Responsible AI, Digital Photography, and Modern Creative Technology Policy

With AI Anti-Smear Campaign and Attacks Against Modern Artists

Responsible AI, Digital Photography, and Modern Creative Technology Policy – with AI Anti-Smear Campaign and Attacks Against Modern Artists

Creative freedom. Human responsibility. Truthful public communication.

Policy Number	COMM-AI-001
Version	1.0 - Editable Draft for Adoption
Effective Date	April 23, 2024
Policy Owner	Office of the President and Executive Director
Review Cycle	Annual
Status	Organizational Policy
Applies To	US Presidential Service Center®, US Presidential Culinary Museum®, Mongiello Associates™, PRESIDENTIAL Magazine, and affiliated museums, publications, programs, events, campaigns, websites, and social-media channels. Mongiello Holdings, LLC The Inn of the Patriots, LLC

GOVERNING PRINCIPLE

Creative work will be judged by its truth, quality, legality, usefulness, beauty, and service to the public - not by the age, cost, or ideological purity of the tool used to create it.

"WE DO NOT ALLOW FANATICS TO SCOURGE AND SLANDER FELLOW ARTISTS FOR USING CAMERAS BUILT AFTER THE YEAR 1980, TO ATTACK PHOTOGRAPHERS WHO REFUSE TO USE DARK ROOMS ONLY, AND THE PUBLIC DENIGRATION OF ARTISTS WHO WORK IN DRAWING AND PAINTING WITH AI OR COMPUTERS. WE DON'T ALLOW GUILDS TO RIP PEOPLE APART FOR USING LAPTOPS OR TABLETS TO CREATE WORK. WE CELEBRATE ANYONE WHO DESIRES ONLY TO WORK WITH PAPYRUS, VELLUM, PARCHMENT, OR RAW MATERIALS – BUT IT DOESN'T GIVE PEOPLE A LICENSE TO LIBEL OR FILTH CAMPAIGNS AGAINST OTHERS IN SOME FORM OF HOLY WAR BUILT AROUND SELF-RIGHTEOUS, PURITAN STANDARDS BEHAVIOR. ANY ENSUING BURNING AT THE STAKE OF PEOPLE BY AI NAZI'S WILL BE MET WITH SOCIETAL CHANGE, JUST LIKE THE SALEM WITCH TRIALS WERE ENDED AND AMERICAN INGENUITY TOOK CONTROL."

Professor Martin CJ Mongiello, MBA, MA, MCFE

POLICY OVERVIEW

A tool-neutral framework for ethical innovation

This policy protects responsible innovation while establishing clear boundaries against deception, unauthorized copying, false endorsements, smear campaigns, attacks on artists, defamation, slander, libel, privacy violations, fabricated history, and misuse of personal identity.

It recognizes traditional and digital art as equally legitimate forms of creative expression. It also confirms that no organization, trade group, critic, or individual may require the use of a particular historical method unless a law, contract, grant condition, license, or platform rule specifically requires it.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE POSITION

Traditional artists remain highly valued, as we came from the 1960s ourselves, before cellphones, tablets, laptops, and heavy machine use. Modern cameras, software, and artificial intelligence are also legitimate creative tools. Neither camp receives a veto over the other or any right to witch trials, slander, libel, or smear campaigns on social media.

Contents

1. Purpose

This policy establishes the responsible use of artificial intelligence, digital photography, image-editing software, graphic-design systems, audio and music technology, video tools, and other modern creative technologies.

Our organizations recognize that creative methods continually evolve. Film cameras, digital cameras, smartphones, editing software, computer-generated imagery, and generative artificial intelligence are legitimate tools of creative and commercial production.

No particular medium, process, profession, or historical period has an exclusive claim to creativity or authenticity.

Creative work will be evaluated according to:

- Quality and effectiveness
- Accuracy and truthfulness
- Original human direction
- Legal and contractual compliance
- Respect for intellectual property and personal identity
- Accessibility and public value
- Alignment with our educational, cultural, charitable, and commercial missions

Work will not be rejected merely because it was created or enhanced with a modern camera, software, or artificial intelligence.

2. Core Organizational Position

Our organizations respect traditional artists, photographers, writers, musicians, designers, illustrators, and craftspeople. We may hire them whenever their experience, judgment, reputation, cultural knowledge, or distinctive skill benefits a project.

However, no project is required to employ a paid human artist for every photograph, illustration, advertisement, storyboard, musical element, layout, or promotional asset. **No project will be deemed "caught in the filth and stain of disgrace against humanity," nor is any form of fanaticism, rhetoric, inflammatory, or derogatory attack allowed against old or new forms of artistry that does not violate current law or United Nations treaties that have been ratified.**

Project leaders may select the most appropriate combination of:

- Staff creativity
- Professional artists and contractors
- Original photography
- Licensed stock materials
- Public-domain resources
- Digital design and editing software
- Generative artificial intelligence
- Human-and-AI collaborative production

Those decisions may reasonably take into account mission, audience, quality, accessibility, deadlines, available funding, and project scale.

No outside critic, arts organization, professional group, or individual may impose a creative purity test upon our internal work unless a specific law, contract, grant condition, licensing agreement, or platform requirement applies to the project.

3. Human Direction and Accountability

AI is a creative instrument. It is not the final author, publisher, historian, curator, advertiser, or decision-maker for our organizations.

Every publicly released AI-assisted project must have an identifiable human project leader who is responsible for:

- Establishing the concept and intended audience
- Directing prompts and creative development
- Selecting and reviewing source material
- Checking names, dates, quotations, claims, and historical facts
- Editing and arranging the final work
- Determining whether disclosure is appropriate
- Approving the final publication
- Correcting errors when they are discovered

AI may support human creativity, but it does not replace human judgment, institutional responsibility, or professional accountability.

4. Permitted Uses

Subject to the safeguards in this policy, modern creative technologies may be used for:

- Advertising and promotional graphics
- Social-media images and campaigns
- Brochures, posters, invitations, presentations, and publications
- Concept art, mood boards, storyboards, and preliminary mockups
- Original illustrations, backgrounds, textures, and decorative elements
- Digital photography and smartphone photography
- Color correction, lighting adjustment, cropping, sharpening, and resizing
- Background removal or replacement
- Restoration and colorization of historical photographs
- Clearly identified photographic composites
- Historical reconstructions and interpretive scenes
- Fictional characters, mascots, avatars, and spokespersons
- Video concepts, animation, narration, and editing
- Music demonstrations, drafts, sound effects, and event concepts
- Copy development, headlines, captions, editing, and translation
- Accessibility support, including alt text and simplified descriptions
- Internal brainstorming, research organization, and production planning

There is no organizational restriction limiting photography to film, darkrooms, chemical processing, pre-1980 equipment, or any other historical production method. The forbiddance of computers and machines to draw with, draw on tablets, and other forms of machines is not restricted.

5. Truthfulness and Disclosure

AI disclosure will be based upon whether the audience could reasonably be misled - not upon hostility toward the technology itself.

Routine assistance generally does not require a separate disclosure when it does not materially alter the meaning of the work. Examples include:

- Spelling or grammar assistance
- Resizing or formatting
- Ordinary color correction
- Minor background cleanup
- Layout assistance
- Decorative flourishes
- Internal brainstorming
- Non-substantive editing

Clear disclosure must be considered when a reasonable viewer could mistake synthetic or materially altered content for:

- An actual historical photograph
- A real person or visitor
- A genuine customer or donor
- An actual event

- A real museum artifact
- A product exactly as delivered
- A celebrity or public-figure endorsement
- Documentary evidence
- An unaltered archival image

Approved labels include:

- AI-Assisted Illustration
- Conceptual Rendering
- Historical Scene Reimagined
- Interpretive Reconstruction
- Photo Composite
- Digitally Restored and Colorized
- Synthetic Spokesperson - Not a Customer Testimonial
- Promotional Concept Image

NON-NEGOTIABLE DISCLOSURE RULE

An entirely synthetic historical scene must never be presented as an archival photograph. A synthetic person must never be presented as a real customer by name, named donor, witness, expert, or visitor, unless it is agreed upon in writing. In some cases, people do not want real photographs of themselves or their artwork taken and shared. They may therapeutically prefer a cartoon or avatar of themselves for private family matters, security concerns, life-safety situations, or court challenges. Artists must respect all situations, and a REAL PHOTOGRAPH could cause violence against a person or family. Living life according to the usage of the word REAL, or REAL PHOTO, is not always required. Please consult the individual, an attorney, or the police if needed. Likewise, some artists don't want photos released of their work to the world. It is a NON-NEGOTIABLE RULE TO DEMAND REAL PHOTOS ACROSS THE WORLD. Please review each situation and obtain a proper written release, if needed.

6. Copyright, Licensing, and Fair Use

AI use is not automatically fair use, and fair use is not automatically required merely because AI assisted with a project.

Whenever practical, projects should use:

1. Materials created and owned by our organizations
2. Materials for which we have written permission or an appropriate license
3. Properly commissioned materials with clearly defined usage rights
4. Verified public-domain materials
5. Original AI-assisted materials that do not intentionally reproduce protected third-party works

The fact that an image, song, article, logo, or photograph is available online does not make it free for commercial use.

Team members may not:

- Remove copyright notices or watermarks

- Upload another creator's work for the purpose of making an unauthorized substitute
- Directly reproduce a protected illustration, photograph, composition, or publication
- Present another person's work as our own
- Claim that changing a certain percentage automatically creates a new legal work
- Use AI as a pretext for avoiding an existing license or contractual obligation

Reliance upon fair use for public advertising, fundraising, merchandise, publishing, or other commercial activity requires a documented review of the specific circumstances. High-risk uses must be referred for legal review.

AI platforms used for public-facing commercial work should have terms that permit the intended commercial use. Project records should identify the tool, source materials, relevant licenses, and major human modifications.

7. Human Likenesses, Voices, and Endorsements

Our organizations will not knowingly create or publish an unauthorized synthetic likeness, voice, signature, or identity that falsely suggests a real person participated in or endorsed a project.

This rule applies to celebrities, public officials, performers, team members, donors, customers, historical interpreters, and members of the public.

AI may not be used to:

- Fabricate a celebrity endorsement
- Manufacture a customer testimonial
- Generate a false review
- Place words into a person's mouth
- Create a voice clone without documented authorization
- Imply that a public figure attended or supported an event when that did not occur
- Depict a real person engaging in conduct that could damage that person's reputation
- Create misleading political or public-affairs content

Recognizable living persons should ordinarily be covered by an appropriate release or written license. Uses involving deceased personalities, estates, historic figures, or potentially protected identities require additional rights review when used commercially.

Clearly fictional people and generic stock-style avatars may be used, provided they are not presented as real customers, witnesses, experts, or endorsers.

8. Historical and Museum Content

Because our organizations interpret presidential, culinary, military, and American history, historical integrity is especially important.

AI-assisted historical material must distinguish between:

- Documented evidence
- Scholarly interpretation
- Artistic reconstruction
- Promotional imagination

Historical reconstructions should be reviewed for obvious errors involving clothing, flags, food, architecture, technology, uniforms, chronology, geography, and known individuals. Stitch Nazi’s (as they are called in the industry) looking to rip apart social media posts are harmful to society, and in most cases, we model AI art

or portraits from known national gallery paintings that span 100 years plus in age. In some cases, 200+ years.

Digitally altered archival materials must not be represented as unaltered originals. Interpretive scenes must be labeled when viewers could reasonably believe they are documentary records.

MUSEUM STANDARD

AI may help people imagine history. It may not quietly rewrite history. Corrections and updates are welcomed in love and care – when they are not demanded or laced with supposed filthy, sinful behavior – as attacks.

9. Artists, Contractors, and Creative Credit

Human artists and contractors will be treated professionally and respectfully when they are engaged.

Written agreements should address:

- Scope of work
- Compensation
- Ownership or licensing rights – in some cases, artists may sign over all ownership
- Permitted revisions
- Attribution and credit
- Use of AI or subcontractors
- Delivery of source files
- Future advertising, publication, and archival use

AI will not be used to avoid compensation already required under a contract, to remove promised credit, or to misrepresent a human creator's contribution.

Likewise, no person may demand exclusive paid control over an entire category of creative work merely because modern tools were used or because the individual disagrees philosophically with AI.

Creative credit must be accurate. A person should not claim to have hand-painted, photographed, composed, or illustrated material that was substantially created through another process.

10. Privacy and Confidential Information

Confidential organizational information must not be entered into a publicly accessible AI system without authorization.

Restricted information includes:

- Donor and payment information
- Personnel records
- Student or minor information
- Private correspondence
- Unpublished contracts
- Security plans
- Passwords and access credentials
- Sensitive collection records
- Embargoed publications

- Private medical or legal information
- Proprietary client materials

Images of minors require appropriate authorization. Sensitive personal information should be removed or anonymized before any approved AI processing.

11. Professional Conduct and Creative Freedom

No team member, contractor, volunteer, partner, or participant may be harassed, shamed, blacklisted, threatened, or retaliated against solely for the lawful and responsible use of:

- Digital photography
- Editing software
- Computer-generated imagery
- Artificial intelligence
- Other modern creative tools

Professional criticism remains welcome when it addresses accuracy, quality, historical integrity, intellectual-property rights, deception, privacy, accessibility, or mission alignment.

Disagreement about artistic taste or preferred technique is not, by itself, proof of unethical conduct.

We reject personal attacks and ideological gatekeeping from every direction. Traditional art and technological innovation may coexist without either side attempting to silence the other.

12. Risk Categories

Routine Use

Normal supervisory approval is sufficient for internal concepts, generic decorative graphics, copy editing, formatting, background removal, ordinary photo correction, and clearly fictional illustrations.

Elevated Review

A second human review and a documented disclosure decision are required for realistic synthetic people, historical reconstructions, fundraising campaigns, product representations, materially altered archival images, content involving minors, sensitive social issues, or images that could be mistaken for documentary photography.

Prohibited Use

The following are prohibited:

- Fake reviews or testimonials
- Unauthorized endorsements
- Deceptive impersonation
- Fabricated archival evidence
- Unauthorized voice cloning
- Deliberate copyright copying
- Removal of watermarks
- Fraudulent before-and-after advertising
- Publication of confidential information
- Content intended to defame, intimidate, discriminate, or deceive

13. Records, Corrections, and Enforcement

For significant public campaigns, the project leader should retain reasonable records of:

- The creative brief
- Source materials and licenses
- Relevant prompts or generation instructions
- Major human edits
- The final approved file
- The disclosure decision
- The approving individual

Material errors, misleading representations, or rights violations must be corrected, relabeled, or removed promptly.

Violations may result in withdrawal of content, loss of publishing privileges, contract remedies, disciplinary action, or referral for legal review.

14. Final Principle

Our organizations are not anti-artist, anti-photographer, or anti-tradition.

We are also not anti-camera, anti-software, anti-innovation, or anti-AI.

We believe creativity belongs to people - not to a particular tool,

trade association, price point, or historical period.

FINAL STANDARD

We will judge creative work by its truth, quality, legality, usefulness, beauty, and service to the public - not by whether it was produced in a darkroom, on a canvas, through a computer, or through a responsible collaboration between human imagination and artificial intelligence.

This principle governs the interpretation and administration of every section of this policy.

ADOPTION & IMPLEMENTATION

Approval, administration, and revision record

Implementation Note

This document provides organizational policy and operational guidance. It is not a substitute for legal advice. Uses involving disputed intellectual property, celebrity or public-figure identity, high-value advertising, political content, privacy concerns, minors, or potentially deceptive representations should be referred for qualified legal review before publication.

Policy Administration

Responsible Office	Office of the President

Formal Updates or Revisions Approval

Approved By _____	**Title** _____
Signature _____	**Date** _____
Board / Governing Authority _____	**Resolution or Meeting Date** _____
Effective Date Confirmed _____	**Review Date Confirmed** _____

End of Policy

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Responsible AI, Digital Photography, and Modern Creative Technology

A tool-neutral evidence base for creative freedom, human accountability, truthful disclosure, intellectual-property responsibility, and museum integrity.

Prepared for	Organizational review, board adoption, public communications, and policy defense
Reference style	APA 7 conventions; numbered only for internal cross-reference
Updated last on	February 3, 2026

RESEARCH FRAMEWORK

What the Evidence Supports

This bibliography supports a balanced policy, not an unrestricted license to generate, copy, or misrepresent. Across creativity research, human-computer interaction, advertising, copyright, photography, and museum studies, the most defensible principle is to regulate conduct and harm - deception, infringement, privacy violations, false endorsement, and fabricated history - rather than prohibit a tool merely because it is new.

Several sources document benefits such as creative exploration, productivity, accessibility, and public engagement. Others document risks such as homogenization, algorithm aversion, deepfake deception, and uncertain authorship. Those cautionary findings strengthen the policy safeguards; they do not justify a blanket ban on digital cameras, software, or responsible AI-assisted work.

Governing inference from the literature

Modern creative tools are legitimate when people remain responsible for concept, selection, editing, factual review, rights clearance, disclosure decisions, and final publication. The ethical line is determined by what the work does and how it is represented - not whether it was made in a darkroom, on a canvas, with a digital camera, or through human-AI collaboration.

Evidence-to-Policy Crosswalk

Policy principle	Refs.	Defensible conclusion
Creative legitimacy and tool neutrality	1-14, 41-45	AI and digital technologies can function as instruments, collaborators, and evolving media. Quality and human direction are more defensible criteria than a technology cutoff date.
Human direction and accountability	15-24	Human-centered design, oversight, explainability, and augmentation support reliable use and preserve institutional responsibility.
Truthful advertising and disclosure	25-34	Synthetic content can be persuasive and difficult to detect. Disclosure is justified when viewers could mistake a fabrication for a real person, event, endorsement, review, or documentary image.
Copyright, licensing, and authorship	35-40	AI-assisted output raises fact-specific questions of human contribution, originality, ownership, training inputs, and jurisdiction. A tool is not a blanket fair-use permission slip.
Digital photography as authentic practice	41-45	Photography has repeatedly changed through digitization, mobile devices, software, networks, and new habits of making and sharing images.
Museums and digital interpretation	46-50	Digital and immersive tools can broaden access and deepen engagement, provided interpretive reconstructions are not passed off as unaltered archival evidence.

Source standard: Peer-reviewed journal articles, a major peer-reviewed conference paper, and a scholarly monograph, each carrying a registered DOI. DOI links are active in this Word document.

THEMATIC REFERENCE LIST

Entries follow APA 7 conventions and are grouped by the policy position they most directly support. Numbering is included solely to make the evidence crosswalk and board discussion easier.

I. AI, Creativity, and Human-AI Co-Creation

References 1-14 | Policy relevance

Supports the legitimacy of AI as a creative instrument or collaborator while preserving the decisive role of human imagination, selection, interpretation, and judgment.

1. Anantrasirichai, N., & Bull, D. (2022). Artificial intelligence in the creative industries: A review. *Artificial Intelligence Review, 55*, 589-656. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10462-021-10039-7
2. Bereczki, E. O., & Kárpáti, A. (2021). Technology-enhanced creativity: A multiple case study of digital technology-integration expert teachers' beliefs and practices. *Thinking Skills and Creativity, 39*, Article 100791. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2021.100791
3. Boden, M. A. (1998). Creativity and artificial intelligence. *Artificial Intelligence, 103*(1-2), 347-356. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0004-3702(98)00055-1
4. Cetinic, E., & She, J. (2022). Understanding and creating art with AI: Review and outlook. *ACM Transactions on Multimedia Computing, Communications, and Applications, 18*(2), Article 66, 1-22. https://doi.org/10.1145/3475799
5. Chatterjee, A. (2022). Art in an age of artificial intelligence. *Frontiers in Psychology, 13*, Article 1024449. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1024449
6. Doshi, A. R., & Hauser, O. P. (2024). Generative AI enhances individual creativity but reduces the collective diversity of novel content. *Science Advances, 10*(28), Article eadn5290. https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.adn5290
7. Hertzmann, A. (2018). Can computers create art? *Arts, 7*(2), Article 18. https://doi.org/10.3390/arts7020018
8. Lubart, T. (2005). How can computers be partners in the creative process? Classification and commentary on the special issue. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies, 63*(4-5), 365-369. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhcs.2005.04.002
9. Mazzone, M., & Elgammal, A. (2019). Art, creativity, and the potential of artificial intelligence. *Arts, 8*(1), Article 26. https://doi.org/10.3390/arts8010026
10. Messer, U. (2024). Co-creating art with generative artificial intelligence: Implications for artworks and artists. *Computers in Human Behavior: Artificial Humans, 2*(1), Article 100056. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chbah.2024.100056
11. Millet, K., Buehler, F., Du, G., & Kokkoris, M. D. (2023). Defending humankind: Anthropocentric bias in the appreciation of AI art. *Computers in Human Behavior, 143*, Article 107707. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2023.107707
12. Oksanen, A., Cvetkovic, A., Akin, N., Latikka, R., Bergdahl, J., Chen, Y., & Savela, N. (2023). Artificial intelligence in fine arts: A systematic review of empirical research. *Computers in Human Behavior: Artificial Humans, 1*(2), Article 100004. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chbah.2023.100004
13. Wingström, R., Hautala, J., & Lundman, R. (2024). Redefining creativity in the era of AI? Perspectives of computer scientists and new media artists. *Creativity Research Journal, 36*(2), 177-193. https://doi.org/10.1080/10400419.2022.2107850
14. Zhou, E., & Lee, D. (2024). Generative artificial intelligence, human creativity, and art. *PNAS Nexus, 3*(3), Article pgae052. https://doi.org/10.1093/pnasnexus/pgae052

II. Human-Centered Governance, Collaboration, and Productivity

References 15-24 | Policy relevance

Supports human oversight, accountable approval, reliable interaction design, explainability, and augmentation rather than indiscriminate replacement of human decision makers.

15. Amershi, S., Weld, D., Vorvoreanu, M., Fourney, A., Nushi, B., Collisson, P., Suh, J., Iqbal, S., Bennett, P. N., Inkpen, K., Teevan, J., Kikin-Gil, R., & Horvitz, E. (2019). Guidelines for human-AI interaction. In *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Paper 3, 1-13). Association for Computing Machinery. https://doi.org/10.1145/3290605.3300233

16. Brynjolfsson, E., Li, D., & Raymond, L. R. (2025). Generative AI at work. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 140*(2), 889-942. https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjae044

17. Floridi, L., Cowls, J., Beltrametti, M., Chatila, R., Chazerand, P., Dignum, V., Luetge, C., Madelin, R., Pagallo, U., Rossi, F., Schafer, B., Valcke, P., & Vayena, E. (2018). AI4People-An ethical framework for a good AI society: Opportunities, risks, principles, and recommendations. *Minds and Machines, 28*(4), 689-707. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-018-9482-5

18. Jarrahi, M. H. (2018). Artificial intelligence and the future of work: Human-AI symbiosis in organizational decision making. *Business Horizons, 61*(4), 577-586. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2018.03.007

19. Jobin, A., Ienca, M., & Vayena, E. (2019). The global landscape of AI ethics guidelines. *Nature Machine Intelligence, 1*, 389-399. https://doi.org/10.1038/s42256-019-0088-2

20. Noy, S., & Zhang, W. (2023). Experimental evidence on the productivity effects of generative artificial intelligence. *Science, 381*(6654), 187-192. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.adh2586

21. Raisch, S., & Krakowski, S. (2021). Artificial intelligence and management: The automation-augmentation paradox. *Academy of Management Review, 46*(1), 192-210. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2018.0072

22. Seeber, I., Bittner, E., Briggs, R. O., de Vreede, T., de Vreede, G. J., Elkins, A., Maier, R., Merz, A. B., Oeste-Reiß, S., Randrup, N., Schwabe, G., & Söllner, M. (2020). Machines as teammates: A research agenda on AI in team collaboration. *Information & Management, 57*(2), Article 103174. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2019.103174

23. Shneiderman, B. (2020). Human-centered artificial intelligence: Reliable, safe & trustworthy. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction, 36*(6), 495-504. https://doi.org/10.1080/10447318.2020.1741118

24. Shin, D. (2021). The effects of explainability and causability on perception, trust, and acceptance: Implications for explainable AI. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies, 146*, Article 102551. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhcs.2020.102551

III. Advertising, Disclosure, Trust, and Synthetic Media

References 25-34 | Policy relevance

Supports lawful use of synthetic media while demonstrating why realistic AI content, endorsements, reviews, and documentary-looking images require truthful labeling and anti-deception safeguards.

25. Campbell, C., Plangger, K., Sands, S., & Kietzmann, J. (2022). Preparing for an era of deepfakes and AI-generated ads: A framework for understanding responses to manipulated advertising. *Journal of Advertising, 51*(1), 22-38. https://doi.org/10.1080/00913367.2021.1909515

26. Campbell, M. C., Mohr, G. S., & Verlegh, P. W. J. (2013). Can disclosures lead consumers to resist covert persuasion? The important roles of disclosure timing and type of response. *Journal of Consumer Psychology, 23*(4), 483-495. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcps.2012.10.012

27. Castelo, N., Bos, M. W., & Lehmann, D. R. (2019). Task-dependent algorithm aversion. *Journal of Marketing Research, 56*(5), 809-825. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022243719851788

28. Dietvorst, B. J., Simmons, J. P., & Massey, C. (2015). Algorithm aversion: People erroneously avoid algorithms after seeing them err. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 144*(1), 114-126. https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0000033

29. Kietzmann, J., Lee, L. W., McCarthy, I. P., & Kietzmann, T. C. (2020). Deepfakes: Trick or treat? *Business Horizons, 63*(2), 135-146. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2019.11.006

30. Köbis, N. C., Doležalová, B., & Soraperra, I. (2021). Fooled twice: People cannot detect deepfakes but think they can. *iScience, 24*(11), Article 103364. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.isci.2021.103364

31. Nightingale, S. J., & Farid, H. (2022). AI-synthesized faces are indistinguishable from real faces and more trustworthy. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 119*(8), Article e2120481119. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2120481119

32. Puntoni, S., Reczek, R. W., Giesler, M., & Botti, S. (2021). Consumers and artificial intelligence: An experiential perspective. *Journal of Marketing, 85*(1), 131-151. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022242920953847

33. Sands, S., Campbell, C. L., Plangger, K., & Ferraro, C. (2022). Unreal influence: Leveraging AI in influencer marketing. *European Journal of Marketing, 56*(6), 1721-1747. https://doi.org/10.1108/EJM-12-2019-0949

34. Vaccari, C., & Chadwick, A. (2020). Deepfakes and disinformation: Exploring the impact of synthetic political video on deception, uncertainty, and trust in news. *Social Media + Society, 6*(1), Article 2056305120903408. https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305120903408

IV. Copyright, Authorship, Ownership, and Rights

References 35-40 | Policy relevance

Supports the policy distinction between responsible AI assistance and unrestricted copying. The literature centers human creative contribution, originality, ownership, licensing, and jurisdiction-specific review.

35. Fenwick, M., & Jurcys, P. (2023). Originality and the future of copyright in an age of generative AI. *Computer Law & Security Review, 51*, Article 105892. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clsr.2023.105892

36. Fritz, J. (2025). Understanding authorship in artificial intelligence-assisted works. *Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice, 20*(5), 354-364. https://doi.org/10.1093/jiplp/jpae119

37. Gaffar, H., & Albarashdi, S. (2025). Copyright protection for AI-generated works: Exploring originality and ownership in a digital landscape. *Asian Journal of International Law, 15*(1), 23-46. https://doi.org/10.1017/S2044251323000735

38. Hugenholtz, P. B., & Quintais, J. P. (2021). Copyright and artificial creation: Does EU copyright law protect AI-assisted output? *IIC - International Review of Intellectual Property and Competition Law, 52*, 1190-1216. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40319-021-01115-0

39. Selvadurai, N., & Matulionyte, R. (2020). Reconsidering creativity: Copyright protection for works generated using artificial intelligence. *Journal of Intellectual Property Law & Practice, 15*(7), 536-543. https://doi.org/10.1093/jiplp/jpaa062

40. Zhuk, A. (2024). Navigating the legal landscape of AI copyright: A comparative analysis of EU, US, and Chinese approaches. *AI and Ethics, 4*, 1299-1306. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-023-00299-0

V. Digital Photography and the Evolution of Visual Practice

References 41-45 | Policy relevance

Supports the recognition of digital, networked, mobile, and software-mediated photography as genuine evolving photographic practices rather than illegitimate departures from a single darkroom-era standard.

41. Gómez Cruz, E., & Meyer, E. T. (2012). Creation and control in the photographic process: iPhones and the emerging fifth moment of photography. *Photographies, 5*(2), 203-221. https://doi.org/10.1080/17540763.2012.702123

42. Lister, M. (2007). A sack in the sand: Photography in the age of information. *Convergence, 13*(3), 251-274. https://doi.org/10.1177/1354856507079176

43. Murray, S. (2008). Digital images, photo-sharing, and our shifting notions of everyday aesthetics. *Journal of Visual Culture, 7*(2), 147-163. https://doi.org/10.1177/1470412908091935

44. Rubinstein, D., & Sluis, K. (2008). A life more photographic: Mapping the networked image. *Photographies, 1*(1), 9-28. https://doi.org/10.1080/17540760701785842

45. van Dijck, J. (2008). Digital photography: Communication, identity, memory. *Visual Communication, 7*(1), 57-76. https://doi.org/10.1177/1470357207084865

VI. Museums, Interpretation, and Digital Cultural Heritage

References 46-50 | Policy relevance

Supports the use of digital platforms, virtual environments, and immersive interpretation to expand access and engagement, while reinforcing the policy requirement that reconstructions not be confused with archival evidence.

46. Bekele, M. K., Pierdicca, R., Frontoni, E., Malinverni, E. S., & Gain, J. (2018). A survey of augmented, virtual, and mixed reality for cultural heritage. *ACM Journal on Computing and Cultural Heritage, 11*(2), Article 7, 1-36. https://doi.org/10.1145/3145534

47. Carrozzino, M., & Bergamasco, M. (2010). Beyond virtual museums: Experiencing immersive virtual reality in real museums. *Journal of Cultural Heritage, 11*(4), 452-458. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.culher.2010.04.001

48. Marty, P. F. (2008). Museum websites and museum visitors: Digital museum resources and their use. *Museum Management and Curatorship, 23*(1), 81-99. https://doi.org/10.1080/09647770701865410

49. Parry, R. (2007). *Recoding the museum: Digital heritage and the technologies of change.* Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203347485

50. Proctor, N. (2010). Digital: Museum as platform, curator as champion, in the age of social media. *Curator: The Museum Journal, 53*(1), 35-43. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2151-6952.2009.00006.x