Anonymous

U.S. Copyright Office

RE: Artificial Intelligence & Copyright [Docket No. 2023-06]

December 5, 2023

I. Introduction

Generative AI systems, and AI image generators in particular, are able to generate derivative images at breakneck speed and are essentially only limited by the processing power available to an AI system at any given time. This means that they are able to flood the internet with derivative, low-quality, low-effort "spam" that can easily drown out creations by human artists that were created over hours and hours of tireless manual labor.

Ironically, that very same amalgamation of human labor is what makes these systems so powerful in the first place. Under the guise of non-profit research, AI developers have trained their models on an inconceivably large amount of copyrighted work, without consent, credit, compensation or control, and are currently operating a for-profit business powered by a technology that, if left unchecked, may permanently damage art as a profession, the perception of the artistic process and art as a whole.

II. Impact on artists

Visual artists generally need to advertise their work on personal websites or social media to attract customers. As it stands, AI image generators enable opportunists to flood search engines and social media with potentially thousands of spam images that mimic an artist's style. This not only opens the door to market confusion, but a copycat could damage or influence the artist's reputation or alter the public perception of them by including elements and creative decisions that the artist would never make. To name an example, as of November 29th, 2023, the top result when googling American artist Kelly McKernan is an AI-generated imitation of her style.[1] Not only does this demonstrate the ability of AI forgeries to quickly propagate and pollute search engines and the wider internet but this digital impersonation has a chilling effect on artists' agency and ability to control their online identity. Artists are essentially competing with a distorted version of themselves.

Meanwhile, AI companies themselves are actively creating a culture of cheap mimicry by encouraging users to generate images by including popular artists' names as prompts. For instance, the name of Polish artist Greg Rutkowski's has been used as a prompt no less than 400,000 times as of December 2022. AI companies are adding insult to injury by not only using the creative works of professional artists in their training data without credit, consent or compensation but also directly encouraging their users to infringe on artists' copyrights.

[1] https://twitter.com/Kelly_McKernan/status/1729709817210470626

III. **The “tool” argument**

In their comment to the United States Copyright Office, Technet argues that Generative AI is just another tool that will allow people to “create new visual works regardless of their skill with a pencil or paintbrush” and likens Generative Ai to the invention of the camera. But unlike Generative AI systems, the invention of the camera was not made possible by taking every available piece of art in the world and compressing it down into a wooden box, but instead by developing a mechanism that allows for capturing light through a lens and onto a roll of film.

If these systems were created independently of the artistic process, if they were simply a different way to capture the world we see without exploiting the works of artists, it stands to reason that no creative would have any objections to them.

But “Generative Artificial Intelligence” is not a new, intelligent way to capture the world we see. It does not and cannot create things that are not contained within its training data. It merely reshuffles patterns and objects that it has already seen. The only reason why one might even confuse these systems as “intelligent” is the unimaginable ingenuity, breadth and quality of copyrighted human works that have been ingested into the training data. Without these works, an AI system wouldn’t be able to generate so much as a stick figure.

IV. **“Opt-out” as a means of evading responsibility**

In their comment to the United States Copyright office, Stability AI assures creators that they are reacting to their concerns by proactively soliciting opt-out requests in upcoming training for new Stable DIffusion models[2]. They mention that they will honor “over 160 million opt-out requests in upcoming training for new Stable Diffusion models” and boast about “respecting industry-standard digital protocols like robots.txt, which indicates whether a website consents to automated data collection for ancillary purposes such as indexing or analysis.[3]

As forthcoming as this proposal from Stability AI may seem, it is an olive branch designed to shift responsibility away from the copyright infringing businesses to the aggrieved copyright holders themselves. Wether they are industry-standard or not, it is unreasonable to expect artists to stay up to date with so-called “digital protection protocols” and issue (legally non-binding) opt-out requests to any and all startups or big tech firms that decide that artists’ copyright is merely an inconvenience to be bypassed. AI companies should not be exempt from licensing copyrighted material simply because their business model is built on a shaky foundation of vast amounts of indiscriminately acquired data.

Additionally, it seems that Stability is conflating publicly-available content with public domain content. Artists do not waive the copyright to their works when they post it on the internet, nor does the absence of a “robots.txt” or any other protocol give any individual or entity the permission to do with the work as they please. Stability is essentially arguing that it is legally permissible to steal groceries from the grocery store as long as there’s no “do not steal” sign in front of the store.

Arguing against a licensing scheme for training data , Microsoft writes that “without access to a broad set of training materials from varied sources, Ai models may become biased or inaccurate.” If Microsoft cared about accuracy, they wouldn’t have integrated a large language model, or LLM,

---

[2] Stable Diffusion is a text-to-image Ai model made by Stability AI.

[3] https://www.regulations.gov/comment/COLC-2023-0006-8664

into their Bing search engine. LLMs are not purveyors of truth, they are text prediction engines. Inaccuracy is baked in. The argument appears to be that without exceedingly large amounts of copyrighted data, Microsoft's search engine assistant will produce even less accurate results than it does currently. As The Guardian notes, "Chatbots such as ChatGPT, developed by the US firm OpenAI, can be prone to 'hallucinations' or inaccuracies" which two lawyers relying on Chat-GPT to generate court filings found out the hard way.[4]

Microsoft also cautions that smaller start-ups are going to get priced out of "developing responsible AI models" should licensing schemes become the norm. In the age of monopolistic tech companies with market caps valued in the trillions of dollars, this concern for up- and coming enterprises seems performative at best. Microsoft, by virtue of being one of the dominant forces in the tech sector will come out on top no matter if licensing schemes become standardized or not.

V. **The human argument**

In their comment to the United States Copyright Office, Microsoft writes that "copyright law has always permitted humans to read and examine copyrighted materials to learn how to write, understand scientific patterns, or how to paint or take a photograph.*

This is a complete mischaracterisation that only serves to further anthropomorphise and mystify a glorified plagiarism engine. Try as they might, humans cannot copy references exactly. They can try, over and over again, and they are likely to get better which each laboured attempt, but they will never achieve a perfect copy.

Machines, on the other hand, excel at copying any style of painting, any piece of architecture, any medium, any creature or plant or concept as long as it is sufficiently represented in the training data.

Stability AI CEO Emad Mostaque describes the way Stable Diffusion works as follows: "We took a hundred terabytes of data - a hundred thousand thousand megabytes of images - 2 billion of them - and we squished it down to a 2-4 gigabyte file. And that file can create everything that you've seen. That's insane right?"[5] It should go without saying, but a human cannot create an image, let alone 2 billion images, with the mechanical precision and speed of an AI image generator. The human brain does not operate in this way and it certainly does not operate at this magnitude.

VI. **The democratization argument**

Proponents of Generative AI often defend the technology as a "democratization of art," failing to realize that art already has virtually no barrier to entry. Anyone who is willing to pick up a pencil and paper is capable of creating art. Proponents confuse the ability to create art at all with the ability to produce highly-rendered professional works in the style of artists with years or even decades of experience.

---

[4] https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2023/jun/23/two-us-lawyers-fined-submitting-fake-court-citations-chatgpt

[5] https://fingfx.thomsonreuters.com/gfx/legaldocs/znpnzrgyzpl/AI%20COPYRIGHT%20LAWSUIT%20amended.pdf

As much as Ai companies would have you believe otherwise, people who do not spend the considerable amount of time required to master a craft are not entitled to make stunning masterworks of art. They are not entitled to write brilliant, page-turning novels. Or compose beautifully touching symphonies. Companies that do not care about or respect art do not have the right to harness its history and profit from it hand over fist. Nor do they have the right to lecture artists about democratization or the possibilities of "pioneering new artistic mediums." Artists are united in their opposition to this exploitative technology because they, unlike tech firms, have a deep and profound connection to art and an undying passion for creating it.

VII. **Unimpeded AI is a detriment to humanity**

Companies that evangelize the potential of Artificial Intelligence like to focus on the highfalutin, positive impacts that AI technologies can have. The unsavory elements of AI are usually left unaddressed. Here are some of them:

AI-generated non-consensual or underage pornography

Ever since deepfake technology emerged, women have predominantly been the target of non-consensual AI pornography. The broad availability of Ai image and video generators has since exacerbated this problem tenfold. Text-to-Image and Image-to-image as well as Image-to-video technology has made it easy for anyone to create realistic pornographic images or video of private individuals or even children.

In a report on AnyDream, a monetized service that distributes Deepfake pornography through Discord and other avenues, investigative journalists at Bellingcat uncovered "multiple incidents of AnyDream being used to generate nonconsensual pornographic deepfakes of private citizens."[6]

As David Thiel, one of the authors of the Stanford report notes, the indiscriminate way in which training data was scraped has exposed a fatal flaw in Image Generators like Stable Diffusion: The potential of generating Child Sexual Abuse Material, or CSAM.

In an interview with Bellingcat, Thiel says: "I consider it wrong the way that Stable Diffusion was trained and distributed — there was not much curation in the way of what data was used to train it," adding that "it was happily trained on explicit material and images of children and it knows how to conflate those two concepts."[7]

The potential ability to generate CSAM with even mainstream image generators is perhaps the most chilling testament to the lack of guardrails and ethical considerations that AI companies have been allowed to operate with, but it's by no means the only one. Generated pornographic images and videos can easily be abused as a means to blackmail, bully or exact revenge and represent a massive danger and potential source of tremendous trauma especially to women and children in the age of unfettered Generative Ai.

AI-generated voice impersonation scams

Generative AI technology has made it trivial to extract convincing AI voices of any private individual using mere seconds of voice recordings. These voice models can then be used by

---

[6] https://www.bellingcat.com/news/2023/11/27/anydream-secretive-ai-platform-broke-stripe-rules-to-rake-in-money-from-nonconsensual-pornographic-deepfakes/

[7] https://www.bellingcat.com/news/2023/11/27/anydream-secretive-ai-platform-broke-stripe-rules-to-rake-in-money-from-nonconsensual-pornographic-deepfakes/

unscrupulous individuals to trick unsuspecting, vulnerable people into believing that a loved one is at the other end of the call. The voices of daughters or nephews might suddenly call on the phone and beg for help after being abducted on their way home from school.

This nightmare scenario is not unlike what happened to an attorney from Philadelphia, Gary Schildhorn, who testified before Congress in November 2023 about a panicked phone call he received from what he assumed was his son.

Summarizing Schildhorn's testimony, Independent writes "Brett said that his nose was broken, that he had hit a pregnant woman's car and instructed his father to call the public attorney assigned to his case."[8] Schildhorn was told by a public defender who identified himself as "Barry Goldstein" to post bail for his son but got suspicious when he was instructed to send the $9000 using a Bitcoin kiosk. Contacting his daughter in law about his son's predicament prompted his son to call Schildhorn and assure him that he was fine. He had been scammed.

There is currently no way to prevent these AI voices from being synthesized because Ai companies unleashed these voice generators without the necessary safeguards to prevent misuse. As Schildhorn put it in his testimony, "Cryptocurrency and AI have provided a risk-less avenue for fraudsters to take advantage of all of us."[9] Underlining the vulnerability and powerlessness that AI systems as well as cryptocurrency have unwillingly exposed us to, he concludes by saying: "If we're harmed by somebody, there's a remedy either through the legal system or through law enforcement. In this case, there is no remedy. And that fundamental basis is broken."

AI companies, by continuing to push AI systems without proper guardrails and protections for copyright holders, will continue to make sure that this fundamental basis will remain broken for the foreseeable future and more people will fall prey to these technologies.

Fake stock photos using Generative AI

AI has emboldened opportunists to deceive people in ways that are more sophisticated than ever before. This is especially troublesome when considering AI's ability to quickly manufacture misinformation and misleading imagery that looks convincing even upon closer inspection. Adobe, itself heavily invested in the AI arms race, has enabled users to sell AI-generated war photographies allegedly showing the deadly Hamas-Israel war on its stock repository Adobe Stock. According to reporting by the Register, "an Adobe Stock image titled 'Conflict between Israel and Palestine generative AI,' that shows black clouds of smoke billowing from buildings, appears to have been published in numerous internet articles as if it were real."[10]

Adobe Stock are doing the bare minimum by requiring all Generative AI content to be labeled as such. But in essence, by allowing the sale of generated war photographies without any clear identifying features (i.e. watermarks) on the images themselves, they are contributing to the spread of misinformation. The speed at which people are able to generate AI images has already had a perceptible negative impact on the quality of image search results and, without intervention, a majority of images we see on the internet may soon be AI-generated fakes.

---

[8] https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/americas/ai-phone-scam-voice-cloning-gary-schildhorn-b2455448.html

[9] https://www.c-span.org/video/?c5093648/philadelphia-attorney-tells-lawmakers-fell-victim-ai-scam

[10] https://www.theregister.com/2023/11/08/adobe_ai_israel_hamas_war_pics/

There are more examples of AI being used to the detriment of humanity. A report by cybersecurity firm SlashNext showed that “since the fourth quarter of 2022, there’s been a 1,265% increase in malicious phishing emails, and a 967% rise in credential phishing in particular.”[11]

All this confirms what only the most ardent of AI supporters would deny: Unregulated and unimpeded Artificial Intelligence is a net negative to society. Some may argue that bad actors will commit crimes regardless but allowing them access to the most powerful disinformation tools the world has ever known is a consequence of Ai companies being asleep at the wheel and rushing products to market without adequate safeguards.

VIII. **The deterioration of consent**

In the age of AI, creators' consent seems to have become nothing but an inconvenience to be sidestepped by large tech firms and smaller startups. Consent is either assumed or disregarded, and seemingly almost never sought directly from creators. CG Trader, “the world’s largest 3D stock marketplace,” recently changed their licenses to automatically allow all 3D models uploaded to their site to be used for AI training. While this change of policy might not be illegal, it undermines the agency of the creators who have contributed 3D models to their site, and may not be comfortable or even aware that their creations are going to be used in this way.

Adobe’s Firefly image generation tool is powered by hundreds of millions of stock photos, illustrations and vector graphics uploaded by Adobe Stock contributors. Adobe’s commitment to “developing creative generative AI responsibly, with creators at the center”[12] rings hollow when considering the discontent of the very people who have contributed to their stock database for years without any knowledge that their works would be used as training for a replacement of the service they provide. According to VentureBeat, who spoke to some of these contributors, Adobe “trained Firefly on their stock images without express notification or consent.”

This assumption of consent without seeking it directly from the creators themselves is illustrative of a larger problem in the current AI gold rush: Wether overtly or secretly, companies that stand to benefit from AI have been emboldened to strip creators of their rights without a care for the larger repercussions. No legitimate business can simply take the resources that fuels their business without worrying about remuneration to the parties that provided those resources in the first place.

IX. **A business built on a house of cards**

In their comment, TechNet justifies the unauthorised use of copyrighted data by claiming that copyright cannot become “a veto over new technologies” led by the “desire to upend copyright” by “a limited set of advocates.” After all, according to them, “AI companies have poured tens of billions of dollars of investment into Generative AI.”[13]

The “limited set of advocates” of course refers to artists (and others) who have demonstrated against their work being absorbed into a business that justifies its upending of copyright law by promising “huge advances in fields from physics to medicine to education, continuing economic

---

[11] https://www.cnbc.com/2023/11/28/ai-like-chatgpt-is-creating-huge-increase-in-malicious-phishing-email.html

[12] https://www.adobe.com/products/firefly.html

[13] https://www.regulations.gov/comment/COLC-2023-0006-8767

growth, and tens or hundreds of millions of new jobs over the next two years"[14] and other such promises.

This limited set of advocates happens to provide the majority of the value that AI companies are profiting from without giving them a dime of compensation in return. Undermining artists and calling them a limited set of advocates is like dismissing airplane pilots as a limited set of advocates for fastening one's seatbelt on a flight. Pilots might only account for a small number compared to the number of plane passengers but it is generally advisable to listen to them when they tell you about planes and how to behave on them.

AI companies and the capital that backs them built their businesses on the expectation that all data should be free. Artists are simply the first ones in the line of fire to have their rights stripped away and their data exploited. Although dismissed and ridiculed as luddites, they are the proverbial canaries in the coal mine.

X. **Fair use**

As Andreessen Horowitz, a private American venture capital firm, plainly stated in an interview with Business Insider, "imposing the cost of actual or potential copyright liability on the creators of AI models will either kill or significantly hamper their development."[15] The venture capital firm says that it "has invested in scores of AI companies and startups based on its 'expectation' that all this copyrighted content was and will remain available as training data through 'fair use,' with no payment required."[16]

In other words, if the defense of "fair use" doesn't hold water in court, the entire for-profit business centered around artificial intelligence and machine learning essentially falls apart overnight. "Fair use" is an affirmative defense against the accusation of a violation of copyright, or more accurately in the case of AI, a defense against the accusation of the violation of copyright of almost every protected work available on the internet.

The maker of Chat-GPT, Open AI, has found a unique way to navigate the legal grey area of scraping data without consent and profiting from it. As a so-called "capped-profit company", their organization is set up as a hybrid between a non-profit and for-profit structure. By their own admission, the reason they structured the company in this way is because "no pre-existing legal structure we know of strikes the right balance."[17]

The company's dubious business model is not the only instance of AI companies skirting the line between non-profit and for-profit legal structures. For instance, the LAION 5B-dataset was developed by LAION using images assembled by CommonCrawl, both of which are non-profits located in Germany. As non-profits, they are exempt from the legal scrutiny that collecting and using copyrighted data would otherwise entail.

The issue is when this non-profit research is then used as the basis for a for-profit business, which is exactly what happened with Stability AI when they launched their own image generator Stable

---

[14] https://www.regulations.gov/comment/COLC-2023-0006-8767

[15] https://www.businessinsider.com/marc-andreessen-horowitz-ai-copyright-2023-11?r=US&IR=T

[16] https://www.businessinsider.com/marc-andreessen-horowitz-ai-copyright-2023-11?r=US&IR=T

[17] https://techcrunch.com/2019/03/11/openai-shifts-from-nonprofit-to-capped-profit-to-attract-capital/

Diffusion. Stable Diffusion is the flagship product by Stability AI and is powered by the LAION 5B dataset, which was created under the auspices of non-profit research and is made up of legally privileged data.

Another mainstream image generator, Midjourney, was similarly built using stolen data. Answering a question from Forbes about wether the San Francisco-based startup seeks consent from living artists or work still under copyright, Midjourney Founder David Holz said: “No. There’s no way to get a hundred million images and know where they’re coming from.”[18]

In the interview, Holz laments the lack of traceability of pictures on the internet by saying that “it would be cool if images had metadata embedded in them about the copyright owner or something.”[19]

There are two issues, however: First, the International Press Telecommunications Council (IPTC) tested 15 of the top social media sites[20] and found that when uploading images to sites like Twitter, Instagram or Facebook “Important image metadata is not retained in images after upload to some of the most popular social media sites.” According to the IPTC, “only one social media site, Behance, received favorable results for retaining and displaying embedded data.” The removal of metadata not only interferes with an image’s traceability, but makes it difficult for artists to protect their copyright and ensure proper licensing.

In other words, as platforms like Twitter and Instagram have become the dominant platforms for sharing art online, creators rights’ have slowly and silently been stripped away. In many ways, this has laid the groundwork for the massive copyrighted data heist that AI companies are in the process of getting away with.

Second, AI companies (including Midjourney) have not demonstrated that they care about the traceability of individual images. They are extremely protective of the large datasets they use because the more data points an AI can pull from, the more effective and lifelike the image (or text) generation will be. Giving an inch to creators could potentially massively reduce the amount of available images (or text) to pull from and thus drastically reduce the effectiveness of the AI system.

When artists started to demand compensation for the copyrighted data in the training sets, AI companies pivoted to using the “fair use” argument as a defense because

1. Remunerating each and every piece of copyrighted material could prove to be prohibitively expensive.

2. Removing the copyrighted material from the dataset could significantly reduce the ability of Generative AI systems.

Since Ai systems force artists into a situation where they have to compete with their own digital simulacra, powered by their own works and ideas, the fair use argument is a dubious one at best.

---

[18] https://www.forbes.com/sites/robsalkowitz/2022/09/16/midjourney-founder-david-holz-on-the-impact-of-ai-on-art-imagination-and-the-creative-economy/?sh=571764c32d2b

[19] https://www.forbes.com/sites/robsalkowitz/2022/09/16/midjourney-founder-david-holz-on-the-impact-of-ai-on-art-imagination-and-the-creative-economy/?sh=571764c32d2b

[20] https://www.embeddedmetadata.org/social-media-test-results.php

Again, these systems can produce an overwhelming volume of images at a speed that no artist could hope to match in several lifetimes.

The fair use doctrine explicitly states that certain “limited” uses might otherwise be considered infringement. The wholesale scraping of billions of images, a staggering amount of which are copyrighted, can be considered many things, but “limited” is not one of the words that springs to mind. The mass copyright theft perpetrated by AI companies is too overwhelming in scale for a fair use defense to be applicable.

A future in which AI companies successfully make their case and get away with their massive data heist will no doubt be tantamount to a complete erosion of creators’ rights and might be the beginning of the end of copyright as we know it.

XI. **Climate change and AI**

Meta in their comment to the US Copyright Office laments that a miscalibration of the “delicate balance between copyright, and innovation and competition”[21] could stifle our ability to combat climate change and global pandemics. This language betrays the limited capabilities of current AI systems and conveniently ignores the huge amounts of energy that AI systems require.

According to Sasha Luccioni, an Ai researcher who studies the energy consumption of AI systems, “generative tasks and ones that involve images are more energy- and carbon-intensive compared to discriminative tasks and ones that involve text,” adding that “Stable DIffusion XL uses ~1 phone charge worth of energy per generation and emits as much carbon as driving 4 miles.[22]”

While image generations are the most wasteful, any company that is advocating for lessening the effects of climate change should look at reducing rather than increasing the amount of superfluous AI technology in their consumer products as even text generating AI uses significant amounts of energy per generation.

In an interview with Scientific American, Alex de Vries, a data scientist at the central bank of the Netherlands and a Ph.D. candidate at Vrije University Amsterdam, cautions: ”I highlighted that if you were to fully turn Google’s search engine into something like ChatGPT, and everyone used it that way—so you would have nine billion chatbot interactions instead of nine billion regular searches per day—then the energy use of Google would spike. Google would need as much power as Ireland just to run its search engine.”[23]

Barring an unlikely advancement of AI technology that has yet to take place, current AI systems are little more than glorified, highly energy-intensive data plagiarism engines. They cannot retrieve what is not in the training data. Relying on AI to produce solutions to climate change and brand-new vaccines to as yet unknown diseases is about as advisable as relying on Chat-GPT for citations in a court of law.[24]

---

[21] https://www.regulations.gov/comment/COLC-2023-0006-9027

[22] https://twitter.com/SashaMTL/status/1730552774419480933

[23] https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/the-ai-boom-could-use-a-shocking-amount-of-electricity/

[24] https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2023/jun/23/two-us-lawyers-fined-submitting-fake-court-citations-chatgpt

While AI is unlikely to hold the (correct) answers to climate change, the current rush to bring AI products to market may well accelerate the current trajectory of edging us closer to the point of no return where climate change is concerned.

Scientific American writes that “a continuation of the current trends in AI capacity and adoption are set to lead to NVIDIA shipping 1.5 million AI server units per year by 2027. These 1.5 million servers, running at full capacity, would consume at least 85.4 terawatt-hours of electricity annually - more than what many small countries use in a year, according to the new assessment.”

While De Vries admits that the large upfront hardware investment as well as supply chain issues prevents a Chat-GPT-style search engine from Google in the near term, he warns that “if you’re going to be using generative Ai in applications [such as search engines], that has the potential to make every online interaction much more resource-heavy.”[25]

However, the spectre of climate change should have no bearing on the question of wether artists continue to enjoy the protections offered by copyright law. Despite Meta’s focus on globe-spanning existential threats in their opening statement, they are distractions from the dangers of Generative AI that exist today, particularly as they pertain to creators’ rights.

XII. **Conclusion**

The replacement of artists is not a far-flung concern, it is happening at a concerning rate and it is happening right now. The rights of artists, such as they are, are being systematically dismantled by corporate greed and a culture of unearned hype. The mental health of aspiring and working artists is at an all-time low due to corporate overreach and corporate apologists that mock those who would dare to stand in the way of so-called progress.

That is why AI companies, if they are to continue harnessing copyrighted data - our data, need to take responsibility and pay artists their fair share or be forced to stop using copyrighted works altogether.

The fear-mongering that paints the stifling of AI as a risk to national security or other flawed fatalistic premises highly overstate the capabilities of so-called Artificial Intelligence and serves to undermine the real, immediate dangers of the technology. If a business model needs to bend established rules and circumvent copyright law to work at all, maybe the business model itself needs to be reevaluated.

Tech firms are hell-bent on rushing technologies to market that make the internet less usable, less trustworthy and less safe, and society will have to bear the brunt of a technology that is overwhelmingly used to the detriment of humanity and primarily empowers society’s worst actors. These firms consider copyright an obsolete relic that stands between them and a lucrative future where every creative endeavour, wether big or small, gets absorbed and regurgitated by a slot machine of endlessly recycled detritus.

---

[25] https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/the-ai-boom-could-use-a-shocking-amount-of-electricity/

The US Copyright Office has a unique opportunity to put an end to the continued erosion of copyright and the assault on the rights of artists and individuals all over the world.

Respectfully,

Anonymous

Artist