



The Miyazaki Paradox: AI Art Vs. Human Creativity: Where Do We Draw The Line?

KALPANA KUMARI

STUDENT AT AMITY UNIVERSITY PATNA

Abstract

The ethical ramifications of AI and digital tools' ability to alter artistic styles, or, to put it simply, the quick and rapid rise of advanced software and its potential moral consequences, have put artistic creations like Studio Ghibli's popular artwork and stories at risk of being fully consumed by the general public in a matter of minutes. Unquestionably, software can repeat itself in any kind of art, particularly in the modern digital environment. However, the question remains whether it can substitute the human drama's philosophical currents and emotional touch, which are unique to Hayao Miyazaki's storytelling style.

Miyazaki's actual artwork is trending throughout the entire technology sector. The concern is whether AI can replace the uniqueness of genuine art forms and their copyrights, even though it is undeniable that AI and digital technologies can replicate any style of art. A more balanced approach is recommended in the paper's conclusion, including the adoption of digital ethical principles, stringent intellectual property laws, and respect for the originality of artistic creations. Instead of eradicating such a distinctive art style, the most crucial thing is to honor and promote Studio Ghibli's conventional human art depiction.

Keywords: digital art, AI tools, creativity, technology, intellectual property rights, copyright law, fair use doctrine, cultural heritage protection, Hayao Miyazaki, Studio Ghibli, and technology.ⁱ

INTRODUCTION :

ⁱⁱSince the beginning of time, people of all ages have been enthralled with the mystical, charming, and endearing world that Studio Ghibli brought and that the ultimate legend Hayao Miyazaki developed and crafted. The finest illustration of creative temperament can be found in the quantity of human expressions, feelings, and humility that it carries toward the internal and exterior ties of humanity, as elegantly displayed through such arts.

This essay investigates whether strict copyright enforcement inhibits or encourages creativity, how Studio Ghibli handles the nexus between artistic borrowing and copyright protection, and the effects of their strategy on worldwide storytelling. In the end, this study contends that the "Ghibli Effect" calls into question established ideas of art ownership and emphasizes the necessity of a fair copyright policy in the creative sectors. Introduction Hayao Miyazaki and Isao Takahata formed Studio Ghibli, which has grown to be a major force in animation worldwide, inspiring many generations of artists and storytellers.ⁱⁱⁱ

The replacement of human artistic emotions with artificial intelligence (AI) and technical artwork, as well as its supremacy in such domains of human imagination creation, is the most troubling question that emerges in the modern technological world. In addition to raising serious concerns regarding copyright law, this confrontation between AI and Ghibli's original human artwork has also been interpreted as a violation on artistic feelings and cultural legacy.^{iv}

Ghibli movies, such as *Spirited Away* (2001), *Howl's Moving Castle* (2004), and *My Neighbor Totoro* (1988), frequently incorporate elements of mythology, folklore, and classic literature while retaining their unique voices. The question of where intellectual property enforcement starts and where creative inspiration ends is brought up by this situation. The Ghibli Effect draws attention to the intricate conflict that exists in the contemporary media landscape between cultural appropriation and copyright protection.^v

The Moral and Ethical Aspect: Is It Possible for Technology to Fully Capture Ghibli Art's Soul and Heart?

The Miyazaki art form has brought attention to the most significant subject that humanity has ever interpreted: will technology eventually supplant humans? Although it is undeniable that digital and technological tools can replicate the visual and thematic representation of Ghibli's artwork, the primary issue with these AI-generated materials is that they lack the human expression, empathy, and the complexities of interpersonal relationships that are so masterfully and iconically depicted in the Ghibli film.

The emotional frequency viability and authenticity of accountability that come from real-life experiences, personal problems, and human emotions are frequently overlooked by artificial intelligence (AI) or digitally interpreted forms of narrative. It is frequently noted that artists incorporate intangible aspects of life, such as memories, cultural history, and philosophical viewpoints, into their work, giving it a soul. The subtleties and emotions of human sensibility, the spontaneity of creative inspiration, or the cultural depth ingrained in a piece of art, on the other hand, cannot be captured or maintained by technology, but it can interpret design and style alterations in key qualities.

It is true that such technology advancements and changes erase the long-standing and traditional history of creating such a lovely art form. Undoubtedly, AI and digital tools can replace the uniqueness of such a beautiful art form. Hayao Miyazaki's lifetime achievement is the warm and lovely cinematographic representation of a beautifully portrayed art in such a demographic manner of soft and delicate human emotions.^{vi}

• THE NEED FOR ETHICAL DEBATE ABOUT GHIBLI AI ART AND THE FIGHT FOR ARTISTIC AUTHENTICITY:

International copyright systems, like the Berne Convention, require that authors give their permission before their creations can be copied or altered. Legal accusations for infringement may surface if AI models use copyrighted content without permission or payment. Since no copyright rules in the world were initially formed to cover AI-generated works, the validity of AI-generated art is still up for debate. Therefore, the following are some major legal issues with AI-generated works:

• Is content produced by AI considered a derivative work?

The degree to which AI-generated content resembles previously published copyrighted content and the laws governing copyright protection will determine whether or not it qualifies as a derivative work. Any work that is "recast, transformed, or adapted" from an original work is considered a derivative work under the U.S. Copyright Act. An AI-generated image may be deemed an unauthorized derivative work, which gives copyright holders exclusive rights, if it closely resembles a copyrighted work, such as Studio Ghibli's distinctive artistic style, and was created using training data containing copyrighted materials without authorization.

• Is it possible for copyright laws to protect an artist's distinctive style?

The idea expression dichotomy states that the copyright protects the way an idea is expressed but not the concept itself. This implies that although a particular piece of art (such a painting or illustration) is protected by copyright, the larger artistic movement or method that produced it is not. Since doing so would impede creative freedom and innovation, courts worldwide have repeatedly held that methods, techniques, and artistic approaches are not covered by copyright protection. However, an AI-generated work can violate copyright if it closely mimics original copyrighted material, including particular characters, melodies, or eye-catching visual patterns.

AI is unlikely to be regarded as an infringement if it only mimics a general style without replicating certain protected features. However, an AI-generated piece may face legal action if it significantly resembles an artist's copyrighted works, particularly if it is utilized for profit.

Literature Review

The legal limits of AI-generated art are examined in a number of current studies, particularly with relation to copyright and fair use. There are ownership disputes because the current copyright legislation, which was created a long time ago, makes only passing reference to AI authorship. Human emotions and touch are absent from the computer version of the original works. Although the literature discusses the issues that mostly stem from legal and ethical concerns, there aren't many studies that clearly show how AI affects productions like Studio Ghibli. In an attempt to close these gaps, this article evaluates the relationship between copyright regulations and artistic integrity and AI-generated artistic duplication of original works.

- **When training models on copyrighted works, should AI businesses be forced to get licenses or pay compensation?**

One of the most important legal and ethical issues is whether AI businesses should be forced to pay for or get licenses when training models on intellectual works. Copyright holders have the sole authority to generate derivative works, distribute them, and reproduce them under the present copyright legislation. Unless it is "fair use," copyright infringement may occur if AI companies use copyrighted materials without permission. The fair use doctrine takes into account a number of considerations, including the type of the copyrighted work, the amount and substantiality of the portion used, the purpose and character of the use, and the impact on the market.

AI firms frequently contest the idea that using copyrighted works to train models is transformative and qualifies as fair use. Licenses for AI training are already being required in several areas. Text and data mining are allowed by the EU's Copyright Directive, but copyright holders have the option to opt out, thus AI businesses must essentially request permission. On the other hand, there are currently no explicit rules regarding AI training under US copyright law.

In the event the courts decide against AI companies, they might have to pay royalties to copyright holders or secure licenses, just like streaming services do for musicians. On the other hand, AI companies may continue to use copyrighted materials without paying for them directly if their outputs are deemed to be sufficiently transformative. Although the legal situation is still unclear, future rules will probably make clearer what AI developers must do with regard to copyrighted content.^{vii}

Social media platforms have recently been inundated with thousands of artificial intelligence (AI)-generated graphics that mimic the Studio Ghibli aesthetic. Tools like ChatGPT and Grok, which can turn any photograph into dreamlike scenarios with delicate hues and ethereal landscapes, reminiscent of great works like Spirited Away or My Neighbor Totoro, have been the driving force behind this movement. This kind of information has even been advocated by OpenAI CEO Sam Altman.

Although the studio's founder, Hayao Miyazaki, has not specifically addressed this new generation of AI-generated visuals, he has expressed his disapproval of the technology in the artistic realm on multiple occasions. According to Miyazaki, AI-generated art is soulless and depletes the human creative process; in other words, art ought to originate from the author's soul rather than from algorithms.

There are various issues with this situation from a legal perspective. The works that embody an artist's "style" are protected by intellectual property law, but the artist's "style" itself is not. The Berne Convention, which regulates copyright globally, states that permission from the work's owner is necessary before a work can be reproduced, altered, or transformed. An infringement might occur if AI models were trained on Ghibli's copyrighted imagery without permission.^{viii}

AI Dominance: A Legal Minefield or a Technical Achievement?

With its rapid developments, particularly in the area of technology, the modern world is undoubtedly a marvel of human achievement, but does it also pose a threat? The actual question that requires an answer is that one. While technical improvisation in content editing is a time-saver, does it really lack the human empathy and emotional sensitivity that a typical human being carries with him throughout his life? That is another matter of grave concern that both AI and humankind are facing criticism about. The recent software development to edit and create images of Ghibli Studio art is one such example where technology and mankind are currently facing trials of human emotions. It is indeed a matter of fact that artists in such a field will be worried about their years and lifetime of practice and dedication towards their beloved work in which they have given their entire existence to be just produced to users within a fraction of a second. Such an exercise of an act in legal terms is a mere copyright infringement.^{ix}

Copyright Issues: Digital Art's Legal Line of Control

Artists original, distinctive, and imaginative creations are safeguarded by the Copyright Law and Intellectual Property Rights. It asserts that they are the only owners of them and that no third party may violate those rights. Any digital output that bears a striking resemblance to cartoon plots, characters, or visual styles may be subject to trial. Unauthorized adaptations of the artist's original works or derivatives by other parties are expressly forbidden by the Copyright Law. It violates Ghibli Studios' copyright since the artwork was produced and altered using technological or software methods that closely resemble their distinctive intellectual property rights.

Another problem with Ghibli's art's legal bounds is that critics have developed or expressed the view that it does not violate intellectual property rights because it transforms novel, distinctive, and unique content. It is a fair use, to put it simply. The degree of originality, the work's intent, and its effect on the market are some of the elements that the Honorable Courts take into account when evaluating the Doctrine of Fair Use. While it is true that some digitally or software-created content may be viewed as creative reinterpretations, it is also important to remember that copyright or intellectual property rights will be violated if the content is too similar to its original work or lacks originality.^x

The true question is who owns these digital pieces of information, as digital and technology instruments themselves have advanced, or, to put it simply, gotten more sophisticated. Is it the program developer, the creator, or nobody? In many nations, this matter is not resolved until court cases are conducted.

Only human creators are granted sole ownership under the traditional laws governing copyright claims and intellectual property rights; the true problem arises with AI-generated work and its responsibility. Any artist who produces Ghibli-inspired or Ghibli-style content using digital or technical instruments may be identified as a copyright holder. In actuality, though, ownership issues occur if AI or an algorithm makes a substantial contribution to the creative or innovative process.

Any artist who produces Ghibli-inspired or Ghibli-style content using digital or technical instruments may be identified as a copyright holder. In actuality, though, ownership issues occur if AI or an algorithm makes a substantial contribution to the creative or innovative process.

Scholars and experts with extensive knowledge of the legal underpinnings of technology law have made numerous criticisms, arguing that some jurisdictions consider and acknowledge to a greater extent that software developers are the true owners. On the other hand, other experts make similar arguments and hold the opinion that all content produced and generated by artificial intelligence should be in the public domain. Weak legal bounds resulting from recent developments in AI copyrights leave artists, developers, and legal professionals perplexed and constrained by shaky legal norms and rights of their digital authorship.

Copyright Violations and Their Repercussions

Serious concerns regarding copyright infringement have been highlighted by the growing use of AI in many industries and its dependence, particularly in the context of creating art. When the outcomes closely resemble a legendary person's actual artistic creations. All of the AI-generated outcomes in the Studio Ghibli scenario bear a striking resemblance to the original aesthetics and tenor of Hayao Miyazaki's works. Since the goal of copyright law is to safeguard original works, any unapproved copies of the original artwork may expose the creators to fines, content removal requirements, and reputational damage.

The dilemma of who is responsible for the infringement—the person who developed the program, the user who is producing the content, or the AI itself—occurs when AI content almost replicates the original artwork. Since there are now no particular copyright rules that clearly outline the history of copyright infringement, the entire situation is subject to a hazy trial. However, before determining whether an AI-generated work is eligible for the fair use doctrine, courts often consider how much the original material is altered.^{xi}

The Nintendo case

Large-scale copyright laws have typically consolidated power in the hands of major media corporations rather than benefiting smaller creators. This group might unintentionally strengthen the legal and economic systems they normally criticize in their efforts to stop the spread of generative AI. Consider the Nintendo scenario, for instance. The well-known ROM-hosting websites LoveROMS.com and LoveRETRO.co were sued by the corporation in 2018 for allegedly engaging in "brazen and mass-scale infringement" of its intellectual property rights. It is important to remember that these featured game ROMs that were no longer sold commercially. The owners agreed to pay \$12 million in damages (a symbolic amount) as part of the out-of-court settlement, and both websites were taken down permanently and replaced with legal takedown notices.

As planned, the case reinforced the impression that even archival or non-commercial distribution of older games would not be allowed, sending a frightening message throughout the ROM preservation and emulation communities.

Furthermore, it is generally accepted that Apple blocked emulator apps from the App Store until very recently because of worries about possible copyright infringement and Nintendo lawsuits. Apple first started to loosen its regulations after the Digital Markets Act (DMA) of the European Union went into force, mandating that the company let third-party app stores for iOS devices. Emulators soon became popular in these other app shops, forcing Apple to change its rules in order to remain competitive.^{xii}

Political support

The larger lesson is not just about technical advancement or stasis, but also about how rapidly institutional focus, state interest, and money can unite behind a single paradigm and how fast that support may dissipate when expectations are not fulfilled. We are already seeing a comparable surge of international funding and political support due to the explosive growth of Large Language Models (LLMs) and generative image technologies. The dominant discourse portrays this as an essential route to the development of Artificial General Intelligence (AGI) or possibly Superintelligence (the phrases have no universally accepted definition).

In light of this, addressing the financial and environmental consequences of generative AI is not just morally required, but also practically necessary. The onus of increasing efficiency falls not only on cutting-edge AI laboratories like OpenAI but also on the larger ecosystem, which includes semiconductor companies, cloud infrastructure providers, and GPU manufacturers. There are already signs of infrastructure strain: several posts by Sam Altman on X and the implementation of rate limitations on OpenAI's picture creation models imply that present demand is outpacing the hardware's operational capability.

The industry will be severely impacted if these systems continue to have excessive energy requirements and prohibitive operating expenses. By its very nature, investment capital looks for efficiency and return.

Frontier AI businesses run the risk of losing investors if they are unable to cut expenses or show scalable routes to revenue. Such circumstances have the potential to swiftly erode institutional trust and funding, as demonstrated in previous technological cycles.^{xiii}

Methodology

This entire document attempts, to the best of its ability, to illustrate and emphasize an active approach to the repercussions and ultimate outcomes of using AI mindlessly. Understanding the application of copyright laws, fair use principles, and intellectual property rights to AI-generated art is its primary goal. This is especially true when it comes to references drawn from culturally significant forms of works, such as those created by Studio Ghibli.

In order to prevent future problems and understanding regarding copyright infringement, the research also considers legal regulations and the necessity of adopting more structured legislation. The goal of this specific study on copyright infringement interpretation has also been to avoid restricting it to its legal ramifications. A bare attempt has also been made to examine in detail the loss of the original, incredibly touching art form that was brought about by the renowned Hayao Miyazaki. The entire civilization will be at serious risk from future interpretations and replications of such works of great art.

The study also attempts to adopt a comprehensive approach by examining the current legal frameworks and the issue of whether they are adequate to protect people's rights in the modern world of rapidly evolving technology, including international copyright agreements such as the Berne Convention and court decisions regarding works produced by artificial intelligence.^{xiv}

THE AREA OF GREY

The quick growth of artificial intelligence has created difficult legal issues and sparked debate over whether the current copyright system is sufficient to handle these changes. Particularly, under conventional copyright regulations, AI-generated output in the creative sector raises serious concerns about ownership, uniqueness, and infringement.

Because the existing laws do not specifically cover these situations, there is legal ambiguity that raises the possibility of infringement and abuse in this rapidly changing artificial intelligence environment. The ambiguity and uncertainty in current laws and court rulings are reflected in the "grey area" that exists at the nexus between AI technology and Indian copyright law.

Because AI lacks legal personality and is not considered an author, the traditional copyright frameworks, which are based on the ideas of human authorship and creativity, are ill-equipped to fully handle the issues presented by AI-generated content. As a result, this gray area makes it more difficult to enforce and defend intellectual property rights.

Significant ethical and legal issues are also raised by the common practice of using enormous datasets—which may contain copyrighted and licensed content—to train AI models without first acquiring express permissions or authorizations. Existing theories, however, find it difficult to accommodate the novel nature of AI-generated works, and proving such infractions is still difficult from a legal and technical standpoint.

In addition to harming copyright holders, this ambiguity puts the creative industries at risk for wider issues including market displacement and a weakened sense of authenticity for these artistic creations. To provide clear rules controlling the extent of AI-generated creative works under copyright law, substantial legislative reform and judicial clarification are urgently needed in light of the aforementioned difficulties. The goal of these reformative initiatives should be to achieve a balance between protecting the integrity and authenticity of the creative sector and encouraging technological innovation. Stakeholders must proceed cautiously in this gray area until such clarity is obtained, keeping in mind the ethical ramifications of using AI in creative processes as well as the common legal ambiguities.^{xv}

i <https://www.vintagelegalvl.com/post/the-future-of-miyazaki-art-can-ai-capture-the-soul-of-ghibli-magic-without-infringing-ip-rights>

ii <https://www.vintagelegalvl.com/post/the-future-of-miyazaki-art-can-ai-capture-the-soul-of-ghibli-magic-without-infringing-ip-rights>

iii <https://www.ijfmr.com/papers/2025/2/40851.pdf>

iv <https://www.vintagelegalvl.com/post/the-future-of-miyazaki-art-can-ai-capture-the-soul-of-ghibli-magic-without-infringing-ip-rights>

v <https://www.ijfmr.com/papers/2025/2/40851.pdf>

vi <https://www.vintagelegalvl.com/post/the-future-of-miyazaki-art-can-ai-capture-the-soul-of-ghibli-magic-without-infringing-ip-rights>

vii <https://www.theippress.com/2025/03/31/ghibli-ai-art-and-copyright-the-copyright-dilemma-of-ghibli-style-creations-and-the-looming-legal-battles-ahead/>

viii https://intellectual-property-helpdesk.ec.europa.eu/news-events/news/studio-ghibli-vs-ai-tribute-or-copyright-infringement-2025-04-15_en

ix <https://www.vintagelegalvl.com/post/the-future-of-miyazaki-art-can-ai-capture-the-soul-of-ghibli-magic-without-infringing-ip-rights>

x <https://www.vintagelegalvl.com/post/the-future-of-miyazaki-art-can-ai-capture-the-soul-of-ghibli-magic-without-infringing-ip-rights>

xi <https://www.vintagelegalvl.com/post/the-future-of-miyazaki-art-can-ai-capture-the-soul-of-ghibli-magic-without-infringing-ip-rights>

xii <https://frontline.thehindu.com/science-and-technology/ghibli-ai-art-generated-images-moral-panic-copyright/article69411983.ece>

xiii <https://frontline.thehindu.com/science-and-technology/ghibli-ai-art-generated-images-moral-panic-copyright/article69411983.ece>

xiv <https://www.vintagelegalvl.com/post/the-future-of-miyazaki-art-can-ai-capture-the-soul-of-ghibli-magic-without-infringing-ip-rights>

xv <https://ijlmh.com/wp-content/uploads/Studio-Ghibli-and-the-Copyright-Conundrum-Indian-Copyright-Law-Perspective-on-AI-Generated-Art.pdf>