

Rich Campanella

1.

I've been singing the praises of AI technology since about 2017 when I first started following DeepMind after seeing their chess AI named AlphaZero. At that time it was clear to me that this technology would eventually help us cure diseases and solve many problems. My excitement continued over the next few years as I followed DeepMind's creation of an AI for StarCraft, one of my all-time favorite strategic video games. However, as time went on and I thought more about the long-term implications of this technology, my overall thoughts became more and more conflicted. While I still look forward with great excitement to the many benefits this technology will provide within fields such as medicine and science, as an artist I have never been less inspired and more distraught by the introduction of a new technology into my field of work and expertise.

After much thought over the course of about 6 years, I now firmly believe that this technology should be used for things that have some amount of urgency, for things that are beyond us in terms of ability to process and/or accomplish, for education, or to automate things that we do not enjoy doing or that are not defined by a passionate connection to the activity or profession. The arts do not fall into the category of fields that possess any of those qualities and therefore I think allowing AI into the space of the arts risks severe compromise or even destruction of beloved activities, professions, practices, and disciplines that have enriched our brains and lives since the beginning of our existence. With fields such as medicine and science, our advancements are based on our decoding of the laws of the systems that govern our physical universe which are external to us and far larger and more complicated than us. In order for us to advance our understanding of the laws governing the universe that we inhabit and the connection of our physical bodies to the laws of our universe, it will require processing and finding patterns within extremely large sets of data which would be impossible for humans to accomplish without the use of machines that exceed our processing ability by orders of magnitude. However, the arts are not beyond us or external to us, they are practices where we transmute elements of our experience into various artistic mediums that can be experienced by our very own senses in order to stimulate those senses and communicate aspects of our experience to other humans with the same senses. Also, the arts are one of the few fields where 100% of artists working professionally are doing so purely out of passion, and they pursued their careers in spite of great financial risk and instability. An activity that people pursue professionally in spite of great financial risk and instability is clearly something that brings meaning to those peoples' lives, and therefore we should be extremely cautious about bringing automation into fields defined by passion and meaningful connection to their profession. There has also been much published scientific evidence about the cognitive benefits of engaging with artistic mediums that directly involve the manual use of the parts of our brains related to the senses involved in the particular art form.

There has been no prior technology with as much dominant overlap onto the spectrum of creative potential of human talent as AI, even in its current state let alone its future state, and therefore many of our laws and protections regarding copyright and IP, and the ideas that influenced prior decisions related to them, likely need to be re-examined. 'Overlap' is a key word here, and is very important to keep in mind in being able to accurately assess the effects of this technology.

I will talk about who this technology benefits most and who it benefits least and harms the most, address various misguided or incorrect ideas and justifications being put forth by those in favor of generative AI such as the highly reductive classification of AI as simply another artistic tool often compared to something like a paintbrush, frequent incorrect analogies to history and the introduction of previous technologies when talking about why generative AI won't destroy the careers of artists, and frequent misguided marketing language selling AI to consumers such as telling them it will help them "unleash their creativity," but before addressing those points which lean a bit more on the philosophical side I want to focus on the most concrete issues that I see regarding copyright. These risks are as follows: 1. Allowing AI-generated work to be copyrighted opens the door to people being able to copyright and profit off of work they had no hand in authoring whatsoever. 2. AI is fundamentally anti-competitive.

While there are ways to engage with generative AI where some control is exerted over the AI model (the amount of control is often highly exaggerated) allowing AI-generated work to be copyrighted opens the door to people being able to copyright work they had no hand in authoring whatsoever. In the short time that generative AI has been available to the general public, people have already begun creating other AI systems that automate the creation of prompts that are given as inputs to generative AI models when requesting them to generate content. AI systems trained to automate all possible inputs (prompts and other parameters) to generative AI will inevitably grow alongside generative AI itself, the result of which will be AI systems that generate content completely on their own.

One example of this is DeepMind's PromptBreeder. An article titled "Deepmind's Promptbreeder automates prompt engineering" from the-decoder.com explains how PromptBreeder "automates prompt engineering by generating better prompts in successive generations using an evolutionary algorithm." There is a video of a YouTuber explaining how he uses one AI model to generate prompts which are then automatically fed into Midjourney. He presses a button, steps away for a while, comes back to dozens or hundreds of high-quality pieces generated by Midjourney, selects which he thinks will sell the best, and then uploads them for sale on Etsy as digital downloads. There are also prompt generation sites that aid in generating prompts as well as neural networks called CLIP interrogators that, when fed an image (non-AI generated or AI generated), will give the user a prompt that they can feed into a AI art generator to produce a similar image.

A world where a person can press a button, wait for AI to generate a bunch of pieces of art, select which pieces they like the best, copyright those pieces of art, and then sell and profit from those pieces of art sounds a bit like hell on earth from my perspective as an artist. This path

leads to creativity becoming completely meaningless and actually detrimental to engage in, as whoever has access to the most compute power has the most potential to generate and own “creative” works (especially as these technologies inevitably become far more advanced over time).

One video on YouTube titled “How to Make Money Using Midjourney (\$100/Hour Side Hustle)” on the channel called Alek talks about the ease of ability in generating and selling AI art. In a prior video he explained that he has little to no artistic experience whatsoever. Some quotes from this video that are telling are: “You can get really good images in about 5 minutes once you get really good.” When analyzing the amount of money a user made on website fiverr based on the metrics on their page he says: “It’s probably much closer to around \$8,000, but just keep in mind that he’s having AI do all of the hard work for him.” Then he says: “Even if you have no experience whatsoever, I still think this is possible for almost anyone.” In another video titled “6 Etsy Shop Ideas That Can Replace Your 9-5” he explains how easy the process is for generating and selling AI art stickers: “This process is really simple, where you just go into Midjourney AI and just ask it to print you a sticker. It will make one right before your eyes, and then you just have to digitally cut it out from the background and upload it for sale on Etsy.” Keep in mind that all of the art he is selling on Etsy is master-level quality artwork, made because AI models were trained on the work of master artists, he has little to no experience doing anything artistic, but yet he is profiting in a significant manner off of selling work he had little to no influence in the creation of. In that same video he even shows how he uses ChatGPT to give him the ideas for the stickers.

On the second point, AI is fundamentally anti-competitive. Sam Altman, CEO of OpenAI, has stated that it is the goal of he and his colleagues to build Artificial General Intelligence. From Wikipedia, “An artificial general intelligence (AGI) is a hypothetical type of intelligent agent. If realized, an AGI could learn to accomplish any intellectual task that human beings or animals can perform.” (cite) While not yet AGI, the current generation of AI technologies that prompted this discussion about generative AI is a very strong step toward that ultimate goal and has already succeeded in being able to learn how to accomplish certain creative intellectual tasks to the level of human masters and beyond. Since this technology is fundamentally based upon giving machines the ability to learn as humans learn, yet at rates orders of magnitude faster than humans can, this technology will eventually have complete and dominant overlap with every cognitive, creative, and intellectual task a human being can possibly perform. The reason why AI is fundamentally anti-competitive is because this means that any new styles or forms of content created by human artists in an attempt to remain competitive by differentiating their work from what AI can do will simply be trained into, or learned by, AI models extremely quickly. These new or updated AI models can then be instantly distributed for free to anyone who wants to be able to use AI to generate work incorporating those new styles or forms of content. This is certainly already possible today for current individual creative mediums such as visual art, music, and literature. For some of these mediums, training AI models is currently only accessible to those in the industry except for visual art (in my knowledge), where training AI art models on chosen content is already available to the general public for free via open-source models such as Stable-Diffusion. I’ll talk more about this later, but this idea of overlap is crucial

in understanding how this technology affects creatives today and down the road, and also illuminates why comparisons to how the invention of the camera or digital painting tools like Photoshop didn't destroy art and artists are false comparisons. (the areas of overlap between a camera and the overall spectrum of human creative potential or Photoshop and the overall spectrum of human creative potential are quite small, compared to AI which is very large already and eventually will be complete)

The current and future overlap of this technology with nearly every aspect of creativity a human can engage in is something fundamentally not present with any prior technology. Therefore, we may have to re-examine many aspects of our protective laws surrounding copyright and IP. The introduction of this technology has brought to light the fact that we actually had a number of 'natural' protections in place already, which were in place simply due to human limitation of time, energy, talent, and skill. The reality is that technology that allows machines to simulate human learning and execution of cognitive, intellectual, and creative tasks without human limitation and at rates orders of magnitude faster than humans can and will replace human cognition. I'll talk a bit more about this in the answer to the question relating to what to do about style and copyright.

After mentioning how important the idea of overlap is with AI, I'd like to quickly digress in order to stress the idea that I believe those that will be making the decisions regarding copyright of AI-generated material will be making some of the most impactful decisions on what it means to be a creative human being in history. The reality is that there are probably far more people that want AI-generated material to be copyrightable than not (due to reasons I'll address later) and it is highly important that ethics and logical argumentation are valued more in this decision-making process than popular support for the use of this technology or the amount of dollars pushing for copyrightability of AI-generated work. These decisions could be a watershed moment in history for what it means to be a creatively talented human being. If AI-generated work is allowed to be copyrighted, I believe it will represent the passing of the torch of creation of human art to AI.

Back to the general topic of AI being anti-competitive, though differing from the previous point, I'd like to provide a hypothetical scenario to consider. This may be something we have to contend with some day, but imagine a future world where pretty much everyone has a brain implant device installed and one function these devices can perform is that they can control our bodies to automate our physical movements and motor skill tasks. Imagine these brain implants contain AI models that have been trained on videos of the best basketball players of all time and can send the necessary nervous system signals to make a person's body move without their control and play basketball like a top-level pro player; even if that person has never touched a basketball in their life or played any other sport. If that technology was allowed to be used in professional basketball, basketball as a competitive sport is dead. At that point the 'game' now becomes about making sure you have the latest hardware and software for the brain implant device, and maybe some kind of general strategic considerations or ways to tweak the way the AI models perform, but people actually using their own athletic talents and skills to play basketball would be dead. Since machines perform with higher consistency and learn faster than humans, opting to not use the brain implant would actually put you at a disadvantage. This is actually the worst for the people who loved playing basketball so much that they devoted their

lives to training to get to the top level of the sport because now, not only do they get sidelined from doing the thing they love, it was their own top-level gameplay that was used by other people to train the AI models that sidelined them from the very thing they love doing. This technology would but now they don't have to train as much to maintain. While it is true that a brain implant device such as the one in question could lead to some other forms of competition, the fact that it has overlap with basketball and is allowed to be used in pro leagues kills basketball. A technology such as this would not only overlap with basketball, it would be with every form of human athletics.

While creative-based fields aren't solely based on competition like sports, the reality is that the game of life is competitive and creative fields have always been so. There has always been competition in terms of being able to consistently output quality work that people want to consume as well as the competition surrounding who can find the next big advancements related to style or technique that drive an artform forward. The people that make those contributions get to associate their names to whatever their contributions are and that has been one of the main ways artists have been able to make and sustain careers. With a technology that overlaps with all human cognitive function, competition of human talent instead becomes competition of who has access to the most compute power.

In the hypothetical basketball-playing brain implant example, the technology is actually the least beneficial and the most harmful for the top-level athletes whose gameplay was used to train the AI models. They can already play at the top-level so there isn't much to gain there. Using the brain implant would allow them to reduce human error to be even more consistent and it would save them time physically training, but physical training was likely something they enjoyed anyway if they were willing to push themselves to get to the top-level in the first place. However, the technology is the most beneficial by far for basketball players that are not at the top-level or for people who have never played basketball or any other sports. Now all of the sudden the top-level athletes have an influx of competition since effectively anyone that wants to play basketball can play like the best basketball players of all time. Is it fair or ethical that the players that had the talent and put in the hard work to become the best players have had their gameplay used against them to essentially give what they can do to other people? Now imagine the people that wanted to install and run these AI models in the brain implant could install them for free.

This brings me to critiques of common ideas and arguments put forth by those in support of generative AI, especially large companies. The reality is that there is a lot of money to be made by large companies that are in a position to take advantage of this technology at the expense of the talented individuals whose work is the reason these AI models are able to generate content anyone cares about in the first place. This takes the form of companies wanting to be able to downsize their art departments and take advantage of the high rates of speed that generative AI can produce high-quality work. Then there is the industry marketing these technologies to people who want to use them to generate material. The reality is that top-level talent in any field represents a small number relative to the overall population, otherwise we wouldn't find talent to be remarkable. It is for this reason that there is a huge opportunity to make a lot of money by

companies that can essentially monetize making top-level talent and skill available to people, because the percentage of the population within any field that would benefit greatly from being able to use AI that gives results like that of top-talent far outweighs the percentage of the population of the top-talent themselves. There is a lot of language used within marketing campaigns that I, as a creative who has studied, practiced, and honed my crafts for nearly 30 years, think is highly inaccurate but effective marketing.

Those in favor of generative AI repeatedly use the word ‘tool’ when talking about this technology; as in “AI tools”. On multiple occasions I’ve heard statements along the lines of: “generative AI is a tool, like a paintbrush.” While, yes, it technically could fall into the category of things we consider tools (as could another human technically), I take issue with this extremely reductive attempt to shoehorn generative AI into the same category as something like a paintbrush. Those in favor of being able to use generative AI to generate copyrightable works they can profit off of are banking on being able to get the relevant institutions and general public to (incorrectly) consider generative AI to be simply another artistic tool, and do not want the true nature of this technology to be accurately analyzed and categorized.

The reality is that generative AI is nothing like a paintbrush. If one were to try to compare it to a paintbrush it would be more like a magical, enchanted paintbrush that anyone with no prior artistic experience or artistic skill can ask using spoken language to paint something; to which the magical paintbrush will respond by levitating and painting something on its own that looks like it was done by a master artist. A normal paintbrush in the hand of someone with no artistic experience and skill will expectedly yield a result of very low quality, while generative AI in the hands of someone with no artistic experience and skill, even someone who has only started learning how to use generative AI minutes, hours, or days prior, can yield a result of master-level quality. It should be obvious that the only way it would be possible for someone with no artistic experience or skill to yield a result of master-level quality is if something else is making the creative decisions and executing the artistic work. When someone uses AI to generate art they are not the creator, they commission art from the AI model.

We don’t feel comfortable referring to another human as a tool, even though technically a human could fall into the category of a tool in certain circumstances. Generative AI is a simulated version of the cognitive processing that happens in a human artist’s brain. It is essentially a synthetic superhuman artist. Hypothetically, if a human master artist was in a coma and a brain implant was installed that allowed us to query the artistic parts of their brain with requests in spoken/written language that would result in master-level artistic outputs from this human master artist’s brain (without their consent), would we consider that human in a coma to be a tool and allow people to copyright the outputs that resulted from their inputs?

I read an article talking about the pitfalls of categorical thinking. One such pitfall described in the article was referred to as “compression.” Compression in this context refers to the fact that, once we’ve placed things into the same category, we can often begin to lose sight of the ways in which those things differ. We sort of ‘compress’ everything we’ve placed into the same category such that their differences are less considered and therefore we often mistakenly think things in

the same category are more alike than they actually may be. Though I don't want to ascribe malintent, I think people that want to extend copyright protection to works generated using AI and encourage the adoption of generative AI into creative fields want us all to experience this pitfall of compression when it comes to placing generative AI in the same category that we place a paintbrush.

This raises one of the main issues when it comes to deciding whether or not something generated by AI should be able to be copyrighted. Though people will defend generative AI by saying that a user can engage with the technology in ways that give them a lot of control over the output of the AI (a claim that is extremely exaggerated), the reality is that, while it is possible to exert a small amount of control, it is still completely possible to engage in an entirely hands-off manner, pressing a single button to have AI generate a master-level work of art; and we are only in the infancy of this technology.

Another very common piece of marketing language, while there are some variations, comes in the form of statements along the lines of "unleash your creativity with AI." The reality is that

The creation of a piece of art is a series of an extremely large number of creative decisions on both the macro and micro levels and the execution of various skills to manifest those creative decisions. It is all of those decisions collectively that bring about the manifestation of a particular piece of art. When you compare this to the process of using AI to generate art, a person is making orders of magnitude less creative decisions, sometimes even none. By this fact alone, using AI to generate art is objectively a less creative activity on behalf of the human involved.

There is no way to use generative AI where one isn't outsourcing the vast majority, if not all, of the creative decisions to the AI model. Therefore, preventing the ability to copyright works generated using AI would, at worst, prevent someone who only contributed a very small amount to the generation of work done by AI from copyrighting something that an AI model did the vast majority of the work to manifest anyway. At best, it would stop numerous people from being able to have copyright protection for works of art they had barely any hand at all in authoring.

Another argument that proponents of generative AI use to gain support for the widespread adoption of this technology is that it saves time on time-consuming tasks that people generally don't want to do. This seems to resonate with everyone, since we all would like to save time on things that are time consuming and unnecessary but when it comes to creative pursuits, what does this even mean? The creation of art is the process of creative decision-making and execution of skills to manifest those decisions. If the actual act of creating art is considered to be a time-consuming task that a person does not want to do, meaning they consider the vast number of decisions required to manifest a piece of art to be unnecessarily time-consuming, then they should not be able to outsource those creative decisions to something else and claim full ownership of the final product. They are actually probably in the wrong field. Furthermore, people also tout generative AI as a great brainstorming and ideation tool. Again, when it comes to the realm of IP, if a person considers brainstorming and idea generation to be a

time-consuming task that they don't want to engage in then they also may be in the wrong field. I'm not sure what meaning copyright has anymore in a world where someone can use AI to generate ideas for them, feed those ideas into other generative AI that will manifest the idea, then copyright the manifestation of the idea. At that point it really is no longer about being creative, talented, and skilled, but about who has access to the most compute power.

In an attempt to assuage artists, many proponents of generative AI like to use comparisons to previous technological advancements when talking about the effects generative AI will have on artists and creatives. Commonly cited examples are how the camera didn't kill off traditional artists and how digital art didn't kill off traditional art. These are false comparisons that may fool people who don't have a deep understanding of technology and art. Since most people don't have a deep understanding of both technology and art, this makes these comparisons highly effective for the proponents of generative AI since they are able to play on that lack of understanding to gain more support for the adoption of this tech in creative industries.

The reason why these are inaccurate comparisons is because of extremely different amounts of overlap between technologies such as a camera or digital painting programs like Photoshop with the overall spectrum of human creative potential. Again, a technology that aims to eventually simulate all forms of human cognition, intellect, and creativity will achieve complete and dominant overlap of all human creativity. Even though it is not at that point yet, it is already performing far more than well enough to be a threat and has led to artists already losing their jobs.

One comparison that is made often is to the invention of the camera and the practice of photography. While it is true that there was some panic amongst artists at the time of this technological advancement, the panic being felt today is not another instance of unfounded panic. The first reason is due to overlap. If we think about what a camera can do compared to what an artist can do there is actually very little overlap. Though some artists specialize in photo-realistic drawing or painting that results in works that look like they are photos, a camera could never produce a painting. In most cases, a portrait of a human painted by another human looks completely different from a picture taken using a camera. The look of a painting is something that has always been appreciated and valued so, due to a human-produced painting still retaining stylistic differences from a picture taken with a camera, this is one reason why, even after all of these years, the camera didn't even completely replace artists that are portrait artists. It's not because people care that a human made the painting (though some do), it's simply because what a camera can produce does not overlap with what a human can produce in terms of the aesthetics of a painting. Beyond that, there was still so much room for artists to add personal style into their renderings of subjects from life, to create art from their imaginations, to create art from imagination with personal style, all of which a camera could never achieve. Fast forward to today, and the uses of generative AI overlap with nearly everything an artist could possibly do, even down to imagination and style. This is because generative AI and AGI aim to simulate human cognitive function. Generative AI can mimic artistic style, imagine new works of art in any style, create images that look like they were taken with a camera, create images that look like paintings or drawings, can synthesize subjects with

different styles and concepts, you name it. Generative AI completely overlaps with everything an artist can do and therefore is absolutely able to completely replace artists. The fallacy is the idea that, since artists found ways to make new forms of content during previous technological advancements, that artists will always be able to find ways to make new forms of content with every new technological advancement. The reality is that a technology that simulates human cognition can and will replace human cognition. There has been nothing anywhere close to being able to simulate human creative cognition with any previous technological advancement. Most importantly, generative AI is based on “machine learning” technology. Machine Learning aims to make machines able to learn, just as humans do, except at rates that far exceed human capacity to learn. What this means is that any way that human artists find to differentiate ourselves from AI (you know, as those in support of AI say we have always done with every technological advancement prior) will be able to be learned and replicated by AI nearly instantly. Again, a common talking point is that with the invention of the camera artists began pushing more into stylization and more imaginative subject matter. A camera could not learn the things that human artists did to differentiate themselves from the part of art that overlapped with what a camera could do. However AI will be able to learn whatever we do instantly. This is the last technological advancement when it comes to being able to replace artists.

Another comparison that I’ve seen people make is to tools like Adobe Photoshop for digital painting compared to traditional painting. They will say that traditional artists were panicking about the rise to prominence of digital art. This comes back to the ideas surrounding what a “tool” actually is that I detailed earlier. Someone using something like Adobe Photoshop to create digital art does not have to mix paints or deal with any of the complexities of working with a physical medium, but they absolutely have to understand and apply through execution all of the necessary concepts for making great art that a traditional painter uses; form, value, composition, color, perspective, etc. If someone can create high quality digital paintings in Adobe Photoshop, they would also be able to create high-quality works in traditional artistic mediums. Much of the frustration of traditional artists when digital art rose to prominence was due to a misunderstanding of the technology. Ironically, artists out of touch with technology incorrectly thought that what digital artists were doing was actually what generative AI is doing today! They thought the computer was actually doing the artistic work for them.

I think most, if not all, artists would agree that things like mixing paints and dealing with the other physical aspects related to physical medium (like allowing paint to dry, etc.) is ancillary to the actual process of creating art, and therefore tools that remove that aspect of the process are fine because they don’t remove any significant chunk of creative-decision making from the process. However, something that actually removes the actual art-making from the process of making art is not to be thought of as another “artistic tool,” at that point that thing is just the artist. When we think of the Sistine Chapel, we think of Michelangelo as the artist and Pope Julius II as the one who commissioned the work.

Due to this, it’s important to point out the fact that change is not always, in and of itself, good. I’ve heard many people say that artists are just resisting change, which they usually follow up with references to previous technological advancements and how artists felt at the time about

them. There was even a commercial from a company that disrespectfully mentioned how artists are resisting change and how that particular company was instead embracing change. However, we've already examined why this technological advancement is unprecedented and incomparable to those that happened before. For any creative individual who is highly talented, this change is net negative.

People have been using photography and how it interacts with copyright law as a way to try to pry open the door to AI-generated content being copyrightable. I don't want to make any enemies here but push has come to shove and I'm just going to be honest. No offense to photographers - I enjoy taking creatively oriented photos myself - but objectively there are far less creative decisions that are made, controlled, or executed upon when a photographer sets up and takes a photo compared to, say, someone painting something from their imagination. When painting an image, one has to make the same broad decisions a photographer does regarding the composition, lighting, etc. but also an extreme amount of other decisions because the subject matter has to be rendered by the painter - it doesn't exist in the world already as it does for a photographer. As things are now, photography does not significantly overlap with traditional or digital art and therefore does not displace or threaten traditional or digital artists. As things are now an artform based on lesser amounts of creative decision-making and creative-control, therefore requiring less artistic skill overall, doesn't displace or threaten an original artform that is based on much deeper creative control and intention. However, the difference with allowing AI-generated content to be copyrightable is that AI overlaps entirely with everything both traditional and digital artists can do, as well as what photography, and it can be engaged with in a way that requires no creative-decision making at all. At this point, if the way photography interacts with copyright law is being considered as a doorway for copyright protections regarding generative AI, I think we likely need to re-examine what we deem a protectable threshold for creative decision-making. It should not be the case that due to an art form of less creative-control and decision-making we allow a technology that has complete overlap with art forms of complete creative-control and decision-making to gain copyright protection and destroy art forms of full creative-control and decision-making.

32.

Laws generally reflect the state of the world (of which technology is highly relevant) at the time they were created. None of the laws related to copyright were drafted with a technology that completely overlaps the full spectrum of human creativity in mind.

While it's true that you can't currently copyright style, there were some massive "protections" already "in place" that weren't even regarded as protections because they were just worldly realities: talent, number of artists, and time. There aren't that many people that pursue the arts as a career relative to the overall population and there simply are not that many people talented and dedicated enough to develop the skill to rip-off some other highly talented artist's style to

begin with. There was also a buffer of time before other people started to replicate an artist's style or integrate elements of it well enough to be significant because they would have to actually learn how to replicate the style first. Then there is the societal protection of being labeled a "rip-off," which encourages people to differentiate themselves. With all of these natural "protections" in place, law was written to address needed protections to the degree in which they were required while maintaining a healthy balance in order to not stifle artists and competition in the realm of artistic IP.

The entrance of AI removes all of those natural "protections" that were in place. Now people who have no artistic talent or experience can use the style of any master artist for whatever purpose they want, including to make money. Since the talent requirement is now non-existent, the number of people now in a position to be capable of using another artist's style is theoretically the entire population that has internet access. It no longer requires time for anyone to learn how to replicate an artist's style and integrate elements of it into their own style because AI can learn the style in no time and then anyone can use it. Due to these natural protections being eliminated, protections now need to be reconsidered.