

On Ownership of Copyright of Generated Works under Generative Artificial Intelligence

Sobre a propriedade de direitos autorais de obras geradas sob inteligência artificial generativa

Wang Ping¹

ABSTRACT

As artificial intelligence continues to revolutionize technological landscapes through breakthrough innovations, AI-generated content (e.g., text, images, music) has sparked disputes over intellectual property ownership. The traditional legal framework is centered on "human creation." Whether machines can become the subject of copyright has challenged traditional laws, such as Copyright Law, Patent Law, and ethical norms. This article examines the significant issues surrounding the ownership of works created by artificial intelligence: first, from the judgment of the United States, China, and the European Union, the judgments of AI-related copyright disputes are analyzed, and the possible holders of AI-generated works are identified, which may involve the developer, the user, the provider of training data, or the AI system itself, but have not yet been clearly defined in the existing legal system. In addition, there are differences in legislation and jurisprudence on such issues across various jurisdictions (e.g., the U.S., the EU, and China), with some countries preferring to attribute rights to developers or users. In contrast, others refuse to recognize the legitimacy of non-human authors. The study points out that the issue of ownership of AI-generated works needs to be resolved by balancing the incentives for technological innovation with the protection of the public interest, and based on this, it proposes that AI-generated works should be given legal protection and that the law should encourage innovation. In the future, it is necessary to explore further the synergistic mechanism of technological transparency, ethical responsibility, and legal adaptability to meet the challenges of property rights in the age of intelligence.

Key Words: Generative Artificial Intelligence; Artificial Intelligence Generated Works; Copyright Ownership

RESUMO

Com o rápido desenvolvimento da tecnologia de inteligência artificial (IA), o conteúdo gerado pela IA (por exemplo, texto, imagens, música etc.) levou a disputas sobre a propriedade no campo da propriedade intelectual. Embora a estrutura jurídica tradicional esteja centrada na "criação humana", a subjetividade não humana das obras geradas por IA representa um desafio para as leis de direitos autorais, leis de patentes e normas éticas existentes. Este artigo explora as principais questões de propriedade de obras geradas por IA: primeiro, analisa os julgamentos de disputas de direitos autorais relacionadas à IA da jurisprudência dos Estados Unidos, da China e da União Europeia e conclui que os possíveis detentores de obras geradas por IA, cujos sujeitos de direitos podem envolver o desenvolvedor, o usuário, o provedor de dados de treinamento ou

¹ Postgraduate students of Lanzhou University (Lanzhou, China). The email: 3497957752@qq.com.

o próprio sistema de IA, ainda não foram claramente definidos no sistema jurídico existente. Além disso, há diferenças na legislação e na jurisprudência sobre essas questões em diferentes jurisdições (por exemplo, EUA, UE e China), com alguns países favorecendo a atribuição de direitos a desenvolvedores ou usuários, enquanto outros se recusam a reconhecer a legitimidade de autores não humanos. O estudo aponta que a solução para o problema da propriedade de obras geradas por IA precisa equilibrar os incentivos à inovação tecnológica com a proteção do interesse público e, com base nisso, propõe que as obras geradas por IA recebam proteção legal e que a lei incentive a inovação. O mecanismo sinérgico de transparência tecnológica, responsabilidade ética e adaptabilidade legal precisa ser mais explorado no futuro para enfrentar os desafios dos direitos de propriedade na era da inteligência.

Palavras-chave: Inteligência Artificial Generativa; Obras Geradas por Inteligência Artificial; Propriedade de Direitos Autorais

SUMMARY:

INTRODUCTION; 2. ANALYSIS OF THE RELEVANT CASES OF THE UNITED STATES, THE EUROPEAN UNION, AND CHINA ON COPYRIGHT DISPUTES OVER WORKS GENERATED BY GENERATIVE ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE; 2.1 U.S. JUDGMENT ON COPYRIGHT OF WORKS GENERATED BY GENERATIVE ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE; 2.2 CHINESE JUDGMENT ON THE COPYRIGHT OF AI-GENERATED WORKS; 2.3 EU COUNTRIES' JUDGMENT ON COPYRIGHT OF AI-GENERATED WORKS —TAKING GERMANY AS AN EXAMPLE; 3. ANALYSIS OF COPYRIGHT HOLDERS OF GENERATED WORKS UNDER GENERATIVE ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE; 3.1 AI DEVELOPER HOLDS COPYRIGHT; 3.2 THE AI USER HOLDS COPYRIGHT; 3.3 AI ITSELF AS A SUBJECT OF RIGHTS; 4. LEGAL IMPROVEMENT ON COPYRIGHT OWNERSHIP OF GENERATED WORKS UNDER GENERATIVE ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE; 4.1 THE LAW SHOULD ENSURE FAIR PROTECTION FOR THE RIGHTS HOLDERS OF WORKS GENERATED BY GENERATIVE ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE; 4.2 THE LAW SHOULD ENCOURAGE INNOVATION; 5. CONCLUSION; 6. REFERENCES

1. INTRODUCTION

In today's world, Artificial Intelligence is rapidly developing, with ChatGPT and DeepSeek as the representatives of artificial intelligence software. Artificial Intelligence has a strong learning ability, and as the instructions continue to be domesticated, the database of AI will continue to improve. It can provide more personalized needs for different users. Artificial intelligence technology has been used in many fields, such as journalism, literature, music, art, and creation. As a new thing, it brings convenience. Still, it raises some questions, such as whether artificial intelligence can become a legal subject, who holds the copyright of works created by artificial intelligence, and so on. A series of questions has challenged the modern legal system.

On August 1, 2024, the EU released the world's first "Artificial Intelligence Act"² (EU AI Act), which came into effect throughout the European Union and is also by far the world's most comprehensive bill for the regulation of artificial intelligence. However, the bill is riddled with loopholes. In June 2023, the European Parliament overwhelmingly passed the AI Act, which unfortunately states that it does not apply to military, defense, or scientific research and that Artificial General Intelligence (AGI) is not included in the high-risk category. The EU considered initially including all AGI systems in the "high-risk" category, but was opposed by tech giants such as Open AI, Google, and Microsoft, who argued that broadly including AGI systems in the high-risk category would lead to over-regulation and hinder AI innovation.

U.S. President Donald Trump announced the repeal of the former government's AI regulatory policy, joined Oracle, Softbank, and other companies to start the "Stargate" program, investing \$500 billion to build data centers and AI infrastructure, declaring that "the United States must lead the AI revolution.

Open AI CEO Sam Altman predicts the realization of General Artificial Intelligence by 2025, saying it will "disrupt all industries" and calling for copyright laws to be updated to address the legal challenges of AI-generated content.

French President Macron emphasized the importance of AI in combating climate change, environmental crises, and digital transformation at the Paris AI Summit 2025, criticized the over-regulatory tendency of the EU's Artificial Intelligence Act, and called for "innovation before regulation" to prevent Europe from falling behind in the global AI race. 2025 Boao Forum for Asia³ AI has become one of the four major topics that have reached a consensus on not only stifling the momentum of innovation but also effectively preventing possible risks, establishing a safe, reliable, and trustworthy AI system, and allowing the fruits of science and technology to benefit all humanity. However, it is also facing legal lag and responsibility determination challenges, such as the division of responsibility for automated driving accidents, AI-generated content copyright attribution, and other issues that have yet to have a clear legal basis.

As we can see, it is still unknown how to better protect the copyright of works generated by generative AI in various countries, and the relevant laws are in flux. However, copyright disputes triggered by AI-generated works have occurred frequently. As the final arbiter of disputes, the court

² In https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=OJ:L_202401689. Last access: April 24, 2025.

³ In <https://www.boaforum.org/zh/newsdetail.html?permissionId=705&detailId=51412>. Last access: April 24, 2025.

cannot refuse to adjudicate because there are no relevant legal provisions. At the same time, in judicial practice, most of the handling of this kind of case lacks a legal basis. In the meantime, most cases lack a legal basis in judicial practice. Based on this, this paper compares relevant domestic and international jurisprudence. It suggests who should own the copyright of AI-generated works under the current and future legal frameworks from the perspective of rights protectionism and how the law can be adapted to ensure fair protection and innovation. The implications of granting rights to AI users or developers and whether machines can be the subject of copyright are discussed. This paper adopts the literature research, comparative analysis, and case study methods. Through searching and analyzing the papers, journals, and monographs on copyright-related issues of AI-generated works at home and abroad, the paper understands the current status of academic research on copyright protection of AI. It lays the foundation for further analysis by comparing the relevant judicial precedents on copyright protection under generative AI in China, the United States, and the European Union; the paper puts forward feasible suggestions for further revision and improvement of the law.

2. ANALYSIS OF THE RELEVANT CASES OF THE UNITED STATES, THE EUROPEAN UNION, AND CHINA ON COPYRIGHT DISPUTES OVER WORKS GENERATED BY GENERATIVE ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

Copyright disputes over works generated by AI have been occurring in different countries, and due to the lack of uniform legal norms, different countries have not yet formed a unified consensus. The Thaler case shows that US courts have rejected the copyright application for works generated entirely by AI and insisted on "human creation" as the only criterion. In China's two cases of AI copyright disputes, the court insisted on a specific analysis of individual cases, such as human beings using AI systems-generated works, which can apply for copyright protection. Although the EU has not explicitly ruled on similar cases, this paper cites the case of Germany LAION, reflecting the convergence of its legal principles with those of the United States, paying more attention to the "intellectual creation" of the substantive.

2.1 U.S. JUDGMENT ON COPYRIGHT OF WORKS GENERATED BY GENERATIVE ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

In *Stephen Thaler v. United States Copyright Office*⁴, The Plaintiff owns computer programs he claims possess "artificial intelligence" that can generate original visual art similar to that produced by human artists. This AI system, "Creativity Machine," generated a work titled "A Recent Entrance to Paradise." Thaler tried to register this work with the Copyright Office, designating the author as the "Creativity Machine." However, the Copyright Office rejected his application. According to the Copyright Act⁵, the works of ownership must be owned by human beings. The work lacked the human authorship necessary to support a copyright claim. After that, Thaler litigated a lawsuit in the Washington D.C. Federal District Court in 2023. Unfortunately, the court did not support his lawsuit request. Meanwhile, the Federal Appeals Court also upheld the original verdict in 2025, emphasizing that "human creation" is a core requirement of copyright law. From the current U.S. legal documents and jurisprudence, the U.S. has a more precise position on determining the copyright of generative AI works, limiting the authors to human beings.

2.2 CHINESE JUDGMENTS ON THE COPYRIGHT OF AI-GENERATED WORKS

China's first AI-generated image copyright infringement case⁶ was decided by the Beijing Internet Court in 2023. Plaintiff Li generated the disputed image using the open-source software Stable Diffusion, publishing it on the Xiaohongshu platform under "Spring Breeze Brings Tenderness." Defendant Liu used the image without authorization and removed the plaintiff's attribution watermark from the Xiaohongshu platform, misleading users to believe the defendant was the work's author. The court believes that when people use artificial intelligence models to generate images, there is no issue determining who is the creator between two entities. Essentially, it is still humans who use tools to create, meaning that it is humans rather than artificial intelligence models who invest their intelligence throughout the entire creative process. Encouraging creativity is widely recognized as the core purpose of the copyright system. In this context and technological reality,

⁴ In <https://www.westlaw.com>. Last access: April 24, 2025.

⁵ In <https://www.copyright.gov/title17/>. Last access: April 24, 2025.

⁶ In <https://wenshu.court.gov.cn/>. Last access: April 24, 2025.

images generated by artificial intelligence that reflect human creativity and intellectual input should be recognized as works and protected by the Copyright Law of the People's Republic of China.⁷

China's second AI copyright image case⁸ occurred in Changshu, Jiangsu Province, where the Intellectual Property Rights of the Changshu Municipal People's Court heard the case, which rendered its judgment in March 2025. The plaintiff, Lin, used the AI tool Midjourney to generate the picture "Accompanying the Heart" and later applied it to the State Copyright Bureau to register it as a fine artwork, with the author and the copyright holder as his own. A Hangzhou-based technology company and a Changshu-based real estate development company used the image in their online and live promotional graphics without permission. The court held that Lin's detailed picture design, which incorporated modifying the prompt words and the picture processing software, embodied his unique choice and arrangement. The floor plan generated this way was original and belonged to the works protected by the Copyright Law of the People's Republic of China.⁹ At the same time, it was determined that the copyright enjoyed by Lin should be limited to the picture and that the manufacture of physical devices based on "love" only for construction and design does not constitute an infringement of copyright to avoid excessive protection of copyright and abuse of rights. From this, it can be seen that the Chinese judiciary adheres to the case-by-case principle in the field of AI copyright and analyzes specific problems in a concrete manner, not only to protect the rights holders and encourage innovation but also to limit the scope of protection and avoid abuse of rights.

2.3 EU COUNTRIES' JUDGMENT ON COPYRIGHT OF AI-GENERATED WORKS —TAKING GERMANY AS AN EXAMPLE

German photographer Rober Kneschke sued the non-profit organization LAION (full name Large-scale Artificial Intelligence Open Network)¹⁰, accusing it of illegally using his photographic works to train AI models. The reason is that LAION provides an image-text pair dataset called "LAION 5B" on its website, which is freely available to the public. The plaintiff argued that it had processed the data in a way that involved the copyrighted images. The District Court of Hamburg

⁷ In https://www.pkulaw.com/en_law/a3b3a54bea64f090bdfb.html. Last access: April 24, 2025.

⁸ In <https://mp.weixin.qq.com/s/qKuRwkVFwGem8UaVjfyjiA>. Last access: April 24, 2025.

⁹ In https://www.pkulaw.com/en_law/a3b3a54bea64f090bdfb.html. Last access: April 24, 2025.

¹⁰ In <https://openjur.de/u/2495651.html>. Last access: April 24, 2025.

ruled in the first instance that LAION's AI training data set, despite unauthorized use of Kneschke's photographic works, complied with the statutory requirements of text and data mining for scientific research and did not constitute an infringement of copyright.

Although this case involves a dispute over the legality of the AI training data, i.e., the input side, it also indirectly provides a reference for the copyright issue of artificially generated objects.

3. ANALYSIS OF COPYRIGHT HOLDERS OF GENERATED WORKS UNDER GENERATIVE ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

The copyright holders for AI-generated works can be roughly categorized into three groups: AI developers, AI users, and AI itself. Based on the above judgments of some representative countries on copyright disputes of AI-generated works, some countries, such as the United States, have always insisted that the subject of copyright can only be human beings. China's judicial attitude of encouraging creativity and protecting copyright to a limited extent allows the application of copyright for the products of further creation by the person using the AI generator. It can be seen that different countries have different attitudes towards this, so in the current and future legal framework, who should own the copyright of works generated by artificial intelligence, and can artificial intelligence itself become the subject of rights? Kanchana offers that the question of who should own the copyright of a creative work by artificial intelligence is mainly unanswered because granting copyright protection to AI has not been forthcoming (Kanchana, 2021). With the continuous innovation of AI technology, the solution to these problems will be more favorable to the development of science and technology.

3.1 AI DEVELOPERS HOLD COPYRIGHT

Advocating that AI developers hold the copyright of AI-generated works is based on the fact that AI designers put in resource labor and that it takes a lot of time, money, and technology to develop AI. The current generative AI generates content in the mode of data collection, algorithm design, model training, etc., to the final output; the AI itself does not have a mind and cannot create; it is only in the user inputs relevant instructions; according to specific program algorithms for retrieval, and then presented to the user. This idea is similar to the idea that the photographer owns the copyright

of the picture taken by the camera rather than the camera itself owning the rights. The aim is to incentivize designers to create better work and promote technological iteration while also protecting the rights of developers. For example, the UK Copyright, Designs, and Patents Act 1988¹¹ provides that copyright in computer-generated works belongs to "the person who has made the necessary arrangements for the creation," which usually points to the developer or operator. However, there are limitations to this view. The AI developer argument overemphasizes the protection of the rights of developers and designers. It ignores that the ultimate decider of AI-generated works is the user, who controls the final content of the AI. So, should the user be entitled to some copyright? If AI developers monopolize the right, it will significantly reduce the enthusiasm of users, and developers' monopoly of the right will inhibit the application innovation of AI tools, forming a one-way output structure of "technology oligopoly—user passive acceptance", and hindering the collaborative development of the generative AI industry. Secondly, U.S. copyright law requires that works reflect "the fruits of human intellectual creativity." In contrast, AI-generated works lack the participation of human beings and do not meet the requirements of copyright law.

3.2 THE AI USER HOLDS COPYRIGHT

The AI User Doctrine refers to the idea that the copyright of AI-generated works belongs to AI users. Niu(2024) believes that the copyright ownership of artificial intelligence products belongs to the user as a general principle, and belongs to investors as a supplementary special rule. Although the AI developer has made a series of inputs, such as data training, the user has also paid a reasonable consideration, and the developer has not only developed the product for a particular user alone but has also put it into the market for use and has received a return on the cost of its inputs. Secondly, the content of the AI output relies on the user's instructions, parameters, and instructions to modify the input continuously, and the process also reflects the user's intellectual creation behavior. For example, in the above Chinese AI copyright image case, the user utilized the AI software Midjourney to input prompts several times for the creation of a text-generated image, which ultimately generated "love balloons by the Oriental Pearl Tower at night" and then manually modified the image several times in the iterative process, ultimately completing the work "Accompanied by the heart." The Chinese

¹¹ In <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1988/48/contents>. Last access: April 24, 2025.

court held that the floor plan generated this way was original. Its essence is also people's creation using an AI tool, which is a means to an end and is not fundamentally different from other tools. However, granting them the right that the core creation of AI models, such as training data and algorithm design, comes from the developer may be unfair to the developer. Secondly, granting all rights to AI users may lead to the abuse of rights and infringement of other people's legal rights, such as AI developers.

3.3 AI ITSELF AS A SUBJECT OF RIGHTS

AI as a subject of rights refers to anthropomorphizing AI into a legal personality, endowing it with legal status, and enjoying the capacity for rights and behavior. For example, the legal personality of a Chinese company can be registered under the law by being established by the law, having independent property, and being able to assume responsibility independently. It has a legal personality called a "legal person." The same is true of the United States company; the company is legally registered and separated from the shareholders, managers, and other natural persons to become an independent legal subject.

Early U.S. law viewed corporations as "anthropomorphic persons," artificial persons whose existence depended on the authorization of government charters. With the development of the economy, the company is gradually regarded as a "real person, enjoying constitutional rights and assuming independent responsibilities in business activities. Wu (2024) states that, unlike companies, artificial intelligence does not have independent assets and cannot independently assume obligations. Even if that is so, the machine enjoys legal personality; how does one take responsibility, such as tort liability? Wang (2025) believes that generative artificial intelligence such as ChatGPT do not have the qualifications of criminal liability subjects. Artificial intelligence can be divided into two categories based on its abilities and application scope: weak AI and strong AI. Currently, in the stage of weak artificial intelligence, the machine does not have "autonomous consciousness." Wang (2023) argues that current artificial intelligence systems are unable to understand the tasks they perform, lack of "autonomous consciousness", and as a subject of rights, artificial intelligence itself may also raise some moral and ethical issues. So far, he thinks it is impossible for artificial intelligence to have a legal personality (Tin & Stjepan, 2023). From a philosophical point of view, artificial intelligence imitates the human brain's organizational structure and thinking operation mechanism. Even the most

powerful computing power, the most advanced intelligent machine, cannot reach the level of human intelligence, cannot have human consciousness, and cannot replace or exceed human attributes. For example, the United States firmly does not recognize that artificial intelligence can become the subject of copyright. Secondly, society can accept the extension of rights from living beings to machines. It may also cause ethical conflicts and conflicts of interest between humans and AI.

4. LEGAL IMPROVEMENT ON COPYRIGHT OWNERSHIP OF GENERATED WORKS UNDER GENERATIVE ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

The United States Copyright Office has published guidance that officially repudiated AI-generated content (AIGC) copyright registration on March 16, 2023. Additionally, with the judgment by the Beijing Internet Court published in 2024, drastic controversies concerning AIGC arose again. The legal protection of works generated by artificial intelligence and the attribution of rights is an important challenge facing the current global legal system, which requires finding a reasonable way between technological innovation and rights balance. Under the current and future legal framework, it should be ensured that the rights holders of works generated by artificial intelligence receive fair protection. Only in this way can we better encourage and motivate rights holders to further innovate.

4.1 THE LAW SHOULD ENSURE FAIR PROTECTION FOR THE RIGHTS HOLDERS OF WORKS GENERATED BY GENERATIVE ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

The fair protection of the rights holders of works generated by artificial intelligence is a significant proposition that the legal system in the digital age must respond to. An Xin refers to AI-generated works' significant protection challenges within the existing copyright law framework and proposes recommendations for the copyright protection of AI-generated works(An,2023). With the widespread application of AI-generated content in fields such as literature, art, and business, the law needs to protect human creators' rights and reserve space for technological innovation. Its institutional design must break traditional frameworks and build a multi-dimensional new protection system. For example, the precedents of the US and EU courts hold a negative opinion on the protection of AI-generated works. The US Copyright Office clarified 2023 that the AI-generated parts of *the Zarya of the Dawn* comic are not protected and adhere to the principle of "human intelligence creation." The

U. S. Court of Justice established in the "Monkey Selfie" case¹² that non-human subjects do not enjoy copyright. There is also China, which attributes the rights to the user for protection. In 2020, the Nanshan District Court in Shenzhen, China, tried an AI-generated content infringement case, and the court found that Tencent used Dreamwriter software to complete the writing and publication of the article in question, which has copyright and meets the protection conditions of copyright law for written works. It can be seen that there is no consensus among countries on whether artificial intelligence-generated works should be protected by law. However, each country can develop practical and feasible protection strategies based on its situation and national conditions.

4.2 THE LAW SHOULD ENCOURAGE INNOVATION

Law is an effective means of encouraging technological development and innovation. A sound law can confirm and guarantee the priority position of scientific and technological development in national social life and ensure a favorable social environment for the smooth development of science and technology. Technology is crucial for the development of a country, and AI technology, as the core driving force of the new technological revolution, is profoundly reshaping the global competitive landscape, and its strategic significance for national development is increasingly prominent. Therefore, if the law does not provide any protection for AI users using AI-generated products, it does not encourage AI developers to engage in AI technology research and development or AI model training, and it does not promote or even hold a negative attitude towards AI-generated products. Imagine who would still use AI technology for related creations. As the saying goes, market demand is like an engine of innovation. It drives industrial upgrading and iteration and ignites the sparks of creativity, making every idea a golden key to solving problems. Various countries are currently encouraging technological innovation to facilitate policy and technical support. However, at the same time, the legal aspect should also be appropriately revised or abolished, such as further interpreting relevant legal definitions to adapt to current economic and social development.

¹² In <https://m.huanqiu.com/article/9CaKrJT0Wo>. Last access: April 24, 2025.

5. CONCLUSION

The era of artificial intelligence, which has changed the traditional human-centered creation mode, has challenged the legal systems of various countries today. Although countries have successfully formulated relevant legal documents, there is no uniform consensus on the ownership of the copyright of works generated by artificial intelligence, and even the different court decisions in different regions vary. Some scholars advocate for developing an international convention for recognizing copyright in generative artificial intelligence works, as copyright is territorial, and the level, scope, and degree of intellectual property protection vary among countries (Song & Lu, 2024). As to whether machines can be the subject of copyright, no country in the world has explicitly recognized machines (such as artificial intelligence) as the subject of copyright. National laws generally adhere to the principle of "anthropocentrism," i.e., the object of copyright protection must result from human intellectual activities. However, there are differences in the specific rules on the attribution of rights in different countries, and some countries attribute the copyright of AI-generated works to the developers, users, or other relevant subjects rather than to the machines themselves through legislation or judicial practice. The European Union explicitly adheres to the standard of "the fruits of human intellect" and requires that the work must reflect the "author's personality". For example, the Court of Justice of the European Union has emphasized in several cases that only the creations of natural persons are protected by copyright and that self-generated content by AIs cannot satisfy this requirement. The U.S. Copyright Office has explicitly refused to register copyright for purely AI-generated content, and judicial practice follows the "human author" principle. For example, in the Monkey Selfie case, the court held that a non-human subject (such as an animal or a machine) could not be the subject of copyright. China's judicial practice emphasizes the central position of "human intellectual input." The Beijing Internet Court held in the "AI Painting Case" that the user's personalized expression was reflected in the prompts and parameter modification adjustments. Hence, the user enjoys copyright, but the AI itself is not the subject of authorship. However, the AI itself is not the subject of the author.

In general, with the reliance on AI in people's daily lives and the iterative upgrading of AI technology, it is a general trend that AI-generated works need legal protection. Efforts should be made to achieve a balance between fair protection of rights holders and encouragement of innovation to realize the harmonious coexistence of AI technology and human development.

5. REFERENCES

- Kanchana, K. (2021). Artificial intelligence and challenges for copyright law. *International Journal of Law and Information Technology* 28(4), 279–296. https://xueshu.baidu.com/usercenter/paper/show?paperid=1g420x20xm5h0re0km4k0460qa061674&site=xueshu_se
- Nianlian, W. (2024). Research on Copyright Protection Path of Artificial Intelligence Generated Objects. *Beijing University of Posts and Telecommunications*. <https://link.cnki.net/doi/10.26969/d.cnki.gbydu.2024.002344doi:10.26969/d.cnki.gbydu.2024.002344>
- Shiyan, N. (2024). Research on Copyright Protection of Artificial Intelligence Generated Content (AIGC). *Shanxi University of Finance and Economics*. <https://doi.org/10.27283/d.cnki.gsxcc.2024.000560>
- Tin, M & Stjepan, M. (2023). ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND (TECHNOLOGICAL DIGITAL) ARBITRATION. *University Law School in Mostar* (28), 52-85. <https://hrcak.srce.hr/250131>
- Xin, A. (2023). Legal Rights Protection of Artificial Intelligence Generated Works from the Perspective of Copyright. *The Frontiers of Society, Science and Technology* 5 (18). https://kns.cnki.net/kcms2/article/abstract?v=RN_8baVbY4fBoZBR6eZllrce_2DiqVGYYttJWCz52fDzfRws1SnCqXG9DJX95FkK3gJt0bhflv57eKG-V2g9RC0JMmhH2JSwcUQ8v-XVlqOvHPyMIAMJ1YK7SSF0uODkaw4xkYGZNL9mmgjxyeYNhCulqz6Re-xF2syEUmXdryQ3mblcunA4gObfxMtTT3IAHRTtOqqWhoB3UJNdgi8Sw==&uniplatform=NZKPT&language=CHS
- Yaqi, W. (2025). Definition of properties, ownership of rights, and infringement risks of ChatGPT products. *Journal of Tangshan University*, 38 (02), 61–69. <https://doi.org/10.16160/j.cnki.tsxyxb.2025.02.009>
- Yunbo, S & Yang, L. (2024). Dilemmas, Models, and Legislative Improvement of Copyright Recognition of Generative Artificial Intelligence Works. *Digital Economy and Rule of Law*, (02), 49-67+243. https://kns.cnki.net/kcms2/article/abstract?v=N5Mfx_KcSpIN4con2X40CSfh48MHaZ62_idDxpeUhG9iFaTPrdSW916hTRuRkEEMK-wU-kwREVlblwN9hJEajkdBw4GJwHx-MCuYStkP3yxH8j3sZULf7K3lgxAiMRtxk8QdAkCBHRZrWLwJHvo8Xq7gGxLx27GjLNins_mb6rNjlpil7mrqGS8y54-3tM1&uniplatform=NZKPT&language=CHS
- Zhuo, W. (2023). Research on Copyright Ownership of Artificial Intelligence Products. *China University of Political Science and Law*. <https://doi.org/10.27656/d.cnki.gzgz.2023.000126>