AI "art" of all forms, ex. visual, written, audio, etc. should not be used for any sort of profit, especially without the consent of the people who made the work it was trained off of. No one should be able to monetize something that was created by an algorithm trained on real people's hard work. This includes monetization not just from direct sale but from things like ads and subscription services. It also should have no place in the process of creating something that will be monetized, such as concept art or rough drafts of scripts.

I don't even think all "AI" is necessarily bad, but the way it currently works and is used is completely unethical and poses a threat to many people's livelihoods, especially artists so far. Also, since the neural network is getting things from different places to combine, and since it is a piece of technology and should be tracking what it's doing and where it's getting that information, I see no reason to not at the very least mandate an easily accessible bibliography linking to the sources the AI took the data from.

I believe that training neural networks off of people's creations violates their copyright and it should stay that way. That art belongs to the person who made it, and by using it to train a neural network it is being used to create the very foundation of how it works. If this program is then used to create something, that thing could not have existed without someone's copyrighted work being used in the process. If this, in any way, is used for monetary gain without compensation to the artist or consent from the artist, that is a violation of their rights to their work. It is also a violation if the AI network itself is monetized in any way, such as through ads or a subscription service on their website.

Most of this form of "AI" in and of itself cannot exist or function properly without stealing peoples copyrighted work. It is quite literally built to do that. Some people try to argue that it's the same as humans learning from other artists but obviously that isn't the case. Humans can only learn from so many people as opposed to a machine who can harvest an insane amount of data and we have to actually study and learn from people's work and learn how to apply it in our own unique way that, no matter what, will differ from person to person, unlike a network built to work in a certain way every time using data from people who actually did do something.

In addition, the only options for who deserves the credit for AI "art" other than the artists it stole the data from are the person who typed the prompt, the creators of the neural network, or the machine itself. None of these make any sense.

As for the person who typed the prompt, I know a lot of them argue that they are the creators, but that feels like saying that because you wrote something that inspired someone to draw art that means you made the art, which is obviously not true. I understand that making these prompts work well is a learned skill, but they could be using that skill elsewhere. Something like that could easily be used to assist search engines and database keywords, to help make actual ethical AI for things like medical use, as a way to analyze things people actually made, a starting point for learning to code, or even could be translated into actual writing. There's no reason that using a skill like that for an unethical program should be the only choice if they want

to use it, it's like saying that the person who commissioned someone for an art piece should count as the artist because they described what they wanted to them.

As for the creators of the neural network, the rights can't belong to them for many of the same reasons that they can't belong to whoever typed the prompt. It also feels like if someone took pieces of copyrighted literature, barely changed a couple of words, shuffled some paragraphs out of order, and put them in a collection, then said that it was their original work because they were the ones that did that process and tried to sell it as such without permission or credit to the authors of the original text. To be fair that probably wasn't the most concise and understandable metaphor but hopefully you get my point.

Now for the machine, obviously it shouldn't get the credit because it isn't sentient and has no reason to deserve rights of its own. It's not even literal Artificial Intelligence or anything like that, that's just used as a buzzword for a lot of things, so there's no logical argument to be made for any machine or program deserving its own rights.

In conclusion there's no reason for the rights to AI "art" to go to anyone but the people who made the work used to train the neural network.

One last addition, I also think there should be something to prevent companies from hiding something in their TOS or contracts saying they can use whatever you make or share to train an AI or anything along those lines.