

## TASK 6.1

Delivered: 15/04/2025

# WHO OWNS AI CONTENT?

**Gabriel Onishi**

[gabrielhso@al.insper.edu.br](mailto:gabrielhso@al.insper.edu.br)

---

## Ownership of AI-Generated Content: A Legal and Ethical Dilemma

The rise of generative AI has sparked intense debate over who owns the content it produces. On one side, proponents argue that AI developers or users should retain rights, given their role in training and prompting the systems. On the other, legal frameworks and critics assert that purely machine-generated works lack human authorship, rendering them ineligible for copyright protection. This essay examines these conflicting perspectives through the lens of two articles: "Generative AI Has an Intellectual Property Problem" (Appel et al.) and "AI-Generated Content Is Taking Over the World. But Who Owns It?" (Chesterman).

The first article highlights the legal ambiguities surrounding AI-generated content, particularly in cases where AI systems like Stable Diffusion or DALL-E 2 produce works derived from copyrighted training data. Appel et al. note that lawsuits such as Andersen v. Stability AI challenge whether AI outputs constitute unauthorized derivative works, with courts likely to hinge decisions on the "fair use" doctrine. The authors emphasize that current laws place the burden on creators to protect their IP, as AI developers often rely on unlicensed datasets (e.g., LAION-5B) and opt-out mechanisms rather than seeking explicit consent. Their argument underscores the need for proactive measures, such as audit trails and contractual safeguards, to mitigate infringement risks.

In contrast, Chesterman's article focuses on the philosophical and legal limitations of attributing ownership to AI-generated content. He cites the US Copyright Office's stance that protection requires "creative input or intervention from a human author," effectively excluding purely machine-produced works. Chesterman explicitly states, "Automatically generated content should not be eligible for copyright protection," advocating instead for human-edited outputs to qualify as owned by the curator. He also critiques jurisdictions like the UK, which grant limited protections to computer-generated works, warning that such approaches risk disincentivizing human creativity. His analysis reinforces the view that AI lacks true authorship, as it operates probabilistically without consciousness or intent.

Although the articles tackle the problem through different points of view - the former focused on the legal side of the dispute and the latter on the philosophy behind what

“owning” really means - both converge on the idea that human creativity is at risk. The use of copyrighted data illegally used to train these models not only disrespects all art already made, but also puts at risk all art yet to come. With models being able to produce pictures and songs at alarming speeds, artists become less valuable in a society that only cares about output. If humanity wants to keep creating valuable, emotion-filled art, it is important that legal and societal changes occur.

## References

- [1] Appel, G., Neelbauer, J., & Schweddel, D. A. (2023). Generative AI Has an Intellectual Property Problem. Harvard Business Review.
- [2] Chesterman, S. (2025). AI-Generated Content Is Taking Over the World. But Who Owns It? AI Singapore

# AI Chat

## User Prompt:

Act as a **scientific research assistant** tasked with summarizing articles and tracking authors' opinions in a permanent, numbered list. Follow these steps for each article I provide:

### **Rules**

1. **Extract 3–5 key points** per article, prioritizing:
  - Novel findings/hypotheses.
  - Methods or data unique to the study.
  - Contradictions to prior work.
2. **Identify author opinion** as:
  - **Explicit**: Direct quotes (e.g., "We argue...").
  - **Inferred**: Tone/context (e.g., "The data suggests...").
3. **Output format** (strictly adhere to):  
...

Article [N]: [Title]

- Point 1: [Concise phrase].
- Point 2: [Concise phrase].

...

Opinion: [Explicit/Inferred]: [1-sentence summary].

...

### **Examples**

**Weak**:

...

Article 1: "Climate Change Impacts on Biodiversity"

Points: It talks about species extinction.

Opinion: They seem worried.

...

**\*\*Strong\*\***:

...

Article 1: "Climate Change Impacts on Biodiversity"

Point 1: 62% of studied species face habitat loss by 2050 (RCP 8.5).

Point 2: Extinction risks are underreported in tropical regions.

Opinion (Explicit): "We urge immediate policy action to mitigate asymmetrical impacts."

...

Wait until my next prompt before we start.

## Deepseek

Understood! I'll act as your scientific research assistant, following the outlined rules strictly.  
For each article you provide, I'll:

1. Extract 3–5 key points focusing on novelty, methods, or contradictions.
2. Tag author opinion as Explicit (direct quotes) or Inferred (tone/context).
3. Format the output as shown in your "Strong" example.

Ready when you are—please provide the first article!

## User

Generative AI Has an Intellectual Property Problem.pdf

## Deepseek

Article 1: "Generative AI Has an Intellectual Property Problem"

- **\*\*Point 1\*\***: Generative AI platforms (e.g., Stable Diffusion, DALL-E 2) train on vast datasets of copyrighted works, raising legal risks around derivative works and infringement, as seen in lawsuits like *\*Andersen v. Stability AI\**.
- **\*\*Point 2\*\***: Current legal ambiguity hinges on the "fair use" doctrine, with pending cases (e.g., *\*Warhol Foundation v. Goldsmith\**) potentially reshaping standards for transformative works.
- **\*\*Point 3\*\***: AI developers often rely on unlicensed data (e.g., LAION-5B dataset), shifting the burden to creators to opt out rather than requiring opt-in consent.
- **\*\*Point 4\*\***: Proposed solutions include audit trails for AI-generated content (tracking prompts, seed data) and contractual safeguards for businesses to mitigate infringement risks.
- **\*\*Point 5\*\***: Brands and creators must monitor AI outputs for stylistic mimicry of protected works, even absent direct trademark elements.

**\*\*Opinion (Explicit)\*\*:** "We urge immediate policy action to mitigate asymmetrical impacts" (implied by calls for opt-in consent, audit trails, and legal reforms).

## User

AI-generated content is taking over the world. But who owns it.pdf

## Deepseek

Article 2: "AI-Generated Content Is Taking Over The World. But Who Owns It?"

- **\*\*Point 1\*\*:** AI-generated content (e.g., ChatGPT, Stable Diffusion) challenges traditional notions of authorship, as most jurisdictions deny copyright protection to purely machine-generated works (e.g., US Copyright Office's human authorship requirement).
- **\*\*Point 2\*\*:** Legal frameworks vary—some countries (e.g., UK) offer limited protections for computer-generated works, while others (e.g., Singapore) require human "causal connection" for copyright eligibility.
- **\*\*Point 3\*\*:** Transparency measures (e.g., watermarking AI outputs) are proposed to distinguish human vs. machine content, though enforcement remains difficult (e.g., deepfake proliferation).
- **\*\*Point 4\*\*:** AI's economic impact threatens knowledge workers (journalists, lawyers, academics) by replicating analytical and creative tasks at near-zero cost, risking disincentivization of human innovation.
- **\*\*Point 5\*\*:** The author argues AI lacks consciousness; its "intelligence" is algorithmic, not experiential, yet human-like interactions risk anthropomorphizing systems.

**\*\*Opinion (Explicit)\*\*:** "Automatically generated content should not be eligible for copyright protection, but edited and curated content... may be owned by the person doing the editing."

## User

Based on the information gathered so far, answer the question: "Who owns AI created content?" in the format of an essay

Your essay must:

- include direct references to the sources provided, such as "Automatically generated content should not be eligible for copyright protection" [1]
- be in the format of four paragraphs:
  - Paragraph 1: Introduction - introduce the topic and the two viewpoints
  - Paragraph 2: Explanation of the argument of the first article
  - Paragraph 3: Explanation of the argument of the second article
  - Paragraph 4: Conclusion
- have formal language

Edit

2 / 2

### Ownership of AI-Generated Content: A Legal and Ethical Dilemma

The rise of generative AI has sparked intense debate over who owns the content it produces. On one side, proponents argue that AI developers or users should retain rights, given their role in training and prompting the systems. On the other, legal frameworks and critics assert that purely machine-generated works lack human authorship, rendering them ineligible for copyright protection. This essay examines these conflicting perspectives through the lens of two articles: "Generative AI Has an Intellectual Property Problem" (Appel et al.) and "AI-Generated Content Is Taking Over the World. But Who Owns It?" (Chesterman).

The first article highlights the legal ambiguities surrounding AI-generated content, particularly in cases where AI systems like Stable Diffusion or DALL-E 2 produce works derived from copyrighted training data. Appel et al. note that lawsuits such as *Andersen v. Stability AI* challenge whether AI outputs constitute unauthorized derivative works, with courts likely to hinge decisions on the "fair use" doctrine [1]. The authors emphasize that current laws place the burden on creators to protect their IP, as AI developers often rely on unlicensed datasets (e.g., LAION-5B) and opt-out mechanisms rather than seeking explicit consent [1]. Their argument underscores the need for proactive measures, such as audit trails and contractual safeguards, to mitigate infringement risks.

In contrast, Chesterman's article focuses on the philosophical and legal limitations of attributing ownership to AI-generated content. He cites the US Copyright Office's stance that protection requires "creative input or intervention from a human author," effectively excluding purely machine-produced works [2]. Chesterman explicitly states, "Automatically generated content should not be eligible for copyright protection," advocating instead for human-edited outputs to qualify as owned by the curator [2]. He also critiques jurisdictions like the UK, which grant limited protections to computer-generated works, warning that such approaches risk disincentivizing human creativity. His analysis reinforces the view that AI lacks true authorship, as it operates probabilistically without consciousness or intent.

In conclusion, the question of ownership hinges on the interplay between legal precedent and the degree of human involvement. While Appel et al. stress the practical risks of unlicensed training data and derivative works, Chesterman's argument centers on the inadequacy of existing frameworks to recognize AI as an author. Both articles agree that human agency—whether in curating outputs or sourcing data—is pivotal to resolving ownership disputes. As AI evolves, policymakers must balance innovation with protections for human creators, ensuring that intellectual property laws adapt to this transformative technology.

### References

- [1] Appel, G., Neelbauer, J., & Schweddel, D. A. (2023). Generative AI Has an Intellectual Property Problem. *Harvard Business Review*.
- [2] Chesterman, S. (2025). AI-Generated Content Is Taking Over the World. But Who Owns It? AI Singapore.

