

With all respects to the Copyright agency and affiliate sides, I propose my comment on legal regulation of AI.

I'm against AI being granted copyright rights on several bases.

One, it is being used to push those whose work was used as an „input material“ for the AI into much worse economic state. Prompts are used as signals to let the AI network know to target and copy the work of specific artists. These **signals** are an issue. AI generated images that include a **living person's name in the prompt list**, or whose work was trained on without royalties or license should not receive copyright protection. The person's whose work is being used has to compete in the same market against copies of themselves.

1.1 <https://twitter.com/GlynnTarrant/status/1698419169388110208>

1.2 <https://twitter.com/TrevyLimited/status/1685617421325885440>

1.3 <https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fi/679kc5re217p96hlv6a28/dfm2ulu-8e070991-8647-4c0e-aeb9-70e3cb99433c.jpg?rlkey=zpk0gpyxaqpw5jdfd9jop9ac&dl=0>

1.4 <https://twitter.com/TimberPuppers/status/1691957127345029369> .....

Two, AI generative images should not receive copyright protection because they are profiting off copyrighted work. The intent of using the copyrighted images is to generate new profits. At the same time, merely using AI generative software also comes with a price tag. Subscription for prompt generation goes above 40\$ for Midjourney alone. This is without any licensing involved. Profiteering & fast cash is taking place at a rapid pace-

2.1 <https://docs.midjourney.com/docs/plans>

2.2

<https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fi/3mqfnwzutnlytoa1jx3xj/profteering.jpg?rlkey=go938h6vkdxr37e29idzmjzua&dl=0>

2.3

<https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fi/52pmcuop3d3o5nphjq41v/ghjghjghj.jpg?rlkey=pxga9242zynm8orpi7cxsde40&dl=0>

2.4

<https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fi/0oxij84l1dr6mv6mv12zc/457g457g4567gzu.jpg?rlkey=j8ac6m1dl9xjx79qymydx7ow3&dl=0>

This is akin to a mass laundering of art. No transparency. No accountability, and sheltering of unfair practices.

Three, data collection for training this Image generative software is non-compliant. Those who are included in the process (and sometimes direct targets of it) have no say in it. Humans should have self autonomy and be able to choose if they want to participate in an enterprise. This should be a human right, and it should not be debatable. If you want to sell something- that decision should be up to you. Data used to train many AI image generative software is acquisitioned through force or by subterfuge, not by consensual agreement. This should be made clear and transparent in AI generative software.

3.1 <https://twitter.com/iriscompietart/status/1692444222517842094>

3.2 <https://pbs.twimg.com/media/F4xO2oYW0AASCH5?format=webp&name=small>

- 3.3 <https://www.dropbox.com/scl/fi/osrq89xzgmwu21z6j9vd9/dfm2um2-bd94aa30-8933-49cc-bda3-7e737b0418c8.jpg?rlkey=o59lmpc55ffqsrcey1wkgc6ao&dl=0>
- 3.4 [https://twitter.com/Kelly\\_McKernan/status/1667322946325557249](https://twitter.com/Kelly_McKernan/status/1667322946325557249)
- 3.5 <https://twitter.com/TrevyLimited/status/1680869798006214656>

Why does copyright exist in the first place? To incentivize and promote authors, through the provision of property rights, to create new work and pursue excellency. While Big tech talks about safety and responsibility, large companies are protecting themselves first at the expense of everyone else, without any checks on their power. Can big tech simply „strong arm“ the rules because it doesn't fit their profit expansion models? I support progress, but allowing certain actors to exploit labour using stolen resources is hardly it. If driving can have driving regulations, then so can AI. AI needs to have fair practices installed.

**Note: If provided links do not open by clicking on them, please copy and paste them into your browser.**