Zanc Laura

As it has already been mentioned, the AI Copyright has sparked a lot of debates. In this comment, I will present how how the Artificial Intellignece is affecting the average person, but also how it's affecting artists. Furthermore, beside addressing the main topics, I will also answer some of the presented questions.

First of all, the 4 main issues in regards to AI Copyright have been successfully identitified. However, I would also want to suggest a few more issues that might or might not have been hinted at trough certain questions. One issue that should also be taken into consideration is the use of AI with malicious intent, such as **the creation of pornographic content of minors or women**. One such case that has happened recently is the case of the Spanish girls, whose photos of themselves (fully-clothed) have been run through an AI program that managed to create realistic naked photos of those minors. The mothers of the victims have raised the issue of these photos being uploaded on pornographic sites, but also how these photos were used to blackmail the victims (extortion of money in exchange of not releasing the AI nude photos of the victims). The original photos of the girls are usually taken from their own social media account. This clearly points out how the free reign of AI programs over data sets from every part of the internet is extremely problematic and unethical. Actually, the concept of anybody being able to create AI programs and any AI programs being released to the public with zero regulation, such as AI programs that make nudes, clearly constitutes a grave problem that **needs** to be addressed.

(links for the Spanish girls case: https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-66877718 https://edition.cnn.com/2023/09/20/europe/spain-deepfake-images-investigation-scli-intl/index.html)

Another issue worth mentioning is how the AI content is contributing to the deep fakes and the misinformation that currently takes place on the internet or media. Not only could AI content be used against a person (creating fake pictures, using an AI with the voice of said person etc.), but it can also be used to sway the public opinion, especially on current world conflicts or in regards to social or political issues. The scope and the use of an AI should also be taken into consideration.

More than that, the creation of fictional people, especially fictional women, who seem to be objectified could also potentially negatively affect young girls mental health. The same can be said about young boys. As a psychology student, I consider that the mental health aspect of creating unrealistic fake humans with AI should also be taken into account.

In regards to the posed questions here are my answers:

From the *General Questions* section:

1. As it stands right now, this new technology is causing more harm than good. However, there could be certain benefits is such systems were used as an aid instead of a replacement. Such benefits would be, in the case of artists, using AI generated images for inspiration. Certainly, AI could be used to speed up some processes in regards to other fields. On the other hand, as I've already mentioned, AI can be used in malicious ways and it also uses copyrighted content (many

times copyrighted content from artists) to create and **sell** products or AI "art". Clearly, the aspect of replacing the jobs of people will have a negative effect on the population. While this might seem beneficial for corporations, we have to consider the economical or financial aspect of such action. If an AI could be used to replace an entry-level job, this might be an obstacle for students to be able to enter the working field. The same issue can be addressed in regards to people from disadvantaged backgrounds. If even a professional (someone with higher education and experience) could be replaced by an AI program, then the standards of a job might raise even higher, which will only widen the gap between those who were able to obtain such job and those who had limited resources and because of that are being excluded from such opportunities.

2. As an artist myself, I can confidently say that the use of AI has definitely had a lot of negative impact on me and many other artists. One of the issues is how such AI generated content can create an illustration much faster than the average artist. This also affects the commissions some artists take, as the AI users can gain far more easily an audience and clients. More than that, the obvious issue is how AI programs wouldn't be able to create anything if it wasn't for the current artist's work. It has become clear that these programs are using copyrighted artwork to generate their desired result. More than that, certain people have even used the program to create a very similar artstyle as certain artists (such was the case of a well-known artist, SamDoesArt). While it's true that an artstyle can't be copyrighted, such strange similarity could potentially harm the original artist as it could step into identity theft (pretending to be said artist).

3. Here I present links to certain studies that I've found to be relevant to our current issues:
   - https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/SHR-01-2021-0003/full/html
   - https://dl.acm.org/doi/abs/10.1145/3600211.3604681
   - https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-030-35746-7_3
   - https://dl.acm.org/doi/abs/10.1145/3531146.3533779
   - https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1071581922001744?via%3Dihub

From the *Transparency and Recordkeeping* section:

15. Yes, both the developers and of AI models and creators of datasets should have the obligation to collect, retain, and disclose records regarding the materials used to train their models.

From the *Copyrightability* section:

18. A person being able to chose what images go into the AI program and and being able to use prompts shouldn't be considered enough proof to claim authorship over the output. The process of creation have always meant a direct input and a level of skill and creativity from the person creating. Graphic designers, while they might use free or paid fonts, icons or vector art not created by them, they still directly interact with the material to create something new. To make a graphic design, one still needs knowledge (for example color theory, composition, how to use the program, etc.), skills and creativity. The same cannot be said about an AI user. For example, the following description "blond cute

anime girl in pink dress" is fairly vague. If an artist is asked to draw such a model, one could clearly see, not only the level of knowledge, skill and creativity, but also clear intent. Meanwhile, the same prompt being given to an AI program, while it might create the said image in a certain way, it does not represent clear intent. The image might be aesthetically pleasing, but it might not make sense even from an artistic point of view. That alone, proves that what was created is substantially made by a machine and not a human. The human, nor the program can go through the **process** of creation, unlike artists, whose artwork go through different art stages (in other words, it is a ***fully controlled*** process). An AI user, does not go through the same actions that a digital artist does to create said artwork. If a painter doesn't paint, how could it be called a painter? The same logic should apply to the AI generated images and the AI users.

20. While there might be a certain group of people who would want to be able to legally profit off of AI generated work, I can say firmly that I'm against such a policy and I belive I'm not the only one with such stance. If an AI work is not human made, how could it even be protected by copyright laws? This would mean that the AI content would be recognized as human work (which it isn't). To protect AI generated content would contradict the copyright protection of human made, original work. That would directly harm people such as artists and not only.

From the *Labeling or Identification* section:

28. Yes, it should be mandatory that the AI work is labeled as such.