Generative artificial intelligence has the potential to be one of the most powerful tools for the growth of human knowledge and the expression of human creativity since the printing press.

The core purpose of copyright law is to allow humans to learn from each other and grow the amount of knowledge and beauty in the world. Whatever copyright scheme is used to govern generative artificial intelligence should aim towards this same goal.

1. Generative artificial intelligence should be allowed to read and learn from existing public data. The core of knowledge is sharing, the more knowledge we share the more it grows. Copyright law already recognizes this by allowing for transformative works. Generative artificial intelligence transforms large amounts of raw public data into insights and meta-data. This meta-data is facts about the world and human conversations. Because they are facts, the meta-data is uncopyrightable. For those who wish to keep data private, this can be done through the existing system of EULA and NDAs. For these reasons, both philosophical and legal, generative artificial intelligence should be allowed to read and learn from copyrighted data.

2. Like all tools, the products of generative artificial intelligence begin and end in the mind of humans. If I want a picture of a cloudy field I must craft a prompt, I must command the system to create a set of images, I must sort through those images, and finally I must choose which of the images best suits my needs. The creative process is different but it is no less human. As to who owns this rights to this art, it should be the human (or legal person) that initiated the prompt and decided on the final product. Until a human finishes this process of choosing and "publishing" the work, it should be treated as a natural phenomena and is owned by no one.

3. If generative artificial intelligence is used by a person to create infringing works then the person should be treated the same as if they used more traditional methods to create it. If a user asks a generative artificial intelligence system for a love song and it generates "Justify My Love" by Madonna, the user should not be held liable so long as they do not choose to "publish" that song. If they download it and keep it, or put it on the internet as their own, then they should be treated the same as if they had recorded the song and distributed it.

I hope that this feedback is helpful in the review process. Generative artificial intelligence will be extremely important going forward and it is vital that we as a society not stifle this new invention. The United States of America has always been the home of technological innovation and it will remain so if we are able to ensure that we have a regulatory structure that is friendly to this emerging technology.

I hereby affirm that no part of this document was generated by artificial intelligence and was instead wholly created by a natural person.