

## Paul's Opening

1. Harm (Not Copyright)
  - a. Some opening anecdote
    - i. Misinfo
    - ii. Deepfakes (Taylor Swift)
      1. Caveat: this wasn't done with a generative model, most likely.
    - iii. A really concrete example:
      1. Meta releases imagery model
      2. 13yo kid trains a pornography generator
        - a. URL passed around a small community (8chan)
  - b. Not just this one set of harms, but an entire collection
    - i. Toxicity, harassment
    - ii. Labor displacement, misinfo/disinfo
    - iii. Copyright infringement
2. I believe in the power of this technology to spur some really life-enhancing new innovations
  - a. But, I think most of them can be realized (and quickly) with responsible control and monitoring
3. "Responsible Gatekeepers"
  - a. Systems are widely shared with responsible individuals with accountability mechanisms built-in
    - i. Contracts
    - ii. Monitoring
    - iii. Ability to rescind access
    - iv. Government involvement / oversight
  - b. This can be scaled up or back
    - i. We expect healthy competition in how much control, but there will be a baseline of control (Google can be more willing to license; OpenAI may be less willing; some noble nonprofit will focus on non-paying but important customers)

## Blake's opening

1. Paul's talked about the benefits of non-openness. But I'm going to talk about the harms of mandating openness. The first is it's going to make them impossible to regulate
  - a. Absent openness we have max a half dozen big targets
  - b. Mandating openness increases the landscape of regulatory targets by many orders of magnitude—basically makes enforcement impossible
  - c. Platforms embracing this idea are cynical Goliaths trying to surround themselves with sympathetic Davids
    - i. Substituting the toxic political economy of "Big Tech" for the faux mom-and-apple pie Americana schmaltz of entrepreneurship
2. Mandating openness will require the expenditure of vast legal and political capital akin to what we might spend on just directly regulating these harms

- a. The last time we successfully compelled openness was AT&T, and that took 70 years and a far more functional regulatory apparatus and a Supreme Court not inclined toward regulatory and First Amendment Lochnerism
  - b. And AI is vastly more complicated than that.
3. Paul is being too generous about the benefits.
  - a. AT&T was far more beneficial to society than anything the AI companies have put on the table—ubiquitous point-to-point communication between every American
  - b. AI is basically a child's toy crossed with a nuclear weapon
  - c. We have no reason to believe that more “innovation” here is actually going to yield more positive results. The people funnelling money into this ecosystem are the doofus venture capitalists that thought NFTs were going to revolutionize the world.
4. Mandating anything less than complete openness is just going to put all these new “Innovators” in the thrall of the Big Tech companies, recreating the problematic gatekeeper situation that we have now
5. The only real barriers to competition that openness overcomes are (a) more environmentally harmful usage of giant compute and (b) access to large data sets that should probably be illegal for copyright and privacy reasons
6. The benefits of transparency are just giving weird-nerd researchers more access to identify esoteric details of problems that we already understand and need to act on.
7. In conclusion, openness is bad because we should keep AI small enough to strangle it in the bathtub.

#### Paul's Questions

1. To Casey: Are you focused primarily on credentialed academics, non-academic creatives, teens? Because the less institutional control we have, the likelier that some of the harmful uses I am worried about will happen.
2. To Luis: If he opens the door to the Meta distinction, we should follow up to make him defend it. There's no easy principled way to distinguish Meta and others.

#### Blake's Questions

1. To Luis: How do you believe open communities will flourish in this space given the vast differences between AI technology and e.g., knowledge commons like Wikipedia or open source software?
2. To Casey: Is researcher access an end onto itself, and if so, what are the benefits, and if it is only a means to other ends, what are they?

#### Themes/notes for Blake

1 Paul Benefits and harms

2 Blake Regulability and competition

Take it down a notch on the “compelling” problems and focus on other aspects

It's a pipe dream that we're actually going to get openness

You're just going to spark the giants, not empower communities

## Other ideas

1. This has very little to do with the openness of open source, free software, or creative commons. The movements share a label but little else.
2. Meredith Whitaker, et al's, point about openness being a cynical ploy by Meta to stifle competition.
3. Most of these people aren't going to be doing interesting research. They're either going to be getting published or building profit-making schemes. Can't we pick 5 smart PhD students every year, and give them a model—that's probably all we need.

## Blake's Closing Thoughts

1. Openness has always really been about control and exercising power
2. Political economy

## Paul's Closing Thoughts

1. Bursting the bubble of OSS.
  - a. That didn't go that well.
  - b. Rampant insecurity. More eyes didn't make all bugs shallow!
2. AI in 2023 is very different than software in 1987.
  - a. So much money flowing around.
  - b. This isn't "information want to be free".
  - c. The barriers to entry are so much higher
3. End with harm.