

# Fundamental questions on art and AI

THE accelerating power of artificial intelligence to generate creative content is forcing us to confront fundamental questions about art, originality and the future of human creativity.

The recent viral wave of AI-generated images mimicking Studio Ghibli's iconic style, facilitated by tools like ChatGPT, serves as a vivid, and perhaps unsettling, example of this burgeoning reality.

The public fascination was undeniable, showcasing AI's impressive ability to replicate a deeply loved aesthetic. But it immediately sparked debate.

For many artists and admirers, including figures like Ghibli's Hayao Miyazaki who values the human touch, seeing a unique style reproduced algorithmically feels inherently problematic.

It raises crucial questions about copyright infringement through AI training data, the potential dilution of distinct artistic voices, and where homage ends and imitation begins.

Arguments that new technologies always face initial resistance, and eventually become accepted tools, certainly hold historical weight. Digital tools, once novel, are now integral to animation and many art forms, offering efficiencies that artists themselves leverage. Economic realities often necessitate adapting to technological advancements.

But the sheer speed and mimicry capability of modern generative AI present a different scale of challenge. This isn't just about automating laborious tasks; it's about replicating the very essence of artistic style.

How do we value human creativity, skill and years of developed craft when AI can produce a stylistic facsimile in moments? As AI models become increasingly sophisticated, capable of mimicking countless other artists and styles, the Ghibli example surely won't be the last such controversy.

The path forward requires careful navigation. Ignoring the potential legal and ethical pitfalls is risky, yet overly restrictive regulation could stifle the genuine innovation AI might offer.

Perhaps models involving collaboration and fair compensation, such as licensing agreements between AI developers and original creators whose styles significantly inform the AI's output, could offer a more equitable approach by ensuring the artists are able to monetise their creations.

This isn't just about one studio or one AI tool. It's about establishing principles for how AI and human creativity will coexist. As AI continues its rapid advance, we urgently need a broader societal dialogue to develop frameworks that foster responsible innovation while respecting and protecting the artists who inspire it.

**THULASY SUPPIAH**