

Clementine C.  
Lakeside Middle School  
13510 1st Ave. NE  
Seattle, WA 98125

U.S. Copyright Office  
Library of Congress  
101 Independence Ave. S.E.  
Washington, D.C. 20559-6000

To whom it may concern:

My name is Clementine C. I am a student at Lakeside Middle School in Seattle, Washington, and we are studying copyright and artificial intelligence in my 7th grade class. We have looked at different examples and court rulings, and here is my final opinion.

First, I think that artists and authors with private websites or copyrighted work should be allowed to opt out of having their work used as a training platform for AI. Without the option to withdraw their work from AI's sources, their original work and styles could be copied or recreated, purposefully or unintentionally. To artists this is unfair, to have their hard work possibly be closely recreated with no benefit to them. I understand that this could hinder the AI's ability to learn from the widest variety of sources to have the most accurate outputs. When the cost (the artists' hard work or style being easily recreated by anyone with access to generative AI) is this high, however, I believe that artists and authors should be allowed to protect their work.

CNN did an article on this, in October 2022, with interviews with artists who are being affected by the new AI. For one of the interviews, Rachel Metz, who works for CNN, got onto zoom with artist Erin Hanson to look at some AI paintings in Hanson's style. Erin Hanson has a very defined style that took her a long time to perfect, that AI is recreating in seconds. When looking at the art that was created by AI, Hanson agreed that it did look like her paintings, and she might even use one in her home. This shows that it is not only possible for people to think that it could actually be an artist's true painting, even if it was done by AI, but also that some people might choose the AI's painting instead of a true one if it were close enough and cheaper. This is dangerous for the artists and could lead to a decline in business and less original human artwork.

Second, I believe that in the terms of AI art, the person who used the AI to create the image should be allowed to copyright the image, although not the prompt used. This is because although said person did not actually create the artwork, they did in fact use the available resources to create a new piece of artwork. However, if the prompt used was copyrighted by that person, there would be many more issues of accidentally used prompts, and a decrease in possible inputs. In addition, I also think that twenty percent of the reproduction value of the image, (that would usually go to the person that holds the patent), would instead go to the creators of the AI platform used to create the image.

In conclusion, I believe that artists and authors should be able to protect their work from artificial intelligence training and that AI-created images should be able to be copyrighted, but with firm restrictions.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my letter. I await your response and appreciate your dedication to addressing the evolving challenges in the realm of copyright.

Sincerely,

Clementine C.