Who gets the rights?

Henry Wilt

In the dynamic landscape of Artificial Intelligence (AI), the ethical question of attribution emerges as a pivotal inquiry, prompting an exploration into the complex interplay of individuals, algorithms, and societal contributions shaping the credit for AI's transformative outputs. As AI systems continue to advance and permeate various aspects of our lives, understanding the intricate web of intellectual contributions becomes paramount. The intricate dance between human ingenuity and machine learning algorithms raises profound ethical considerations regarding the allocation of credit for the outcomes generated by these systems. At the heart of this inquiry lies not only the recognition of individual efforts but also a broader contemplation of societal implications, equity, and the potential consequences of overlooking the multifaceted nature of AI development. Navigating the terrain of AI credit allocation demands a nuanced exploration that delves into the roles of researchers, programmers, data contributors, and the ethical frameworks that should guide the attribution process in this rapidly evolving technological landscape. I possess a plethora of sources and references, spanning from academic works to news articles. These diverse perspectives explore the question of AI credit attribution, examining arguments that attribute credit to the creator of the AI as well as those that emphasize the importance of the text/images on which the AI was trained. This paper seeks to unravel the complexities surrounding the distribution of credit in AI, shedding light on the ethical dimensions that underpin the recognition and acknowledgment of contributions in this transformative field. Addressing this one question of who should get the rights of an AI output?

Exploring the ethical dimensions of determining the rightful ownership of AI-generated output can be approached through various lenses, including the legal, surface, and philosophical

perspectives. In this ethical discussion, emphasis will be placed on these three aspects, with the goal of navigating the complex terrain and achieving a more clarified understanding by its conclusion. At the legal level, the delineation of rights becomes a crucial focal point, involving considerations of intellectual property, patent law, and the legal frameworks that govern ownership in the realm of artificial intelligence. Unraveling the intricacies of legal rights ensures that the attribution of credit aligns with established norms and regulations. While on the surface level, the tangible contributors to AI development, such as individual creators, programmers, and data providers, come into sharper focus. Examining the visible layers of contribution helps discern who actively participated in shaping the AI's capabilities. Surface-level analysis provides a practical perspective on crediting those who directly influence the AI's output. Furthermore, delving into the philosophical dimension, the underlying principles that guide our ethical reasoning about AI ownership and credit allocation are brought to the forefront. This level of examination explores questions of moral agency, responsibility, and the broader societal implications of AI contributions. By engaging with the philosophical discourse surrounding AI ethics, we aim to enrich our understanding and contribute to a more comprehensive ethical framework. In traversing these distinct levels, this ethical discussion aspires to pave the way for a more coherent and equitable terrain, where the attribution of credit for AI output aligns with a thoughtful consideration of diverse perspectives. The culmination of this exploration seeks to contribute to the ongoing dialogue surrounding AI ethics and its impact on the distribution of rights and recognition.

At the legal level of ownership, determining that ownership of the output generated by Artificial Intelligence involves an examination of intellectual property, copyright law, patent regulations, and existing legal frameworks. Key questions arise regarding whether AI-created content should be treated similarly to traditional creations and, if so, how current laws

accommodate the unique nature of AI-generated outputs. There are multiple people who are at the forefront of this technology that want to see all the legal power be kept with the companies who created the AI. Along with users of the AI that disagree and their belief for the attribution to be credited from the users. Intellectual property laws, which traditionally govern the ownership and rights of creators, are facing challenges in adapting to the intricacies of AI. One perspective argues for the recognition of AI as a tool created by human hands, making its output an extension of the creator's intellectual prowess. However, this notion clashes with the evolving nature of AI, where machine learning algorithms independently generate content without direct human intervention. The difference between these two trains of thoughts has a fundamental distinction, whether the AI has consciousness or could have consciousness. This will be looked into further in the paper when I examine the philosophical side of ownership. Copyright is another layer that we have to comb through, and currently the United States does not allow any AI generated output to be copyrighted. Robertson brings to our attention how this falls in line with the court's decision that anything of non-human expression is ineligible for copyright protection. While this may be true, the courts go on to say that "doesn't necessarily mean any art with an AI component is ineligible", this isn't proven until it actually happens in a court. So, for all intents and purposes, AI work is non-human and legally uncopyrightable. Patent law introduces another layer of complexity. In cases where AI systems contribute to groundbreaking inventions, the question of inventorship becomes central. Existing patent laws typically recognize human inventors, raising uncertainties about how to attribute ownership when AI plays a pivotal role in innovation. Advocates for AI ownership rights argue for legal frameworks that acknowledge the collaborative efforts involving both humans and machines. Navigating this legal terrain requires a careful balance between acknowledging the intellectual contributions of human creators and recognizing the autonomous capabilities of AI systems. As we look into the legal intricacies, it becomes evident that adapting existing laws or

establishing new frameworks is essential to address the evolving landscape of AI ownership. It is also essential to ensure a fair and legally sound attribution of rights to the output produced by artificial intelligence. It goes without saying when it comes to the output, the companies that create these artificial intelligences will have control of where, how, and when this output gets used.

Transitioning from the legal intricacies surrounding AI ownership to the surface-level analysis, we shift our focus to the identifiable contributors whose tangible efforts shape the development of artificial intelligence and influence the question of ownership. The question of ownership revolves around the identifiable contributors who actively shape and contribute to the development of artificial intelligence. This analysis involves recognizing the tangible efforts of individuals, including creators, programmers, and data providers, who play crucial roles in the AI creation process. There are multiple pathways to dive into to understand where the credit should lay with, but the programmers, who created the AI, is where we will begin. At the forefront of AI development are the individuals who conceive, design, and program the algorithms that power intelligent systems. The ownership debate often centers on whether the creative minds behind the code should be the primary beneficiaries of AI-generated outputs. The argument contends that the intellectual input of programmers significantly influences the AI's capabilities. But the programmers usually work on small parts of the totality of the whole codebase. Their efforts are dwarfed by the comparison of the major other functions that the artificial intelligence is built upon. By design, companies structure themselves in this way to lighten the load of any one developer, but it leaves the developers without the credit of the output. Next, an argument could be made for the data that gets contributed or taken to build the models that these AIs are run on. Data, often referred to as the lifeblood of AI, plays a pivotal role in training algorithms. Those who provide the datasets used to train AI models contribute substantially to the system's learning process. The ownership discussion extends to whether data contributors should be recognized and credited for

their role in shaping the AI's output. Controversy arises from whether the credit lies with the dataset behind the AI; if this were the case, all outputs from any generated source could potentially go unused by others, as the model would perpetually retain sole credit. In some sense of understanding that the model behind an AI is like its brain, then it would be no different from a human taking inspiration from art and work done previous by others. Which goes into is the artificial intelligence consciousness or not. Surface-level analysis thus emphasizes the tangible and identifiable aspects of AI creation, attributing ownership to those actively involved in the development process and dataset behind it. However, as AI systems become more autonomous and capable of learning independently, this approach faces challenges in accurately reflecting the nuanced dynamics between human contributors and machine intelligence.

Delving into the philosophical dimension of AI ownership requires an exploration of the underlying principles and ethical considerations that guide our understanding of responsibility, moral agency, and societal implications. This level of analysis goes beyond legal frameworks and surface-level contributions, seeking to unravel the complex web of ethical considerations in attributing ownership to the output of artificial intelligence. Many agree that the current rate of artificial intelligence is not intelligent enough to be counted to another human's capacity to understand. But as we are now into a realm of imaging a future where AI could be powerful enough to gain consciousness. Then, it would come to be known that the work or output done by an AI should be credited by the AI since it would be a seemly similar level of human intelligence. One fundamental philosophical inquiry revolves around the moral agency of AI. As AI systems become more autonomous and capable of independent decision-making, questions arise regarding their moral responsibility. Exploring whether AI can be considered an entity with moral agency influences discussions on who should own the outcomes of its actions. Ethical considerations extend to the role of humans in overseeing AI systems. While machines may generate outputs,

humans design, train, and deploy them. Examining the ethical implications of human responsibility in AI development raises questions about accountability and ownership of the resulting outputs. At the philosophical level, it is essential to consider the broader societal impact of AI outputs. Ownership discussions should address potential disparities, ensuring that the benefits and consequences of AI technologies are distributed equitably. This involves contemplating how ownership structures can contribute to or alleviate existing societal inequalities. Ethical considerations in AI ownership necessitate transparent decision-making processes. Philosophically, the emphasis is on ensuring that the allocation of credit aligns with principles of fairness, openness, and ethical conduct. Striking a balance between innovation and ethical standards becomes crucial in shaping the philosophical framework for AI ownership. As we navigate the philosophical dimension, the goal is to contribute to an ethical foundation that not only acknowledges the evolving nature of AI but also addresses the profound implications of AI ownership on individuals, communities, and society at large.

Having explored the philosophical intricacies surrounding AI ownership, turning to my own reflections on the ethical considerations and potential solutions in navigating this complex landscape. In considering where credit for the creation of an AI should be attributed—whether to the AI itself, the user, or the company. I find that a balanced perspective suggests both the artificial intelligence and the user should rightfully share the credit for the output. Currently, the output of AI is made up of the collection of data behind that the algorithms will choose certain likely paths through. Which makes the belief should be that AI deserves all the credit for coming up the output but, if there was no user input, then no output would be generated. Therefore, the combination of both inputs creates one single output where the attribution will lay. In the future, there is a possibility where an AI may no longer need the input from a user to create art or work in general, which then the output should be credited toward that AI.

In conclusion, the exploration of AI ownership spans a multifaceted landscape, encompassing legal, surface-level, and philosophical dimensions. The legal analysis reveals the challenges of adapting existing laws to the unique nature of AI-generated outputs, with debates surrounding intellectual property, patent regulations, and copyright laws. Surface-level considerations highlight the tangible contributors, such as programmers, and data providers, each vying for rightful credit. Philosophical insights dive into the moral agency of AI, human responsibility, and the societal impact of ownership structures. As I reflect on these complexities, a nuanced perspective emerges. The amalgamation of both artificial intelligence and user input appears as a fair attribution of credit for the AI's output. The ongoing debate surrounding AI consciousness adds a layer of contemplation, with the potential for AI to gain consciousness, challenging traditional notions of ownership. In the present context, the output of AI is a collaborative result, drawing from the creative algorithms shaped by human ingenuity and the user inputs that guide its development. While the legal and surface-level analyses provide practical considerations, the philosophical dimension enriches the discussion with ethical principles and societal implications. The evolving landscape of AI suggests a future where the nature of ownership may transform. As AI systems become more autonomous and potentially gain consciousness, the ethical framework surrounding ownership will demand ongoing adaptation. Regardless of the path ahead, a balanced and inclusive approach to credit attribution is vital, recognizing the symbiotic relationship between human users and artificial intelligence in the creation of transformative outputs.

References

Avrahami, Omri, and Bar Tamir. "Ownership and Creativity in Generative Models." *ArXiv.org*, 2 Dec. 2021, https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2112.01516. Accessed 12 Dec. 2023.

Epstein, Ziv, et al. "Who Gets Credit for AI-Generated Art?" *IScience*, vol. 23, no. 9, Sept. 2020, p. 101515, www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2589004220307070, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.isci.2020.101515.

Guadamuz, Andres. "Artificial Intelligence and Copyright." *Wipo.int*, Oct. 2017, www.wipo.int/wipo_magazine/en/2017/05/article_0003.html.

McKendrick, Joe. "Who Ultimately Owns Content Generated by ChatGPT and Other AI Platforms?" *Forbes*, 21 Dec. 2022, www.forbes.com/sites/joemckendrick/2022/12/21/who-ultimately-owns-content-generated-by-chatgpt-and-other-ai-platforms/?sh=393b0c275423. Accessed 12 Dec. 2023.

Morreale, Fabio. "Where Does the Buck Stop? Ethical and Political Issues with AI in Music Creation." *Transactions of the International Society for Music Information Retrieval*, vol. 4, no. 1, 2021, pp. 105–113, https://doi.org/10.5334/tismir.86.

Parra, Dex, and Scott R. Stroud. "The Ethics of AI Art - Center for Media Engagement - Center for Media Engagement." *Mediaengagement.org*, 24 Feb. 2023, mediaengagement.org/research/the-ethics-of-ai-art/.

Robertson, Adi. "The US Copyright Office Says an AI Can't Copyright Its Art." *The Verge*, 21 Feb. 2022, www.theverge.com/2022/2/21/22944335/us-copyright-office-reject-ai-generated-art-recent-entrance-to-paradise.

Schneider, Jacob. "Generative AI's Output: How Is It Created, and What IP Rights Should It Receive? | Insights | Holland & Knight." *Www.hklaw.com*, 3 Oct. 2023,

www.hklaw.com/en/insights/publications/2023/10/generative-ais-output-how-is-it-created-and-what-ip-rights. Accessed 12 Dec. 2023.