AI, Copyright, and the Precarious Future of Creativity: Navigating a Legal and Ethical Maelstrom

1. Executive Summary

The rapid proliferation of generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) has ignited a fierce global debate, situated at the complex intersection of technological innovation, intellectual property rights, and the very essence of human creativity. Two recent, highly publicized events—the controversial dismissal of Shira Perlmutter, the U.S. Register of Copyrights, and the tragic story of OpenAI whistleblower Suchir Balaji—have served as critical flashpoints, dramatically escalating this discourse and exposing deep-seated tensions. This report analyzes these pivotal events, their profound impact on the interpretation of copyright law, particularly the "fair use" doctrine, and their broader implications for the future of creative industries and AI governance.

The dismissal of Register Perlmutter, immediately following the U.S. Copyright Office's (USCO) release of a nuanced report on AI and copyright that was perceived as more favorable to creators than to AI developers, has raised serious concerns about the politicization of copyright policy and the potential erosion of institutional independence in technologically complex domains. The report's introduction of "market dilution" as a cognizable harm under fair use, and its skepticism towards the "bad faith" sourcing of training data, likely triggered significant opposition, highlighting the high stakes involved in defining the legal boundaries for AI development.

Concurrently, the courageous whistleblowing by former OpenAI researcher Suchir Balaji, who alleged widespread copyright infringement in the training of models like ChatGPT, particularly post-commercialization, brought internal ethical conflicts within the AI industry to the forefront. His subsequent tragic death, and the ensuing controversy, have amplified public and legal scrutiny of AI companies' data practices and the adequacy of whistleblower protections. Balaji's actions underscored the argument that the shift to large-scale commercial deployment fundamentally alters the fair use calculus and highlighted the intertwining of copyright concerns with broader AI safety and oversight deficiencies.

These events have intensified the battle over the fair use doctrine. AI developers argue for a broad interpretation, emphasizing transformative use and public benefit, while creators and copyright holders point to market harm, commercial exploitation, and the sheer scale of unauthorized copying. The USCO's May 2025 report, though non-binding, has become a central text in this debate, with its analyses of transformative use, market harm, and data sourcing being heavily scrutinized. The limitations of traditional analogies, such as comparing AI to search engines or human learning, are becoming increasingly apparent, suggesting a need for more tailored legal frameworks.

The implications for the future of creativity are profound. While AI offers potential as a powerful assistive tool, concerns abound regarding the devaluation of human labor, job displacement, and the potential homogenization of creative expression. The legal definition of "authorship" in an era of human-AI collaboration is under strain, and copyright law's traditional focus on "expression" rather than "style" leaves creators vulnerable to AI's capacity for stylistic emulation.

Navigating this labyrinth requires robust ethical imperatives and a clear path toward effective AI governance. The current landscape is characterized by a tension between the rapid pace of AI innovation and the slower development of regulatory safeguards, a potential credibility gap in corporate "ethical AI" commitments, and the challenge of achieving global governance amidst geopolitical rivalries.

This report concludes that addressing these multifaceted challenges demands proactive engagement from policymakers to clarify copyright law and strengthen protections; greater transparency and accountability from the tech industry; unified advocacy and adaptation from the creative community; and continued nuanced legal and academic analysis. The controversies surrounding Perlmutter and Balaji are not mere isolated incidents but crucial opportunities to shape a future where AI innovation and human creativity can coexist responsibly and equitably.

2. Introduction: The Confluence of Controversy – AI, Copyright, and Shifting Power Dynamics

The dawn of advanced generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) has ushered in an era of unprecedented technological advancement, simultaneously sparking profound societal and legal questions. As AI models demonstrate increasingly sophisticated capabilities in creating text, images, music, and code, they have also exposed a fundamental conflict: the technology's insatiable appetite for vast datasets for training purposes clashes directly with the established rights of copyright holders whose works form the bedrock of these datasets. This tension has rapidly escalated into a fierce, multi-front debate involving technologists, artists, legislators, and legal scholars, all grappling with how to reconcile the promise of AI with the principles of intellectual property and the future of human creativity.

Against this backdrop of escalating debate, two distinct yet interconnected events in 2024 and 2025 have served as powerful catalysts, dramatically heightening public awareness and intensifying the scrutiny on the AI industry and its regulatory environment. The first is the controversial dismissal of Shira Perlmutter, the Register of Copyrights and Director of the U.S. Copyright Office (USCO), an event that many observers linked to the USCO's contemporaneous release of a significant report on AI and copyright. The second is the tragic story of Suchir Balaji, a young former OpenAI researcher who turned whistleblower, raising alarms about the company's data practices and alleged copyright infringement, before his untimely death. These events, while different in nature, have become flashpoints, illuminating the complex interplay of technological ambition, legal interpretation, ethical considerations, and significant economic interests that define the current AI landscape.

This report will dissect these catalyzing events, examining their origins, immediate consequences, and broader implications. It will explore how Perlmutter's dismissal and Balaji's whistleblowing have impacted the critical legal doctrine of "fair use," which stands at the heart of the AI copyright debate. Furthermore, the report will analyze the potential future of creativity in an age increasingly shaped by AI, considering the challenges and opportunities for human creators. Finally, it will assess the wider ramifications for AI governance, ethical development, and the ongoing efforts to establish a legal framework that can accommodate this transformative technology while upholding fundamental rights and societal values. The following timeline provides context for these key developments.

Table 1: Timeline of Key Events

Date	Event	Significance/Immediate Impact	Relevant Sources
Oct 2020	Shira Perlmutter appointed Register of Copyrights and Director of the U.S. Copyright Office (USCO).	Established Perlmutter as head of key agency for copyright policy.	
Nov 2022	OpenAI releases ChatGPT.	Marks a turning point in public awareness and commercialization of generative AI, raising ethical/legal questions about training data.	
Aug 2024	Suchir Balaji resigns from OpenAI.	Cites ethical concerns over AI training practices and copyright.	
Oct 2024	Suchir Balaji publishes blog post "When Does Generative AI Qualify for Fair Use?".	Publicly articulates his critique of AI companies' fair use claims and alleged copyright infringement.	
Oct 23, 2024	*New York Times* interviews Suchir Balaji about his concerns regarding OpenAI and copyright.	Balaji's allegations receive wider media attention.	
Nov 18, 2024	*New York Times* lawyers name Balaji in court filing as potential witness in lawsuit against OpenAI.	Positions Balaji as a key figure with potentially relevant evidence in a major copyright infringement case.	
Nov 26, 2024	Suchir Balaji found dead in his San Francisco apartment.	Tragic event that sparks widespread speculation and intensifies scrutiny of AI ethics and whistleblower protection. Initial ruling: suicide.	
Feb 14, 2025	San Francisco Medical Examiner releases autopsy report, ruling Balaji's death a suicide.	Official finding maintains suicide, though family disputes this and public skepticism continues.	
May 9, 2025	USCO releases pre-publication version	Highly anticipated report addresses fair	

Date	Event	Significance/Immediate Impact	Relevant Sources
	of "Report on Copyright and Artificial Intelligence – Part 3".	use for AI training; seen as critical of some AI developer arguments and more favorable to creators.	
May 9, 2025	Librarian of Congress Carla Hayden dismissed by President Trump.	Precedes Perlmutter's dismissal; part of a leadership shakeup at the Library of Congress.	
May 10, 2025	Shira Perlmutter dismissed as Register of Copyrights by President Trump.	Dismissal immediately after AI report release fuels accusations of political interference and intent to influence AI copyright policy.	
May 2025	Shira Perlmutter files lawsuit challenging her dismissal.	Argues President lacks authority for unilateral removal, seeks injunction.	
May 28, 2025	Federal judge refuses to issue temporary restraining order to block Perlmutter's removal.	Judge rules Perlmutter hasn't shown irreparable harm; legal case continues.	
June 4, 2024 (Published Date of Article)	AI employees (current/former from OpenAI, others) publish "A Right to Warn" letter.	Calls for greater oversight, accountability, and whistleblower protection in AI industry, citing significant risks. (Note: Date discrepancy in snippets likely refers to article publication, not letter release, but contextually relevant).	
Ongoing	Multiple copyright infringement lawsuits against AI companies (e.g., NYT v. OpenAI) progress.	Courts grapple with applying existing copyright law, especially fair use, to AI training and outputs.	

3. The Perlmutter Dismissal: Politicization at the Helm

of Copyright Policy?

The abrupt dismissal of Shira Perlmutter as the Register of Copyrights in May 2025 sent shockwaves through the intellectual property and technology law communities, raising profound questions about the independence of the U.S. Copyright Office (USCO) and the potential politicization of AI copyright policy. This move, occurring in close proximity to the release of a pivotal USCO report on AI, has been widely interpreted as an attempt to influence the direction of U.S. copyright law at a critical juncture for the burgeoning AI industry.

3.1. Background: Shira Perlmutter and the US Copyright Office (USCO)

Shira Perlmutter, a renowned copyright expert, was appointed Register of Copyrights and Director of the USCO in October 2020. Her tenure began towards the end of President Trump's first term, and she continued to serve under President Biden. The USCO, housed within the Library of Congress, plays a crucial role in the U.S. copyright system by administering copyright registration, providing authoritative interpretations of copyright law, and advising Congress on policy matters. Perlmutter's leadership was marked by efforts to modernize the office and address the complexities introduced by digital technologies, including AI. She was recognized for her expertise and willingness to engage with diverse viewpoints.

3.2. The US Copyright Office's May 2025 Report on AI and Copyright

Central to the controversy is the USCO's report, specifically "Copyright and Artificial Intelligence – Part 3: Generative AI Training," released in a "pre-publication" version on May 9, 2025. This report was the culmination of extensive public consultation, including over 10,000 comments received since August 2023 , and was highly anticipated for its guidance on the use of copyrighted works to train generative AI models.
Key findings of the report pertinent to the fair use debate include:
- **No Immediate Government Intervention on Licensing:** The report stopped short of recommending immediate government intervention on fair use or compulsory licensing for AI training. Instead, it advised allowing the nascent licensing market for AI training data to evolve organically, while also exploring alternative mechanisms like extended collective licensing schemes to address potential market gaps and inefficiencies.
- **Primacy of Transformative Use and Market Effects:** The report underscored that any fair use analysis must be context-specific, with transformative use and market effects being the most significant factors judges would likely assess. It stated that training a generative AI foundation model on a large and diverse dataset will "often be transformative," but cautioned that transformativeness is a matter of degree. Training is "most transformative" for research or non-substitutive tasks in closed systems, while training a model to generate outputs "substantially similar to copyrighted works in the dataset" is less likely to be deemed transformative, especially if the original work is not being parodied or commented upon.
- **Copying for Training Implicates Reproduction Right:** The USCO concluded that the steps required to produce a training dataset containing copyrighted works "clearly implicate the right of reproduction". Consequently, such copying would constitute infringement unless defensible as fair use.

- **AI Training vs. Human Learning:** The report pushed back against analogies comparing AI training to human learning or characterizing it as purely "non-expressive." It noted that AI training involves "the creation of perfect copies with the ability to analyze works nearly instantaneously," leading to models that "can create at superhuman speed and scale," thus differentiating AI's relationship to copyright from human cognitive processes.
- **Market Harm and "Market Dilution":** Perhaps one of its most controversial points, the report broadened the traditional understanding of market harm (the fourth fair use factor). It argued that this factor "should not be read so narrowly" as to only include direct substitution. The USCO introduced the concept of "market dilution," suggesting that the "speed and scale at which AI systems generate content pose a serious risk of diluting markets for works of the same kind as in their training data". This could occur even if AI outputs are not substantially similar to specific training works, but compete stylistically or thematically, thereby depressing the value of human-created works. This interpretation was generally seen as favorable to copyright holders.
- **"Bad Faith" Sourcing of Training Data:** The report addressed the issue of AI companies using datasets containing pirated or illegally accessed works. It stated that "the knowing use of a dataset that consists of pirated or illegally accessed works should weigh against fair use without being determinative," as copyright owners have a right to control access to their works.

Overall, the report was perceived by many as being more aligned with the interests of rightsholders than those of AI developers seeking broad, unencumbered use of copyrighted material for training. While some commentators described it as a "mixed bag" or not "blatantly" favoring one side , its critical stance on certain arguments for the free use of copyrighted materials was undeniable.

3.3. The Dismissal and Its Timing

Shira Perlmutter was dismissed by then-President Trump on Saturday, May 10, 2025 , just one day after the pre-publication release of the USCO's AI report. This action followed the dismissal two days earlier of Carla Hayden, the Librarian of Congress, who had appointed Perlmutter. The White House had cited criticism from conservatives that Hayden was advancing a "woke" agenda as a reason for her dismissal.

The timing of Perlmutter's removal, particularly on a weekend and so closely following the AI report's release, was widely viewed as no coincidence and strongly suggested a direct link to the report's content. Representative Joe Morelle, the top Democrat on the Committee on House Administration, decried the move as "a brazen, unprecedented power grab with no legal basis". Some reports and commentators explicitly connected Perlmutter's dismissal to her alleged refusal to endorse efforts by tech figures like Elon Musk to freely use copyrighted works for training AI models. The Writers Guild of America East, for instance, stated that the report's findings stood "in contrast to the opinion and financial interests of billionaires like Elon Musk and Sam Altman, Trump allies who own AI companies and want to freely steal copyrighted works". This sequence of events points to a potential erosion of institutional independence in technologically complex policy areas. The swift removal of a respected expert head of a technical agency like the USCO, immediately after the agency released a nuanced report critical of powerful tech and political interests, suggests a troubling vulnerability. Specialized government bodies may face undue political pressure when their findings conflict with executive agendas or the desires of influential lobbyists. This concern extends beyond copyright, touching upon the integrity of expert-driven policymaking in rapidly evolving fields such as AI. The

executive branch's actions could be interpreted as an attempt to directly steer the USCO's stance on AI and copyright, aligning it with specific economic or political preferences and bypassing established processes of policy development and expert consultation. This also raises constitutional questions, as Perlmutter's legal team argued that the Register of Copyrights is part of the legislative branch, and therefore not subject to unilateral presidential removal.

The "unusual pre-publication" of the USCO report the day before Perlmutter's dismissal adds another layer to this narrative. It is plausible that this release was a strategic counter-move. Sources close to the USCO suggested that Perlmutter, anticipating her impending dismissal, may have ordered the report released to ensure its findings entered the public record before any potential suppression or alteration by a new, politically aligned leadership. This suggests an internal awareness of the political risks associated with the report's content and a deliberate effort to preemptively counter the expected political fallout. Such an action would ensure that the Office's analysis remained available to courts, policymakers, and the public, irrespective of subsequent leadership changes.

Furthermore, the USCO report's introduction of "market dilution" as a cognizable harm under fair use likely represented a new and contentious battleground. This expansion of traditional copyright thinking, moving beyond direct substitution to include broader market saturation effects, could significantly restrict AI developers' ability to train models on copyrighted works if any AI-generated content competing stylistically or thematically is deemed harmful. This particular aspect of the report may have been a key trigger for opposition from AI proponents who rely on expansive interpretations of fair use. The Perlmutter dismissal, if linked to this specific point, underscores the sensitivity and high stakes associated with this reinterpretation of a core copyright doctrine.

3.4. Legal Challenges and Implications for USCO Independence

In response to her dismissal, Shira Perlmutter filed a lawsuit seeking an injunction to block her removal. Her legal team argued that the President lacks the authority to unilaterally remove the Register of Copyrights or to appoint an acting Librarian of Congress, as these positions are considered part of the legislative branch. While a federal judge, U.S. District Judge Timothy Kelly, initially refused to issue a temporary restraining order, ruling that Perlmutter had not met the legal burden of showing irreparable harm, the case was not finalized, and the path to a preliminary injunction remained open.

The dismissal and the ensuing legal battle have significant implications for the independence and future direction of the USCO. There are widespread concerns that these actions threaten to politicize the AI copyright debate. Such politicization could undermine the USCO's credibility and its influential role in shaping copyright law and policy. The USCO's reports and studies, while not legally binding on courts, traditionally serve as "persuasive authority" due to the Office's deep expertise. If the Office is perceived as being subject to political whims, the weight of its pronouncements could diminish.

Moreover, the controversy has cast doubt on the fate of the May 2025 AI report itself. Speculation abounds that the report might be suppressed, substantially revised to reflect a more pro-AI stance, or never finalized under new leadership. Even if the pre-publication version remains accessible, its official status could be contested, potentially weakening its influence in ongoing and future legal disputes. The Trump administration's actions signaled a clear intent to advocate for changes in copyright law more favorable to AI providers than to copyright holders,

directly countering the perceived leanings of Perlmutter's USCO.

4. The OpenAI Whistleblower: A Tragic Voice in the AI Ethics Debate

The discourse surrounding AI, ethics, and copyright was further intensified by the revelations and subsequent tragic death of Suchir Balaji, a young former researcher at OpenAI. His allegations against one of the leading AI development companies, coupled with the disturbing circumstances of his passing, have cast a harsh light on the internal practices of the AI industry and the profound ethical dilemmas it faces.

4.1. Suchir Balaji: The Whistleblower

Suchir Balaji was a 25-year-old (later reported as 26 at the time of his death) computer scientist who had worked at OpenAI for four years. During his tenure, he contributed to significant projects, including the development of training data for models like WebGPT and the influential GPT-4. However, Balaji grew increasingly troubled by the company's data acquisition and usage practices, leading him to resign in August 2024 due to these ethical concerns.

4.2. Core Allegations Against OpenAI

Balaji's primary concerns revolved around copyright infringement and the ethical implications of OpenAI's commercial activities:

- **Copyright Infringement and Fair Use:** He argued that OpenAI's extensive scraping of online material, including copyrighted books, articles, and code repositories, to train its AI models—particularly for commercialized products like ChatGPT (released in November 2022)—could no longer be justified under the "fair use" doctrine. He publicly stated his belief that OpenAI was violating U.S. copyright law. In October 2024, he penned a detailed blog post titled "When Does Generative AI Qualify for Fair Use?", in which he meticulously critiqued what he saw as AI's copyright loopholes and exploitation of fair use.
- **Threat to Livelihoods and Market Substitution:** Balaji contended that OpenAI's practices posed a direct threat to the livelihoods and business models of creators and publishers whose copyrighted material was being used without compensation to train AI systems that could then produce competing content. He argued that generative AI often creates market substitutes for original works, eroding revenue for the original creators.
- **Shift with Commercialization:** A key element of Balaji's critique was the idea that OpenAI's approach to data collection became particularly problematic with the company's shift towards heavy commercialization. While its use of web-gathered data might have been less contentious during its earlier, research-focused, non-profit phase, the launch and monetization of powerful tools like ChatGPT marked a turning point, raising serious ethical and legal questions about using copyrighted material for commercial gain. This "commercialization threshold" appears to have been a critical factor in his decision to speak out, suggesting a belief that the "purpose and character of the use"—a primary fair use factor—had fundamentally changed, thereby weakening any fair use defense.
- **Data Transparency:** Balaji also highlighted a concerning trend towards reduced transparency in OpenAI's data sourcing practices, noting that the company was less forthcoming about the specific datasets used for training newer models like GPT-4

compared to its predecessor, GPT-3.

4.3. OpenAI's Defense and Industry Stance

OpenAI has consistently maintained that its use of publicly available data for training AI models is protected by fair use principles. The company, along with other major AI developers like Google, has actively lobbied the U.S. government to classify AI training on copyrighted data as fair use, framing it as essential for maintaining U.S. competitiveness in the global AI race, particularly against rivals like China. In response to Balaji's public statements, OpenAI indicated that it first became aware of his specific concerns when *The New York Times* published his comments and that the company respected his and others' right to share their views freely.

4.4. The Tragic Death of Suchir Balaji

Suchir Balaji was found dead in his San Francisco apartment on November 26, 2024, at the age of 26. The initial ruling by authorities was suicide by a self-inflicted gunshot wound. However, this conclusion was immediately and forcefully disputed by his parents, who alleged foul play. They commissioned a second, private autopsy, which they claimed revealed signs of a struggle, including a head injury inconsistent with suicide, and suggested he was shot from an angle he could not have managed himself. Balaji's mother, Poornima Rao, publicly raised specific questions about the investigation, alleging failures in CCTV footage around her son's apartment and discrepancies in the toxicology report, particularly concerning the levels of GHB found in his system in combination with alcohol.

Despite these claims, the San Francisco Office of the Chief Medical Examiner (OCME) released its official autopsy report on February 14, 2025, reaffirming the cause of death as suicide. The OCME report noted that the apartment door was dead-bolted from the inside, Balaji had recently researched brain anatomy on his computer, gunshot residue was found on his hands, his DNA was on the pistol found at the scene (which was registered to him), and toxicology results showed alcohol, amphetamine, and GHB in his system.

The circumstances of Balaji's death, particularly his status as a whistleblower and his potential role as a witness in *The New York Times*'s copyright infringement lawsuit against OpenAI (Times lawyers had named him in a November 18, 2024 court filing as someone who might possess "unique and relevant documents"), fueled widespread public speculation and conspiracy theories. Prominent figures, including Elon Musk and Congressman Ro Khanna, called for greater transparency and a more thorough investigation, amplifying concerns that Balaji might have been silenced.

4.5. Impact of Balaji's Revelations and Death

Regardless of the unresolved questions surrounding his death, Suchir Balaji's actions as a whistleblower have had a significant impact. His articulate and technically informed critique of AI data practices from an insider's perspective lent considerable weight to the arguments of creators and copyright holders. The human element of a young, principled researcher taking an ethical stand, followed by his tragic death, personalized the abstract debates over AI ethics and copyright, making them more accessible and urgent to the broader public and policymakers. This served as a catalyst, intensifying public discourse and increasing scrutiny of AI companies' operations.

Balaji's case has also starkly highlighted the potential risks faced by whistleblowers in the

powerful and often secretive tech industry. Around the same period, a letter from current and former employees of OpenAI and other AI companies, titled "A Right to Warn about Advanced Artificial Intelligence," lamented the lack of effective oversight, the dominance of financial incentives over safety, and the insufficiency of existing whistleblower protections, which often focus on illegal activity rather than the many unregulated risks in AI. These broader concerns about AI safety and corporate accountability resonate strongly with Balaji's specific focus on copyright. The aggressive pursuit of data for model training, potentially disregarding copyright, can be seen as symptomatic of a wider industry culture that may prioritize rapid development and market dominance over ethical and legal boundaries. The fierce debate sparked by Balaji's whistleblowing, therefore, contributes not only to the copyright discussion but also to a more comprehensive push for AI governance that addresses transparency, accountability, and corporate responsibility across all facets of AI development and deployment.

5. Fair Use Under Fire: Reinterpreting Copyright for the AI Era

At the heart of the legal maelstrom surrounding AI and creativity lies the doctrine of "fair use," a cornerstone of U.S. copyright law that attempts to balance the rights of copyright holders with the public interest in the free flow of information and the creation of new works. The rise of generative AI has thrust fair use into an intense spotlight, with AI developers and copyright owners advancing starkly contrasting interpretations of how this flexible, yet notoriously complex, legal principle should apply to the training of AI models.

5.1. The Fair Use Doctrine: A Primer

Section 107 of the U.S. Copyright Act permits the limited use of copyrighted material without permission from the rights holder for purposes such as criticism, comment, news reporting, teaching, scholarship, or research. Whether a particular use is "fair" is determined on a case-by-case basis, guided by four statutory factors:
1. **The purpose and character of the use,** including whether such use is of a commercial nature or is for nonprofit educational purposes, and whether it is "transformative" (i.e., adds something new, with a further purpose or different character).
2. **The nature of the copyrighted work,** with use of more creative or unpublished works typically weighing against fair use.
3. **The amount and substantiality of the portion used** in relation to the copyrighted work as a whole.
4. **The effect of the use upon the potential market for or value of the copyrighted work**. No single factor is determinative, and courts weigh them together to reach a conclusion.

5.2. AI Developers' Arguments for Fair Use

AI developers and their proponents argue that training AI models on copyrighted data largely falls within the ambit of fair use, emphasizing the following points:
- **Transformative Use:** They contend that the process of training an AI model is highly transformative. The AI system is not merely reproducing the input data; it is "learning" patterns and relationships from vast quantities of information to acquire the ability to generate new, original outputs that are typically not substantially similar to any single

training input. The USCO's May 2025 report acknowledged that training a model on diverse datasets will "often be transformative," though it qualified this by stating transformativeness is a matter of degree.
- **Public Benefit and Innovation:** The development of AI is presented as serving a significant public interest by fostering innovation, creating powerful new tools with wide-ranging applications, and enhancing U.S. technological competitiveness on the global stage.
- **Analogy to Search Engines and Human Learning:** Some proponents draw analogies between AI data ingestion and the way search engines crawl and index the web (as in the *Authors Guild v. Google* "Google Books" case) or how humans learn by reading and processing diverse sources of information. The argument is that, like humans, AI models need to "read" broadly to learn. However, the USCO report notably pushed back against the direct analogy to human learning, citing AI's capacity for perfect copying and superhuman scale of operation.
- **Outputs Typically Non-Infringing:** A common assertion is that generative AI models rarely produce outputs that are substantially similar to specific works in their training datasets, meaning the final product shared with users is typically not infringing.

5.3. Creators' and Copyright Holders' Counterarguments

Conversely, creators, publishers, and their advocates argue that the unauthorized use of copyrighted works for AI training is a clear infringement and does not qualify as fair use:
- **Lack of Transformation and Market Substitution:** They argue that when AI models are trained on copyrighted works and then used to generate outputs that compete directly with, or serve as substitutes for, those original works or the market for similar creative content, the use is not genuinely transformative. This is particularly true, they contend, when the AI is commercialized. The USCO report itself noted that training a model to generate outputs "substantially similar to copyrighted works in the dataset" is less likely to be transformative.
- **Commercial Exploitation:** The large-scale, systematic ingestion of copyrighted works for the development of highly profitable commercial AI products, without permission or compensation to the creators, is seen as fundamentally unfair and exploitative.
- **Nature of the Work and Amount Used:** AI models often ingest entire copyrighted works, including those that are highly creative and expressive (e.g., novels, artworks, news articles). Using the entirety of such works typically weighs against a finding of fair use, unless the use is exceptionally transformative.
- **Market Harm:** This is a critical point of contention. Creators argue that AI training and the resultant AI-generated content cause significant harm to the existing and potential markets for their original works. This harm manifests as lost sales, diminished licensing opportunities (as AI companies bypass licensing by claiming fair use), and the broader "market dilution" highlighted by the USCO report, where a flood of AI-generated content devalues human-created works and makes it harder for creators to earn a living. Proponents of creator rights argue that licensing markets should be allowed to develop, enabling AI companies to pay for the data they use.
- **"Bad Faith" Data Sourcing:** The reported use of "pirated" datasets or material accessed through means that circumvent paywalls or terms of service is cited as evidence of bad faith, which should weigh heavily against fair use. The USCO report supported this view, stating that knowing use of illicitly sourced data bears on the character of the use.

5.4. Key Legal Cases and Interpretations

The legal landscape is actively being shaped by ongoing litigation:
- The case of *Thomson Reuters v. Ross Intelligence*, though involving an older, non-generative AI legal search tool, provided some early signals. The court rejected Ross's fair use defense for using Westlaw headnotes (derived from case law) to "train" its system to identify relevant cases, even though the headnotes themselves were not reproduced in Ross's output. The court emphasized the commercial nature of Ross's product and the potential negative impact on Thomson Reuters' market, including its ability to license its data for AI training. This ruling suggested that even non-reproductive "training" uses can fail the fair use test if they are commercial and harm the copyright owner's market.
- The *Authors Guild v. Google* (Google Books) decision is frequently invoked, often by AI proponents. In that case, the Second Circuit found Google's scanning of millions of books to create a searchable database and display snippets to be a transformative fair use, emphasizing the public benefit of the search functionality and the limited nature of the display. However, critics argue that the context of generative AI is fundamentally different, as GenAI models can produce extensive, novel content that may directly compete with the training data, unlike Google Books' snippet view which primarily served as a finding tool.
- Numerous high-profile lawsuits are currently underway, including those filed by *The New York Times*, the Authors Guild, and various groups of artists and writers against AI companies like OpenAI, Microsoft, and Stability AI. These cases are directly litigating the fair use of copyrighted materials for training large language models (LLMs) and image generators, and their outcomes will be pivotal.

5.5. Scholarly and Expert Opinions

The academic and expert community is deeply divided. Some legal scholars, like Mark MacCarthy (as analyzed by the Brookings Institution), argue that AI companies are likely to prevail on their fair use defense, primarily on the grounds of transformative use and the creation of new products that do not directly compete by reproducing the input works. The Chamber of Progress, critiquing Suchir Balaji's arguments, also strongly defends a broad interpretation of fair use for AI training, emphasizing that copyright does not protect facts and that enabling competition is a positive purpose of fair use.

Conversely, other experts and groups, such as the Authors Alliance (while supporting fair use for research), have expressed concerns about the USCO report's broad interpretation of market harm, finding it difficult to reconcile with existing case law. Techdirt was critical of the USCO report's overall stance on fair use, arguing it misapplied settled principles and unduly favored copyright owners at the expense of innovation. The Copyright Alliance has highlighted the crucial role of whistleblowers like Balaji in exposing practices that challenge fair use claims. The USCO's May 2025 report itself, despite being non-binding, stands as a significant piece of expert analysis that leans towards a more cautious approach to fair use in the AI training context.

The doctrine of "transformative use," a linchpin of modern fair use analysis since *Campbell v. Acuff-Rose Music, Inc.*, is being stretched to its conceptual limits by generative AI. AI developers emphasize the transformation involved in creating sophisticated models capable of

novel generation , while critics counter that if the AI's ultimate function is to produce content that serves the same market or purpose as the copyrighted training data, any transformation is superficial or illusory. The USCO report itself acknowledges this complexity, suggesting that transformativeness is a matter of degree, influenced by the AI's purpose and the similarity of its output to the training data. The *Ross Intelligence* case, though not involving generative AI, found a non-generative AI use to be non-transformative due to its commercial nature and competitive impact, offering a potential parallel. This debate forces a critical question: Is the legally relevant transformation in the *process* of model creation or in the *product* (the AI output) and its market role? The answer will likely require a more nuanced judicial interpretation of "transformative" specifically for AI, potentially reshaping fair use doctrine itself.

Furthermore, the analogies frequently employed in this debate—comparing AI training to search engine indexing or to human learning—are proving increasingly inadequate. The USCO report, for instance, explicitly challenged the human learning analogy by pointing to AI's perfect recall, immense scale, and superhuman speed of processing, which differ qualitatively from human cognitive processes. Critics also note that while search engines primarily direct users to original sources, generative AI has the capacity to supplant those sources by creating derivative or alternative content. These flawed analogies suggest that existing legal frameworks may not neatly fit the unique challenges posed by generative AI. Consequently, courts and policymakers might need to develop *sui generis* approaches for analyzing AI's use of copyrighted data, rather than force-fitting it into pre-existing conceptual boxes. This could involve recognizing AI training as a distinct category of use that requires its own specific rules or interpretations within copyright law.

The sheer scale of data required for training state-of-the-art AI models—often involving millions of copyrighted works —combined with the practical difficulties of negotiating individual licenses for each piece of data, and the looming threat of widespread infringement claims if fair use is narrowly interpreted, creates a scenario teetering on "market failure." Traditional, bilateral licensing mechanisms may be inefficient or entirely unworkable at this scale. This reality is implicitly acknowledged in the USCO report's exploration of "extended collective licensing schemes" as a potential solution to bridge gaps and overcome market inefficiencies, even as it primarily advocates for the organic evolution of voluntary licensing markets. While some large AI companies are striking substantial licensing deals with major content providers , such solutions may not be scalable or accessible for smaller creators or for all types of content. If courts ultimately rule against a broad application of fair use for AI training, and if individual licensing proves impractical on a mass scale, the pressure to devise alternative compensation and access mechanisms will be immense. This could compel a significant re-evaluation of collective rights management organizations and even the politically sensitive option of statutory or compulsory licensing—areas of copyright law that have historically been contentious but may offer a path forward in the AI era.

Table 2: Comparative Analysis of Stances on Fair Use in AI Training

Stakeholder Group	General Stance on Fair Use for AI Training Data	Key Arguments for Their Stance (citing specific fair use factors where applicable)	Proposed Solutions/Policy Recommendations (if any)
U.S. Copyright Office (as per May 2025 Report)	Cautious; fair use is context-specific and not a blanket permission. Training implicates	**- Transformative Use (Factor 1):** Often transformative, but degree varies based on	Allow nascent licensing market to evolve; explore extended collective licensing; no

Stakeholder Group	General Stance on Fair Use for AI Training Data	Key Arguments for Their Stance (citing specific fair use factors where applicable)	Proposed Solutions/Policy Recommendations (if any)
	reproduction right.	purpose and output similarity. Not analogous to human learning due to scale/precision. - **Nature of Work (Factor 2):** Less emphasis in report compared to other factors. - **Amount Used (Factor 3):** Full work copying may be reasonable if functionally necessary and outputs are not infringing. - **Market Harm (Factor 4):** Significant concern; includes "market dilution" from AI-generated content. - **Other:** "Bad faith" sourcing (pirated data) weighs against fair use.	immediate government intervention on compulsory licensing.
AI Developers/Tech Companies (e.g., OpenAI, Google)	Broadly supportive of fair use for AI training.	- **Transformative Use (Factor 1):** Training creates new tools and non-identical outputs; serves a new purpose. - **Public Benefit/Innovation (Factor 1):** Essential for technological progress and U.S. competitiveness. - **Market Harm (Factor 4):** Outputs typically don't substitute for specific training inputs; market for originals not directly harmed.	Classify AI training on copyrighted data as fair use; oppose restrictions that hinder innovation.
Creator Advocacy	Generally oppose	- **Lack of**	Require licenses and

Stakeholder Group	General Stance on Fair Use for AI Training Data	Key Arguments for Their Stance (citing specific fair use factors where applicable)	Proposed Solutions/Policy Recommendations (if any)
Groups/Whistleblowers (e.g., Authors Guild, Suchir Balaji)	broad fair use claims for commercial AI training without consent/compensation.	**Transformation/Market Substitution (Factors 1 & 4):** AI outputs often compete with or devalue original works, especially when commercialized. - **Commercial Exploitation (Factor 1):** Unfair to use copyrighted works for profit without permission. - **Amount Used (Factor 3):** Ingestion of entire creative works. - **Market Harm (Factor 4):** Significant damage to creators' markets through lost sales and licensing.	compensation for use of copyrighted works in AI training; stronger enforcement of copyright.
Legal Scholars – Pro-Fair Use for AI (e.g., Chamber of Progress, some aspects of Brookings analysis)	Support fair use for AI training as crucial for innovation.	- **Transformative Use (Factor 1):** AI learns and creates new things, akin to search engines or even human learning (though this is debated). - **Market Harm (Factor 4):** Copyright doesn't protect against all competition or protect facts; focus should be on direct substitution by infringing outputs, which is rare.	Allow courts to apply existing fair use principles; caution against premature regulation that could stifle AI development.
Legal Scholars – Pro-Creator Rights/Limited Fair Use for AI (e.g., some aspects of Authors Alliance, Techdirt critique of USCO)	Argue current fair use interpretations are being misapplied or are insufficient to protect creators from harms of AI training.	- **Misapplication of Transformative Use (Factor 1):** Focusing on the AI model as the "new work" ignores the purpose of the original works and the nature of	Need for clearer legal rules or reinterpretation of fair use that better accounts for AI's unique impact; potential for new licensing models.

Stakeholder Group	General Stance on Fair Use for AI Training Data	Key Arguments for Their Stance (citing specific fair use factors where applicable)	Proposed Solutions/Policy Recommendations (if any)
		the outputs. - **Market Harm (Factor 4):** USCO's "market dilution" concept may be too broad or inconsistent with case law, OR, conversely, current market harm analysis doesn't adequately capture AI's impact.	

6. The Future of Creativity: Navigating AI's Impact on Creators and Industries

The debate over AI and copyright is not merely a legal or technical one; it strikes at the heart of how society values and supports human creativity. As generative AI models become increasingly adept at producing sophisticated content, the implications for artists, writers, musicians, and other creative professionals are profound and multifaceted, prompting a re-evaluation of authorship, originality, and the economic underpinnings of creative work.

6.1. AI as a Tool vs. AI as a Creator

A central question in determining the legal status of AI-generated content is the role of human authorship. The U.S. Copyright Office has consistently maintained that U.S. copyright law protects works of human authorship. Consequently, content generated autonomously by an AI system, without sufficient human creative input, does not qualify for copyright protection on its own. However, the USCO acknowledges that AI can be used as an assistive tool by human creators. In such cases, if a human makes a sufficiently creative contribution to the work—through expressive input, modifications, arrangement, or selection—the resulting work may be eligible for copyright.
The challenge lies in determining what constitutes "sufficient human contribution." The USCO has indicated that this will be a case-by-case analysis, evaluating factors such as the extent of human control over the final output and whether the human input demonstrates original, creative authorship. Crucially, the Office has clarified that merely providing prompts to an AI system is generally insufficient to qualify as human authorship, as the AI model generates content based on complex algorithms and learned patterns rather than direct creative instruction from the prompter. This nuanced distinction between AI as a tool and AI as an autonomous creator will be critical in shaping intellectual property rights in an AI-suffused creative landscape.

6.2. Economic and Professional Impact on Human Creators

The proliferation of AI tools capable of generating high-quality creative content at low cost raises

significant economic concerns for human creators:
- **Devaluation of Human Labor and Income:** There is a palpable fear that AI could devalue the skills and labor of human artists and writers, leading to reduced income and fewer opportunities. If AI can produce comparable work more cheaply or quickly, the market price for human-created content may fall.
- **Job Displacement:** The potential for job displacement in creative industries is a serious concern. Roles traditionally performed by human illustrators, copywriters, musicians, and designers could be automated or significantly augmented by AI, leading to a shrinking job market for these professions.
- **Market Dilution:** As highlighted by the USCO report and echoed by many creators, there is a risk that AI systems could flood markets with vast quantities of content, making it increasingly difficult for human creators to gain visibility, find an audience, and earn a sustainable living. This "market dilution" could occur even if the AI-generated works are not direct infringements of specific copyrighted pieces but simply occupy the same stylistic or thematic space.

The promise of AI democratizing content creation by lowering barriers to entry presents a paradox. While more individuals may be empowered to create, this very accessibility, when coupled with the potential for AI to mass-generate content, could inadvertently devalue the unique skills, deep craft, and individual vision that characterize professional human artistry. The traditional "non-zero" or "modicum of creativity" standard for copyright protection might prove insufficient to meaningfully distinguish human artistry if AI can easily meet this low threshold (assuming some human involvement to satisfy authorship). This suggests that society may need to re-evaluate how it values and economically supports human creativity beyond the mere fact of copyrightability, perhaps by emphasizing provenance, the human story behind the work, or new economic models for creators.

6.3. The Nature of Creativity in an AI-Driven World

Beyond economics, AI challenges fundamental notions of creativity, originality, and authenticity:
- **Homogenization and Derivativeness:** Some scholars and critics express concern that an over-reliance on AI tools, which are trained on existing data, might lead to a narrowing of creative expression, resulting in more homogenized or derivative works rather than genuine innovation. If AI optimizes for patterns found in its training data, it may struggle to produce truly groundbreaking or idiosyncratic art.
- **Originality and Authenticity:** When AI can convincingly mimic the style of known artists or generate content that is virtually indistinguishable from human-created work , questions arise about the meaning of originality and authenticity. The ability of AI to emulate artistic styles is particularly problematic because copyright law traditionally protects the specific expression of ideas, not the underlying ideas or an artist's style itself. However, an artist's unique style is often central to their identity, brand, and market value. AI's proficiency in learning and replicating styles creates a vulnerability for creators whose distinctiveness is their primary asset, even if the AI-generated outputs are not direct copies of existing works. This gap in protection might lead to calls for new legal frameworks, such as "style rights" or an expansion of moral rights, or the application of unfair competition laws to address the commercial exploitation of an artist's signature style by AI—a significant departure from traditional intellectual property principles.
- **Augmentation of Human Creativity:** On a more optimistic note, AI also holds the potential to augment human creativity, serving as a powerful collaborator that can handle

tedious tasks, suggest new directions, or enable the creation of entirely new forms of art and expression. AI could lower the technical barriers to realizing complex creative visions, thereby increasing productivity and expanding the creative toolkit.

6.4. Ethical Considerations for Creative Industries

The integration of AI into creative workflows necessitates careful consideration of several ethical issues:
- **Consent and Attribution for Stylistic Use:** The ethics of training AI models on an artist's work to replicate their style without their consent or compensation is a major point of contention.
- **Transparency:** There is a growing demand for transparency regarding the use of AI in content creation, allowing audiences and consumers to understand the provenance of the works they engage with.
- **Fair Compensation and Credit:** As human-AI collaboration becomes more common, developing models for fair compensation and appropriate attribution for all contributors (human and, in some conceptual sense, the AI's developers or the underlying data creators) will be crucial. The USCO's stance that AI-generated content alone is not copyrightable but AI-assisted human work can be forces a deeper examination of what constitutes "sufficient human contribution." As AI tools become more sophisticated and capable of generating substantial portions of a work from minimal human prompting, the line between AI as a mere instrument and AI as a substantive co-creator will inevitably blur. This challenges the legal definitions of authorship and inventorship , potentially requiring legal frameworks to evolve to recognize new forms of collaborative authorship or to assign rights and responsibilities differently in human-AI creative partnerships. This also has implications for accountability when infringing or harmful content is generated through such collaborations.

7. Navigating the Labyrinth: Ethical Imperatives and the Path to AI Governance

The controversies surrounding Shira Perlmutter's dismissal and Suchir Balaji's whistleblowing are emblematic of a larger, urgent need for robust ethical frameworks and effective governance in the rapidly advancing field of artificial intelligence. As AI systems become more powerful and pervasive, navigating their development and deployment requires addressing not only copyright issues but also a broader spectrum of societal risks and ethical imperatives.

7.1. Broader Ethical Landscape in AI Development

Concerns about the ethical trajectory of AI development extend far beyond intellectual property. Insiders from prominent AI labs, including current and former employees of OpenAI, have publicly voiced alarm about systemic issues within the industry. In a notable open letter titled "A Right to Warn about Advanced Artificial Intelligence," these individuals highlighted:
- **Evasion of Oversight:** A tendency for leading AI companies to avoid effective oversight due to strong financial incentives to prioritize rapid development and deployment over caution.
- **Weak Accountability:** A lack of sufficient accountability structures, both internally within

companies and externally through government regulation, to manage the profound risks associated with advanced AI.
- **Lack of Transparency:** AI companies possess substantial non-public information about their systems' capabilities, limitations, and safety measures, yet have weak obligations to share this information with governments and none with civil society.
- **Significant Risks:** Beyond copyright, these employees pointed to risks including the further entrenchment of existing societal inequalities, the potential for widespread manipulation and misinformation, and, in the most extreme scenarios, the loss of control over autonomous AI systems, potentially resulting in catastrophic outcomes.

This reflects an inherent tension: the rapid pace of AI innovation, fueled by intense competition and substantial financial investment , consistently outstri инноваций в области ИИ, обусловленный интенсивной конкуренцией и значительными финансовыми стимулами , постоянно опережает способность правовых и этических рамок управления адаптироваться. Это создает постоянное регуляторное отставание, при котором вред может проявиться до того, как будут созданы эффективные меры защиты. The default approach often becomes innovation first, with regulation and ethical considerations lagging behind—a reactive stance that is particularly perilous with powerful, rapidly scaling technologies like AI.

7.2. The Role and Protection of Whistleblowers

Whistleblowers like Suchir Balaji, and others such as Louis Hunt and Ed Newton-Rex (who also raised concerns about AI companies' practices regarding copyrighted material and fair use) , play an indispensable role in exposing potential misconduct, ethical lapses, and unaddressed risks within the AI industry. Their courage often sparks crucial public discussions and can trigger regulatory scrutiny.
However, the environment for whistleblowers in the tech sector, particularly in the cutting-edge field of AI, is often precarious. As the "Right to Warn" letter detailed, existing whistleblower protections are frequently insufficient because they tend to focus on clearly illegal activities, whereas many of the most pressing risks associated with AI are not yet specifically regulated. Broad confidentiality agreements and non-disparagement clauses can effectively silence employees or expose them to retaliation if they voice concerns externally. The signatories of the letter called on AI companies to commit to fostering a culture of open criticism, to refrain from enforcing agreements that prohibit risk-related criticism, and to establish verifiably anonymous processes for raising concerns to boards, regulators, and independent expert organizations.
The public commitments made by AI companies to ethical AI development and safety can sometimes appear at odds with the experiences reported by whistleblowers and the outcomes of events like Perlmutter's firing. This potential disconnect between stated principles and internal practices, which may be driven by overriding commercial or political pressures, creates a credibility gap. "Ethical AI" initiatives, if not backed by robust, independent oversight and genuine accountability, risk being perceived as public relations efforts designed to preempt stricter regulation rather than representing deep, enforceable commitments to responsible development.

7.3. The Quest for Effective AI Governance

The confluence of these issues underscores the urgent need for effective AI governance. There is an ongoing debate about whether existing legal frameworks are adequate to address the

novel challenges posed by AI. While the USCO, for instance, suggested in its January 2025 report that current copyright laws adequately address AI-generated content for now (though not necessarily AI training) , many legal experts and policymakers believe new legislation or significant regulatory intervention is necessary. Intellectual property lawyer Bradley Hulbert, commenting on Balaji's allegations, suggested that congressional intervention might be required given the rapid evolution of AI technology. Some scholars go further, proposing fundamental revisions to legal frameworks to accommodate AI's transformative impact.

The challenge of AI governance is compounded by its inherently global nature. AI development, data sourcing, and deployment transcend national borders, meaning that isolated national or regional regulatory efforts may be insufficient or could even be counterproductive. The United Nations High-level Advisory Body on Artificial Intelligence has emphasized the need for international cooperation to develop interoperable governance frameworks, share AI's benefits equitably, and avert an "AI arms race" or a "race to the bottom" on safety and rights. However, achieving such global coordination is complicated by national interests—such as the U.S. framing AI dominance as a matter of national competitiveness against rivals like China —and differing legal traditions and policy priorities. The Perlmutter dismissal, for example, was seen by some analysts as potentially widening the policy gap between the U.S. and the European Union on technology regulation.

7.4. Potential Policy Directions

As policymakers grapple with these complex issues, several potential policy directions are emerging:

- **Licensing Regimes:** As discussed in the context of copyright, various licensing models are being considered. These range from encouraging voluntary direct or collective licensing agreements between AI developers and rights holders, to exploring more structured systems like extended collective licensing (ECL), as suggested by the USCO. In scenarios of persistent market failure, more interventionist options like compulsory licensing might also come under consideration, though these are generally viewed as a last resort.
- **Transparency in AI Training and Operation:** There are growing calls for mandates requiring AI developers to be more transparent about the datasets used to train their models and the functioning of their algorithms. An example is a bill introduced in the California legislature that would require developers of large-scale AI models to disclose copyrighted works used in training. Such transparency could facilitate licensing negotiations and help identify potential infringements or biases.
- **New or Clarified Legal Protections:** This could involve legislative amendments to clarify how existing copyright law applies to AI training and AI-generated outputs. Some stakeholders advocate for *sui generis* (unique) rights for AI-generated works, although the USCO currently sees no compelling case for this. Others focus on new protections for human creators against specific harms caused by AI, such as unauthorized stylistic imitation or unfair market competition.
- **Strengthening Ethical Oversight and Accountability:** This includes fostering independent oversight bodies, promoting robust internal ethics boards within AI companies that have genuine authority, and establishing clear lines of accountability for harms caused by AI systems.
- **Fortifying Whistleblower Protections:** Specific legal safeguards for AI whistleblowers that address the unique nature of AI risks, beyond just clear illegality, are needed to

encourage internal and external reporting of concerns without fear of retaliation.

8. Conclusion: Charting a Course Through Disruption and Debate

The dismissal of U.S. Copyright Chief Shira Perlmutter and the tragic saga of OpenAI whistleblower Suchir Balaji are not isolated incidents. They are potent symptoms of the profound legal, ethical, and economic disruptions unleashed by the rapid advancement of generative artificial intelligence. These events have served to galvanize an already intense debate, throwing into sharp relief the inherent conflicts between the voracious data requirements of AI models, the established rights of creators, the profit motives of a burgeoning industry, and the public interest in both innovation and the preservation of human creativity. They underscore the urgent need for clarity, foresight, and a balanced approach as society navigates this transformative technological frontier.

The core tensions remain largely unresolved. The scope of the "fair use" doctrine in the context of AI training data is being fiercely contested in courts and public forums, with billions of dollars and the future of entire industries hanging in the balance. The very definition of "authorship" and "creativity" is being challenged as AI's capabilities expand, blurring the lines between human and machine creation. The economic viability of creative professions faces uncertainty in a world where AI can generate vast quantities of content cheaply and quickly. And overarching all of this is the monumental challenge of establishing effective, adaptive, and globally coherent AI governance that can keep pace with the technology's evolution while mitigating its myriad risks.

Charting a responsible course forward requires concerted action from all stakeholders:

- **For Policymakers:** The onus is on legislative and regulatory bodies to proactively engage with these complex issues. This includes fostering inclusive, multi-stakeholder dialogues to inform policy; considering targeted legislative reforms to clarify the application of copyright law to AI (addressing data training, the status of AI-generated works, and viable licensing mechanisms); significantly strengthening whistleblower protections, especially for those raising concerns about unregulated AI risks; and actively pursuing international cooperation to establish baseline norms and standards for AI governance, preventing a race to the bottom.
- **For the Tech Industry:** AI developers and companies must move beyond rhetoric to demonstrate a genuine and verifiable commitment to ethical principles. This requires greater transparency in data sourcing and model development processes; proactive and fair engagement with creators and rights holders to develop equitable licensing solutions; and the cultivation of internal cultures that value open criticism, protect whistleblowers, and prioritize safety and accountability alongside innovation and profit.
- **For the Creative Community:** Artists, writers, musicians, and their representative organizations must continue to advocate forcefully for the protection of creator rights and fair compensation in the age of AI. This also involves exploring new economic models that can sustain creative livelihoods, adapting to and leveraging AI tools where appropriate while vigorously championing the unique value of human artistry, and actively participating in policy debates to ensure their voices are heard.
- **For Legal Professionals and Academia:** The legal and academic communities have a critical role to play in providing nuanced analysis, interpreting existing laws in the context of novel technological challenges, and helping to develop new legal and ethical frameworks that are fit for purpose in the age of AI. Continued research into the societal

impacts of AI and the efficacy of different governance approaches is essential. The controversies ignited by the Perlmutter dismissal and the Balaji revelations, while unsettling, offer a critical opportunity. They have brought the profound questions surrounding AI, copyright, and creativity to the forefront of public consciousness, creating a moment for deliberate and thoughtful consideration of the path ahead. Navigating the AI revolution successfully will require a delicate balance—one that fosters innovation and harnesses the immense potential of artificial intelligence, while simultaneously safeguarding human creativity, upholding ethical principles, protecting fundamental rights, and ensuring that these powerful new technologies ultimately serve the public interest. The choices made today in courtrooms, legislative chambers, and boardrooms will irrevocably shape the future.

Works cited

1. Judge denies request to block Trump from removing Copyright ..., https://apnews.com/article/trump-shira-perlmutter-copyright-office-6e06cd2c07af855de4d124132081c1ee 2. President Trump's firing of U.S. copyright chief over Generative AI ..., https://aifray.com/president-trumps-firing-of-u-s-copyright-chief-over-generative-ai-report-threatens-to-politicize-ai-copyright-debate/ 3. Fired Copyright Office head Shira Perlmutter sues Trump ... - NPR, https://www.npr.org/2025/05/23/nx-s1-5408982/register-of-copyrights-lawsuit-trump 4. The Implications of Shira Perlmutter's Firing on AI and Copyright ..., https://ubos.tech/news/the-implications-of-shira-perlmutters-firing-on-ai-and-copyright-laws/ 5. The Copyright Office Report about Fair Use in AI & the Dismissal of ..., https://www.authorsalliance.org/2025/05/12/the-copyright-office-report-about-fair-use-in-ai-the-dismissal-of-the-register-of-copyrights-a-drama-in-three-parts/ 6. US Copyright Office Issues Report Addressing Use of Copyrighted Material to Train Generative AI Systems, https://www.srz.com/en/news_and_insights/alerts/us-copyright-office-issues-report-addressing-use-of-copyrighted-material-to-train-generative-ai-systems 7. The Copyright Office Report on AI and Fair Use: A Generative ..., https://www.msk.com/newsroom-alerts-copyright-office-ai-report 8. [The AI Show Episode 148]: Microsoft's Quiet AI Layoffs, US Copyright Office's Bombshell AI Guidance, 2025 State of Marketing AI Report, and OpenAI Codex, https://www.marketingaiinstitute.com/blog/the-ai-show-episode-148 9. Copyright Chief Fired Amid AI Debate - Publishers Weekly, https://www.publishersweekly.com/pw/by-topic/digital/copyright/article/97748-copyright-chief-fired-amid-ai-debate.html 10. Statement on the Firing of Shira Perlmutter and the Release of the U.S. Copyright Office's Report on Generative AI Training | Press Room, https://www.wgaeast.org/statement-on-the-firing-of-shira-perlmutter-and-the-release-of-the-u-s-copyright-offices-report-on-generative-ai-training/ 11. OpenAI whistleblower speaks out on company's data scraping ..., https://getcoai.com/news/openai-whistleblower-speaks-out-on-companys-data-scraping-policies/ 12. Tragic Death of Whistleblower Suchir Balaji Raises Alarm in AI ..., https://opentools.ai/news/tragic-death-of-whistleblower-suchir-balaji-raises-alarm-in-ai-community 13. Tragic Death of OpenAI Whistleblower Suchir Balaji - Paradigm Shift, https://www.paradigmshift.com.pk/suchir-balaji/ 14. Suchir Balaji - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Suchir_Balaji 15. AI Whistleblowers: The Truth-Tellers Behind the Algorithms ..., https://copyrightalliance.org/ai-whistleblowers/ 16. OpenAI whistleblower who raised legal concerns about ChatGPT's datasets has died - PBS, https://www.pbs.org/newshour/nation/openai-whistleblower-who-raised-legal-concerns-about-chatgpts-datasets-has-died 17. Former OpenAI Staffer Says the Company Is Breaking Copyright

Law and Destroying the Internet : r/Futurology - Reddit,
https://www.reddit.com/r/Futurology/comments/1gcilj4/former_openai_staffer_says_the_compan
y_is/ 18. the copyright conundrum: ani vs openai and the fight for fair use,
https://www.khuranaandkhurana.com/2025/03/26/the-copyright-conundrum-ani-vs-openai-and-t
he-fight-for-fair-use/ 19. www.forbes.com,
https://www.forbes.com/sites/virginieberger/2025/03/15/the-ai-copyright-battle-why-openai-and-
google-are-pushing-for-fair-use/#:~:text=Artificial%20intelligence%20powerhouses%20OpenAI
%20and,against%20international%20rivals%2C%20particularly%20China. 20. OpenAI
whistleblower Suchir Balaji's mom shares image from day of ...,
https://www.livemint.com/news/world/openai-whistleblower-death-case-suchir-balaji-rejects-suici
de-claim-alleges-cctv-failures-toxicology-report-erro-11741857584375.html 21. The Dark Side of
AI: Financial Gains Lead to Oversight Evasion, Say ...,
https://www.cmswire.com/digital-experience/employees-say-ai-companies-dodge-effective-overs
ight-threaten-humanity/ 22. AI Infringement Case Updates: February 24, 2025 - McKool Smith,
https://www.mckoolsmith.com/newsroom-ailitigation-11 23. How the Open AI "Whistleblower"
Gets Fair Use Wrong: Applying the ...,
https://progresschamber.org/insights/how-the-open-ai-whistleblower-gets-fair-use-wrong/ 24.
The U.S. Copyright Office's Draft Report On AI Training Errs On Fair Use | Techdirt,
https://www.techdirt.com/2025/05/21/the-u-s-copyright-offices-draft-report-on-ai-training-errs-on-
fair-use/ 25. Copyright alone cannot protect the future of creative work,
https://www.brookings.edu/articles/copyright-alone-cannot-protect-the-future-of-creative-work/
26. Scraping the Surface: OpenAI Sued for Data Scraping in Canada - American Bar
Association,
https://www.americanbar.org/groups/business_law/resources/business-law-today/2025-february/
openai-sued-data-scraping-canada/ 27. OpenAI, The New York Times debate copyright
infringement of AI tech companies in trial arguments - Digiday,
https://digiday.com/media/openai-the-new-york-times-debate-copyright-infringement-of-ai-tech-c
ompanies-in-first-trial-arguments/ 28. US Copyright Office Issues Key Update On AI And
Copyrightability – January 2025 Report,
https://globallawexperts.com/u-s-copyright-office-issues-key-update-on-ai-and-copyrightability-ja
nuary-2025-report/ 29. Creativity, Artificial Intelligence, and the Requirement of Human Authors
and Inventors in Copyright and Patent Law,
https://www.law.berkeley.edu/wp-content/uploads/2025/01/2024-07-05-Mammen-et-al-AI-Creativ
ity-white-paper-FINAL-1.pdf 30. Conference Abstracts - Squarespace,
https://static1.squarespace.com/static/65bef1fde463c6764ff27da8/t/67e9f3578013e0018cd5219
4/1743385441917/7th+IPIRA+Abstracts.pdf 31. Governing AI for Humanity - Final Report - the
United Nations,
https://www.un.org/sites/un2.un.org/files/governing_ai_for_humanity_final_report_en.pdf