

Original Article

# The Competitive Hegemony of Human and Artificial Intelligence in Music Creation: A Historical Inquiry in Creative Power

Seung Gyu Lim

Lecturer, Sangmyung University, Korea (seungkyu87@naver.com)

## ABSTRACT

**Objectives:** This study investigates how the authority over music creation has historically been shaped not by a linear evolution of musical styles or composers, but through power struggles among competing societal forces. It aims to redefine music creation as a space of hegemonic negotiation rather than as a purely artistic or individual endeavor. **Methods:** A qualitative literature review and historical analysis were conducted to trace the socio-political forces that have influenced the dominant agents in music creation. The study identifies five key historical phases—Church vs. Court, Monarchy vs. Aristocracy, State vs. Bourgeoisie, Capital vs. Artist, and Human vs. AI—to examine the shifting dynamics of creative power. **Results:** The analysis reveals that music creation has consistently reflected broader sociopolitical tensions, with authority over musical production shifting according to the dominant power structure of each era. From religious institutions and monarchies to modern capitalism and artificial intelligence, each force has contributed to redefining the locus of creative control. **Conclusions:** The study concludes that the future of music creation will likely not be determined by technological sophistication alone. Instead, cultural distinction, aesthetic identity, and symbolic influence are emerging as the new criteria for creative hegemony, suggesting that culture itself may become the dominant force in the next phase of musical power.

**Keywords:** Artificial Intelligence, Creative Subject, Hegemony, Music creation, Power Structure

Received 31 March 2025

Revised 21 April 2025

Accepted 22 April 2025

**Citation:** Lim SG. The Competitive Hegemony of Human and Artificial Intelligence in Music Creation: A Historical Inquiry in Creative Power.

The Journal of Transdisciplinary Studies. 2025; 9(1): 11-20.

<https://doi.org/10.22685/jts.2025.9.1.11>

**Copyright:** © 2025 by The Journal of Transdisciplinary Studies. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0>)

## 1. Introduction

Music has long functioned not merely as a form of artistic expression but as a domain closely intertwined with socio-political power throughout human history. It has consistently been created, circulated, and interpreted within particular social structures and value systems [1], with dominant powers in each historical period employing music as a medium through which to articulate and reinforce their ideologies and agendas. While conventional music historiography has tended to emphasize the stylistic evolution of music, technical innovations, and the achievements of prominent composers [2], comparatively little scholarly attention has been devoted to the power dynamics underpinning musical production or to the competitive relationships among creative agents.

Nevertheless, musical creation has invariably been situated within specific regimes of power [3], and the nature of those regimes has evolved continuously—from the Church and monarchy to the bourgeoisie, the nation-state, the individual artist, corporate entities, and most recently, artificial intelligence. Importantly, the creative agents of each era have not functioned as unitary authorities, but have emerged within competitive configurations of multiple forces. Through these contests, hegemonic power has been established—power capable of shaping musical forms, modes of distribution, aesthetic norms, and the social functions of music.

This study refrains from approaching the historical development of music as a linear succession of stylistic paradigms or generational shifts. Instead, it interrogates the configurations of hegemonic struggle in each historical

period, and how these dynamics have structured the authority and agency of musical creation. In doing so, the research conceptualizes music not as an autonomous cultural artifact, but as a product situated within broader sociopolitical interactions and power relations. Central to this investigation is the task of historically reconstructing the tension between creative autonomy and external forces of control.

Accordingly, this study poses the following key questions:

- Who held hegemonic authority in musical creation during each historical period, and through what competitive mechanisms was that authority established?
- How did musical forms and functions transform in response to shifts in power?
- With the emergence of artificial intelligence as a creative agent, how is the hegemony of music creation entering a new historical phase?

## 2. Research Methods

### 2.1. Overview of Research Methodology

Rather than framing the historical development of music creation as a linear evolution of musical styles or a narrative centered on canonical composers, this study focuses on the formation of hegemonic power over music creation through competitive structures among dominant power agents across different historical periods. To this end, the research employs a historical-interpretive methodology grounded in qualitative literature analysis [4,5].

The investigation proceeds along the following analytical trajectory:

First, it identifies and categorizes the prevailing sociopolitical powers of each era—from the medieval Church and royal courts to the modern State, bourgeoisie, capital, digital platforms, and Artificial Intelligence—as key agents in the control of music creation.

Second, based on documentary and secondary sources, it examines how these agents participated in competitive structures that influenced the authority and legitimacy of music creation.

Third, it analyzes how such competitive dynamics historically contributed to shifts in musical styles, compositional methods, distribution systems, and the conceptualization of the creative subject.

Fourth, through a case study of contemporary music production environments shaped by generative AI, the study explores how the emerging power struggle between human creators and Artificial Intelligence is reconfiguring the hegemonic landscape of music creation today.

This study adopts a qualitative and interpretive research orientation, aiming not at statistical generalization but at a critical reconstruction of the changing power configurations surrounding musical authorship. By tracing the historical interplay between creative agency and structural authority, the study seeks to illuminate the evolving relationship between music and sociopolitical power across both human and post-human contexts.

To ensure analytical consistency, this study selected historical cases based on the following three criteria: First, the presence of clearly identifiable power agents that influenced the structure of music creation, Second, significant shifts in the authority of the creative subject and the sociopolitical role of music, and Third, the availability of credible secondary literature offering historical, musicological, and sociological analysis.

Literature selection was conducted through a qualitative review of scholarly articles, historical monographs, and musicological studies published between 1990 and 2025, with particular emphasis on sources addressing the intersection of music and power. Key academic databases such as JSTOR, Web of Science, and DBpia were utilized in the process.

Furthermore, the historical periods delineated in this study were structured around the evolution of musical styles, following the periodization proposed in *A History of Western Music 1 & 2* by Heo Younghan et al. [6]. Accordingly, the Medieval-Renaissance period corresponds directly to traditional musicological categorizations. The Age of Absolutism primarily refers to the Baroque era, while the era of Civil Society encompasses both the Classical and Romantic periods, as well as other contemporaneous currents in musical creation. The Industrial Capital era includes the popularized musical forms that emerged after Modernism. Lastly, the Age of Artificial Intelligence refers to the present and emerging future, where music creation is increasingly shaped by technological agency.

Within each of these periods, the study examines representative figures, genres, and institutions to analyze how competitive power structures have influenced the conditions and forms of musical creation.

While this study presents a framework that analyzes each historical period through a binary opposition between two dominant powers in music creation, this approach is not intended to reduce the complexity of historical realities. In fact, each era witnessed a multiplicity of creative agents and layered structures of authority, with relationships far more intricate than any binary model could fully capture. For instance, late medieval music creation was not solely a matter of Church versus Court; it also involved monastic institutions, urban civic patronage, and regional

aristocracies. Likewise, in the era of industrial capital, the mainstream music industry coexisted with subcultural movements, working-class musicians, and grassroots digital communities.

Nevertheless, this study employs a dyadic model as an analytical device because the notion of *creative hegemony* inherently focuses on structures of concentrated control. In each historical period, creative power was rarely shared equally but rather monopolized—whether culturally, politically, or economically—by dominant agents who exerted authoritative influence over the production and legitimization of music. The opposing agent in each binary pair, then, is not meant to suggest a simplistic dichotomy, but rather to represent the principal counterforce that resisted or disrupted hegemonic control. As such, the binary structure is not a reductive simplification, but a heuristic tool that enables clearer insight into the ways in which creative authority was historically contested, consolidated, or redefined.

## 2.2. Definition of Core Concepts and Analytical Framework

### 2.2.1. Creative Subject

Traditionally, the creative subject in music has been conceptualized as the individual composer—an autonomous artist endowed with inspiration and originality [7]. However, in contemporary music production environments, creative agency is no longer confined to the composer alone. A diverse range of actors—including producers, performers, digital platforms, algorithms, and even audiences—now participate in and influence the processes of musical creation [8,9]. In this study, the term creative subject is redefined and expanded to encompass any entity that exercises creative authority within specific socio-cultural and technological conditions.

### 2.2.2. Power

Within the context of music creation, power does not solely denote political oppression or institutional control. Rather, it encompasses a broader range of structural forces that shape the direction, style, and conditions of creation, as well as the social positioning of the creative subject. Musical creation has historically been negotiated through interaction with such power structures [10], with specific forms of power functioning either as enablers or constraints on creative activity [11].

### 2.2.3. Hegemony

Drawing on Antonio Gramsci's framework, hegemony

in this study refers not to coercive force, but to a form of cultural dominance established through voluntary consent. Within the domain of music creation, hegemony manifests in the processes by which certain musical styles, genres, or modes of production are legitimized, while others are relegated to the margins. This hegemonic order is not static; rather, it is continually reshaped through tensions among competing power agents and functions as a mechanism for producing and reinforcing cultural norms [12,13].

### 2.2.4. Competitive Structure

Creative authority has rarely been monopolized by a single entity. Across historical periods, multiple power agents have vied for legitimacy and influence within the field of music creation. This study examines selected historical cases to analyze how such competitive structures have reshaped the conditions, processes, and formal characteristics of musical creation.

## 3. Results

Building upon the analytical framework established in the preceding sections, this part of the study offers a detailed examination of how competitive structures surrounding creative authority have been constructed and transformed in the context of music creation from the medieval period to the present. Each historical phase is analyzed through the lens of tensions and conflicts among dominant power agents, their impact on musical styles and social functions, and the evolving identity of the creative subject. The analysis further extends to the contemporary rise of Artificial Intelligence as a creative agent, which signals a critical inflection point in the ongoing reconfiguration of power dynamics within music creation.

### 3.1. The Medieval and Renaissance Periods: Church vs. Court

In medieval Europe, the Catholic Church maintained a near-total monopoly over music creation. Monophonic forms such as Gregorian chant were deemed sacred and governed strictly by ecclesiastical norms [14]. The Church exercised centralized control over music education, notation systems, and performance practices, positioning itself as the primary locus of cultural and creative authority.

Beginning in the 14th century, however, the rise of mercantile classes in Italian city-states and the diffusion of humanist thought fostered a growing secular patronage

**Table 1. Comparison of Church and Court Music During the Renaissance**

Category	Church Music	Court Music
Function	Religious ceremonies	Court events, Entertainment, Love songs
Style	Masses, Motets	Chansons, Madrigals, Frottolas
Lyrics	Latin	Vernacular
Musical Features	Restrained melodies, Emphasis on counterpoint, Limited harmony	Experimental harmony, Independent voice parts, Expressive emotions
Representative Figures	Josquin des Prez, Palestrina	Claudio Monteverdi, Luca Marenzio

of the arts. Influential families such as the Medici sponsored non-religious artistic production, while intellectuals like Erasmus and Pico della Mirandola emphasized human emotion and individual expression, prompting a shift in the cultural perception of music [15]. In response, the Church adopted polyphonic techniques and developed sophisticated forms such as the motet and the mass. Composers including Josquin des Prez and Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina established compositional styles marked by contrapuntal clarity, textual intelligibility, and formal balance.

During this transitional period, aristocratic courts emerged as new agents of musical creation. Under their patronage, troubadours and Minnesänger performed works on secular themes, and by the late Renaissance, court-sponsored music evolved into emotionally expressive and stylistically experimental genres such as the madrigal, chanson, and frottola. These were exemplified by composers such as Claudio Monteverdi, Luca Marenzio, Claudin de Sermisy, and Clément Janequin.

The period spanning the late medieval to Renaissance eras thus witnessed the emergence of a competitive structure between ecclesiastical and courtly powers. This rivalry instigated significant shifts in musical themes, forms, expressive techniques, and socio-cultural functions. While the Church pursued heightened aesthetic refinement to preserve its religious authority, the Court articulated secu-

lar values and cultural autonomy through the development of novel musical forms. This transformation marked the beginning of a gradual decentralization of creative hegemony and a weakening of the Church's exclusive control over musical production.

### 3.2. *The Age of Absolutism: Monarchy vs. Aristocracy*

In 17th-century Europe, the aftermath of religious wars and political instability gave rise to centralized absolutist monarchies, under which music became increasingly instrumentalized as a vehicle of state power. Nowhere was this more pronounced than in France, where the absolutist regime of Louis XIV strategically employed music to consolidate royal authority and construct a cohesive national image.

Louis XIV institutionalized the control of intellectual and cultural production through the establishment of royal academies, thereby integrating the arts, scholarship, and music into a centralized bureaucratic framework [16]. Within this context, Jean-Baptiste Lully developed the court opera as a performative embodiment of royal grandeur, which came to function as the state-sanctioned official musical form. Composers were repositioned not as autonomous creators but as administrative functionaries operating within the cultural machinery of the state [17].

**Table 2. Comparison of Royal and Aristocratic Music During the Age of Absolutism**

Category	Royal Music	Aristocratic Music
Function	Visualization and sonification of state power; political legitimation	Display of aristocratic refinement; expression of personal emotions and tastes
Style	National opera, orchestral music, ceremonial choruses, ballet music	Chamber music, small ensembles, arias, cantatas
Institutional Basis	State-controlled academies; court composers and performers	Private patronage by aristocrats
Musical Features	Authority, harmony, balance, order—embodiment of royal ideals	Delicacy, individuality, refined emotional expression; emphasis on subtle sentiment and diverse taste
Representative Figures	Jean-Baptiste Lully	Monteverdi, Scarlatti, Telemann, Henry Purcell

In contrast, non-absolutist regions such as England, Italy, and the German states maintained systems of aristocratic patronage that supported a more decentralized model of musical production. Salon-based chamber music flourished in these contexts, with composers including Claudio Monteverdi, Alessandro Scarlatti, Georg Philipp Telemann, and Henry Purcell contributing to its evolution. Within these aristocratic circles, music retained a degree of artistic autonomy and functioned primarily in the realms of sociability and entertainment, relatively insulated from direct political control [18].

In sum, while aristocratic music in non-absolutist societies continued to develop in continuity with Renaissance traditions, royal power—most notably in France—asserted hegemonic control over musical creation during the Age of Absolutism. The aristocratic patronage system was gradually subsumed into official state institutions, and music itself was transformed from a medium of personal or cultural expression into an apparatus for the visual and auditory projection of political power.

### 3.3. The Bourgeois Era: State vs. Civil Society

The French Revolution of 1789 fundamentally restructured the political and social order by disseminating the ideals of popular sovereignty, equality, and liberalism [19]. These transformations also reconfigured the power dynamics of music creation, giving rise to a new competitive structure between the state and emerging civil society. While Enlightenment thought emphasized reason and universalism, the rise of Romanticism foregrounded emotion, individuality, and creative autonomy, thereby establishing new models of the creative subject.

In this new sociopolitical context, the hegemonic authority over music creation—previously consolidated under absolutist monarchies—was redefined as a tension between state-centered ideological production and bourgeois-led artistic initiatives. On one hand, music aligned with state

power served nationalist agendas, as exemplified in the works of composers such as Hector Berlioz, Bedřich Smetana, Antonín Dvořák, and Pyotr Ilyich Tchaikovsky, who sought to articulate national identity, collective sentiment, and cultural unity through their compositions [20].

On the other hand, bourgeois musical production was supported through private patronage, voluntary cultural participation, and a growing public concert culture. The bourgeois class expanded its creative agency by disseminating music via print media, music education, and institutionalized performance venues. This enabled the emergence of art for art's sake, with composers such as Ludwig van Beethoven, Johannes Brahms, Felix Mendelssohn, Franz Schubert, Frédéric Chopin, and Robert Schumann representing the flourishing of autonomous musical expression. Instrumental music, in particular, achieved formal and structural maturity through genres such as the symphony, sonata, and chamber ensemble.

During this so-called Bourgeois Era, musical hegemony was no longer monopolized by a singular power but was instead formed within a complex interplay between state ideologies and bourgeois cultural authority. While differing in form and function, both forces shared underlying values of individual creativity and expressive freedom. This competitive structure of musical hegemony persisted throughout the 19th century, marking a significant phase in the historical evolution of creative power.

### 3.4. The Era of Industrial Capital and Digital Technology: Capital Power vs. Independent Artist

Since the late 19th century, the rise of industrial capital and technological innovation has fundamentally restructured the power dynamics of music creation, previously situated within the tension between the state and civil society. With the emergence of record labels, broadcasting companies, and later global entertainment conglomerates, the standards and value systems of music increasingly came under

**Table 3. Comparison of State-Centered and Bourgeois-Centered Music During the Bourgeois Era**

Category	State-Centered Music	Bourgeois-Centered Music
Function	Reinforcement of national identity; promotion of patriotism; dissemination of ideology; use in public ceremonies	Expression of personal emotion; pursuit of artistic autonomy; exploration of identity; emotional exchange
Style	Nationalist tone poems, marches, anthems; large-scale orchestral works; collective choruses	Lieder, symphonies, concertos, piano works, chamber music; autonomous forms
Institutional Basis	National conservatories, state theaters, state commissions	Public concerts, independent publishing, bourgeois patronage, salon culture
Musical Features	Grand, narrative, heroic sentiment; emphasis on communal values and historical narratives	Subjective emotions, delicate sentiment, individual structure; confessional and experimental tendencies
Representative Figures	Berlioz, Smetana, Dvořák, Tchaikovsky	Beethoven, Mendelssohn, Brahms, Schubert, Chopin, Schumann

**Table 4. Comparison of Capital-Powered and Independent Artist Music in the Era of Industrial Capital and Digital Technology**

Category	Capital-Powered Music	Independent Artist Music
Function	Reflecting mass taste; expanding market share; generating profit; commodification of music	Pursuing artistic autonomy; expressing social messages; experimental creation; articulating identity
Style	Repetitive, hook-centered choruses; short run-times; trend-based composition and arrangement; audiovisual stimulation; brand collaborations	Free structure; genre blending; emotion-focused; improvisation; emotional realism
Institutional Basis	Publishers, record labels, broadcasters, agencies; platforms (e.g., YouTube, Spotify, Apple Music)	Indie labels, home studio production, crowdfunding; promotion and distribution via social media
Musical Features	Trot, dance, pop, EDM, K-pop, etc.	Folk, hip-hop, soul, indie rock, bands, ambient, lo-fi, free jazz
Representative Figures	Michael Jackson, Max Martin, BTS, BLACKPINK	Billie Eilish, Bob Dylan, Brian Eno, The Black Skirts, Silica Gel

the control of capital-oriented institutions. Prioritizing commercial viability over artistic merit, this transformation gave rise to a producer-centered production model that displaced the composer and performer as the central creative agents—a structure that persists into the present. Capital-led music production came to dominate the global mainstream, as exemplified by industry-engineered figures such as Max Martin, BTS, and BLACKPINK [21].

Among such examples, Michael Jackson epitomized the capital-intensive superstar model, presenting a globally integrated entertainment system that combined music with visual media, concerts, merchandise, and mass communication. This commercial music model emphasized repetition and catchy hooks, optimizing musical content for maximum profit and broad market reach. In recent years, platform capitalism has further refined this structure by shaping music according to algorithmic visibility and exposure metrics. Creators are increasingly subsumed within the industrial logic of entertainment production, effectively functioning as laborers within the cultural economy.

In contrast to this system, the independent artist emerged as a counterforce in music creation. In response to commercial saturation, economic stratification, and sociocultural marginalization, these artists deliberately positioned themselves outside the mainstream. Their work appeals to niche audiences seeking authenticity and emotional resonance rather than market-oriented appeal. Often operating through small-scale distribution, self-managed labels, or DIY home studios [22,23], independent musicians rely heavily on digital platforms and social media for promotion and audience engagement. This model enables low-cost production and direct access to listeners without reliance on financial capital.

Notable cases include Billie Eilish and Finneas, who recorded “Ocean Eyes” in a home studio and initially released it via SoundCloud. In Korea, artists such as The Black

Skirts, Stella Jang, 10cm, and Silica Gel gained prominence through online platforms, with Silica Gel in particular leveraging visual media—timelines, motion graphics, and short-form videos—on Instagram and TikTok rather than traditional live performances.

The struggle for creative hegemony in this era thus unfolds as a contest between industrial capital and independent artistic agency. Nonetheless, the global music industry remains overwhelmingly dominated by capital power. While some independent artists—such as AKMU and Yerin Baek—eventually enter contracts with major agencies, many others continue to face long-term economic insecurity. In light of these structural asymmetries, it is reasonable to conclude that capital-led systems continue to hold hegemonic control over music creation in the age of industrial capitalism and digital media.

### 3.5. The Age of Artificial Intelligence: Human vs. AI

Recent advancements in artificial intelligence-based music generation technologies have accelerated the transformation of creative processes. It is now possible to produce high-quality music through simple text prompts, encompassing melody, lyrics, harmony, arrangement, vocal synthesis, and even post-production. These technological developments signal a paradigmatic shift in the structure of creative hegemony—one that had remained largely under the control of industrial capital since the 19th century—toward a new phase of competition.

Historically, the struggle for hegemonic power in music creation has unfolded among human agents, including religious institutions, monarchies, bourgeois publics, and capital-driven producers. In contrast, the current era marks the emergence of a competitive structure between human and non-human creative entities. As generative AI assumes an increasingly autonomous role in composition and pro-

duction, the field of music creation is entering a qualitatively different mode of contestation, in which human artistic agency is no longer the sole locus of creative authority.

### 3.5.1. *Evolution of AI Music Creation Technology and Its Active Involvement*

Music, as an art form structured through language-like elements such as rhythm, harmony, pattern, and repetition, has proven particularly amenable to machine learning applications [24]. Early experiments in algorithmic composition focused on replicating the styles of composers with highly codified formal structures—such as Bach and Mozart—thereby reinforcing the notion that music could be technically reproduced and even created without human involvement.

Historically, human creators have demonstrated a proactive engagement with technological tools. Devices such as loop machines, sequencers, digital audio workstations (DAWs), autotune, and samplers have long been integrated into creative workflows, illustrating that musical creation involves not only inspiration but also technological manipulation. In this respect, the incorporation of artificial intelligence represents a logical extension of this technocultural trajectory.

However, the rise of AI in music creation is not attributable to technological advancement alone. It is the product of multiple converging factors: the structural compatibility of music with algorithmic systems, the expansion of the digital ecosystem, industrial demands for speed and efficiency, and the willingness of creators to adopt new media technologies. In particular, the proliferation of platforms such as YouTube, TikTok, and OTT services has intensified the demand for background music that is repetitive, easily customizable, and free from copyright constraints—needs that traditional creative systems have struggled to meet.

In response, AI-based automation technologies have been rapidly adopted across various production contexts. Immune to emotional fatigue and capable of generating unlimited outputs, AI has emerged as an efficient alternative for industries seeking cost-effective and high-volume content generation.

Consequently, AI-generated music can no longer be regarded as a speculative or experimental phenomenon. It already functions as a practical and autonomous creative agent within specific industrial sectors. The fact that music entirely generated without human authorship is now actively consumed suggests that the foundational assumption—namely, that creation is an exclusively human activity—is undergoing fundamental redefinition.

### 3.5.2. *Dissolution of Creative Boundaries and the Emergence of a New Competitive Structure*

With the practical integration of AI music generation technologies, the boundary between human and machine-authored creation is increasingly becoming indeterminate. Whereas AI was once confined to auxiliary roles or partial automation, it now possesses the technical capacity to autonomously complete entire musical works. As a result, a substantive competitive relationship has emerged between human and non-human creative agents.

In practical contexts such as composition contests, music distribution, and commercial content production, AI-generated music is at times indistinguishable from human-created works—and in some instances, even evaluated more favorably. A notable case occurred in 2024 at the Glocal Future Education Expo hosted by the Jeollanam-do Office of Education, where a piece composed by an elementary school teacher using an AI tool was awarded first place. The judges reportedly did not recognize that the composition had been AI-generated, highlighting a symbolic moment in which machine-based creativity outperformed its human counterpart in a public institutional setting.

More recently, Suno AI has emerged as a platform capable of generating complete musical tracks—including melody, harmony, rhythm, lyrics, and vocals—from a single line of text input. Music produced through Suno is now actively utilized across platforms such as YouTube, TikTok, and SoundCloud, with some tracks reaching general streaming audiences without explicit labeling as AI-generated content. Furthermore, AI systems operate without emotional fatigue or physical limitation, producing content continuously and with greater temporal efficiency. These attributes offer significant advantages in sectors that demand rapid, high-volume production, such as background music for video content, advertisements, and short-form social media media.

These developments signal a critical inflection point: the human creator no longer holds a decisive upper hand in the domain of musical authorship. The struggle for creative hegemony has thus entered a new epoch, no longer confined to intra-human competition but extended to non-biological agents that had previously existed outside the conceptual boundaries of creative subjectivity. Humanity now faces an unprecedented cultural and civilizational challenge—namely, the contest for creative dominance against artificially intelligent entities capable of autonomous artistic production.

Although AI-generated music technology remains in its early stages, and most publicly accessible generative models are still in prototype form, a growing body of research has actively investigated audience responses to AI-com-

posed music. Numerous studies indicate that listeners generally exhibit negative perceptions of AI-generated music. Even when the technical quality of AI-created music is comparable to that of human composed works, listeners often perceive it as lacking expressive depth [25]. or as threatening human authorship and cultural imagination leading to a sense that such music is "uncomfortable to listen to" [26].

Moreover, audience responses have demonstrated negative evaluations of AI-generated music even when listeners were unaware of the work's authorship. Studies have shown that listeners tend to distrust the creative credibility of AI composers regardless of contextual framing [27]. While it is difficult to predict how long such perceptions will persist, it is conceivable that public attitudes may shift dramatically if AI systems reach a level of deep learning capable of replicating human level expressivity.

Supporting this possibility, recent studies suggest that listeners' positive expectations regarding the emotional and aesthetic potential of AI music can significantly increase their willingness to accept and engage with such works [28]. These findings highlight the dynamic and potentially reversible nature of public perception regarding AI-generated music.

### 3.5.3. Shared Creative Power and Human-AI Collaboration

As artificial intelligence begins to challenge human creative subjectivity and establish itself as a competing agent, a growing number of creators are exploring the potential for collaborative authorship between humans and AI. Rather than positioning AI solely as a technological threat or instrumental tool, these creators seek to integrate it as a co-creative subject, thereby signaling a paradigm shift in how creative power is conceived, distributed, and exercised.

One notable example is American musician Holly Herndon's collaboration with an AI entity named Spawn, which was trained on her own vocal data. The resulting album, *PROTO*, redefined the boundaries of authorship by treating the digital voice as an integral member of a collective creative community alongside the human voice. Similarly, composer David Cope's development of EMI (Experiments in Musical Intelligence)—a system capable of analyzing the stylistic patterns of human composers and generating new works in their likeness—complicates the distinction between human originality and machine reproduction.

AI is also enabling creative outcomes previously unattainable through human capacities alone. In 2020, South Korean broadcaster SBS utilized AI voice synthesis technol-

ogy to reconstruct the voice of the late Kim Kwang-seok, allowing him to "perform" a song he had never recorded during his lifetime. Likewise, Mnet's project *AI Again* reanimated the voice and presence of the late artist Turtleman through a combination of vocal AI and holographic representation. Such examples illustrate AI's potential not only as a generative agent but also as a medium for cultural restoration and emotional re-engagement.

These developments suggest that AI need not function merely as a substitute for human creativity, but rather as a partner that expands its boundaries. In this context, creative hegemony can no longer be understood as grounded solely in the biological human subject; instead, it now operates within a technologically mediated environment where voice, memory, and even emotion are subject to computational reconstruction. This indicates a fundamental reconfiguration of the creative subject—not as a fixed identity, but as a fluid and distributed presence within collaborative networks. Moving forward, the discourse on creative hegemony may shift from a zero-sum struggle to one centered on the governance, negotiation, and distribution of creative agency across human and non-human actors.

## 4. Conclusion

This study has approached the historical development of music creation not as a linear narrative of stylistic evolution or a chronology of canonical composers, but as a series of competitive structures among power agents that have shaped the contours of creative hegemony. From the Church and Court of the medieval period to the State and Civil Society of the modern era, from capital-driven industries and digital platforms to individual creators and, most recently, artificial intelligence, the act of music creation has consistently unfolded within tensions with prevailing structures of power.

In every historical phase, authority over musical creation was not monopolized by a singular agent but emerged through struggles among multiple, often competing, forces. These struggles have had profound implications for the evolution of musical styles, modes of distribution, functional purposes, and audience reception. In particular, the contemporary rise of AI-based creative technologies poses a fundamental challenge to the historically exclusive status of the human as the creative subject. This development signals not only the fragmentation of human-centered authorship but also a broader decentralization of creative power toward non-human entities.

By shifting the analytical lens from aesthetic progress to power-centered historical dynamics, this study re-

contextualizes music history as an ongoing negotiation between artistic agency and structural authority. In doing so, it raises critical questions regarding subjectivity, legitimacy, and the ethics of creation—not merely to reinterpret the past, but to offer a conceptual foundation for anticipating the future of creativity.

Nonetheless, the study has several limitations. It does not engage with the stylistic microstructures of musical genres, nor does it account for regional or cultural specificities. Moreover, the legal, institutional, and ethical challenges posed by AI-generated creativity remain largely unexplored within this framework. Future research must adopt a more interdisciplinary approach, incorporating inquiries into the evolving status of creative subjects, copyright and governance systems, and the ethical frameworks of audience reception.

Above all, this study underscores that the hegemony of music creation has never been confined solely to the artistic domain. Rather, it has developed in dynamic interaction with the dominant powers of each era—be they religious, political, economic, or technological. These forces have shaped not only the production and consumption of music but also the very criteria by which creativity is legitimized. As technological capabilities approach functional parity with human creativity, the locus of future power is likely to shift from technology to culture. In a post-functional landscape, values that remain uniquely human—such as identity, imagination, affect, and symbolic meaning—will assume heightened significance.

In this context, those creative agents who possess cultural sensitivity, symbolic depth, and inner distinctiveness will emerge as central figures in the reconfiguration of creative hegemony. Music creation, therefore, must now be understood not merely as a productive activity, but as a philosophical and social inquiry into the nature of human subjectivity and creative legitimacy. It is precisely this inquiry that will define the starting point for reimagining where and by whom the future hegemony of music creation will be shaped.

Moreover, as artificial intelligence emerges not only as a technological competitor but also as a potential creative collaborator, the nature of power relations in music creation is likely to become increasingly networked, fluid, and co-constitutive. Rather than viewing the human-AI relationship as a zero-sum struggle, future inquiries must explore models of co-authorship and hybrid agency that reflect the distributed nature of creativity in post-human contexts. This shift calls for a more refined theoretical framework—one capable of capturing the layered, dynamic, and sometimes paradoxical interactions that define the evolving landscape of creative hegemony.

## Conflicts Interest

No author has any other conflict of interest to declare.

## Funding

No funding was received for this study.

## Author Contributions

The author was solely responsible for the conception and design of the study, literature review, analysis of historical and contemporary data, drafting, and revising of the manuscript.

## ORCID

<https://orcid.org/0009-0004-3684-6136>

## References

1. Cross S. The enduring culture and limits of political song. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*. 2017;4(1):1371102. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2017.1371102>
2. Won YJ. Revisiting the history of 1970s popular music: A proposal for comprehensive reassessment. *Journal of Popular Narrative Studies*. 2025;31(1):427–470. <https://doi.org/10.18856/jpn.2025.31.1.011>
3. Kwon DH. Industrial folksong and the popular music in modern era. *Tongyang Ŭmak*. 2014;36:167–223.
4. Kim HY. A study on the qualitative data analysis of Korean education research. *The Education of Korean Language*. 2014;147(0):377–405.
5. Putri AA, Nurjihana F, Tarigan RCB Br, Febriana I. The pengembangan teks laporan penelitian dalam penyusunan historiografi sejarah. *Kohesi*. 2024;5(1): 15–28. <https://doi.org/10.57094/kohesi.v5i1.1653>
6. Heo Y, Kim M, Park M, Joo D, Kwon S, Lee S, Shin I. A history of Western music 1. Seoul: Simseoldang; 2009:15–276.
7. Irvine IJ, Strahan BJ. Creativity and the construction of self: Implications for music. *New Mexico(Albuquerque): Association for the Study of Higher Education Annual Meeting*; 1997: 133.
8. Hsueh S, Fdili Alaoui S, Mackay WE. Deconstructing creativity: Non-linear processes and fluid roles in contemporary music and dance. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction* 2019;3(203):21. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3359305>
9. Foxwell I, Knox D. Composing with algorithms: two novel generative composition tools. *Audio Mostly*

- Conference. 2012:76-81. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2371456.2371468>
10. Sawyer RK, Henriksen D. The sociology of creativity. In: Sawyer RK, Henriksen D. *Explaining Creativity: The Science of Human Innovation*. 3rd ed. New York: Oxford Academic; 2023. p. 227-246 <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780197747537.003.0011>
  11. Pascu CE. Creativity and censorship in music: 'Like the Danube carving through a mountain, it produces wonders' - A dialogue with Adrian Pop. *Studia Universitatis Babeş-Bolyai*. 2024;9-20. <https://doi.org/10.24193/subbmusica.2024.2.01>
  12. Lee HK. Tradition, nationalism, and locality: A study on identity discourses in Korean contemporary music. *Journal of Society for Music and Reality*. 2020;59(0):5-34. <https://doi.org/10.35441/MNK.59.2.1.5>
  13. Herciu M. The competitiveness of national economies in their struggle for power supremacy. *Studies in Business and Economics*. 2007;2(2):16-29.
  14. Park ES. Toward a new theoretical view of centonization in Gregorian chant, the tract. *Journal of Ewha Music Research Institute*. 2002;6(0):31-75.
  15. Carr D. Music, meaning, and emotion. *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*. 2004;62(3):225-234. <https://doi.org/10.1111/J.0021-8529.2004.00155.X>
  16. Clarke JA. Abbe Jean-Paul Bignon "Moderator of the Academies" and Royal Librarian. *French Historical Studies*. 1973;8(2):213. <https://doi.org/10.2307/285925>
  17. Park HT. A study on Jean Baptiste Lully's world. *The Korean Journal of Dance*. 1998;23(0):201-220
  18. Kwon ST. 'Le bon goût' and 'Les goûts réunis' in French Baroque music: Regional, political, and generational conflict. *Journal of the Science and Practice of Music*. 2022;47(0):91-119. <https://doi.org/10.36944/JSPM.2022.04.47.91>
  19. Woloch I. The new regime: Transformations of the French civic order, 1789-1820s. *Contemporary Sociology*. 1995;24(2):196. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2076857>
  20. Kim HJ. The interaction of nationalism and cosmopolitanism in the 19th century: The case of 'Hungarian' music. *Journal of the Musicological Society of Korea*. 2024;27(2):41-71. <https://doi.org/10.16939/JMSK.2024.27.2.41>
  21. Lee SY, Chang MH. Analysis of global success factors of K-pop music. *Journal of the Korea Entertainment Industry Association*. 2019;13(4):1-15. <https://doi.org/10.21184/jkeia.2019.6.13.4.1>
  22. Kim CH. Proposal for the development of indie music using YouTube personal channel: Focusing on indie music channel. *Korean Journal of Popular Music*. 2020;25:71-110. <https://doi.org/10.36775/kjpm.2020.25.71>
  23. Lim SG, Chang MH. Necessity of strengthening sound engineering competency for popular music composers. *Journal of the Korea Entertainment Industry Association*. 2022;16(2):41-56. <https://doi.org/10.21184/jkeia.2022.2.16.2.41>
  24. Gioti AM. Artificial intelligence for music composition. In: Miranda ER, editor. *Handbook of artificial intelligence for music: Foundations, advanced approaches, and developments for creativity*. Cham: Springer; 2021:53-73. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-72116-9\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-72116-9_3)
  25. White CW. Listeners consider AI-made music less expressive than near-identical human-made content. *Berkeley Program in Law & Economics*. 2024;156(4\_Supplement):A11. <https://doi.org/10.1121/10.0034929>
  26. Rubinstein Y. Uneasy listening: Towards a hauntology of AI-generated music. *Resonance*. 2020;1(1):77-93. <https://doi.org/10.1525/RES.2020.1.1.77>
  27. Moura FT, Maw C. Artificial intelligence became Beethoven: How do listeners and music professionals perceive artificially composed music? *Journal of Consumer Marketing*. 2021;38(2):137-146. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JCM-02-2020-3671>
  28. Lee JP. The impact of perceived risk to AI music on the general public's music listening behavioral intention: Using extended MGB model. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Convergent Research Interchange*. 2024;10(9):505-514. <https://doi.org/10.47116/apjcri.2024.09.40>