

Lauren: Join me now at the law offices of Solomon and Associates, where global celebrity and pop icon TAYLOR SWIFT has a meeting scheduled with her legal team to discuss issues raised by the growing use of AI in the entertainment industry.

TAYLOR LEARNS ABOUT AI

Taylor is talking to an unidentified person on the phone when Jack Antonoff interrupts her.

JACK:

Taylor, we need to go. They are ready for us.

TAYLOR:

Motions 1 minute to Jack.

Hey, Kanye, I'm gonna let you finish, but I am late for a meeting right now.

Hangs up quickly and smugly.

To Jack.

That was so satisfying.

JACK:

Ha. Well, we need to go. Everyone is waiting for us.

TAYLOR:

As she walks with Jack. Alright. Remind me again. Who are we meeting with and why?

JACK:

Solomon and Associates. Our lawyers. We had an appointment to talk to them about AI. As a producer, I am both excited about the opportunities AI brings and worried about other people using our work without our consent.

TAYLOR:

We already have lots of impersonators and copycats. Why would AI worry you more?

JACK:

I think impersonators have to let folks know that they are pretending to be someone they are not, you know- for entertainment purposes. They can't market an album as Taylor Swift without facing legal trouble.

TAYLOR:

Then I suppose, we should ask our attorneys what legal protections we have against AI stealing or editing our work.

JACK:

Agreed.

Taylor and Jack walk in. All attorneys at the table stand up quickly and put on a big smile. They walk through and quickly introduce themselves by first name, some awestruck, and others playing it cool. Taylor and Jack take a seat at the end of the table. All the attorneys sit down.

Thanks so much for rearranging your schedules so quickly to meet with us. Again, this is Taylor Swift and I'm Jack Antonoff, producer and song co-writer.

JAIME:

The pleasure is ours. I'm Jaime Troy, Managing Attorney at Solomon and Associates. Mr. Antonoff and I had spoken several times to discuss some of his concerns with the widespread use of artificial intelligence. At his request, we've assembled a fantastic team of entertainment, copyright, and technology lawyers to provide you with some information and to answer your questions.

I thought it would be best to have Curtis start us off with a short introduction about the history behind AI.

Curtis' Presentation

JAIME:

Thanks for that summary, Curtis. Now, let's take a look at recent uses of AI within the music industry. I'm sure you must remember music legend Randy Travis.

TAYLOR:

Of course! I loved listening to him when I was younger. What does Randy have to do with artificial intelligence?

JAIME:

You may have heard that Randy Travis suffered a stroke in 2013. As a result, he was not able to release much content. But in April of this year, he released a new song. Except Randy Travis didn't sing the song. Randy used voice cloning technology, which uses over 40 different recordings of Randy Travis' voice to train the AI program. Let's take a look.

Randy Travis clip plays for 1 minute.

<https://youtu.be/azCEpoYLxeg?feature=shared>

TAYLOR:

It warms my heart to know that my favorite artists can still create music even after they lose their ability to perform.

JAIME:

Yes, and with your permission, your voice could even be used after you are gone.

TAYLOR:

Wait. How would that work? Has that even been done?

JAIME:

Let me have Ekuia talk to you about Star Wars.

EKUA:

Thanks, Jaime.

To answer your question. Yes, it has been done in multiple formats. James Earl Jones, who voices the character Darth Vader in Star Wars, died last month. However, in 2022, Jones signed over the rights to Lucasfilms to recreate his voice via artificial intelligence.

TAYLOR:

I'm glad that Darth Vader's voice will remain the same. Could you imagine if Darth Vader had Jim Carey's voice? Or Tom Hanks' voice?

EKUA:

I doubt Lucasfilms would ever cast Tom Hanks as Darth Vader. But it is not just the voice, we also have instances where a performer has been recreated via AI.

Rogue One was released in theaters in 2016. Because the events in Rogue One take place right before the events of New Hope, it was important to include central characters such as Princess Leia and General Moff Tarkin. However, Carrie Fisher, who played the original Princess Leia, was already 60 in 2016.

Lucasfilm created a CGI version of Princess Leia and General Moff Tarkin in the original version of Rogue One released in theaters. Unfortunately, the CGI versions looked plastic. A Time magazine reporter likened the generated version to an animated character from the movie The Polar Express. A popular deepfake YouTuber by the name of "Shamook" subsequently used previous film footage of Carrie Fisher in other movies to improve upon the plastic-looking CGI version. Let's take a look at Shamook's deep fakes:

Video plays re: Star Wars Deepfakes

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CXMb_MO3aw

1:41 to 2:00

TAYLOR:

Wow, that looked so realistic!

EKUA:

It is. Lucasfilm was so impressed with Shamook's skills that they offered him a job as a "Senior Facial Capture Artist" for another Star Wars series, The Mandalorian.

Technology has only gotten better and better since 2016. In 2019, the Irishman was released. The film stars Robert DeNiro, Al Pacino, and Joe Pesci. Using de-aging technology, visual effects were able to turn these men, all in their late

seventies, to their late thirties or early forties. No face markers were even used during filming.

That same year, audiences watched a 50-year-old version of Will Smith interacting with a 23-year-old version of himself in Gemini Man.

More recently, we have Indiana Jones Dial of Destiny released in 2023. In the film, we watch Harrison Ford, who was 79 years old playing a 37-year-old version of Indiana Jones.

AI basically allows performers to time travel, be in two places at once, and live on after they have died!

TAYLOR:

Well, I'd love to be remembered standing in a nice dress staring at the sunset, but only after I'm gone. It is mind-blowing to think that somewhere else, there'd be a lifelike version of myself doing something else at this very moment.

JACK:

Well, you've been saying how you wish you could spend more time with Travis and travel without people following you around. Maybe we can use AI to take your place when you want to, so you can get some down time. I don't know if the technology is good enough for this yet, but could an AI version of Taylor perform on the Eras tour so she could get a break?

TAYLOR:

Is that even allowed?

JAIME:

Well, it depends. James, would you be able to talk to Miss Swift about the venues using AI versions of Miss Swift to perform?

JAMES:

Certainly. A venue can only use an AI version of you, like a hologram, pending copyright access to your music, a patent to the hologram technology - or a license to use that tech from the hologram company- and personality rights of the artist.ml

State laws are a bit all over the place on this. New York has a law that protects against what it calls "unlawful replicas", including AI-generated replicas, via a right to publicity but only for deceased performers. That law defines a "digital replica" as the following: [onscreen only] "original, computer-generated, electronic performance...in which the individual did not actually perform, that is so realistic that a reasonable observer would believe it is a performance by the individual being portrayed and no other individual." As you can imagine this would only be possible with the raw 'data' so-to-speak of your prior concerts, music, and even interviews you have done to make the replica as real as possible.

JACK:

And has this been done before?

JAMES:

This has been most prominently done with deceased celebrities and performers, perhaps most famously - Tupac in 2012 [image on slide] but the right to reproduce Patsy Cline, Buddy Holly, and Roy Orbison's likeness in hologram form has also been released by their respective estates. You could even have hologram of you perform with a live band - here is an example of a Buddy Holly hologram performing with a live band [play short video on slide]

In an even more modern context, a London-based company called Layered Reality is creating what it's calling "an immersive entertainment experience" based on Elvis (called the Elvis Evolution) which has put hundreds of hours of concert video footage, photos, and music into a computer model to create an audiovisual likeness of Elvis that will perform "live" for audiences. [image on slide]

TAYLOR:

But they'd need my permission, right? Someone can't just open up an immersive Taylor Swift experience using AI and have it perform "live" for audiences, right?

JAMES:

That is correct. Layered Reality secured the exclusive global rights for the creation of immersive experiences based upon Elvis' life story and music. The global rights were secured from Authentic Brands Group (Authentic) who obtained ownership of the rights to Elvis' estate in November 2013.

So Ms. Swift, the short answer is that it has mostly only been done for deceased performers and celebrities but it likely can be done for living performers, too.

With what we know right now, a venue could only do such a thing with the permission and licensing rights from multiple parties, obviously including your own. If you wanted to orchestrate something like this yourself, the technology exists but it would likely come down to whether you could market the event as an "authentic" Taylor Swift concert.

TAYLOR:

Even if I could use an AI version of me to perform, I wouldn't. Could you imagine what the Swifties would do if I ended up being a big fake.

JACK:

But Taylor, you have to remember that you aren't the only one who owns Taylor Swift songs.

TAYLOR:

Are you suggesting that Scooter Braun, or Shamrock, or whoever owns my original albums from Big Machine Records could create a Taylor experience using those materials?

JAMES:

Well, it wouldn't be that easy. First of all, Miss Swift still holds licensing rights as the creator of musical work, so she can make sure that any lucrative licensing deals for movies, television, or an immersive experience go to the new Taylor's versions rather than the versions previously owned by Big Machine.

JACK:

But what about artists who gave up their licensing rights as the creator of musical work because they were desperate to be signed? What if it was part of the contract when they recorded and produced the music videos? Couldn't the new owners of Taylor's original albums use AI to generate a new show or music video for profit?

TAYLOR:

Wouldn't it be similar to the Screen Actors Guild? I remember hearing about how they all went on strike to make sure AI couldn't replace their work?

JAMES :

Actually, one of our senior partners, Heather, was following the SAG litigation closely and would be in a better position to talk about the SAG negotiations. Heather, would you be able to answer Miss Swift's questions?

HEATHER :

I sure can! The November 2023 SAG-AFTRA TV/Theatrical agreement with the Alliance of Motion Picture and Television Producers codified the use of AI and is a significant step in recognizing and protecting the rights of performers in an age where AI is becoming increasingly prevalent in content creation.

The agreement covers performers' consent and compensation for digital alterations, employment-based digital replicas, independently created digital replicas, and synthetic performers.

TAYLOR :

I like the focus on consent! But what's the difference between these digital replicas?

HEATHER :

A digital alteration is the practice of changing an actor's work in photography or a soundtrack previously recorded and explicit consent is required to make these alterations unless they're "substantially as scripted, performed, and/or recorded." So, the studio doesn't need your consent if there's a redubbing or postproduction edits explicitly made for "purposes of cosmetics, wardrobe, noise reduction, timing or speed, continuity, pitch or tone, addition of visual/sound effects or filter, standards and practices, ratings, an adjustment in dialogue or narration, or other similar purposes."

Employment-based digital replicas apply to likenesses of actors who are already under contract for a series or film generated "for the purpose of portraying the performer in photography or a soundtrack in which the performer did not actually perform."

In other words, the replica is created during the performer's employment with their physical participation and is used to portray the performer in scenes they didn't actually shoot.

The agreement mandates that the studios get consent from performers for the creation and use of their digital replica, which must come from the performer or after their death from an authorized representative of the performer or from the Union. The contracts must be clear with a reasonably specific description of the use. Additional consent is required for use in additional projects.

TAYLOR:

So, similar to what we previously discussed with James Earl Jones, Carrie Fisher, Irishman, and Indiana Jones.

HEATHER:

Exactly.

As far as compensation is concerned, you won't make any additional money if an AI supplements your performance, but you also won't make any less. If your digital likeness works, so do you. The SAG agreement ensures that whether it's you or your digital double onscreen, you'll get paid. And you'll even get residuals for use that would normally generate residuals.

Independently created digital replicas are created using existing materials and are used to portray the actor in scenes they didn't actually shoot. It basically means you don't have to show up to set at all or even be alive. Like with employment-based digital replicas, the studio must get consent prior to use from the performer or if the person is deceased, from their authorized representative or the Union. And the contract must be clear with a reasonably specific description of the use.

JACK:

Ah, so if Taylor agrees, the studio can use AI to generate her digital image in a movie or on stage? Would there be any restrictions on compensation or contracts?

HEATHER:

The compensation and residuals for our independently created digital replica are freely bargained. Put your agent to work!

I also want to mention that it's not just big names that get paid, but that background actors are also protected. I know you care a lot about your dancers and crew. If a digital version of a background actor's voice or likeness is made without them physically present, they must also give consent and must be compensated. And if lip or facial movements are altered to look like they are speaking and dialogue is added, they will be upgraded to a day performer.

TAYLOR:

But what about a character that is basically me but isn't actually me?

HEATHER:

What you're referring to is using generative AI, which is a subset of AI that learns patterns from data and produces content based on those patterns to simulate voice, facial expressions, and movements in new content.

If a studio uses generative AI to create a character that has a main facial feature that clearly looks like you and they use your name and face to prompt the AI system to do this, they must first get your permission and agree on how the character will be used in the project. The producers must notify the Union and bargain over compensation and another appropriate consideration.

TAYLOR:

You said something about a synthetic performer? That sounds creepy!

HEATHER:

Right, and I'm not talking about an actor with too much plastic surgery and fillers. Synthetic performers are entirely AI-generated "actors" who are presented as real people; according to the agreement, they can't be "recognizable as an identifiable natural performer." The agreement acknowledges "the importance of human performance in motion pictures and the

potential impact on employment.” It also stipulates that the union be notified and given “an opportunity to bargain in good faith” if producers are considering casting an AI performer.

In short, digital alterations to your performances cannot be made without your consent.

TAYLOR:

I’m really glad to hear that the entertainment industry recognizes the importance of having the artist’s consent prior to using their work and are taking steps to fairly compensate the performers.

But what happens when they don’t have my consent? What can be done to stop unauthorized fake versions?

JAIME:

Great question. Let’s have Cordelia, Chris, and Leah get us up to speed on the new legal developments across the nation.

CORDELIA:

Thanks, Jaimee. Let’s start where you spent the early part of your career: Tennessee.

TAYLOR:

I love Tennessee!

CORDELIA:

In 2023, Tennessee passed The Ensuring Likeness, Voice and Image Security Act, called the ELVIS Act for short. The legislation was designed to protect individuals’ rights regarding the use of their voice likenesses, ensuring that consent is required before anyone can replicate or use a person’s voice.

The ELVIS Act is the first of its kind. It protects an individual’s voice likeness regardless of whether the sound contains the individual’s actual voice or a simulation of the voice of the individual. It is the first attempt to crack down on generative AI’s ability to create new content in familiar voices, without the consent of the creator. As you’ll learn, the

ELVIS Act has inspired a string of similar legislation across the country.

TAYLOR:

And just to be clear, this is the law in Tennessee now? It has already been passed?

CORDELIA:

Yes. The ELVIS Act also adds voice to the state's right of publicity law, which historically included protection for unauthorized use of an individual's name, photograph, and likeness.

TAYLOR:

And what would happen if someone violated the ELVIS Act?

CORDELIA:

The ELVIS Act creates three civil causes of action for voice likeness: knowingly using; publishing, performing, distributing, or transmitting; and a right of action against the technology which created or distributed the voice likeness. Violators of the Act not only face civil liability, but can face a Class A Misdemeanor.

In other words, it is now a crime.

JACK:

Speaking of the ELVIS Act. I've been thinking- Elvis passed away long before cell phones, internet, or AI was used. How good can AI versions of Elvis be?

CORDELIA:

Quite good actually. Would you like to see an AI performance from the man who inspired the name of the bill?

JACK:

Absolutely.

[AI ELVIS CLIP]

JACK:

That was amazing. I have so many ideas now..

TAYLOR:

I am really glad Tennessee is spearheading this effort, but I don't usually live or work in Tennessee much anymore. What is happening in other states?

Tyler:

Actually, Taylor, there are quite a few states that are recognizing the need to set up safeguards against the development of AI. If you're ever in—for argument's sake—I don't know, a presentation about AI in the Pacific Northwest, Oregon and Washington have some interesting things going on.

Taylor:

Okay... a very specific example, but I'm all ears.

Tyler:

Well, both states are actually taking proactive steps to regulate and harness the power of artificial intelligence, with a focus on privacy, transparency, and ethics.

Oregon established the AI Advisory Council in 2023. The council was formed to create a framework for the ethical use of AI in state government. The council's main goals include developing clear policies for AI usage, addressing ethical concerns, and protecting personal data. It consists of up to 15 members, including experts in data ethics, AI, and representatives from the Governor's Racial Justice Council. The council has been tasked with submitting a recommended action plan within 12 months of its first meeting. The first meeting was in November, so we should be seeing an action plan shortly from the Governor's Office.

Taylor:

That sounds interesting, can you give me a little more information about what the council will try to accomplish?

Tyler:

Of course, Ms. Swift!

The Oregon AI Advisory Council has several key objectives: First, it wants to establish ethical standards and policies for AI usage in state government by creating policies that prevent misuse, bias, and discrimination while promoting fairness and transparency in AI decision-making.

Second, the council is focused on protecting personal information and ensuring data privacy AI systems. Since they often rely on large datasets, the Council aims to protect personally identifiable information and ensure that AI technologies do not infringe on individuals' privacy.

Finally, it aims to promote diversity, equity, and inclusion.

Taylor:

And they're doing something similar in Washington you said? Even though Oregon is the objectively better state? What're they doing up there?

Tyler:

Wow, you think Oregon is better? That is T-Swift canon now.

In Washington, Senate Bill 5838 was passed in 2024, which established an AI Task Force. The task force is composed of 42 members and is responsible for assessing AI's impact on a wide range of sectors, including public safety, labor, equity, and privacy. The task force is expected to produce its first report in 2024.

Similar to Oregon, the task force consists of experts from different fields, including industry leaders, government officials, and academic experts. Their primary focus is ensuring that AI technologies are deployed responsibly, with special attention to privacy, security, and fairness.

JACK:

That's great to hear but what about the rest of the states? What is the federal government doing?

LEAH:

Even more exciting is that the federal government is finally making some moves to protect artists such as yourself, Ms. Swift.

In April of this year, the Generative AI Copyright Disclosure Act was introduced in the House of Representatives requiring generative AI systems to file a notice with the Copyright Office detailing all copyrighted works used to train the system. Presumably, the copyright holders would have to give permission for the generative AI system to use their work while generating "new" product. The bill has been referred to the House Committee on the Judiciary. Some have said taking all copyrighted material from an AI system would be an impossible task as copyrighted materials are often found on other websites.

In July of this year, the NO FAKES Act was introduced in the Senate. The Nurture Originals, Foster Art, Keep Entertainment Safe (or NO FAKES) Act will create a federal intellectual property right to a person's voice and likeness, and a prohibition of unauthorized production of digital replicas.

This bill provides a national standard to protect creators' likenesses from being used without their consent, giving them control over their digital personas and offering recourse for unauthorized use by holding individuals, companies, and platforms accountable.

Proposed by a bipartisan group of Senators, the NO FAKES Act is designed to protect original content and ensure the safety of entertainment by requiring licensing deals for digital replicas, with the stipulation that individuals must be represented by counsel for such agreements to be valid. The bill has been referred to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

JACK:

Are there any limits or loopholes?

LEAH:

The bill includes specific exclusions for liability, such as digital replicas used in news, sports broadcasts, documentaries, and commentary. This indicates a balance between protecting individual rights and allowing certain uses of digital replicas that serve the public interest.

JACK:

That makes sense. It sounds like the law is, or will be, on our side and we shouldn't have to worry too much about others profiting off of an unauthorized replica in Taylor's image or likeness.

TAYLOR:

But if a Shamook could create such a convincing version of Carrie Fisher without ever asking for consent, couldn't individuals just post their AI creations of Taylor Swift, singing songs about cats and cardigans? Would any of the laws prevent search engines or other websites from posting or reposting fake images or videos of me?

CHRIS:

Yes- search engines and websites may be subject to liability for posting or reposting fake/unauthorized content.

The extent of liability would likely depend on several factors. Key considerations might include:

- 1. Awareness:** If a search engine is made aware of counterfeit goods being promoted through its services and fails to act, this could strengthen the case for liability. The expectation may be that search engines should have systems in place to detect and respond to such issues proactively.
- 2. Response to Complaints:** The act may impose a duty on search engines to respond to complaints regarding counterfeit products. A lack of timely and effective response could be viewed unfavorably and result in liability.
- 3. Reasonable Efforts:** The standard for liability might hinge on what constitutes "reasonable efforts" in preventing the promotion of counterfeit goods. Search engines will likely need to demonstrate that they are taking meaningful steps to comply with the act's requirements. Per the language of the law itself, these efforts must be taken as soon as is "technically and practically feasible."
- 4. Legal Precedents:** As with many emerging laws, the interpretation and enforcement of the NO FAKES Act will evolve through court cases. Legal precedents established in

these cases will significantly influence how liability is determined for search engines and other platforms.

And it has been successful for the most part. We at the firm have tried to find, for demonstration purposes, a video with a digital replica of you performing a song you did not write. The closest we found so far is this:

Digital Heart

<https://youtu.be/6OCGrDhKuKA?feature=shared>

(Play from 3:49 to 6:11)

TAYLOR:

That is both impressive and scary at the same time. They were able to combine so many of my songs! And it really didn't sound bad.

I'm not really worried about this woman releasing that song under my name, but it is scary to think how easily someone could use my songs to generate something I don't approve of.

Speaking of which- If folks can't create videos of my digital replica performing songs I didn't write, why is it that people can alter my photos without any repercussions?

JAIME:

I'm sorry I'm not following you.

TAYLOR:

Isn't this use of my image without my permission?

Pulls out phone and presses on an image. The images are projected on screen.

<https://npr.brightspotcdn.com/dims3/default/strip/false/crop/606x888+0+0/resize/1100/quality/50/format/png/?url=http%3A%2F%2Fnpr-brightspot.s3.amazonaws.com%2Fa9%2Fa7%2Fcd83044743528cce61c49c6484d9%2Fscreen-shot-2024-08-22-at-09-26-18.png>

[Slide 28 - "Swifties for Trump" Images]

I know I did not endorse him.

JAIME:

Garrett, can you cover this?

GARRETT:

I'd be happy to. Use of AI content to influence elections is a hot topic right now. There is a lot of potential for misinformation and misleading content, which has legislatures concerned. Take a look at this "message" from Kamala Harris, for example.

[Slide 29 - Harris deepfake video]

—

GARRETT:

It goes on (and on). But you get the idea. And of course that isn't really her.

TAYLOR:

Wow - that is really outrageous. *Almost* as bad as "Swifties For Trump." What is the law doing about this kind of thing?

GARRETT:

The law is really behind the technology in this area. Starting in 2019, a few states like Texas[\[1\]](#) and California[\[2\]](#) passed laws restricting "deepfake videos" or "materially deceptive audio or visual media," where it's used to influence an election. A few other states like Minnesota[\[3\]](#) and Michigan[\[4\]](#) passed similar laws in 2023. This area continues to evolve, with proposed federal legislation on "materially deceptive AI-generated media," [\[5\]](#) and other states are taking further steps.

TAYLOR:

Well, I hope they figure something out soon. But back to my issue—what can I do when people use an AI image of me for a political purpose?

GARRETT:

The new laws that are currently being proposed and passed in this context don't have protections for you directly. Instead they do things like create a criminal offense for using misleading AI content to influence an election, or give candidates the right to sue if they are portrayed inaccurately.

TAYLOR:

Wouldn't Swifties for Trump and the Kamala video you showed us meet those criteria? Why hasn't someone been criminally prosecuted for misuse of AI?

GARRETT:

Well, it's hard to say. There are time limits under some of the laws, where the material has to be distributed within 30 or 60 days of an election. Other laws explicitly include a *mens rea* element of intent to influence an election. So both Swifties for Trump and the Kamala video may not meet the requirements. More importantly prosecutors may not know where to find the original creator. President Trump denies generating the image. Elon Musk would most certainly say he just posted the Kamala video as a joke.

To be fully transparent, I haven't found any examples of actual criminal prosecution.

TAYLOR:

This makes me so upset. I just want to curl up with cats and cry. They're really the only ones I can trust.

GARRETT:

However, as more legal restrictions on misleading AI content are put into place we may see less of things like "Swifties for Trump," or new legal remedies may become available.

And there are always common law claims for defamation or false light^[6] but these types of suits often just result in the republication of the image you want removed. The best thing you can do is respond directly - put out your own message with your actual views to set the record straight. You could even sign it, "Childless Cat Lady."

TAYLOR:

Like this?

[Slide 30 - Taylor Instagram Post]

GARRETT:

Oh, I see you're way ahead of me!

Just one last thing, my daughter is a huge fan, could I just get your signature on this Tortured Poet's vinyl cover?

TAYLOR:

Of course! And here's a guitar pick for her, too.

Garrett pulls out his phone and tries to take a selfie.

Jaime clears his throat and glares at Garrett, who backs away from Taylor.

JAIIME:

In summary, while unauthorized AI can cause problems for artists, it can also be a form of insurance for artists such as yourself. Should something happen to your voice or your physical appearance, allowing AI to gather as much data about you now may help you to live on when your back and knees start to ache and you can't just shake it off.

TAYLOR:

That's true. I may feel like I'm 22, but I am turning 35 soon. What do you think, Jack?

JACK:

I think technology could be helpful when we all get older, but I'm most interested in how we can use the technology now. For example, if we used the same voice cloning technology Randy Travis used, I could use it to test out songs I'm writing without having to wait for you to be available to sing it. It would allow us to release even more albums quickly.

TAYLOR:

As long as no one hears it before I do!

Turns to the Attorney Panel.

Thanks for the information. I am not sure how I feel about all of this yet. I guess I am going to take some time to let myself process these feelings.

Ok, I'm done processing. We're going to write a song about this meeting. Jack, give me a beat!

Taylor's song re: Gus Solomon Inn of Court plays.

<https://suno.com/song/90a49866-2d94-4085-9e85-d5cd3197f636>