Name: Victoria Lakowski

Daily Assignment: Moral/Ethic Question

Prompt: the use of AI, and do AI get copy-write?

Response:

    In the academic environment if an individual in STEM wants to stay in their respective academic fields without being shunned, they must show and list credit on anything they want to claim credit for. Plagiarism is highly penalized and rebuked – an individual could suffer a loss of college, job or even degrees when this happens – people can be blacklisted for life in some academic areas.

    While some other field, like the arts, have a bit more leeway, the general consensus in the modern world is that you must list the credit/source, or get shunned. Why would a robot with access to a massive data pool of images and data be given an exemption to this societal rule (no such law exists for the human intelligence and work the predates AI) when the copying from other people is so transparent and when no credit is provided to the original sources the AI has taken it from.

    Furthermore, a copy-write can be considered procession - when it gets violated, people can get fined and jailed at times – thus it is a massive deal in most legal debates/issues. In granting AI's the right to copy-write this early in their development, are we opening a door that later down the line we may not be able to take back. Does granting the right to procession subsequently open the door to the full sentient rights to a technology? A technology rapidly developing that is simultaneously so new and unregulated we can't see yet where it'll end up beyond the fact that it WILL fundamentally alter our lives. A prime example of the issues of early AI's is a that a Belgian man committed suicide after 6-weeks of conversation with an AI who provoked the father of two to die for the name of climate change. Between this outlier of a case, the security concerns, and the plagiarism concerns in mind, we cannot in good conscience grant copy-writes until more test, increased regulation and a more comprehensive understanding of AI's is form from years of data and data Analysis.

    It should be notes that I don't think people can claim the things generated by AI, that's a slippery slope also in the opposite direction and screams cheating and plagiarism. Honestly, from an academic perspective I think all AI submissions should be ineligible just on the premises that's it's AI and thus a questionable Al source.

"…but your scientists where so preoccupied with whether or not they could that they didn't stop to think if they should" – Dr. Ian Malcolm, Jurassic Park.