

William Lee

One of the key themes of this inquiry is to define the limitations of AI-systems' use of copyrighted material for training. To an extent, we are aware that AI-systems draw knowledge from an algorithm created by a human. Therefore, someone is responsible and liable for the illegal or malfeasance use of available data. It is an important distinction to make that, while the purpose of an AI-system might be to improve the quality of life, it is ultimately a tool to make profit. When a company is making profit out of their AI-system that was trained on the cumulative knowledge available through the World Wide Web and databases from consumers, then no one who uses an AI-generative program has the right to copyright the creation.

In some cases, the learning happens unsupervised, and has warranted controversial debate around who is responsible when the material mimics copyrighted materials or human-traits that are unique to the identities of users (voice, text, and experience). I am not fully aware the extent that companies protect themselves from lawsuits against them using my human-experience or content (that is not copyrighted) that was developed using their interface. I believe that no company should assume (or have in fine print) that because you use their product, they can use it to train their AI-systems. In Europe, people have the *right to be forgotten*. The European Data Protection Regulation regulates the right to have personal data deleted, on-demand from all databases they wish to disappear. There is an opportunity to improve federal policy through the regulation of the right to opt-out, as an owner of copyrighted material and as a person whose profile can be used for AI training. With the opportunity to add language and protections to the opt-out policy to be "forgotten from all databases they wish to disappear" then all creators of content, whether copyright or not, can have the security and legal protections against the illegal or malfeasance use of their creations.