My research question: How do current and evolving intellectual property laws and copyright regulations consider human contributions versus AI, and to what extent do these rules aid or hinder the interests of artists, developers, and the public?

Synthesis Matrix ENC 2135	Source 1 Helyer, R. (2023). What are the copyright rules around AI art?	Source 2 Mahari, R., Fjeld, J., & Epstein, Z. (2023). *Generative AI is a minefield for copyright law*.	Source 3 Moran, B., & Vézina, B. (2023). Why we're against copyright protection for AI-generated output.	Source 4 Somaya, D., & Varshney, L. R. (2020). Ownership dilemmas in an age of creative machines	Source 5 Huson, G. (2018). I, Copyright. Santa Clara High Technology Law Journal, 35(2), 54.	Source 6 Heikkila, M. (2022). Greg Rutkowski is a more popular prompt than Picasso. MIT Technology Review, 125(6), 9.
Main Idea #1: **Current copyright rules hinder digital artists and developers and AI programs.**		This article covers specifics of tools used for creating art that a human creates. "Copyright law requires meaningful creative input – a standard satisfied by clicking the shutter button on a camera" similar to inputting data into AI. Other tools like Photoshop can be used and the art remains copyrightable.		An art collective used AI to create a work of art that sold for $350,000. Authorship was contested by the programmer who shared his code online. " developers of the creative AI systems could be granted IP rights over innovations produced by their AI, potentially in addition to the IP rights granted to users or operators of the system".	This in-depth article questions whether AI has evolved enough to be granted copyright protection by itself. There are pros and cons for both sides including, "The whole purpose of the intellectual property system is to grant rights to creators to induce them to innovate", which is not applicable to and AI program.	
Main Idea #2: **Current standards are in the interest of original artists who create art without the use of AI.**	This article describes the current issue of copyright infringements. It looks into different types of AI generators and how they gather images online. "This is problematic as the algorithms are often trained without the original artists' consent". The author advises that it should always be assumed copyright infringement is involved.					This article is in the perspective of original artists who are affected by AI scrubbing their works for the AI's training. " The online search brought back work that had his name attached to it but wasn't his".

| Main Idea #3:

AI-generated outputs are not original human-made work, therefore should be officially categorized as public domain. | | | This article discusses what authorship means in regard to copyright rules. The author focuses on how during this fast paced evolution, there are too many unknowns to make a clear decision. " AI-generated outputs should be in the public domain, at least pending a clearer understanding of this evolving technology". | This article also explores a compromise of sorts, "IP rights might be a much shorter duration of the right, which would put AI creations more quickly into the public domain". | | |