

1. Apologies: this will go fast: I speak quickly, partly because of where I grew up, partly because I'm excited, partly because there is so little time in this session.
2. But: the slides are available on my site, also in a version with many of the spoken words. The slides have many links, which, I believe, are worth following.
3. Another apology: I will be a bit **spicy**, because I think if you are going to have a small appetizer, it should be exciting, it should entice you to eat more. So I'm going to speed past some of the slides, hoping you will be motivated to come look at the more carefully, later. As part of being spicy, it's possible I will offend some people. Please know that I intend to be provocative here, but in other contexts I'm really a nice person and will be very respectful and apolitical, if that's what you prefer.
4. Last apology: I will read from paper a fair bit, because that's the only way I can be sure to say all I want to say in this time.

1. I wanted to do this talk because I was a little uncomfortable (or maybe “pissed off”?) that the work of the CC AI WG from a few years back seems to have been dropped down a dark hole and forgotten.
2. CC periodically has WGs on various topics, one was active on the topic of AI and CC issues, plus larger copyright issues since the WG was part of the Copyright Platform. The head of the WG was Max Mahmoud Wardeh. We met and talked and built various parts of [the CC AI WG PubPub site](#). Mahmoud presented our results in a CC event on [9 Nov 2021](#).
3. That was all before the hype cycle started! But when it did, and CC began to write blog posts and offer expert opinions, and speak to WIPO and EU bodies... wouldn't CC have brought the band back together to support that new work? I'm not sure why it didn't happen.
4. I am proud of the work that the WG did. We discussed a perspective which we called “There's no there, there” following a quote of the American writer Gertrude Stein's comment about her birth city, Cincinnati.
5. **But please note: I don't speak for Mahmoud or the WG in whole or in part!** Today's talk uses the WG perspective on AI as its jumping-off point, but goes farther following my own thoughts, and the WG should not be blamed for what I say here today! The bridges I burn here today are my own, not in any way theirs!

1. One nice thing about “AInt” is that it sounds like the US English contraction of “is not.” This emphasizes how AInt is not what it is claimed to be, it doesn’t do the things it is claimed to do, and the proper response is probably negation.
2. Instead of describing the public as naive and afraid of scifi, more generous would be to note that we use language which implies a computer or program has agency all the time, and very naturally: my Kindle *learns my reading speed* when I start a new book; we have to *teach the program* how to handle exceptions; the program *tries all possible passwords* in a brute-force attack; and so no.
3. “Regulatory capture” describes when an government agency whose purpose is to regulate some industry in the public’s interest is instead *captured* by the commercial entities of that industry. We need to ask if **regulatory capture by metaphor** is happening now for AInt, perpetrated by a mixture of agents: amoral (immoral) profit-maximizers who are intentionally scaring us; tech-bros who have thoughtlessly taken their own metaphors too seriously; people who haven’t (because they’ve been told it is too hard for them) looked at all into the tech and are credulously accepting the claims of the other groups.
4. In the NFT and cryptocurrency space some entertaining folks have said the only people still working there are grifters, racist tech-bros, and useful idiots. I wonder if the same thing is going on with folks who believe the claims of AInt hype.
5. (Maybe we have to add a category: “cyborgs traveling back in time from the future to make not take AInt seriously because they named a prominent early AInt *ChatGPT*, which is **ridiculous** in French.”)

1. The word “statistic” technically means “a number computed from a sample” which is certainly what is happening here.
2. The numbers here are values which sit on the edges of that network diagram and in the cells – although in actual AInts, there are often dozens of layers, billions of parameters, and hundreds of TBs of training data: they’re not called **Large Language Models** for nothing! See [this OpenAI eprint](#) for a source of some of these numbers
3. Note that this term “neural network” is very deceptive: this computer data structure is actually very little like the way networks of actual biological neurons work.
4. There’s a [very nice series of videos on using this data structure](#) by [3Blue1Brown](#).

1. The histogram is from a study I did for CC of the results of taking the CC Cert course. Looking at it, we can conclude something about the real world: the total performance improved significantly on a basic knowledge test of copyright and licensing issues, with the average percent correct on that test going up by more than 20 percentage points after taking the course.
2. The scatter plot seems to show that these unspecified bad things happened went **up** as the independent variable – the variable along the bottom ( $x$ ) axis – went **down**.
3. Actually, histograms and scatterplots are mostly example of “descriptive statistics,” not statistical modelling. We could make a model out of the scatterplot by trying to analyze that relationship between the number of bad things and the independent variable. Let’s assume it’s a linear[=straight line] relationship ... probably not accurate, but it will get us started.

1. I'm belaboring this point because it shows both how many choices a statistical modeler has to make, and how, in principle, we understand on some deep level how these powerful statistical techniques work.

1. Extrapolation is considered a bad thing in statistics. But sometimes it's all you can do. And sometimes it is enough.
2. Note one of the reasons extrapolation is considered bad is that on a larger range of in the independent variable, maybe a better model would use a bent link, not a straight line, like the "hockey stick" curve in climate models, or some exponent growth scenario which would look linear over a short range of the independent variable. So, the warning is, *extrapolation only gets you more of the same [the same model], on a larger scale; maybe something different [innovation, creativity] is necessary, and statistical models don't innovate.*
3. Of course, sometimes doing the same thing as before, not innovating, still does valuable things, like it could have saved the lives of the Challenger astronauts, and it will definitely save a lot of hung-over undergraduates from failing their first year writing courses by generating entirely non-innovative but statistically reasonable essays on the Great American Novel or whatever in time to turn them in on time.

1. I don't have anything spicy to say here, other than: listen to your tech people, make them explain what they are thinking in clear terms.
2. Well, also, I want to say, following Cicero: always be aware of *cui bono* [who benefits]. The middle management at Morton Thiokol didn't want to scrub the Challenger launch because it would get them in trouble with their bosses for having made a defective booster rocket. The upper management didn't want to scrub the launch because to do so would threaten their contract with NASA and thus their future revenue stream.
3. Today's AI is all about making hundreds of billions of dollars for the folks who can convince you that they have something radically new – that will maybe even threaten the future of the human race.
4. What is threatening our future is the current version of neoliberal capitalism. Whenever someone says “don't experiment with AGI [“artificial general intelligence”], it's an existential threat to humanity” I think “this biased perspective is designed to convince me to give you more money and power, what we should not have experimented with in the last half-century or so is neoliberal capitalism, which bred monsters like you, and yet we did that experiment and now look at the world situation in the world, with things like the price of life-saving vaccines being higher for poor countries than for rich countries.” For vaccines, those rich fools should have followed the advice: **Be selfish, share.**



1. So when someone talks about “generative AI nt”, I want you to think of “flipping coins for fun and profit.”
2. Or maybe “flipping coins to convince useful idiots to give me more money and power.”
3. OK, plus a little extrapolation. Which is why we can also think of generative AI nt as **extrapolation as a service**.
4. Which, although it is aggressive, is less aggressive than **mansplaining as a service**.

1. Really, don't blame Mahmoud.
2. I'm sorry if I called anyone in this room a grifter, a useful idiot, or a cyborg.