

Mediascapes journal 26/2025

Copy, Paste, Create. Authorship, Creative Labor, and Intellectual Property after Generative AI*

Federico Pilati**
Università di Bologna

Maria Tartari***
CNR - Istituto di Scienze del Patrimonio Culturale

Artificial Intelligence is reshaping cultural and creative industries by challenging long standing paradigms of creativity. Tracing a trajectory from traditional models to the current digital landscape, this article argues that generative AI represents more than a technological innovation—it is also a renewed manifestation of participatory and decentralized creative practices. By examining ongoing changes and challenges through the interconnected lenses of authorship, labor, and intellectual property, our inquiry reveals how AI simultaneously democratizes and disrupts traditional notions of cultural production, suggesting a transformative shift with profound implications for both artists and publics.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Computational Creativity, Authorship, Intellectual Property

* Article submitted on 24/12/2024. Article accepted on 28/08/2025.

** federico.pilati2@unibo.it

*** maria.tartari@ispc.cnr.it

Introduction

The trajectory of cultural expression and creation has been characterized by significant paradigmatic shifts, each intricately linked to technological and societal transformations. From the collective oral traditions of preliterate societies to the individualistic ethos of the industrial age, and now to the emerging digital paradigm influenced by Artificial Intelligence (AI), the conceptualization and praxis of creativity continue to evolve, challenging established notions of authorship, originality, and cultural value (Boden, 2004).

Digital technologies have facilitated unprecedented ease in remixing and recontextualizing existing content (Jenkins, 2006). Lessig (2008) in 'Remix' argues that this read/write culture represents a return to a more participatory form of cultural creation, challenging the read-only culture that dominated much of the 20th century. Similarly the very idea of open, collaborative and accessible use of coding in projects like Wiki and GitHub have facilitated new forms of collective authorship (Bruns, 2008). Moreover, the ubiquity of smartphones with high-quality image sensors and intuitive editing applications has further democratized content creation. To this extent authors like Manovich (2018) argue that these technologies have given rise to new aesthetic forms and practices, blurring the demarcation between amateur and professional content creation.

These observations serve as a point of departure for our examination of AI's role in creative processes and its potential to innovate cultural production. Indeed, AI can be seen as a technological response to a social demand for collective creativity that has existed for decades. This is reminiscent of the early 20th century, when technologies like the phonograph, radio, and cinema responded to the need for easily reproducible and accessible sounds and images, as scrutinized by Benjamin (1935) in 'The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction'. However, the scale and nature of AI's impact is unprecedented. Unlike previous technological innovations that primarily affected the reproduction and distribution of cultural works, AI has the potential to be directly involved in the creative process itself. This raises profound questions about the nature of creativity and the role of human agency in cultural production. As asked by Esposito (2022), can Artificial Intelligence be genuinely creative, or are so-called generative technologies merely tools amplifying human creativity?

Moreover, the collective feedback loops embedded in AI-assisted creativity challenges our individualistic notions of genius and artistic expression that have dominated Western thought since the

Renaissance (Simonton 2000). AI's integration into cultural creation represents both a rupture and a continuity with historical shifts in creativity. While it democratizes access and enables new modes of expression, it also forces society to confront enduring questions about authorship, value in cultural labour and intellectual property.

By examining the emerging modes of AI-assisted creativity, this article aims to focus on how AI is reconfiguring our understanding of authorship and creativity, leading us towards new forms of cultural creation that blur the boundaries between individual and collective,

human and machine agency. To do so we will analyse AI's integration into cultural production based on three interconnected dimensions. Firstly we will highlight the uses of AI as a creative tool. AI tools have indeed the potential to democratize creativity by lowering the technical barriers to entry in various creative fields while the use of AI in cultural production challenges traditional notions of authorship. Secondly, we will focus on creative labor markets, as traditional organizational models of cultural production are being reshaped by AI. Finally, we will study how the collective and AI-assisted nature of emerging forms of creativity poses challenges to the existing intellectual property legal framework.

Are AI technologies reconfiguring the creative ecosystem?

Despite the significant challenges, the integration of AI into cultural production signals a transformative moment, not merely a technological evolution but a deep reshaping of social, cultural, and creative paradigms. Generative AI operates as a synthesizer of collective human knowledge, trained on vast datasets that distill the creative contributions of diverse, often unacknowledged, individuals. This shift suggests that cultural production is increasingly moving away from hierarchical, top-down structures toward more distributed, participatory, and networked forms of creation. In this context, authorship is no longer a static attribution but becomes an accessible, fluid, multi-layered phenomenon involving human actors, algorithms, and the datasets that underpin AI systems.

This perspective resonates with posthumanist theory, which challenges anthropocentric models of agency. Haraway (1991) famously proposed the “cyborg” as a hybrid entity that destabilizes boundaries between human and machine, while Braidotti (2019) highlights how posthuman subjectivity emerges from relational entanglements with technological and ecological others. Likewise, software studies scholars such as Fuller (2008) and Chun (2011) remind us that algorithms and code are not neutral tools but cultural agents embodying particular assumptions, values, and histories. Placing AI creativity within this lineage reveals its situatedness: generative systems are relational artifacts, co-produced by human labor, cultural archives, and computational infrastructures.

However, this democratization must be critically examined through the lens of its unintended consequences. While AI can enhance individual creativity, it may paradoxically reduce collective diversity in content creation (Doshi & Hauser, 2024). The algorithmic training of AI systems often amplifies dominant cultural patterns, potentially marginalizing alternative narratives and perspectives. Addressing these biases is crucial for ensuring that AI-facilitated creativity does not erode the richness of global cultural diversity.

Generative AI techniques, such as text-to-image models, also play an increasingly prominent role in fostering collective creative exploration. These technologies can facilitate collaborative speculation and community engagement by enabling diverse groups to envision and discuss future scenarios. Indeed, AI holds the potential to redefine how collective intelligence operates, bridging gaps and creating synergies between human and

machine cognition. Verhulst (2018) argues that AI can enable collective intelligence to scale, while collective intelligence in turn, humanizes AI by embedding it in systems of shared meaning and social interaction. Leveraging AI for collective intelligence could transform how we address complex global challenges, from climate change to urban planning, by augmenting individual cognition and enhancing the functioning of collaborative systems (Evans et al., 2021).

In this context, AI acts not as a substitute for human creativity but as a tool that amplifies the capacity for collective problem-solving and innovation. The unexpected divergences between human-imagined and AI-generated outputs often spark new insights and lateral thinking. These moments of cognitive dissonance serve as creative catalysts, encouraging participants to refine and expand their ideas, making generative AI an invaluable tool in participatory design and speculative innovation. For example, community workshops might use AI-generated visualizations to reimagine urban spaces, allowing stakeholders to engage in dynamic and iterative processes of co-creation. These augmentations offer exciting possibilities but also demand a nuanced understanding of human agency in processes mediated by algorithmic systems (Esposito 2022).

In their chapter *Artificial Intelligence and Collective Intelligence* from the *Handbook of Collective Intelligence*, Weld, Lin, and Bragg (2015) present a compelling case for the integration of AI in crowdsourcing, emphasizing its potential to unlock new possibilities for collective intelligence. By exploring the growing intersection between artificial intelligence (AI) and crowdsourcing, highlighting how these two domains can complement and enhance each other. They identify two key connections: the use of AI to improve crowdsourcing processes and the reliance on crowdsourcing to support AI development, particularly through the creation of labeled datasets for supervised learning algorithms. While their primary focus is on the former, the authors recognize the reciprocal influence of these fields and their potential to reshape collective problem-solving.

Crowdsourcing, by design, is an online participatory practice that brings together large and distributed groups of workers and creatives to achieve common goals. This approach leverages the diversity, availability, and collective intelligence of the wisdom of the crowd (Surowiecki, 2005), enabling innovative applications across various domains. Bansal (2024) argues that AI offers powerful solutions to these challenges, making it an essential tool for advancing crowdsourcing. By automating task allocation, improving quality control, and optimizing workflows, AI has the potential to make crowdsourcing platforms far more efficient, cost-effective, and accessible to novice users.

For example, AI algorithms can dynamically match tasks to the most suitable workers based on their skills, interests, or past performance, thereby increasing the likelihood of high-quality outputs. Similarly, AI can model the accuracy of individual contributors, aggregate responses to resolve conflicts or errors, and identify outliers to ensure reliability in results. These capabilities not only address the logistical difficulties of crowdsourcing but also enhance its overall effectiveness. The authors envision a future where AI fundamentally transforms crowdsourcing, enabling it to operate at unprecedented levels of efficiency and scalability.

AI-enhanced collective intelligence can surpass the capabilities of either humans or AI alone by leveraging their complementary strengths within multilayered network frameworks (Cui & Yasserli, 2024). As Cui and Yasserli claim, the pressing challenges faced by contemporary society often surpass the capacity of human efforts, whether undertaken individually or collaboratively.

As AI continues to develop, its role within human collectives is poised to evolve, transitioning from a mere assistive tool to a more integrated and participatory agent. By combining their distinct yet

complementary strengths, humans and AI have the potential to achieve levels of collective intelligence that neither could attain independently. However, these human-AI systems are marked by inherent complexity, driven by intricate interactions and interdependencies; humans bring diversity that spans surface-level traits, such as demographics, to deep-level characteristics like values and expertise.

Similarly, AI agents vary in their functionalities and degrees of anthropomorphism, influencing how they interact with human collaborators. This multilayer perspective highlights the capacity of human-AI collaboration to address artistic and cultural challenges that neither could tackle independently. They claim that blending the computational power of AI with the nuanced judgment and emotional resonance of human creativity, this synergy introduces novel possibilities for artistic expression and cultural production.

Another fundamental aspect that suggests that AI technologies may reconfigure the creative ecosystem, is that human-AI co-creation enables artists to tap into an unprecedented pool of collective memory and data, fundamentally supporting collaborative strategies. AI systems, trained on vast datasets comprising historical and contemporary works, serve as repositories of collective cultural memory. These systems can uncover connections and patterns that might escape human perception, inspiring artists to push creative boundaries. For instance, artists employing generative AI tools can explore unfamiliar artistic styles, juxtapose disparate cultural references, or simulate entirely new forms of artistic media. Such tools democratize access to creative resources, opening up pathways for individuals and communities traditionally excluded from the art world.

Ultimately, the relationship between AI and collective art creation reflects broader societal shifts toward hybrid human-machine systems. These systems not only redefine the creative process but also offer a lens through which to examine our evolving relationship with technology, culture, and each other. In this context, the integration of AI into the arts serves as both a mirror and a catalyst for reimagining the possibilities of collective human creativity.

Artificial Intelligence as a Creative Tool

In the very last few years, AI is increasingly being utilized as a tool to assist human creators in various domains. As discussed by Brynjolfsson and McAfee (2014) in 'The Second Machine Age', AI could augment human creativity, allowing more individuals to express

themselves artistically and contribute to cultural production. In music, for example, AI systems like AIVA can compose original pieces in various styles. In their exploration of the relationship between artificial intelligence (AI) and artistic creation, Mazzone and Elgammal (2019) highlight the transformative impact of GANs on the field of algorithmic art, as exemplified by the AI-generated portrait Edmond de Belamy sold at Christie's in 2018 (Elgammal, 2018). Parallely, emerging applied projects are exploring how AI can facilitate collaborative creation. For example, Magenta, a research project from Google, is developing machine learning models that can collaborate with human musicians in real-time improvisation. AI systems are also being utilized to aggregate and analyze collective human knowledge and creativity. Projects like MIT's Collective Intelligence Design Lab are exploring how AI can be used to enhance group decision-making and creative problem-solving (Malone, 2018).

Taking this new and still unsettled context, AI tools have the potential to democratize creativity also by lowering the technical barriers to entry in various creative fields. Manovich (2018) in 'AI Aesthetics' explores how AI is transforming the nature of creative work, arguing that it represents a new stage in the automation of visual creation that began with photography in the 19th century. In this term, the proliferation of AI in cultural production is likely to redefine what we consider valuable

artistic skills. As routine technical tasks become automated, there may be an increased emphasis on uniquely human capabilities such as emotional intelligence, cultural understanding, and the ability to create meaningful narratives. Traditionally, digital art required artists to meticulously code the rules and parameters that defined the desired aesthetic outcome.

This approach meant that the creative process was heavily reliant on the artist's direct control over the computational system, with outcomes that adhered strictly to predefined rules. However, the advent of GANs has introduced a new paradigm in which the artist's role shifts from coding specific aesthetic rules to setting up machine learning algorithms capable of learning these aesthetics independently (Manovich 2024). By analyzing extensive datasets of images, these algorithms internalize patterns and styles, enabling them to generate new images that align with the aesthetics they have learned. This shift broadens the possibilities for artistic creation and redefines the interaction between the artist and the algorithm. Rather than directly producing the artwork, the artist now focuses on curating the dataset, configuring the algorithm, and refining the results in both pre- and post-production phases (Grilli and Pedota 2024).

Importantly, failure cases of AI art attempts highlight a critical distinction in the creative process: the absence of explicit artistic intention in the unexpected results. While the artist guides the overall process and curates the output, the specific deformations or anomalies generated by the machine are not deliberate choices. Instead, they emerge as byproducts of the algorithm's attempt to imitate learned patterns. Despite this lack of intentionality, these outcomes can still resonate with viewers, challenging traditional notions of artistic agency and authorship. Colton and Wiggins (2012) in their work on computational creativity

anticipated that this shift towards machine serendipity might lead to a greater focus on the conceptual aspects of art, with technical execution becoming less central to artistic value.

A posthumanist lens clarifies that intentionality in human–AI creative systems is distributed across socio-technical assemblages rather than located solely in either the human or the model. Haraway's (1991) cyborg and Braidotti's (2019) posthuman subject foreground hybrid agencies that destabilize human/machine dichotomies and explains how happy accidents emerge from material–discursive entanglements of prompts, training data, model architectures, interfaces, hardware, and institutional settings. From this standpoint, algorithmic serendipity is not the model intending, but an emergent property of the assemblage—co-authored by designers, dataset curators, prompt engineers, and end-users. In practice, authorship becomes a choreography of iterative selections and curatorial judgments whereby purposes are negotiated and revised across human and computational agents (relational intentionality). Algorithms are cultural artifacts embedding histories and norms, thus serendipity is patterned by infrastructural choices (e.g., datasets, sampling, loss functions) rather than neutral randomness. This reframing strengthens the claim that human–AI creativity is fundamentally relational and contextual, with agency emerging from the ongoing alignment between human goals and machine affordances.

AI's capacity to analyze and synthesize vast amounts of cultural data could lead to both increased diversity and potential homogenization of cultural output. In this sense AI systems, particularly those based on machine learning, can be conceptualized as capitalizing on collective creativity. These systems are trained on vast datasets of human-created content, essentially distilling and recombining the collective creative output of humanity. Boden (2004) in 'The Creative Mind' discusses how computers enable new forms of combinatorial creativity on a scale previously unimaginable. This raises intriguing questions about the nature of creativity itself and the role of human agency in AI-assisted creation. On one hand, AI could help surface and combine diverse cultural influences in novel ways. On the other, if AI systems are primarily trained on dominant cultural outputs, they could reinforce existing cultural biases and hegemonies.

Despite these promising developments, the integration of AI into art creation raises critical questions. The boundaries between human and machine contributions often blur, complicating traditional notions of creative ownership. The notion of democratization of creative practices requires critical scrutiny. As Terranova (2000) argues in her work on free labor, digital participation often conceals forms of invisible exploitation, while platforms channel the creative energies of users toward market-oriented logics. Similarly, van Dijck, Poell, and de Waal (2018) emphasize that platform-based participation is rarely neutral, being shaped by infrastructures of visibility, ranking, and monetization. From this perspective, democratization through AI must be seen as ambivalent: it lowers barriers to entry, but simultaneously reinforces new asymmetries of control over cultural production. Furthermore, the use of AI in art challenges the role of artistic practice as a space for scientific inquiry. While traditionally viewed as a medium for self-expression and cultural critique, art increasingly serves as a testing ground for AI technologies, blurring the boundaries between creative and scientific endeavors. The intersection of these domains

raises ethical considerations about the purpose of art and the responsibilities of artists, technologists, and audiences in shaping its future.

Addressing these challenges requires coordinated action across multiple domains. Governments, private markets, and community-driven initiatives must collaborate to ensure the safe and equitable development of AI in the arts. Regulatory measures can establish guidelines for ethical AI use, intellectual property rights, and equitable compensation for creators whose work contributes to AI training datasets (de Neufville & Baum, 2021). Meanwhile, private markets can incentivize innovation by supporting human-AI co-creation projects that prioritize inclusivity and social impact. Community self-organizing efforts, such as open-source AI art platforms or decentralized funding models, can empower grassroots artistic movements and ensure that the benefits of AI are distributed more equitably.

Creative Labor Market

Empirical research offers nuanced insights into the resilience of creative occupations in the face of automation. Frey and Osborne (2017) highlight that creative professions are relatively resistant to full automation, as many tasks within these roles require a combination of originality, emotional intelligence, and contextual awareness—qualities that AI has not yet fully mastered. However, the resilience of creative occupations varies by domain. Fields like graphic design, content generation, and algorithmic art have seen rapid integration of AI technologies, with tools that can produce visually appealing designs or text-based content autonomously. In contrast, roles that involve high levels of interpersonal interaction, such as theater direction or curatorial work, remain less susceptible to automation due to their reliance on human judgment and cultural interpretation.

The integration of AI into creative processes is likely to have further significant impacts on creative labor markets, as it transforms the roles and skills required of creative professionals (Grilli and Pedota 2024). On the one hand, AI systems can automate routine creative tasks and empower creators to produce and distribute high-quality content at a fraction of the cost, fostering a more democratized approach to creativity. This automation creates efficiency but also raises concerns about the displacement of jobs that rely on these tasks (Frey and Osborne 2017).

The rapid advancement of AI technologies has driven significant transformations in areas traditionally reliant on human creativity, such as music, visual arts, literature, and scientific discovery. These technologies are not only augmenting human creative processes but, in some cases, are beginning to replace them, bringing the question of whether AI can truly be considered creative closer to the realm of reality. Creative professionals who can adapt to these changes by integrating AI into their practice—using it as a tool to enhance, rather than replace, their creative processes—are likely to find new avenues for growth (Epstein et al. 2023).

In the music industry, for instance, AI-based systems have ushered in a new era of innovation following the disruptions caused by digitization, streaming, and free downloading. Today, autonomous AI systems are capable of composing, arranging, and even performing music (Carnovalini and Rodà 2020). Technologies such as holographic representations of musical icons and humanoid robots delivering live performances are reshaping the boundaries of artistic expression. Many AI-driven musical composition tools produce original, copyright-free works, enabling users to integrate their own compositions with AI-generated pieces. This dynamic opens new avenues for co-creation, offering composers and audiences fresh ways to engage with music while maintaining human agency as a central element of creative expression.

In these and other ways, AI technologies have redefined the processes and outputs of creativity, enabling new forms of artistic and cultural expression that were previously unimaginable. These tools lower barriers to entry in creative fields by providing accessible platforms for non-specialists to produce professional-quality work (Manovich 2018). For instance, generative AI tools like OpenAI's DALL·E and AIVA enable users without formal training to create compelling visual art and music compositions; Adaptive AI systems personalize creative outputs based on user preferences, fostering more intimate and tailored artistic experiences. AI is not merely a substitute for human creativity but a collaborator. Hybrid workflows combine human intuition and contextual understanding with AI's computational power, enabling the production of sophisticated works that neither could achieve alone. For example, in fashion design, AI can analyze trends and suggest patterns, while designers bring the vision and cultural sensibility to refine and contextualize the outputs (Manovich 2024). These shifts require businesses and professionals to adopt more agile and collaborative approaches, leveraging AI not only as a tool for production but also as a means to engage audiences in more interactive and participatory ways.

In this sense, humanities professionals, trained in disciplines such as language, communication, and fine arts, provide a depth of contextual awareness that is vital for designing effective and meaningful AI prompts. The burgeoning field of AI prompt engineering, which involves crafting inputs to guide AI systems' outputs effectively, is enriched by the contributions of humanities scholars and creative professionals. While the field is often seen through the lens of technical expertise, the nuanced insights brought by these disciplines are indispensable for advancing the ethical, cultural, and creative dimensions of AI development.

These experts possess the ability to interpret and convey complex ideas with subtlety and precision, ensuring that AI-generated content resonates with diverse audiences. For instance, a novelist or playwright might design prompts that encourage AI systems to simulate complex character dialogues or generate compelling narratives. Similarly, visual artists could contribute to prompts that inspire AI-driven creative outputs, such as designing illustrations. This collaborative infusion of creativity not only enhances the functionality of AI systems but also expands their potential to inspire and engage users. By introducing elements of surprise, playfulness, and aesthetic appeal, creative professionals ensure that AI interactions resonate on a deeper, more human level.

The integration of humanities perspectives into AI prompt engineering is particularly crucial for addressing ethical challenges and mitigating biases. Scholars from fields such as philosophy, anthropology, and critical theory are adept at interrogating the ethical dimensions of technology, providing a framework for identifying and addressing potential risks. AI systems, trained on vast datasets, often inherit the biases embedded in those datasets. Without careful consideration, prompts can unintentionally reinforce stereotypes, marginalize certain groups, or propagate harmful narratives. Humanities scholars, with their critical lens, can analyze the underlying assumptions and values encoded in prompt design, advocating for strategies that prioritize fairness and inclusivity (Floridi 2024). By embedding ethical considerations into the very fabric of prompt engineering, they help guide AI development toward outcomes that respect human dignity and diversity.

Copyrights and Intellectual Property

When an AI system generates a piece of music or art, questions arise about who the author is - the AI system, its creators, the people whose work it was trained on, or some combination of these? Gunkel (2017) in 'Robot Rights' explores these questions, arguing that our current legal and ethical frameworks may be inadequate to deal with the creative output of AI systems. The ease of copying and modifying digital content has already posed significant challenges to traditional copyright frameworks. Boyle (2008) in 'The Public Domain' argues that current copyright laws, designed for an analogue age, are ill-suited to the realities of digital cultural production and may stifle creativity and innovation. The emergence of Creative Commons licenses, as discussed by Aufderheide and Jaszi (2018) in 'Reclaiming Fair Use', represents an attempt to create more flexible copyright arrangements that better suit the realities of digital creation and distribution.

For instance, paraphrasing, often seen as a way to reframe existing content, occupies a legally contentious space when it comes to copyright law. In many jurisdictions, including Italy, copyright infringement extends beyond exact replication. The Italian Supreme Court (Cassazione) has ruled that even paraphrasing a text with superficial changes—such as replacing a few words or restructuring sentences—can constitute copyright infringement if the core structure and substance of the original work remain intact. This interpretation complicates the use of AI tools like ChatGPT, which often summarize or paraphrase content with only minor alterations. Copyright law has traditionally been reserved for works that exhibit originality and are created by humans. In most jurisdictions, the absence of human authorship renders AI-generated works ineligible for copyright protection (Guadamuz 2021). These works are often considered part of the public domain, available for use without restriction. However, the situation becomes more nuanced when humans play a significant role in shaping the AI-generated output. For instance, if a person uses AI to produce a draft and then refines or adds substantial creative elements, the resulting work could potentially qualify for copyright protection.

In the European Union, the Copyright Directive introduces a text and data mining exception, which allows large-scale data extraction and reproduction for non-commercial purposes unless explicitly restricted by rights holders (Rosati, 2019). Compounding these challenges is the ethical dilemma posed by the training of AI models. These systems rely on vast datasets, often compiled from publicly available online content with several authors and co-authors, much of which is copyrighted. Reflecting on the integration of AI in creative processes, we can identify and expand upon several key considerations, particularly regarding the transformation of copyright systems, equitable remuneration for creators, and the implications of new production and distribution models.

Lemley and Casey (2019) in 'Fair Learning' argue for the need to rethink copyright law in light of machine learning, suggesting that we may need new frameworks to balance innovation incentives with the public interest in AI-generated works.

Konrad Gliściński, in his 'Reclaim the state: public interest in copyright and Modern Monetary Theory' (2022) highlights the opportunity to reimagine cultural production as a shared, equitable endeavor, leveraging AI not as a tool of consolidation for platform capitalism but as a democratizing force within a restructured system of public support for creativity.

The traditional copyright system, built around exclusive rights, has historically aligned with the development of capitalism, prioritizing market-driven incentives for creators. However, the system is not inherently tied to this structure and can be reimaged. In the context of AI and cultural production, AI-generated works, which challenge notions of authorship and originality, expose the limitations of a copyright model reliant on exclusivity. Platform capitalism, characterized by centralized control of content production and distribution, exacerbates inequalities in creative industries. The author claims that AI tools are deeply embedded in this system, often owned and operated by large corporations that benefit disproportionately: Companies that control AI training datasets and algorithms profit from the aggregated contributions of countless creators without redistributing value equitably. This mirrors the broader critique of platform capitalism, where intermediaries capture most of the revenue. AI complicates the already fraught question of compensating creators. For instance, if an AI model trained on copyrighted works, which means having a long chain of authors and contaminations, with several generates new outputs, who should benefit? We invite to embrace the vision of Gliściński, whose proposal for a publicly funded model aligns with the challenges posed by AI by shifting the focus from exclusivity to accessibility, ensuring equitable remuneration for multiple creators in a system where AI complicates traditional notions of authorship, and encouraging the development of tools and systems that prioritize public benefit over private profit.

Conclusion

The integration of AI in cultural production represents not just a technological shift, but a profound social and cultural transformation. It challenges our understanding of authorship and creativity, potentially leading us towards new forms of collective cultural creation. This shift brings with it both possibilities and significant challenges. The democratization of creative tools and the potential for AI to augment human creativity could lead to an explosion of cultural production and new forms of artistic expression. At the same time, it raises complex practical, ethical and legal questions about the nature of creativity, the value of human artistic labor, and the ownership of AI-generated works.

As we stand at the potential threshold of this momentum, it's clear that the impact of AI on cultural production will be far-reaching and multifaceted. The need to preserve human agency, cultural diversity, and fairness in creative processes underscores the importance of developing frameworks that balance technological innovation with equitable opportunities for creators. The fusion of humanities, creative disciplines, and technical expertise is crucial to navigating this transformative moment.

While technologists provide the foundation for AI systems, humanities scholars bring contextual understanding, ethical insight, and cultural sensitivity, and creative professionals contribute imagination and innovation. At the same time, it is crucial to acknowledge the risks inherent in the current configuration of generative AI. As Zuboff (2019) demonstrates, the concentration of data and computational power within platform capitalism tends to reinforce asymmetries of control and surveillance, rather than dismantle them. Moreover, as Couldry and Mejias (2019) argue, the very extraction of human creativity and cultural expression as “raw data” constitutes a new form of colonial appropriation, which complicates optimistic narratives of democratization. Thus, the cultural future shaped by AI will depend not only on technical affordances but on the political capacity to resist exploitative infrastructures and imagine alternative, more equitable socio-technical arrangements. Together, these perspectives shape a multidisciplinary approach that ensures AI systems not only enhance productivity but also reflect the complexity and diversity of human culture.

Moving forward, it is essential to embrace this collaborative vision while addressing systemic issues in copyright, authorship, and labor markets. Publicly funded and decentralized models of cultural production could provide a more inclusive and equitable alternative, prioritizing access and fair compensation over proprietary control. Such systems would amplify marginalized voices and foster cultural innovation, reflecting the richness of diverse perspectives.

Ultimately, the future of creativity in the age of AI will be determined by the choices we make as societies—choices that define how we integrate, regulate, and adapt AI within our creative practices. By leveraging AI as a partner rather than a competitor, and by centering ethical and inclusive principles, we can ensure that this transformative technology serves as a tool for enriching the cultural landscape, preserving human creativity as its guiding force.

Biographical note

Federico Pilati is a researcher at the University of Bologna and teaches *Generative Artificial Intelligence for Social Research* at the University of Milan–Bicocca.

Maria Tartari is a researcher at the CNR Institute of Cultural Heritage Sciences and teaches *Cultural Economics* at IULM University in Milan. She works as a cultural planning consultant and actively collaborates with EIT Culture & Creativity.

References

- Aufderheide, P., & Jaszi, P. (2018). *Reclaiming fair use: How to put balance back in copyright*. University of Chicago Press.
- Bansal, G. (2024). Wisdom of the experts, not the wisdom of the crowds: The power of case-based research in the age of AI. *Journal of Information Technology Case and Application Research*, 26(1), 90–91. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15228053.2024.2322860>
- Benjamin, W. (1935). The work of art in the age of mechanical reproduction. In *Illuminations*. Schocken Books.
- Boden, M. A. (2004). *The creative mind: Myths and mechanisms*. Routledge.
- Boyle, J. (2008). *The public domain: Enclosing the commons of the mind*. Yale University Press.
- Braidotti, R. (2019). *Posthuman knowledge*. Polity.
- Bruns, A. (2008). *Blogs, Wikipedia, Second Life, and beyond: From production to produsage*. Peter Lang.
- Brynjolfsson, E., & McAfee, A. (2014). *The second machine age: Work, progress, and prosperity in a time of brilliant technologies*. W. W. Norton & Company.
- Carnovalini, F., & Rodà, A. (2020). Computational creativity and music generation systems: An introduction to the state of the art. *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence*, 3, 14. <https://doi.org/10.3389/frai.2020.00014>
- Chun, W. H. K. (2011). *Programmed visions: Software and memory*. MIT Press.
- Colton, S., & Wiggins, G. A. (2012). Computational creativity: The final frontier? In *ECAI 2012*. IOS Press.
- Couldry, N., & Mejjias, U. A. (2019). *The costs of connection: How data is colonizing human life and appropriating it for capitalism*. Stanford University Press.
- Cui, H., & Yasserli, T. (2024). AI-enhanced collective intelligence. *Patterns*, 5(11). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.patter.2024.101074>
- De Neufville, R., & Baum, S. D. (2021). Collective action on artificial intelligence: A primer and review. *Technology in Society*, 66, 101649. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2021.101649>

- Doshi, A. R., & Hauser, O. P. (2024). Generative AI enhances individual creativity but reduces the collective diversity of novel content. *Science Advances*, 10(28), eadn5290. <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.adn5290>
- Elgammal, A. (2018). AI is blurring the definition of artist. *American Scientist*, 107(1), 18–21. <https://doi.org/10.1511/2019.107.1.18>
- Esposito, E. (2022). *Artificial communication: How algorithms produce social intelligence*. MIT Press.
- Epstein, Z., Hertzmann, A., Investigators of Human Creativity, Akten, M., Farid, H., Fjeld, J., ... & Smith, A. (2023). Art and the science of generative AI. *Science*, 380(6650), 1110-1111. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2306.04141>
- Evans, J., Hinds, R., Jung, M. F., & Pescetelli, N. (2021). Leveraging artificial intelligence for collective intelligence. In *Academy of Management Proceedings* (Vol. 2021, No. 1, p. 15722). <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMBPP.2021.15722symposium>
- Floridi, L. (2024). On the future of content in the age of artificial intelligence: Some implications and directions. *Philosophy & Technology*, 37(3), 112. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13347-024-00806-z>
- Frey, C. B., & Osborne, M. A. (2017). The future of employment: How susceptible are jobs to computerisation? *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 114, 254–280. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2016.08.019>
- Fuller, M. (2008). *Software studies: A lexicon*. MIT Press.
- Gliściński, K. (2022). Reclaim the state: Public interest in copyright and modern monetary theory. *Internet&Sociedade*, 3(2). <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5063272>
- Grilli, L., & Pedota, M. (2024). Creativity and artificial intelligence: A multilevel perspective. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 33(2), 234–247. <https://doi.org/10.1111/caim.12580>
- Guadamuz, A. (2021). Do androids dream of electric copyright? Comparative analysis of originality in artificial intelligence generated works. In J.-A. Lee, R. Hilty, & K.-C. Liu (Eds.), *Artificial intelligence and intellectual property* (pp. 147–176). Oxford University Press.
- Gunkel, D. J. (2017). *Robot rights*. MIT Press.
- Haraway, D. (1991). *Simians, cyborgs, and women: The reinvention of nature*. Routledge.
- Jenkins, H. (2006). *Convergence culture: Where old and new media collide*. NYU Press.
- Lee, H. K. (2022). Rethinking creativity: Creative industries, AI and everyday creativity. *Media, Culture & Society*, 44(3), 601–612. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01634437221077009>
- Lemley, M. A., & Casey, B. (2019). Fair learning. *NYU Law Review*, 94(6). <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3528447>
- Lessig, L. (2008). *Remix: Making art and commerce thrive in the hybrid economy*. Penguin.
- Malone, T. W. (2018). *Superminds: The surprising power of people and computers thinking together*. Little, Brown and Company.
- Manovich, L. (2018). *AI aesthetics*. Strelka Press.

- Manovich, L. (2024). *Diffusions in architecture: Artificial intelligence and image generators*. Polity.
- Mazzone, M., & Elgammal, A. (2019). Art, creativity, and the potential of artificial intelligence. *Arts*, 8(1), 26. <https://doi.org/10.3390/arts8010026>
- Rosati, E. (2019). Copyright as an obstacle or an enabler? A European perspective on text and data mining and its role in the development of AI creativity. *Asia Pacific Law Review*, 27(2), 198–217. <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3452376>
- Simonton, D. K. (2000). Creativity: Cognitive, personal, developmental, and social aspects. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 151–158. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066x.55.1.151>
- Surowiecki, J. (2005). *The wisdom of crowds*. Vintage.
- Terranova, T. (2000). Free labor: Producing culture for the digital economy. *Social Text*, 18(2), 33–58. https://doi.org/10.1215/01642472-18-2_63-33
- Van Dijck, J., Poell, T., & de Waal, M. (2018). *The platform society: Public values in a connective world*. Oxford University Press.
- Verhulst, S. G. (2018). Where and when AI and CI meet: Exploring the intersection of artificial and collective intelligence towards the goal of innovating how we govern. *AI & Society*, 33, 293–297. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-018-0830-z>
- Weld, D. S., Lin, C. H., & Bragg, J. (2015). Artificial intelligence and collective intelligence. In *Handbook of collective intelligence* (pp. 89–114).
- Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. PublicAffairs.