts, or even the AI itself. These questions are pressing within such sectors as digital art and music, where the creation of artificial intelligence works is on the rise.

Plus, some countries have decided that since these works are entirely the work of machines, there is no author wall, and hence lack of human authorship, they cannot get copyright protection.[10] On the other hand, the authors of many pieces appear to be concerned about whether such a position is reasonable or if it will be necessary to redress in the future with the advancement of technology and the creation of works through AI.

4.2 Authorship Attribution for AI-Generated Works

One more critical issue concerning artificial intelligence-generated content relates to the ownership of such content. It is established within the present copyright law, that the party who creates a work will generally own the work. But in works produced by artificial intelligence, this distinction is irrelevant. Is the creator of the AI tool the one who should get the credit or should the user of the AI take some credit as well? Or, whether it is the AI system creator that holds the rights over the creation.

As a result, it has been argued that the works produced by artificial intelligence systems cannot claim copyright protection because they lack human authorship; this has been the ruling in many courts. Accordingly, the U.S. Copyright Office declared that copyright protection shall not extend to any works “created by a machine or other mechanical process without any creative input or direction by a human author”.[11] This has serious consequences for the few sectors of the economy that depend on AI content creation, such as journalism, advertising, and film.

Meanwhile, some legal theorists have come up with modern authorship concepts that account for the input of both humans and artificial intelligence when making works. This set of models involves the co-authorship of the human operator and the AI subsystem as joint authors of the work.

4.3 Challenges in Copyright Protection for AI-Generated Content

Numerous challenges exist in the application of copyright law to content generated with the help of AI. The principal concern would be the absence of a human author. The Berne Convention and numerous other domestic legislations on copyright state that the works have to be of human authors to count.[12] This suggests that works created by artificial intelligence cannot be considered for copyright and therefore open such works to exploitation and use without permission.

Another problem is the issue of authorship. When the AI system autonomously creates content, it is not clear who should own that content. For example, a corporation may want to use an AI system to produce promotional content. In this case, who has the right to claim the copyright for the created content: the company, the AI's creator, or the person who submitted the requests?

Lastly, there is still the issue of infringement. AI technologies that are trained with copyrighted content may also produce works that resemble pre-existing ones, resulting in concerns over infringements of plagiarism or copyright.[5] These challenges underscore the urgency for legal reform regarding issues created by AI-specific content.

4.4 Case Studies and Legal Precedents

However, several recent judicial proceedings have shown the problems associated with traditional

copyright laws and content produced by AI technologies. The adoption of the conceptual tradition of copyright principles in this case is dependent on the ruling in the United States Copyright Office v. Narutov, where the dispute was about a photo taken by a wild monkey. The courts ruled out that any animals as non-human entities cannot claim the ownership of the copyright which is also within the context of works created by an AI.

While the case of Nucleus was peripheral to AI, it created a body of work that would help argue against the inclusion of non-human authors in the ambit of works protected by US copyrights. The other significant case is the one of Thaler v. Comptroller General of Patents 2020 where an attempt is made to probe the waters of patent law concerning AI authorship. In the case of Thaler, there was a judgment that said that it is impossible to treat an AI system as an inventor according to the UK patent law; this suggests a great deal concerning the treatment of works produced by AI within the framework of copyright law.

These cases underscore the need for a reassessment of existing legal frameworks considering the increasing participation of AI in content building and creativity. With the evolution of AI systems possessing the ability to produce creative material, courts, and legislatures shall be compelled to devise new mechanisms of recognition and protection of such works.

5. Trademark Law and AI-Generated Content

5.1 AI-Generated Logos and Branding

AI is increasingly being used in the creation of logos, slogans, and other branding elements that are essential for businesses to distinguish their products and services in the marketplace. AI tools like Logojoy and Looka allow users to generate logos by inputting preferences such as color schemes, symbols, and style.[13] The AI then generates a variety of branding options based on these inputs. While these AI-generated logos represent new opportunities for businesses, they also raise certain more significant legal questions in terms of ownership and protection under trademark law.

The ownership, in traditional trademark law, would normally revolve around the creator of a particular logo or brand element. But who is to be considered a creator when an AI system produces a certain logo? Does ownership lie with the user providing inputs, with the developer of the AI system, or with the AI system itself? Since U.S. trademark law like copyright law relies on human authors, AI-created output often does not fit into the legal structures that exist today. Particularly germane to business, this is a pressing issue for those using AI-generated creations as unique branding elements representative of their products in the marketplace.

5.2 Trademark Infringement Risks with AI-Generated Content

One of the main risks to IP that involves trademark law is related to AI-generated content; a significant risk with AI-generated content in the context of trademark law is trademark infringement. Trademark infringement refers to a situation where one party utilizes a mark similar to another party's already registered trademark, and it creates confusion among consumers. AI systems, which are often trained on vast datasets that include existing trademarks, may accidentally produce logos, slogans, or brand names that closely resemble existing trademarks. This can be a breeding ground for lawsuits and infringement claims.[14]

A generative model for AI, for example, might create a logo for a small business that happens to closely resemble the logo of a well-renowned company.[15] Even if the similarity was coincidental, the business using the AI-generated logo might still be found liable for trademark infringement under such circumstances, though the infringement be completely unintentional and, literally, the result of a machine's actions. This risk underlines the care that a business should take in reviewing AI-

generated content for infringement of an existing trademark, considering that in case of infringement, there may be costly consequences awaiting litigation and damages.

5.3 AI's Role in Trademark Creation and Enforcement

AI is not only being used to create trademarks but also to enforce them. AI-driven tools are increasingly being employed by businesses to monitor the marketplace for potential trademark infringements. Such tools apply machine learning algorithms to scour the internet, social media platforms, and product listings for instances where a trademark is being used without authorization or where similar marks may confuse consumers.

For example, AI-based trademark enforcement systems can flag logos, product names, or slogans that are similar to a company's registered trademarks, allowing businesses to take swift action to protect their intellectual property.[16] This has made trademark enforcement more efficient and cost-effective, as businesses no longer need to rely solely on manual monitoring processes.

However, AI tools also bring some challenges to trademark enforcement. False positives are considered to be infringing when they do not result in unwarranted legal actions and affect business relationships unnecessarily. The most important thing in the process of enforcing a trademark is human oversight, with AI tools as assistants rather than the main actors of the legal profession.[17]

6. Patent Law and AI-Driven Innovations

6.1 AI as Inventor: Patent Eligibility for AI-Generated Innovations

Traditionally, patent law requires that an invention be attributed to a human inventor. In recent years, AI systems have been increasingly contributing to the actual development of new technologies and innovations, and so the question has arisen: can an AI system be recognized as an inventor under patent law? The laws of patent, in their current form, for instance, do not permit naming an AI as the inventor of the invention in most jurisdictions, including the United States, the European Union, and the United Kingdom. Applications for patents must be filed in the name of a human inventor, even if the invention was created or significantly contributed to by an AI system.

The most well-known case in this context is the DABUS case in which an AI system created two inventions: a new type of container for beverages, and a device for attracting attention in emergencies. Its developer-the artificial intelligence system named as inventor by the developer in patent applications filed by Dr. Stephen Thaler. However, patent offices in the United States, Europe, and the UK rejected these applications because only humans can be named as inventors, Thaler v. Comptroller General of Patents, 2020. This case illustrates a growing tension between AI-driven innovation and traditional patent laws.

6.2 Ownership of AI-Generated Inventions

The core of the debate surrounding AI-generated inventions is the question of ownership. When an AI system produces a new invention, who should claim the rights for that invention-the developer of the AI system, the user who inputs the data and operates the AI, or the company owning the AI? Current patent legislation is structured based on the assumption that inventors are human beings; therefore, ownership of inventions could be harder to determine when AI systems have important roles in the invention process.[18]

When AI-generated inventions are not considered to satisfy the criteria of a human inventor in the context of patent law, then those inventions will not be patentable at all, with resultant imitation and exploitation that can dampen innovation in the respective industries dependent on AI in research and

development. Some legal scholars have suggested that patent law should be reformed to allow for shared inventorship between humans and AI, or even to recognize AI systems as inventors in their own right. However, this would require a significant shift in the legal understanding of intellectual property and the role of AI in the creative process.

6.3 Legal Cases in Patent Law Regarding AI Contributions

Several legal cases have tested the boundaries regarding AI contributions. The so-called DABUS case, mentioned above, is one of the most prominent examples of how courts and patent offices are wrestling with the question of AI inventorship. In the present case, for instance, both the UK Intellectual Property Office and the European Patent Office have held that under existing laws, only human beings are to be regarded as inventors, even though in this case the AI system concerned had itself developed the inventions in question independently of any human contribution.[19]

Another related case is Stanford University v. Roche Molecular Systems, 2011, in which the U.S. Supreme Court made a ruling on the issue of patent ownership and the rights of inventors. While this case did not involve AI, it brought into focus the clarity of ownership agreements in patent law. With the increasing prevalence of AI systems in the invention process, similar legal disputes regarding AI developers, users, and company contributors to the ownership of AI-generated inventions are likely to arise.

These cases illustrate that legal reform will be needed to deal with the increasing role of AI in innovation; as the autonomy of AI systems increases, new frameworks by courts will be required for the recognition and protection of inventions generated by AI.

7. Ethical Considerations in AI-Generated Content

7.1 The Role of Human Oversight in AI-Generated Creativity

With enhanced capabilities of AI systems for creative works, human oversight is an important ethical consideration. This might be argued because even though AI autonomously produces content, be it art, music, or even inventions, most argue that human supervision must be done to ensure the content produced meets the minimum ethical standards and societal norms. For example, AI-generated artwork and even written materials may contain something offending or inappropriate, especially in cases where the training AI has biased or problematic data states that through oversight, AI-generated content goes under ethical consideration, just like works created by humans.[3] This is mainly very important in such fields as healthcare, where certain innovations driven by AI might have life-altering consequences. For instance, an AI system used to design medical devices must be carefully monitored to ensure that the resulting products meet safety standards and are ethically sound. As AI systems become more integrated into creative and technical industries, the balance between autonomy and oversight will become a key ethical consideration.

7.2 Ethical Concerns in the Attribution and Ownership of AI-Generated Works

The attribution and ownership of AI-generated works raise several ethical concerns. If a work is generated entirely by an AI system, should the human developers or users of the AI be credited as the authors or owners of the work?[20] Some argue that it is unethical to attribute human authorship to works that were created autonomously by machines, as this misrepresents the nature of the creative process.

Another aspect where the issue is highly complex from an ethical perspective is that of ownership. When a business employs an AI system to produce a highly successful product or work of art, who

should reap the financial rewards of that product or artwork? Should the developers of the AI system get a profit share, or should the user alone, who in most contexts 'operated' the AI? These questions also raise broader issues of equity and the distribution of wealth within an AI-driven economy of creativities.[21] With the ongoing creation of the creative economy by AI systems, ethical frameworks will be required to ensure that both human and non-human contributors are appropriately and equitably credited and remunerated.

7.3 The Impact of AI-Generated Content on Traditional Creative Industries

The rise of AI-generated content can disrupt traditional industries in creative fields, raising ethical issues on what happens next with human creativity. With the likes of art, music, and writing, AI systems keep upping their game in providing high-quality content at a fraction of the cost and time of such content produced by human creators. This has led to concerns that AI-generated content could devalue human creativity and lead to job losses in industries that have traditionally relied on human talent.[22]

AI-driven technologies such as Amper Music can, for instance, compose and produce original songs within minutes in the music sector. Such systems could eliminate the need for some human composers like in some predictable projects such as composing background scores for TV commercials or video games. Similarly, press tools or editorial aids, like Jasper, are capable of plagiarizing news and publishing articles without the need for human journalists.

Albeit content generated from AI may save time and enhance creativity on one end, one would also be concerned about the moral obligation of the companies and industries towards human creators. As AI continues to expand its wings, appropriate policies will be needed to draw the line on how to encourage creativity that exploits AI, without too much undermining human creative activities.

8. The Future of Intellectual Property Law with AI

8.1 Reforming IP Law to Accommodate AI

As an additional aspect, they assume that the existing norms of intellectual property legislation will have to be revised, considering the new types of works created with the assistance of AI. There are current intellectual property treaties for artworks, slogans, and inventions–“copyright”, “trademark”, and “patent” respectively. Suppose one considers who owns the copyright for the 2D images presented in this scenario. Such content presents issues that perhaps these well–established laws may not have addressed for instance. This is because some modern copyright regulation is designed to safeguard only creations that are attached to a real person, most patent laws indicate that an inventor is a single entity who can hold rights to an invention.

Some academic lawyers have made recommendations for the establishment of an additional intellectual property right that deals directly with works emanating from artificial intelligence. The protection sought would be to grant ownership rights either as copyright or patent in respect of living and non-living artificial intelligence or at the very least creating possibilities for AIs and human beings to be regarded as co-authors or inventors. Other perspectives argue conversely, that, AI authored work, being work that is not done by manpower, deserves no protection and thus should be treated as belonging to the public domain. This is so because then any changes that will be passed in the IP codes will have to be in a manner that encourages advancement without hindering the traditional creators as well as their creations due to AI blandishments.

8.2 International Approaches to AI and IP Law

As the volume of AI-generated work increases, countries across the globe are pondering how to modify their intellectual property laws to comply with this new phenomenon. For example, the European Union has been discussing the issue of copyright for AI-generated works and the necessity of human input in such cases.[10] The U.S., in contrast, has been more restrictive with U.S. Copyright Office decisions determining works generated by machines are not copyrightable.

In this respect, the European Patent Office and the UK Intellectual Property Office have declined the increasing use of AI as a tool to assist inventors and designers, as existing patent laws – which require a human to be the author – do not recognize such inventorship. More progressive nations, however, such as South Africa, have been more accommodating in that the DABUS AI system was granted a patent in the year 2021, marking the first time in history an AI has been named as an inventor in a patent application.

These varying approaches multiply from country to country, which emphasizes the critical importance of collaboration internationally and the need to make adequate adjustments in IP law. Otherwise, the treatment of content created through the use of AI would differ within the same laws in different territories.

8.3 Potential Areas for Future Research and Legal Development

The following are some of the key areas that call for further research and development as the legal landscape surrounding AI and intellectual property continues to evolve. One area of focus is the question of AI inventorship.[7] As AI systems become more autonomous and capable of generating new inventions, legal scholars and policymakers will need to consider whether AI should be recognized as an inventor, and if so, how this would affect patent law and innovation more broadly.

Another avenue of future research is in the area of how AI-generated content is affecting traditional creative industries. As AI becomes more dominant in fields related to art, music, and journalism, there is an emerging fear that human creators will become dislocated from the workplace and that human creativity will be devalued. In the future, policymakers will have to determine how to foster human creativity while embracing efficiencies and innovations proposed by AI.

Finally, research is needed into the ethical implications of AI-generated content, in the light of issues over authorship and ownership in an AI-driven economic order. As AI reshapes the creative landscape, these ethical considerations will assume increasing prominence.

9. Conclusion

9.1 Summary of Key Findings

The present paper has analyzed, from legal and ethical points of view, content generated by artificial intelligence from the perspective of intellectual property protection. Some other results worth mentioning relate to the observed fact that existing IP laws including copyright, trademark, or patent law are barely effective concerning AI-generated works. For instance, most copyright laws stipulate that there must be an author, which most countries tend to use to disallow protection of works generated by Artificial intelligence. There is a parallel situation in patent law, where the human inventor is a prerequisite, thus current laws do not allow patenting of users' AI-created inventions.

From the perspective of trademark law, issues such as ownership and infringement may occur as AI systems create logos and branding images. Under certain scenarios, AI systems also create content that is similar to an already owned trademark and there could be a clash of legalities. Also, the issue of the morality of computer-generated content raises concerns relating to attribution – who should be

credited for the work – and its effects on existing creative businesses.

There are strong indications that Artificial Intelligence is at the moment leading, in an unparalleled and disruptive manner, to changes in the landscape of intellectual property, and this calls for legal reforms at all levels to manage the threats and harness the potential of content generated by Artificial Intelligence.

9.2 Recommendations for Policy and Legal Reform

In light of the issues associated with content created by artificial intelligence, certain policy and legal amendments should be proposed. For instance, changes could be made to copyright law to allow the registration of AI-related works, either by granting authorship to AI systems or enabling dual authorship to AIs and people alike. This solves the problem of market exploitation of AI-created content, as well as the creative person working with the AI.

As far as patent legislation is concerned, it could be changed to give the right of recognition as an inventor to an artificial intelligence, if only together with a human being. This would promote the development of sectors where AI is applied for r and d, especially in medicine, building, and other engineering fields.

Lastly, the trademark legislation shall become part of this when it emerges that AI-produced content may violate a previously existing trademark. Any company that deploys AI in the creation of any branding designs such as logos will have to carry out an exhaustive search to avoid infringing upon the rights of third parties.

These transformations will entail a legal regime facilitating creative commercial operations but restricting owners' rights to and ensuring the protection of their works.

9.3 Final Thoughts on the Future of AI and IP Law

The continuous evolution of AI has extended and will extend its great impact on intellectual property law, and the creative industries in general. However, much as AI opens up new avenues for innovation and efficiency, great legal and ethical challenges equally arise, issues that must be resolved. Existing IP laws were not designed with this autonomous nature of AI-generated content in mind; thus, without legal reform, the rights of creators and businesses may not be adequately protected in an increasingly AI-driven economy.

The future of intellectual property law will probably be a combination of legal reforms and technological advances that will protect AI-generated content without leaving human creators behind. This may include new categories of IP protection for AI-created works, as well as the harmonization of IP laws across jurisdictions through international cooperation.

Meanwhile, full consideration should be taken of the ethical implications of AI-generated content, which pertain to such key issues as authorship and ownership, especially when it comes to its impact on traditional creative industries. Policymakers will have to strike a balance between promoting innovation and protecting the rights of human creatives as AI continues to change the creative landscape.

References

[1] Gervais D. The machine as author. IIC - International Review of Intellectual Property and Competition Law 2020; 51(1), 1–33.

[2] Abbott, R. I think, therefore I invent: Creative computers and the future of patent law. Boston College Law Review 2016; 57(4), 1079–1126.

[3] Binns R. Fairness in machine learning: Lessons from political philosophy. In Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency 2018; 149–159. https://doi.org/10.1145/3287560.3287598

[4] Smith A, Brown T. AI and trademark enforcement: The role of machine learning in protecting brand identity. Trademark Reporter 2021;111(1), 45–78.
[5] Liu C, Zhang Y. The legal challenges of AI-generated works. Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice 2022;17(3), 257–264.
[6] Burk DL. AI patenting. Minnesota Journal of Law, Science & Technology 2021;22(1), 35–67.
[7] Calo R. Artificial intelligence policy: A primer and roadmap. UCLA Law Review 2017;51(3), 399–435.
[8] Cohen JE. AI and the future of copyright: Creativity without human authorship. Columbia Journal of Law & the Arts 2020;43(2), 1–30.
[9] Thaler v. Comptroller General of Patents. (2020). UKIPO decision on AI inventorship. United Kingdom Intellectual Property Office. https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/thaler-v-comptroller-general-of-patents
[10] European Parliament. (2020). Intellectual property rights for the development of artificial intelligence technologies. European Parliament Report (2020/2016(INI)). https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/A-9-2021-0176_EN.html
[11] U.S. Copyright Office. (2020). Compendium of U.S. copyright office practices. https://www.copyright.gov/comp3/
[12] Glucoft J. Patents in an era of infinite monkeys and artificial intelligence. Stanford Technology Law Review 2015; 19(1), 32–51.
[13] Jones A. AI and branding: The future of trademark law. Journal of Intellectual Property Law 2022;19(2), 123–145.
[14] Kaminski M. Authorship, disrupted: AI authors in copyright law. Berkeley Technology Law Journal 2019;34(2), 1–50.
[15] Merges RP, Menell PS. Copyright law and AI: Rethinking incentives for creativity. California Law Review 2018;106(5), 1–42.
[16] Brown T. AI and trademark enforcement: The role of machine learning in protecting brand identity. Trademark Reporter 2021;111(1), 45–78.
[17] Lowe N. AI and the future of patent law. Harvard Journal of Law & Technology 2021;34(2), 57–89.
[18] Ramsey LP. Innovating policy for AI patents. Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice 2016;11(2), 156–170.
[19] Samuelson P. Rethinking originality in copyright law in the age of artificial intelligence. Columbia Law Review 2018;118(6), 1476–1524.
[20] Van den Berg B. The ethical implications of AI in creative industries. Journal of Ethics & Information Technology 2020;22(4), 321–334.
[21] Woodrow H. The AI dilemma: Patent eligibility and the future of innovation. Michigan Technology Law Review 2020;26(2), 71–96.
[22] Zhu H, Lee E. AI, data, and the future of intellectual property law. Journal of Law, Innovation & Technology 2019;11(1), 23–47.