THE Authors Guild

Before the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy
Request for Information on Regulatory Reform on Artificial Intelligence

Comments of the Authors Guild
October 27, 2025

The Authors Guild thanks the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) for the opportunity to provide comments on regulatory priorities regarding the development, deployment, and adoption of artificial intelligence (AI) technologies in the United States. The Guild is a national nonprofit association of over 17,000 professional writers of all genres. Its members include leading historians, biographers, academicians, journalists, and other writers of nonfiction and fiction whose works have appeared in the most influential and well-respected publications in every field. The Guild has a fundamental interest in ensuring that works of authorship and the rights of authors are protected, and that the hard work and talents of American authors are rewarded so that they can keep writing, as intended by the Framers of the United States Constitution.

A healthy and vibrant free market for written works promotes the free exchange of ideas and is crucial to our culture and the future of democracy. That marketplace is entirely dependent on strong copyright laws. Copyright is the bedrock for the excellence and abundance of our national literary output, on which many other creative works, such as film and video are based, and which we export around the world. It allows ecosystems to develop in which the writers of tomorrow can invest in education and training to become talented writers and take the time to write, and where others can invest in their works and disseminate them to the public, with a reasonable expectation of a return on their investment. But it is a precarious, low-profit marketplace, one that has suffered loss already since the introduction of the internet and from the authors' perspective is already on shaky ground.

Introduction

The Request for Information (RFI) seeks information about federal laws, regulations, and processes that may "unnecessarily hinder the development, deployment, and adoption of artificial intelligence (AI) technologies within the United States." We submit these comments in anticipation of the arguments that OSTP may receive from commenters—including AI and other tech companies and interest groups who have long opposed protections for copyright owners in various contexts—who will argue that federal intellectual property laws are such a hindrance. They have contended that it is too difficult or even impossible for AI companies to license all the books and other creative works they need to train their large language models (LLMs). And they argue that we therefore must allow AI companies to take these works for free, without

permission from or payment to the people who created them, and most importantly, without giving the creators and their investors any control whatsoever over how their works are used by AI, even to prevent them from being mimicked and copied by AI machines. They say they need to do this in the name of winning the AI race and raise national security issues and the specter of China outpacing the United States if we don't give the tech companies what they want, but that is a red herring. AI companies would simply rather not be bothered and not have to pay for one of the products' main ingredients if they don't have to so they can generate even more value for themselves. What is at issue is simply whether authors and other creators—out of all of the suppliers of material and services that generative AI requires—should subsidize AI companies; and the clear answer is no.

Copyright is no more a barrier to AI development than any other property right or business interest. No one argues that AI companies should be freed from paying for electricity, data centers, or programmers; and yet the AI companies argue with a straight face that creators—those who can least afford it—must bear the weight of our AI race against China. It is absurd if you think about it.

Let's line up the actual facts.

1. Copyright is part of our Constitution because our Founders understood that democracy relies on free speech and the way to promote free speech is to allow the marketplace to reward and incentivize writers and other creators. Copyright creates that free market by giving authors exclusive rights to their work so they can decide to who, for what and at what price to sell or license their work to authors. This allows people to write what they perceive to be the truth rather than what the wealthy or government wants them to say. It also creates ecosystems that future writers and creators can rely on to spend the resources getting trained and to pursue excellence, and then to earn an income writing so they can devote themselves to their craft and get increasingly better.

2. Allowing AI companies to train on authors' works without permission takes away from them the right to decide who gets to use their work and how. Not only can they not prevent the AI companies from using their work, but because of the nature of generative AI, once a work is used to train the AI, it can be used to generate outputs that incorporate the work and infringe and/or compete unfairly with the work. All of these uses are typical licensed uses and, for the copyright system to function properly—as intended—the uses should be licensed.

3. The potential harm to writers from unlicensed AI use is far graver than that of any other technologies. If training AI on professionally created works is treated as fair use or otherwise made legal, it will undermine the entire copyright ecosystem for the already precarious profession of writing with potentially disastrous results and in contradiction to the very purpose of copyright.

4. The major LLM owners are worth billions, and in some cases trillions.[1] Yet, they have relatively few employees. For instance, Anthropic, valued at $183 billion, has only approximately 1,500 employees,[2] which comes out to a valuation of $122 million per employee.

5. By contrast, full-time, professional writers (65% of whom have post-graduate higher education) earn a median $ 20,000 a year from all writing-related sources, down 42% from the last decade.[3] Writers' incomes will necessarily drop even more if they have no control over AI use or any compensation from it. And many will be forced to take up other jobs that allow them to eat and keep a roof over their heads. Publishers will be forced to publish fewer types of human authored books to stay afloat, leading to even further loss of sustainable literary output.

6. Books—hundreds of thousands or millions of them—are an essential a part of any competitive LLM as data centers and like them need to be legally purchased.

7. It is simply false that licensing is too hard. Licenses for the books and journalism that AI companies need to train their models are readily available. Dozens of AI licensing deals have already been reached and the multiplicity of new licensing platforms that are constantly emerging. Publishers and third-party licensing entities are actively offering licenses to AI companies, but, we understand, the big AI companies have in most recent cases turned them down.

8. Licensing is not cost-prohibitive. Indeed, the amount of money that AI companies would have to spend to license professionally written books and journalism is tiny compared to what they spend on data centers and electricity. To be clear, we do not believe that AI companies need to license every piece of content on the open internet; we are concerned primarily with professionally created content that relies on the copyright system and free market to be produced and disseminated to the public. Much open web content—social media posts, corporate website text, user comments, and innumerable other items posted

---

[1] OpenAI was recently valued at $500 billion, Anthropic at $183 billion, Meta at $1.83 trillion, and Alphabet at $2.98 trillion. MacKenzie Sigalos, *OpenAI wraps $6.6 billion share sale at $500 billion valuation*, CNBC (Oct. 2, 2025), https://www.cnbc.com/2025/10/02/openai-share-sale-500-billion-valuation.html; Ashley Capoot, *Anthropic raises $13 billion funding round at $183 billion valuation*, CNBC (Sept. 2, 2025), https://www.cnbc.com/2025/09/02/anthropic-raises-13-billion-at-18-billion-valuation.html#:~:text=Anthropic%20announced%20it%20has%20closed%20a%20$13,billion%20at%20the%20beginning%20of%20the%20year; Yahoo! Finance, Meta Platforms, Inc., https://finance.yahoo.com/quote/META/ (last visited Oct. 24, 2025); Yahoo! Finance, Alphabet Inc., https://finance.yahoo.com/quote/GOOG/key-statistics/ (last visited Oct. 24, 2025).

[2] Forbes, https://www.forbes.com/companies/anthropic/#:~:text=In%20September%2C%20the%20company%20secured,CEO%20Dario%20Amodei%20Employees%201%2C500 (last visited Oct. 24, 2025).

[3] Key Takeaways from the Authors Guild's 2023 Author Income Survey, https://authorsguild.org/news/key-takeaways-from-2023-author-income-survey/

on the open internet every second of the day—often are not produced for purposes of monetization, and their use for AI training generally will not affect their value, an important and often decisive factor under the fair use doctrine.[4]

If copyright is an obstacle to be swept away, we will see irreparable damage to the creative professions that sustain millions of American jobs, contribute trillions to our economy, and make our cultural exports the envy of the world. It will make the writing profession—already a highly tenuous occupation—an impossibility for countless authors, whose markets will be drowned by a flood of AI-generated knockoffs that their works were used to create. The harm will extend to all of us. Casting aside such copyright protection for the short-term benefit of the tech sector will upend that longstanding incentive structure and lead to a future with far fewer works new works being produced that promote learning and progress as the Constitution intended. Voluntary, free-market licensing solutions, on the other hand, will allow both the AI and the copyright sectors to thrive.

1. **Licensing of professionally created text-based content is eminently feasible and cost-effective and necessary to a functioning copyright system**

Professionally authored, commercially-released books rely on the commercial marketplace to cover the costs of investment in their creation and distribution. They are produced and distributed for sale or licensing under models that are intended to cover those costs and allow for investment in new literary works.[5] AI companies' stealing these works from pirate sites to build highly lucrative commercial platforms directly undermines these markets, which weighs heavily against any contention that such activity is fair use.

As noted above, robust licensing markets for AI training already exist and are growing by the day. The Copyright Alliance has compiled a list of dozens of licensing agreements between AI companies and copyright owners across a wide spectrum of creative industries.[6] The actual number is likely far greater, as the list includes only publicly reported deals. In the publishing sector, several major trade and academic publishers, including Wiley, Taylor & Francis, Oxford University Press, Cambridge University Press, Sage, DeGruyter Brill, and Harper Collins have publicly announced AI licensing deals.[7] In the news media sector, recent deals include licenses

[4] *See* 17 U.S.C. 107(4); *Harper & Row, Publrs. v. Nation Enters.*, 471 U.S. 539, 566 (1985) (describing market effect as "undoubtedly the single most important element of fair use").

[5] Commercially released books of the nature used by AI companies to build their AI are rarely legally made available for free on the open internet. Ebooks are available for purchase, but only on sophisticated e-commerce platforms like Amazon, Apple, and Bookshop that have security and do not allow the books to be scraped.

[6] https://copyrightalliance.org/artificial-intelligence-copyright/licensing/

[7] See, e.g., Jim Milliot, Wiley Creates AI Partnership Program, Publishers Weekly (Oct. 17, 2024), https://www.publishersweekly.com/pw/by-topic/industry-news/industry-deals/article/96248-wiley-creates-ai-partnership-program.html; Matilda Battersby, Taylor & Francis set to make £58m from AI in 2024 as it reveals second partnership, The Bookseller (July 25, 2024), https://www.thebookseller.com/news/taylor-francis-set-to-make-58m-from-ai-in-2024-as-it-reveals-second-partnership; Heloise Wood, Wiley and Oxford University Press confirm AI partnerships as

from the Associated Press,[8] NewsCorp,[9] Reuters,[10] Le Monde,[11] The Financial Times,[12] Vox Media,[13] The Atlantic,[14] and Dotdash Meredith[15] (which owns popular magazine brands such as People and Entertainment Weekly).

AI companies can also license works from individual creators through voluntary collective licensing arrangements. Several such platforms have already emerged, such as Created by Humans, which has partnered with the Authors Guild to provide a way for authors to license their works for AI uses on terms that they themselves choose.[16] Other companies like the Copyright Clearance Center[17] and Vermillio[18] are building and deploying licensing platforms.

The Administration should work to facilitate these types of voluntary, free-market licensing solutions. For example, as discussed in our prior comments in connection with the AI Action Plan, the Guild has proposed legislation clarifying that U.S. antitrust laws do not prohibit creators from forming collective management organizations (CMOs) to negotiate with AI companies on behalf of copyright owners. Such models have been used in the music industry for decades through entities like ASCAP, BMI, SoundExchange, and the Mechanical Licensing Collective. Collective licensing is a widely established concept around the world. Typically, one or more CMOs are authorized by law to negotiate on behalf of copyright owners in specified sectors and to collect and distribute royalties.[19] Far from being impractical, as these examples

---

Cambridge University Press offers 'opt-in,' The Bookseller (Aug. 1, 2024), https://www.thebookseller.com/news/wiley-cambridge-university-press-and-oxford-university-press-confirm-ai-partnerships; Authors Guild, Harper Collins AI Licensing Deal, https://authorsguild.org/news/harpercollins-ai-licensing-deal/. For a continually updated list of current agreements in the publishing sector, see https://sr.ithaka.org/our-work/generative-ai-licensing-agreement-tracker/.

[8] Nitasha Tiku, Newspapers want payment for articles used to power ChatGPT, Wash. Post (Oct. 20, 2023), https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2023/10/20/artificial-intelligence-battle-online-data/.

[9] https://investors.newscorp.com/news-releases/news-release-details/news-corp-and-openai-sign-landmark-multi-year-global-partnership

[10] https://www.axios.com/2024/10/25/meta-reuters-ai-news-facebook-instagram

[11] https://www.lemonde.fr/en/about-us/article/2024/03/13/le-monde-signs-artificial-intelligence-partnership-agreement-with-open-ai_6615418_115.html

[12] https://www.ft.com/content/33328743-ba3b-470f-a2e3-f41c3a366613

[13] https://www.voxmedia.com/2024/5/29/24166483/vox-media-openai-strategic-content-and-product-partnership

[14] https://www.theatlantic.com/press-releases/archive/2024/05/atlantic-product-content-partnership-openai/678529/

[15] https://dotdashmeredith.mediaroom.com/2024-05-07-Dotdash-Meredith-Announces-Strategic-Partnership-with-OpenAI,-Bringing-Iconic-Brands-and-Trusted-Content-to-ChatGPT

[16] Authors Guild Partners with Created by Humans to Empower Authors in the AI Era (Oct. 9, 2024), https://authorsguild.org/news/ag-partners-with-created-by-humans-to-empower-authors-in-ai-era/.

[17] https://www.copyright.com/

[18] https://vermill.io/platform/licensing/

[19] *See* International Federation of Reproduction Rights Organizations, Member List, https://ifrro.org/page/membership-list/ (listing over 160 CMOs in approximately 90 countries representing "many millions of authors, visual artists, and publishers of books, journals, newspapers, magazines and printed music").

show, voluntary licensing solutions offer a win-win, allowing AI companies to efficiently obtain the works they need while ensuring fair compensation for creators.

These kinds of deals are how copyright works. When new technologies and uses for copyrighted works emerge, new licensing models are necessarily created alongside them to accommodate the new uses. Why should AI be an exception? It is no different than in the early 1900s when movies were developed. Should movie studios have gotten away with arguing that they did not need to license books they based films on simply because they were a new use at the time and there was no existing licensing market for the use before film existed?

AI the companies' practice of relying on notorious offshore pirate websites as their source of books is not a solution that should be tolerated. Piracy is not a cost-effective solution for anyone. As shown by the recent settlement in *Bartz v. Anthropic*—in which Anthropic has agreed to pay $1.5 billion to copyright owners following the court's conclusive ruling that its downloading of pirated books is ***not*** fair use—continued reliance on piracy will prove far more costly and uncertain for AI companies than a licensing model. The costs will be even greater for the creative professions that drive so much of our economy and culture. There is extensive empirical research supporting the commonsense conclusion that digital piracy directly and substantially harms creators' ability to make a living and that this in turn "harms society by reducing economic incentives for investment in creative output."[20] If such theft is somehow found to be fair use, the harms will be compounded exponentially, as rogue actors will have even greater incentive to amass ever-larger pirate libraries for AI companies to access.[21] This is not a sustainable way forward.

Licensing, by contrast, provides a predictable, market-based solution that is well within reach of copyright owners and AI companies alike.

2. Licensing is crucial to the viability of the creative professions

Licensing is essential to allowing authors to recover a fair share of the enormous value that they create for AI companies. Generative AI simply could not exist without published books and other high-quality works to train on. And critically, as even the AI companies and their supporters appear to acknowledge, they are not copying the works simply to teach the LLM grammar rules and the meaning of words; they are ***consuming the works' expression*** so that the LLM can learn narrative and copyrightable elements of writing style, as well as "different

[20] Written Testimony of Dr. Michael D. Smith, Carnegie Mellon University, at 2, *Too Big to Prosecute?: Examining the AI Industry's Mass Ingestion of Copyrighted Works for AI Training*, Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Crime & Counterterrorism (July 16, 2025), https://www.judiciary.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/64bc45b6-9e04-22e4-34c1-12d0efad69ef/2025-07-16%20-%20Testimony%20-%20Smith.pdf.

[21] *See id.* at 4 ("Indeed, this the unlicensed use of pirated content could create a new illicit licensing business model for pirate networks: adding new stolen content to their collections, knowing that AI developers will want access to them.").

perspectives, opinions, and ideas."[22] Copyright owners must have the ability to be compensated for such uses—not only as a matter of basic fairness, but for the viability of the entire creative ecosystem. A single book typically takes many years to research, write, and edit, and the authors, publishers and others in the value chain need to be paid to make that investment worthwhile. Allowing AI companies to take those works for free deprives those actors of the ability to recover their investments, forcing them to subsidize the tech sector and dramatically undermining their incentives to produce and disseminate new works.

Licensing also gives creators the ability to control how their works are used in AI outputs. Most writers reasonably and wisely fear their work being copied and mimicked by LLMs in a way that will dilute the market for their work, because without licensing they have no control over how AI companies are using their works or allowing users to do so. Once trained on a book, an AI model can produce outputs that directly infringe a work, like summaries, excerpts, and derivative works such as video and audio versions, as well as outputs that emulate a particular author's body of work. This means that when LLMs are trained on authors' works without permission, not only do authors not get paid for that use of their work, but they also lose sales of their books to AI-generated books that infringe or otherwise serve as substitutes. AI companies have the ability to block those kinds of outputs and will implement such protections if required. But without the ability to license, authors have no power to prevent or impose limits on downstream and output uses like these.

As a federal court recently put it,

> Generative AI has the potential to flood the market with endless amounts of images, songs, articles, books, and more. People can prompt generative AI models to produce these outputs using a tiny fraction of the time and creativity that would otherwise be required. So by training generative AI models with copyrighted works, companies are creating something that often will dramatically undermine the market for those works, and thus dramatically undermine the incentive for human beings to create things the old-fashioned way.[23]

We already are seeing the impacts of this exploitation. AI-generated books are now commonplace on Amazon and other platforms, and we and our members already have seen many examples of markets for certain genres, like romance, hobbies, and self-help, being diluted with AI-generated works.[24] It is common to see an AI-generated "summary" or other knockoff of an

---

[22] Written Testimony of Christopher Callison-Burch at 10, House Jud. Comm., Subcom. on Courts, Intell. Prop., and the Internet, Hearing on Artificial Intelligence and Intellectual Property: Part I–Interoperability of AI and Copyright Law, May 17, 2023, https://judiciary.house.gov/sites/evo-subsites/republicans-judiciary.house.gov/files/evo-media-document/callison-burch-testimony-sm.pdf.

[23] Order Denying the Plaintiffs' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment and Granting Meta's Cross Motion for Partial Summary Judgment, at 1-2, *Kadrey v. Meta*, No. 23-cv-03417, doc. no. 598 (N.D. Cal. June 25, 2025).

[24] *See, e.g.*, Jules Roscoe, *AI-Generated Books of Nonsense Are All Over Amazon's Bestseller Lists*, Vice (June 28, 2023), https://www.vice.com/en/article/ai-generated-books-of-nonsense-are-all-over-amazons-

anticipated bestseller appear on Amazon on the day of or even before the release of the real book.[25] These knock-offs unfairly capitalize on the success of human authors by confusing consumers and diverting sales away from the original books.

Absent appropriate guardrails, AI-generated outputs like these will eventually swallow a substantial portion of the marketplace for books, the effect of which will be to undermine the entire publishing ecosystem. Even before the rise of AI, we were living in a precarious time for writers. Between 2009 and 2018, authors' median incomes dropped 42%.[26] The Authors Guild's most recent authors' earnings survey found that the median writing-related income for full-time authors in 2022 was just over $20,000, with only half of that from books.[27] It does not take much more income loss before many can no longer afford to write professionally. That in turn will impact the breadth of books that are written and published and prevent many great stories, histories, and ideas from seeing the light of day. And with less money flowing into the publishing industry, publishers will be far less able to invest in a broad assortment of new books, forcing them to focus on proven bestsellers, such as celebrity books and books by already established brand-name writers, making it even harder for talented, up-and-coming authors writers to be discovered and earn meaningful income.

3. Allowing AI companies to take works for free undermines the overall copyright system upon which the public relies

AI companies are advocating for a world in which they are free to exploit creators' works on a massive scale and in which machine-generated books, news articles, music, and more can be produced at a pace with which no human can compete. If realized, that vision will upend the careful balance of interests that the copyright laws have served to protect since the country's founding.

The Framers of the Constitution recognized the critical importance of intellectual property to the nation's success. They expressly authorized Congress to pass laws "[t]o promote the Progress of

---

bestseller-lists/ ("Amazon's Kindle Unlimited young adult romance bestseller list was filled with dozens of AI-generated books of nonsense. . . ."); Mikael Thalen, *Apparent AI-generated books on Charlie Kirk's assassination flood Amazon*, SAN (Sept. 11, 2025), https://san.com/cc/apparent-ai-generated-books-on-charlie-kirks-assassination-flood-amazon/. Indeed, one recent study found that 82% of books in the "herbal remedies" subcategory on Amazon were likely written by AI. Aisha Down, *Detection firm finds 82% of herbal remedy books on Amazon 'likely written' by AI*, The Guardian (Oct. 22, 2025), https://www.theguardian.com/books/2025/oct/22/detection-firm-finds-82-of-herbal-remedy-books-on-amazon-likely-written-by-ai.

[25] *See, e.g.*, Andrew Limbong, *Authors push back on the growing number of AI 'scam' books on Amazon*, NPR (Mar. 16. 2024), https://www.npr.org/2024/03/16/1238983175/authors-push-back-on-the-growing-number-of-ai-scam-books-on-amazon (describing multiple examples of AI-generated summaries).

[26] Authors Guild Survey Shows Drastic 42 Percent Decline in Authors Earnings in Last Decade, https://authorsguild.org/news/authors-guild-survey-shows-drastic-42-percent-decline-in-authors-earnings-in-last-decade/

[27] Key Takeaways from the Authors Guild's 2023 Author Income Survey, https://authorsguild.org/news/key-takeaways-from-2023-author-income-survey/

Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries."[28] These protections are not just for the personal benefit of creators. As the Supreme Court has long recognized, copyright exists not just to "secure a fair return for an author's creative labor," but ultimately "to stimulate artistic creativity for the general public good."[29] By allowing copyright owners to set the price and conditions for uses of their works—and to prevent others from exploiting those works without permission—copyright provides the essential incentive structure for creators to invest the vast amounts of time, money, and training necessary to produce high-quality works from which society at large will benefit. In this way, "the Framers intended copyright itself to be the engine of free expression."[30]

Sweeping aside this protection to the benefit of AI companies will turn this foundational structure on its head, with ripple effects spreading throughout the ecosystems that copyright creates. The vast majority of authors today rely on other types of writing—freelance journalism, advertising, website content, etc.—to make up for losses in book income. Fewer book publishing deals will mean that more authors will need even more supplemental income while working on their personal writing projects. But AI is already also replacing many of those jobs as well, resulting in writers being attacked on multiple flanks.[31]

Critically, this outcome isn't just bad for writers; it is bad for the very AI advancement that the tech companies argue is paramount. For AI companies, the quality of an LLM depends directly on the quality of the materials used to train it. As bestselling author David Baldacci recently testified to Congress, "If AI companies only needed words, they could have fed every dictionary in the world into their machine learning. . . . What they needed was complete, well-crafted, living, breathing stories, with characters that seemed real, plots that made sense, dialogue that appeared genuine. Humanity on the page."[32] It is for that reason that the AI companies have sought out recently published, professionally authored books and articles, going so far as to brazenly scrape millions of books from pirate websites. There is simply no other way to produce outputs that can replicate modern language and storytelling and avoid outdated concepts that would undermine the product's appeal. Thus, the continued impoverishment of the literary profession will, over time, have the perverse effect of diminishing the quality of the very AI outputs that are displacing human authors. At bottom, the development of a robust, world-

---

[28] U.S Const. art. I, § 8, cl. 8.
[29] *Twentieth Cent. Music Corp. v. Aiken*, 422 U.S. 151, 155 (1975) (internal quotation marks omitted).
[30] *Harper & Row*, 471 U.S. at 558.
[31] *See, e.g.*, Pranshu Verma and Gerritt de Vynck, *ChatGPT took their jobs. Now they walk dogs and fix air conditioners*, Washington Post (June 2, 2023), https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2023/06/02/ai-taking-jobs/
[32] Written Testimony of David Baldacci at 3, *Too Big to Prosecute?: Examining the AI Industry's Mass Ingestion of Copyrighted Works for AI Training*, Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Crime & Counterterrorism (July 16, 2025), https://www.judiciary.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/64bc45b6-9e04-22e4-34c1-12d0efad69ef/2025-07-16%20-%20Testimony%20-%20Baldacci.pdf.

leading AI sector in the United States depends directly on the health of the creative industries. In a very real sense, our fortunes are tied together.

More broadly, the AI companies' vision will have profound negative consequences for our entire society and culture. The benefits of human creativity are incalculable and can never be replicated by LLMs. Generative AI cannot generate anything that can rival human authorship in terms of true novelty. They mimic human creativity only by regurgitating variants of what they have been trained on, and as such are always stuck in the past. A culture dominated by AI outputs would be inherently reductive, producing far fewer products of human imagination that collectively move us forward as a society. It would be a grave mistake to treat human creation as just another outmoded technology that can be done more efficiently by machines. Rather, the law should continue to respect what the Founders well understood—that strong protection for works of authorship is the best way to promote the advancement of knowledge for the benefit of the entire nation.