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## Q Can you summarize the video from three separate perspective one about AI ethics, AI regulation, generative AI and thoughts about the future for the world with AI, in as much detail and addressing all the varied perspectives.

Sure, I can summarize the video from the perspectives of AI ethics, AI regulation, generative AI, and thoughts about the future of the world with AI.

**AI Ethics:**

1. **Data Privacy and Security:** Sam Altman, the CEO of OpenAI, emphasizes the importance of protecting individuals' privacy and data. He raises concerns about using consumer data to train AI models and the need for a national privacy law. He also discusses the need for transparency in how data is used, especially in the context of AI-generated material.
2. **Intellectual Property:** Altman raises questions about who owns the rights to AI-generated material and the use of copyrighted songs and images in training these models. He suggests that creators should have control over how their creations are used and that there should be more transparency in the process.
3. **Misinformation**: Altman mentions a bill introduced on political advertisements and the need to hold people accountable for spreading false information. He also discusses the spread of fake information through social media and other platforms, and the difficulty in detecting and preventing it.

**AI Regulation:**

1. Liability Frameworks: Altman discusses the need for liability frameworks for tool users and those who build on top of their creations. He argues that the government should not over-regulate online platforms, but rather establish liability standards for major companies like IBM.
2. Regulatory Approach: Altman advocates for a precision regulatory approach that focuses on the point of risk, where technology meets society. He suggests the need for a Cabinet-level organization in the United States to address the large number of risks and amount of information related to AI.
3. International Agency for AI Regulation: Altman proposes an international agency for AI regulation that may have jurisdiction over US corporations and activity not related to national security. He believes this is a step in the right direction to regulate AI in a fair way.

**Generative AI:**

1. Responsibility: Altman mentions that Section 230, which provides immunity for online platforms, does not apply to generative AI, and companies like OpenAI bear a lot of responsibility for the tools they create.
2. Impact on Creators: Altman discusses the need for creators to find new ways to succeed with new technology. He mentions working with visual artists and musicians to figure out what people want. The conversation then turns to compensation for artists and the use of copyrighted works without consent.
3. Transparency: Altman emphasizes the importance of transparency in social media platforms and algorithms, particularly in relation to local news. He suggests that the Platform Accountability and Transparency Act would give researchers access to information about algorithms and bias, which is crucial for understanding the political and competitive ramifications of generated content.

**Future of the World with AI:**

1. Global Coordination: Altman believes that the development of AI is inevitable and that it will require global coordination to work properly. He expresses a desire to learn from others and support the idea of the US taking a leadership role in this effort.
2. Impact on Local News: Altman argues that as more content is generated by unreliable systems, the quality of overall news will decline, making transparency even more important. He also mentions a study by News Guard that shows 50 websites are already generated by bots, which will make it more difficult for local news organizations to compete.
3. Impact on Various Industries: The video highlights concerns from various industries, including healthcare, finance, and logistics, about the impact of AI on their businesses. The author argues that establishing federal preemption for online privacy and data security is necessary, and the Commerce and Judiciary Committees must decide how to move forward.

## Q Summarise this video in key points.

The video titled "Part 3 ChatGPT OpenAI CEO; Sam Altman, Testifies at Senate AI Oversight Hearing 05.16.23" is a Senate Judiciary Committee hearing examining artificial intelligence regulations. Here are the key points:

1. The CEO of OpenAI, Sam Altman, emphasizes the need for collaboration to figure out the right framework for regulating AI. He mentions that Section 230, which provides immunity for online platforms, does not apply to generative AI, and companies like OpenAI bear a lot of responsibility for the tools they create.
2. Altman discusses the need for liability frameworks for tool users and those who build on top of their creations. He argues that the government should not over-regulate online platforms, but rather establish liability standards for major companies like IBM.
3. Altman advocates for a precision regulatory approach that focuses on the point of risk, where technology meets society. He suggests the need for a Cabinet-level organization in the United States to address the large number of risks and amount of information related to AI. He also proposes an international agency for AI regulation.
4. Altman acknowledges the complexities of diplomacy involved in the development of a global standard for artificial intelligence (AI). He expresses a desire to learn from others and support the idea of the US taking a leadership role in this effort.
5. Altman raises questions about who owns the rights to AI-generated material and the use of copyrighted songs and images in training these models. He suggests that creators should have control over how their creations are used and that there should be more transparency in the process.
6. Altman discusses the importance of protecting individuals' privacy and data, and mentions efforts to create a national privacy law. He also mentions a bill introduced on political advertisements and the need to hold people accountable for spreading false information.
7. Altman emphasizes the importance of transparency in social media platforms and algorithms, particularly in relation to local news. He suggests that the Platform Accountability and Transparency Act would give researchers access to information about algorithms and bias, which is crucial for understanding the political and competitive ramifications of generated content.
8. The speaker discusses the idea of not suing social media companies to allow the internet to flourish, but also note that Section 230 is being used by social media companies to avoid liability for user-generated content. The speaker gives an example of a mother calling a company about an app being used to bully her child, and the company not responding, leading to the child's suicide.

The video ends with a reminder not to miss the fourth part of the discussion.

## Q Transcript

Part 3 ChatGPT OpenAI CEO; Sam Altman, Testifies at Senate AI Oversight Hearing 05.16.23 - YouTube

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dsIZ6RsTHcI

Transcript:

(00:00) the fate of humanity rest on the decisions and regulations implemented regarding AI in present times during a senate reading on AIO website CEO of openai provides testing part three senator thank you I think what's happening today in this hearing room is historic I can't recall when we've had people representing large corporations or private sector entities come before us and plead with us to regulate them in fact many people in the Senate base their careers on the opposite that the economy will Thrive if

(00:44) Government gets the hell out of the way and what I'm hearing instead today is that stopped me before I innovate again message and I'm just curious as to how we're going to achieve this as I mentioned section 230 in my opening remarks we learned something there we decided that in section 230 that we were basically going to absolve the industry from liability for a period of time as it came into being well Mr Oldman on the podcast earlier this year you agreed with host Kara Swisher that section 230 doesn't apply to

(01:26) generative AI and that developers like open AI should not be entitled to full immunity for harms caused by their products so what have we learned from 230 that applies to your situation with AI thank you for the question Senator I I don't know yet exactly what the right answer here is I'd love to collaborate with you to figure it out I do think for a very new technology we need a new framework certainly companies like ours bear a lot of responsibility for the tools that we put out in the world but tool users do

(02:00) as well and how we want and also people that will build on top of it between them and the end consumer and how we want to come up with a live a liability framework there is a super important question um and we'd love to work together the point I want to make is this when it came to online platforms the inclination of the government was get out of the way this is a new industry don't over regulate it in fact give them some breathing space and see what happens I'm not sure I'm happy with the outcome as I

(02:30) look at online platforms me either and then the harms that they have created uh problems that we've seen demonstrated in this committee child exploitation cyber bullying online drug sales and more I don't want to repeat that mistake again and what I hear is the opposite suggestion from the private sector and that is come in the front end of this thing and establish some liability standards Precision regulation for a major company like IBM to come before this committee and say to the government please regulate us

(03:04) can you explain the difference in thinking from the past and now yeah absolutely um so for us this comes back to the issue of trust and Trust in the technology trust is our license to operate as I mentioned in my remarks and so we firmly believe and we've been calling for precision regulation of artificial intelligence for years now this is not a new position we think that technology needs to be deployed in a risk responsible and queer way that people we've taken principles around that trust and transparency we call them

(03:39) our principles that were articulated years ago and build them into practices that's why we're here advocating for precision regulatory approach so we think that AI should be regulated at the point of risk essentially and that's the point at which technology meets Society let's take a look at what that might appear to be members of Congress are pretty smart a lot of people maybe not as smart as we think we are many times and government it certainly has a capacity to do amazing things but when you talk about our ability to

(04:12) respond to the current Challenge and perceive challenge of the future challenges which you all have described in terms which are hard to forget as you said Mr Alden things can go quite wrong she said Mr Marcus democracy is threatened I mean the magnitude of the challenge you're giving us is substantial I'm not sure that we respond quickly and with enough expertise to deal with Professor Marcus you made a reference to CERN the international Arbiter of nuclear research I suppose I don't know if that's a fair characterization but it's

(04:51) the characterization I'll start with what is it what agency of this government do you think exists that could respond to the challenge that you've laid down today we have many agencies that can respond in some ways for example the FTC um we have CC and there are many agencies that can but my view is that we probably need a cabinet level uh organization within the United States in order to address this and my reasoning for that is that the number of risks is large the amount of information to keep up on is so much I think we need a lot

(05:33) of technical expertise I think we need a lot of coordination of these efforts so there is one model here where we stick to only existing law and try to shape all of what we need to do and each agency does their own thing but I think that AI is going to be such a large part of our future and is so complicated and moving so fast this does not fully solve your problem about a dynamic world but it's a step in that direction to have an agency that's full-time job is to do this I personally have suggested in fact

(06:04) that we should want to do this in a global way I wrote an article on The Economist I have a link in here an invited essay for the economist suggesting we might want an international Agency for AI That's what I wanted to go to next and that is the fact that I'll get aside from the CERN and nuclear examples because government was involved in that from day one at least in the United States but now we're dealing with Innovation which doesn't necessarily have a boundary we may create a great U.S agency and I

(06:36) hope that we do that may have jurisdiction over U.S corporations and U.S activity that doesn't have a thing to do with what's going to bombard us from outside the United States how do you give this International Authority the authority to regulate in a fair way for all entities involved in AI I think that's probably over my pay grade I would like to see it happen and I think it may be inevitable that we push there I mean I I think the politics behind it are obviously complicated I'm really heartened by the degree to which

(07:08) this room is bipartisan and supporting the same things and that makes me feel like it might be possible I I would like to see the United States take leadership in such organization it has to involve the whole world and not just the US to work properly I think even from the perspective of the companies it would be a good thing so the companies themselves do not want a situation where you take these models which are expensive to train you have to have 190 some of them um one for every country that that wouldn't be a good way of operating when

(07:38) you think about the energy costs alone just for training these systems it would not be a good model if every country has its own policies and each for each jurisdiction every company has to train another model and maybe you know different states are different so Missouri and California have different rules and so then that requires even more training of these expensive models with huge climate impact um and I mean just it would be very difficult for the companies to operate if there was no Global coordination and

(08:05) so I think that we might get the companies on board if there's bipartisan support here and I think there's support around the world that is entirely possible that we could develop such a thing but obviously there are many you know nuances here of diplomacy that are over my pay grade I would love to learn from you all to try to help make that happen Mr open can I weigh in just briefly briefly please uh I want to Echo support for what Mr Marcus said I think the U.

(08:32) S should lead here and do things first but to be effective uh we do need something Global as you mentioned this can this can happen everywhere there is precedent uh I know it sounds naive to call for something like this and it sounds really hard there is precedent we've done it before with the iaea we've talked about doing it for other Technologies they're given what it takes to make these models uh the chip supply chain the sort of limited number of competitive gpus the power the US has over these companies I think there are paths to

(09:02) the U.S setting some International standards that other countries would need to collaborate with and be part of that are actually workable even though it sounds on its face like a impractical idea and I think it would be great for the world thank you Mr chairman thanks Senator Durbin and in fact I think we're going to hear more about what Europe is doing European Parliament already is acting on an AI act uh on social media Europe is ahead of us uh we need to be in the lead I think uh your your point is very well taken uh

(09:37) let me turn to Senator Graham Senator Blackburn thank you Mr chairman and thank you all for here with us today I put into my chat GPT account should Congress regulate AI chat GPT and it gave me four Pros four cons and says ultimately the decision rests with Congress and deserves careful consideration so on that you know it was uh very balanced I recently visited with the Nashville Technology Council I represent Tennessee and of course you had people there from Health Care Financial Services Logistics educational

(10:18) entities and their concerned about what they see happening with AI with the utilizations for their companies Miss Montgomery you know some similar to you they've got Health Care people are looking at disease analytics they're looking at predictive diagnosis how this can better uh the outcomes for patients Logistics industry looking at ways to save time and money and yield efficiencies uh you've got financial services that are saying how does this work with Quantum how does it work with blockchain how can we use this but uh it

(10:59) I think as we have talked with them Mr chairman one of the things that continues to come up is yes uh Professor Marcus as you were saying the EU different entities are ahead of us in this but we have never established a federally preem given preemption for online privacy for data security and put some of those foundational elements in place which is something that we need to do as we look at this and it will require that Commerce Committee Judiciary Committee decide how we move forward so that people own their virtual

(11:40) you and um Mr Altman I was glad to see last week that your open AI models are not going to be trained using consumer data I think that that is important and if we have a second round I've got a host of questions for you on data security and privacy but I think it's important to let people control their virtual you their information in these settings and I want to come to you on music and content creation because we've got a lot of songwriters and artists and a I think we have the best creative community on the

(12:23) face of the Earth they're in Tennessee and they should be able to decide if they're copyrighted songs and images are going to be used to train these models and I'm concerned about open ai's jukebox uh it offers some re-renditions in the style of Garth Brooks which suggests that open AI is trained on Garth Brooks songs I went in this weekend and I said write me a song that sounds like Garth Brooks and it gave me a different version of Simple Man so it's interesting that it would do that but you're training it on these

(13:08) copyrighted songs these MIDI files these sound Technologies so as you do this who owns the rights to that AI generated material and using your technology could I remake a song insert content from my favorite artist and then on the creative rights to that song thank you Senator uh this is an area of great interest to us I would say first of all we think that creators deserve control over how their Creations are used and what happens sort of beyond the point of them releasing it into the world um second I think that we need to figure

(13:59) out new ways with this new technology that creators can win succeed have a vibrant life and I'm optimistic that this will present it then let me ask you this how do you compensate the art the artist that's exactly what I was going to say okay um we'd like to we're working with artists now visual artists musicians uh figure out what people want there's a lot of different opinions unfortunately at some point we'll have let me ask you this do you favor something like Sound Exchange that has worked in the area of

(14:29) radio I'm not familiar with exchange I'm sorry okay you've got your team behind you get back to me on that that would be a third party entity okay so let's discuss that let me move on um can you commit as you've done with consumer data not to train chat GPT open AI jukebox or other AI models on artists and songwriters copyrighted works are used their voices and their likenesses without first receiving their consent so first of all jukebox is not a product we offer that was a research release but

(15:10) it's not you know unlike child we've lived through Napster yes but that was something that really cost a lot of artists a lot of money oh I understand yeah for sure digital distribution era I don't I don't know the numbers on jukebox on the top of my head as a research release I can I can follow up with your office but it's not jukebox is not something that gets much attention or usage it was put out to to show that something's possible well Senator Garvin just said you know and I think it's a fair warning to you all if

(15:44) we're not involved in this from the get-go and you all already are a long way down the path on this but if we don't step in then this gets away from you so are you working with a copyright office are you considering protections for Content generators and creators in generative AI yes we are absolutely engaged on that again to reiterate my earlier point we think that content creators content owners need to benefit from this technology exactly what the economic model is we're still talking to artists and content owners about what

(16:20) they want I think there's a lot of ways this can happen but very clearly no matter what the law is the right thing to do is to make sure people get significant upside benefit from this new technology and we believe that it's really going to deliver that but that content owners licenses people totally deserve control over how that's used and to benefit from it okay so on privacy then how do you plan to account for for the collection of voice and other user-specific data things that are copyright righted user-specific data

(16:54) through your AI applications because if I can go in and say write me a song that sounds like Garth Brooks and it takes part of an existing song there has to be a compensation to that artist for that utilization and that use if it was radio play it would be there if it was streaming it would be there so if you're going to do that what is your policy for making certain you're accounting for that and you're protecting that individual's right to privacy and their right to secure that data and that

(17:35) created work so a few thoughts about this uh number one we think that people should be able to say I don't want my personal data trained on that's I think that's right that gets to a national Privacy Law which many of us here on the Deus are working toward getting something that we can use I think strong privacy my time's expired like in the old back thank you Mr chip thanks Senator Blackburn Senator Corbin thank you very much Mr chairman um and uh um Sarah Blackburn I love Nashville I love Tennessee love your music but I

(18:08) will say I use chat GPT and just asked what are the top creative song artists of all time and two of the top three were from Minnesota that would be uh Prince I'm sure they might Vincent Bob Dylan AI won't change and you're seeing it here all right so on a more serious note though my staff and I um in my role as chair of the rules committee and leading a lot of the election bill and we just introduced a bill that's representative Yvette Clark from New York introduced over the house Senator Booker and Bennett and I did

(18:45) um on political advertisements but that is just of course the tip of the iceberg you know this from your discussions with Senator Hawley and others about the images and my own view it's Senator grams of section 230 is that we just can't let people make stuff up and then not have any consequence but I'm going to focus in on what my job one of my jobs will be on the rules committee and that is election misinformation and we just asked Chef GPT to do a tweet about a polling location in Bloomington Minnesota and said there are long lines

(19:19) at this polling location at atonement Lutheran Church where should we go now albeit it's not an election right now but the answer the tweet that was drafted was a completely fake thing go to one two three four Elm Street and so you can imagine what I'm concerned about here with an election upon us with primary elections upon us that we're going to have all kinds of misinformation and I just want to know what you're planning on doing it doing about it I know we're going to have to do something soon not just for the

(19:53) images of the candidates but also for misinformation about the actual polling places and election rules thank you Senator that we we talked about this a little bit earlier we are quite concerned about the impact this can have on elections I think this is an area where hopefully the entire industry in the government can work together quickly there's there's many approaches and I'll talk about some of the things we do but before that I think it's tempting to use the frame of social media um but this is not social media this is

(20:26) different and so the the response that we need is different you know that this is a tool that a user is using to help generate content more efficiently than before they can change it they can test the accuracy of it if they don't like it they can get another version but it still then spreads through social media or other ways like chat gbt is a you know single player experience where you're just using this um and so I think as we think about what to do that's that's important to understand that there's a lot that we can and do do

(20:58) there um there's things that the model refuses to generate we have policies uh we also importantly have monitoring so at scale uh we can detect someone generating a lot of those tweets even if generated one tweet is okay yeah and of course there's going to be other platforms and if they're all spouting out fake election information I just that I think what happened in the past with Russian interference and lag it's just going to be a tip of the iceberg without some of those fake ads so that's number one

(21:29) number two um is the impact on intellectual property and Senator Blackburn was getting in some of this with song rights um and I have serious concerns about that but news content um so Senator Kennedy and I have a bill uh that was really quite straightforward that would simply allowed uh the um the news organizations an exemption to be able to negotiate with basically Google and Facebook Microsoft was supportive of the bill but basically negotiate um with them to get better rates and um be able to not have some leverage and

(22:07) other countries are doing this Australia and the like and so my question is when we already have a study by Northwestern predicting that one-third of the U.S newspapers are that roughly existed two decades are gonna go are going to be gone by 2025 unless you start compensating for everything from book movies books yes but also news content we're going to lose any realistic content producers and so I'd like your response to that and of course there is an exception for copyright in section 230 but I think

(22:42) asking little newspapers to go out and Sue all the time just can't be the answer they're not going to be able to keep up yeah like it is my hope that tools like what we're creating can help news organizations do better I think having a vibrant having a vibrant National media is critically important and let's call it round one of the internet has not been great for that right we're talking here about local that you know reporting or high school for show scores and a scandal in your city council those kinds

(23:10) of things for sure they're the ones that are actually getting the worst the low radio stations and broadcast but do you understand that this could be exponentially worse in terms of local news content if they're not compensated well because what they need is to be compensated for their content and not have it stolen yeah again our our model you know our the current version of uh gpt4 ended training in 2021 it's not it's not it's not a good way to find recent news uh and it's I don't think

(23:41) it's a service that can do a great job of linking out although maybe with our plugins it's it's possible uh if there are things that we can do to help local news we would certainly like to again I think it's it's critically important um May I add something there yeah but let me just ask you a question you can combine them quick more transparency on the platforms um Senator Coons and sonar Cassidy and I have the platform accountability transparency act to give researchers access to this information of the

(24:10) algorithms and the like on social media data would that be helpful and then why don't you just say yes or no and then go at his uh the transparency is absolutely critical here to understand the political ramifications bias ramifications and so forth we need transparency we've got the data we need to know more about how the models work we need to have scientists have access to them I was just going to amplify your earlier point about local news a lot of news is going to be generated by these systems they're not reliable News Guard

(24:37) already is a study I'm sorry it's not in my appendix but I will get it to your office showing that something like 50 websites are already generated by Bots we're going to see much much more of that and it's going to make it even more competitive for the local news organizations and so the quality of the sort of overall news Market is going to decline as we have more generated content by systems that aren't actually reliable in the content they're generated thank you and thank you at a very timely basis to make the

(25:05) argument why we have to mark up this bill again in June I appreciate it thank you Senator Graham thank you Mr chairman and Senator Hawley for having this I'm trying to find out how it is different than social media and learn from the mistakes we made with social media the idea of not suing social media companies is to allow the internet to flourish because and if I slander you uh you you can sue me if you're a billboard company and you put up the slander can you sue the billboard company we said no basically

(25:39) section 230 is being used by social media companies to high to avoid liability uh for activity that other people generate when they refuse to comply with their terms of use a mother calls up the company and says this app is being used to bully my child to death you promise in the terms of use you would prevent bullying and she calls three times she gives no response the child kills herself and they can't sue do you all agree we don't want to do that again yes if I may speak for one second there's a fundamental distinction between

(26:21) reproducing content and generating content yeah but you you would like liability where people aren't absolutely yes in fact IBM has been publicly advocating to condition liability on a reasonable Care standard so let me just make sure I understand the law as it exists today Mr Solomon thank you for coming your company is not claiming that section 230 applies to the tool you have created yeah don't miss the fourth part thank you for watching this climber