

Margaret MonteLeon

Professor Christopher Mykolyk

CSCI 77800: Ethics and Computer Science

1 September 2020

Glover, D., & Gobir, N. (2020, July 16). On to the Next One: Jay-Z Beefs with A.I....Are Other Artists Next? Retrieved September 01, 2020, from <https://yr.media/tech/on-to-the-next-one-jay-z-beefs-with-a-i-are-other-artists-next/>

The innovation discussed in the linked article is a form of AI. A simplistic explanation of how this innovation works is that the AI is trained using audio input of a speaker's voice. The AI analyzes the nuances of the speaker's tone and cadence. This then allows the computer to generate audio files that sound exactly like the speaker. This conflict described in this article is about how this AI was used to generate a Hamlet soliloquy using a computer-generated version of Jay-Z's voice. Jay-Z, arguably one of America's most famous and prolific rap artists, demanded that the AI generated Hamlet audio be removed from YouTube claiming that it was copyright infringement. The videos were initially removed but then were reposted with YouTube's permission.

This is indeed a legal issue that will likely be addressed in the courts. The voice in the audio recording *sounds* like Jay-Z but, in reality, is a computer-generated sample. Who owns the rights to that Jay-Z sounding, computer generated voice? Jay-Z or the programmer?

The implications of this technology are far reaching. It's about more than just copyrights and artists getting paid. Admittedly, I spent some time on the Vocal

Synthesis YouTube page. It's fun to hear President Bush rap 50 Cent's "In da Club", but it can be dangerous and provocative to generate fake audio. When do these fakes create a threat to democracy? Consider that this form AI will likely become more accessible to laypeople in the future. It might be fun to hear your great-grandmother speaking the words to Cardi-B & Megan the Stallion's "WAP" but these recordings could be generated to fabricate mistruths to destroy relationships or can be used to simply bully others. It is a fantastic tool for manipulation. The question remains, where does one draw the line between creative license and freedom of speech, and preventing mass disinformation?