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AI ABUSE AND NEGATIVE EFFECTS IN THE MUSIC ENERTAINMENT INDUSTRY

**INTRODUCTION:**

Artificial Intelligence has transformed the entertainment industry, but in my case study I am focusing on the music industry. AI has enabled innovation tools for creation, production, and distribution. However, despite all the benefits there are some negative effects. AI’s misuse and unintended consequences that spark significant ethical, economic, and cultural concerns. My analysis examines some key cases of AI abuse in the music industry, its negative effects on artists, listeners, and creative ecosystem and the broader implications for the stakeholders. Drawing from real-world examples, we’ll explore how AI’s capabilities, which are powerful but can undermine human creativity, mental health, and economic stability when abused.

**CASE EXAMPLES OF AI ABUSE IN MUSIC:**

**“Heart on My Sleeve” – UNAUTHORIZED VOICE CLONING**

In April 2023, an AI-generated track was created called “Heart on My Sleeve” that was produced by Ghostwriter, they mimicked the voices of Drake and The Weekend by using voice synthesis technology. Of course, the song went viral, amassing millions of streams before being removed from Spotify due to copyright infringement claims from UMG (Universal Music Group). The track was produced without the consent of the artists. It exploits their vocal likenesses which are protected under the right of publicity laws in some regions. The AI model was trained on copyrighted material scraping from the internet, raising ethical and legal questions. Drake and The Weekend faced a loss of control over their artistic identities with potential damage to their brand if fans mistook the track as authentic. Such unauthorized use can evoke distress/anxiety knowing their voices can be replicated easily without permission bringing up ethical and legal questions. UMG’s response highlights systemic issues. AI companies often train models on copyrighted works without licenses which threaten artists livelihoods.

**MICHAEL SMITH’S STREAMING FRAUD SCHEME:**

In 2024, North Carolina musician Michael Smith was federally charged for generating over 100,000 AI-composed songs, uploading them to Spotify and Apple Music under fake artist names and using bots to inflate streams. Allegedly earning $10 million in illicit royalties over seven years. Smith exploited AI music generators to flood streaming platforms with low effort content, manipulating algorithms to siphon royalties from legitimate artists. Bypassing creative authenticity and platform integrity. The fans were misled by inauthentic content eroding trust in platforms’ recommendation systems. Genuine musicians saw diluted royalty pools as streaming payouts are divided among all streams. A 2024 study projected a 27% income drop for musicians by 2028 due to AI saturation, equating to €2.7 billion lost globally. The flood of mediocre AI music risks devaluing human artistry, a worry for someone like you who values drawing as a creative outlet.

**ANTHROPIC LAWSUIT BY MAJOR MUSIC PUBLISHERS:**

In October 2023, Universal, Sony, and other publishers sued AI company Anthropic alleging its models were trained on copyrighted song lyrics without permission. The case remains ongoing as of February 2025. Anthropic’s use of copyrighted material to fuel its AI exemplifies a widespread practice among tech firms prioritizing innovation over creators’ rights. Artists and songwriters lose compensation and control challenging copyright norms. Profits flow to tech giants rather than creators a concern echoed in posts on X about AI “oligarchizing” rather than democratization.

**NEGATIVE EFFECTS OF AI ABUSE IN MUSIC:**

The negative effects in the music industry in AI are affected by economic displacement, income loss, erosion of creative authenticity, mental health, identity threats, ethical and privacy violations.

The issue of AI-generated music floods streaming platforms, reducing royalties for human artists. Tools like Boomy and Suno allow anyone to create songs instantly, often without artistic merit yet they compete for the same revenue pool. Over 70% of musicians surveyed in 2024 feared AI’s impact on their livelihoods, with streaming supply shocks already overwhelming listeners. The impact mirrors automation’s disruption in other fields efficiency gains comes at a cost of the human workers especially with independent artists with limited resources.

AI music often lacks the emotional depth and nuance of human work. Critics argue it mimics rather than innovates. “Heart on My Sleeve” replicated Drake’s style but not his lived experience. AI can copy sketches but not your intent or mental health journey behind them AI can not replace human touch in art. A similarity in AI-driven music could stifle diversity, prioritizing safe predictable outputs over bold human expression.

Voice cloning and deepfakes threaten artists’ sense of self and agency. Fans may also feel deceived, impacting on trust in music as a personal connection. Imagine the stress of seeing your voice/art hijacked by AI, it would feel like a violation of personal boundaries. Artists like Claire L. Evans of YACHT have expressed ambivalence not wanting to give too much to AI but also not rejecting it outright reflecting a broader tension.

AI models trained on scraped data like Google’s music AI or Anthropic’s lyric database it raises privacy and consent issues. Artists don’t opt in, yet their work fuels the tech profits. The Anthropic lawsuit underscores this abuse with publishers demanding transparency and compensation. This parallels data misuse in other entertainment sectors like deep-fake films which amplify ethical concerns.

**STAKEHOLDERS**

Artists fear displacement and loss of control yet some like David Guetta embrace AI as a tool highlighting a divide in adaptation. Labels like UMG and others push back via lawsuits and lobbying like Tennessee’s ELVIS Act, which is effective in July 2024 that protects vocal likeness, but the risk alienates innovative artists. Listeners may enjoy AI’s music novelty but could grow wary of its inauthenticity affecting engagement. Tech firms profit from AI tools yet face legal and reputational risks if courts restrict training data use. AI has potential to aid creativity but the abuse when ethics are ignored is still being figured out.

Cases like Smith’s fraud and Anthropic’s alleged infringement suggest an oligarchic shift, power concentrates with tech firms not the creators. Economic data supports this, musicians’ income is projected to shrink while AI companies will thrive. Culturally the risk isn’t just displacement, but devaluation of music becomes a problem for AI to solve not a human endeavor anymore. However, AI’s negative effects aren’t inevitable. The Beatles “Now and Then” (2023) used AI restoratively not abusively to enhance a human creation. The difference really lies in the intent and consent. Abuse stems from exploitation not the technology itself.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

To help avoid the abuse of AI in the music industry we could work on regulation, transparency, support systems, and education. If we strengthen copyright laws to require licensing for training data and protects vocal likenesses universally. Like the United Kingdom that is proposing this change in 2025. For transparency mandate AI firms to disclose training sources and secure the consent of artists to reduce ethical breaches. Perhaps they have a support system where platforms could prioritize human music in algorithms or maybe create AI-specific royalty pools to preserve income for artists. Education is also important to understand AI’s dual nature as a creative tool vs a potential weapon, to help guide responsible development.

**CONCLUSION:**

AI’s integration into the music industry offers both promise and peril. Cases like “Heart on My Sleeve”, Smith’s fraud, and Anthropic lawsuit reveal its capacity for abuse, economic harm, identity theft, and cultural erosion. As an AI student who enjoys drawing, these issues of creativity and wellbeing are at stake. While AI can enhance entertainment its negative effects demand vigilance, ethical frameworks, and a reassertion of human value in art. Without action the music industry risks becoming a tech-driven echo chamber drowning out the voices it once amplifies.
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