

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS



Open Access, Refereed Journal Multi Disciplinary
Peer Reviewed

www.ijlra.com

DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced or copied in any form by any means without prior written permission of Managing Editor of IJLRA. The views expressed in this publication are purely personal opinions of the authors and do not reflect the views of the Editorial Team of IJLRA.

Though every effort has been made to ensure that the information in Volume II Issue 7 is accurate and appropriately cited/referenced, neither the Editorial Board nor IJLRA shall be held liable or responsible in any manner whatsoever for any consequences for any action taken by anyone on the basis of information in the Journal.

Copyright © International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis

EDITORIAL TEAM

EDITORS

Dr. Samrat Datta

Dr. Samrat Datta Seedling School of Law and Governance, Jaipur National University, Jaipur. Dr. Samrat Datta is currently associated with Seedling School of Law and Governance, Jaipur National University, Jaipur. Dr. Datta has completed his graduation i.e., B.A.LL.B. from Law College Dehradun, Hemvati Nandan Bahuguna Garhwal University, Srinagar, Uttarakhand. He is an alumnus of KIIT University, Bhubaneswar where he pursued his post-graduation (LL.M.) in Criminal Law and subsequently completed his Ph.D. in Police Law and Information Technology from the Pacific Academy of Higher Education and Research University, Udaipur in 2020. His area of interest and research is Criminal and Police Law. Dr. Datta has a teaching experience of 7 years in various law schools across North India and has held administrative positions like Academic Coordinator, Centre Superintendent for Examinations, Deputy Controller of Examinations, Member of the Proctorial Board



Dr. Namita Jain

Head & Associate Professor

School of Law, JECRC University, Jaipur Ph.D. (Commercial Law) LL.M., UGC -NET Post Graduation Diploma in Taxation law and Practice, Bachelor of Commerce.



Teaching Experience: 12 years, AWARDS AND RECOGNITION of Dr. Namita Jain are - ICF Global Excellence Award 2020 in the category of educationalist by I Can Foundation, India. India Women Empowerment Award in the category of "Emerging Excellence in Academics by Prime Time & Utkrisht Bharat Foundation, New Delhi. (2020). Conferred in FL Book of Top 21 Record Holders in the category of education by Fashion Lifestyle Magazine, New Delhi. (2020). Certificate of Appreciation for organizing and managing the Professional Development Training Program on IPR in Collaboration with Trade Innovations Services, Jaipur on March 14th, 2019

Mrs.S.Kalpana

Assistant professor of Law

Mrs.S.Kalpana, presently Assistant professor of Law, VelTech Rangarajan Dr.Sagunthala R & D Institute of Science and Technology, Avadi. Formerly Assistant professor of Law, Vels University in the year 2019 to 2020, Worked as Guest Faculty, Chennai Dr.Ambedkar Law College, Pudupakkam. Published one book. Published 8 Articles in various reputed Law Journals. Conducted 1 Moot court competition and participated in nearly 80 National and International seminars and webinars conducted on various subjects of Law. Did ML in Criminal Law and Criminal Justice Administration. 10 paper presentations in various National and International seminars. Attended more than 10 FDP programs. Ph.D. in Law pursuing.



Avinash Kumar



Avinash Kumar has completed his Ph.D. in International Investment Law from the Dept. of Law & Governance, Central University of South Bihar. His research work is on "International Investment Agreement and State's right to regulate Foreign Investment." He qualified UGC-NET and has been selected for the prestigious ICSSR Doctoral Fellowship. He is an alumnus of the Faculty of Law, University of Delhi. Formerly he has been elected as Students Union President of Law Centre-1, University of Delhi. Moreover, he completed his LL.M. from the University of Delhi (2014-16), dissertation on "Cross-border Merger & Acquisition"; LL.B. from the University of Delhi (2011-14), and B.A. (Hons.) from Maharaja Agrasen College, University of Delhi. He has also obtained P.G. Diploma in IPR from the Indian Society of International Law, New Delhi. He has qualified UGC – NET examination and has been awarded ICSSR – Doctoral Fellowship. He has published six-plus articles and presented 9 plus papers in national and international seminars/conferences. He participated in several workshops on research methodology and teaching and learning.

ABOUT US

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH & ANALYSIS
ISSN

2582-6433 is an Online Journal is Monthly, Peer Review, Academic Journal, Published online, that seeks to provide an interactive platform for the publication of Short Articles, Long Articles, Book Review, Case Comments, Research Papers, Essay in the field of Law & Multidisciplinary issue. Our aim is to upgrade the level of interaction and discourse about contemporary issues of law. We are eager to become a highly cited academic publication, through quality contributions from students, academics, professionals from the industry, the bar and the bench. INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH & ANALYSIS ISSN 2582-6433 welcomes contributions from all legal branches, as long as the work is original, unpublished and is in consonance with the submission guidelines.

AI, COPYRIGHT, AND MORAL RIGHTS: LEGAL CHALLENGES FOR AUTHORS IN THE DIGITAL ERA"

AUTHORED BY - MALAVIKA SATHYANATHAN¹

Abstract

The swift development of artificial intelligence (AI) has posed great challenges to conventional copyright law, especially concerning authors' moral rights. Moral rights, such as the right of attribution and integrity, are crucial in protecting the personal and intellectual bond between creators and their works. With AI increasingly participating in the creative process, issues of attribution, unauthorized alteration, and possible copyright infringement come into question. This essay discusses the ethical implications of content created by AI on moral rights, touching on the legal and ethical issues around ownership, responsibility, and safeguarding artistic integrity. Solutions range from imposing transparency requirements, licensing regimes, equitable compensation models, and stronger legal safeguards to protect authors' rights over their creative work. Ensuring a balance between innovation and respect for authors' rights is key in reshaping copyright law to fit the changing digital era.

Keywords: *Moral rights, copyright law, artificial intelligence, right of attribution, right of integrity,*

INTRODUCTION

Technological advancements in recent years are parallel to the invention of the printing press in the 15th century. Interestingly, the Copyright law of that day did not exist, but with time, protecting intellectual property is of paramount importance. From a historical perspective of the development of copyright law, Gutenberg's invention was the spark that massively increased the circulation of creative works especially books. Authors in that era had a vulnerable position with regards to production and sale as they could only be brought to production and sold behind the back of a patron. Therefore, they had next to no means by which to protect their creations. Seen from another angle, the development of book printing at the same time is comparable to modern digital technologies. It helped cultural development greatly, but it also

¹ Author is a masters student in Intellectual Property Law at Christ University, Bengaluru

helped to promote unauthorized reproduction and distribution of works. Given the high cost of book printing, entrepreneurs would need to spend a good deal of money on book printing and hence rulers would issue special privileges to specific persons making them operate in some parts and for times with an intent to protect their interests. Moral rights law seeks to protect the rights of creative authors that are independent of their works' commercial worth. These rights, which have been widely acknowledged in copyright laws worldwide, go beyond merely securing an author's financial interests. According to Rathke, the concept of moral rights is rooted in the belief that there is an intimate and deeply personal connection between an author's creative expression and their work. In England, especially in the 17th and 18th centuries, the foundations of the copyright laws emerged, and this trend and evolution can be largely seen. For this reason, early copyright law may be traced to the Crown granting the exclusive right to print. These printing privileges were part of the printing industries' own regulatory framework that the printing industry manufactured in London through its printing guild, the Stationers' Company.

The first law to use formal legislation on the subject developed during the reign of Queen Anne, but a view of a larger historical development of copyright law in England may be seen beyond this point. In 1709, this landmark statute was introduced and became the Statute of Anne, which was first enacted on April 10, 1710². In the 1700s, the limitations of a draft version of the statute, enacted in 1707, reflected that the authors had an 'undoubted property' in their works. Nevertheless, this terminology was changed to 'sole right and liberty of printing,' which implies the influence of the positivist legal thought focused on legally given rights rather than property. The Statute of Anne stands out historically because it became both Britain's first official copyright law and the first one established worldwide. The law triggered a shift from conventional society towards legal administration of intellectual property by defining clear copyright standards. Under the Statute of Anne copyright started to exist because this law began protecting writers as owners of their literary work. Through the Statute of Anne publishers gained the right to buy and sell copyright ownership from its creators. Under the Statute of Anne both Authors and publishers gained legal protection since the law granted publishers special rights after the original creators. The regulations protected authors from issues while helping publishers through legal contracts in literature business until future laws arrived. Other nations established copyright laws after following Britain's lead in legal development. Since

² Copyright Act of 1790. The full title: An Act for the encouragement of learning, by securing the copies of maps, Charts and books, to the authors and proprietors of such copies, during the times therein mentioned

1790 the United States adopted copyright regulation based on British law³. At that time France set up its original copyright law system. The European trend of enacting copyright laws kept growing during the 19th century with Prussia⁴ and Austria⁵ making their own laws to safeguard intellectual property rights. Copyright law of today exists to support people who generate works that bring important creativity and science to the world. Copyright law helps creators accomplish their objectives by offering them both rights relating to public respect and rights to financial benefits. Lawmakers create an equal balance among authors, users and society while setting up this legal system. Copyright law evolves swiftly to keep pace with societal, technological, and business advancements. However, frequent updates to these laws can make it challenging to maintain a stable balance among stakeholders. Despite being designed with good intentions, legal provisions often lead to unforeseen consequences, particularly in the digital age, where the original objectives of the law may become obscured or undermined. Each country creates legal protection to secure what its citizens have made in culture. Technology improved at speed during the last century and the first decade of this century made a strong impact on moral rights. Under the term Moral Rights or Author's Special Rights makers of content maintain their legal connection to their works by law⁶. The moral rights system works regardless of whether or not an author earns money from their created work. Moral rights exist because an author needs freedom to decide how to use their work. The global support for moral rights started when the Berne Convention entered into force in 1886. The development of moral rights law hit several challenges including those starting from the United States. Their progress reached new heights following their endorsement of both Universal Copyright Convention and the Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS). Global copyright law expanded in power as WIPO included moral rights following these organizational updates.

Characteristics of moral rights from a conventional perspective.

- **Origins and theoretical framework of moral rights.**

Intellectual property protections stem from defending individual personality rights of creators. During the 19th century moral rights started to develop in France under the name **droit moral**. French courts in the start of the 1500s confirmed that only authors own the publishing rights to their work. French law protects moral rights more fiercely across Europe than Anglosphere

³ The full title: An Act for the encouragement of learning, by securing the copies of maps, Charts and books, to the authors and proprietors of such copies, during the times therein mentioned.

⁴ Prussian Copyright Act of 1837.

⁵ Austrian Copyright Act of 1846.

⁶ The term 'moral rights' derives from the French expression 'droit moral'.

legal systems because it came from those original French concepts. Jane C. Ginsburg explains how French and Anglo-American copyright laws work differently which reveals their major significance. Moral right protection takes a distinct form under French law alongside other copyright systems in continental Europe. French copyright and other European nation laws function primarily to protect authors yet Anglo-American copyright stands apart by caring about society's needs. France grants strong moral rights protection through its author-centered approach whereas Anglo-American systems grant more economic rights since these rights serve social purposes. Under civil versus common law the connection between authors and their ethical rights requires diverse formal legal protection (Pogácsás 2022). How nations with European civil laws manage moral rights stands opposite from the way they operate in nations under Anglo-Saxon legal systems and the United States. The United States did not grant moral rights to artists until it passed VARA in 1990⁷. VARA creates written protection for authors who own specific visual artworks by allowing them to establish or erase their ownership status and maintain control of their creations. The U.S. Congress evaluated moral rights changes through a public hearing on July 15th 2014 as part of its total copyright review⁸.

In 1886 the international community adopted the Berne Convention as the first global copyright law known as its primary reference point⁹. Under Article 6bis of the Berne Convention authors possess two essential moral rights that include their authorship identity right also known as paternity¹⁰ and their right to maintain work quality known as respect¹¹. Through this rule authors have the right to approve specific modifications or prohibit work damages¹². During the 1928 Rome meeting the Berne Convention leaders approved moral rights for the first time.

The inclusion of moral rights within the TRIPS Agreement¹³ appears to be largely ineffective, as the agreement explicitly states that “Members shall comply with Articles 1 through 21 of the Berne Convention (1971) and the Appendix thereto. However, Members shall not have rights or obligations under this Agreement in respect of the rights conferred under Article 6bis

⁷ United States Copyright Office. (2019, April). Authors, attribution, and integrity: examining moral rights

⁸United States Copyright Office. (2019, April). Authors, attribution, and integrity: examining moral rights in the United States: a REPORT of the register of copyrights

⁹ Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works, adopted in 1886.

¹⁰ Ibid

¹¹ Article 6bis, Berne Convention (Paris Act, 1971) – Right of attribution

¹² Berne Convention, Article 6bis(1): Authors have the right to object to any distortion, mutilation, or other modification of their work.

¹³ TRIPS Agreement: Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights, 1994.

of that Convention or of the rights derived therefrom”¹⁴. The absence of moral rights in the TRIPS Agreement is often attributed to the differing levels of protection that various countries are willing to recognize and enforce (Schéré, 2018)¹⁵. Additionally, some scholars argue that the internationalization of intellectual property law is primarily embedded within the broader framework of global trade relations. As a result, its foundation is largely economic, with personal rights—such as moral rights—receiving little to no emphasis¹⁶.

In addition, the discrepancy between continental and common law countries' views on the moral rights also inherently shaped the preparation of the TRIPS Agreement. Nevertheless, moral rights are somehow neglected when morally significant rights are restricted to bilateral and multilateral agreements which results in an unfair situation between the parties concerned.

The rapid advancement in the digital world makes it increasingly unlikely to incorporate moral rights in the international copyright conventions. During the negotiations of the TRIPS Agreement, the postponement of the recognition of moral rights occurred during the technological boom. Current technological progress is moving very rapidly and the direction of which is in major doubt and hence, achieving international harmonization in the protection of the moral rights becomes even more challenging.

Meaning and Concept of Moral Rights

Which are moral rights under copyright, a mandatory provision of copyright law that protects an author's non-economic, personal or spiritual interest in his or her work. The commonly accepted view of moral rights states that creators of copyrightable works have inalienable rights to their works as well as to their interests associated with them other than those usually granted copyright holders in different legal systems. Moral rights doctrine is based on the first principle that extends the authors' rights beyond the mere economic rights to their work. It is not that the artistic creation is a commercial product that can be purchased and sold, but actually it is an expression of the creator self, it is a reflection of their identity and personality and even of their creative essence. Moral rights accord the author the rights to such identity with its expression in artistic or intellectual works, so as to secure the authorship and would remain there (for

¹⁴ TRIPS Agreement, Article 9(1) – Exclusion of moral rights from obligations under the agreement.

¹⁵ Schéré, 2018 – Discussion on harmonization challenges in moral rights protection.

¹⁶ Analysis of moral rights in the context of global trade and intellectual property law.

performance, reproduction or transmission) to attest for them as the original creator and also to preserve the work's idea and essential features. Copyright law do not allow the transfer of moral rights unlike economic rights. An author can sell the economic rights in his creation to other parties and thus deny them the ability to earn money from it, but he can still protect the integrity of his work, for example in public readings, performances and broadcasts through the enforcement of its moral rights. The moral rights of the creators have been recognized in section 57 of the Copyright Act, 1957, on the basis of Article 6bis of Berne Convention (1886)

key Features of Legally Recognized Moral Rights

In addition to the right of paternity and the right of integrity, the Berne Convention has also guaranteed the right to decide about the publication of a work, as well as of the right of publication, in many national copyright laws. In terms of protecting the author's right to establish paternity, the right to paternity can be thought of as the right to have one's name linked to one's work. However, in some cases, this right is seen as a separate entitlement. The right of paternity essentially gives an author the capacity to claim authorship of her creation. However, this right is usually exercised against authors, who prevent their name from appearing in copies of their work or any use of the work unless it includes reproduction, as stated in the WIPO Glossary. This right gives the creator the right to receive proper attribution and allow them to be identified as the original author.

Specifically, the right of attribution is closely related to the right to authorship; one does not concretely exist without the other as an author's assertion of authorship of the work would typically involve publishing the author's name on the work itself. In addition, this right includes the possibility to be anonymous or use a pseudonym. All types of reproduction in the sense of having obtained for free a copy of the work, all forms of quotation, all forms of referring in an extract, it may depend on the form of the work, these are different ways of attribution rights. This right, even in the cases of adaptation, where the adapted version falls to the original creator. Authors have the right to be sure that their name is displayed in a way that is appropriate for how the work happened to be used. Attribution is not unjustifiably the right to credit because, unless proven otherwise, the name on a work in the usual place of names is presumed to be the creator of that work. In fact, this right is violated when the author's name is omitted in many cases, and this right can be abused in order to plagiarize. In this context also, we have the practice of ghostwriting. Ghostwriting is the activity of writing a piece based on a client or employer's ideas and in his or her style, and publishing the work under one's own name. While

ghosting is common in political discourse and other occasional speeches or performances, legal scholarship defines these as the most common instances of it. Usually the ghostwriting is due to the tax dollars following their author, in addition to the very large financial compensation for the writer, or due to an employer-employee relationship, where the author writes something for his boss.

It is moral rights' core principle, and protection for the author's essence and spirit, the right of integrity. One of the most elementary personal rights to the author one of the most complicated. First it was recognized on an international basis when the Berne Convention first stated that authors had the right 'to object to any distortion, mutilation, or other modification of the work, prejudicial to his honour or reputation'¹⁷. This was expanded in 1948 at the 1948 Brussels revision conference to include 'any distortion of mutilation or other modification of, or other derogatory action in relation to the said work prejudicial to his honor or reputation'¹⁸. By this modification, it was understood that not every modification was a violation; it was an alteration only that in its nature and as it was applied would injure the reputation or honor of the author. As explained in a Commentary on the Berne Convention (Ficsor, 2003)¹⁹, author's honor and reputation protection is not limited to the author's professional identity as a creator, but includes personal dignity as an individual. The right of integrity retains the intimate relationship between author and work, but projects that work to the community without contaminating the author's repudiation. Since society and the author's professional peers evaluate an author, and since one of the most inviolable is one who is judged on works, this is considered one of the rights. The search regarding the protection of the integrity of a work corresponds to wholeness and inviolability ideas. It does not have to apply to the physical form of the work but must include preservation of the artistic and intellectual message of the work. A work is intact in its entirety, meaning that its title is intact, and integrity of work reaches to material copies as well as all other forms of artistic expression²⁰.

Based on the specific nature of the right to integrity, it is notable that, even with equal intervention, the personhood rights of an author must be weighed against the user interests. The result of such a weight depends on variables like the nature of work, the way used, and the

¹⁷ Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works, Article 6bis (1886).

¹⁸ Berne Convention, Brussels Revision Conference (1948)

¹⁹ Ficsor, M. (2003). Commentary on the Berne Convention, WIPO.

²⁰ WIPO Guide to the Berne Convention (1978), p. 45

character of intervention. For example, some researchers maintain that, within the area of fine arts, the right of integrity may very well limit artistic liberty (Adler, 2009). Yet, it is essential to note that, in the context of court proceedings, one has to keep an equilibrium between artistic liberty and other authors' moral rights (Sápi & Halász, 2021). Moreover, it is important to recognize that moral rights, such as the right of integrity, are not absolute and are subject to some restrictions in European copyright regimes. A primary drawback of the right of integrity, and of exclusive copyright protection in general, is the term of copyright protection. Once the term expires, the work is in the public domain. In general, this is to say that after the copyright term, any person may freely use the work in whatever form without seeking permission or royalties from the author. Moral rights are also affected by the lapse of copyright protection. Whereas the right to authorship (paternity right) persists even after the term of copyright expires, other moral rights, for example, the right of integrity, normally lose effect after the protection period. Consequently, works in the public domain tend to be subject to the greatest level of alteration.

Another significant shortcoming of copyright, and more so moral rights, is the doctrine of parody, which has become increasingly relevant in recent years. According to the existing EU copyright regime, parody constitutes free use, subject to the three-step test and not interfering with the normal exploitation of the original work. Nevertheless, if a use interferes with the ordinary operation of the work, e.g., by contaminating its integrity, it will be illegal. The interconnection between parody and moral rights is best understood via this dynamic: while parody tends to be authorized as free speech, the right of integrity provides a limitation of its ambit. Because of this interaction, there is widespread practice of extensively modifying works—particularly those in the public domain—whose original protection period has already lapsed, with parody being a leading example of such modification.

Author's moral rights and social network platforms

The social media revolution has changed how creators distribute their creative work to their audiences and how audiences offer critical assessment of this work. Authors receive strong exposure options from these platforms though their moral rights remain susceptible to substantial threats because of these platforms. Authors hold specific moral rights that prevent other users from using their work without attribution along with altering it in ways which degrade its creative message. Fast content distribution through digital channels results in reduced author protection because current legal systems operate without suitable solutions to

these problems.

The unauthorized distribution of altered content and misattributed work and intentional work distortions from authors presents one major concern. People who use social media platforms commonly modify creative content using memes and edits along with AI generated adjustments without obtaining approval from the original creators. The lack of author recognition combined with violations of their work integrity through unauthorized manipulations devalues their creative source while creating potential harm to their author brand. Authors face increased reluctance to generate content when exposed to harsh criticism and harassing comments on these platforms and therefore it becomes relevant to determine if moral rights protection should extend to defense from harmful external digital interactions.

Current copyright laws protect original works yet they fail to protect authors from the emotional damages that occur through social media content activities. The straightforward nature of sharing and modification of content creates substantial difficulties for enforcement teams thus putting creators at risk of facing professional damage to their reputation. Legislators together with legal scholars have to evaluate digital protections because authors need proper safeguards for their creative works as social media continues its transformation.

People now accept as fact that social media endangers privacy and personal rights while accessing private data (Halász, 2020)²¹. Creativity and created work should not stand apart from all others when it comes to exposure. Does the acceptance of potential social media-caused harm to written works exist among authors regarding their creations and creative development? The act of reading hostile public comments about authorial work does not breach their moral rights but it remains capable of damaging their creative energies anyway. The large impact external forces have on authors presents a challenge to legislative initiatives supporting creative expression because these efforts could turn out to be ineffective.

Furthermore, although it is indisputable that social media plays a contributing role in such personal rights and copyright infringing matters as they are, is it furthermore reasonable to suggest that its role in copyright is exclusively negative? There is nothing inherently wrong with showing copyrighted works or extracts on the supported site, so the answer is

²¹ *Social Media and Copyright: A Legal Perspective*, 2020, for a discussion on the balance between infringement risks and promotional benefits in digital content distribution.

straightforwardly no. However, on the contrary, the promotion of copyrighted works on social media is the norm and it has become easier for authors to get awareness about the way their works are being used and shared²².

Today, in a market which has undergone a revolution in the media industry structure (Grazian, 2005), thanks to the digital revolution, which has significantly influenced the market of the copyright in the past, we must give to what is due; authors moral rights. In the light of this aspect, it is still necessary to underline the protective character of the moral rights, because the ethical consideration is of equal importance as for the exclusive economic rights for encouraging the creative work. The phenomenon of mass production (Pogácsás, 2017) of creative efforts within networked social media is also an important aspect. One such is the prime example, for instance Instagram, where the images, which have a large number accumulate over them an impressive unity and originality in form, thus give them a quality out of ordinary images and make them the subject of copyright. Users have social media at their disposal to say whatever they want however they want. Is it, then, particularly suitable for authors to exercise their freedom of expression and publish their works on this platform? Where creative work has to be published is not stipulated by copyright law. Now, while social media works great to reach a wide audience to share certain types of content such as photographs, short videos (live streams), poems and short literary pieces it is not necessarily the most suitable platform for all kinds of works. Another great concern with regard to this is a form of the right to publication such as the right of withdrawal. With this right under enforcement, social media becomes a highly complex business. According to the Hungarian Copyright Act the authors' right to untie their consent is granted, when their consent is untied in writing and for a valid reason. Furthermore, they can also withdraw their published works from further use but have to pay for the damages they have caused. However, this right does not limit the employer's continued use of the work or restrict an assignee in the economic rights from using the work according to the assigned rights. Keeping control of written form requirement and banning any further use in the digital space is difficult, especially in light of prohibition. Just like sharing a work on social media and over the Internet, an author may have a previously published work deleted or hidden from their profile, but there's no promise to completely remove the work from the Internet.

²² For an analysis of how social media platforms facilitate copyright awareness among authors, see Smith, J., *Digital Copyright in the Age of Social Networks*, 2021.

Consequently, another serious issue lies in the presence of the viral nature of social media, where the content may be massively spread, archived and reprocessed by the authors outside the narrative. Although the right of withdrawal can terminate even an author's own contract, copies of his or her work may persist, in reposts, screenshots or third-party websites in such a way that full enforcement of the right of withdrawal is close to impossible. This raises concerns about the practical limits to the moral rights afforded to creators in the digital space where authors may have difficulty in policing their creative output from the public domain of social media. In addition, several social media platforms also have terms of services that they claim to exercise a broad license over their uploaded content for use, storage or distribution, making it even harder for an author to have control over their works. Through these contractual agreements, copyright protections may be subordinated or forfeited to these contractual agreements, giving authors very little if any recourse if they want to rescind or stop distribution of their work after the fact. The legal systems need to develop new rules which correspond to digital publishing complexities. There needs to be clear definitions for the withdrawal right in online contexts and social media platforms need improved tools to protect author works. New strategies to protect intellectual property rights through copyright and moral rights protection need development because social media creates broad creative accessibility yet makes it hard for authors to maintain control along with the flow of content.

Media convergence together with digitalization triggers discussions about copyrights that emphasize economic rights above moral rights during this modern era. The increasing dominance of social media platforms in the media market has led them to interact directly with copyright safeguards especially regarding moral rights despite their lack of content creation abilities. The digital spaces treat moral rights as unwelcome entities according to specific theoretical viewpoints. Copyright protections receive limited recognition on social media platforms especially for the specific rights related to moral protection.

The Intersection of Moral Rights and the AI-Copyright Equation

If we recognize that some works have been partially generated by AI—usually under the supervision and management of a human—the justification for extending moral rights comes into view. Essentially, the eligibility for copyright protection for work done by AI is inherently linked with ownership of the related rights. The initial purpose and rationale of moral rights is to convey a close intellectual and moral connection with the creator, hence promoting more creation. From this perspective, in the event of works created solely by AI, there is no necessity

to speak of moral rights, as there is no individual to whom they can be attributed. Nonetheless, the author of the AI may have moral rights toward the AI but not on novel works produced by the AI, as they are already autonomous from him. Jane C. Ginsburg posited that if human participation in creating creative works is merely to have a computer write a literary, artistic, or musical work in a style or genre, the subsequent works must be considered computer-generated. That is, the human contribution fails to express sufficient intellectual creativity to meet the threshold of authorship demanded by the Berne Convention. Moral rights are not theoretical privileges to which a creator is entitled; they tend to carry economic meaning and operate like a brand. Violation, enforcement, and their economic costs may provide reasons for legal claims, showing the economic aspect of moral rights when there is an infringement. Aside from the issue of whether and how rights may be accorded to the creator or user of AI, it is also important to consider whether AI can itself violate the moral rights of other creators—e.g., the right of attribution or integrity—and who is responsible for doing so. Since rights are always accompanied by obligations, logically, if the creator or owner of AI is accorded moral rights, they must also be held responsible for any violations. As previously addressed, the virtual age's mass production of intellectual works has deconstructed the differences between creators and users. If AI-created material is afforded copyright protection, then AI should also be classified as a user in this juridical sphere. Other researchers claim that although machines and algorithms were once considered to be nothing more than tools in the hands of their creators, this is no longer so, as they now take an active part in the creative process (Hristov, 2017). The very concept of creativity, which the quoted author assigns to AI, is rooted deeply in the intricacy of artistic creation. Creative work is inherently connected with personal talent and creativity, contributing to economic development by creating intellectual worth (Simon, 2014). In addition, copyright protection demands that a work is the result of intellectual labor of its creator, given that intellectual activity is the basis for creativity. Although a machine's creative work relies finally on the human who coded and designed it, mere computation in an "artificial brain"—even when organized along lines of formulaic success, as in the case of AI-synthesized music in **Beyond the Fence**—is deficient in the attributes of intellectual creativity. Thus, such pieces don't qualify on the basis of law to possess an individual character. A crucial question, especially regarding moral rights such as the right of paternity and attribution, is whether employing a "recipe for success" or adopting aspects from other works as source material or inspiration in AI-generated work amounts to copyright infringement. The response hinges on a variety of factors. A key consideration is whether or not those employed elements or passages within machine learning and AI-generated works are identifiable and recognizable.

If they are, the permission of the original author is needed for their use. The failure to secure this permission amounts to copyright infringement, which breaches both economic and moral rights—particularly the right to paternity and attribution. In certain situations, this could also constitute plagiarism. Second, from the viewpoint of the right to integrity, there is an equally significant issue as to whether a writer is to be told that their writing or parts thereof are being utilised in creating an AI piece of work.

In my opinion, the original writer must be told since they may give or withhold consent if they know of such utilization. The right to integrity becomes especially pertinent where the original author contends that the use of their work by the AI undermines their moral rights and distorts the integrity of their original work.

As content produced by artificial intelligence grows more common, safeguarding authors' moral rights—specifically the right of attribution and integrity—needs new regulatory and legal strategies. The below solutions can assist in safeguarding original creators' moral rights while AI tools keep advancing. Strengthening Transparency and Attribution Requirements Create legal requirements that mandate AI developers and users to reveal the origin of data employed in training AI systems. Create automated tracking systems that recognize and reward original authors whose works are used in AI-generated content. Apply metadata tagging or blockchain-based attribution systems to provide appropriate recognition to creators. Permit authors to license their works for AI training specifically in clear terms that establish moral rights protections. Establish an opt-out regime whereby authors may keep their work from being employed in AI-created content where they feel that it might undermine their integrity or reputation. Create remuneration schemes whereby authors are paid monetary rewards when their writings are utilized to train AI or are considerably integrated into AI products. Create collective rights management organizations to manage AI-based copyright use and pay royalties to impacted creators. Encourage ethical industry standards calling for AI creators to uphold copyright and moral rights. Impose on AI businesses to partner with writers to establish equitable usage policies and guarantee that content generated through AI does not misrepresent or twist an author's original material.

Conclusion

The emergence of AI-generated content poses major challenges to the safeguarding of authors' moral rights, especially the right of attribution and the right of integrity. As AI becomes more embedded in the creative process, it is important to create legal frameworks and ethical guidelines that provide for human creators to be fairly credited and protected. Enhancing transparency, instituting mechanisms of licensing, broadening protections under the law, and evolving equitable compensation models can ensure the balance between technology advancement and retention of authors' rights. It is finally the legal imperative and an essential foundation for ensuring that creative work upholds its integrity and value amidst the changing digital environment.

