

Monetization of AI-Generated Songs for Authors' Economic and Moral Rights Protection

Monetisasi Lagu Ciptaan Kecerdasan Artifisial untuk Perlindungan Hak Ekonomi dan Moral Pencipta

Faradigma D. Zainuddin¹, Nirwan Junus², Nurul Fazri Elfikri³

¹⁻³ Universitas Negeri Gorontalo, Indonesia

Article Info

Corresponding Author:

Faradigma D. Zainuddin

*rarazainuddin28@gmail.com

History:

Submitted: 15-04-2026

Revised: 06-05-2026

Accepted: 08-05-2026

Keyword:

Monetization; Creative Song; Artificial Intelligence.

Kata Kunci:

Monetisasi; Lagu Ciptaan; Artificial Intelligence.

Abstract

Rapid advancements in Artificial Intelligence (AI) have significantly impacted the music industry by enabling AI systems to autonomously create song compositions. This development presents critical legal challenges, particularly concerning the protection of economic and moral rights associated with AI-generated songs. The study examines whether current Copyright Law effectively addresses these issues, employing normative research methods and focusing on relevant legislation and concepts. Findings indicate considerable limitations within existing legal frameworks since the definition of a creator typically pertains to human authors. Consequently, works produced by AI are subjected to a legal gap, resulting in ambiguity regarding the safeguarding of moral and economic rights. The study advocates for regulatory reforms that would clearly define the legal status of AI-generated works, ensuring both legal certainty and fair intellectual property rights protection in the evolving digital landscape.

Abstrak

Perkembangan pesat dalam Kecerdasan Buatan (AI) telah berdampak signifikan pada industri musik dengan memungkinkan sistem AI untuk secara mandiri menciptakan komposisi lagu. Perkembangan ini menghadirkan tantangan hukum yang krusial, terutama terkait dengan perlindungan hak ekonomi dan moral yang terkait dengan lagu-lagu yang dihasilkan oleh AI. Studi ini meneliti apakah Undang-Undang Hak Cipta saat ini secara efektif menangani masalah-masalah ini, dengan menggunakan metode penelitian normatif dan berfokus pada undang-undang dan konsep yang relevan. Temuan menunjukkan adanya keterbatasan yang signifikan dalam kerangka hukum yang ada karena definisi pencipta biasanya berkaitan dengan penulis manusia. Akibatnya, karya yang dihasilkan oleh AI terjebak dalam kesenjangan hukum, yang mengakibatkan ketidakjelasan mengenai perlindungan hak moral dan ekonomi. Studi ini mendorong reformasi regulasi yang akan secara jelas mendefinisikan status hukum karya yang dihasilkan oleh AI, memastikan kepastian hukum dan perlindungan hak kekayaan intelektual yang adil di lanskap digital yang terus berkembang.



Copyright: © 2026 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY SA).

[doi](https://doi.org/10.65101/lawric.v1i3.263) <https://doi.org/10.65101/lawric.v1i3.263>

A. INTRODUCTION

1. Background

The rapid advancement of technology, unprecedented in its speed, has brought significant changes in various aspects of human life, including art, culture, and the creative industry. Digital innovation not only opens new opportunities in the creation and distribution of artworks but also poses profound challenges, particularly regarding legal protection of intellectual property rights. One of the rapidly developing phenomena is the use of artificial intelligence (AI) in producing music and songs.

AI is no longer just a tool; it has become capable of independently generating music compositions thru algorithms based on massive datasets of music. The music produced thru AI technology has attracted attention because it can accelerate and simplify the creation process. However, the advancement of AI technology has also led to issues in the realm of intellectual property, particularly concerning copyright.¹

This situation raises a fundamental legal question: who holds the copyright to a song autonomously generated by an AI system, and how do the mechanisms for protecting economic rights and moral rights apply to such works? In the Indonesian copyright legal system, Law Number 28 of 2014 on Copyright serves as the main foundation for regulating and protecting every created work. This regulation emphasizes that copyright is an exclusive right that arises automatically based on the declarative principle after a creation is realized in tangible form. However, the provision is built on the assumption that the creator is a human being with will, creativity, and personal expression.²

In a legal perspective, the monetization of songs is a manifestation of the economic rights inherent in a creation as regulated by Law Number 28 of 2014. The law provides legal protection to creators or copyright holders to obtain economic benefits from the use of songs, while also regulating the limitations and mechanisms of their utilization. However, in practice, the monetization of songs in the digital era faces various complex legal issues, especially when the works are generated by AI systems. The distribution of songs thru digital platforms often involves many parties, such as creators, producers, aggregators, and platform providers, leading to complexities in determining the rights and obligations of each party.

¹ Ni Kadek Indriyani, *MUSIK CIPTAAN ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE DI ERA DIGITAL*, 12, no. 3 (2026): 1569–80.

² "UU No. 28 Tahun 2014," diakses 9 Juli 2026, <https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/details/38690>.

Law Number 28 of 2014 in Article 40 paragraph (1) states that protected works include songs or music with or without lyrics. However, this regulation is based on the assumption that the work is created by an author who possesses creative awareness and autonomy. If a song is created by AI working thru algorithms without creative awareness, then doubts arise as to whether the work can be categorized as a creation protected by copyright. Furthermore, Article 18 and Article 30 of the Copyright Law regulate the mechanism for the transfer of economic rights over creations, explicitly placing humans as the holders of rights with personal and economic relationships to their creations. This situation further emphasizes the normative problem when dealing with AI creations that do not have legal personality.³

The issue arises because the construction of copyright law is still centered on humans as creators. AI does not possess will, consciousness, reputation, dignity, or legal responsibility like humans or legal entities. Thus, when a song is created entirely by AI, it is difficult to determine whether the song meets the "distinctive and personal" elements required by copyright law. A song entirely produced by AI cannot yet obtain copyright because it does not meet the distinctive and personal elements, although liability for infringement can be directed toward the system developers and AI users.⁴

The royalty mechanism has not specifically addressed the issue of AI-generated songs. If a song is entirely produced by AI, it is still unclear who can register the song, who is entitled to royalties, whether the prompt user can be considered the creator, whether the AI developer can be considered the rights holder, or whether the song does not receive copyright protection at all. Until now, there has been no specific regulation regarding copyright ownership of AI-generated works, leading to legal uncertainty in the distribution of moral and economic rights over music produced by AI.⁵

From the perspective of economic rights, AI-generated songs raise questions about the distribution of economic benefits. If the AI-generated song is commercialized and generates revenue, it needs to be determined whether that revenue belongs to the AI user, the AI developer, the dataset owner, the producer, the digital platform, or other parties that contributed creatively. There is a normative gap that causes legal uncertainty

³ "UU No. 28 Tahun 2014."

⁴ Theodora Shelina, "Hak Cipta Atas Lagu Yang Dihasilkan Artificial Intelligence: Kepemilikan Dan Pertanggungjawaban Atas Pelanggaran Dalam Regulasi Hak Cipta Indonesia," *Arjuna* 6, no. 1 (2025): 64–76.

⁵ Lili Sekararum Utami dan Subianta Mandala, *Aspek Legalitas Atas Hak Moral dan Hak Ekonomi dalam Pembuatan Musik Dari Generator Music AI*, t.t., <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.59141/japendi.v6i7.8114>.

regarding copyright protection for AI-generated music in Indonesia, thus necessitating a legal reformulation, including thru conceptual approaches such as the work made for hire doctrine.⁶

Previous research provides an overview of the dynamics of copyright protection in the digital era. Chrisanti and Sulistiyantoro (2024) discuss legal protection for AI-generated art by comparing regulations in Indonesia, the UK, and Canada, revealing that there are no clear rules regarding AI as a creator in Indonesia. Artawijaya and Asri (2025) highlight the issue of the principle of originality in works produced by AI based on Article 1 of the Copyright Law. Sinaga (2024) examines the recognition of copyright for artwork generated thru AI and concludes that the existing normative construction is still oriented toward the creator as a human subject. Unlike those studies, this research specifically analyzes the mechanisms of moral rights and economic rights protection for AI-generated songs in the context of digital monetization based on Law No. 28 of 2014.⁷

2. Problem Formulation

Based on that background, the problem formulation in this research is how the legal status of songs created by Artificial Intelligence within the Indonesian copyright system relates to the protection of economic rights and moral rights, as well as how the mechanisms for protecting economic rights and moral rights in the monetization of songs created by Artificial Intelligence that involve human creative contributions.

3. Research Methodology

This research uses the normative legal research method, which focuses on the analysis of applicable legal norms, legal principles, and legal doctrines. This method was chosen because the issues examined are of a juridical-normative nature, namely analyzing the normative construction capability of Law Number 28 of 2014 on Copyright in accommodating the phenomenon of song works produced by Artificial Intelligence systems⁸. 8 The approaches used in this research include two main approaches.

First, the statute approach, which involves examining all regulations related to the subject of study, particularly Law Number 28 of 2014 on Copyright and its implementing regulations. Second, the conceptual approach, which is carried out by studying the

⁶ Indriyani, *MUSIK CIPTAAN ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE DI ERA DIGITAL*.

⁷ Randy Artawijaya dan Dyah Permata Budi Asri, "Analisis Asas Orisinalitas Dalam Pasal 1 Undang-Undang No. 28 Tahun 2014 Tentang Hak Cipta Terhadap Karya Yang Dihasilkan Oleh Artificial Intelligence," *Jurnal Sosial Teknologi* 5, no. 12 (2025): 4287-95, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.59188/jurnalsostech.v5i12.32572>.

⁸ Peter Mahmud Marzuki, *Penelitian Hukum*, 13 ed., 13 (Kencana, 2027).

concepts of intellectual property law, legal protection theory, and justice theory relevant to the issues being researched.

The legal materials used include primary legal materials in the form of legislation, secondary legal materials in the form of literature, scientific journals, and previous research results, as well as tertiary legal materials in the form of legal dictionaries and encyclopedias. The technique for collecting legal materials is conducted thru library research, while the analysis is carried out descriptively-analytically by outlining the obtained legal materials and then systematically analyzing them to address the research problem.

B. DISCUSSION

1. Basic Concepts of Creators and Works in Copyright Law

The normative construction regarding creators and creations in Law Number 28 of 2014 on Copyright is the main foundation in determining the subjects and objects of legal protection. Article 1 paragraph 1 emphasizes that copyright is an exclusive right that arises automatically based on the declarative principle after a creation is realized in tangible form. This provision indicates that the mechanism for copyright protection is not based on administrative formalities, but rather on the fact of creation itself, so the state does not grant this right, but recognizes and protects the right that has automatically arisen.⁹

Furthermore, Article 1 paragraph 2 defines the creator as "an individual or several individuals who independently or jointly produce a work that is distinctive and personal." This formulation emphasizes the element of originality as an absolute requirement in copyright protection. Originality in the context of copyright law does not always mean absolute novelty, but rather the presence of a personal touch, creativity, or individual expression that distinguishes a creation from other works. Thus, the mechanism for regulating creators in the law focuses on the relationship between the work and the legal subject who possesses intellectual and creative abilities.¹⁰

As for creations, Article 1, paragraph 3 states that a creation is any work of creation in the fields of science, art, and literature that is expressed in a tangible form. This formulation emphasizes that an idea or concept alone does not receive legal protection until it is realized in a concrete form. This principle is known as the fixation principle,

⁹ "UU No. 28 Tahun 2014."

¹⁰ OK Saidin, *Aspek hukum hak kekayaan intelektual: (Intellectual property rights)*, 2010.

which means that protection is granted to expressions, not to ideas. This mechanism aims to maintain a balance between protecting individual rights and the freedom of thought in society, so that the law prevents the monopoly of ideas that should be able to develop freely.¹¹

Systematically, the mechanism for regulating the basic concepts of creator and creation in Law No. 28 of 2014 shows a close relationship between legal subjects and protected objects. The creator is the party who first obtains the rights, while the creation is the object that is protected as long as it meets the established normative criteria. The rights can then be transferred to the copyright holder through legitimate transfer mechanisms such as written agreements, inheritance, or licenses. Thus, the basic concept of creator and creation in this law is built on three main elements: the human subject as the creator, the tangible expression as a condition for protection, and the declarative principle as the mechanism for the birth of rights.

2. The Position of Artificial Intelligence in the Copyright Regime

The development of AI technology has presented profound conceptual challenges within the copyright legal regime, particularly regarding the status of AI as an entity that produces works. In Law Number 28 of 2014, the creator is defined as "one or more persons" who produce works that are distinctive and personal in nature. The formulation grammatically and systematically indicates that the subject of the creator is a human being as a legal subject. AI as a technological system does not have legal personality, does not possess free will, and cannot be held legally accountable. Therefore, within the current normative framework, AI cannot be categorized as a creator as defined by the law.

In the copyright regime, the main point of legal protection lies in the existence of a creation born from the creator's creativity. In Indonesia, the main legal basis used is Law Number 28 of 2014 on Copyright. Copyright is understood as the exclusive right of the creator that arises automatically after a creation is realized in a tangible form. The Copyright Law also places the creator as an individual or individuals who produce works that are distinctive and personal. With that formulation, the construction of Indonesian copyright law is still oriented toward humans as creators, not machines or artificial intelligence systems.

Thus, AI is more appropriately placed as a tool for creation rather than as a legal

¹¹ Muhamad Djumhana dan R. Djubaedillah, "Hak milik intelektual: Sejarah, teori, dan praktiknya di Indonesia," (*No Title*), 1993.

subject of creation. In legal doctrine, a legal subject is a party that can possess rights and obligations. Humans and legal entities can become legal subjects because both are recognized by the law as holders of rights and bearers of obligations. AI does not yet have such status. Christi and Cahyaningsih's research concludes that AI cannot be considered a legal subject in national law because it merely executes human commands and cannot be personified as a human with legal capacity. The research also emphasizes that AI-generated works do not yet receive copyright protection if they contradict legal provisions and intellectual property theories that still emphasize the role of humans.¹²

In the case of *Thaler v. Perlmutter*, the United States court rejected the copyright registration for a work claimed to be autonomously created by an AI system because copyright law requires human authorship. The court placed human authorship as a fundamental requirement for copyright protection, so works produced without human contribution do not qualify as objects of copyright protection.¹³

In the Indonesian copyright regime, this issue is also closely related to moral rights. Moral rights arise from the personal relationship between the creator and their creation. Moral rights include the right to have their name credited, to use a pseudonym, to maintain the integrity of the creation, and to object to changes that harm the creator's honor or reputation. AI does not possess reputation, honor, will, or personal identity like humans do. Therefore, AI cannot logically or legally hold moral rights. If a song is created with the help of AI, moral rights must still be attributed to the human who made a genuine creative contribution, not to the AI. The legal status of works produced by AI is still unclear because Law Number 28 of 2014 does not explicitly regulate creations produced by AI. The research places AI not as a legal subject, so the legal responsibility for AI works remains with the person or legal entity that utilizes and operates it.¹⁴

Thus, the position of AI within the copyright regime can be formulated in three positions. First, AI is not a creator because it does not fulfill the elements of personality, will, consciousness, and legal responsibility. Second, AI can be positioned as a tool for creation if humans remain the ones determining the final creative expression. Third,

¹² Gladys Azalia Christi dan Diana Tantri Cahyaningsih, "Problematisasi Subjek Hukum Hak Cipta Terkait Status 'Pencipta' Atas Hasil Artificial Intelligence," *Jurnal Ilmiah Wahana Pendidikan* 10, no. 22 (2024): 561–77, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14569001>.

¹³ Saleh Al-Sharieh, "Copyright Denied for Generative AI: Remarks on *Thaler v Perlmutter*," *Utrecht Journal of International and European Law* 40, no. 1 (2025): 48–54, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.5334/ujel.644>.

¹⁴ Dewa Ayu Made Vidha Kanya Dhaniswari dan Made Aditya Pramana Putra, *HAK CIPTA TERHADAP KARYA YANG DIHASILKAN OLEH KECERDASAN BUATAN*, 2025.

works entirely produced by AI without significant human contribution fall into a legal gray area and currently lack a strong basis for obtaining copyright protection akin to human creations.

3. Mechanism for Protecting Moral Rights for AI-Created Songs

Moral rights in Law Number 28 of 2014 are regulated in Article 5, which states that moral rights are rights that are permanently attached to the creator to perform attribution (name attribution), use a pseudonym, modify the creation in accordance with propriety, and maintain the creation from distortion or modification that harms the creator's honor. Moral rights reflect the emotional connection and reputation between the creator and the work they produce, are non-transferable, and remain attached even after the economic rights are transferred to another party. The protection of moral rights is very strong normatively because it is timeless.¹⁵

However, when faced with a song generated autonomously by an AI system, the mechanism for protecting moral rights encounters fundamental normative obstacles. Because moral rights can only attach to human legal subjects who possess personality and personal integrity, a song that is entirely generated by AI without significant human creative involvement does not have an entity that can claim those moral rights. There is no human whose name can be listed as the creator, no reputation to maintain, and no personal relationship between the creator entity and the produced work.

If a song is produced by an AI system with creative direction contributed by humans (for example, humans determining the musical style, mood, or certain parameters), then normatively it is still possible to recognize those humans as the creators or at least as parties with moral rights related to the work. In this situation, the protection of moral rights can still operate as intended. However, if the AI system generates songs entirely autonomously without human creative intervention, then the moral rights mechanism in Law No. 28 of 2014 cannot be applied because there is no legal subject who holds the moral rights.

This condition indicates that the existing regulations contain a significant legal gap regarding the protection of moral rights over AI works. In the practice of monetizing AI songs on digital platforms, the absence of a moral rights holder leads to unclear attribution of works, potential identity misuse, and the lack of any legal mechanism that can be used by anyone to maintain the integrity of the work from unwanted distortion or

¹⁵ Henry Soelistyo, *Hak cipta tanpa hak moral*, 2011.

modification. This creates a protection gap that needs to be promptly addressed thru regulatory updates.

4. Mechanism for Protecting Economic Rights for AI-Created Songs

Economic rights as regulated in Article 8 and Article 9 of Law Number 28 of 2014 grant exclusive authority to the creator or copyright holder to obtain financial benefits from the use of their creation. Economic rights include reproduction, distribution, public performance, broadcasting, communication to the public, and rental of the creation. Unlike moral rights, economic rights can be transferred to other parties thru agreements, inheritance, or other legal mechanisms. In the context of songs, economic rights serve as the legal basis for monetization mechanisms, including royalty payments by users to rights holders thru Collective Management Organizations (CMOs) as regulated in Articles 87 to 93 of the Copyright Law.¹⁶

In the context of AI-generated songs, the mechanism for protecting economic rights faces layered issues. If the song is produced with human involvement as the creative director or AI system operator, then legal responsibility and economic rights can be imposed on that person as the creator or rights holder. Conversely, if the song is produced entirely by AI without significant human creative intervention, then ambiguity arises regarding the subject entitled to the economic benefits from the song. There is no human creator who can be designated as the holder of economic rights, making the mechanisms for royalty payments and distribution of economic benefits indeterminate.

This issue becomes even more complex in the context of monetizing songs thru digital platforms. In practice, AI-generated songs can easily be uploaded and monetized by users or AI system developers thru various mechanisms such as ad revenue, streaming royalties, music usage licenses, or other commercial collaborations. Without clarity on the legal status of the song, the distribution of royalties and licensing arrangements become difficult to determine. The economic rights that should serve as an instrument of protection against commercial exploitation cannot be optimally applied because there is no legal subject explicitly recognized as the rights holder. As stated by Saputra, Fahmi, and Daeng (2022), the royalty payment mechanism based on Law No. 28 of 2014 essentially requires clear identification of the creator or rights holder as the basis for the allocation of economic benefits.¹⁷

¹⁶ "UU No. 28 Tahun 2014."

¹⁷ Egi Reksa Saputra dkk., "Mekanisme pembayaran royalti untuk kepentingan komersial berdasarkan

This condition has the potential to cause disputes and conflicts of interest, especially when there are parties profiting financially from AI-generated songs without a clear legal basis regarding the ownership of the work. This ambiguity also affects the royalty management system that has been managed by LMK, as the identification of creators and copyright holders is a prerequisite for that system. In the case of songs produced by AI, this identification becomes more complex because there is not always a human creator who can clearly be recognized as the rights holder, which ultimately causes the royalty system to malfunction.

5. Analysis of the Compatibility of Law No. 28 of 2014 with the Principles of IP Protection

The regulations in Law Number 28 of 2014 essentially reflect the fundamental principles in the Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) system, particularly the principle of protecting human creations as a form of appreciation for intellectual capabilities. In the perspective of the legal protection theory as articulated by Satjipto Rahardjo, the law functions to provide protection for human interests so that they are not harmed by others. The Copyright Law has accommodated that function by granting exclusive rights to creators, both in the form of moral rights and economic rights. Normatively, Law No. 28 of 2014 is in accordance with the theory of legal protection because it provides legitimacy, recognition, and mechanisms for protecting the interests of creators.¹⁸

From the perspective of the theory of distributive justice, copyright regulation aims to provide fair compensation to creators for their intellectual contributions. Economic rights as regulated in Article 8 and Article 9 allow creators to earn royalties from the commercial use of their creations. However, this principle of distributive justice cannot operate effectively in the context of AI-generated songs if there is no clear legal subject as the recipient of the economic benefits. The absence of human creators in the process of creating AI-based songs causes the mechanism for distributing economic benefits to lose the object that is the target of its protection.

The principle of legal certainty, which is one of the main objectives of copyright regulation, also faces a similar challenge. Legal certainty is reflected in the systematic regulation of rights subjects, protected objects, the duration of protection, and dispute resolution mechanisms. In the context of AI works, the ambiguity regarding who the

Undang-Undang Nomor 28 Tahun 2014 tentang Hak Cipta," *Jurnal Pendidikan Tambusai* 6, no. 3 (2022): 13658–6378, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.31004/jptam.v6i3.4490>.

¹⁸ Satjipto Rahardjo, *Ilmu Hukum* (2016).

creator or rights holder is causes the principle of legal certainty to not be optimally realized. This has implications for uncertainty in monetization practices, dispute resolution, and the enforcement of economic and moral rights over AI-generated songs. The development of technology, particularly the use of generative AI in music creation, also tests the principle of originality that is the foundation of the intellectual property rights system. As examined by Artawijaya and Asri (2025) and Sinaga (2024), Indonesia's Copyright Law is still oriented toward the creator as a human subject, so works entirely produced by AI pose legal problems that cannot be resolved solely thru textual interpretation of existing provisions. Thus, although in principle, Law No. 28 of 2014 is consistent with the classical concept of intellectual property rights, this law faces significant adaptation challenges in response to the development of AI technology.

6. The Void of Norms and Its Legal Implications

A legal gap is a condition where a legal issue that actually occurs in society does not receive adequate regulation in the applicable legislation. In the context of AI-generated songs, this legal gap is identified in several interconnected aspects that directly impact the mechanisms for protecting moral rights and economic rights.

First, the normative gap in terms of the definition of the creator. Article 1 paragraph 2 of the Copyright Law grammatically defines the creator as "one or more persons," which indicates that the legal subject of copyright is limited to humans. There are no provisions regulating the legal status of works produced entirely autonomously by AI systems that do not have legal personality. As a result, there is ambiguity regarding the legal status of the work, whether it falls into the public domain, is owned by the AI developer, or receives no protection at all.

Second, the absence of norms regarding the mechanism for protecting economic rights over AI works. In a situation where there is no identifiable human creator, there is no legal subject entitled to receive royalties from the commercial use of the song. This creates a situation where parties that profit financially from the monetization of AI songs (such as technology developers, platform users, or the digital platform itself) operate without clear legal foundations regarding their rights and obligations.

Third, the absence of norms regarding law enforcement mechanisms in the digital realm. Although the Copyright Law has regulated criminal and civil sanctions, the enforcement mechanisms against internet violations still face jurisdictional and evidentiary challenges. The distribution of content thru global platforms often involves

servers located abroad, making it difficult for national law enforcement agencies to reach them. This legal gap causes the protection of creators' economic rights to be less than optimal, especially in the context of illegal streaming and the use of AI-generated songs without clear rights status.

Fourth, the absence of norms in regulating the transparency of royalty distribution on digital platforms. Although the mechanism of Collective Management Organizations (CMOs) has been regulated in Articles 87-93, there are no detailed technical regulations regarding the transparency of royalty distribution algorithms on digital platforms. This has the potential to create an imbalance between creators and platform providers, which ultimately weakens the effectiveness of economic rights protection in the digital era.

7. Analysis of the Effectiveness of Protecting Moral Rights and Economic Rights

The effectiveness of the protection of moral rights and economic rights in Law No. 28 of 2014 needs to be analyzed not only from a normative perspective but also from the perspective of implementation and its adaptability to technological developments. Normatively, Law No. 28 of 2014 has strongly regulated the protection of moral rights thru Article 5, which provides protection without a time limit, as well as comprehensive protection of economic rights thru Articles 8 and 9, which cover various forms of commercial utilization. This regulation reflects the adoption of the dualism system of copyright as known in the civil law system, which distinctly differentiates the personal (moral) dimension and the commercial (economic) dimension of copyright.

However, when applied to the context of AI-generated songs, the effectiveness of moral rights protection faces structural obstacles. First, moral rights, which are personal and inherent to the individual creator, cannot be applied to works produced by non-human entities. Second, in the context of monetization practices on digital platforms, the removal of creator attribution or modification of works online often occurs rapidly and on a large scale, making it difficult to restore moral rights even if a human creator exists. Without an effective digital monitoring system, creators must undergo a lengthy legal process to restore their rights.

From the perspective of economic rights protection, its effectiveness is also influenced by the ability of the royalty management system to identify and distribute economic benefits fairly. Research by Saputra, Fahmi, and Daeng (2022) shows that the royalty payment mechanism based on Law No. 28 of 2014 is a form of economic justice implementation because users of creations for commercial purposes are required to

compensate the rights holders. However, in the context of AI-generated songs, this system faces a fundamental difficulty: the absence of a clear creator or rights holder causes the royalty distribution mechanism to lose its recipient subject.¹⁹

In the perspective of legal protection theory, the effectiveness of a norm is not only determined by the existence of rules but also by the legal structure and culture that support it. Although Law No. 28 of 2014 normatively fulfills the elements of preventive protection thru registration and licensing, as well as repressive protection thru criminal and civil sanctions, its effectiveness in the context of AI is still very limited. This condition shows that beside normative aspects, factors such as legal literacy, public awareness, and the ability of regulations to adapt to technological developments are crucial in determining the effectiveness of copyright protection in the era of artificial intelligence.

C. CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the juridical-normative analysis, it can be concluded that the regulation of economic rights and moral rights in Law Number 28 of 2014 on Copyright has fundamentally provided comprehensive protection for human creators, but has not yet fully accommodated songs produced by Artificial Intelligence. The definition of a creator, which refers to "one or more persons," places AI outside the scope of copyright law subjects, so songs entirely produced by AI without human creative contribution face a normative gap regarding the holders of moral rights and economic rights. Copyright protection is still possible if AI is only used as an auxiliary tool and there is significant and identifiable human intellectual contribution in the creation process. Therefore, an update of regulations is needed that explicitly governs the status of AI works, the limits of human contribution, mechanisms for economic rights ownership, royalty distribution, and transparency in the utilization of works on digital platforms.

REFERENCES

- Al-Sharieh, Saleh. "Copyright Denied for Generative AI: Remarks on Thaler v Perlmutter." *Utrecht Journal of International and European Law* 40, no. 1 (2025): 48–54. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.5334/ujel.644>.
- Artawijaya, Randy, dan Dyah Permata Budi Asri. "Analisis Asas Orisinalitas Dalam Pasal 1 Undang-Undang No. 28 Tahun 2014 Tentang Hak Cipta Terhadap Karya Yang

¹⁹ Saputra dkk., "Mekanisme pembayaran royalti untuk kepentingan komersial berdasarkan Undang-Undang Nomor 28 Tahun 2014 tentang Hak Cipta."

- Dihasilkan Oleh Artificial Intelligence.” *Jurnal Sosial Teknologi* 5, no. 12 (2025): 4287–95. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.59188/jurnalsostech.v5i12.32572>.
- Christi, Gladys Azalia, dan Diana Tantri Cahyaningsih. “Problematika Subjek Hukum Hak Cipta Terkait Status ‘Pencipta’ Atas Hasil Artificial Intelligence.” *Jurnal Ilmiah Wahana Pendidikan* 10, no. 22 (2024): 561–77. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14569001>.
- Dhaniswari, Dewa Ayu Made Vidha Kanya, dan Made Aditya Pramana Putra. *HAK CIPTA TERHADAP KARYA YANG DIHASILKAN OLEH KECERDASAN BUATAN*. 2025.
- Djumhana, Muhamad, dan R. Djubaedillah. “Hak milik intelektual: Sejarah, teori, dan praktiknya di Indonesia.” (No Title), 1993.
- Indriyani, Ni Kadek. *MUSIK CIPTAAN ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE DI ERA DIGITAL*. 12, no. 3 (2026): 1569–80.
- Mahmud Marzuki, Peter. *Penelitian Hukum*. 13 ed. 13. Kencana, 2027.
- Rahardjo, Satjipto. *Ilmu Hukum*. 2016.
- Saidin, OK. *Aspek hukum hak kekayaan intelektual:(Intellectual property rights)*. 2010.
- Saputra, Egi Reksa, Fahmi Fahmi, dan Yusuf Daeng. “Mekanisme pembayaran royalti untuk kepentingan komersial berdasarkan Undang-Undang Nomor 28 Tahun 2014 tentang Hak Cipta.” *Jurnal Pendidikan Tambusai* 6, no. 3 (2022): 13658–6378. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.31004/jptam.v6i3.4490>.
- Shelina, Theodora. “Hak Cipta Atas Lagu Yang Dihasilkan Artificial Intelligence: Kepemilikan Dan Pertanggungjawaban Atas Pelanggaran Dalam Regulasi Hak Cipta Indonesia.” *Arjuna* 6, no. 1 (2025): 64–76.
- Soelistyo, Henry. *Hak cipta tanpa hak moral*. 2011.
- Utami, Lili Sekararum, dan Subianta Mandala. *Aspek Legalitas Atas Hak Moral dan Hak Ekonomi dalam Pembuatan Musik Dari Generator Music AI*. t.t. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.59141/japendi.v6i7.8114>.
- “UU No. 28 Tahun 2014.” Diakses 9 Juli 2026. <https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/details/38690>.