

Introduction

Hello and thank you for your time,
I'm an average worker, so I'm part of the majority of people.
Like most, my goal is to be happy and feel accomplished.
I am not following the logic of being more productive, but better productive.
I don't have the logic of big companies wanting to earn more, take the most market share. What I want,
it is to feel enriched personally, internally, to explore my potential, to explore what I am. Loving what I do, loving my days.

The marketing of AI forces me to enter into a logic of speed and quantity forcing me to forget myself.

We can see how those who have "business" logic are disconnected from the true meaning of life, as for example when Microsoft says

"AI will power tools that make everyone more productive at work, school or home. "

Be more productive at school?

Is this supposed to mean that students will be able to produce more homework thanks to AI that can assist them / calculate / write for them?

While the most important thing is to really understand the lesson, to really appreciate the information to see if you like writing, or calculating.

Tech companies in favor of AI highlight the fact that everything is within everyone's reach and that it's great for creativity.

It is absolutely necessary to take into account that what has become within everyone's reach and in unmanageable quantities are scams of all kinds, whether targeted at one person or on a large scale, also, revenge porn via deepfake, fake news, etc.

It is possible to stem this phenomenon through digital or other laws/infrastructure.

Companies say it's impossible. So I appeal to their visionary side, to their "everything is possible" mentality (which they put forward so much when it comes to praising AI) to continue like this, and imagine what to do to supervise the use of AI.

At the very beginning of the invention of the car, we did not imagine red lights, driving licenses did not exist, nor the obligation to wear seat belts, limits on alcohol consumption, timetables for parking etc etc.

While I recognize that generative AI has enormous potential for accomplishing projects, I worry that large companies are brushing aside the big downsides of such widely available technology behind nice words. Even though these are debatable:

- regarding making art accessible to the disabled: all disabled people who wanted to make art have always done so. Whether it's people drawing with their mouths, their feet, their stumps, people with chronic illnesses or mental disorders. Art is not only therapeutic (unlike typing keywords like in

Google image) but also, disabled artists who only have art to work/distinguish themselves are also penalized by the AI which works against them .

- concerning the fear supposedly equivalent to that of the arrival of the camera: the camera offers a product totally different from paintings, this is why painters have been able to continue to exist, although the demand has dropped (which is the thing they were afraid of). The camera exists by itself: it did not need to collect all the paints and then create paintings in the artists' style. But the AI had to collect all the artists' works to exist, to be able to make illustrations.

- Concerning the fear of live performers compared to cinema/TV: the live experience is totally different than TV or cinema. The audience for live performers has declined/changed in favor of non-live performances, but these experiences are different. The public will see artists live for a special experience.

But on the other hand, AI does exactly the same thing and in the same market as artists.

- Concerning the fear of the printing press being said to be unjustified, when it allowed the creation of copyright without which the fears were precisely justified.

Also, I am perplexed by certain arguments supposed to justify AI consequences.

Many more or less directly imply that since it functions similar to that of a human, people who use it should be authorized to do it (as it was themselves...?).

I think this "detail" should be completely ignored:

For example, there are many places where visitors are prohibited from making video recordings.

Now, imagine that an AI company invents the camereye : a camera that retrieves information via an eye-shaped lens, which functions like an eye, then stores it on a system that functions like human memory but more efficient, then can digitally reconstruct what it saw, with a hyper faithful style as many artists know can do. And would do this reconstruction frame by frame but faster than a human.

In the end, we have a video recording.

Should this camera be allowed in places where it is forbidden to make video recordings on the pretext that it functions like a human?

I think the "like a human" question should not be considered at all, and we should only worry about the consequences of the existence of such devices.

Answers to questions :

1.

Unlike photography or cinema,

AI does exactly the same thing as the artists against whom it competes.

An AI user who sells drawings (poster, T-shirt, poster...) in the style of an artist "XYZ" does the same thing as this artist "XYZ" who sells his drawings (poster, T-shirt , poster...) in his own style.

The notable difference being that the AI user can do a colossal amount and impersonate as many artists as they want. Something that artists do not allow themselves to do for obvious ethical reasons.

“ The goal of Generative AI is to help authors create *new* content [...] No one could seriously contend that a technology whose sole function is to create new works is at cross-purposes with copyright law ”
TechNet said

-> About 'new content '“

In fact, there is a colossal amount of content that is just variations of existing things.

My favorite artists are imitated, but also the small craftsmen who sell cups, clothes, candles, pastries etc.

Most days, I can still figure it out, but I come across more and more false images like this making me confused about who is a real seller, who is a generator for fun, who is consciously running a scam.

It's getting worse for small businesses and for customers.

“ It will make countless people both more productive and more creative; it will certainly encourage, facilitate, and inspire the creation of more new, creative works than any technology since semiconductors and personal computers. “ TechNet said

-> I draw badly and using this technology takes all of my project ideas from totally doable to accessible.

Yet I am discouraged: I think I have several good ideas, but if they are that good, I take the risk of being copied hundreds of times before people realize that the idea came from me.

I'm condemned to hoping that I don't have too good ideas, it's discouraging.

These projects went from dreams to completely dead because even hiring artists to do the drawings for me runs into the same problem: they would get copied too.

The problem would be solved if the AI was restricted to 3 styles (max 10-ish) so for those who want to stand out, we could paint over it or something.

“ That the technology enables the creation of new works that might compete with the works of today's artists is not a reason to distort copyright into a tool of protectionism “ TechNet said

-> Art has always evolved: we very well recognize what was done in the 20s, or 50s or 90s and until today I still saw new artists bringing freshness, surprising styles.

Discouraging artists to create new things (by fear of being stolen) in favor of AI users who just repeat styles is technologically impressive, but culturally disastrous.

3.

9.5. Yes human creator should they have a right to object to an AI model being trained on their work even if does not own the copyright, if not, they might fear to accept any job

34.

- AI seems to only imitate the bests artists.

Was hand remove done to filter out beginners' styles,? (as it was done to remove shocking images) and therefore, can it be continued to remove still living/non-consenting artists?

- Quantity is something very important to take into account.

It's the quantity that makes the poison, it's the quantity that makes a message become harassment.

All the problems of imitation, scam and other have moved to another category of problem by the fact that the possible quantity has increased in a colossal proportion.

It is essential to do something.

-Arguing that we cannot eliminate every problemes in all countries is not a reason to do nothing. Counterfeits, child labor and many other bad things exist. However, we can choose to do things ethically to mitigate the damage.