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[00:00:00] **Speaker 1** So in terms of I know the legislature passed a bill last year, voice vote was unanimous. I can get that talked about regulating AI. What does it actually do and what will the impact be this fall for television commercials.

[00:00:13] **Speaker 2** Or the regulation applies to political advertisements? And it basically requires that the advertisers, if they use I say so in the ads, the content was produced by I in some kind of way. And so, we've actually done research on this, in terms of correcting misinformation when we'll show people, misinformation correction piece, that a human is created and then the debate is created and we, we, we tell them an AI board is created, it people actually tend to trust it a little bit more. And so that that kind of ran against what we thought might happen. And so people tended to trust the AI created, information correction. Now, political advertisements, usually not information correction is usually really strong claims sometimes claims that aren't true or really flirting. The line with what's true. Candidates though candidates really like to control their message. And so I'd be surprised if they fully ceded, their own advertisements to AI. They might use AI to generate ideas. They might ask ChatGPT, you give me ten potential ways to make this claim or give me 20 potential? You know, crowd, you know, crowds that look like this or that, but then they might find the one they like and they go, go shoot it for real. And then they wouldn't have to say that it was AI generated. You know, I think the real danger with AI in this election is not in campaign advertisements. It's in social media posts that go viral.

[00:01:38] **Speaker 1** And there's really no regulation for that.

[00:01:39] **Speaker 2** That's right. There's there's really nothing, the state legislature or the Congress can do to stop that unless they really want to regulate, people's speech in a way that would, probably be very difficult to do successfully and get passed on the courts.

[00:01:56] **Speaker 1** So but back to the bill in Wisconsin. The one thing that jumped out to me was the only thing that it really seemed to do was relieve television stations of any responsibility to make sure that they couldn't be held liable if the campaigns themselves did not disclose or disclosed improper.

[00:02:11] **Speaker 2** Yeah, it's very similar to how social media operates, where if, you or I say something that's completely false on Facebook, it goes viral. Lots of people believe it. Facebook can't get in trouble. And now the same kind of principle applies to AI in television ads, where it won't be the TV stations that air the ads that get into trouble. But the candidates who didn't disclose that there was AI.

[00:02:32] **Speaker 1** It does that only what obligation is there on the WB, the broadcasters Association or individual television stations? I tried contacting them, and none of them would go on to talk about how they handle individual claims or allegations that that had is false. It needs to be pulled down and we know we're going to be flooded with advertising. So what is the stop gap there for me in terms is just more truth, more ads against each other.

[00:02:56] **Speaker 2** There are examples of ads getting pulled down because they're not true, or the reaction to them, was so negative that some stations sometimes will say, we're not going to air this particular ad, whether that happens because the content of the ad or part of the content of the ad was created by I, I think is is an open question, probably only if there's misinformation being shown in one way or another. And even then, you know, broadcast companies aren't looking to make history here and be accused of bias by taking down the ad of one side but not the other. And and so if if one side is really good at disclosing if they use AI and ads and the other side isn't, that might, you know, pose a real problem for them, it's reasonable for viewers of television programing to believe the content that they see is verifiably true, and it's reasonable for people to think that the content they see in the ads that stations choose to air are true. And so there is a bit of responsibility on the side of the broadcasters, but it's also extremely hard to police. How can they know for sure the video was AI generated? How can they know for sure the script was AI generated? These are really difficult problems to solve without universally accepted ways of solving them.

[00:04:08] **Speaker 1** So we've seen when you talked about social media, we saw have been example of misinformation when Kamala Harris first and when she had that rally in Michigan at the airport hangar, and then there were all sorts of conspiracy theories, and that was an AI generated. Right. Is that the most likely way that AI comes into play in terms of it just being a boogeyman, like get something to scare people, like, this is all fake. You can't trust anything.

[00:04:32] **Speaker 2** I think that there were kind of two ways I could matter. One is using AI as a boogeyman, so something happens. The other side says, oh, that must be. I can't possibly be real. You should be skeptical of the other side because they you're they're using AI. The other is that a candidate picks up on a post that uses AI and treats it as true, which is also happened where a former President Trump shared information that Taylor Swift at endorsed in which she had not. Right. And so when when these kinds of things happen to especially when the. Candidates themselves. Pick it up and share it. Those things are going to take on a life of their own in really remarkable and fast ways that are hard to regulate.

[00:05:09] **Speaker 1** Is this a different than like, you know, the scare about deep fakes four years ago or, you know, Russian influence? And we just saw the Biden administration release new sanctions against Russia today. Is this is I new or is it just a new term for lies and misinformation?

[00:05:25] **Speaker 2** It's another tool, right? I can tell us things that are verifiably true and I can make things up. It's not AI that's doing that. It's it's how the the user, you know, intends to share that information. And so it's, it's another tool. It can be used. It can be used appropriately. It can be misused. Some people will use it. Well, some people will misuse it. It's really hard, I think, to think about how should we approach content that's produced by artificial intelligence? Artificial intelligence could look at the box score of a baseball game and write up a story about how, you know, this player went two for four and had a home run, and this one had the game winning RBI, and the pitcher went this many innings and could write a story that's probably fairly serviceable. But if I starts describing the crowd reaction now, AI is making that up. And so what's the line that we want to draw? And the same kind of question is going to come toward us when it comes to political campaigns. Where are we going to draw the line about claims that are artificially generated, and how are we going to police? Who's making those claims? Are they disclosing where the claims come from? Candidates have to cite sources when they make claims about things their opponents have said in ads presently. And now in Wisconsin, they have to say if it came from I. Whether that means it's false or true, though, is still another question.

[00:06:45] **Speaker 1** And what about third party interest groups who don't care if they get fined $1,000?

[00:06:50] **Speaker 2** These are the places where I think we might have to pay a little more attention. Like they don't mind paying a fine, and they don't think that the negative attention will rise to the level of the good that they get for their side by fomenting chaos and sharing things that aren't true. And so in a world where there's not very much regulation on what third party advocates can do. The law in Wisconsin is trying to at least say, you've got to tell us if it's coming from AI. But that's not the same thing as saying, is the information true? That's a separate question.

[00:07:26] **Speaker 1** Is it when we I think some people think of AI, they think of images. But you've also talked about how it can create the phrasing in the wording. It then if I helps generate something, but then a human goes in and touches it up, is it really AI anymore or is it just if it's Johnny Cash singing Beyoncé song or some other use it.

[00:07:45] **Speaker 2** Right? I think this is an open question. Right? So it'll be very difficult, I think, to prove that a script from an ad was AI generated, even if it was, or even if the impetus was AI generated. So I asked ChatGPT to write me an ad that talks about my advocacy for reproductive rights and low taxes, and it gives me three scripts, and I like one of them, and I tweak it a little bit to put it in my voice. Have I used AI? Yes. Is the final copy? I will not wholly so. Do I have to disclose? Not clear. And so it's probably something the courts would have to resolve.

[00:08:21] **Speaker 1** Who is being? Who is most likely to be susceptible to these kinds of advertising? Because we already know that the vast majority of people have already made up their minds. So is it the late low info people that come in at the end, or is it seniors or who's out there folks?

[00:08:37] **Speaker 2** So I think in terms of believing content they haven't encountered before, low information voters who are paying attention at the last minute are often susceptible to messages because they are new to them. They haven't been paying attention to the race, and these things are new. Sometimes, though, those of us who are really invested in politics could also be swayed by this. If the information hits us in our political sweet spot. If there's something good about our side, or really bad about the other side, we might be more susceptible to believe that information if it's false. And you know, not do the work that it that it takes to try to to suss out whether it's true.

[00:09:12] **Speaker 1** When it comes to the the long history of dirty campaigning and all that kind of stuff. Where does this fall in? Is this a new era of scariness and of, you know, low and low ball politics, or is this just kind of fitting into the pattern of where we're going?

[00:09:27] **Speaker 2** I think it's, I think it's another tool to campaign in the way that political candidates in the United States have always campaign. They've always been negative campaigns. They've always been campaigns that have flirted with the truth. There have always been campaigns that go over flirting with the truth. They just start saying things that aren't true. AI is a tool to help with that. I'm a little more worried about AI generated deepfakes, where you have Kamala Harris or Donald Trump saying something that they did not say, but it looks like they did. That's something that's a little more worrisome than AI generating content or making a crowd seem a little bit bigger. I mean, these are problems, but they're not they're not the same, as, you know, putting words in someone's mouth and leading a lot of people to draw a conclusion about someone that that you know, is coming from a false pretense.

[00:10:14] **Speaker 1** And where is the line when it comes to that someone who's not part of a campaign, but or maybe you're they're part of a campaign of putting out an ad that's designed to influence, but also comes across as maybe a parody, like, oh, it was clear I was making a joke about this when I put that out.

[00:10:29] **Speaker 2** Yeah, I mean that that's really difficult, right? The Supreme Court has protected our right to engage in satire and parody. And, I don't know that the court imagined that we might be able to generate content where it looks like, you know, the actual person you're parodying is saying the words, you know, in a way. So it's a little bit new. I think that, you know, people who do that are on the safest ground if they, you know, disclose prominently that this is a parody or satire or something like that. But, you know, sometimes people will read something in The Onion and get really upset, even though, of course, The Onion is America's finest fake news source, it's a pretend, you know, satirical source. And sometimes people who aren't familiar with it will see it and think it's true. And that'll certainly happen with AI generated images and content as well.

[00:11:15] **Speaker 1** And where does mentioning The Onion brings it to, like the Epoch Times or the Wisconsin Independent, which is, you know, both of these being mailed to people's homes without them asking for them. Epoch times have booths at both conventions. Where did those kind of outlets fit into this whole this conversation.

[00:11:37] **Speaker 2** They're trying to. Generate conversations about issues they care about and help candidates they prefer. And that's really no different than any other kind of campaign strategy. They're trying to help their side and hurt the other side. You know, a lot of these sources are news sources. They're they're sharing things that don't go through a rigorous fact check. They don't correct mistakes. They don't punish reporters who make errors. They don't. They don't seem they they don't seem to try to be fair. To the both sides. Well, they're, you know, there's their rages of, of these, you know, kinds of things, you know. I would say, you know, Fox News is a little different in that they have different kinds of programing. So Pete Buttigieg, a spokesperson for the Biden administration, a cabinet member, will go on to Fox News and answer questions. Right. That's not happening so much in The Epoch Times. Although, you know, there are lots of hosts on the opinion programing side of Fox News and they're in their prime time, their most watched shows where lots of things are said that don't, don't pass the test of the, of meeting the verifiable truth.

[00:12:53] **Speaker 1** And is that right in terms of the public and how they're influenced? I mean, in Fox News kind of filtering over to the Epoch Times, Fox News clearly has a news division where they do traditional journalism and then they have their primetime show.

[00:13:07] **Speaker 2** That's right.

[00:13:08] **Speaker 1** And a lot of people can't tell the difference.

[00:13:10] **Speaker 2** That's right. That it's it's akin to a newspaper where, you know, newspapers clearly say this is our opinion page, and some people will still read them and think, oh, well, the newspaper's so biased they're sharing their opinions when that is the purpose of that page. Right. And the purpose of Fox programing 7 p.m. on, you know, in the Central time zone is to persuade us not to not to inform us.

[00:13:31] **Speaker 1** How bad is it going to be for ads this fall? I mean, do you track those? Do you? I know you've done research on some of these things. What does this this look like?

[00:13:38] **Speaker 2** I think we're going to have, a historic number of ads will probably have a historic number of negative ads. We're seeing both sides start to devote more resources to social media advertising, which is a little more of the Wild West. And in terms of, political advertising and I think, you know, but the real gray area is when someone else does something using AI, making stuff up, trying to just just to share things that aren't true. And then a candidate picks it up and shares it. So it's not an advertisement, but it's still the candidate endorsing this content that is false. Like that's where we're in the most trouble, and we need journalists the most to help us, sort through what's true and what's not.

[00:14:21] **Speaker 1** All right. Anything else you want to.

[00:14:22] **Speaker 2** I think that covers up.

[00:14:23] **Speaker 1** Yeah. Thank you so much. Yeah.

[00:14:24] **Speaker 2** You bet. Appreciate it. Yeah. You bet.

[00:14:26] **Speaker 1** All right.