Artificial Intelligence And Intellectual Property Law

1. JAHNAVI KIRAN   2. DR. VINIT KUMAR SHARMA

1. Student, University Institute of Legal Studies, Chandigarh University, NH-95, Chandigarh-Ludhiana Highway, Gharuan, Mohali (Punjab) 140413

2. Assistant Professor, University Institute of Legal Studies, Chandigarh University, NH-95, Chandigarh-Ludhiana Highway, Gharuan, Mohali (Punjab) 140413

ABSTRACT

Artificial Intelligence (AI) systems have been rapidly gaining popularity and adoption in today's technologically advanced world. This line suggests that as advanced technologies continue to develop, there will come a point when these systems can create remarkable innovations entirely on their own, without any need for human involvement. Indeed, the intersection of AI and Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) raises complex questions. It challenges conventional definitions of patents and copyrights, and necessitates new regulations and frameworks to address the ownership and protection of AI-generated creations. These questions include issues related to authorship, ownership, and the ethical implications of AI's role in creating content. Addressing these concerns is crucial as AI continues to play a significant role in various fields. The sentence you provided discusses the aim of a paper, which is to offer insights into the growing influence of intellectual property rights (IPR) laws and artificial intelligence on a global scale and the challenges that arise as a result. In a different context, it could mean the paper's purpose is to shed light on the increasing impact of IPR laws and AI on a global scale and the associated difficulties. In this line, it means that the text or technology is trying to offer recommendations or guidance that go beyond just intellectual property rights (IPR). It's also trying to tackle issues related to whether individuals could be held criminally responsible for the content generated by these technologies.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Intellectual Property Law, Copyright Law, Patent Law, Right of Artificial Intelligence Systems

INTRODUCTION

The phrase "more sophisticated forms of software being incorporated into them" means that AI systems are becoming increasingly advanced as they integrate more complex and advanced software components. The line you provided suggests that AI-enabled systems have evolved beyond basic tasks like calculations and are now capable of generating complex creative works such as poetry and artwork. It implies a shift from purely functional uses to more artistic and expressive capabilities in AI. In this context, the question being raised pertains to whether creative work generated by AI or machine learning algorithms can be granted special status or protection under Intellectual Property (IP) laws, similar to how human-created works are protected. It's essentially a query about the legal and ethical considerations surrounding AI-generated content and its potential recognition and rights within the framework of intellectual property laws. The passage you provided seems to be introducing the structure of a paper or a text, highlighting that the authors will delve into various issues related to AI and intellectual property (IP) discourse, particularly focusing on Copyright Laws and AI. In a different context, this line could mean that the paper shifts its focus to the more thoughtful or careful aspects of the copyright debate regarding AI solutions and emphasizes the connection between patent laws and AI systems. The paper ultimately ends by offering suggestions or advice on these matters.

WHAT IS ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE?

"Artificial Intelligence" refers to the capability of computer systems to make decisions or perform tasks autonomously, often with the assistance of human intelligence. It signifies the technology's ability to mimic human cognitive functions, such as problem-solving and decision-making, in various applications. The term "artificial intelligence" was officially coined by computer scientist John McCarthy during a conference in 1956, marking a pivotal moment in the field's history.[1] In this context, it appears that "he" is describing the concept of a program or system that processes information in a way that mimics how an intelligent person would respond to similar input. The idea is to create a system that behaves intelligently, as if it were a human, when presented with certain information or stimuli. The line suggests that AI projects were developed with a focus on instilling machines with the ability to perform tasks that typically demand human-like creativity. It implies that there was a strong interest and desire to make machines capable of tasks that involve imagination, problem-solving, and artistic expression.

In this context, the mention of the "Turing test" by Sir Alan Turing refers to a test designed to determine whether a machine can exhibit intelligent behavior that is indistinguishable from that of a human. It's a way to assess whether the results generated by a machine are due to its own intelligence or if they are merely the product of algorithms and commands. The test involves interactions with a machine, and if a human evaluator cannot reliably distinguish the machine's responses from those of a human, it suggests a level of artificial intelligence or machine intelligence that can mimic human intelligence. This line describes a test where users engage in text-based conversations with either a human or a machine (like a chatbot) without knowing the identity of the conversation partner. After the conversation, the users are asked to indicate whether they think they were communicating with a human or a machine based on their interaction. It's assessing the user ability to discern between human and machine interactions in a text-only format. The statement you provided is discussing the Turing Test, which measures a machine's intelligence based on whether its responses are indistinguishable from human responses. However, the statement also mentions the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO)

---

[1] Prof. A. Lakshminath & Dr. MukundSarda, Digital Revolution and Artificial Intelligence

and their categorization of AI into three groups: expert systems, perception systems, and natural-language systems. These categories highlight the various areas where AI technology is applied beyond just human-like language responses.[2]

Expert systems refer to computer programs designed to solve problems in specialized fields of knowledge. These systems are capable of tasks such as diagnosing medical conditions, recommending treatment, and determining geological conditions, among others. Essentially, they are software applications that use expert knowledge to make decisions or provide recommendations within their specific domain of expertise. "Indeterminate legal status of works created with the aid of computers" means that there is uncertainty or ambiguity regarding the legal rights and copyright ownership of creative works generated with the assistance of computer systems. This issue has not been definitively resolved in many states, indicating that there is no clear, established legal framework for such works. Systems that enable computers to perceive the world through sight and hearing. These systems might be used by various professionals, including topologists and word context experts, each with their own unique perspective and purpose for using this technology. It seems to be highlighting the versatility of such systems in different contexts or fields. The debate over copyright for AI-generated works has indeed continued, and it has raised questions about intellectual property and legal rights. While the denial of copyright in 1956 set a precedent, the discussion continues, with national courts considering the matter from various angles and interpretations.

COPYRIGHT AND ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

"Locke's economic theory of possessive individualism" likely suggests that copyright is justified by the idea that individuals have the right to possess and benefit from the fruits of their intellectual labor, in line with the principles of individual ownership and economic self-interest proposed by philosopher John Locke. This theory is often used to support the notion that creators should have exclusive rights to their original works, as it aligns with the concept of personal property rights.[3]

The discussion here pertains to the relevance of copyright in the context of AI-generated literary works. As AI technology advances and can create original literary content, it raises questions about how copyright applies to these creations. AI-generated literary works, the application of Locke's economic theory of possessive individualism to copyright becomes complex. While traditional copyright principles align with the idea that creators should benefit from their intellectual labor, the unique nature of AI-generated content challenges the traditional notion of an individual author.

AI systems lack personal consciousness and intent, raising questions about the attribution of creative agency. The debate centers on whether copyright, designed to protect individual creators, is suitable for works produced by non-human entities. Some argue for adapting copyright laws to accommodate AI-generated content, considering factors like the involvement of human programmers or the societal value of fostering AI creativity. As technology evolves, the intersection of intellectual property and AI-generated works prompts a reevaluation of existing legal frameworks to balance the protection of innovation with ethical considerations and the evolving nature of creativity.

---

[2] A. Johnson-Laird, Neural Networks: The Next Intellectual Property Nightmare? 7 The Computer Lawyer 14 (March 1990).
[3] R. Kurzweil, The Age of Intelligent Machines, 272-275 (MIT Press: 1990)

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE & COPYRIGHT PROTECTION

The statement suggests that in 1974, the National Commission on New Technological Uses of Copyrighted Works (CONTU) expressed skepticism about the practicality of developing an AI with the ability to create independent works. The term "theoretical and not practical" implies that, at the time, the idea of AI generating original content was considered more of a conceptual possibility than a feasible reality.[4] In 1986, the Office of Technology Assessment (OTA) reexamined the issue and, in contrast to CONTU and co-authors, asserted that artificial intelligences should be regarded as valid copyrighted works, presenting a differing perspective on their status and implications within the realm of intellectual property.[5] The AI creativity debate continues to evolve, with one camp highlighting computers' limitations in replicating human creativity, while the opposing side emphasizes redefining creativity in the context of AI capabilities.[6] That AI's ability to generate novel ideas and creative outputs challenges traditional notions of creativity, prompting a reevaluation of what it means for a machine to be creative. The ongoing debate explores the nuanced intersection of human ingenuity and artificial intelligence, raising questions about the unique aspects of creativity that may remain exclusive to human experience.

The debate around AI creativity often involves Lovelace's argument that machines lack true creativity due to their rule-bound behavior. She suggests that true creativity involves unpredictability, something machines, and computers, with their adherence to routines, might struggle to achieve. However, some counter this by likening writers to machines, highlighting how they process existing works and derive inspiration from pre-existing ideas, much like AI.

Additionally, Lovelace's argument draws attention to the role of unpredictability in true creativity, a quality she believed machines inherently lacked due to their rule-bound nature. However, critics of this perspective draw parallels between writers and machines, noting the similar process of deriving inspiration from existing works. This comparison raises intriguing questions about the nature of creativity, challenging traditional definitions and inviting a broader understanding that encompasses both human and artificial contributions. The evolving discourse on AI creativity reflects a dynamic exploration of the boundaries and possibilities within the intersection of technology and human ingenuity.

PATENT LAWS & ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

The term "patents" refers to legal protections granted for inventions, recognizing the novelty and utility of a created technology. The shift in technology towards AI introduces complexities as these systems, driven by their own learning, may autonomously generate new inventions. This raises unique challenges within the realm of patent law, as it requires a reevaluation of traditional concepts to accommodate the inventive potential of AI systems. The subsequent sections of the paper will delve into this evolving relationship between patents and AI, exploring the legal dilemmas that arise in this intersection.

---

[4] Final Report, NATIONAL COMMISSION ON NEW TECHNOLOGICAL USES OF COPYRIGHTED WORKS 4 (1978), http:// eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ ED160122.pdf

[5] Intellectual Property Rights in an Age of Electronics and Information, U.S. OFFICE TECHNOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT 1986), https://www.princeton.edu/~ota/disk2/1986/8610/8610.PDF

[6] DAVID GELERNTER, the muse in the machine 83 (free Press,1994)

The intersection of patents and AI presents a fascinating legal landscape. One key challenge is determining inventorship when AI systems autonomously generate inventions. This departure from human-centric innovation poses questions about who should be credited and granted patent rights. Additionally, issues like disclosure requirements and the role of human oversight in AI-generated inventions further complicate the traditional patent framework. As technology advances, the legal system must adapt to strike a balance between fostering innovation and maintaining fairness in patent protection.[7]

In navigating these complexities, legal scholars, policymakers, and practitioners must collaborate to establish guidelines that balance the incentives for AI innovation with the principles of fairness and public interest embedded in patent laws. This evolving relationship prompts a continuous reassessment of legal norms to keep pace with the dynamic landscape of AI technology. Furthermore, the international nature of AI development introduces challenges in standardizing patent laws across jurisdictions. Harmonizing patent regulations becomes crucial to ensure a coherent global framework that encourages innovation while addressing ethical concerns related to AI. As AI continues to reshape industries, the legal discourse on patents must remain adaptive, fostering a supportive environment for inventors while addressing the unique nuances of AI-generated inventions.

PATENTS & THE CURRENT LAW

"Invention" refers to a creation that can be either a product or a process. It provides users with a unique way of accomplishing a specific action, and it may also present a new solution to an already existing technical problem. The term encompasses innovations that are eligible for exclusive rights through a patent. The patent rights provide the holder with legal authority to prevent others from making, selling, or using the patented invention for a specific period. The resulting monopoly is seen as a legitimate reward for the original inventor.[8] The AI systems are capable of performing tasks and generating inventions that traditionally stem from human cognitive processes. The idea here is that the outcomes produced by these machines may be eligible for patents, highlighting the evolving role of AI in innovation and intellectual property.

Under U.S Patent Law, the term "inventor" refers to either a single individual or a group of individuals who contributed to the creation or discovery of the subject matter covered by the patent. The emphasis is on those responsible for the inventive concept or idea behind the invention.[9] This passage suggests that although legislative intention in the United States may not explicitly include inventions by non-humans, the increasing role of AI in innovation prompts a need for legal consideration. The European Union's effort to extend national laws for copyrightable works generated by machines reflects a step toward recognizing AI creativity. However, the text emphasizes the importance of also addressing inventions and patent applications originating from AI systems and robotics.

The European Parliamentary Committee acknowledges that within a few decades, AI systems might outperform human intelligence in executing tasks. However, the concern lies in the potential challenges arising from uncontrolled AI systems autonomously determining and managing their own future.[10] When considering AI systems with high autonomy, the potential for independent discovery raises challenges in protecting intellectual

[7] Patents, WORLD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ORGANIZATION, http://www.wipo.int/patents/en/.

[8] Patent Protection – UNHinnovation, UNIVERSITY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, http://innovation.unh.edu/patent-protection.

[9] Consolidated Patent Laws,100 (f), U.S.C35, https://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/pac/mpep/consolidated laws.

[10] Draft Report with recommendations to the Commission on Civil Law Rules on Robotics, European Parliament (2014-2019),

property. The dilemma lies in defining and safeguarding the unique contributions made by these machines without traditional human intervention. This necessitates a reevaluation of patent rights and legal frameworks to address the distinct nature of AI-generated innovations.

"novelty" refers to the requirement that the invention must be new and not previously disclosed or known publicly. "Inventive step" means the invention should not be obvious to someone skilled in the relevant field. Finally, "capable of industrial application" means the invention must have practical utility and be applicable in an industrial or commercial setting. These criteria collectively ensure that a patented invention is both original and has practical value.[11] The current state of AI involves programming systems with predefined objectives. Advancements are needed for AI to possess human-like intelligence, enabling them to make judgment calls in novel situations. Additionally, patent cases often deny protection to computer programs deemed mechanical rather than inventive.[12] This limitation highlights the challenge of securing patents for AI programs that lack innovative qualities, as courts emphasize the distinction between routine processes and genuinely inventive applications in the realm of artificial intelligence.

The human/robot inventor dichotomy poses challenges in granting patents to AI programs. It notes changes in countries like India, where eligibility criteria have shifted to accommodate AI-created software on generic machines. The text emphasizes the need for streamlined laws to facilitate patenting AI inventions, but acknowledges existing obstacles and the necessity for a deeper examination of related issues.

CONCLUSION

 That while acknowledging the contribution of AI-generated work is a crucial step for the future, the real challenge lies in effectively implementing and addressing the current issues surrounding intellectual property (IP) in relation to AI. Developing robust frameworks for AI-generated work within the existing intellectual property landscape is essential. Striking a balance between encouraging innovation and protecting creators' rights will be pivotal for fostering a sustainable and ethical AI-driven creative ecosystem. This involves defining clear ownership and attribution standards, as well as adapting legal structures to accommodate the unique nature of AI-generated creations. Collaborative efforts between policymakers, legal experts, and the tech industry are necessary to navigate these complexities and establish a framework that ensures fair recognition and compensation for all contributors, both human and artificial.

---

[11] The Patents Act, $ 2(I), 1970 (India); The Patents Act, $ 2(ja), 1970 (India); The Patents Act, $ 2(ac), 1970 (India).

[12] Bilsk v. Kappos, 561 U.S. 593 (2010).