Matthew Butterick is leading a wave of lawsuits against major AI firms, from OpenAI to Meta. Win or lose, his work will shape the future of human creativity.

https://www.wired.com/story/matthew-butterick-ai-copyright-lawsuits-openai-meta/

Dear Federal Register Reader c/o The United States Copyright Office,

I submit this statement letter as public input record for recommended policy on public copyright for artificial intelligence.

The above source is the practice of civil legal restraint against the State's presumption of ownership in an AI duplicate or 'digital twinning' artifice of a person's name, image, likeness or creation.

The US citizen owns themselves. AI derived identity shall not be a presumptive body of work to be used, propagated, named as owned by the United States government or by any other International body, non-governmental organization, business or international governing entity.

This principle, which is and may be overlooked by selective and corrupt denial of applied and enforceable law, shall not change the facts of this. Business operations using generative AI production, involving the production of copycat identity, have the ability to generate an involuntary image capture of a citizen using public image psychometry or other myriad biometric attributes. This is not for single source use by any government contract or by any lone technical actor seeking to ownership of a person and their material estate via their generated attributes online. It conveys as a combination of unlawful impersonation, identity theft and in some cases, even human trafficking.

This includes but is not limited to the ability conduct monetary trade exchanges for resources. Personality and identity is not a matter of personal credit if you own the attributes. Therefore, the case is made strong to recognize a persons identity existential offline and the online identity is the counterfeit copy. The challenge to individual human rights is for a born-human person to continue to be recognized as 1) a legally integral person and 2) owned by no counterfeiting digital enterprise or federating actor using government enterprise to capture a reprise of the identified person and 3) the ability to issue legal arrest of any commandeered reputation manufactured by a third party.

The US government bears the enforcement burden to remediate grievance for a citizen's identity from counterfeiting schemes using AI by any foreign government. This includes but is not limited to: BRICS nation states coordinating social credit arcs to monetize or demonetize a US citizen, portrayals of their worth as a foreign State asset, trade of "twinned" people in VR/AR environments, persons transactioned as a unit of currency to domestic US banks and outlets based on derived profiles at social media websites, recombined with digital surveillance activity billed as 'research' both online and off.

While this certainly includes matters of privacy, the parameters of uncontrolled logistics around international data flows as a matter of hidden trade of identified people. AI made counterfeits might function the same as human trafficking by way of generative AI systems, using modular PRC chip technologies like NVIDIA twinning in AR environments. The PRC may try to claim a proxy title upon a US

born person while in an artificial environment containing their hardware, software or even their code based on their laws.

This is a live example of how generative AI would manifest as continued abuse of social credit monitoring and surveillance of US citizens as companies' virtual capital. It should be stopped as a practice. Congress should migrate the US technical economy away from a surveillance-based economy for the global Internet. The monetization model is just as much of a driver for surveillance basis in AI training as any other rule or engineering governance instruction made by a company or other actor. These brief remarks should aid the scope of the following recommendations for this agency.

The simple reforms for this agency is to make rules that establish clear and unfettered ways and means for a US citizen to issue personal enforcement of civil will onto global FAST enterprise systems or any evolving AI system who manufactures counterfeit likeness for monetary exchange denomination or bank value. Either for sale or as enterprise batched currency. If a law is recommended, the law should expressly prohibit a company from licensing a person's data and identity without first providing an express rate of exchange for the license and to formally register consent, through a personal financial brokerage, for any use and exchange of name, image, likeness and online "footprint" of data and the terms and conditions of use limits be set by the data owner.

This is not currently done. No US individual is granted knowledge of the rate of exchange by an appointed a personal broker who knows how their image representation is shared as commerce before an exchange. The lack of such structure creates a price fixed environment against private property and rights of self-owned persons.

Thank you for observing the interests of the identified person in the United States. Consumer-led prohibitions of the license of personal information via a FDIC broker would be a practical measure, if the basises of surveillance exchanges are still used with generative AI and AI aggregation. It also cuts the consumer in on a data economy that has been exploited while employing AI generation at online platforms. In Real Estate, the landlord creates the terms of the contract not the renter. The individual is the property owner. AI platform aggregators use tools and cultivate upon that property.

Thank you for considering my remarks in your policy making and rules. While I want mass surveillance capitalism to end indefinitely. However, there is no current legal enforcement for the platforms due to simple corruption and lack of political will, in most cases. If case law were enforced for consumer benefit, those aspects which are not viewed as illegal today would be met with certain enforcement. For the terms that are not unlawful, but remain in a regulatory grey area, I hope these remarks will help you establish moderating guidance.

Sincerely,

Sheila Dean