

**The 2023 Writer's Strike:
Generative Artificial Intelligence as an Existential Threat**

By: Angelo J. Artuso

September 20, 2026

From May 2 to September 27, 2023, the Writer’s Guild of America (“WGA”), representing over 11,500 film and television writers, went on strike against the Alliance of Motion Picture and Television Producers (“AMPTP”) and the three major broadcast companies, ABC, CBS, and NBC (hereafter, the “Companies” or “Company”). Two and one-half months later, SAG-AFTRA, representing over 160,000 actors, performers, and media professionals, launched a similar strike against the Companies. In addition, other film industry guilds and unions including IATSE and the Teamsters recognized the WGA strike and refused to cross the picket lines. The WGA strike was eventually resolved by agreement to a new three-year contract that addressed some of the Guild’s concerns including the Companies’ increasing use of Generative Artificial Intelligence (“GAI”).

This essay explores the question of whether the GAI provisions of the 2023 Minimum Basic Agreement (MBA) between the WGA and the Companies will be a short-lived victory or just the opening battle in a much longer war that will continue to plague WGA’s members and other writers; a war in which victory is by no means assured.

The WGA’s GAI Goal in 2023

As they headed into the 2023 contract negotiations, one of the WGA’s primary goals was to reach an agreement on contract terms that would govern the use of GAI. The WGA was right to be concerned. The danger to the livelihoods of human writers and creators posed by GAI was, and remains, very real. As one 2024 study noted,

Fiction writing has long been considered a quintessentially human endeavor, intertwining imagination, emotion, and storytelling skills. By exploring AI-generated fiction, we challenge traditional notions of authorship and creativity and provoke reflection on the nature of storytelling in the digital age. This research expands the scope of storytelling possibilities, fostering collaboration between human writers and artificial intelligence systems and pushing the boundaries of literary innovation.

Jadhav, 2024.

The study concluded, in part, that “As artificial intelligence technology continues to develop, it is likely that *AI-generated novels will become increasingly complex and indistinguishable from human-generated novels in the future.*” *Id.* (emphasis added).

Another study documented how rapidly GAI has infected our culture and society. ChatGPT was released for public use on November 30, 2022. According to a Pew Research Center study released in August 2026, in the three years and seven months since the release, GAI has been used in thirty-five percent (35%) of all new webpages posted on the Internet. “In the July 2026 snapshot, signs of AI authorship can be found in over one-third of pages published after ChatGPT was released. This is [in line with other studies](#) that have shown that large shares of recently published pages on the internet were likely written or substantially edited by AI.” Bestvater, et al., 2026.

In sum, GAI poses an existential threat to current business models, and by extension a lot of human writers. This is especially so in the film and television industry which has a well-deserved reputation for being ruthlessly devoted to extracting every last nickel out of its projects, partners, and work force.

The Companies’ initial response to WGA’s proposal to fashion terms that addressed their use of GAI was, at first, silence (i.e., cue the crickets). “AMPTP has been . . . stonewalling on free work for screenwriters and on AI for all writers . . .” WGA Update, May 1, 2023. It took the first two months of a grueling strike before the AMPTP was even willing to discuss the issue of GAI in the contract negotiations. “AMPTP says they are willing to talk about AI.” WGA Update, August 4, 2023.

After more than four months on strike, the WGA and the Companies finally signed a Memorandum of Agreement for the 2023 WGA Theatrical and Television Basic Agreement (the

“MOA”). The MOA was signed by WGA and the Companies and ratified by a ninety-nine percent (99%) vote of the WGA Membership.

What the WGA Got in the MOA

The 2023 MOA became effective on September 25, 2023, and expired on May 1, 2026. A Memorandum of Agreement for the 2026 MBA was signed by the parties on May 2, 2026, and is effective through May 1, 2030. So, what did the WGA get from the Companies regarding the use of GAI?

A new Article 72 was added to the 2023 MBA which provides:

- The WGA and the Companies acknowledge that for purposes of the MBA, the term GAI refers to a “subset of artificial intelligence that learns patterns from data and produces content, including written material, based on those patterns, and may employ algorithmic methods.” MOA ¶72A, 2023. GAI does not include traditional AI technologies like those used in computer generated images (CGI) and visual effects (VFX). *Id.*
- The Companies acknowledge that GAI is not a person and therefore, is neither a writer nor a professional writer as defined in the MBA. Moreover, they agree that written material produced by GAI “shall not be considered literary material under this or any prior MBA.” MOA ¶72B, 2023.
- If a Company gives GAI produced material to a writer and instructs them to use it as the basis for writing a script, treatment, or other work, then the Company shall:
 - Tell the writer that the written material was produced by GAI;
 - The GAI produced material shall not be considered “assigned material” for purposes of determining the writer’s compensation;

- The GAI produced material shall not be considered source material for purposes of determining the writer’s credit;
- The GAI produced material shall not be the basis for disqualifying a writer from “eligibility for separated rights”;
- These provisions apply when a writer, with the Company’s consent, uses GAI as part of preparing their work; and
- The Company agrees that it will not “publish or exploit GAI written material for the purposes of evading” the requirements listed above.

MOA, ¶72C, 2023.

In addition:

- A writer must obtain the Company’s consent before using GAI. MOA, ¶72D, 2023.
- The Company may not require, as a condition of employment, that a writer use a GAI program “which generates written material that would otherwise be ‘literary material’ . . . if written by a writer . . . (e.g., a Company may not require a writer to use ChatGPT to do their work).” MOA, ¶72E, 2023.
- Nothing in Article 72 restricts any writer who has retained “reserved rights” from objecting to the use of their work “to train, inform, or in any other way develop GAI software or systems” MOA, ¶72F, 2023.

The 2026 MOA modified Article 72 ¶G. by adding a new paragraph 2 which provides:

2. The Company shall give written notice to the Guild if the Company grants a license to a non-affiliated third party, which provides for compensation to be paid to the Company, for the use of literary material covered by this Agreement to train a public-facing commercially available GAI system for the purpose of creating new outputs (a 'GAI License'). At the request of the Guild, the Company shall meet to discuss such GAI License, including remuneration, if any, subject to appropriate confidentiality agreements.

How GAI has Impacted the Creative Arts

GAI has taken the economy by storm and has an increasing impact on human work, education, endeavors, and relationships every day. The creative arts have not been immune to this sea change in technology. The Internet is filled with GAI content in which the only human input was to compose the prompt and sometimes, not even that. More than fifty percent (50%) of all internet traffic is now generated by a ‘bot’. Gaudiaut, 2026. It may only be a matter of time, therefore, before virtually all internet traffic is no longer generated by a human being. See, e.g., The Dead Internet Theory. Of course, this begs the question of whether the internet itself may be headed for extinction. How long will people continue to use it, once they know that much of what is on there is fabricated, biased, or otherwise untrustworthy? Only time will tell.

Of course, the creative arts are in a slightly different position from reporters, databases, academic journals, and other resources that typically deal in nonfiction, or at least claim to. Creative art, by its nature, is subjective. As the saying goes, “Beauty is in the eye of the beholder.” The question is whether GAI and similar systems can advance to the point where it is impossible to detect when it has been used to create a picture, video, novel, short story, or screenplay. There is already GAI created work on the internet and elsewhere, including work that most humans either cannot detect or simply do not care if it is real. A 2026 article in U.S. News and World Report, for example noted that

“At The Verge, Jess Weatherbed took stock of the online content related to what is formally known as The Coachella Valley Music & Arts Festival in California. ‘A quick scroll through my social media feeds has already shown me many uncannily attractive figures in glitzy outfits, posing for perfectly staged photographs with celebrities,’ Weatherbed wrote. ‘Only some of these content creators aren’t really there. They don’t even exist at all outside of our screens. They’re generated using AI tools.’”

Knox, 2026.

When the day arrives that GAI generated stories, poems, films, and other creative works are indistinguishable from work created by a human, it could well be “Game Over” for most human writers.

Then again, it might not. Humans are incredibly resourceful, creative, and adaptive. Take sports for example. An Olympic power lifter has trained their body to lift tremendous amounts of weight. The current world record for the deadlift is 1,126.56 pounds. Yet, a power lifter is not built for gymnastics. Gymnasts have trained **the same muscles** to perform completely different functions. But a gymnast is unlikely to be competitive in sprinting or swimming events. Each of these different athletes use the same muscles, muscles which they have individually trained and adapted for a specific purpose.

The same holds true with respect to knowledge, creativity, and human mental activity. A theoretical physicist would, very likely, be lost when it comes to fixing an air conditioner. Just as an air conditioning tech is unlikely to understand how to throw a clay pot. The current state of GAI is such that all it can really do is search through massive databases and combine previously created works and hybridize them to “create” something that is considered new.

Then again, isn't that a big part of what a lot of creative writers do now? Don't many “new” works simply find ways to tell a story that includes elements that have not been used in combination before? Take the fantasy genre, for example. J.R. Tolkien is generally recognized as the “father” of modern fantasy. In fact, however, he was a professor of Anglo-Saxon with an intimate knowledge of old languages (no longer spoken) and their myths, legends, and history. His genius was in combining these many diverse parts into a truly engaging narrative in modern English. To be honest, however, we must ask whether making such combinations is really a “new” work or simply a combining and refashioning of preexisting works? If GAI gets better at making

“new” combinations from pre-existing works, will it really be all that different than most human writers?

Credo 23 is an Artisanal Designation

As part of the pushback against GAI, Justine Bateman, a writer, director, and producer, created the Credo23 Council. Credo23 explains its mission as follows:

Films and series are Art Forms.
 We are committed to filmmakers who reflect that in their work.
 With the increasing proliferation of generative AI video, we differentiate ourselves by making very human, very raw, very real films/series, that respect the process of filmmaking.
 We are interested in The New.
 We stand on shoulders of the great filmmakers of the past and we move the ball down the field in this time.
 Our time.
 Leaving this art form better than we found it.

Credo23, 2026.

Credo23 provides filmmakers with a way to differentiate their work from GAI-generated projects. It does this, in part by offering a stamp of approval which can be granted to films that meet the following requirements:

Filmmakers desiring the CREDO 23 stamp on a project must have adhered to the following:

1. **No AI (Artificial Intelligence) has been used on this film, in any way.** Including, but not limited to “Generative AI” (under this or any other name for the current or expanded process). The script, the directing, the acting, etc. are 100% human.
2. **Minimal CGI and VFX have been used on this film.** It has been applied only to fix minor flaws or to create minor effects. (This portion is waived for CREDO 23 VFX projects.)
3. **This is a union film.** The production company is a signatory to at least one of the following unions: DGA, WGA, SAG, IATSE, and Teamsters for the purposes of employing the cast/crew and filming this project. (This portion is waived for experimental and documentary feature films.) Projects originating in non-US countries will be considered with their corresponding foreign unions.

Credo23, 2026.

While the effort to preserve human work in the creation and making of film is admirable, it is insufficient to single-handedly stem the rising tide of GAI-generated projects for a couple of reasons. First, it depends on people caring enough about the work to insist on human creation. Second, it depends upon those in power to resist the siren call of AI and support Credo23's initiative. Neither of these requirements are going to be easy to meet.

Do most people care about human creation? With respect to whether people will care enough about the work to insist on human creation, the battle against human nature will be difficult to win. In general, most folks have shown time and again that they are frequently willing to accept mediocre products over quality ones. As Admiral Gorshkov, former Commander-in-Chief of the Soviet Navy famously said, "Better is the enemy of good enough." There are a lot of people who, because of price or convenience or both, are willing to accept "good enough." How many people buy the product "Made in China" or Vietnam, India, or Bangladesh, instead of a better built but more expensive product "Made in America" because the difference in price is more important to them than the country of origin?

The appeal of mediocrity is seen in a wide variety of products. Olive oil is a good example. Oxygen, heat, and age degrade the quality and quantity of the polyphenols in olive oil. Most olive oils in the grocery store spend weeks in warm warehouses, delivery trucks, and on shop shelves long before they reach the consumer. A significant amount of olive oil sold in grocery stores is, therefore, "stale" or oxidized. It is well documented that such oil lacks the same quality or quantity of polyphenols. Markhali, et al., 2024. Polyphenols are powerful antioxidants that deliver the health benefits for which olive oil is known and presumably are the reason a lot of people use olive oil.

Despite the decline in the health benefits of olive oil that occurs under mass-manufacturing, shipping and storage conditions, many people either continue to buy store brands because of the difference in price or fail to educate themselves about the differences in health benefits between true, fresh extra virgin olive oil from a single source and what they buy at the store. Various purity stamps and markers, not unlike the Credo23 stamp, have been introduced to tell discriminating consumers that the oil so endorsed is what it says it is. *See, e.g.*, Denominazione d'Origine Protetta, which ensures that the olive oil with this mark is produced, processed, and packaged in a specific region of Italy, and meets strict quality standards.

The same is true with other products. Genuine parmesan cheese is the only cheese permitted to be marked in the EU as “Parmigiano Reggiano,” a product designation of origin label (PDO). The label guarantees that the cheese has been made according to strict regulations in specific regions of Italy. Likewise, sparkling wine produced in the Champagne region of France is the only wine in the EU that may be marked as “Champagne.” All other, similar sparkling wines must avoid the use of the word “Champagne.” As a practical matter, however, producers outside the EU may disregard the EU labeling law and use “méthode champenoise” or even Champagne on labels for products not exported to the EU.

Like these examples, the Credo23 stamp is just a certification that the film meets the requirements of being made entirely by humans, with minimal CGI and VFX use, and was union made. In other words, it is comparable to the designation of origin stamps cited above. It is designating an artisanal product produced the “old-fashioned” way. Unless and until legislation is passed requiring the Credo23 stamp on all films, the Credo23 initiative is completely voluntary. The chances of actual legislation being passed along these lines, however, is slim and none.

Indeed, the U.S. Constitution itself stands in the way. Article I, Section 10 of the Constitution provides that “No state shall . . . pass any . . . Law impairing the Obligation of

Contracts. . . .” Since agreements between the WGA and the Companies has been a matter of contract for over a century, a law preventing the use of GAI could very likely be held to be unconstitutional and, therefore, unenforceable.

The Credo23 stamp is therefore, simply an indication to folks who care about human creativity and who, through their own moral sense, do not wish to submit to the control of a machine. Such people will care whether a film was made by real people. Unfortunately, if human nature is any indication, people who care about how their film is made will likely be in the minority. The traditional film industry, particularly the movie theaters, may soon find themselves relegated to the role of the opera or radio shows in today’s world. They still exist. They still produce great artists many of whom are at the peak of their craft, but their audiences are greatly diminished, and their exhibit spaces and broadcast options are limited. They survive but they do not command the audience and attention they once did.

Do the powers that be care? The second reason Credo23 faces an uphill battle has to do with the siren song of decreased costs, less production time and work, and fewer employee ‘headaches’ that are the alleged promises of GAI. The ability of those in power in the film industry to resist the perceived benefits of GAI and do the right thing is suspect at best. Exhibit 1: the fact that it took more than two months on strike before the Companies were willing to even talk about GAI. Obviously, the Companies perceived GAI as something of value that they wished to pursue without the pesky writers reining in their current plans.

The Competition Between Human Made Films and GAI-Generated Films is Already Here

It is important to understand that the WGA agreement with the Companies regarding the use of GAI binds only the WGA, its members, and the Companies that signed the 2023 MOA and

the 2026 MOA. The Agreement is not enforceable against any nonparty. Some users of GAI have already thrown down the gauntlet as shown by a current competition between two films.

The Odyssey, a recent film by Christopher Nolan, has drawn a tremendous amount of public attention. Work on the screenplay began in March 2024. It debuted more than two years later, on July 6, 2026. The estimated cost to produce and market the film is \$375 million. Estimated worldwide revenues are currently \$1,688,914,890. Box Office Mojo, 2026.

Odysseus: The Fall is a film completely by GAI. It debuted on September 16, 2026. According to executive producer Tom Rogers, the film was made over the course of three months (as compared to *The Odyssey*'s two years), working part time (as compared to hundreds of human employees), and its cost was described as “mostly a small expense related to cloud token credits” (as compared to \$375 million). Katz, 2026. The film has not been out long enough to gauge its public reception. So far, it has received only one review (a negative review) on Rotten Tomatoes in the two days since its debut.

Odysseus: The Fall is a shot across the bow of the traditional film industry and the competition between the two films presents a chance to evaluate a near head-to-head comparison with respect to audience reception. It will be very interesting, therefore, to see how *Odysseus: The Fall* does financially. As GAI storytelling and ability to handle nuance and human emotion improve, it will be a serious challenge to an industry, that in many ways, is still mired in a business model that is over one hundred years old.

There are other factors that must be evaluated when considering the looming competition between GAI and traditional filmmaking. Consider, for example, how different things might look now if the producers of *Odysseus: The Fall* had stolen the march on Nolan's film by debuting a month earlier instead of two months after? If it was considered a passable film, offered for half the price, say \$5 (the current national average movie ticket costs \$10.50), would it have satisfied

most of the public's desire to see a film about Odysseus, resulting in lower revenue for Nolan's film?

Admittedly, \$1.6 billion, and counting, is nothing to sneeze at, but it is almost a cliché that for every blockbuster like *The Odyssey*, there are eight or nine other films, costing hundreds of millions of dollars and years to produce, that lose money. The siren song of GAI may soon be tugging very hard at studio executives, independent production companies, and their respective shareholders. Moreover, any serious improvements in GAI over the next four years, are likely to have a significant impact on the industry landscape. From the Companies' perspective, things may be very different on May 1, 2030, than they were on September 25, 2023, when the companies agreed to terms that currently govern the use of GAI. By 2030, most of the Companies may decide, not unlike Odysseus, to venture off into the digital sea, leaving the WGA and its members stranded on a desert island.

How the GAI Protocols Have Reshaped the Film and Television Industry

The GAI protocols have returned some measure of control to the writers. The 2023 MOA makes it clear that their work cannot be used to train their competitors, i.e., GAI, without their consent. Owners of copyrighted materials may, however, voluntarily turn over content to be loaded into, analyzed, and used by GAI platforms. This may be the primary reason behind the 2026 MOA addition to Article 72 ¶G.2, which provides that the Companies will notify the WGA if they enter into a license agreement with a GAI platform company allowing that company to use their material to create a "new" work. Obviously, works on which a copyright is no longer in force may be used without limitation. So, Alexandre Dumas, Jules Verne, Mark Twain and their descendants are out of luck.

As the capability of GAI continues to grow and improve, we should expect each WGA contract negotiation in the future to involve tweaks, modifications, and amendments to Article 72; provided that, the Companies do not eliminate it altogether. While the GAI protocols are binding only on the WGA, its members, and the Companies, they may still serve as an example and starting point for contract terms that could be negotiated by writers who are playing in the much larger field of work where the borders and rules for GAI have not yet been defined. Even if such terms are not included in a particular writer's contract, the fight may not be over. Despite the parade of "we're all going to lose our jobs" scenarios forecast by many observers of the GAI landscape, there is still an old writer's friend who will remain faithful and provide some level of protection.

Copyright to the Rescue?

The rise of GAI has immensely complicated the interpretation and application of copyright law. Interestingly, some argue that even the first step of the GAI process, text and data mining ("TDM") of existing works, may itself run afoul of copyright law. In fact, studios have begun to warn GAI platforms that they will sue if their movies are used for GAI training or output. Cho, 2025. In 2025, Universal Pictures began adding the following statement to the end credits of its films, "This motion picture is protected under the laws of the United States and other countries. Unauthorized duplication, distribution or exhibition may result in civil liability and criminal prosecution." Cho, 2025. While this language is not all that new, Universal Pictures emphasized that it is meant to apply to "the theft of its films for data mining and GAI training purposes." *Id.* Some studios have recently filed lawsuits against various AI platforms.

In *Disney Enterprises, Inc., et al. v. Midjourney, Inc.*, C.D. Cal., Case No. 25-5275, filed June 11, 2025, Disney and Universal Pictures claim that the AI platform Midjourney ". . . seeks to reap their creative investment by selling an AI image-generating service 'that functions as a virtual

vending machine, generating endless unauthorized copies of Disney’s and Universal’s copyrighted works.” Rosati, 2025¹

How could TDM constitute copyright infringement? The answer lies in the copyright law. Title 17 U.S. Code § 106 provides that the owner of a copyrighted work has “[T]he exclusive rights to do and to authorize any of the following: (1) to *reproduce* the copyrighted work in copies . . .” (Emphasis added).

In her article, Professor Eleonora Rosati notes, “[T]he U.S. copyright office also recently acknowledged ‘[t]he steps required to produce a training dataset containing copyrighted works clearly implicate the right of reproduction’ and ‘[t]he training process also implicates the right of reproduction.’” Rosati, 2025, citing United States Copyright Office, *Copyright and Artificial Intelligence, Part 3, Generative AI Training Report, (Pre-Publication Version) (May 2025)*, available at <https://www.Copyright-and-Artificial-Intelligence-Part-3-Generative-AI-Training-Report-Pre-Publication-Version.pdf> pp. 26 – 27.

Thus, the provision of Article 72 ¶F, of the 2023 MOA, that “Nothing in Article 72 restricts any writer who has retained “reserved rights” from objecting to the use of their work “to train, inform, or in any other way develop GAI software or systems . . .” presciently predicted the Copyright Office’s interpretation of U.S. copyright law.

If a writer wants to keep their work from being data-mined by a GAI platform, then they should reserve this right in the copyright terms of their contract with the production company or publisher.

¹ An interesting aside from Professor Rosati noted that Adrien Brody won the 2025 Oscar Award for Best Actor for his AI-altered performance in *The Brutalist*. The AMPAS, therefore decided that “. . . while consideration of human involvement remains key – movies containing parts generated with the aid of AI are also eligible for Oscar nominations and awards.” Rosati, 2025.

Japan, Singapore, and the EU have already enacted laws that carve out specific exceptions to allow, under certain conditions, TDM activities for works protected by copyright. Rosati, 2025. Other activities by GAI platforms also implicate a creator's other copyright protections. For example the online publication of a dataset in which the creator's work is stored implicates the creators right to make the work available to the public. Similarly, GAI outputs may infringe on a creator's rights to create derivative works, make a work available to the public, and distribute a work. *Id.* The maze that GAI platforms will have to negotiate to avoid liability for copyright infringement appears to be complex.

In sum, copyright owners are not entirely powerless against GAI appropriation of their works, but the specific facts of each situation are important and the application of the law to any particular set of facts can become very complex. One downside to the copyright defense to GAI is that the copyright law is not self-executing. It requires the copyright owner to take legal action and possibly file a lawsuit. Unfortunately, intellectual property lawsuits are among the most expensive types of claims to take to trial, and the outcome of any trial is never guaranteed.

Conclusion

If GAI does nothing else, it has ability to level the playing field. It has had, and will continue to have, a profound impact on the film industry. Future negotiations between the WGA and the Companies will include the argument that the Companies and the writers need to join the 21st Century or risk being left behind by China, India, Europe, and other emerging centers of film production. The "soft power" of films on the global stage has been clear for more than ninety years. The U.S. has, until now, been the undisputed champion when it comes to exercising such power. The advent of GAI, however, makes holding on to that position increasingly difficult, especially when competing with countries that may not have a strong and long-established commitment to protecting intellectual property.

While the current MOA terms on the use of GAI are helpful, they probably will not be able to completely protect or insulate writers from further disruptive changes that lie in the future. The future of GAI as a true competitor to writers, film producers, television broadcasters, and publishers will be decided by factors completely outside their control. Rather, the tech companies, currently locked in fierce competition with one another, are the ones who have control not just over the future fate of writers, but over the fate of tens of millions if not billions of other people.

In the end, the issue is not whether GAI can be strangled in the crib. It is whether there is a way for creatives to make it their servant rather than their master.

REFERENCES

- Bestvater, Samuel, Smith, Aaron, Terbush, Carson, Baronavski and Chadva, Janakee, (2026, August). How Much of the Internet is Written with AI? *Pew Research Center*
<https://www.pewresearch.org/data-labs/2026/08/20/how-much-of-the-internet-is-written-with-ai/>
- Box Office Mojo, (2026, September). The Odyssey.
<https://www.boxofficemojo.com/title/tt33764258/>
- Cho, Winston, (2025, August). Universal Pictures to Big Tech: We'll Sue if you Steal our Movies for AI. *The Hollywood Reporter*.
<https://www.hollywoodreporter.com/business/business-news/universal-pictures-big-tech-well-sue-if-you-steal-movies-ai-1236337712/>
- Credo23 (2026). <https://Credo23.com>
- Gaudiaut, Tristan (2026, May). Bad Bots are Taking Over the Web. *Statista*.
<https://www.statista.com/chart/35950/share-of-global-web-traffic-generated-by-humans-and-bots-since-2018/>
- Jadhav, Harshada, (2024, April). A Research Study on How AI Creates Fiction Stories, *International Journal for Research and Applied Science and Engineering Technology*, vol. 12, issue IV, April 2024.
<https://www.ijraset.com/research-paper/how-ai-creates-fiction-stories>
- Katz, Leslie. (2026, July). Home Epic 'The Odyssey' Gets a Full-Length AI-Generated Film, *Forbes*.
<https://www.forbes.com/sites/lesliekatz/2026/07/14/homer-epic-the-odyssey-gets-a-full-length-ai-generated-film/>

Knox, Oliver (2026, April). The Fake Influencer Plague is Here: AI Comes for Your Newsfeed. *U.S. News and World Report*.

<https://www.usnews.com/news/u-s-news-decision-points/articles/2026-04-20/the-fake-influencer-plague-is-here-ai-comes-for-your-newsfeed>

Markhali, Fereshteh and Teixeira, Jose (2024). Stability of Target Polyphenols of Leaf-added Virgin Olive Oil Under Different Storage Conditions Over Time. *2 Sustainable Food Technology*, vol. 2, issue 3.

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/org/science/article/pii/S2753809524000486>

Memorandum of Agreement for the 2023 WGA Theatrical and Television Basic Agreement (2023).

https://www.wgacontract2023.org/uploadedfiles/contracts/2023_mba_moa.pdf

Rosati, Eleonora (2025). The Future of the Movie Industry in the Wake of Generative AI: A Perspective Under EU and UK Copyright Law. *Computer Law & Security Review: The International Journal of Technology Law and Practice*.

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2212473X25000793>

Memorandum of Agreement for the 2026 WGA Theatrical and Television Basic Agreement (2026).

https://www.wgaeast.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2026/06/2026_mba_moa.pdf

WGA Review of 2023 Contract Campaign, Updates (2023).

https://www.wgacontract2023.org/?fbclid=IwY2xjawTwODlwZG9mAWV4dG4DYWVtAjEwAGlYaWQRMXFrDmszWmZTU21CRkZUV3FzcnRjBmFwcF9pZBAyMjIwMzIxNzg4MjAwODkyAAEe69psrCdwKDrAYScuoReBFhnhoo52XbYiP77NjgM30bQVfzMYqnctXMqUXQ_aem_o7KRNHZLdcigWlHoSvh74A