AI generated content has already introduced incorrect and often dangerous misinformation. The explicit aim of the text AI bots is to make content that is inseparable from real, accurate content. This often includes citations to data that doesn't exist, for information that is blatantly false. Additionally, AIs are often trained on scraped data, which can cause serious confusion when AI content claims to belong to a well-known and trusted individuals/orgs. This in turn leads to said individuals/orgs. reputation as a trustworthy source being harmed.

AI acts entirely on prejudice resulting in discriminatory practices such as in detecting fraud or deciding what loan applications to approve. In addition, the complete lack of care for accuracy by AI means that anything an AI creates would have to be verified in multiple ways, causing more work.

https://www.reuters.com/article/australia-tech-ai/feature-australian-robodebt-scandal-shows-the-risk-of-rule-by-algorithm-idUKL8N3340SN

Many countries have introduced the use of AI in their debt collection and fraud detection systems, resulting in discriminatory practices with many people falsely accused of owing nonexistent debts/committing fraud. Some victims of these AI systems committed suicide.

AI needs to be made illegal in any decision-making process as it is inherently discriminatory and biased. Any AI generated content should be required to be revealed as such, given the rampant inaccuracies. AI involvement in the arts should be heavily regulated with significant AI involvement preventing any copyrights.

AI models tend to keep tight-lipped about their training sources, often explicitly stated to avoid lawsuits from copyright holders. They often seem to scrape portions of the internet, including both copyrighted and public domain works. Once the AI has trained on the dataset, it's impossible to remove the impact of any specific content from its training without essentially restarting.

To my knowledge, current AI models are essentially machine learning models, trained by giving them significant amounts of data until they can produce intelligible outputs that mimic the data inputs that match search term criteria. It's impossible to be certain of the training data without seeing the dataset, but it's almost certain if they return similar content for search terms they wouldn't understand without having used that data.

Training AI models never falls under fair use, as fair usage laws are all meant for humans. Additionally, an AI model inherently provides content evoking the idea of what it was trained on. This both isn't fair use and directly attempts to replace the copyright holders. Every AI model does this to thousands of people/orgs.

AI models should have to have explicit opt-in consent from every copyright holder to use it for training. There is no reason why any copyrighted data should be fed into a training AI dataset without prior permission. It's an active choice to input that dataset. Practically, this would mean AI models would rely primarily on public domain works. Given how AI functions, even if the human creator doesn't hold the copyright, they should be considered to be the owner and their permission required for the purpose of AI training.

Direct voluntary licensing is both feasible and the only ethical option for AI training datasets. AI models should be discouraged from using vast amounts of copyrighted works from a large variety of people. Their primary training source should be public domain works. An inclusion of copyrighted works is a deliberate choice that will result in those works being traced in everything the AI produces.

All those involved with the AI model should be expected to ensure the correct permissions exist for the dataset. Multiple controls should be in place to ensure that the dataset isn't corrupted with stolen copyrighted data, which would result in the entire model needing to be retrained.
Every work in an AI model dataset leaves its trace in every single output that model will ever produce. The input terms determine to what degree in a specific output, but it is a permanent and constant contributor.
AI companies are currently having money thrown at them hand over fist, lack of funding to adhere to regulations is not a problem for them.
On any topic where accuracy is needed(ex: medicinal, legal, financial, etc), AI raises the risk of harming anyone who encounters their content. These areas should be more strictly regulated.
AI models should be required to keep their training materials publicly available, including all the same information as would be required in a formal citation. This would require little extra effort, and serve as an extra control.
Copyright laws are the only current laws impacting AI models that I'm aware of.
If a human uses an AI system to create a 'prompt' as inspiration, such as for writing or art, then the human is the author. Any more significant involvement from the AI then the AI is the author. Simply inputting commands or even editing outputs isn't enough to claim ownership.
Copyediting is an existing job that humans do, and they aren't authors.
Revisions should be made to clarify that, in order for the work to qualify for copyright, it must be made with any AI involvement being extremely limited and not necessary to the creation of the work.
No legal protections for AI material are necessary. Any produced material should automatically be public domain. AI models' profitability doesn't lie in the outputs themselves, but in what humans do around that output.
The Copyright laws only protect human-created works, not AI. If it was protected it would actively harm the "progress of science and useful arts" by attempting to replace them with inaccurate and derivative outputs.
AI works do not need to be substantially similar to a copyrighted work to be violating copyright. As an AI model, every work they trained on impacts every single output to varying degrees. Any work produced using a system trained on a bad dataset automatically violates copyright.
AI models should be legally required to keep their training records public. If a copyright owner at any time suspects that their work has been used and not recorded properly, there should be a regulatory agency that oversees the AI models that they can make a report to, as well as the normal litigation channels.
All developers and companies involved in the creation and ownership of the AI model should be directly liable. End users of the system could be secondarily liable if there is evidence that they knew about the copyright violations and still used the model.
"Open-source" AI models increase the potential scope of infringement, but ultimately don't have any specific unique infringement risks.
The nature of AI means that AI models regularly break 17 U.S.C. 1202(b) currently. AI models mix up their training dataset to create something "unique" that sounds realistic, which means that citations are always incorrect as a trained dataset would see just repeating the correct information as too much from the same source work.

Many industries will try to get around the copyrighted works issue by having a person edit AI output into something usable. These works should not qualify for copyright, and the legislation should limit AI involvement to a “prompt” or inspiration level.
Laws should require AI material to be prominently labeled as such. Any works from news stories to art should have this requirement. Similar to a watermark for art, or an author’s name for written works. AI models should automatically include this on generated works, and any changes made by users should make the AI label equally as prominent and visible. Many tools already exist to automatically watermark, sign, or label works. A failure to prominently label/removal of a label for an AI work should result in significant fines for the party responsible.
I am not aware of any current laws applying generally to AI material imitating a particular person, although some iterations could fall under copyright, trademark, and privacy laws.
Yes, Congress should set a floor for state law protections against AI material. AI material imitating people should be heavily protected, as this kind of material could significantly impact the income and reputation of the individual being imitated. Due to the significant risks involved, AI imitation should require the person involved to give permission for the impressions used, and permission for the final AI imitation, in that specific form only. No AI imitation should be made publicly available without said consent at multiple levels. If the person the AI is imitating is deceased, the decision would fall to those who inherited their estate.
Yes there should be protections against AI trying to replace a human creator, without explicit permissions from either the individual or their estate inheritors.
Section 114(b) needs to be revised to require permissions when AI is involved.