
**American Journal of Public Law and Political Education, 2026, 15-27**
https://publishingjournals.org/ajplpe
Volume: 3 | Number: 1 (2026) March

# Evaluation of the Legal and Institutional Frameworks for Artificial Intelligence and Artistic Equity in the Music Industry

**Mary Omeyi Ekoja**
Faculty of Law, Bingham University, FCT Abuja, Nigeria

***Correspondence :** Mary Omeyi Ekoja
meyiekoja24@gmail.com

Received: 15-04-2026
Accepted: 10-05-2026
Published: 08-06-2026



## Abstract

The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into the music industry has generated unprecedented legal, economic, and ethical challenges that existing intellectual property frameworks appear ill-equipped to resolve. This article evaluates the adequacy of current legal and institutional frameworks in addressing the multifaceted implications of AI for artistic equity in the music industry, with particular emphasis on copyright ownership, voice-cloning technologies, AI training datasets, authorship principles, and the economic vulnerability of independent artists. Drawing on doctrinal legal analysis and a comparative review of scholarly and policy literature, the study identifies critical regulatory gaps arising from the application of traditional copyright law to AI-generated creative works and examines the institutional limitations of regulatory agencies, collecting societies, and digital platforms in monitoring and enforcing artists' rights within an automated creative environment. The findings reveal that prevailing copyright systems — anchored in the principle of human authorship — are fundamentally unsuited to determining ownership of AI-generated music, assigning liability for unauthorized use of copyrighted training data, or protecting artists' personality and identity rights against AI replication. The article further demonstrates that the commercialization of AI-driven music production has intensified economic inequality within the industry, disproportionately disadvantaging independent musicians and culturally diverse creators. In response, the article proposes a comprehensive reform agenda encompassing statutory clarification of AI authorship and copyright standards, mandatory licensing and disclosure obligations for AI training datasets, strengthened personality rights protections against voice-cloning, enhanced institutional capacity and expertise within copyright regulatory bodies, and coordinated international governance through organizations such as the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) and UNESCO. The article concludes that effectively protecting

artistic equity in the AI era requires not merely incremental legal adjustment but a fundamental reconceptualization of authorship, ownership, and creative value that centers human artistic dignity alongside technological innovation.

**Keywords**

Artificial Intelligence, Music Industry, Copyright Law, Artistic Equity, Authorship, Voice-Cloning, Intellectual Property, Generative AI, Music Regulation, Digital Creativity.

## Introduction

The emergence of Artificial Intelligence (AI) has altered the structure of several global industries, and the music industry is among the sectors experiencing one of the most dramatic transformations. Over the last decade, AI technologies have evolved from simple recommendation algorithms into sophisticated generative systems capable of composing melodies, producing instrumentals, cloning voices, mastering tracks, and even predicting commercial music trends. What once appeared to be a futuristic experiment has now become a commercial reality. Music streaming platforms, record labels, software developers, and independent creators increasingly rely on AI-driven tools to enhance production efficiency and audience engagement [1]. Still, beneath this wave of innovation lies a growing legal and ethical tension concerning artistic ownership, creative authenticity, and economic fairness within the industry.

Traditionally, music creation has been regarded as a deeply human process shaped by emotion, culture, personal experience, and intellectual effort. Copyright systems across the world were therefore designed on the assumption that creative works originate from identifiable human authors. However, the rise of generative AI has complicated this assumption. Modern AI systems can now generate songs that imitate the vocal patterns, lyrical style, and compositional structure of existing artists with remarkable accuracy. In some instances, AI-generated songs have become commercially successful despite being created without the direct participation or authorization of the artists whose works or identities inspired them [2], [3],[4]. This development raises difficult questions regarding authorship, copyright ownership, licensing, moral rights, and compensation. It is no longer entirely clear where the boundary between technological innovation and artistic exploitation should be drawn.

The controversy surrounding AI in music became more visible with the circulation of AI-generated songs imitating globally recognized musicians. Several artists and music corporations have accused AI developers of unlawfully using copyrighted musical works to train machine-learning systems without consent or remuneration. Critics argue that such practices amount to digital appropriation, particularly when artists' voices and styles are reproduced for commercial gain. Supporters of AI innovation, on the other hand, maintain that AI merely functions as a creative tool, similar to earlier technological advancements in music production [5]. This divide reflects a broader struggle between technological progress and the protection of intellectual property rights within the digital economy.

Beyond copyright concerns, the issue of artistic equity has emerged as a major aspect of

contemporary debates on AI regulation in the music industry. Artistic equity refers to fairness in recognition, compensation, access, and protection for creators whose intellectual and cultural labor sustains the industry. The increasing integration of AI threatens this balance in several ways. Large technology corporations with access to extensive datasets and advanced computing infrastructure may dominate music production and distribution channels, leaving independent artists at a disadvantage [6] . Emerging musicians may also struggle to compete in digital spaces increasingly saturated with algorithmically generated content. In some cases, AI-generated music can dilute cultural originality and weaken the economic value attached to human creativity.

Legal and institutional frameworks governing intellectual property rights have struggled to keep pace with these rapid technological changes. Existing copyright laws in many jurisdictions were not designed to address the complexities of machine-generated creativity or AI-assisted authorship. Questions concerning whether AI-generated music qualifies for copyright protection, who owns such rights, and how liability should be assigned in cases of infringement remain subjects of ongoing legal uncertainty [7]. Similarly, institutional bodies responsible for regulating music rights and digital platforms often lack adequate regulatory mechanisms to monitor AI-related violations effectively. This regulatory gap creates an environment where exploitation can occur with limited accountability.

Against this background, this article evaluates the effectiveness of existing legal and institutional frameworks in addressing the challenges posed by Artificial Intelligence within the music industry. The article further examines the implications of AI technologies on artistic equity, intellectual property protection, and the future of human creativity in music production. By analyzing the emerging legal debates and institutional responses surrounding AI-generated music, the study seeks to highlight the urgent need for balanced regulatory systems capable of encouraging innovation while safeguarding the rights and economic interests of artists [8].

## Methods

### 2. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROBLEM

The rapid integration of Artificial Intelligence into the music industry has exposed serious weaknesses within existing legal and institutional systems governing creativity, intellectual property, and artistic protection. Although AI technologies have introduced efficiency and innovation into music production, they have simultaneously created a regulatory crisis that many legal frameworks appear unprepared to address. The core problem lies in the growing disconnect between technological advancement and the ability of laws and institutions to protect the rights, identity, and economic interests of human artists within an increasingly automated creative environment.

One of the most pressing concerns is the unauthorized use of copyrighted musical works in training AI systems. Generative AI models rely heavily on large datasets consisting of existing songs, lyrics, vocal recordings, melodies, and instrumental arrangements collected from digital platforms and online databases. In many situations, these materials are used without the knowledge, permission, or compensation of the original creators. AI developers often argue that

such use falls within permissible technological research or fair use exceptions, while artists and copyright holders contend that it constitutes infringement and exploitation. This disagreement reveals a significant legal grey area in contemporary copyright law, particularly regarding whether AI training processes amount to unlawful reproduction of protected works.

The problem becomes even more complicated when AI systems imitate the voices, styles, or identities of musicians. Voice-cloning technologies can now reproduce the vocal patterns of artists with striking accuracy, making it difficult for listeners to distinguish between authentic recordings and AI-generated imitations. This development threatens not only the economic rights of artists but also their moral rights and professional identity. A musician's voice is often regarded as a unique element of personal expression and commercial value. Therefore, the unauthorized replication of such identity features raises concerns relating to personality rights, privacy, reputational harm, and unfair commercial exploitation.

Another major issue involves ownership and authorship of AI-generated music. Traditional copyright law is built upon the principle of human creativity, meaning that copyright protection generally applies to works created through human intellectual effort. However, AI-generated compositions challenge this principle because the extent of human involvement in the creative process may be minimal or uncertain. Questions therefore arise concerning who should be recognized as the legal author of AI-generated music. Should ownership belong to the programmer who designed the AI system, the user who entered prompts into the software, the company operating the platform, or should such works remain outside copyright protection entirely? The absence of clear legal answers creates uncertainty for artists, investors, producers, and regulatory institutions alike.

Economic inequality within the music industry has also intensified due to AI expansion. Large technology companies possess significant financial resources, advanced computing infrastructure, and access to massive amounts of digital data required for AI development. Independent musicians and smaller creative communities often lack similar resources and may therefore become increasingly marginalized within a market dominated by automated content production. AI-generated music can be produced rapidly and at relatively low cost, enabling corporations to prioritize quantity and algorithmic efficiency over human artistry. Consequently, many musicians fear a future in which creative labor becomes undervalued and financially unstable.

Institutional challenges further deepen the problem. Regulatory agencies, copyright boards, collecting societies, and judicial systems in many countries have struggled to respond effectively to AI-related disputes. In some jurisdictions, there are no specific laws governing AI-generated content or voice replication technologies. Even where legal protections exist, enforcement mechanisms are often weak due to the borderless nature of digital distribution. AI-generated

songs can circulate globally within minutes across streaming platforms and social media networks, making it difficult for national institutions to monitor violations or enforce accountability consistently.

Additionally, ethical concerns surrounding authenticity and cultural integrity continue to grow. Music has historically served as a reflection of human emotion, social identity, and cultural heritage. Excessive dependence on AI-generated creativity risks reducing music to a purely commercial and algorithmic product detached from lived human experience. Some critics argue that the unchecked commercialization of AI-generated music could gradually erode originality, diminish emotional depth in artistic expression, and weaken appreciation for authentic human creativity.

In essence, the central problem is not merely the existence of Artificial Intelligence in music production, but the inability of current legal and institutional frameworks to regulate its impact fairly and effectively. The imbalance between technological capability and regulatory preparedness has created uncertainty, exploitation, and inequality within the music industry. Unless modern legal systems evolve to address these emerging realities, the conflict between AI innovation and artistic equity is likely to intensify in the coming years.

## Results and Discussions

## 3. CAUSES AND EFFECTS OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE ON ARTISTIC EQUITY IN THE MUSIC INDUSTRY

The growing tension between Artificial Intelligence and artistic equity in the music industry did not emerge suddenly. It is the result of several interconnected technological, economic, legal, and institutional factors that have developed alongside the rapid expansion of the digital economy [9]. While AI itself is not inherently harmful, the conditions surrounding its development and application have contributed significantly to the challenges presently confronting musicians, copyright holders, and regulatory authorities across the world.

### *3.1 Causes*

One major cause of the problem is the rapid advancement of machine-learning technology and generative AI systems. In recent years, AI developers have created highly sophisticated software capable of analyzing massive volumes of musical data and reproducing patterns associated with human creativity [10]. These systems are trained using extensive digital datasets containing songs, lyrics, voice recordings, rhythms, and compositional structures obtained from online platforms and streaming services. Because technological innovation often develops faster than legal regulation, governments and institutions have struggled to establish effective laws capable of controlling how these datasets are collected and utilized. As a result, AI systems continue to evolve within a largely uncertain regulatory environment.

Another important cause is the commercialization of digital content and the growing influence of technology corporations within the entertainment industry. Music has increasingly become data-driven, with streaming platforms relying heavily on algorithms to determine visibility, recommendations, and consumer engagement [11]. AI technologies provide companies with opportunities to reduce production costs, automate creative processes, and maximize profits through large-scale content generation. Consequently, commercial interests frequently outweigh ethical concerns relating to artistic consent, originality, and equitable compensation. In many instances, artists possess limited bargaining power compared to multinational technology firms that control digital infrastructure and audience access.

Weaknesses in existing copyright laws also contribute significantly to the problem. Most intellectual property systems were established during periods when creativity was understood exclusively as a human activity [12]. These laws generally recognize authorship, originality, and ownership based on direct human intellectual contribution. However, AI-generated music complicates these concepts because machine systems can now independently generate creative outputs that resemble human compositions. The absence of specific statutory provisions regulating AI-assisted works creates uncertainty concerning liability, ownership rights, licensing obligations, and infringement standards. This legal ambiguity allows many AI-related practices to operate without clear accountability.

Institutional inefficiency represents another major contributing factor. Regulatory agencies, courts, copyright commissions, and collecting societies often lack the technical expertise and enforcement capacity necessary to address emerging AI-related disputes effectively. In developing countries especially, digital governance systems may already face structural limitations such as inadequate funding, weak policy coordination, and outdated technological infrastructure [13]. Even in advanced jurisdictions, institutional responses to AI innovation have frequently been reactive rather than proactive. This delay creates opportunities for exploitation before adequate legal safeguards can be introduced.

### *3.2 Effects*

The effects of these developments on the music industry are extensive and increasingly visible. One significant effect is the economic displacement of musicians and creative professionals. AI-generated music can be produced more quickly and cheaply than traditional human-created compositions, making it attractive to commercial producers seeking cost efficiency [14], [15], [16]. As automated systems become more sophisticated, there is growing concern that human musicians, songwriters, producers, and session performers may lose employment opportunities or experience declining income streams. Independent artists are particularly vulnerable because they often lack the financial resources required to compete within technologically driven markets.

Another major effect is the erosion of artistic originality and authenticity. Music has historically served as a medium for emotional expression, storytelling, and cultural identity. Human creativity reflects lived experiences, social realities, and personal imagination in ways that machines cannot fully replicate. However, AI-generated music often relies on imitation and predictive algorithms derived from pre-existing artistic works. This raises concerns that excessive dependence on AI could gradually encourage repetitive, formulaic, and commercially optimized music at the expense of originality and emotional depth [17]. Over time, audiences may find it increasingly difficult to distinguish between authentic artistic expression and algorithmically manufactured content.

The rise of AI-generated music has also intensified concerns regarding exploitation and unfair appropriation of artistic identity. Voice-cloning technologies allow AI systems to reproduce the voices and stylistic characteristics of artists without authorization. Such practices can damage reputations, mislead audiences, and deprive musicians of financial benefits associated with their personal brand and creative identity [18]. In some cases, AI-generated songs have falsely appeared to feature well-known musicians, creating confusion regarding authenticity and ownership. These developments demonstrate how technological misuse can undermine both artistic integrity and public trust within the music industry.

Cultural implications are equally significant. Music often functions as a repository of cultural memory, heritage, and social values. The unchecked dominance of AI-generated content may weaken local musical traditions and reduce opportunities for culturally diverse artistic expression. Global AI systems trained primarily on commercially successful Western music may unintentionally marginalize indigenous sounds, minority languages, and regionally distinct musical identities. This could contribute to cultural homogenization within the global entertainment industry [19].

Furthermore, the legal uncertainty surrounding AI-generated works has increased litigation and regulatory disputes across multiple jurisdictions. Courts, policymakers, and copyright institutions are now confronted with unprecedented questions regarding the limits of fair use, ownership of machine-generated works, and the scope of personality rights in the digital age [20]. The absence of consistent international standards complicates enforcement efforts and creates uncertainty for creators, investors, and digital platforms operating across borders.

Ultimately, the causes and effects of AI within the music industry reveal a broader conflict between technological progress and the preservation of artistic equity. While AI offers valuable opportunities for innovation and creative experimentation, its unregulated expansion threatens to disrupt traditional understandings of authorship, ownership, and human creativity [21]. Without effective legal reform and institutional adaptation, the long-term consequences may

include increased inequality, weakened artistic protection, and a gradual transformation of music from a human-centered cultural practice into a predominantly algorithmic commercial product.

## 4. POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Addressing the legal and institutional challenges posed by Artificial Intelligence in the music industry requires a comprehensive and multidimensional approach involving governments, international organizations, technology companies, musicians, copyright institutions, and digital platforms. Since AI technology is advancing rapidly across national borders, isolated regulatory efforts may prove insufficient [22]. Effective solutions must therefore combine legal reform, institutional strengthening, ethical governance, technological accountability, and international cooperation in order to protect artistic equity while still encouraging innovation and technological development.

### *4.1 Legal and Regulatory Reform*

One of the most important solutions is the reform of existing copyright laws to accommodate the realities of AI-generated creativity. Current intellectual property frameworks in many countries were designed before the emergence of generative AI systems and are therefore inadequate for addressing contemporary digital disputes. Legislators should introduce specific statutory provisions clarifying the legal status of AI-generated music, ownership rights, liability standards, and licensing obligations. Clear legal definitions are necessary to determine whether AI-generated works qualify for copyright protection and to identify the individuals or entities entitled to such rights [23]. Without legal certainty, disputes concerning ownership and infringement will continue to increase.

Governments should also establish stricter regulations regarding the use of copyrighted materials for AI training purposes. AI developers and technology companies must be required to obtain proper authorization before using musical works, lyrics, or voice recordings in machine-learning datasets. Licensing systems could be introduced to ensure that musicians receive fair compensation whenever their creative works contribute to AI development. Such systems would recognize the economic value of artistic labor while promoting responsible technological innovation [24]. In addition, transparent disclosure obligations should compel AI companies to identify the datasets used in training their systems, thereby improving accountability and reducing unauthorized exploitation.

### *4.2 Protection of Artistic Identity Rights*

Another important recommendation involves the protection of artists' identity rights, particularly concerning voice-cloning and digital replication technologies. Legal systems should recognize an artist's voice, image, and stylistic identity as protected aspects of personality rights deserving legal protection against unauthorized commercial use. This would help prevent

situations where AI-generated songs imitate musicians without consent, potentially damaging their reputation or depriving them of financial benefits [25]. Strong penalties should also be introduced against deceptive AI practices that intentionally mislead audiences regarding the authenticity of musical works.

### *4.3 Institutional Reform and Capacity Building*

Institutional reform is equally necessary for effective regulation. Copyright commissions, collecting societies, judicial institutions, and regulatory agencies must strengthen their technological capacity in order to monitor AI-related activities efficiently. Specialized regulatory units focusing on digital intellectual property and AI governance should be established within relevant institutions. Judges, lawyers, policymakers, and copyright administrators should equally receive continuous training on emerging technological issues affecting the creative industry. Without adequate institutional expertise, even well-drafted laws may remain ineffective in practice.

### *4.4 International Cooperation and Harmonization*

International cooperation is another critical component of effective regulation. Since digital music distribution operates globally, national laws alone may be insufficient to control cross-border AI-related infringements. International organizations such as the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), and regional economic bodies should collaborate in developing harmonized global standards for AI governance within the creative industries. International treaties and policy guidelines could assist countries in creating consistent legal approaches to issues such as copyright protection, licensing, digital identity rights, and ethical AI usage.

### *4.5 Platform Accountability and Technological Governance*

Digital streaming platforms and social media companies also have significant responsibilities in promoting artistic equity. These platforms should implement stronger verification systems capable of identifying AI-generated content and distinguishing it from authentic human-created music. Labeling requirements may help audiences understand when songs are produced or modified using AI technology. In addition, platforms should develop rapid complaint-resolution mechanisms enabling artists to report unauthorized voice replication, copyright infringement, or deceptive AI-generated content. Greater platform accountability would reduce the spread of harmful or misleading digital material.

### *4.6 Education, Ethics, and Collaborative Models*

Educational awareness is another essential solution. Many artists, especially independent musicians and emerging creators, remain unaware of their legal rights within the evolving digital environment. Governments, universities, professional associations, and music industry

organizations should organize educational programs and workshops focusing on AI literacy, digital copyright protection, licensing systems, and technological ethics. By improving awareness, artists can better protect themselves against exploitation and participate more effectively in discussions surrounding technological regulation.

Ethical considerations should also remain central in the development and deployment of AI systems within the music industry. Technology companies should adopt ethical guidelines emphasizing fairness, transparency, consent, accountability, and respect for human creativity. AI should function primarily as a supportive creative tool rather than a mechanism for replacing human artistic labor entirely. Maintaining this balance is essential in preserving the emotional, cultural, and social significance of music as a fundamentally human form of expression.

Furthermore, policymakers should encourage collaborative models between AI developers and musicians instead of adversarial relationships. Partnerships involving artists, software engineers, producers, and regulatory bodies could promote innovative uses of AI while ensuring fair compensation and recognition for creators. Such collaboration would allow technology and human creativity to coexist in mutually beneficial ways rather than in direct competition.

Ultimately, the challenges created by Artificial Intelligence within the music industry cannot be solved through legal reform alone. They require a broader commitment to protecting artistic dignity, economic fairness, and cultural authenticity in the digital age. By modernizing legal frameworks, strengthening institutions, promoting ethical standards, and encouraging international cooperation, societies can create a balanced regulatory environment where technological innovation advances without undermining the rights and value of human creators.

## Conclusion

The emergence of Artificial Intelligence within the music industry represents one of the most significant technological developments in contemporary creative culture. AI has transformed the processes of music production, distribution, marketing, and audience engagement in ways that were previously unimaginable. Through machine learning, generative algorithms, and voice-cloning technologies, AI systems are now capable of performing functions traditionally associated with human creativity. While these innovations have introduced efficiency, accessibility, and new opportunities for artistic experimentation, they have also generated complex legal, ethical, and institutional challenges that continue to reshape the global music industry.

This study has demonstrated that existing legal and institutional frameworks remain largely inadequate in addressing the realities created by AI-generated music and digital creative technologies. Traditional copyright systems were established on the assumption that creative expression originates from human intellectual effort. However, AI-generated compositions challenge conventional understandings of authorship, originality, ownership, and liability. As a result, legal uncertainty persists concerning the status of AI-generated works, the rights of musicians whose creations are used to train AI systems, and the extent to which artistic identity

can be protected against unauthorized technological replication.

The study further revealed that the issue extends beyond copyright disputes alone. Artificial Intelligence has broader implications for artistic equity, economic fairness, cultural authenticity, and the future of human creativity within the entertainment industry. Independent musicians and smaller creative communities face increasing vulnerability within a digital environment dominated by large technology corporations possessing advanced computational resources and extensive access to data. The commercialization of AI-generated content threatens to reduce the economic value attached to human artistic labor while encouraging forms of creative production driven primarily by algorithms and market efficiency rather than emotional depth and cultural expression.

Moreover, institutional weaknesses have intensified these challenges. Regulatory agencies, copyright boards, judicial institutions, and collecting societies in many jurisdictions have struggled to respond effectively to the speed and complexity of technological innovation. Inadequate regulatory mechanisms, weak enforcement capacity, and the absence of harmonized international standards have created opportunities for exploitation, unauthorized appropriation, and legal inconsistency across digital platforms. These gaps demonstrate the urgent need for modernized governance structures capable of balancing technological advancement with the protection of artistic rights.

Nevertheless, Artificial Intelligence should not be viewed solely as a threat to the music industry. When properly regulated and ethically deployed, AI possesses the potential to serve as a valuable creative tool that supports innovation, expands artistic possibilities, and enhances accessibility within music production. The challenge therefore lies not in resisting technological progress entirely, but in ensuring that such progress operates within legal and ethical boundaries that respect human creativity and artistic dignity. Innovation and artistic protection should not exist as opposing objectives; rather, they must function together within a balanced regulatory framework.

To achieve this balance, governments, international organizations, technology companies, and music industry stakeholders must collaborate in developing comprehensive legal and institutional responses to AI-related challenges. Copyright laws must be updated to reflect emerging digital realities, stronger protections must be introduced for artists' identity rights, and transparent licensing systems should ensure fair compensation for creators whose works contribute to AI development. Equally important is the strengthening of institutional capacity, international cooperation, and ethical accountability in the governance of AI technologies.

In conclusion, the relationship between Artificial Intelligence and the music industry represents a defining issue in the broader debate concerning technology and human creativity in the twenty-first century. The future of artistic equity will depend largely on the willingness of societies to adapt legal systems, regulatory institutions, and ethical standards to the realities of digital innovation. If carefully managed, AI can coexist with human creativity in ways that promote both technological advancement and artistic protection. However, if regulatory gaps persist and commercial interests continue to overshadow artistic rights, the music industry may gradually experience increased inequality, weakened cultural authenticity, and the erosion of the human element that has historically defined musical expression. Therefore, protecting artistic

equity must remain a central priority in shaping the future legal and institutional frameworks governing Artificial Intelligence in the music industry.

## References


[1] R. Abbott, *The Reasonable Robot: Artificial Intelligence and the Law*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2020.

[2] B. Andersen, "Artificial intelligence and copyright ownership in the music industry," *J. Intellect. Property Law*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 45–67, 2021.

[3] L. Bently, B. Sherman, D. Gangjee, and P. Johnson, *Intellectual Property Law*, 6th ed. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford Univ. Press, 2022.

[4] D. L. Burk, "Copyright and artificial intelligence," *Chicago-Kent J. Intellect. Property*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 1–18, 2019.

[5] A. J. Cockfield and J. Pridmore, "A synthetic age for music and copyright regulation," *Int. Rev. Law Comput. Technol.*, vol. 35, no. 3, pp. 211–229, 2021.

[6] J. E. Cohen, *Between Truth and Power: The Legal Constructions of Informational Capitalism*. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford Univ. Press, 2019.

[7] G. Davies and K. Garnett, *Moral Rights*. London, U.K.: Sweet & Maxwell, 2018.

[8] D. Gervais, "The machine as author," *Iowa Law Rev.*, vol. 105, no. 5, pp. 2053–2092, 2020.

[9] P. Goldstein and B. Hugenholtz, *International Copyright: Principles, Law, and Practice*, 4th ed. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford Univ. Press, 2021.

[10] A. Guadamuz, "Artificial intelligence and copyright," *WIPO Mag.*, no. 5, pp. 14–19, 2017.

[11] E. Hemmungs Wirtén, "Artificial intelligence, creativity, and copyright dilemmas in digital culture," *Inf. Cult.*, vol. 55, no. 4, pp. 403–421, 2020.

[12] J. Karaganis, Ed., *Media Piracy in Emerging Economies*. New York, NY, USA: Zone Books, 2018.

[13] M. A. Lemley and B. Casey, "Fair learning," *Texas Law Rev.*, vol. 99, no. 4, pp. 743–785, 2021.

[14] S. M. McJohn, "AI-generated music and ownership rights," *Entertainment Sports Lawyer*, vol. 36, no. 1, pp. 8–15, 2020.

[15] P. S. Menell, "Artificial intelligence and intellectual property law," *Berkeley Technol. Law J.*, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 315–356, 2019.

[16] M. O'Brien, "Digital ethics and AI creativity in modern music production," *J. Media Ethics*, vol. 37, no. 1, pp. 27–41, 2022.

[17] P. Samuelson, "Allocating ownership rights in computer-generated works," *Univ. Pittsburgh Law Rev.*, vol. 47, no. 4, pp. 1185–1228, 2017.

[18] M. Senftleben, "Copyright limitations and artificial intelligence," *IIC – Int. Rev. Intellect. Property Competition Law*, vol. 51, no. 4, pp. 395–412, 2020.

[19] A. Smith, "Voice cloning technologies and personality rights in entertainment law," *Harvard J. Law Technol.*, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 455–482, 2021.

[20] R. Towse, *A Textbook of Cultural Economics*, 2nd ed. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2019.

[21] United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), *Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence*. Paris, France: UNESCO Publishing, 2021.

[22] World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), *WIPO Technology Trends 2019: Artificial Intelligence*. Geneva, Switzerland: WIPO Publications, 2020.
[23] P. K. Yu, "Artificial intelligence and intellectual property law policy," *Ohio State Law J.*, vol. 81, no. 2, pp. 345–398, 2020.
[24] N. Ziv, "AI-generated creativity and the future of music regulation," *Entertainment Law Rev.*, vol. 33, no. 6, pp. 179–192, 2022.
[25] European Parliament, *Intellectual Property Rights for the Development of Artificial Intelligence Technologies*. Brussels, Belgium: European Union Publications, 2020.