ADVANCE SOCIAL SCIENCE ARCHIVE JOURNAL
Available Online: https://assajournal.com
Vol. 04 No. 02. October-December 2025.Page# 2171-2185
Print ISSN: 3006-2497 Online ISSN: 3006-2500
Platform & Workflow by: Open Journal Systems
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17787339

AI-Generated News and the Question of Legal Liability: Who Owns the Truth?

Amna Fazail
Lecturer
Department of Media & Communication Studies
The Women University, Multan, Pakistan
amna.fazail@wum.edu.pk
Dr. Sajid Sultan
Lecturer in Law
Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan (Vehari Campus), Pakistan
sajidsultan@bzu.edu.pk
Dr Aqsa Iram Shahzadi
(Corresponding Author)
Assistant Professor
Institute of Media and Communication Studies
Bahauddin Zakariya University Multan, Pakistan
mrsaqsairam@bzu.edu.pk

Abstract
Artificial intelligence is fast becoming part of the journalism industry and has reinvented how news is created, distributed and understood. Generative AI systems have the potential to generate content imitating human reporting and present difficult legal, ethical and epistemic issues. The paper presents conceptual, legal and policy issues surrounding AI-generated journalism and focuses specifically on authorship, liability, intellectual property and the ethics of truth. It suggests the destabilization of the traditional concepts of human agency, copyright and accountability when algorithms are the pseudo-authors and also assesses the new regulatory frameworks that might be applied to make algorithms more transparent, fair and editorially controlled. The paper discusses the conflict between technological advancement and the right to real information of the population by examining the problem of defamation, copyright ownership, the influence of algorithms and misinformation. It is contended in the paper that AI-generated news ownership is not a proprietary issue but more of collective custodianship and thus necessitates legal, ethical and policy interventions that introduce the elements of responsibility, transparency and moral accountability throughout the data-processing and content-generating

algorithms. The analysis offers a context through which societies are able to come to terms with the possibilities of an AI-supported journalism efficiency and the long-standing need to remain truthful and accountable.
Keywords: *AI-generated journalism, Legal liability, Intellectual property, Authorship, Truth and transparency, Algorithmic accountability, Ethical journalism, Misinformation*

1: Introduction – The Rise of AI in News Production

Artificial intelligence (AI) in journalism is one of the most significant technological changes that have ever happened in the media history. Starting with relatively plain data-driven reporting, such as automated sports overviews and financial updates, it has now led to the application of large language models (LLMs) that can be used to write full news stories with minimal human interaction. OpenAI ChatGPT, Google Gemini and Anthropic Claude are now utilized on a regular basis to create news bulletins, editorial articles and social-media posts. This high-speed automation is threatening the principles of media ethics, accountability and truth. In case of an AI system, a misleading or defamatory article is created, there is a critical legal question: who is liable to the error, the developer, the user or the publisher?

Increasingly the modern newsroom has turned into a hybrid setting where algorithms are used to supplement and, in some cases, also, substitute human editors. It has been observed by scholars that AI tools can make journalism more efficient through the creation of summaries, translation of content and tailoring news feeds. However, these efficiencies are at the expense of transparency and verification. The algorithmic processes which are replacing the traditional editorial protections over the truth are not only mediating the truth, but the mechanics of the process are themselves obscure even to the creative team. Such black-box problem makes ethical responsibility and legal responsibility harder since neither intention nor foreseeability, which is a foundational principle of tort and media law, is easily provable when an AI makes a mistake when not directed by humans (Миколайчук & Жуковська, 2025a).

The power of AI to make information a democratic process is frequently cheered up but it is also powerful to spread misinformation. The rate at which AI can duplicate and promulgate incorrect or biased stories is by far out of human corrective ability. The recent empirical study of algorithmic journalism released in 2024 warns that the generative models often manipulate or fake quotations or factual material, but that they still have stylistically plausible writing (Shao, 2025). This kind of synthetic truth confuses the distinction between fact and fiction and also establishes a post-journalistic atmosphere where the semblance of reliability might take the place of veracity. In this respect, even the very concept of the truth as viewed by the law becomes uncertain and the issue of the liability cannot be decided without a reassessment of epistemological premises underlying media law.

The consequences of the same to the discourse of democracy are also dire. The AI systems, which are trained on large but disproportionate data sets, can replicate the biases of society and impact the social perception in hidden but extensive forms. Even though algorithmic curation can promote sensationalist content over factual faithfulness as scholars of computational communication have noted, it therefore undermines the trust of the social in long-established media organizations. (Corsi, 2024). As a result, the parties responsible in the case of AI-generated news resulting in reputation damage or social turmoil are not clear at first glance and it can be

either a coder who created an algorithm or a corporation that implemented it or a journalist who did not oversee it.

The legal systems of the world are finding it difficult to cope with such changes. Most countries, including the developing democracies like Pakistan, do not have clear laws on AI-generated content, whereas such legislative efforts have been made in other jurisdictions such as the European Union, including the AI Act 2024. The current laws regarding defamation, intellectual property or cybercrime assume the presence of a human author who can have intent. However, AI is a non-sentient agent that produces something in a likely manner, thus, avoiding the standard legal types (Act, 2024). The gap between technology and existing legal regulations creates a personal space of liability, which jeopardizes journalistic integrity as well as the rights of the individual.

Alongside legislation and policy, the philosophical issue of possessing the truth obtains a new meaning. In traditional journalism truth is created by way of verification, editorial judgment and ethical responsibility actions that cannot be separated by human agency. In journalism AI, the truth is a product of computation based on the correlation of data and not moral consideration. This change forces one to re-evaluate the normative underpinnings of journalism, as well as law. When machines have the ability to produce the appearance of truth without knowing it, then the new standards of responsibility in the law should be based not on the intent but upon control, foresight and disclosure.

This paper is aimed at questioning these legal and ethical issues that are interwoven around AI-generated news. It will explore the way authorship and accountability ought to be conceived in cases where algorithms and not human beings, are the ones who generate journalistic material, whether existing legal tools are sufficient in terms of regulation of harm inflicted by such material and suggest a framework that would balance innovation and responsibility. This query is an attempt by the paper to provide answers to one of the focal questions that cuts across law, ethics and technology; Who owns the truth when it is written by a machine?

2: Conceptual Framework – Authorship, Truth and Algorithmic Agency

The artificial intelligence of writing and verifying information is a conceptual debate of authorship and truth, which confronts the long-held legal and philosophical beliefs regarding human creativity and responsibility. Conventionally, the author has been seen as the birthplace and the guarantee of truth and is ethically and legally responsible of what he or she says. Nonetheless, as the generative AI models gain momentum and are able to generate coherent and contextually responsive narratives, the connection between authorship and responsibility becomes farfetched. Who will be attributed as the author of a news story generated by an algorithm: the programmer, the news outlet using the model or the user who is providing prompts? And, when the story created by AI disseminates false information or slanders a person, who is the author of the resulting truth or lie?

Authorship is a concept traditionally based on an agent with conscious ability to will and make moral decisions. According to Lockean view, intellectual labor and moral proprietorship is inextricably connected with authorship (Smyth, 2023). However, according to the post-humanist thinkers, such anthropocentric definition falls apart in the age of algorithmic agency. The AI systems do not have any consciousness and do not have any meaning in the human sense; they work on the principle of pattern recognition and probability. Therefore, by laying the

blame of moral or legal accountability on them, one would be contradicting the major principles of jurisprudence (Gunkel, 2024). The idea of algorithmic agency: the ability of computational systems to perform actions in accordance with specific parameters defined by design requires the redefinition of accountability: responsibility is now decentralized to designers, users and institutional structures instead of being concentrated around a single figure, the author.

According to recent empirical research, humans tend to over-attribution intentionality to AI outputs and interpret machine-generated text as having human intentionality. In 2024, communications scholars have also noted that readers will consider AI-generated news more credible when it has an appearance of being humanlike and stylistically coherent; what they refer to as the illusion of authenticity (Wasdahl, 2024). This misconception makes it hard to comprehend the truth in the public since the audiences can view algorithmic objectivity with reference to biased underlying data or prompts. In such a way, the epistemic trust traditionally vested in human journalists, based on professional ethics and verifiable sourcing, is vested on systems, which have neither ethical consciousness nor a system of checks and balances.

Simultaneously, media epistemologists have also discovered the appearance of synthetic truth to be a new form of truth that is produced through algorithmic synthesis and not through empirical validation (Wasdahl, 2024). In contrast to the traditional journalistic truth, which is based on triangulation and cross-checking of the facts, synthetic truth is generated in the form of aggregation and probabilistic recombination of the existing textual information. This kind of truth is not entirely false and not entirely actual, but it is in an intermediate position between representation and simulation. It, therefore, disrupts the epistemological base that defamation, intellectual property and media regulation have been traditionally running on. The binary of true versus false statements in the law will find it difficult to fit this range of synthetic veracity.

More so, the concept of distributed authorship (which was borrowed by the actor-network theory) provides a conceptual framework to explain that the agency of AI-generated journalism is distributed among several actors: coders, datasets, institutions and users (Thäsler-Kordonouri & Koliska, 2025). As per this understanding, an AI system is not a single author but a distributed assembly, in which responsibility is distributed. The sociotechnical corpus, which has been transformed by legal theorists, has been leading to proposals of shared liability regime, which is based on the fact that no one actor has complete control over AI outputs. These models are similar to joint liability as per law of Torts, under which responsibility can be shared in a proportionate way amongst several people who have contributed to damage.

Assuming normative perspective, this dispersion of authorship and agency is problematic to the customary congruence between authorship, ownership and responsibility. In case AI systems are not moral agents, the responsibility of their outputs should be based on the principle of control: the designers, implementers or commercial users of the systems should take the responsibility in proportion to their ability to impact the outcomes. The given principle is especially consistent with new theories in AI ethics concerning human control and openness more than the moral intent attribution to the machines. The legislation should then go beyond the anthropocentric presumptions of authorship and contrive hybrid doctrines of algorithmic accountability-regimes that appreciates human and systemic roles in AI-generated content.

Overall, the theoretical framework of the research on AI-generated journalism should incorporate three dimensions that are interdependent. First, it has to recognize the fact that authorship is not a solitary action but a shared process enclosed within technical and institutional systems. Second, it needs to replicate the meaning of truth without it being an ontological given but rather a construction that is mediated by algorithms which are used to simulate coherence without understanding. Third, it needs to redefine accountability based on control and foreseeability instead of intent and thus redefine legal and ethical responsibility to the algorithms production realities. It is only through this multidimensional conception that law and ethics are able to answer the question that lies at the center of this question; when machines make meaning who is the owner of the truth?

3: Legal Dimensions – Defamation, Copyright and Accountability

The spread of AI-based news material reveals deep legal uncertainties about authorship, liability and redress. The legal frameworks of most countries are still based on anthropocentric concepts of agency, presupposing that the creator or the publishers of information has an intent, understanding and foreseeability. However, generative artificial intelligence, by defaulting such assumptions, generates speech without human involvement and occasionally with historical inaccuracy or slander. This part of the paper examines three main legal issues that are related to AI-generated journalism: defamation and reputational damage, copyright and authorship and the wider context of responsibility within the current legal principles.

1. Defamation and the Problem of Fault

The defamation law is based on the supposition of a human element who can commit a wrong, through negligence or malice. However, the advent of AI-created journalism raises an urgent doctrinal question “may a non-sentient algorithm be sued on grounds of defamation?” Conventional legal aspects of such as publication, falsity, referencing a recognizable person and fault are hard to enforce where a machine produces statements in a probabilistic manner and without human intent. It has been observed by scholars that AI can not have mens rea, but its developers and users could still be responsible in case some harm is caused by the predictable outputs of the algorithm (Perritt Jr, 2023).

The following are the recent cases that depict this new frontier. In Georgia, in 2024, a suit against developers of a generative model was filed in a defamation lawsuit under the jurisdiction of the OpenAI court, leading to criminal charges against one of the journalists involved. Even though the court did not find direct liability of the AI, it emphasized that developers have a duty to eliminate foreseeable harms by training models and ensuring content moderation (Mony Jalajadevi, 2024). This argument is consistent with liabilities of the products: assuming that the AI is a malfunctioning product that produces detrimental results, the liabilities can be considered to lie with the producer or the user.

Two approaches have been suggested by the scholars. The former is the strict publisher liability according to which the media organizations that use AI systems bear the responsibility of all published materials irrespective of the intent and failure (Modi et al., n.d.). Such a model resembles the vicarious liability doctrines, which understand that the dissemination is controlled by the publishers, although the expressive part is carried out by algorithms. The second is shared liability, which involves sharing the responsibility between the AI developer,

platform host and the end use (Henderson et al., 2023). The use of this method is indicative of the collaborative and distributed quality of algorithmic authorship without the loss of the deterrent quality of legal responsibility. A similar predicament occurs within intermediary liability regimes. In the jurisdictions of the influence on the United States of Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act, online platforms are immunized against the content published by users (Wampler, 2024). Nonetheless, AI-generated news puts this principle in jeopardy due to the active creation of news, rather than active hosting of information, on the platform. European legal work on limiting such immunities has been driven by the Digital Services Act and AI Act of 2024, requiring that the platforms that use generative models have a duty of care (Nikolinakos, 2024). This change has been an indication of a growing consensus; algorithmic outputs may not be treated by a legal system as neutral intermediations.

2. Copyright and Authorship

The idea of AI-generated news also questions the very premise of the copyright law, that the right to protection is granted to the work of human creativity. The main question lies in the fact that an AI-generated text is a work in the sense of originality and what is the author of this work? In the majority of copyright laws, such as the Berne Convention and legislation in the national law of a given country, authorship assumes human intellectual labor. AI generated content is a grey area between automation and creativity with an algorithm based process of its production (Fenwick & Jurcys, 2023).

In 2023, the United States Copyright Office stated that AI-generated works were not authored by humans and as such, did not qualify for protection under copyright (Ramos-Zaga, 2025). owever, those who support a hybrid authorship model, whereby the person who has the creative control over the input and output is considered the owner has condemned this standpoint. The scholars of media-law also note that AI in journalism can be highly anthropomorphic, by ways of prompt-engineering, editorial-selection and fact-checking, which can meet originality criteria (Kuai, 2024). This subtle reading keeps with the global trends: the United Kingdom Copyright, Designs and Patents Act already transfer the authorship to the individual, by whom the arrangements required to create the work are made, which can be applied to the works supported by AI.

The copyright issue surrounding AI-generated journalism, in this case, tends to be based on the training period and not the work. Generative models are typically learned using large amounts of copyrighted text and news collections, in some cases without permission. In New York Times v. In the case, the plaintiffs, OpenAI and Microsoft (filed 2024), alleged that it committed extensively copyrighted news article ingestion to generate generative systems (Desai & Riedl, 2024). The consequences of such scenarios will play an important role on determining the scope of legal AI training and derivative utilization. In case of the media companies, the unresolved copyright issues can be both in legal and economic terms: even as AI can save money, it can also potentially put publishers at risk of being sued again on the infringement case.

3. Accountability and Regulatory Innovation

The hardest legal issue to grapple with is how to hold a person responsible when AI-driven journalism is taken to its detriment. Considering that AI systems are not intentional and also are not considered legal persons, responsibility has to be assigned to people or organizations. However, there are only partial solutions to existing

liability doctrines, which are based on negligence, product liability or vicarious responsibility. Researchers have begun to support algorithmic accountability systems, which combine transparency, audits and human control as conditions to the legal use of AI in news media (Okonkwo & Okonkwo, 2024).

One such move in this direction is the AI Act (2024) of the European Union, which introduces progressive obligations according to the risk levels. According to this Act, AI systems that produce content that faces the public are categorized as high-risk and need to be supervised by humans, have traceability and documentation of decision-making activity (Caruana & Borg, 2025a). Equally, the Digital Integrity Bill (2025) in Australia proposes a dualist approach of accountability, giving developers and deployers the same responsibilities in cases of misleading or malevolent communication through the algorithm (Stephens et al., n.d.). Such legislative innovations imply a change in focus towards reactive liability, that is, punishing harm after it is caused, to choose preventive governance by transparency and design accountability.

There can be no explicit regulation, but the common law principles of the duty of care and foreseeability may inform the reasoning of the judges. The courts can compare the use of AI to the undertakings that are inherent to be dangerous and place an extra responsibility on the beneficiaries of the automation. Simultaneously, contributory negligence theories can reduce the responsibility of the actors that make reasonable efforts to confirm the AI-generated material before publication. The legal course here of action is thereby shifted to the collective responsibility- a realization that in the algorithmic journalism, several actors jointly own the truth and that both must be responsible in a commensurate proportion.

4: Ownership and Intellectual Property Issues

The ownership debate in AI-generated journalism is at the cross-section between the intellectual property (IP) law and media ethics and the new concept of algorithmic authorship. Ownership means not merely the authority to regulate and receive commercial gain off of creative work but to presuppose liability to its effects. These rights and obligations cannot be separated in the human-based systems of law: ownership is created by authorship and liability is the result of ownership. Generative artificial intelligence, however, interferes with this correspondence. An AI system that generates news content on its own raises the question of the ownership or who should own the subsequent-generated truth, in a highly contentious battle of legal and philosophical arguments.

1. The Collapse of Traditional Authorship

The concept of authorship as a product of human intellectual work and creativity is based on intellectual property regimes. “The concept of authorship can only be applied to natural persons, as the Berne Convention of 1886 and its amendments thereafter, have established a reinforced nexus between creative performance and human agency” (Onwudiegwu, 2024). However, the introduction of AI-generated journalism cuts off this human touch to the product with a sharp blade. Generative models are generated by computer by using computational pattern recognition and probability distributions, as opposed to human thought and intentionally. This has been appropriately described by legal scholars as the so-called collapse of authorship in which creativity itself has become a property of the mechanism and no longer its producer (Tully, 2024).

This creates serious naivete to the ownership of copyright in the practical aspect. When the article created by the AI does not have a human author, is it a work that can be protected? The U. S. Copyright Office has decided against it, claiming that works created independently by a machine are out of the protection of copyright. However, such exclusion creates a paradox on media organizations that are dependent on AI: they are not able to follow a claim to their record of AI-generated outputs and relinquish that content to the general pool of media. Thus, the incentive structures which are the building blocks of journalistic production are eroded, compromising economic protection and editorial control.

2. Theories of Derivative and Hybrid Ownership

In order to fill this gap, some jurisdictions and researchers suggest hybrid authorship models which consider human-AI cooperation not a duality, but a continuum. In such systems, they give property rights to the person whose creative act of significance is in the AI process, prompt design, selection or editorial curation (Nuotio, 2024). This would be in compliance with the UK Copyright, Designs and Patents act 1988 which vests authorship to the individual who by whom interest is taken in the arrangements which are required to bring the creation of a work about. The hybrid model, although not a perfect one, presents a realistic solution between the human and algorithmic creativity in the end.

Another theory that is currently emerging is the one called derivative authorship, which somewhat perceives AI outputs as the secondary works based on already existing information that is used to train the models (Brauneis, 2024). The concept redefines the concept of ownership because of the rights and permissions of ownership of the training data, rather than the creativity of the AI. News summaries or reports generated by AI as done by media organizations would therefore have a derivative right, as long as the data sources on which they are based have been obtained in a legal manner. But, the chain of legal ownership is broken when the data used in the training contains copied materials, found without permission and in this case, it might be scraped news archives. An example of this dilemma is an OpenAI litigation, in which court claimants argue that generative systems copy the style and structure of copyrighted journalism in the name of machine learning. (T. Chen, 2025).

3. Data Ownership and Collective Rights

In addition to copyright, the AI-generated journalism presents the new problem of ownership of the data. To train a large language model, it needs large datasets lots of news articles, images and government documents whose copyright lies in thousands of web users. Uncharacteristic of that, other thinkers are in support of a collective rights paradigm, in which data creators (such as news outlets and journalists) continue to have corresponding interests in outputs based on their materials (Furendal, 2025). This model is inspired by the mechanisms of collective licensing in the field of music and broadcasting and imagines a similar framework on the basis of AI in the paradigm of data-royalties in the modern world. The result of this approach would be a fair compensation at the expense of remaining open to the technological breakthrough.

European Union has already made first steps towards this direction. According to Article 52 of the AI Act 2024, training data should not violate the copyright and data protection laws; hence, the IP compliance is introduced into the AI governance (Oppedal, 2024). In the meantime, the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) keeps discussing the proposals of data provenance registers to allow creators to track their input in the AI

systems (Aveni, 2024). All these are indicative of a global change toward combining the protection of intellectual property to the mechanisms of transparency and accountability in the process of algorithmic production.

4. Ethical Ownership and the Moral Right to Truth

The issue of AI-generated journalism as its possession spans the realm of economics to the ethical sphere. Researchers are more and more supporting a moral right to truth, which is the idea that the honesty and quality of content issued by journalistic organizations are a public good that outweigh proprietary interests (Миколайчук & Жуковська, 2025b) Within this framework, the possession of the AI-generated news is inseparable, accompanied by the responsibility to guarantee the AI-generated news is true and open. This is a replica of the moral rights doctrine of common copyright law which defends the reputation and the integrity of the work upon the author. When applied to AI, it implies that organizations that monetize automated journalism have a moral responsibility to keep a check on the use of algorithms and report this fact.

In this regard, the possession of truth is a legal and ethical construct. It requires the strike of the economic rationale of copyright against the social need to have correct information. A law system that allows misinformation to be privatized in the name of intellectual property would run the danger of losing the popular confidence. In this regard, the redefinition of ownership in the AI era would be required to include ethical and epistemic responsibility as a part of IP practices, as well.

The general content about AI-generated journalism throws sunlight on a bigger crisis of authorship and responsibility. The legal terms of work, author and owner also need to be redefined as algorithms take over the role of humans who have traditionally been creators. The alternative of hybrid and derivative models are transitional, but reform will last long before three principles of legal clarity, equitable compensation and moral obligations to truth can be reconciled. In the age of AI, ownership cannot be narrowed down to economic entitlement; instead, it has to be a collective agreement to act responsibly in authorship in the age when urbanization of the machine, rather than the human, becomes more and more a reality of writing the world.

5: Ethical and Policy Challenges – Transparency and Truth in the Age of AI Journalism

The ethical and policy issues associated with AI-generated journalism can be explained by the conflict between accountability and innovation. On the one hand, the potential of artificial intelligence is transformative: increased efficiency, customized reporting and information-based insights can democratize the information space. Conversely, the inscrutability of the algorithm systems, ability to construct seeming falsehood and lack of connection with human moral judgments will compromise the integrity and trustworthiness of journalism. The initial ethical dilemma is that it is not only a technological problem but rather an epistemic and normative one, how should societies be able to trust information generated by AI-based news to be both true, transparent and accountable, as long as there is no human conscience to enforce that?

1. Transparency and the Problem of Algorithmic Opacity

Journalistic ethics involves transparency; but artificial-intelligence technologies often follow procedural designs that even hinder even their developers from explaining how they work. The decision-making process of the large language models (LLM) is inscrutable because the choice is performed by probabilistic patterning instead of logical reasoning. This black-boxity undermines the legal principle of foreseeability, as well as the accountability

of the people (Dierickx, 2023). Thus, according to Wardle and Diakopoulos, AI-generated journalism should accordingly assume the so-called explainable architectures, which allow users and regulators to follow the epistemic ancestry of news material, i.e., the way news content is created based on data input and all the way to the end product (Eldridge et al., 2025).

Increasing numbers of researchers are advocating algorithmic transparency legislation stipulated to food-labeling, which would require producers of journalism to disclose the AI tools and datasets used in their operations (Dragomir-Constantin, 2025). This will allow the readers to judge credibility and allow the regulators to audit systems to check bias or misinformation. However, the transparency will not guarantee the truth, the fact that we know how an algorithm works does not mean it provides the right reports. To that effect, transparency should be aligned with the human editorial protection and definite accountability criteria.

2. Deepfakes, Misinformation and Ethical Responsibility

Generative AI is a problem that contributes to the crisis of misinformation across the globe. Awkward images, voices and even stories can be generated using the same technologies that generate legitimate news a phenomenon that deepfakes epitomize (Nasiri & Hashemzadeh, 2025). Once such a situation arises and synthetic media are indistinguishable with reality, the ethical lines of journalism are porous. Researchers have already sounded an alarm based on the precaution that disinformation scenarios caused by deepfaking undermine civil society by saturating consumers with false synonyms, thus causing an unpleasant epistemic exhaustion that reduces the belief in truth (Coeckelbergh, 2023).

In that regard, ethical responsibility is not only accurate but includes media literacy and resilience. Reporting organizations should not just fact-check AI outputs but also inform the readers of the form and the potential dangers of synthetic data. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) has even recommended that states should include AI literacy in their civic education, as the agency recognises that an educated citizenry is pivotal in even normalizing democracy discourse (Ramos et al., 2024). Without these systemic reactions, the misinformation created by AI risks becoming culture normal due to the post-truth society where it does not matter whether the information is true or false.

3. Algorithmic Bias and the Ethics of Representation

The other ethical issue is related to algorithmic bias - systematic issues of distortion in data, which perpetuate social inequalities. The use of AI systems being trained over biased datasets in the past might reinforce stereotypes or movement of under-represented populations on the news (Nah et al., 2024). In the news world, it is played out through the biased choice of topics, the delegitimization of minorities and the adjourning of hegemonic narratives. The principles of ethical AI journalism thus require preemptive bias-reduction by a variety of data sets, fairness assessments and inclusivity.

Non-maleficence, which is to harm no one, is the principle that demands AI developers and media organizations test their models prior to release to locate differences in impacts. Recent policy frameworks such as the UNESCO Guidelines on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence (2024) also require fairness-by-design requirements on AI systems, which manipulate the opinion of the widest audience (Li et al., 2025). The addition of these requirements to national regulations of media could help to make sure that the production of the news on an

algorithm basis does not contradict the wider human-rights provisions, especially the right to dignity and equality.

4. Policy Challenges: Governance, Accountability and Global Disparities

On a policy level, controlling AI journalism would require strike a balance between the innovation and safeguarding democratic principles. Established jurisdictions like the European Union and Canada have come up with the initial frameworks that focus on risk evaluation, auditorability and human control. According to the EU Artificial Intelligence Act (2024), the generative systems that are relevant to media fall under the high-risk category, where such systems must be highly documented and monitored in real-time (Caruana & Borg, 2025b). Developing countries such as Pakistan or Kenya, however, do not have such an equivalent of regulation, which is why there is a risk of the so-called AI colonialism - local media shut down or effects relying on imported technologies, subject to foreign legal standards (Omotubora & Basu, 2024). The difference poses a threat of increasing the global epistemic inequalities as the ability to provide definition of truth will be monopolized by technologically superior actors.

An effective policy reaction should then be multilayered. To start with, the national frameworks are to set clear standards of AI disclosure, data provenance and human editorial responsibility. Second, global collaborations are necessary to avoid arbitrage in different regulations and jurisdictions. Lastly, recognizable standards in the trustful AI-generated journalism, like the eco-labels or fair-trade labels, may also be introduced with ethical certification systems, thus making consumers more accountable.

5. The Ethics of Truth and the Future of Journalism

Beneath these issues of law and policy is an older philosophical question: What is the truth of the era of algorithmic mediation? According to traditional journalism, truth refers to the fact that can be aligned to reality, which can be proved by using the human judgment. However, AI produces truth in a statistical way and this is based on addition and not evidence. It is a deep-rooted difference ethically. In truth being a probabilistic construct, journalism ethics have to shift away from fidelity to fact to fidelity to transparency that requires the process of forming truth to be transparent, verifiable and accountable.

Ethical theorists are starting to support a human-in-the-loop approach where AI is an augmentative device but not an author on its own (X. Chen et al., 2023). These models maintain human responsibility and use the analytic abilities of AI. Finally, ethical validity of AI journalism not only is related to the accuracy of machines but also to the integrity of human institutions which control it. When journalism is to be one of the pillars of democratic society, it needs to incorporate AI innovation in an ethical framework wired more to be open, responsible and human-centered.

6: Conclusion

The advent of AI-based journalism is one of the primary reconfigurations of the truth-making, its performance and its regulation. Throughout the analysis above it is clear that the technology is just a part of the transformation as it is really questioning the framework of epistemic, legal and moral premises that journalism had been resting on over a long period of time. The classical authorship, ownership and accountability have fragmented in an age where machines are now able to exercise some form of probabilistic argument as a

simulation of truth. This question, "Who owns the truth?', is no longer just a rhetorical question, but a desperate question about how societies will be able to maintain the principles of integrity, responsibility and credibility in a world that is growing more synthetic in terms of communication.

The use of AI in the news-making process has disaggregated the traditional singleness of authorship. Instead, now the journalist, now the human caretaker of the truth, is in solid creative and ethical space with algorithms, which do not understand the truth or are held accountable of deceiving. According to this new order, where the truth is a computational construct, it is efficient, scalable, but epistemically weak. This disconnection with creation and its conception of man makes journalism moral nihil and the search of truth has become a matter of statistics. The dilemma is not simply a matter of legal provisions but also much more philosophical: what to do to restore moral responsibility when even authorship is shared between the human intention and the algorithmic automation.

On the legal aspect, the currently established frameworks (based on human agency) do not cope with this change. One of the weaknesses of defamation law is the inability to have a conscious speaker and the inability of copyright to align with algorithmic authorship. Still, it is the same disruptions that provide new ways of redefining responsibility. Media control should cease to be about blame and beginning to contain; it now needs to be proactive control. The concept of the responsibility in the era of AI journalism needs to be redefined as a collective and structural responsibility of the developers, publishers and regulators. Law can only maintain a balance between innovation and justice by introducing transparency and human control in these systems.

A patient of AI-generated news requires a reassertion of the place of human judgment in the center of journalistic practice. The emergence of deepfakes, hallucinations and synthetic truth is an important indicator that the power of technology will not be able to substitute moral judgment. Human supervision of the automated systems will be the integrity of journalism the editors, the fact-checkers and the ethicists who serve as the conscience of the automated systems. Such human-in-the-loop model is not the limitation of the progress but one of its conditions, as fundamental to make sure that the escalation of information does not occur through the sacrifice of credibility.

The way forward at the policy level is to find the balance between innovation and accountability. The governments and media organizations should come up with enforceable disclosure, explainability and fairness standards in news generation using AI. It is necessary that international cooperation takes place to avoid informational asymmetry between the technologically developed areas and the developing ones. Unless this is actively regulated, global discourse would become dominated by a few actors dictating the algorithms that dictate what is seen, what is known and what is believed.

Finally, the concept of possessing the truth goes far beyond the aspects of the law and technology; it is an ethical and civil necessity. The truth may not be privatized or turned into intellectual property and also may not be turned over to machines full time. It is still a collective social phenomenon and it has to be managed and maintained by human actors organizations and societies. The future of journalism lies, therefore, in re-inventing humanity in technology; sustaining the principles of accuracy, transparency and accountability amid

automation. That way, societies will be able to see to it that even within the era of artificial intelligence, the truth will not be an artificially generated mediocre but a social endeavor by people.

References

Act, E. A. I. (2024). The eu artificial intelligence act. *European Union*.
Aveni, A. (2024). The 10th wipo conversation on intellectual property (IP) and frontier technologies. *Revista Coleta Científica*, *8*(16), e16172–e16172.
Brauneis, R. (2024). Copyright and the training of human authors and generative machines. *Colum. JL & Arts*, *48*, 1.
Caruana, M. M., & Borg, R. M. (2025a). Regulating Artificial Intelligence in the European Union. *The EU Internal Market in the Next Decade–Quo Vadis?*, 108.
Caruana, M. M., & Borg, R. M. (2025b). Regulating Artificial Intelligence in the European Union. *The EU Internal Market in the Next Decade–Quo Vadis?*, 108.
Chen, T. (2025). Language Models' Verbatim Copying: Copyright Infringement Analysis through the Lens of the New York Times Co. V. Microsoft Corp., OpenAI, Inc. Et al. *Cardozo Arts & Ent. LJ*, *43*, 349.
Chen, X., Wang, X., & Qu, Y. (2023). Constructing ethical AI based on the "Human-in-the-Loop" system. *Systems*, *11*(11), 548.
Coeckelbergh, M. (2023). Democracy, epistemic agency and AI: political epistemology in times of artificial intelligence. *AI and Ethics*, *3*(4), 1341–1350.
Corsi, G. (2024). Evaluating Twitter's algorithmic amplification of low-credibility content: An observational study. *EPJ Data Science*, *13*(1), 1–15.
Desai, D. R., & Riedl, M. (2024). Between copyright and computer science: The law and ethics of generative al. *Nw. J. Tech. & Intell. Prop.*, *22*, 55.
Dierickx, L. (2023). News automation, materialities and the remix of an editorial process. *Journalism*, *24*(3), 654–670.
Dragomir-Constantin, F.-L. (2025). Algorithmic Transparency in Information Systems: A Legal Necessity for the Protection of Fundamental Rights. *Acta Universitatis Danubius. Juridica*, *21*(1), 126–136.
Eldridge, S. A., Cheruiyot, D. K., Banjac, S., & Swart, J. (2025). *The Routledge companion to digital journalism studies*. Routledge.
Fenwick, M., & Jurcys, P. (2023). Originality and the Future of Copyright in an Age of Generative AI. *Computer Law & Security Review*, *51*, 105892.
Furendal, M. (2025). Collective ownership of AI. *A Companion to Applied Philosophy of AI*, 372–386.
Gunkel, D. J. (2024). The rights of robots. In *Non-Human Rights* (pp. 66–87). Edward Elgar Publishing.
Henderson, P., Hashimoto, T., & Lemley, M. (2023). Where's the liability in harmful AI speech? *J. Free Speech L.*, *3*, 589.
Kuai, J. (2024). Unravelling copyright dilemma of AI-generated news and its implications for the institution of journalism: The cases of US, EU and China. *New Media & Society*, *26*(9), 5150–5168.

Li, Y., Tolosa, L., Rivas-Echeverria, F., & Marquez, R. (2025). *Integrating AI in education: Navigating UNESCO global guidelines, emerging trends and its intersection with sustainable development goals*.
Modi, M. R., Malik, R., Lakhan, P., Mishra, M. S., Tilat, M. S., & Gupta, R. (n.d.). *Corporate Defamation in The Digital Era: Legal Protections for Businesses*.
Mony Jalajadevi, I. (2024). *Algorithmic content moderation and International Criminal Law: Liability assessment of social media platform operators using AI systems-based content moderation under International Criminal Law*.
Nah, S., Luo, J., Kim, S., Chen, M., Mitson, R., & Joo, J. (2024). Algorithmic Bias or Algorithmic Reconstruction? A Comparative Analysis Between AI News and Human News. *International Journal of Communication*, *18*.
Nasiri, S., & Hashemzadeh, A. (2025). The Evolution of Disinformation from Fake News Propaganda to AI-driven Narratives as Deepfake. *Journal of Cyberspace Studies*, *9*(1), 229–250.
Nikolinakos, N. T. (2024). Reforming the EU Civil Liability Framework Applicable to Artificial Intelligence and Other Emerging Digital Technologies: Defective Products—The Revised Product Liability Directive. In *Adapting the EU Civil Liability Regime to the Digital Age: Artificial Intelligence, Robotics and Other Emerging Technologies* (pp. 477–621). Springer.
Nuotio, M. (2024). *The impact of generative AI technologies in journalistic processes on organizational performance: A human-in-the-loop approach*.
Okonkwo, P., & Okonkwo, R. N. (2024). *Digital Media Ethics in Generative AI Journalism: A Framework for Accountability*.
Omotubora, A., & Basu, S. (2024). Decoding and reimagining AI governance beyond colonial shadows. In *Handbook on Public Policy and Artificial Intelligence* (pp. 220–234). Edward Elgar Publishing.
Onwudiegwu, O. A. (2024). *A CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF THE INNOVATIONS UNDER THE COPYRIGHT ACT OF 2022*.
Oppedal, N. M. (2024). *Balancing Innovation and Copyrights: The Legal Framework for AI Training in the European Union*.
Perritt Jr, H. H. (2023). Robot Regulations. *SCL Rev.*, *75*, 219.
Ramos, G., Lamm, E., Cantero, M., Bosoer, L., Ausín, T., & Alarcón, N. G. (2024). *Published in 2024 by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 7, Place de Fontenoy, 75352 Paris 07 SP, France and the UNESCO Regional Office in Montevideo, Luis Piera 1992, 2nd floor, 11200 Montevideo, Uruguay and The Latin American Council of Social Sciences (CLACSO). MTD/SHS/2024/PI/01-REV.© UNESCO 2024*. MTD/SHS/2024/PI/01-REV.© UNESCO.
Ramos-Zaga, F. A. (2025). Reconceptualizing Human Authorship in the Age of Generative AI: A Normative Framework for Copyright Thresholds. *Laws*, *14*(6), 84.
Shao, A. (2025). *Beyond Misinformation: Understanding AI Hallucinations in Science Communication*. The University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Smyth, O. (2023). From John Locke's Essay Concerning Human Undersanding to the Novels of Daniel Defoe: Enquiries into the Mind as Permeable Spirit. *Restoration: Studies in English Literary Culture, 1660-1700*, *47*(2), 85–113.
Stephens, D., Stubbs, M., & White, S. (n.d.). *Digital Resilience*.
Thäsler-Kordonouri, S., & Koliska, M. (2025). Journalistic Agency and Power in the Era of Artificial Intelligence. *Journalism Practice*, 1–20.
Tully, R. (2024). WHO OWNS ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE? *DS 131: Proceedings of the International Conference on Engineering and Product Design Education (E&PDE 2024)*, 545–550.
Wampler, J. (2024). Deep Concern: Safeguarding Elections in the Age of Deepfakes. *Ariz. L. Rev.*, *66*, 815.
Wasdahl, A. (2024). Machine Credibility: How News Readers Evaluate Ai-generated Content. *InterActions: UCLA Journal of Education and Information Studies*, *19*(1).
Миколайчук, В. Р., & Жуковська, А. Д. (2025a). ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN JOURNALISM: BALANCING INNOVATION AND ETHICAL RESPONSIBILITY. *Культура, Інформація, Комунікація: Міждисциплінарний Діалог: Матеріали Всеукр. Наук.*, 150.
Миколайчук, В. Р., & Жуковська, А. Д. (2025b). ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN JOURNALISM: BALANCING INNOVATION AND ETHICAL RESPONSIBILITY. *Культура, Інформація, Комунікація: Міждисциплінарний Діалог: Матеріали Всеукр. Наук.*, 150.