INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ARTS AND LIBERAL STUDIES (IJALS)
(Open Access, Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Journal)
ISSN Online: 3108-1673 ISSN Print:

Artificial Intelligence and The Future of Creative Authorship

Kochumol Abraham

PG Department of Computer Applications, Marian College Kuttikanam Autonomous, India.

Article information

Received: 13th January 2026
Received in revised form: 12th February 2026
Accepted: 5th March 2026
Available online: 23rd April 2026

Volume: 2
Issue: 2
DOI: https://doi.org/10.63090/IJALS/3108.1673.0012

Abstract

The rapid proliferation of artificial intelligence tools capable of generating visual art, literary text, and musical compositions has fundamentally challenged longstanding assumptions about creativity, authorship, and artistic originality. This article examines the philosophical, legal, and ethical implications of AI-generated creative works by drawing on scholarship from aesthetics, computer science, intellectual property law, and art criticism. It traces the debate over whether machines can be genuinely creative, interrogates the copyright and ownership challenges posed by generative algorithms, and evaluates the impact of AI on artistic practice and education. The analysis argues that the future of creative authorship lies not in a binary opposition between human and machine but in collaborative frameworks that leverage the distinctive strengths of both, requiring new legal, pedagogical, and aesthetic paradigms to navigate the transformative potential of AI in the arts.

Keywords: - Artificial Intelligence, Creative Authorship, Computational Creativity, Copyright, Generative Art, Human-AI Collaboration, Intellectual Property, Digital Art.

Introduction

The rapid advancement of artificial intelligence has fundamentally disrupted longstanding assumptions about creativity, authorship, and artistic originality. Tools such as DALL-E, Midjourney, and ChatGPT have demonstrated an unprecedented capacity to generate visual art, literary text, and musical compositions that rival and sometimes surpass human-created works in superficial quality. These developments have ignited fierce debates across the arts and humanities regarding whether machines can truly be creative, who owns the outputs of generative algorithms, and what the proliferation of AI-generated content means for human artists and the creative economy. As Miller (2019) observes, the emergence of AI-powered creativity represents a paradigm shift that challenges centuries of aesthetic philosophy and legal frameworks built around the concept of human authorship.

This article examines the multifaceted implications of artificial intelligence for creative authorship in the contemporary moment. It traces the philosophical foundations of computational creativity, interrogates the legal and ethical challenges posed by AI-generated works, and considers the evolving role of human artists in an increasingly automated creative landscape. Drawing on scholarship from aesthetics, computer science, intellectual property law, and art criticism, the analysis argues that while AI tools represent powerful instruments for artistic exploration, the question of genuine creativity remains deeply entangled with human intentionality, cultural context, and embodied experience. The article further contends that the future of creative authorship lies not in a binary opposition between human and machine but in collaborative frameworks that leverage the strengths of both.

Literature Review

The question of whether machines can be creative has occupied scholars for decades. Boden (2004) provides one of the most influential frameworks for understanding creativity, distinguishing between exploratory, combinational, and transformational creativity. In her analysis, computational systems are capable of the first two modes but struggle with genuinely transformational creativity, which requires a fundamental restructuring of conceptual spaces. Boden's taxonomy has been widely adopted in subsequent research, though some scholars have questioned whether her categories adequately capture the emergent properties of modern deep learning systems.

Colton and Wiggins (2012) extend this line of inquiry by arguing that computational creativity represents the 'final frontier' of artificial intelligence research. They propose that a truly creative computer system must not only produce novel and valuable artifacts but also be capable of appreciating, reflecting upon, and explaining its own creative processes. This requirement for meta-cognition sets a high bar that most current AI systems fail to meet, despite their impressive generative capabilities. The authors suggest that achieving genuine computational creativity would constitute one of the most significant milestones in the history of artificial intelligence.

In the visual arts domain, Elgammal et al. (2017) introduced Creative Adversarial Networks (CANs), which are trained to generate art that deviates from established stylistic norms while remaining within the broader distribution of recognized art. Their experimental results demonstrated that human evaluators often could not distinguish CAN-generated images from works produced by human artists, and in some cases rated the AI works as more novel and aesthetically stimulating. Mazzone and Elgammal (2019) further explored these findings, arguing that AI art challenges conventional notions of artistic intention and raises fundamental questions about the nature of aesthetic experience.

Hertzmann (2018) offers a more skeptical perspective, contending that computers cannot create art in any meaningful sense because art is fundamentally a social activity that requires human intentionality, cultural context, and communicative purpose. In his view, AI-generated images are better understood as products of sophisticated tools wielded by human programmers and curators rather than as autonomous creative acts. This position resonates with Sawyer's (2012) comprehensive framework for understanding human creativity, which emphasizes the role of social interaction, domain knowledge, and cultural context in the creative process.

The legal dimensions of AI creativity have attracted considerable scholarly attention. Guadamuz (2017) examines the implications of AI-generated works for copyright law, noting that most legal systems require a human author as a condition for copyright protection. This creates a significant lacuna when AI systems produce works with minimal human intervention, potentially leaving vast quantities of creative output in the public domain or creating perverse incentives for humans to claim false authorship. Zeilinger (2021) extends this analysis by exploring the broader implications of AI art for intellectual property regimes, arguing that the rise of generative algorithms demands a fundamental rethinking of ownership, attribution, and creative agency.

Floridi and Chiriatti (2020) provide a nuanced analysis of GPT-3's capabilities and limitations, arguing that while the system demonstrates remarkable facility with language generation, it lacks genuine understanding, intentionality, and semantic comprehension. They characterize GPT-3 as a powerful tool for text manipulation rather than a genuine author, drawing an important distinction between the ability to produce linguistically coherent text and the capacity for meaningful communication. This distinction has significant implications for how we evaluate AI-generated literature and poetry.

The Philosophical Debate: Can Machines Be Creative?

At the heart of the AI authorship controversy lies a fundamental philosophical question: what constitutes creativity? If creativity is defined purely in terms of novelty and value the capacity to produce outputs that are both original and useful or aesthetically pleasing then contemporary AI systems arguably meet this threshold. Generative adversarial networks produce images that are statistically unique and often aesthetically compelling, while large language models generate text that can be engaging, informative, and stylistically sophisticated. By this measure, as Elgammal et al. (2017) demonstrate, AI systems are already creative in a functionally meaningful sense.

However, if creativity requires intentionality, self-awareness, and the capacity for genuine expression the ability to mean something by what one creates then AI systems fall far short. Boden (2004) acknowledges this tension in her framework, noting that computational creativity raises profound questions about the nature of consciousness and subjective experience. A CAN may generate a visually striking image, but it does not experience aesthetic pleasure, grapple with existential anxiety, or seek to communicate a particular vision of the world. Hertzmann (2018) argues that this absence of inner life renders AI art fundamentally different from human art, regardless of its surface qualities.

Sawyer (2012) offers a social-constructivist perspective that further complicates the picture. In his framework, creativity is not merely a property of individual minds but an emergent phenomenon that arises from social interaction, cultural dialogue, and collaborative meaning-making. By this account, AI systems are not creative agents but rather participants in a broader creative ecosystem that includes human programmers, curators, audiences, and cultural institutions. The creativity attributed to AI is, in this view, a distributed property of the human-machine system rather than an intrinsic quality of the algorithm itself.

Miller (2019) attempts to bridge these perspectives by proposing that AI creativity should be understood as a distinct category rather than measured against human creativity. He argues that the most productive approach is to recognize AI as a new kind of creative partner that operates according to different principles than human artists. This framework avoids the reductive question of whether machines 'really' create and instead focuses on the novel forms of artistic expression that emerge from human-AI collaboration. Colton and Wiggins (2012) similarly advocate for a pluralistic understanding of creativity that can accommodate both human and computational agents.

Copyright, Ownership, and Legal Challenges

The legal implications of AI-generated art represent one of the most pressing practical challenges in the field. As Guadamuz (2017) documents, existing copyright frameworks in most jurisdictions are predicated on the assumption of human authorship. The United States Copyright Office, for example, has consistently held that works must be created by a human being to qualify for copyright protection, a position reaffirmed in its 2023 guidance on AI-generated content. This creates significant uncertainty for artists who use AI tools in their creative process, particularly when the degree of human involvement varies along a continuum from minimal prompt engineering to extensive post-processing and curation.

Zeilinger (2021) argues that these legal challenges reveal deeper contradictions in the intellectual property system itself. He contends that the rise of AI art exposes the fiction of the autonomous author that has underpinned copyright law since the Romantic era, and that a more honest reckoning with the collaborative, iterative, and culturally embedded nature of all creative production is long overdue. In his view, AI art offers an opportunity to develop more equitable frameworks for recognizing and compensating creative labor, rather than simply extending existing property rights to cover machine-generated outputs.

The question of training data further complicates the ownership landscape. Generative AI systems are trained on vast corpora of existing human-created works, raising concerns about unauthorized use, style appropriation, and the dilution of individual artistic voices. Mazzone and Elgammal (2019) note that these concerns are particularly acute in the visual arts, where AI systems can replicate the distinctive styles of living artists without attribution or compensation. The resulting legal battlesexemplified by high-profile lawsuits against AI art platforms are likely to shape the regulatory landscape for years to come.

Impact on Artistic Practice and Education

The proliferation of AI creative tools is already transforming artistic practice across multiple domains. In the visual arts, AI-assisted creation has become a recognized medium, with AI artworks exhibited in major galleries and commanding significant prices at auction. Floridi and Chiriatti (2020) observe that this integration of AI into artistic workflows represents a continuation of the long history of technological mediation in art, from the camera obscura to Photoshop. However, the degree of autonomy exhibited by current AI systems distinguishes them from previous tools and raises novel questions about the role of the human artist.

In literature and creative writing, large language models have been used for everything from generating poetry and fiction to assisting with screenwriting and journalism. Miller (2019) documents numerous examples of AI-human literary collaboration, noting that the most successful outcomes tend to involve significant human curation and editing rather than unmediated AI output. This observation supports the broader argument that AI is most productively understood as a creative tool or collaborator rather than an autonomous author.

The implications for arts education are equally profound. As AI tools become more accessible and capable, art schools and creative writing programs must grapple with how to integrate these technologies into their curricula while maintaining a commitment to developing distinctively human creative capacities. Sawyer (2012) argues that creativity education should emphasize the social, cultural, and emotional dimensions of creative practice that remain beyond the reach of current AI systems. This includes the capacity for empathic understanding, moral imagination, and critical reflection on the cultural and political contexts of artistic production.

The Ethics of AI-Generated Art

Beyond the legal questions, AI-generated art raises profound ethical concerns about labor, equity, and cultural value. The displacement of human artists by AI systems threatens livelihoods across multiple creative industries, from graphic design and illustration to music composition and copywriting. Hertzmann (2018) acknowledges this concern while arguing that historical precedent suggests technological disruption in the arts tends to create new opportunities even as it eliminates existing ones. However, the speed and scale of AI adoption may outpace the development of new creative niches, creating a period of significant economic dislocation for working artists.

Zeilinger (2021) raises additional ethical concerns about the concentration of AI creative tools in the hands of large technology corporations, which control both the training data and the platforms through which AI art is distributed. This concentration of power threatens to exacerbate existing inequalities in the creative economy and raises questions about cultural diversity, access, and representation. If the aesthetic norms embedded in AI training data reflect the biases and blind spots of dominant cultural traditions, the widespread adoption of AI creative tools could inadvertently homogenize global artistic production.

Colton and Wiggins (2012) suggest that addressing these ethical challenges requires interdisciplinary collaboration among technologists, artists, policymakers, and ethicists. They advocate for the development of ethical frameworks that recognize the legitimate interests of all stakeholders in the AI art ecosystem, including the human artists whose works form the training data, the users who interact with AI tools, and the broader public that consumes AI-generated content.

Future Directions: Toward Human-AI Collaboration

The most promising trajectory for AI in the creative arts appears to lie in collaborative rather than substitutive models. Rather than replacing human artists, AI tools can augment human creativity by expanding the range of possibilities available for exploration, accelerating the iterative process of artistic refinement, and enabling forms of expression that would be impractical or impossible through purely manual means. Boden (2004) anticipates this possibility in her framework, noting that computational tools can help human artists explore conceptual spaces more efficiently and discover unexpected connections between ideas.

Mazzone and Elgammal (2019) describe several examples of successful human-AI artistic collaboration, including projects in which human artists use AI-generated elements as raw material for further creative elaboration. In these cases, the AI system functions as a sophisticated generative tool that produces a range of options for the human artist to select, modify, and integrate into a coherent artistic vision. This collaborative model preserves the role of human intentionality and judgment while leveraging the computational power and generative capacity of AI systems.

Looking forward, Miller (2019) envisions a creative landscape in which human and artificial intelligence coexist as complementary forms of creativity, each contributing distinctive strengths to the artistic process. This vision requires not only technological innovation but also cultural and institutional adaptation, including new legal frameworks for recognizing collaborative authorship, new pedagogical approaches for training artists to work with AI tools, and new aesthetic criteria for evaluating works that emerge from human-machine collaboration. The future of creative authorship, in this view, is neither purely human nor purely artificial but genuinely hybrid.

Conclusion

The rise of artificial intelligence as a creative force represents one of the most significant cultural transformations of the twenty-first century. As this article has demonstrated, AI-generated art challenges longstanding assumptions about authorship, creativity, and artistic value, raising profound philosophical, legal, and ethical questions that remain far from resolution. The philosophical debate over whether machines can truly be creative reveals fundamental disagreements about the nature of creativity itself, while the legal challenges posed by AI-generated works expose deep contradictions in existing intellectual property frameworks.

What emerges most clearly from this analysis is that the future of creative authorship is unlikely to be defined by a simple binary between human and machine creativity. Instead, as scholars such as Miller (2019), Boden (2004), and Mazzone and Elgammal (2019) suggest, the most productive and ethically responsible path forward lies in developing collaborative frameworks that harness the generative power of AI while preserving the distinctively human dimensions of artistic expression: intentionality, emotional depth, cultural sensitivity, and moral imagination. The challenge for artists, educators, policymakers, and technologists is to navigate this transition in ways that promote both innovation and equity, ensuring that the creative possibilities opened by AI benefit not only those who control the technology but the broader human community that art serves.

References

Boden, Margaret A. *The Creative Mind: Myths and Mechanisms*. London: Routledge, 2004.

Colton, Simon, and Geraint A. Wiggins. "Computational Creativity: The Final Frontier?" In *Proceedings of the 20th European Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 21–26. Amsterdam: IOS Press, 2012.

Elgammal, Ahmed, Bingchen Liu, Mohamed Elhoseiny, and Marian Mazzone. "CAN: Creative Adversarial Networks, Generating 'Art' by Learning About Styles and Deviating from Style Norms." *arXiv preprint* arXiv:1706.07068, 2017.

Floridi, Luciano, and Massimo Chiriatti. "GPT-3: Its Nature, Scope, Limits, and Consequences." *Minds and Machines* 30, no. 4 (2020): 681–694.

Guadamuz, Andres. "Artificial Intelligence and Copyright." *WIPO Magazine* 5 (2017): 14–19.

Hertzmann, Aaron. "Can Computers Create Art?" *Arts* 7, no. 2 (2018): 18.

Mazzone, Marian, and Ahmed Elgammal. "Art, Creativity, and the Potential of Artificial Intelligence." *Arts* 8, no. 1 (2019): 26.

Miller, Arthur I. *The Artist in the Machine: The World of AI-Powered Creativity*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2019.

Sawyer, R. Keith. *Explaining Creativity: The Science of Human Innovation*. 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Zeilinger, Martin. *Tactical Entanglements: AI Art, Creative Agency, and the Limits of Intellectual Property*. Lüneburg: meson press, 2021.