Redefining Originality: Human Creativity vs. Artificial Intelligence

Taruna Jakhar

PhD Research Scholar Gujarat national Law University

ABSTRACT

The rapid advancements in artificial intelligence (AI) have redefined the boundaries of creativity, challenging traditional notions of originality that have long been rooted in human cognitive processes and emotional engagement. This paper investigates the evolving paradigm of originality by juxtaposing human creativity with AI-generated outputs. Traditional definitions emphasize personal intellectual effort and emotional input as prerequisites for originality, a standard that AI-generated works often fail to meet due to their reliance on pre-existing data and algorithmic processes. This divergence raises critical legal and philosophical questions about copyright protection, authorship, and ownership.

The paper explores the implications of granting copyright ownership to programmers, users, or investors, while examining the feasibility of recognizing AI as a legal entity capable of holding copyrights. It also considers the necessity for new frameworks, such as algorithmic authorship and criteria for assessing algorithmic novelty, to address the unique nature of AI creativity. By analysing key legal precedents and contemporary scholarship, the paper underscores the urgent need for adaptive legal structures that balance human-centric definitions of originality with the realities of an AI-driven creative landscape. This study offers a foundation for reimagining originality and copyright law in a future increasingly shaped by artificial creativity.

Key words: Artificial Intelligence, Creativity, Copyright Law

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, advancements in artificial intelligence (AI) have significantly transformed various creative fields, prompting critical inquiries into the essence of originality. This research paper, aims to explore the evolving landscape of creativity and the implications of AI-generated works. The primary objective is to investigate how the threshold of originality differs between human creativity and AI outputs, particularly in light of traditional definitions of originality, which focus on human cognitive processes and emotional inputs.

This inquiry will examine whether AI-generated works can fall under the traditional understanding of originality and if new criteria are needed to assess their originality. It will also analyse the eligibility of AI-generated works for copyright protection and the appropriate attribution of authorship. Moreover, the paper will consider the implications of assigning copyright ownership to the creators or operators of AI rather than the AI itself, given that current legal frameworks do not recognize AI as a legal entity. Through this examination, the research seeks to shed light on the criteria for originality, copyright protection, and the ownership complexities in an era increasingly defined by AI-driven creativity.

CONCEPTUALIZING ORIGINALITY

Originality is a foundational concept in copyright law, determining what qualifies for protection. Although the Indian Copyright Act of 1957 does not explicitly define originality, its role is crucial in deciding whether a work merits copyright. Over time, the understanding of originality in India has evolved, shaped by British and international influences. Initially, originality was understood as the result of labour, skill, or judgment, but modern interpretations emphasize creativity as the essential element.

During the colonial era, Indian copyright law followed the British "*sweat of the brow*" doctrine, which focused on the effort put into creating a work. Under this approach, a work that involved labour, even without significant creativity, could qualify for copyright protection. For example, the mere compilation of data or the reproduction of existing material, if it involved skill or judgment, was considered original. This standard, while practical, allowed for the protection of works that did not necessarily embody creative expression.

After independence, the Copyright Act of 1957 brought a new era, but Indian courts initially adhered to the "sweat of the brow" approach. This began to change with the landmark Supreme Court case *Eastern Book Company v. D.B. Modak (2008)*, which marked a shift towards

requiring a "*modicum of creativity*" for a work to be considered original. The Court rejected the idea that mere effort was enough for copyright protection, ruling instead that there must be some creative spark. This decision aligned Indian law more closely with international standards, particularly the U.S. approach established in *Feist Publications, Inc. v. Rural Telephone Service Co.*, where the Supreme Court ruled that originality requires more than labour, it demands minimal creativity.

This shift signifies a major evolution in how originality is assessed. No longer is effort or skill alone sufficient. Originality now requires independent creation, where the work reflects the author's intellectual choices, and involves a level of creativity, no matter how modest. This evolution has brought Indian copyright law into line with international norms, which increasingly emphasize personal expression and intellectual effort as the core of originality.

However, the traditional definitions of originality, grounded in human creativity, face new challenges in the digital age, especially with the rise of AI-generated works. AI systems can produce content that mimics human creativity, but they lack personal agency and subjective thought. This raises complex questions: Can works created by machines truly be considered original if they do not involve human intellectual effort or expression? As AI continues to evolve, it forces us to reconsider whether our current legal frameworks, built on human centred definitions of originality, can accommodate these non-human creators.

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF ORIGINALITY THRESHOLDS

Human creativity involves complex cognitive processes, including critical thinking, problem-solving, and drawing from personal experiences and emotions. When individuals create, they often reflect on their thoughts and feelings, resulting in works that showcase their unique perspectives. This subjectivity is essential for originality, as it connects the creator's choices to the output. Emotional engagement plays a significant role in human creativity, as artists and writers frequently express their feelings and personal experiences, leading to authentic works that reflect their identity. This emotional connection is crucial for defining originality, ensuring that the work is more than just a reproduction.

Most legal systems require original works to demonstrate personal input and creative expression. In the United States, the standard for originality emphasizes minimal creativity, while European and UK laws stress the need for personal expression, indicating that human creativity must involve individual thought and effort to meet the originality threshold.

In contrast, AI creativity relies on algorithms that analyse large datasets to identify patterns and generate outputs. AI systems depend on pre-existing data to create, which limits their originality since they lack the independent thought processes inherent in human creativity. Unlike human creators, who draw from their internal thoughts and emotions, AI operates mechanically, following predefined rules. Although the outputs may appear innovative or unique, they are fundamentally derivative, as AI creates by referencing and recombining existing data. This mechanistic approach raises questions about whether AI-generated works can truly be considered original.

Current copyright laws typically require personal intellectual effort and creativity, which AI-generated works often lack. Consequently, these outputs usually do not meet the necessary criteria for copyright protection. The stark difference between human and AI originality lies in the essence of creation itself. Human creativity is inherently subjective and emotional, while AI creativity is largely objective and algorithmic, driven by data manipulation and pattern recognition. This divergence presents significant challenges for existing copyright frameworks.

If AI develops the capacity to generate genuinely original works without relying solely on pre-existing data, legal systems will need to reevaluate how originality is assessed. New criteria may be necessary to address factors such as algorithmic novelty and innovative data application. Legal frameworks would need to adapt to recognize these new forms of creativity, potentially shifting the focus from traditional human-centric definitions of originality to accommodate the unique characteristics of AI-generated works. Ultimately, while human works are defined by personal intellectual effort and emotional input, AI-generated outputs often fall short of traditional originality standards due to their reliance on existing data and algorithmic processes. As AI continues to advance, the implications for copyright law and the concept of originality will require careful consideration to effectively accommodate both human and AI creativity in an increasingly digital world.

MECHANISM OF AI CREATIVITY

AI-generated works present a unique challenge to traditional copyright law, particularly regarding the concept of originality. Traditionally, originality emphasizes independent creation and personal intellectual effort, often reflecting a deep connection between the creator's personal experiences, emotions, and choices. Human creativity is considered original when it results in something new, reflecting the author's subjective input. However, when we examine

AI's creative process, it becomes clear that AI's mechanisms for generating outputs do not align with this traditional understanding of originality.

At its core, AI relies on pre-existing data that it processes through machine learning algorithms. These algorithms identify patterns, recombine information, and generate outputs that may appear novel or innovative. However, AI-generated works are fundamentally derivative, created by referencing, combining, and transforming data it has been trained on. The process is mechanical, not driven by conscious intention or emotional engagement, as in human creativity. Unlike human creators who rely on internal thought processes, emotions, and experiences, AI operates without subjective input. This lack of independent intellectual effort is key to understanding why AI-generated works do not qualify as original under traditional copyright law.

The difference lies in intention and the creative process itself. Human creators make deliberate choices informed by personal experiences, emotions, and intellectual judgments. Their creations are not just new combinations of existing information but embody personal expression. AI, on the other hand, operates based on pre-programmed rules and data it has been trained on. It does not make decisions based on reflection or emotion, and its outputs are the result of algorithmic processes rather than independent creative thought. AI systems do not create from scratch but from what they have been exposed to, making them a tool for recombining existing data rather than generating something genuinely new.

As such, AI-generated works do not meet the traditional criteria of originality, which require independent intellectual creation reflecting personal effort. AI acts as a tool, recombining and reconfiguring pre-existing data according to programmed instructions. While AI outputs may seem creative on the surface, they lack the essential human element of creativity—intellectual effort and subjective judgment. Therefore, AI-generated works, despite their novelty, do not qualify as original under the traditional meaning of copyright law.

However, this raises important questions about the future; If AI were to evolve to the point where it could produce genuinely original works without relying on pre-existing data, the current legal framework would be inadequate. New criteria or thresholds would be needed to assess the originality of such works. One key question would be whether AI-generated works could demonstrate independent creative thought, even without emotional input. The concept of *algorithmic novelty*, where the uniqueness of the algorithm's process or the unpredictability of its output is considered, could be incorporated into the evaluation of AI-generated originality.

This would require a fundamental reconsideration of how "creativity" is defined, possibly focusing on the process itself rather than just the result.

Furthermore, as AI becomes more sophisticated, its innovative application of data may play a crucial role in assessing the originality of its outputs. If AI systems can apply data in unexpected, creative ways, producing genuinely new results, this innovation might challenge the traditional understanding of originality. Should AI surpass its current limitations and begin to demonstrate genuine creativity, copyright law would need to evolve, recognizing the novelty of algorithmic processes and data applications rather than focusing solely on human intellectual input. This shift would require new legal approaches to accommodate AI's emerging role in creative processes.

IMPLICATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

The rise of AI-generated works has profound implications for copyright law, particularly as legal frameworks grapple with defining and protecting these unique outputs. Understanding the conditions under which AI-generated works can qualify for copyright protection based on current legal standards requires a nuanced examination of originality, authorship, and the broader legal context.

For AI-generated works to qualify for copyright protection, they must demonstrate originality, a criterion that traditionally encompasses the necessity of independent creation and personal intellectual effort. However, AI operates fundamentally differently from human creators; it synthesizes and recombines pre-existing data through algorithms rather than drawing from personal experiences or emotions. Thus, current legal standards present a significant barrier to granting copyright protection to AI-generated works.

To navigate this challenge, it is essential to explore specific conditions under which these works might be considered original. One potential condition is the degree of novelty involved in the AI's output. If an AI system generates a work that presents an unforeseen combination of elements or utilizes data in a genuinely innovative manner, there may be a case for originality. The concept of "sufficient creativity" could be introduced to evaluate whether the output exceeds mere replication or transformation of existing works.

Another consideration is the involvement of human agency in the creative process. If a human directly influences the algorithm's output through thoughtful input, direction, or curation, this involvement may strengthen the argument for originality. The interplay between human intent

and AI-generated outputs could lead to a reassessment of authorship, where both the AI and the human operator share credit in the creative process.

Looking toward future legal adaptations, several modifications to copyright laws may be necessary to address the unique aspects of AI-generated works. First, there may be a need for a distinct category of copyright protection tailored specifically for AI-generated content. Such a category could recognize the novelty of algorithmic outputs without strictly adhering to traditional notions of human-centred originality. This framework could also facilitate a more flexible interpretation of creativity, allowing for the acknowledgment of AI's unique contributions to the artistic landscape.

Additionally, copyright laws should incorporate the concept of "algorithmic authorship." This would mean recognizing the role of algorithms in generating outputs and evaluating their creativity. The law could stipulate that copyright protection applies not only to the final product but also to the innovative processes employed in creating it. This shift in perspective could open doors for new legal precedents while still considering the moral rights of human creators involved in the process.

Establishing clear guidelines for copyright ownership is another crucial modification. As it stands, the question of who owns the rights to AI-generated works remains ambiguous. It is essential to address whether the copyright should reside with the AI's developer, the user who operated the AI, or the AI itself. Clarifying ownership will ensure that creators and innovators receive appropriate recognition and protection for their contributions.

Finally, public policy considerations must inform any modifications to copyright laws. Balancing the need to protect creators with the desire to foster innovation is critical. Legal frameworks should promote collaboration between human and AI creators, encouraging the exploration of new artistic expressions while safeguarding the rights of individuals. This balance will be vital in shaping a copyright landscape that is adaptive and relevant to the evolving nature of creativity.

OWNERSHIP & AUTHORSHIP OF AI GENERATED WORKS

As AI systems continue to evolve and demonstrate the ability to generate original works, significant questions arise regarding authorship and ownership under current copyright laws. Even if AI were to produce genuinely original content, this does not automatically grant it the right to own copyrights. The concept of copyright is intrinsically linked to the notion of human

authorship, which raises critical legal and philosophical considerations regarding how copyright law should adapt to address the complexities introduced by AI-generated works.

The first argument for attributing copyright ownership to the actual programmer or developer of the AI centres on the idea of intellectual labour. The programmer invests significant time, expertise, and creativity in designing and training the AI system. They create the algorithms and establish the parameters that guide the AI's output, effectively shaping its creative process. Since copyright is intended to protect the intellectual contributions of human creators, vesting ownership in the programmer recognizing their critical role in the creation of AI-generated works.

Similarly, the investors who fund the development of AI technologies should also be considered for copyright ownership. Investment in AI development involves substantial financial resources and strategic decision-making. Investors often take on considerable risk, and their contributions play a crucial role in enabling the creation of new technologies. By attributing copyright ownership to investors, the legal framework acknowledges their role in the innovation ecosystem and ensures that they can benefit from the commercial success of the AI-generated works.

Moreover, prompt generators, the individuals who provide specific inputs or instructions to the AI, also deserve recognition in the ownership equation. These prompt inducements can significantly influence the output of the AI, guiding it to produce works that may not have emerged without that particular input. By vesting copyright in prompt providers, copyright law can better reflect the collaborative nature of AI-generated content, recognizing that multiple contributors may influence the creative outcome.

However, granting copyright ownership to AI itself poses significant legal challenges. If AI were to be recognized as an entity capable of holding copyrights, it would necessitate treating AI as a legal person. This raises a host of complex issues: Would AI be able to sue or be sued? Could it own property or enter contracts? Such recognition would require a fundamental rethinking of legal frameworks, including the creation of entirely new laws that could delineate the rights and responsibilities of AI as a legal entity. The implications of such changes would be far-reaching, impacting not just copyright law but various aspects of legal systems worldwide.

Additionally, recognizing AI as a legal person could lead to profound ethical and philosophical questions about the nature of creativity, responsibility, and agency. It would blur the lines

between human and machine, raising concerns about accountability and the potential for AI to exploit legal rights in ways that are currently inconceivable. Thus, while AI's capacity to generate original works is advancing, the traditional legal understanding of copyright as a means of protecting human creativity must be preserved.

Therefore, even if AI generates original works, copyright ownership should be vested in the programmers, investors, and prompt providers who contribute to the creation of those works. Granting AI copyright ownership would entail significant legal and ethical implications that challenge existing frameworks, ultimately necessitating a broader re-evaluation of how rights are assigned in an era where machines are capable of creative output. As legal systems grapple with these questions, they must prioritize the recognition of human contributions to ensure that copyright law remains a viable protection for creativity in the age of AI.

CONCLUSION

The exploration of originality in copyright law, particularly in the context of AI-generated works, reveals significant complexities that challenge traditional definitions and frameworks. This chapter has highlighted the evolution of the concept of originality in Indian copyright law, tracing its development from a focus on labour and skill to an emphasis on creativity and personal expression. While the shift towards requiring a "modicum of creativity" marks progress, the emergence of AI-driven creativity complicates these definitions further.

As AI systems generate outputs that mimic human creativity but lack the essential emotional and intellectual engagement, the question of whether such works can be deemed original remains unresolved. Future inquiries must grapple with the implications of these challenges for copyright law, particularly concerning the ownership and authorship of AI-generated works. While this discussion provides a foundation for understanding these issues, it ultimately underscores the necessity for ongoing dialogue and adaptation as our legal frameworks evolve to meet the demands of an increasingly digital and AI-driven creative landscape.

REFERENCES

1. Celine Melanie A. Dee, Examining Copyright Protection Of AI-Generated Art, 1 DELPHI 31 (2018).

2. Andrew Ahrenstein, AI Generated Art And The Gap In Copyright Law, 15 AM. U. INTELL. PROP. BRIEF 23 (2024).

3. Thushar V. Senan, Abey Augustine & Aswathy Krishnan, AI, Creativity, And Copyright Law In India: Navigating The Boundaries Of Originality And Authorship, 6 INT'l J.L. MGMT. & HUMAN. 2941 (2023).

4. Dorian Chang, AI Regulation For The AI Revolution, 2023 SING. COMP. L. REV. 130 (2023).

5. Patrick Zurth, Artificial Creativity? A Case Against Copyright Protection For AI-Generated Works, 25 UCLA J.L. & TECH. I (2021).

6. Avishek Chakraborty, Authorship Of AI Generated Works Under The Copyright Act, 1957: An Analytical Study, 8 NIRMA U. L.J. 37 (2019).

7. Mala Chatterjee And Jeanne C. Fromer, MINDS, MACHINES, AND THE LAW, Columbia Law Review, NOVEMBER 2019, Vol. 119, No. 7, SYMPOSIUM: Common Law For The Age Of AI (NOVEMBER 2019), Pp. 1887-1916, Columbia Law Review Association, Inc.

8. Gia Jung, Do Androids Dream Of Copyright? Berkeley Technology Law Journal, 2020, Vol. 35, No. 4, Annual Review (2020), Pp. 1151-1178, University Of California, Berkeley, School Of Law.

9. Eastern Book Company and Ors. V. D.B. Modak and Anr. *((2008) 1 SCC 1).*

10. Feist Publications, Inc., Petitioner V. Rural Telephone Service Company, Inc. *(499 U.S. 340)*