

AI IN ARTS

Greta Andersson

The generation of images and artistic media with artificial intelligence is an evergrowing market. The statistics that its value will increase to \$0.92 billion in the year 2030 — now less than a decade away — from its value of \$0.26 billion in 2022 are proof of this unceasing evolution.¹ Content created by these softwares has gone from being easily identifiable to challenging our knowledge and judgement. Therefore, one can logically assume that artists must be dealing with even more notable consequences of this industry as their profession and its principles are continuously questioned.

Among these affected factors of an artist's life is copyright law. It protects original works of authorship, meaning they are made by a human and this creator's rights are what is preserved under said law.² However, artificial intelligence defies these boundaries in multiple ways, making their limits more unclear each day that goes by.

The main concerns this issue highlights include but are not limited to originality, present copyright law infringement and authorship.³ Artificial intelligence works using a model that is based on a large existing dataset. This directly implies that the use of AI for creation of original material will never be truly that, as it merges components from various sources within its database. In some cases, this may even result in explicit partial replications of one or more art piece elements. For this reason, a majority of society is unsure whether the mentioned work should be possible to take legal action against or not.

As for artists, their point of view seems to be very clear. Surveys show that only 10.8% of them believe they are protected from generative AI technology, while an overwhelming majority of 89.2% believe that these laws are outdated to face the challenge AI now brings the world of arts.⁴ Therefore, it is clear this large group is prepared to counter any possibly law-infringing content created by artificial intelligence and the laws currently surrounding it. On a more extreme side, there is even a group of people who do not consider AI-generated works art at all. Another survey by KOAA shows that 76% of the general population does not believe such content pertains to the category of art.⁵

In the case of authorship, the conflict that arises is the uncertainty of who is credited for AI-generated art; whether the programmer behind the system's produced results or the system itself. As previously stated, copyright law traditionally only recognises human authors. Even when their creative involvement is minimal, like in this case. Of course, this also depends on the will of the artist. As 46.4% of surveyed artists have said that they feel like their contribution is irrelevant while 53.6% have said it is fundamental, it is hard to tell which side is truly predominant.⁶ With such split opinions, it seems this issue has yet some time to be resolved socially. However, it is also true that the US Copyright Office is clear in its views on

this for now and states that AI art does not have human authorship. From this point stems the fact that they cannot be copyrighted.⁷ It is also possible that, as mentioned previously, its components are already copyrighted by their original creators.

Aside from arguments against and in favour of this developing technology regarding legal aspects, ethics also take on a main role in this discussion. Although plagiarism and copyright infringement may not seem like a huge problem to those responsible for them, they can have great consequences on other people. This seems to be a main concern for voiceovers and musical artists or voice actors specifically. Logically, this is because their whole job depends on their voice and what they use it for. However, with such tools, it is no longer only them who can use it and take both credit and compensation for it; benefits which belong to the original speaker.⁸

The aspect of ethics brings us back to a common question we all know: “Will AI replace humans artists?” Among aspiring creators, this seems to be a recurring worry as our world evolves. After all, if the lines we have as a society stay as blurred as they are now, people will continue to struggle telling reality from technology apart, ultimately leading to a possibly AI-dominated art scene because of its capability for perfection that us human beings do not consistently have. Instead, we are able to create imperfect content that appeals for its emotion and feeling.⁹ Nonetheless, in the midst of such growth, artists fear the loss of appreciation for their kind of talent may lead to the disappearance of this work field.¹⁰

Regardless of one’s subjective opinions towards this subject, it is obvious that we as a society must come up with the ideal ways to deal with our technological advancements and keep our legal and ethical standards up to date. With such an increasingly influential and relevant part of modern life on our hands, we must treat it with care and have in mind both its risks and its positive impacts on all parties mainly involved and affected by artificial intelligence.

¹[AI in Art Statistics 2024 · AIPRM](#)

²[What Does Copyright Protect? \(FAQ\)](#)

³[Copyright and AI training data—transparency to the rescue? | Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice | Oxford Academic](#)

⁴[Survey Reveals 9 out of 10 Artists Believe Current Copyright Laws are Outdated in the Age of Generative AI Technology](#)

⁵[AI in Art Statistics 2024 · AIPRM](#)

⁶[AI in Art Statistics 2024 · AIPRM](#)

⁷[Court Finds AI-Generated Work Not Copyrightable for Failure to Meet "Human Authorship" Requirement—But Questions Remain | Insights | Jones Day](#)

⁸[The Ethics of Artificial Intelligence: Are AI Voices Legal?](#)

⁹[How do Voice Actors convey emotion? - Clare Reeves Voiceovers.](#)

¹⁰[Future of voice-over industry: AI to replace humans? - International Finance.](#)

