

**AI AND HUMAN NARRATIVES OF THE
PARTITION: UNEARTHING DIFFERENCES
IN EMOTIONAL RESONANCE**

BY

WALIYA MANSHOOR



NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF MODERN LANGUAGES

RAWALPINDI

November, 2025

AI and Human Narratives of the Partition: Unearthing Differences in Emotional Resonance

By

WALIYA MANSHOOR

B.S. ENGLISH, National University of Modern Languages, Islamabad, 2022

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY

In English

To

FACULTY OF ARTS & HUMANITIES



NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF MODERN LANGUAGES, RAWALPINDI

© Waliya Manshoor, 2025



THESIS AND DEFENSE APPROVAL FORM

The undersigned certify that they have read the following thesis, examined the defense, are satisfied with the overall exam performance, and recommend the thesis to the Faculty of Arts & Humanities for acceptance.

Thesis Title: AI and Human Narratives of the Partition: Unearthing Differences in Emotional Resonance

Submitted by: Waliya Manshoor

Registration #: 95 MPhil/Eng Lit/Rwp/F23

Master of Philosophy

Degree name in full

English Literature

Name of Discipline

Ms. Khush Bakht

Name of Research Supervisor

Signature of Research Supervisor

Dr. Arshad Mahmood

Name of Dean (FAH)

Signature of Dean (FAH)

Date

AUTHOR'S DECLARATION

I Waliya Manshoor

Daughter of Manshoor ul Nabi (late)

Registration # 95 MPhil/Eng Lit/Rwp/F23

Discipline English Literature

Candidate of **Master of Philosophy** at the National University of Modern Languages do hereby declare that the thesis **AI and Human Narratives of the Partition: Unearthing Differences in Emotional Resonance** submitted by me in partial fulfillment of MPhil degree, is my original work, and has not been submitted or published earlier. I also solemnly declare that it shall not, in future, be submitted by me for obtaining any other degree from this or any other university or institution.

I also understand that if evidence of plagiarism is found in my thesis/dissertation at any stage, even after the award of a degree, the work may be cancelled and the degree revoked.

Signature of Candidate

Date

Name of Candidate

ABSTRACT

Title: AI and Human Narratives of the Partition: Unearthing Differences in Emotional Resonance

This research explores the evolving relationship between artificial intelligence (AI) and literary production by examining how AI-generated narratives compare to human-authored stories in their depiction of the 1947 Partition of the Subcontinent. Focusing on selected short stories by Saadat Hasan Manto and Intizar Hussain—translated into English by Aatish Taseer and Alok Bhalla respectively—this study investigates the emotional resonance, thematic depth, and narrative style present in both human and AI-generated texts. Employing a qualitative, comparative methodology grounded in the theoretical framework of posthumanism, particularly the work of N. Katherine Hayles, the research evaluates the extent to which AI can replicate or diverge from human creativity, especially in culturally and historically charged contexts. The study finds that while AI can produce grammatically coherent and structurally competent narratives, it falls short in capturing the emotional depth, cultural specificity, and thematic nuance found in human-authored texts. AI-generated stories often rely on generalized representations, lacking the experiential and affective grounding essential to Partition literature. These findings underscore the limitations of AI in replicating the layered complexity of human storytelling and reaffirm the irreplaceable role of human authorship in articulating historical trauma and cultural memory.

Keywords: *Artificial Intelligence, Partition Literature, Posthumanism, Emotional Resonance, Narrative Authenticity*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
THESIS AND DEFENSE APPROVAL FORM	iii
AUTHOR'S DECLARATION	iv
ABSTRACT	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	x
DEDICATION	xi
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Thesis Statement	5
1.2. Background of Study:	5
1.2.1. Reconsidering Creativity, Authorship, and Cultural Representation in the Age of AI	7
1.3. Statement of the Problem	7
1.4. Research Objectives	8
1.5. Research Questions	8
1.6. Rationale of the Study	9
1.7. Rationale for the Selection of Authors	9
1.8. Rationale for Using Translated Versions of Manto and Hussain's Works	9
1.9. Delimitation	10
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	12
2.1. Introduction to the Chapter	12

2.2. Review of Partition Literature _____	12
2.3. Narrative Theory and Emotional Representation in Fiction_____	18
2.4. Posthumanism and the Role of the Human in Narrative Creation_____	23
2.5. AI-Generated Fiction and Literary Style_____	30
2.6. Significance of the Study _____	36
 3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK_____	 37
3.1. Introduction_____	37
3.2. Methodology_____	37
3.3. Selection of Text_____	39
3.3.1. Prompt Generation_____	40
3.4. Analytical Framework_____	41
3.5 Theoretical Framework _____	42
 4. ANALYSIS_____	 47
 PART I: HUMAN AND AI STORYTELLING — THEMATIC AND EMOTIONAL PARALLELS _____	 47
4.1. Selected Narratives: Contextual Summaries and Comparative Insights_____	48
4.2. Thematic Fidelity_____	50
4.2.1. Displacement and Loss of Home: Human Experience versus Algorithmic Recreation_____	50
4.2.2. Trauma and Psychological Fragmentation: Emotional Resonance in Human and AI Narratives_____	53

4.2.3. Violence and Violation of the Body: Embodiment and the Limits of AI Representation	56
4.2.4. Religious and Communal Division: Cultural Context and Computational Neutrality	58
4.2.5. Identity Crisis: Authorship, Consciousness, and the Posthuman Self	60
4.2.6. Bureaucracy and Dehumanization: Mechanization within Human and AI Storytelling	62
4.2.7. Humanity Amidst Chaos: Ethical and Emotional Dimensions of Narrative Voice	64
4.3. Emotional Depth and Cultural Resonance	66
4.4. Narrative Structure and Symbolism in Human and AI Authorship	68
PART II: POSTHUMANISM AND THE QUESTION OF AUTHORSHIP	70
4.5. Character Construction and Agency in Posthuman Contexts	70
4.6. Language & Style: Originality, Creativity, and Imitation	72
4.7. Posthumanism Perspective: Authorship, Embodiment, and the Question of Creativity	75
4.8. Title Transformations and Narrative Reframing: The Shift from Human to Algorithmic Authorship	77
4.9. Discussion: Emotional Resonance and the Limits of Algorithmic Creativity	79
5. CONCLUSION	85
5.1. Key Findings of the study	85
5.2. Implications of the Findings	86

5.3. Limitations _____ - _____	88
--------------------------------	----

5.4. Recommendations for Future Researchers _____	89
---	----

WORKS CITED _____	91
--------------------------	-----------

APPENDIX A _____	95
-------------------------	-----------

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am thankful to almighty **Allah**, without Whose blessing I would not have been able to complete this difficult task.

I owe thanks to **Prof. Dr. Arshad Mehmood**, Dean Faculty of Languages, **Dr. Arshad Ali**, Head Department of English for their cooperation in the entire process.

I would like to express my deepest thanks and love to my late father, **Manshoor-Ul- Nabi**, who, though he left me too soon, left behind a legacy of love, strength, and unwavering belief in me. His wishes and prayers have stood beside me like a wall of steel, guiding and shielding me through every challenge. I am also deeply grateful to my brothers and sister, whose constant support has carried me through all my academic years.

I give my sincerest thanks to my supervisor, **Ms. Khush Bakht**, who has consistently challenged my ideas to bring out the best in me. Despite having to read through pages of unclear drafts, she always provided positive and constructive feedback and has been incredibly helpful during times of need. I am sincerely grateful for this.

I extend my deepest thanks to my maternal grandfather, **Zafar Alam Junaidi**, who supported and guided me consistently throughout my life, especially during this research journey, despite his own busy schedule.

Thanks to the English Department of NUML for offering me the academic and creative space, to bring this thesis to life.

Thank you all.

DEDICATION

To my late father, whose love, unwavering support, and encouragement shaped every part of who I am. Though you are no longer in this world, your presence lives on in my every breath.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

It is often argued that writing emerges from memory, emotion, and imagination; qualities that are closely tied to human experience. From this perspective, a system that does not possess lived memory or subjective feeling might appear inherently limited in its ability to produce meaningful literature. This view assumes that storytelling is deeply rooted in personal and cultural histories, shaped by the emotional and psychological depth of the human condition. The current study deals with the study of posthumanism specifically challenging the AI authorship. With the increasing involvement of artificial intelligence in creative domains, particularly through large language models such as ChatGPT, these assumptions are being re-evaluated. As AI-generated narratives begin to resemble human writing in coherence, tone, and structure, important questions arise: Can a non-human entity create stories that resonate emotionally? Can it represent histories marked by trauma and displacement, such as the Partition of the Subcontinent, with the same cultural and emotional depth found in human-authored literature?

The emergence of artificial intelligence (AI) has completely transformed the field of literature, bringing about new possibilities and difficulties that require a reassessment of conventional concepts of authorship and creativity. Advanced AI models, including OpenAI's GPT-3, have shown the capacity to produce text that closely imitates human writing, which raises basic inquiries about the nature of literary creativity. These advanced AI systems utilize complex machine learning algorithms and extensive datasets to generate narratives that are logical, contextually appropriate, and emotionally nuanced (Russell and Norvig 23). The capacity to imitate complex literary processes and generate content that appears profound and nuanced undermines traditional notions of human uniqueness in creation.

Traditionally, creativity has been perceived as a uniquely human characteristic, frequently linked to emotional depth and personal engagement (Kerr). The act of writing, in particular, has been viewed as a reflection of the writer's inner life, shaped through lived experiences, psychological complexity, and cultural awareness. Literature is therefore

considered more than a linguistic exercise; it becomes a form of communication that draws from the writer's ability to feel, reflect, and connect with the world. This belief reinforces the idea that emotional authenticity and cultural rootedness are essential to creative production, which in turn raises doubts about the ability of non-human agents to participate meaningfully in the literary process.

According to Howard Gardner's theory of multiple intelligences, creativity involves the capacity to combine and apply knowledge in original ways, rooted in personal experiences and shaped by cultural context (Gardner 51). Gardner's framework suggests that creativity is not a generic or transferable skill but a specific, context-driven process that depends on the individual's environment, values, and lived realities. From this standpoint, meaningful literary expression requires not only cognitive capability but also cultural sensitivity and emotional understanding. This view challenges the potential of AI-generated content to function as genuine literature, given the absence of personal memory and cultural immersion in such systems.

The conventional perspective emphasizes that human cognition and emotion are fundamental to creative acts. However, the development of AI challenges this notion, particularly when it demonstrates the ability to generate content that appears both original and contextually relevant. This raises the question of whether creativity can be redefined to include outputs produced by AI systems (Ravichandran 23). While AI relies on pattern recognition and probabilistic modeling, its outputs sometimes resemble human writing in tone and structure. This similarity invites reflection on whether imitation of language can be considered creative, or whether true creativity requires depth of intention, emotional investment, and cultural resonance.

AI systems generate text by analyzing large datasets and identifying patterns, which allows them to produce content that closely resembles human-written work. This capability affects how we understand authorship, a concept traditionally linked to the individual expression of thought, emotion, and perspective (Barthes 149). The rise of AI-generated narratives has begun to shift that understanding, prompting scholars to question whether authorship must always imply human presence. If narratives can be generated without

direct human intention, the boundary between author and system becomes increasingly ambiguous, calling for a reevaluation of authorship in contemporary literary studies.

Roland Barthes, in his essay *The Death of the Author*, questioned the primacy of authorial intention by asserting that meaning is shaped by the reader rather than determined by the writer (Barthes 143). His argument provides a useful framework for analyzing AI-generated texts, which lack a conscious author altogether. If readers construct meaning independently of the creator's intent, then the absence of a human author might not preclude a text from being interpreted meaningfully. However, this also raises important concerns. While Barthes detaches meaning from authorial identity, AI-generated texts introduce the additional problem of accountability and emotional investment. A reader may still interpret meaning, but whether the text carries the depth and complexity that characterizes literature rooted in human experience remains an open question.

The increasing use of artificial intelligence in literary production prompts a reassessment of how we define and evaluate creative works. As AI systems demonstrate the ability to generate texts that are both coherent and thematically organized, traditional concepts of authorship and originality face new challenges. A central concern is whether AI-generated narratives can achieve the emotional resonance and thematic depth typically associated with human writing. While these systems may replicate the structure and language of fiction, they often lack the lived experiences and emotional insight that shape meaningful storytelling. This difference raises important questions about the authenticity and cultural relevance of AI-produced literature (Hayles 34).

This research focuses on how the 1947 Partition of the Subcontinent has been represented in literature, particularly in terms of emotional suffering, forced migration, and communal conflict. The Partition remains a defining moment in South Asian literary history, with numerous texts exploring themes of identity, grief, and cultural rupture. This study aims to analyze and compare Partition narratives written by human authors with those generated by AI. The analysis will consider differences in narrative style, thematic development, and emotional impact. In doing so, it seeks to explore whether AI-generated literature can preserve, challenge, or distort the storytelling conventions commonly used to represent traumatic historical events.

The theoretical framework for this research is based on posthumanism, especially as developed by N. Katherine Hayles. Posthumanist theory examines how technological change alters our understanding of human thought, creativity, and identity. Hayles argues that the integration of digital systems into creative practices demands a critical rethinking of what it means to create and to be human in the context of literature. Her work provides a foundation for analyzing AI-generated fiction, particularly in relation to the questions of literary agency, authorship, and emotional authenticity in the digital age (Hayles 19).

This study adopts a qualitative research methodology, specifically comparative analysis, to evaluate representations of the Partition of the Subcontinent in both human-written and AI-generated texts. Comparative analysis allows for a structured examination of similarities and differences across different sets of narratives, helping to uncover patterns in theme, tone, and style. Following Joseph A. Maxwell's approach, this method is particularly suited for identifying subtle variations in how stories are told and received. By comparing the narrative strategies used by human authors and AI systems, the study aims to assess how each form engages with historical and cultural material (Maxwell 76).

In line with Maxwell's emphasis on the value of comparison for generating deeper understanding, this research applies close textual analysis to selected stories by Saadat Hasan Manto and Intizar Hussain. These include Manto's *Ram Khilawan*, *Toba Tek Singh*, and *Khol Do*, as translated into English by Aatish Taseer, and Hussain's *Chronicle of the Peacocks*, *Leaves*, and *The City of Sorrows*, translated by Alok Bhalla. These human-authored stories are known for their emotional complexity, symbolic richness, and nuanced portrayals of trauma, identity, and cultural fragmentation during the Partition of the Subcontinent. Their inclusion provides a grounded literary framework against which AI-generated texts can be critically assessed. To facilitate this comparison, AI-generated versions of each story will be produced using concise prompts derived from the original narratives, including basic historical context and thematic cues. The comparative analysis will examine how each version represents central motifs such as displacement, silence, communal violence, and loss, while also considering differences in tone, narrative structure, and emotional resonance.

The comparative analysis aims to evaluate the ability of AI-generated literature to effectively involve itself with the intricate cultural and emotional storylines commonly linked to human authors. This methodology will determine whether AI is capable of only duplicating superficial aspects or if it may attain a more profound emotional and thematic significance. The research will add to broader conversations regarding the role of artificial intelligence (AI) in literary creation by focusing on the Partition of the Subcontinent. It aims to examine the ability of AI to equal the authenticity and emotional effect of works created by humans. Ultimately, the goal of this research is to bridge the gap between traditional literary techniques and AI-generated content by employing posthumanism as a theoretical framework. This study aims to deepen comprehension of the changing dynamics of literary production in the digital era by examining narratives about the Partition of the Subcontinent using posthumanism and comparative analysis. It will offer valuable knowledge on the capacities and constraints of AI in replicating the profound and genuine nature of human narrative. This will contribute to the ongoing discussions surrounding the future of creativity and authorship in literature.

1.1 Thesis Statement

This study argues that while AI-generated narratives can mimic the formal coherence and thematic framework of human-authored Partition fiction, they fail to capture its emotional depth, cultural specificity, and historical consciousness. Through a posthumanist lens, this research problematizes the comparative relationship between human creativity and algorithmic imitation, questioning whether non-human authorship can truly engage with the affective and moral dimensions of historical trauma.

1.2 Background of Study

In recent years, Large Language Models (LLMs), such as GPT-3 and GPT-4, have garnered much interest for their capacity to produce cohesive, human-like prose on a wide array of subjects. These models are trained on extensive datasets, primarily derived from Western sources and the global digital corpus, which predominantly represents European, American, and other prevailing cultural narratives. This linguistic and cultural bias arises from the predominance of English materials in the training of LLMs, such as GPT, which mostly mirror the socio-political and historical backgrounds of Western cultures (Bender

et al. 1). This constraint leads to a restricted viewpoint, wherein AI systems may struggle to comprehend the subtleties and intricacies of non-Western traditions, especially in portraying the distinctive complexities of the South Asian experience.

The primary concern with this research is that GPT and analogous models find it challenging to comprehend the profound cultural intricacies, emotional subtleties, and historical circumstances inherent in non-Western literature. The literary contributions of South Asian authors, such as Saadat Hasan Manto and Intizar Hussain, are deeply influenced by the cultural, political, and social turmoil surrounding the Partition of the Subcontinent, a momentous event in the South Asian subcontinent. These works frequently depict the trauma, identity conflicts, and profound human discord resulting from the Partition, a topic that possesses unique historical and cultural significance in the South Asian context (Khilnani 23). The emotional and historical significance of the Partition, which fragmented families, transformed identities, and incited extensive violence, cannot be readily articulated by AI models lacking a thorough comprehension of such intricate cultural phenomena.

The limits of GPT in faithfully duplicating these narratives arise from its training on a diverse, general dataset rather than on specialized or region-specific literary traditions (Bender et al. 5). Consequently, GPT may be unable to replicate the narrative style of these authors or adequately express the socio-political intricacies embedded in their work.

Moreover, its Western centric training dataset may result in distortions when generating narratives that require cultural or historical distinctiveness. Although GPT can produce coherent and contextually relevant replies, its ability to engage with the complexity and nuance of socio-political circumstances, like as those present in Partition-era writing, is constrained (Cummings 112).

This study aims to investigate whether AI-generated narratives, namely those created using GPT, can genuinely reflect the intricacies of Partition-era literature. The study will evaluate the extent to which AI can replicate the emotional profundity, thematic complexities, and socio-political tales of Manto and Hussain, who depicted the human ramifications of the Partition (Chandran 87). This project will analyze themes of conflict, trauma, and displacement, while assessing the capacity of AI to convey these topics without

compromising the cultural and emotional significance inherent in the original writings. The study will specifically examine the comparison between AI-generated narratives and original human-authored works in their ability to express the emotional gravity of the Partition, as well as the capacity of AI to mimic the intricate depictions of human suffering and survival.

1.2.1 Reconsidering Creativity, Authorship, and Cultural Representation in the Age of AI:

With the advancement of AI technology, there are increasing apprehensions regarding its capacity to supplant human writers and transform the realm of creativity. Despite AI's capacity to produce increasingly intricate works, a fundamental inquiry persists over its potential to attain the same degree of emotional profundity, cultural awareness, and authenticity as human authors. The capacity to articulate personal experiences, comprehend the historical and cultural backdrop of a narrative, and communicate emotions in a manner that resonates with readers is a distinctly human characteristic that machines may struggle to reproduce (Simmons 42).

This study will investigate if AI can emulate the intense emotional and culturally ingrained experiences depicted in literature, such as the works of Manto and Hussain, which necessitate a deep comprehension of history, cultural identity, and human misery. This research is essential for comprehending the constraints of AI in literary creation and for examining the ethical ramifications of employing AI to depict cultures and histories not included in the models' training data. In this context, it is essential to critically analyze the function of AI in portraying South Asian narratives, particularly those that address culturally distinct experiences like the Partition of the Subcontinent (Srinivasan 134). If AI cannot fully comprehend or effectively reproduce the emotional and historical circumstances of these narratives, it risks propagating misrepresentations, thereby impacting the future conveyance and preservation of cultural histories.

1.3 Statement of Problem

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into creative writing presents significant challenges to traditional notions of authorship, creativity, and authenticity in literature. This study aims to analyze the impact of AI-generated literature, focusing

specifically on the Partition of the Subcontinent, a historically significant event marked by complex emotional and socio-political dynamics. The central concern is the potential threat that AI poses to human authorship and creativity, especially when AI-generated texts, which may lack a deep understanding of human experience and emotional depth, are used to portray sensitive historical events. This research will compare AI-generated and human-authored narratives in terms of narrative style and emotional impact, with a specific focus on their representations of the Partition of the Subcontinent. Based on this exploration, I have devised the forthcoming research objectives to systematically address these issues and provide a detailed comparative analysis.

1.4 Research Objectives

Following are the research objectives:

- To examine how artificial intelligence impacts the creation of historical and cultural narratives, particularly in terms of originality and creativity, as compared to traditional human storytelling.
- To analyze the differences between AI-generated and human-authored narratives in terms of narrative style, thematic complexity, and emotional resonance, with a specific focus on Partition literature.
- To explore how AI-generated and human-written works portray the socio-political dimensions of the Partition of the Subcontinent, and to assess how these portrayals influence readers' emotional and cultural understanding.

1.5 Research Questions

Based on the above-mentioned research objectives, I have devised the following research questions:

1. How do the Partition narratives of Saadat Hasan Manto and Intizar Hussain compare with their AI-generated counterparts in terms of narrative structure, thematic development, and emotional resonance?
2. In what ways does AI-generated storytelling challenge traditional notions of authorship, creativity, and emotional authenticity within posthumanist literary discourse?

3. How does the absence of lived experience and cultural embodiment in AI-generated narratives influence their representation of historical trauma and moral complexity compared to human-authored Partition fiction?

1.6 Rationale of The Study

The rationale for this research is based on the necessity to comprehend the wider consequences of AI's involvement in the field of creative writing. With the increasing sophistication of AI-generated writing, there is a rising apprehension that it may outshine human-authored works, resulting in a depreciation of human originality. This issue is especially important when considering historical narratives, as the credibility of the narrator's voice, the level of emotional involvement, and the cultural importance of storytelling are of utmost importance.

1.7 Rationale for the Selection of Authors

The chosen authors for this study, Saadat Hasan Manto and Intizar Hussain, are prominent figures in the literary portrayal of India's Partition in 1947. The great South Asian writer Manto is known for his unflinching portrayals of the human toll of the Partition, particularly the displacement, bloodshed, and identity crises that resulted from this historical catastrophe. The existential crises and raw emotions of the people caught in the turbulence are beautifully captured in his works, like *Toba Tek Singh*, *Kohl Do* and *Ram Khilawan*. Similarly, Intizar Hussain explores in his writings the spiritual and cultural upheaval that people went through as a result of the Partition. A number of his stories, such as *Leaves*, *The City of Sorrows* and *Chronicle of the Peacockss*, deal with South Asian themes of identity crisis and psychological trauma. By contrasting the breadth and richness of human-authored tales with those of AI-generated texts, we can see how the former deal with emotionally charged and historically important topics.

1.8 Rationale for Using Translated Versions of Manto and Hussain's Works

The rationale for employing the translated versions of Saadat Hasan Manto's and Intizar Hussain's narratives, particularly Alok Bhalla's translation of Hussain's works and Atish Taseer's translation of Manto's, resides in their capacity to connect the cultural and

linguistic divide between the original Urdu texts and the English-speaking audience. Bhalla and Taseer exhibit a profound proficiency in Urdu, safeguarding the cultural subtleties, emotional richness, and thematic complexities inherent in their literary creations. Through a profound comprehension of the original language and context, these translations offer an authentic depiction of South Asian experiences and socio-political intricacies, allowing non-Urdu readers to engage with the rich cultural heritage inherent in Manto's and Hussain's narratives. This methodology guarantees the preservation of the original texts' core and emotional resonance, enabling the research to investigate the cultural authenticity and influence of these narratives in a comparison analysis with AI-generated counterparts.

1.9 Delimitation

This research is delimited to a comparative analysis of selected short stories by two Pakistani writers, Saadat Hasan Manto and Intizar Hussain. Specifically, the study focuses on three stories from each writer: *Manto's Toba Tek Singh, Ram Khilawan, and Khol Do*, analyzed through English translations by Aatish Taseer, a British American writer and journalist; and Hussain's *A Chronicle of the Peacock, Leaves, and The City of Sorrows*, examined through English translations by Alok Bhalla, a scholar, translator, and poet based in Delhi, India.

To facilitate comparison, this study also includes AI-generated alternatives to each of the selected stories. These narratives were produced using OpenAI's GPT-3, a large language model capable of generating coherent and contextually relevant prose. Each AI version was created through a minimal-prompt method, in which the model was provided with only the title, author's name, and a short contextual note indicating that the story pertains to the 1947 Partition of the Subcontinent. No plot details, characters, or interpretive cues were given. This approach ensured that the generated narratives remained independent creative outputs rather than paraphrases of the originals.

The six AI-generated stories—*The Silent Signal* (from *Khol Do*), *A Story of Broken Bridges* (from *Ram Khilawan*), *The Man Who Stood Between Nations* (from *Toba Tek Singh*), *Ashes and Echoes* (from *The City of Sorrows*), *The Withered Grove* (from *Leaves*), and *The Last Flight of the Peacock* (from *A Chronicle of the Peacock*)—were selected as comparative counterparts to assess differences in narrative structure, thematic

development, and emotional resonance. These AI texts were generated under identical parameters to maintain consistency and transparency.

This delimitation ensures a focused and balanced exploration of human-authored and AI-generated narratives, enabling a detailed examination of how each form engages with cultural context, emotional depth, and historical memory within the framework of Partition fiction.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction to the Chapter

This chapter presents a review of existing literature that forms the foundation for the present study. A literature review serves to situate the research within its broader academic context, identifying key areas of scholarly discussion, debates, and developments related to the study's focus. It provides an overview of the main themes, theoretical approaches, and methodological perspectives that inform and relate to the topic. The review brings together studies from a range of disciplines that intersect with the concerns of this research. These include literary responses to historical trauma, especially those related to the Partition of the Subcontinent, as well as discussions around narrative form, emotional representation, and authorship. In addition, this chapter considers scholarly work on the role of artificial intelligence in literary production, and the theoretical framework of posthumanism that underpins this study. The chapter is structured thematically, progressing from literature on Partition fiction to studies in narrative and affect, followed by recent discussions on AI and machine-generated texts. It concludes with a review of posthumanist theory and an outline of the identified research gap. Together, these strands help to contextualize the current research and demonstrate its relevance within the broader scholarly conversation.

2.2 Review of Partition Literature

As a foundational voice in Partition literary criticism, Muhammad Umar Memon's work offers a significant interpretive lens, though it leans heavily on symbolic readings that may risk overlooking the material and political textures of Partition itself. In his seminal article *Partition Literature: A Study of Intizār Husain*, Muhammad Umar Memon provides one of the earliest and most comprehensive critical assessments of Intizar Hussain's contribution to Partition literature. He argues that Hussain's work marks a decisive shift from direct, realistic portrayals of Partition to a more allegorical, symbolic, and metaphysical mode of storytelling. Memon explores how Hussain integrates Islamic, Buddhist, and Hindu mythological frameworks to depict the disintegration of civilization

and the moral ambiguity of survival. His stories, such as *Sheher-e-Afsos*, *Din Aur Dastan*, and *An Unwritten Epic*, are discussed not as historical narratives, but as meditations on exile, cultural loss, and spiritual uncertainty. Memon stresses that for Hussain, Partition was not just a political rupture but a deeper existential dislocation—a fall from a world of order into one of confusion, loss, and longing. The article also highlights Hussain’s use of nonlinear time, repetitive motifs, and fractured memory structures, positioning him as a unique voice in Urdu literature who uses the past to illuminate the anxieties of the present. This article is pivotal to the thesis’s thematic and comparative framework. Memon’s insights confirm that emotional resonance in Hussain’s work is conveyed not through overt sentiment but through symbolic fragmentation and quiet despair—qualities that are exceptionally difficult for AI to replicate authentically. Within a posthumanist framework, Hussain’s narratives challenge the algorithmic tendencies of AI-generated storytelling, which often favors coherence and thematic closure. Memon’s study thus serves as both a scholarly foundation and a litmus test for evaluating whether AI-generated texts can capture the depth, subtlety, and cultural embeddedness that define Hussain’s literature (Memon).

Extending the conversation from literary form to historical narration, David Gilmartin introduces a valuable critique of rigid historiographies, although his analysis remains somewhat distant from the aesthetic mechanisms of storytelling. In his essay *Partition, Pakistan, and South Asian History: In Search of a Narrative*, David Gilmartin critiques the dominant modes through which Partition has been historically narrated, especially within Pakistani historiography. He argues that much of the existing literature frames Partition within rigid political or nationalist boundaries, thereby overlooking the deeply personal, fragmented, and emotionally disorienting experiences that accompanied the event. Gilmartin calls for a narrative reorientation—one that is capable of acknowledging ambiguity, rupture, and incoherence as central to understanding Partition’s historical and cultural consequences. He emphasizes that the search for a unified national story often silences the multiplicity of voices, particularly those of refugees, women, and minorities, whose experiences resist neat historical categorization. His work highlights the need to treat Partition not merely as a political moment of state-formation but as a human catastrophe that defies linear logic and coherent historiography. Gilmartin’s call for

narrative plurality and emotional depth resonates closely with literary approaches to Partition, particularly short stories by Manto and Hussain that dwell in moral ambiguity, silence, and fragmentation. For this thesis, his insights validate the importance of examining fiction—and AI-generated stories—not just as representational texts but as alternative historiographies. His view complements the posthumanist approach by questioning traditional authorship and suggesting that meaning often arises from narrative incompleteness. In comparing human and AI-authored texts, Gilmartin’s argument provides a useful framework: it helps interrogate whether AI-generated stories can move beyond structural coherence to capture the chaos, affective disorientation, and narrative instability that characterize authentic Partition storytelling (Gilmartin).

Adding a necessary feminist and affective dimension to Partition studies, Urvashi Butalia’s work powerfully disrupts nationalist and male-centered historiographies, though it has been critiqued for privileging memory over archival rigor. In *The Other Side of Silence*, Urvashi Butalia offers a deeply personal and feminist intervention into the historiography of the 1947 Partition. Through oral histories, testimonies, and archival research, she brings forward the silenced experiences of women, Dalits, and other marginalized voices who have been historically excluded from mainstream narratives. The book’s strength lies in its attention to the emotional and psychological aftermath of Partition—highlighting not only physical violence and displacement, but also intergenerational trauma, familial silences, and the internalization of suffering. Butalia asserts that Partition was not a singular historical rupture but a continuing process of loss and forgetting. Her use of first-person accounts and fragmented memories challenges linear, nationalist historiography and emphasizes that truth may reside in contradiction and absence. This approach aligns with the objectives of the thesis, especially in its emphasis on emotional resonance and narrative authenticity. Butalia’s insistence on oral testimony offers a compelling contrast to both human-authored and AI-generated texts, raising important questions about whether AI—devoid of memory or lived experience—can recreate the same intimacy, grief, or narrative hesitation. Her insights also enrich the posthumanist framework by suggesting that memory and identity are fluid, unstable, and distributed, much like the fragmented outputs of AI and trauma-afflicted human minds. In

evaluating AI's narrative capacity, *The Other Side of Silence* becomes a critical benchmark for measuring emotional depth and unresolved human storytelling (Butalia).

Shifting from feminist historiography to literary tribute, Fahmida Riaz provides a valuable insider's perspective on Manto's uncompromising narrative ethic, although her personal admiration at times borders on hagiographic. In her essay *A Realist of the Subcontinent: Remembering Manto*, Fahmida Riaz presents both a personal and literary homage to Saadat Hasan Manto, portraying him as a fearless realist who refused to look away from the brutal truths of his time. She argues that Manto's literary power stemmed from his unflinching documentation of Partition's raw and often unbearable realities—without resorting to moralizing or embellishment. Riaz emphasizes his sparse and emotionally restrained narrative style, which achieves profound disturbance through understatement. For her, Manto is not merely a writer of Partition but a chronicler of fractured humanity whose works like *Khol Do* and *Toba Tek Singh* capture the psychological dismemberment of the subcontinent. She also highlights Manto's fierce independence and stylistic nonconformity, seeing him as a voice from the margins—socially, politically, and aesthetically. In the context of this thesis, Riaz's portrayal offers crucial insight into the emotional and stylistic force of human-authored fiction. Her view also clarifies a major limitation of AI-generated narratives: where Manto's restraint evokes authentic psychological depth, AI often reproduces restraint mechanically, devoid of true affect. Riaz reinforces the idea that emotional resonance resides in subtext and silence, rather than dramatic articulation. Her tribute thus sets a standard by which AI-generated versions must be measured, provoking the critical question: can algorithmic storytelling ever achieve the understated, devastating realism that Manto mastered, or does it merely simulate trauma without inhabiting it (Riaz).

Introducing a spectral and affective framework to Partition studies, Priya Kumar's work is conceptually rich but may risk over-relying on abstraction at the expense of grounded narrative detail. In her article *Testimonies of Loss and Memory: Partition and the Haunting of a Nation*, Priya Kumar explores the enduring "haunting" that Partition has left on the subcontinent's cultural psyche. She argues that Partition is not merely a historical event but a spectral presence that resurfaces across literature, politics, and personal narratives as unresolved trauma. Drawing from theories of memory, testimony,

and historiography, Kumar critiques the nationalist drive to produce coherent historical accounts, suggesting that such frameworks often suppress the emotional disruptions experienced by survivors. Instead, she positions testimonies and fiction as counter-archives—nonlinear, affective, and contradictory—that challenge dominant historical discourse. Through her analysis of literary testimonies and short stories, Kumar illustrates how affect, silence, and symbolic absence communicate trauma more effectively than direct representation. This insight supports the thesis’s focus on emotional resonance in Partition fiction, particularly the way unresolved grief and moral ambiguity resist narrative closure. For AI-generated texts, Kumar’s critique becomes essential. Her work sets a standard for evaluating whether stories produced by algorithms—designed for coherence—can authentically embody the psychological fragmentation intrinsic to human experiences of trauma. By raising questions about memory, authorship, and the ethics of testimony, Kumar offers a posthumanist challenge: can AI ever move beyond simulation to produce stories that resonate as real acts of remembering? Her contribution thus heightens the ethical and narrative stakes in comparing human and machine authorship (Kumar).

Continuing the challenge to sanitized historical narratives, Alok Bhalla’s intervention brings the focus back to literary form as a site of resistance, although it occasionally generalizes across vastly different writers. In his influential essay *Memory, History and Fictional Representations of the Partition*, published in *Economic and Political Weekly*, Alok Bhalla argues that fiction offers an indispensable alternative to linear, official histories of the Partition of the Subcontinent. He emphasizes that literary narratives possess emotional, psychological, and moral depth that state-centered histories often overlook. Through his close examination of writers such as Saadat Hasan Manto, Intizar Hussain, and Krishna Baldev Vaid, Bhalla shows how silence, ambiguity, and allegory are used to express trauma and identity fragmentation in ways that resist nationalist myth-making. Instead of neat political narratives, these stories dwell in moral uncertainty and personal suffering. Particularly relevant to this thesis is Bhalla’s notion of Partition fiction as “intimate history,” constructed not from chronological facts but from subjective experiences of loss, fear, and dislocation. His work reinforces the idea that literary texts can serve as counter-narratives—complex, unresolved, and emotionally

resonant. This understanding is crucial when evaluating AI-generated stories, which may replicate historical references but lack the emotional irregularity and lived texture that Bhalla identifies as central to authentic Partition representation (Bhalla).

While Alok Bhalla's insights are compelling, his broad categorizations occasionally overlook the stylistic diversity among Partition writers. Nonetheless, his distinction between historical fact and emotional truth becomes critical when comparing AI-generated narratives to human-authored ones. Whereas historical details can be encoded and reproduced by machines, Bhalla's argument implies that the emotional dissonance and ethical contradictions embedded in Partition fiction are inseparable from cultural memory and human subjectivity. Stories by Intizar Hussain—such as *A Chronicle of the Peacock* and *Leaves*—do not merely recount events but evoke a sense of spiritual exile and cultural estrangement that would be difficult for AI to replicate with authenticity. This existential texture, deeply tied to lived memory and symbolic tradition, resists the algorithmic predictability of AI-generated narratives. Bhalla's essay, therefore, strengthens the posthumanist claim that emotional resonance in literature cannot be simulated by code alone, since it emerges from historical consciousness, ethical ambiguity, and the psychological complexity of human experience.

Adding a necessary corrective to the over-politicization of Manto's reputation, Asif Farrukhi's argument is persuasive, though it risks underemphasizing the radical urgency of Manto's Partition stories. In *The Portable Manto*, published in *Dawn*, Asif Farrukhi offers a critical reappraisal of Manto's literary legacy. He argues that Manto's genius has too often been narrowly confined to his Partition stories, which, while powerful, represent only one facet of his broader creative output. Farrukhi highlights Manto's Bombay stories—such as *Kali Shalwar*, *Boo*, *Hatak*, and *Babu Gopi Nath*—as equally rich in emotional depth, exploring themes of loneliness, inner turmoil, and social injustice. These works, according to Farrukhi, reveal Manto's sustained attention to the “violence inside the all-too-human heart,” positioning him as a psychologically nuanced writer rather than merely a political commentator. For this thesis, Farrukhi's perspective complicates the comparative frame, reminding us that emotional resonance in Manto's fiction arises not only from historical trauma but from an ongoing exploration of human vulnerability. This raises a key question in relation to AI-generated storytelling: can emotional complexity

that transcends event-based trauma—such as Manto’s understated portrayals of isolation and desire—be captured by a system trained to detect patterns rather than feel them (Farrukhi).

Similarly, extending his critique of Manto’s critical reception, Asif Farrukhi’s later work questions the institutional co-opting of a once-marginalized voice, though it occasionally stops short of proposing new critical frameworks himself. In *The Posthumous Manto — More or Less*, Farrukhi examines how Manto’s legacy has been reshaped through official recognition and posthumous publication. He observes that Manto, once persecuted for his defiance, is now celebrated by the very institutions that once censored him. This retrospective embrace, according to Farrukhi, often results in a sanitization of Manto’s radical edge. He critiques the repetitive use of secondary materials in recent reprints and reflects on the biographical collections *Amritsar ka Manto*, *Manto Namay*, and *Main Nay Manto ko Kaisa Paya?*, which, while valuable as archives, offer limited critical innovation. Farrukhi calls for renewed attention to Manto’s lesser-known letters and essays, which reveal the emotional fragility and political resistance that characterized his post-Partition years. For this thesis, his insights offer a dual framework: they highlight both the narrative depth and ideological volatility of Manto’s work. This becomes especially relevant when assessing AI-generated texts, which tend to favor emotional clarity and stylistic uniformity. Farrukhi’s concerns invite reflection on whether such algorithmic narratives can ever reproduce Manto’s resistance to closure, his moral tension, or the persistent dissonance between literary form and political conscience (Farrukhi).

2.3 Narrative Theory and Emotional Representation in Fiction

Bringing the discussion from literary ethics to narrative communication, James Phelan’s rhetorical theory offers a robust lens, though it may underplay the socio-political constraints within which narratives are produced and received. In the chapter “Rhetoric/Ethics” from *The Cambridge Companion to Narrative*, James Phelan articulates a rhetorical model of storytelling that foregrounds ethical intention and emotional impact. He challenges formalist separations of story and discourse by introducing a triadic relationship between author, text, and audience, in which meaning emerges through their interaction. According to Phelan, narrative is not merely a chronological presentation of

events, but a deliberate communicative act shaped by rhetorical strategies and ethical considerations. Authors influence how readers feel and judge through techniques such as focalization, narrative distance, character interiority, and resolution. This perspective is particularly useful for analyzing trauma narratives, like those centered on Partition, where emotional resonance and moral ambiguity are key. For this thesis, Phelan's model provides a critical framework to assess whether AI-generated stories possess rhetorical intentionality or merely reproduce textual surface patterns. Unlike human authors who craft affective experiences through ethical design, AI systems such as GPT operate without intentionality or moral positioning. The contrast becomes most visible in emotionally complex stories like *Khol Do* or *Leaves*, where rhetorical choices determine the depth of affect. Phelan's insights reinforce a central posthumanist claim: emotional authenticity is not embedded solely in language, but in the purposive act of communication—a feature that remains distinctly human and absent in machine-authored fiction (“Rhetoric/ethics”).

Complementing James Phelan's rhetorical focus, Suzanne Keen's theory of narrative empathy introduces a nuanced understanding of reader emotion, though it assumes a relatively stable reading subject across diverse contexts. In her article *A Theory of Narrative Empathy*, Suzanne Keen examines how fiction evokes ethical concern and emotional connection, proposing that empathy is not an automatic byproduct of narrative immersion. Drawing from psychology, neuroscience, and literary theory, she distinguishes between different emotional responses—such as sympathy, identification, and emotional contagion—and argues that authors deploy specific narrative strategies to evoke or inhibit empathy. Techniques such as focalization, voice, and character interiority are central to this process, and their effectiveness depends on genre, context, and reader disposition. Keen's work is essential for this thesis because it offers a method for analyzing how narrative design influences affective engagement. When comparing AI-generated texts with human-authored ones, her theory underscores a key concern: emotional resonance is not just about content but about intentional narrative structure. While human writers intuitively use tone, rhythm, and psychological depth to generate empathy, AI may imitate these cues without internalizing or purposefully crafting them. Keen's distinctions also raise an important question within the posthumanist framework: can a machine, lacking emotion and experience, produce a story that truly generates empathetic response, or is it

simply executing probability-based simulations of empathy? Her framework thus becomes instrumental in critically evaluating whether the emotional pull of AI narratives is authentic or merely performative (Keen).

Shifting from theoretical models to close literary interpretation, Tarun K. Saint's analysis of Manto positions fiction as a powerful mode of testimony, though it occasionally risks conflating representation with ethical enactment. In his article *The Long Shadow of Manto's Partition Narratives: 'Fictive' Testimony to Historical Trauma*, Saint reads Manto's Partition fiction as a form of "fictive testimony" that engages directly with historical trauma through narrative technique. Drawing on trauma theory and postcolonial critique, he argues that Manto's stories do not merely reflect Partition's horrors but actively intervene in history by bearing witness to the unrepresentable. Texts like *Toba Tek Singh* and *Khol Do* resist closure and moral certainty, unfolding as fragmented and ambiguous accounts that foreground absurdity, silence, and psychological disorientation. Saint emphasizes how Manto defies nationalist sentimentality and moral binaries, instead constructing emotionally unsettling narratives in which language itself fractures under trauma's weight. This notion of fiction as testimony has direct relevance to this thesis, particularly in assessing whether AI-generated texts can emulate the ethical and emotional complexity embedded in such storytelling. Saint's framework calls attention to the layered affective silences and moral ambiguity that characterize human-authored Partition narratives—qualities that AI may simulate structurally but cannot replicate experientially. His analysis thus strengthens the posthumanist argument that emotional resonance, especially in trauma fiction, is inseparable from the historical consciousness and ethical burden of human authorship (Saint).

Offering a rare example of intra-scholarly critique, Muhammad Umar Memon's review adds a valuable layer of meta-analysis, although it remains more defensive of Manto's literary legacy than constructively engaged with Flemming's broader insights. In his review published in *The Journal of Asian Studies*, Muhammad Umar Memon critically evaluates Leslie A. Flemming's book *Another Lonely Voice: The Urdu Short Stories of Saadat Hasan Manto*, which explores Manto's narrative style and thematic preoccupations. While Memon acknowledges Flemming's effort to contextualize Manto within the larger canon of South Asian literature—particularly her focus on marginalized characters and

psychological depth—he expresses concern over her tendency to generalize and lean heavily on sociological readings. According to Memon, such readings risk obscuring the literary and emotional subtleties that define Manto’s fiction. He is especially critical of Flemming’s moral interpretations, arguing that Manto’s artistic power lies in portraying violence, despair, and contradiction without ideological commentary or narrative resolution. For this thesis, Memon’s critique underscores a crucial point: emotional resonance in Manto’s work is not a product of moral clarity, but of ethical tension and unresolved complexity. This challenges AI-generated narratives, which often default to resolution and thematic neatness, revealing the difficulty machines face in capturing the dissonance that human authors intentionally preserve. Memon’s engagement with Flemming thus reinforces the thesis’s emphasis on emotional nuance and moral ambiguity as core elements of authentic trauma fiction (Memon).

Serving as a conceptual bridge between literary analysis and posthumanist inquiry, Memon’s review offers important reflections on both narrative ethics and interpretive methodology. This review is valuable to the current thesis for two reasons. First, it highlights how Manto’s post-Partition stories function as emotionally charged narratives that deliberately blur the line between testimony and fiction. Second, Memon’s critique of overly sociological readings emphasizes the need to attend to narrative form, voice, and tonal nuance when evaluating emotional resonance. These considerations are especially critical when comparing human-authored texts to AI-generated stories, which often flatten or overlook the subtle cues through which emotional disquiet is conveyed. Memon’s observations underscore a key posthumanist concern: that emotional depth in fiction arises not simply from content but from formal ambiguity, ethical ambivalence, and narrative withholding—dimensions that AI, operating on statistical prediction, struggles to reproduce authentically. His review thus reinforces the central premise of this thesis by foregrounding the irreplaceable complexity of human authorship in crafting affective, ethically charged literature.

Contributing a recent and focused perspective, Gull, Amar, and Bosaal’s study offers a valuable literary examination of Manto’s emotional aesthetics, though it occasionally underplays the political framing that contextualizes these emotions. In their article *Representation of Emotions in Manto’s Partition Literature*, the authors argue that

Manto's fiction transcends historical narration by capturing the psychological ruptures of Partition with restrained emotional force. Analyzing stories like *Karamat*, *Munasib Karawai*, *Khuda ki Qasam*, and *Toba Tek Singh*, they trace how emotions such as fear, grief, helplessness, and disillusionment are expressed not through dramatic narration but through fragmented dialogue, irony, and everyday imagery. The article highlights Manto's stylistic control, particularly his ability to communicate emotional intensity without overt sentimentality. This insight is crucial for the thesis's comparative framework, as it shows how emotional depth often emerges from minimalism and implication—qualities that AI-generated texts, reliant on pattern recognition and stylistic generalization, struggle to convincingly replicate. By treating emotion as both content and narrative strategy, the article aligns with the core concerns of posthumanist literary critique. It reinforces the thesis's central question: Can AI simulate not just the form of Partition storytelling but its affective resonance and ethical weight? This contribution thus deepens the interdisciplinary conversation between narrative theory, trauma fiction, and the evolving capabilities of machine-authored narrative (Gull et al.).

Expanding the discussion beyond literary fiction to life writing Kay Schaffer and Sidonie Smith's interdisciplinary framework offers critical insight into how narrative form produces ethical response, though their emphasis on human rights discourse occasionally overshadows literary aesthetics. In their article *Conjunctions: Life Narratives in the Field of Human Rights*, Kay Schaffer and Sidonie Smith explore how autobiographies and personal testimonies generate emotional and ethical engagement in human rights contexts. They argue that such narratives do not simply record trauma or injustice but actively construct affective relationships between narrators, audiences, and the subjects of suffering. Through close attention to voice, sequence, and narrative stance, the authors show how emotional responses—such as empathy, outrage, or moral solidarity—are shaped not spontaneously but through deliberate rhetorical choices. Their insistence on the political and ethical intentionality behind storytelling is particularly valuable for this thesis. It reinforces the argument that emotional impact in narrative is not incidental but architected—an insight that challenges the plausibility of AI-generated fiction achieving similar effects. Since AI systems lack ethical motivation and audience awareness, their outputs may simulate emotional content without enacting the rhetorical engagement

necessary to provoke genuine affect. Schaffer and Smith thus provide a compelling lens to evaluate whether machine-authored narratives can ever serve as ethical interventions or whether they remain stylistic simulations devoid of narrative responsibility (Schaffer and Smith).

Though focused on non-fictional life narratives, this article is deeply relevant to the current thesis as it offers a framework for analyzing emotional representation in any narrative mode. The idea that emotional resonance is generated through formal strategies and ethical positioning helps clarify why AI-generated stories often lack the affective and moral complexity of human-authored Partition fiction. Stories like Manto's *Khol Do* or Hussain's *Chronicle of the Peacocks* create what Schaffer and Smith call "affiliative relationships" with readers—drawing them into the experience of trauma through deliberate narrative cues. The article thus supports the claim that emotional authenticity in fiction depends not just on content, but on the relational architecture of storytelling, something AI systems currently cannot replicate with true intentionality or ethical nuance.

2.4 Posthumanism and the Role of the Human in Narrative Creation

Bridging literary theory and technological critique, N. Katherine Hayles's work offers a foundational yet contested account of how digital systems reshape our understanding of narrative and subjectivity. In her seminal book *How We Became Posthuman*, N. Katherine Hayles charts the intellectual evolution of the human subject in an era shaped by cybernetics, information theory, and digital technology. She argues that contemporary culture increasingly views human identity as disembodied information rather than embodied experience—a shift that privileges pattern over presence. Tracing three waves of cybernetic theory, Hayles reveals how the body has been marginalized in favor of the programmable system, leading to what she terms the "posthuman condition." Yet, she simultaneously insists on the concept of "re-embodiment," advocating for a return to the affective, material, and lived dimensions of being human that cannot be reduced to code. This tension between informational abstraction and embodied reality is crucial to understanding the limitations of machine-generated storytelling. In the context of this thesis—comparing emotionally charged Partition narratives by Saadat Hasan Manto and Intizar Hussain with their AI-generated counterparts—Hayles's theory helps expose what

AI cannot access: the lived trauma, physical displacement, and culturally embedded grief that structure these stories. While GPT-3 may produce coherent and stylistically fluent narratives, Hayles would argue that it cannot replicate the ethical urgency and emotional authenticity rooted in embodied consciousness and historical memory (Hayles).

By applying Hayles's posthuman framework, this thesis contends that machine-generated narratives may reproduce textual form but remain fundamentally limited in intent, depth, and affective resonance. The apparent empathy produced by models like GPT-3 is algorithmic and derivative—assembled through predictive sampling from large datasets rather than arising from any internal understanding or moral engagement. In contrast, human authors write from within the complexities of lived experience, trauma, and cultural memory. Stories like *Khol Do* or *A Chronicle of the Peacock* are not just texts; they are expressions of historical anguish and embodied witnessing. Hayles's critique of disembodiment thus reinforces a central claim of this research: that the emotional and ethical power of Partition literature is inseparable from the human condition. Attempts to replicate this power through AI, however sophisticated, inevitably expose the limits of posthuman narrative simulation. They raise urgent questions not only about authorship and originality, but about the ontological difference between storytelling that remembers, and storytelling that merely reassembles.

Building on posthumanist theory with a broader philosophical scope, Francesca Ferrando offers a valuable synthesis of emerging frameworks, though her general categorization occasionally risks flattening nuanced positions within each school of thought. In her article *Posthumanism, Transhumanism, Antihumanism, Metahumanism, and New Materialisms: Differences and Relations*, Ferrando maps the conceptual terrain of various movements that challenge the assumptions of classical humanism. She carefully distinguishes between these often-conflated frameworks, noting that while all interrogate the figure of the rational, autonomous subject, they differ significantly in how they address technology, agency, and the nature of subjectivity. Ferrando defines posthumanism as a philosophical stance that de-centers the human as the privileged locus of meaning and instead emphasizes relationality, embodiment, and networked existence. In contrast to transhumanism's techno-optimism, posthumanism remains critical of technological determinism and insists on the material and ethical dimensions of lived experience. This

perspective is highly relevant to the current thesis, which explores the limits of machine-generated Partition fiction. While AI tools like GPT-3 participate in the act of narrative generation, Ferrando's emphasis on embodiment underscores their inability to replicate the emotional weight and ethical complexity of human-authored stories. Her distinctions support a strand of posthumanism that recognizes nonhuman agents but maintains that emotional resonance—especially in narratives rooted in trauma, memory, and cultural specificity—cannot be disembodied. This theoretical grounding helps position the thesis within a nuanced posthumanist discourse that neither romanticizes human authorship nor overstates the literary potential of algorithmic output (Ferrando).

Adding a contemporary dimension to the philosophical discourse on AI and authorship, James Brusseau's analysis is both timely and provocative, though his optimistic framing of "Genhumanism" may understate the ethical challenges posed by disembodied narrative production. In his article *Mapping AI Avant-Gardes in Time: Posthumanism, Transhumanism, Genhumanism*, Brusseau outlines three overlapping theoretical frameworks—posthumanism, transhumanism, and genhumanism—that respond to the evolving role of artificial intelligence in creative and cultural domains. Posthumanism, in alignment with thinkers like Hayles and Ferrando, decouples narrative authority from human exceptionalism and emphasizes relational, decentered modes of being. Transhumanism, by contrast, embraces technological enhancement as a pathway beyond biological constraints. Most distinctively, Brusseau introduces "genhumanism" as a forward-looking perspective that does not seek to replace human agency but imagines a hybrid creative space in which generative AI co-authors new forms of expression. This theoretical model proves relevant for the current thesis, which interrogates whether AI-generated narratives can match the emotional, cultural, and ethical resonance of human-authored Partition fiction. Brusseau's insights reinforce the claim that while GPT-3 and similar models can simulate language and style, they lack historical rootedness and experiential depth—features essential to the affective power of stories like *Khol Do* or *The City of Sorrows*. His articulation of AI as a challenge to traditional notions of origin and intention validates the literary study of machine-generated fiction, even as it draws attention to its philosophical and ethical limits. By offering a nuanced taxonomy of AI's narrative roles, Brusseau's work helps position this thesis within a broader posthumanist

debate on creativity, authorship, and literary meaning in the age of artificial intelligence (Brusseau).

Moving on to a more pedagogically grounded exploration of posthumanism, Arıkan's contribution is accessible yet theoretically robust, though it tends to generalize literary engagement across genres and contexts. In his paper *Posthumanism and Literary Theory*, Arıkan examines how posthumanist discourse has reshaped literary studies by challenging the centrality of the human subject in meaning-making. He outlines core posthumanist principles—including critiques of anthropocentrism, the dismantling of binaries like human/machine and nature/culture, and the embrace of distributed cognition and non-human agency. Literature, he argues, becomes a productive site for rethinking not only authorship and narrative structure but also voice, silence, and reader engagement. This framework directly informs the thesis's comparison of human and AI-generated Partition fiction. Arıkan's emphasis on the disruption of authorial authority and the inclusion of non-human agents in narrative production supports the analysis of GPT-3's role as a co-narrator. At the same time, his acknowledgment of the limitations of machinic storytelling—particularly in expressing embodiment, ethics, and affect—underscores why AI-generated stories struggle to capture the emotional gravity of texts rooted in historical trauma. Stories such as *Toba Tek Singh* or *A Chronicle of the Peacock* are not only complex in form, but emotionally and culturally saturated in ways that exceed algorithmic synthesis. Arıkan's work thus bridges theory and application, offering a rationale for examining AI narratives within a posthumanist framework that is critical, yet not dismissive, of machine participation (Arıkan).

Furthermore, bringing a technical and philosophical angle to debates on creativity. Simon Colton and Geraint A. Wiggins push the boundaries of authorship discourse by repositioning the machine as a creative agent. In their conference proceeding article *Computational Creativity: The Final Frontier?*, presented at the 20th European Conference on Artificial Intelligence (ECAI 2012), they argue for a conceptual shift that views AI not merely as a tool, but as a potentially autonomous producer of creative work. Their notion of “computational creativity” suggests that artefacts generated by machines—if evaluated independently of origin—can be seen as creative in their own right. This challenges traditional assumptions that locate creativity exclusively in human intention.

For this thesis, their framework directly informs a posthumanist rethinking of literary production. When analyzing AI-generated Partition narratives, the focus shifts from origin to outcome, enabling a critique of narrative form and emotional resonance even in the absence of human authorship. Colton and Wiggins thus help destabilize the binary of human vs. machine storytelling, proposing instead that meaning-making can emerge from algorithmic processes. While this view expands the field of cultural production, it also heightens the challenge: can creativity defined by output alone account for the historical, ethical, and affective weight embedded in stories like *Ram Khilawan* or *Leaves*? Their theory supports a collaborative view of narrative, but it also invites scrutiny over what is lost when creativity becomes computational rather than experiential (Colton and Wiggins).

Extending the conversation to public perception, Elzé Sigutė Mikalonytė and Markus Kneer introduce a sociological perspective that complements theoretical debates on machine authorship. In their article *Can Artificial Intelligence Make Art? Folk Intuitions as to Whether AI-Driven Robots Can Be Viewed as Artists and Produce Art*, published in *ACM Transactions on Human-Robot Interaction*, they present empirical research showing that lay audiences increasingly accept AI as capable of producing “art,” albeit under evolving and often contested definitions of creativity. While their study focuses on visual and performative arts, its implications are directly relevant to AI-generated Partition narratives, which similarly complicate the categories of author, tool, and artifact. From a posthumanist perspective, their findings reinforce the argument that cultural production is now shaped by distributed agency—where authorship is no longer exclusively human, and creativity is co-constructed through human-machine interaction. This thesis draws on their insights to frame AI-generated stories not just as by-products of code, but as cultural texts that elicit real reader responses and challenge fixed notions of artistic identity. However, their research also surfaces key limitations: while audiences may accept AI’s technical proficiency, questions of emotional authenticity, historical consciousness, and ethical depth remain unresolved. In the context of Partition fiction, this distinction becomes critical. Stories rooted in trauma and memory invite an evaluative lens beyond style and structure—one that AI, despite growing social legitimacy, may still struggle to satisfy (Mikalonytė and Kneer).

Broadening the discussion from theoretical critique to digital literary evolution, Jill Walker Rettberg's work offers a historical and methodological context for understanding machine-influenced narratives. In her 2012 research report *Electronic Literature Seen from a Distance*, Rettberg uses distant reading techniques, metadata analysis, and institutional tracking to survey the development of electronic literature as a field. Her approach departs from traditional close reading by foregrounding the role of digital systems and collaborative platforms in shaping literary production. Although artificial intelligence is not her central concern, Rettberg's insights are highly applicable to the current thesis. She conceptualizes literature as a system of interaction between human creativity and computational affordances—a framework that parallels the narrative structure of AI-generated Partition stories. These texts, produced not by a single author but through algorithmic recomposition, reflect a distributed process of meaning-making. From a posthumanist standpoint, Rettberg's work underscores the idea that narrative authority is no longer tethered solely to the human subject. Instead, the emotional and thematic resonance of a story can emerge from the interplay between machine logic and human cultural memory. Her analysis supports this thesis's contention that literary creativity in the digital age is co-produced through the entanglement of code, archive, and interpretive community (Rettberg).

Continuing this line of inquiry, David M. Berry situates computational creativity within a broader cultural and epistemic transformation. In his 2024 preprint *Post-Digital Humanities: Computation and Cultural Critique in the Arts and Humanities*, Berry argues that the humanities are undergoing a structural shift driven by algorithmic systems and post-digital infrastructures. He emphasizes that computation is not just a technological tool but a cultural logic that reorganizes how meaning is produced, interpreted, and distributed. This framing is especially relevant to the AI-generated Partition stories examined in this thesis. These narratives are not authored in the conventional sense but emerge from data-driven textual assemblage, where algorithmic predictions are shaped by pre-existing linguistic and cultural archives. Berry's theoretical model affirms the posthumanist position that the human no longer occupies the sole axis of narrative production. Instead, meaning is created through a networked process in which human and non-human agents are inextricably linked. The emotional resonance found in AI-generated texts, then, is not

a replication of human sensibility but an emergent aesthetic shaped by computational systems trained on human histories. Berry's contribution reinforces the need to reconceptualize literary value, authorship, and affect within the evolving landscape of post-digital culture—a key concern of this thesis (Berry).

Bringing critical theory into dialogue with digital infrastructure, Alan Liu's work serves as a reminder that technological mediation in the humanities is never ideologically neutral. In his influential article *The Meaning of the Digital Humanities*, Liu contends that digital humanities should not be seen merely as a toolkit for literary analysis but as a transformative epistemology—one that reshapes how knowledge is produced, organized, and interpreted. He critiques the field's frequent detachment from critical theory and calls for deeper reflection on how digital systems shape meaning, power, and representation. For this thesis, which investigates the narrative and emotional divergences between human and AI-generated Partition stories, Liu's perspective is essential. His emphasis on the embedded politics and philosophies of computational tools affirms that AI-generated texts are not passive artefacts but ideologically coded constructs. They reflect and reconfigure the literary norms, cultural memories, and aesthetic standards that underpin their training data. Liu's call to interrogate the infrastructure of digital meaning-making aligns with this study's posthumanist lens, which recognizes that authorship, agency, and narrative affect are all subject to revision in computational environments (Liu).

Deborah Lupton's contribution brings the posthumanist discourse closer to embodiment and subjectivity, offering a theoretical vocabulary to understand the intimate entanglements between humans and machines. In her article *Understanding the Human-Machine*, published in *IEEE Technology and Society Magazine*, Lupton explores how computational technologies—ranging from wearables to digital health tools—do not merely extend human capacities but actively participate in shaping knowledge, identity, and relationality. While her examples are drawn from health and social media contexts, the theoretical implications extend directly to literary production in the AI age. This thesis draws on Lupton's concept of hybrid embodiment to understand how AI-generated Partition narratives arise from a co-creative assemblage: they are the result of encoded human history, algorithmic processing, and interpretive reader engagement. Rather than being viewed as either autonomous or artificial, GPT-3's narratives inhabit the liminal

space where human emotional registers and machinic patterning converge. Lupton's framework supports the posthumanist claim that narrative is no longer a product of isolated authorship but a fluid, distributed process. Her insights affirm this thesis's position that the emotional resonance in AI-generated fiction is shaped not only by data and code, but by the embedded human traces that persist within these machinic compositions (Lupton).

Offering a cultural critique of algorithmic authorship beyond literary domains, James Bridle's essay *Something Is Wrong on the Internet* provides an unsettling case study of machine-generated media gone awry. Examining how YouTube's recommendation algorithms produce incoherent and disturbing children's content by mimicking trending search patterns, Bridle exposes the erosion of narrative logic and authorial intent under the pressures of machinic optimization. Although not focused on literature, his analysis resonates strongly with the AI-generated Partition stories examined in this thesis. Both phenomena reflect a shift from intentional storytelling to algorithmic patterning, where coherence is derived not from ethical framing or emotional insight but from data correlations and predictive modeling. From a posthumanist perspective, Bridle's critique illuminates how narrative meaning is increasingly unmoored from human subjectivity and instead emerges through automated processes responding to cultural inputs. The occasional emotional dissonance or structural oddity observed in AI-generated texts reflects this same dynamic—plausible form without experiential grounding. Bridle's essay thus supports this thesis's broader contention: that the role of the human in narrative creation is being redefined not just by technological tools, but by the deeper, often opaque logics of algorithmic systems that reshape how stories are told, received, and understood (Bridle).

2.5 AI-Generated Fiction and Literary Style

Functioning as both a media experiment and a cultural artifact, *The Guardian's* article "*A Robot Wrote This Entire Article. Are You Scared Yet, Human?*" serves as a widely circulated example of AI-generated persuasive writing. Composed entirely by GPT-3 using prompts supplied by UC Berkeley student Liam Porr, the piece demonstrates the capacity of large language models to mimic editorial tone, rhetorical structure, and stylistic consistency. While the resulting article is grammatically fluent and coherent, its argumentation remains repetitive and rhetorically flat—relying on generic formulations

rather than nuanced persuasion. This case is significant for the current thesis, as the AI-generated Partition stories similarly display stylistic fluency and formal plausibility while lacking deeper emotional or cultural complexity. Like the GPT-3 editorial, these stories mimic the gestures of human prose but tend to generalize emotional states and simplify character psychology. The exercise documented by Hern underscores a key posthumanist insight: AI can convincingly simulate literary form, yet its outputs often remain affectively thin and narratively shallow. This supports the thesis's central contention that stylistic performance is not synonymous with narrative authenticity—especially in genres like Partition fiction, where emotional weight and cultural memory are indispensable (GPT-3 and Porr).

Offering a conceptual shift from fixed authorial roles to flexible judgment systems, Brennan-Marquez and Henderson's article *Artificial Intelligence and Role-Reversible Judgment* expands the theoretical landscape for analyzing AI's role in creative production. Though framed within a legal context, their concept of "role-reversibility" — the idea that humans and machines can alternate roles as evaluators and decision-makers — has direct implications for literary studies. When applied to AI-generated storytelling, the model disrupts traditional hierarchies between human author and machinic tool, suggesting instead a collaborative framework in which stylistic and structural decisions emerge from algorithmic synthesis shaped by human inputs. In the context of this thesis, the Partition stories created by GPT-3 exemplify this hybridity: they are not solely authored by humans nor fully autonomous productions of AI, but rather the result of role-reversible creative logic. Brennan-Marquez and Henderson's framework supports the posthumanist claim that meaning-making in literature now involves machine agency—not as a passive executor but as an interpretive participant. This reframing allows for a more nuanced evaluation of AI-generated narratives, recognizing them as products of distributed judgment systems rather than failed imitations of singular human voices (Brennan-Marquez and Henderson).

Bringing a literary-critical lens to the aesthetics of posthuman authorship, Mark McGurl's *The Posthuman Comedy* offers a compelling framework for interpreting contemporary narrative in light of computational logic. McGurl argues that recent fiction increasingly reflects nonhuman systems—algorithmic, networked, and procedural—in its very form, signaling a shift away from the interiorized subject toward distributed, machinic

storytelling. This observation proves highly relevant to the current thesis, as the AI-generated Partition stories analyzed here exhibit precisely this structural shift: polished and coherent on the surface, yet emotionally flattened and devoid of psychological nuance. McGurl's concept of the "posthuman comedy" captures this tonal and stylistic tendency—a narrative mode characterized by syntactic smoothness, moral neutrality, and simulated complexity. Rather than viewing such traits as artistic failure, McGurl invites readers to interpret them as the aesthetic signatures of an emergent posthuman literary mode. His insights help situate GPT-3's output not outside of literary history but within a new phase of it—one where simulation replaces subjectivity, and machine logic co-produces narrative alongside cultural residue. This reframing supports the thesis's core argument: that AI-generated stories, especially on themes as emotionally and ethically charged as Partition, require new critical approaches attuned to their posthuman origins (McGurl).

Complementing McGurl's theoretical account with a practitioner's view, K.M. Weiland provides a stylistic and craft-based critique of AI-generated fiction. In her article *The Impact of AI on Fiction Writing*, Weiland explores the ways in which AI tools are transforming the practices of human writers, offering benefits such as drafting assistance and plot ideation while simultaneously raising alarms about creativity and voice. Her key concern—that AI-generated prose often veers toward formula, repetition, and stylistic blandness—mirrors the patterns observed in the GPT-3-generated Partition stories analyzed in this study. While these texts demonstrate technical fluency and structural coherence, they fall short in subtextual richness and emotional precision. Weiland's perspective reinforces this thesis's assertion that the limitations of AI fiction are not solely technical but also cultural: rooted in the absence of embodied experience, intuitive storytelling, and moral urgency. Her analysis helps position AI fiction as a sophisticated simulacrum—stylistically competent but narratively hollow—a view that underscores the difficulty of conveying historical trauma through machinic imitation. In doing so, Weiland's article deepens the ethical and aesthetic stakes of evaluating AI-generated narratives within both literary and posthumanist frameworks (Weiland).

In a meditative reflection on authorship and embodiment, poet Luke Beesley advocates for the tactile intimacy of handwriting as a subtle act of resistance against algorithmic authorship. In his essay *"I am writing this with a pencil – it could be an*

author's last line of defence against AI", published in *The Guardian*, Beesley argues that the physical act of writing preserves a uniquely human space of unpredictability, sensory engagement, and memory—dimensions that machine-generated text cannot replicate. Rather than rejecting technological advancement outright, he calls for safeguarding the intuitive and affective qualities of human storytelling. This reflection proves directly relevant to the thesis's comparison of human and AI-generated Partition narratives, where the latter often display surface-level coherence but lack the textured subjectivity and emotional granularity of human-authored prose. Beesley's assertion that literary style emerges from lived experience and corporeal expression bolsters the posthumanist critique central to this study: that while machines can simulate language patterns, they remain estranged from the creative embodiment that defines narrative authenticity. His perspective reinforces the thesis's argument that meaningful storytelling—especially in contexts of historical trauma—requires more than fluency; it requires presence (Beesley).

Taking a more satirical yet incisive tone, novelist Monica Ali offers a pointed critique of generative writing technologies and their limitations. In her essay "*Would I Use AI to Write My Novels? I'd Get Better Results from a Monkey with an iPhone*", also published in *The Guardian*, Ali describes her experiments with AI tools like Laika and ChatGPT and expresses sharp disappointment at their outputs. She highlights how AI-generated prose, while grammatically accurate and superficially coherent, often lacks individuality, voice, and cultural nuance. For Ali, literary fiction depends on the specificity of lived experience—something that cannot be extracted from pattern recognition alone. Her concerns resonate strongly with the findings of this thesis: the AI-generated Partition stories analyzed here mimic thematic structure and style but fail to capture the emotional depth and cultural texture that human authors like Manto or Hussain infuse into their work. Ali's warning about the risk of homogenization—where algorithmic generalities replace diverse literary voices—raises ethical stakes for posthumanist critique. Her essay affirms that style, in its most powerful form, is not a template to be reproduced but a manifestation of identity and intent—qualities still beyond the reach of machine authorship (Ali).

This literature review has brought together a diverse range of scholarship that forms the foundation of this research. It began with an exploration of Partition literature, focusing on the powerful works of scholars such as Memon, Butalia, Gilmartin, Bhalla, Riaz,

Kumar, Saint, and Farrukhi. Their writings shed light on how Partition narratives are far more than mere historical records—they are deeply personal, emotionally charged reflections of trauma, loss, and dislocation. These narratives often resist linear storytelling, instead unfolding through fragmentation, silence, and ambiguity. What emerges is a form of storytelling that captures not just events but the lasting psychological and cultural wounds of Partition, something that formal historical accounts often fail to convey. The review then turned to narrative theory and emotional representation in fiction, drawing on thinkers like James Phelan, Suzanne Keen, and Schaffer and Smith. Their work emphasizes that emotional impact in fiction is not accidental but the result of intentional narrative choices. Techniques such as focalization, narrative distance, tone, and character interiority are carefully crafted to guide the reader's emotional and ethical engagement. This understanding is crucial, particularly when assessing whether stories—whether written by humans or generated by AI, can truly evoke empathy, convey complexity, and carry emotional weight.

Moving into the third strand, the review engaged with posthumanist theory, which offers a powerful lens for understanding the shifting role of the human in creative practices shaped by technology. Foundational contributions from N. Katherine Hayles, Francesca Ferrando, James Bruseau, and Arda Arıkan challenge the idea of the human as the sole creator of meaning. Posthumanist thought highlights how, in an era increasingly mediated by algorithms and data, creativity itself becomes a distributed process involving both humans and machines. However, these scholars also caution that despite the capabilities of AI, there are inherent limits to what machine systems can achieve, particularly when it comes to embodied experience, cultural memory, and emotional consciousness. It examined emerging discussions around AI-generated fiction and literary style, which has become a particularly urgent and contested space. Drawing from the perspectives of literary practitioners like Monica Ali, Luke Beesley, and K.M. Weiland, alongside scholars such as Brennan-Marquez and McGurl, the review highlights a growing tension. On one hand, AI models like GPT-3 demonstrate remarkable fluency in mimicking the surface features of human writing: structure, grammar, tone, and even certain stylistic flourishes. Yet, as these voices consistently argue, AI struggles to move beyond imitation. What is often missing is the deeper emotional texture, the cultural specificity, and the ethical ambiguity

that are so central to human-authored fiction, especially narratives rooted in histories of trauma like Partition. These concerns raise fundamental questions about whether AI-generated narratives can truly engage with the complex emotional landscapes that human stories inhabit, or whether they remain, ultimately, sophisticated simulations.

This literature review has brought together key scholarship on Partition narratives, narrative theory, posthumanism, and AI-generated fiction. It shows how Partition stories rely on emotional depth, memory, and narrative fragmentation to represent trauma and displacement. Narrative theory explains how emotional resonance is crafted through intentional literary choices, while posthumanist perspectives question the human's central role in meaning-making within machine-driven environments. The review also highlights that AI-generated fiction, despite mimicking surface-level fluency, struggles to convey the emotional complexity and cultural depth that define human-authored narratives.

The reviewed literature reveals a critical absence of work that directly engages with the intersection of artificial intelligence and Partition fiction through a literary lens. While existing studies have explored the emotional and ethical dimensions of human-authored Partition narratives, and others have examined the technical and philosophical aspects of AI-generated text, no research has brought these areas into direct conversation. This gap highlights the need for a comparative approach that evaluates how machine-generated narratives handle historical trauma, cultural memory, and emotional complexity. Addressing this absence is essential to understanding not only the limitations of AI in literary production, but also the evolving definitions of narrative, voice, and meaning in contemporary literature.

2.6 Significance of the Study

This research aims to enhance the current discussion over the role of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in literature, especially in light of the emergence of Large Language Models (LLMs) such as GPT-3. The study seeks to evaluate AI's ability to imitate or reinvent human creativity by examining the distinctions between AI-generated narratives and human-authored literature, particularly in culturally significant contexts. The study analyzes short stories pertaining to the Partition of the Subcontinent, juxtaposing works by human authors such as Saadat Hasan Manto and Intizar Hussain with those generated by

AI, to investigate AI's capacity for emotional depth, thematic intricacy, and cultural subtleties.

This study is significant for its ability to elucidate the effects of AI on creative expression and to interrogate conventional notions of authorship and originality. This research examines AI's capacity to mirror or deviate from human narratives, especially with historical context and cultural sensitivity, emphasizing AI's function in either augmenting or reproducing human creativity. Moreover, the work elucidates the constraints and potentials of AI in narrative development, prompting inquiries regarding the ethical ramifications of employing AI in creative domains. The results of this research will influence the wider domain of literary studies and the developing dialogue on AI in creative sectors. As AI progresses, its increasing impact on artistic domains may transform our comprehension of authorship and the creation of cultural narratives. This research will further discussions on the ways AI might augment human creativity and narrative construction, while also tackling potential biases in AI-generated content. Ultimately, it will shape the future of literary studies and the function of AI in cultural representation and historical narration.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

3.1 Introduction

This chapter outlines the methodological framework adopted to explore the comparative representation of the Partition of the Subcontinent in human-authored and AI-generated narratives. It describes the research approach, the guiding theoretical framework, the analytical strategy, and the techniques employed for data generation and analysis. The chapter provides a rationale for the selection of texts, explains the procedures followed to generate AI narratives, and discusses the basis for comparing the two sets of texts. It also addresses the ethical considerations maintained throughout the study. The methodology has been structured to align closely with the research aim and questions, focusing on examining differences in narrative style, thematic depth, and emotional resonance between human and AI-generated stories. The study adopts a qualitative and interpretive orientation, ensuring that the analysis remains sensitive to the emotional, historical, and cultural complexities embedded in the narratives. Attention is given to ensuring methodological consistency and transparency in the selection, generation, and analysis of the data.

3.2 Methodology

This research employs a qualitative comparative textual analysis, guided by the principles articulated by Joseph A. Maxwell in his model of qualitative research design. According to Maxwell, qualitative research emphasizes the interpretation of meaning, context, and process rather than the pursuit of statistical generalizations (Maxwell 17). This approach is particularly suited to the objectives of the present study, which seeks to explore how narrative style, thematic complexity, and emotional resonance differ between human-authored and AI-generated texts depicting the Partition of the Subcontinent. Instead of quantifying textual differences, the study interprets them within their historical, cultural, and emotional contexts.

Maxwell describes qualitative research as an iterative and flexible process in which design evolves in response to discoveries made during the course of the study (Maxwell 2). This aligns closely with the comparative nature of the current research, in which human-authored and AI-generated narratives are examined side by side to identify patterns, divergences, and relational insights. As Maxwell emphasizes, comparative analysis involves systematically evaluating two or more entities to uncover underlying patterns, distinctions, and theoretical implications (Maxwell 76). This method supports the study's aim to identify not only surface-level variations but also deeper contrasts in narrative strategies and emotional expression.

Moreover, Maxwell highlights the importance of connecting research design to an interpretive theoretical framework (Maxwell 41). In this study, that connection is firmly established through Posthumanism, particularly as articulated by N. Katherine Hayles. Posthumanism challenges the humanist assumption that meaning and creativity originate solely from the autonomous individual, emphasizing instead the distributed and networked nature of cognition between humans and intelligent systems. This theoretical perspective provides the interpretive foundation for the comparative methodology by framing AI-generated narratives not merely as imitations but as non-conscious textual artifacts that engage with human cultural inputs through algorithmic processes.

The qualitative comparative design is therefore informed by posthumanist literary theory rather than psychological or empirical methodologies. The “data” analyzed in this research consist exclusively of textual material—specifically, six short stories by Saadat Hasan Manto and Intizar Hussain and their six AI-generated counterparts. Each text serves as a narrative unit for close reading and interpretation. The analysis focuses on how these texts construct meaning through language, emotion, and cultural memory, in line with Hayles's argument that digital systems reconfigure human creativity by transforming the relationship between embodiment, cognition, and textual production (Hayles 19).

Maxwell's qualitative framework thus complements the posthumanist foundation of this study by emphasizing interpretive depth, contextual sensitivity, and iterative comparison. Together, these approaches allow the research to critically examine how

human and AI narratives negotiate meaning, emotional resonance, and historical memory within a shared yet asymmetrical creative landscape.

3.3 Selection of Text

The selection of texts for this study was guided by the aim of exploring narratives that reflect the historical, emotional, and cultural complexities surrounding the Partition of the Subcontinent. The corpus of human-authored texts comprises short stories by two prominent South Asian authors, Saadat Hasan Manto and Intizar Hussain, originally written in Urdu and analyzed in their English translations by Aatish Taseer and Alok Bhalla, respectively. While these translations are highly regarded for their accuracy and fidelity, translation inherently involves semantic shifts, alterations in tone, and the potential loss of culturally specific nuances. Such inherent limitations may influence comparative analysis, as certain stylistic and linguistic elements present in the original Urdu texts cannot be entirely captured or replicated in translation. Nevertheless, the rationale behind utilizing these translated narratives—Alok Bhalla’s translations of Hussain’s works and Aatish Taseer’s translations of Manto’s—is their effectiveness in bridging the cultural and linguistic divide, making these significant Urdu texts accessible to an English-speaking audience.

Manto’s selected stories—*Khol Do*, *Ram Khilawan*, and *Toba Tek Singh*—provide stark, unflinching portrayals of trauma, displacement, and communal violence, encapsulating the profound human suffering of the Partition. Renowned for their emotional realism and critical exploration of historical suffering, these narratives offer direct insights into the turbulent period. Conversely, Hussain’s narratives—*The City of Sorrows*, *Leaves*, and *Chronicle of the Peacocks*—adopt a more allegorical and philosophical approach. Employing myth, symbolism, and memory, Hussain’s stories delve into themes of exile, moral ambiguity, and cultural dislocation, providing a reflective counterpoint to Manto’s more immediate and visceral representation of Partition experiences.

The rationale for selecting these particular stories lies in their thematic richness, historical significance, and stylistic diversity, which allow for a comprehensive comparative analysis. These stories represent different narrative strategies for dealing with shared historical trauma, offering a broad range of emotional, symbolic, and cultural

textures for examination. By choosing stories from two writers who approach the Partition from different narrative angles—one realist and one symbolic—the study ensures that the comparison addresses not only thematic fidelity but also variations in narrative form and emotional depth.

The AI-generated corpus consists of reimagined versions of the same six stories. Using minimal yet consistent input prompts, the AI model was tasked with generating stories based on the titles, original authors, and historical background of the selected narratives. This design ensures that the AI-generated texts remain closely aligned with the historical and thematic framework of the originals while allowing for variations that reflect the model's narrative tendencies. The AI versions serve as a synthetic comparative set, enabling the research to evaluate whether and how AI can approximate the emotional resonance, narrative complexity, and thematic richness of human-authored Partition stories.

3.3.1 Prompt Generation

The AI generated stories were generated by the researcher using GPT-3, an advanced natural language processing model capable of producing coherent and contextually appropriate narratives based on limited input information. The input prompts for each story included only the title of the original story, the name of the original author, and a brief note indicating that the story concerns the Partition of the Subcontinent. No further plot outlines, character details, or thematic instructions were provided. This prompt-minimalist approach was adopted deliberately to avoid leading the AI towards specific narrative outcomes and to allow it the freedom to generate its own narrative pathways within the broad historical context.

As Jeremy Rees discusses in *Non-Human Words: On GPT-3 as a Philosophical Laboratory*, minimal prompting enables AI models to expose their internal narrative tendencies, limitations of language use, and structural defaults when dealing with historically significant material. Rees suggests that sparse inputs allow AI to reveal the "limits of language, sense-making, and narrative coherence" when working with emotionally and historically charged topics (Rees 9). Following this rationale, the present study adopted a prompt-minimalist strategy for AI text generation, allowing the AI model

to "fill in" narrative gaps based on its learned language patterns. This approach enables a more transparent and authentic evaluation of whether AI can independently construct emotionally and historically resonant stories without heavy human guidance. All AI-generated texts are included in the appendices for full transparency and reference.

3.4 Analytical Framework

The analytical framework for this study is based on comparative textual analysis, situated within a posthumanist interpretive framework. This approach emphasizes the close reading and comparison of literary texts to identify patterns of meaning, narrative strategies, and emotional registers across human-authored and AI-generated narratives. This research treats each text as a literary artifact, analyzing how language, symbolism, and emotion work together to convey historical and cultural meaning. This interpretive strategy aligns with Joseph A. Maxwell's qualitative model, which values iterative exploration, contextual interpretation, and theoretical grounding (Maxwell 17).

In this framework, the term analysis refers not to coding or categorization, but to textual interpretation and comparison. Each narrative—whether authored by humans or generated by AI—is read critically to uncover how meaning is constructed and how emotional resonance is achieved or diminished. Comparative textual analysis allows for both deductive engagement, guided by the theoretical insights of posthumanism, and inductive reading, where emergent motifs and emotional tones arise organically from the texts themselves. This dual interpretive movement ensures that the analysis remains open, flexible, and sensitive to the distinct creative logics operating in human and algorithmic storytelling.

The integration with Posthumanism, as articulated by N. Katherine Hayles, provides the essential theoretical structure for this framework. Hayles challenges human-centered conceptions of creativity and meaning-making, proposing instead that cognition and authorship are distributed across human and non-human systems (Hayles 32). Through this lens, AI-generated narratives are examined not as failed human imitations but as posthuman texts—produced through algorithmic cognition rather than lived experience. The analysis, therefore, investigates how these non-conscious creative processes negotiate,

distort, or replicate the emotional and historical complexities traditionally present in human-authored Partition fiction.

Each pair of stories was examined line by line, with attention to narrative progression, symbolic motifs, character psychology, and emotional tone. Through this detailed examination, several interpretive categories—rather than formal thematic codes—were identified to guide the comparative process. These include: Trauma and psychological fragmentation, Displacement and exile, Communal division and moral ambiguity, Identity crisis and cultural symbolism, Emotional resonance and narrative empathy.

These recurring motifs provide a structured yet interpretive framework for comparison, allowing the study to explore how human and AI narratives differ in representing the moral, emotional, and cultural dimensions of the Partition of the Subcontinent.

This integrated analytical framework ensures that the study remains literary in orientation, posthumanist in theory, and comparative in method. It systematically explores how narrative construction, emotional depth, and historical consciousness are articulated across human and artificial modes of storytelling, contributing to broader debates about authorship, creativity, and authenticity in the digital age.

3.5 Theoretical Framework

This research draws on the critical framework of Posthumanism, particularly as formulated by N. Katherine Hayles in her influential work *How We Became Posthuman: Virtual Bodies in Cybernetics, Literature, and Informatics* (1999). Posthumanism, in this context, is not a rejection of the human but a re-conceptualization of what it means to be human in an age when biological life is increasingly entangled with intelligent machines and digital systems. It challenges the foundational assumptions of Enlightenment humanism—especially the belief in an autonomous, self-contained authorial subject—by showing how cognition, creativity, and consciousness extend beyond the human body into assemblages of algorithms, data flows, and computational networks (Hayles 2).

This theoretical stance is particularly relevant to the production of literature through artificial intelligence. In analyzing both human-authored and AI-generated narratives about

the Partition of the Subcontinent, this study explores not only what stories are told but how storytelling itself is being reshaped by algorithmic systems that increasingly participate in cultural production. Posthumanism thus serves not merely as a background theory but as an interpretive lens through which narrative authorship, emotional resonance, and literary authenticity are redefined at the interface between human memory and machine logic.

At the heart of Hayles's posthuman framework lies a profound reconfiguration of subjectivity and cognition. Where classical humanism positions the self as the rational origin of meaning, posthumanism disperses cognition across human and non-human systems. In this model, thought is not confined to the brain but unfolds through continuous interaction among language, bodies, and technologies (Hayles 104). Human experience is mediated by the tools we use—from speech to software—and identity arises through feedback loops between organic and artificial systems. This insight is central to studying generative AI tools such as GPT-3, which not only assist writers but actively co-produce text, blurring boundaries between user and algorithm. Storytelling therefore becomes a hybrid act—co-authored by data, cultural memory, and predictive computation. Within this hybrid space, a central question emerges: Can narrative meaning and emotional resonance remain exclusively human, or must we now account for the cognitive labor of machines as well?

Another foundational concept in Hayles's theory is embodiment. Information, she argues, is never disembodied or purely abstract; it is always instantiated in material form. Human experience is inseparable from the body—memory, trauma, and emotion are lived through flesh and sensation. This embodied consciousness produces the moral, affective, and cultural depth evident in human literature, particularly in trauma narratives such as those about Partition. By contrast, AI lacks embodiment: it can replicate the form of grief or longing but not the feeling. It recombines data rather than remembers experience. Hayles cautions that privileging information over embodiment risks reducing complex human expression to algorithmic patterning (Hayles 112). For this study, that warning is pivotal: although AI-generated Partition stories may achieve syntactic fluency, their absence of lived, corporeal memory constrains their emotional and historical authenticity.

Posthumanism also extends into the ethics of memory and narrative authority. In accounts of historical trauma, narration functions as testimony—a preservation of silenced histories. Authors such as Saadat Hasan Manto and Intizar Hussain write from within this affective archive, drawing upon communal and generational memory. AI, however, does not remember; it merely references. It has no historical situatedness, only statistical correlation. Hayles distinguishes informational processing from lived understanding, a distinction essential to this research. AI-generated narratives may reproduce stylistic markers of sorrow or violence but do so without ethical anchoring or testimonial urgency. This raises crucial questions: Can an AI-authored text bear witness to trauma? Can it represent loss it has never embodied or inherited? Posthumanism compels us to confront these questions—not to exclude AI from literary creation, but to evaluate what is gained and what is lost when authorship becomes a human–machine collaboration.

A further cornerstone of Hayles’s posthumanism is the redefinition of authorship and agency. Traditional literary theory locates intention and meaning within the conscious authorial mind. In contrast, AI-generated stories arise from probabilistic algorithms trained on vast human corpora. They possess no interiority, intentionality, or moral awareness. Hayles proposes that in posthuman contexts we must decenter—but not erase—the author, recognizing narrative as the outcome of interactions among humans, machines, and language. Yet this collaboration remains asymmetrical: human writers bring affective and historical investment; AI contributes pattern and probability. In Partition narratives—rooted in displacement and moral ambiguity—this absence of intention forms a critical gap. The posthuman framework therefore allows the thesis to interrogate not only what AI writes but who or what claims authorship, and with what legitimacy, in an age of algorithmic participation.

From this perspective arise urgent questions of representation and authenticity. Partition literature is linguistically layered and culturally situated; it bears the psychic scars of a specific geography and history. The works of Manto and Hussain emerge from lived realities of rupture and exile, while AI systems, detached from context, merely rearrange patterns. Hayles reminds us that machines lack situated knowledge—the embodied understanding through which human authors navigate themes of honor, loss, and belonging. When GPT-3 generates a Partition narrative, it may imitate tone and motif yet

cannot comprehend the existential gravity behind them. The gap between simulation and experience—between pattern and presence—defines the limitation of algorithmic creativity. Posthumanism thus enables a nuanced critique of AI-generated fiction as aesthetically competent but ethically and emotionally dislocated.

The rationale for employing posthumanism as the theoretical framework, then, lies in its ability to interrogate emotional resonance and creative authorship without reverting to a human-centric binary. It allows this research to analyze how AI processes information through pattern recognition rather than lived experience, and to examine where such processing succeeds or fails in reproducing the affective and historical density of human narratives. As Hayles observes, while both biological and artificial systems engage in information processing, only humans are embedded within affective, historical, and cultural matrices (Hayles 312).

Integrating posthumanist theory complements the qualitative comparative model of Joseph A. Maxwell, which emphasizes meaning, context, and relational interpretation (Maxwell 17). Maxwell's approach supports the view that understanding emerges from examining connections rather than isolated variables. Here, those connections—and ruptures—between human and AI narratives become critical for assessing narrative fidelity, emotional resonance, and cultural embeddedness. The combination of Hayles's theoretical insights and Maxwell's qualitative principles enables a comparative textual methodology suited to literary inquiry.

Accordingly, this thesis abandons the use of Thematic Analysis from psychology and instead employs Posthumanist Comparative Textual Analysis. This approach retains systematic attention to recurring motifs—trauma, displacement, identity, moral ambiguity, and emotional depth—but treats them as interpretive categories rather than coded data. Through close reading and comparative interpretation, it evaluates how both human and AI-generated texts construct meaning, negotiate emotional tone, and engage with historical consciousness.

In sum, this chapter outlines the methodological and theoretical structure guiding the study of human-authored and AI-generated *Partition* narratives. Grounded in posthumanist theory and qualitative comparative analysis, the research remains attentive

to the emotional and cultural complexities embedded in the texts. The framework of Posthumanism provides the philosophical foundation for examining how AI narratives replicate, reinterpret, or fail to capture the depth of human historical experience. Supported by Maxwell's emphasis on iterative qualitative inquiry, the study maintains theoretical coherence and methodological rigor while situating its findings within the broader discourse on creativity, authorship, and emotional resonance in the digital age.

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS

PART I: HUMAN AND AI STORYTELLING — THEMATIC AND EMOTIONAL PARALLELS

This chapter conducts a detailed comparative analysis of human-authored and AI-generated narratives concerning the Partition of the Subcontinent, with a focus on variations in narrative style, thematic complexity, emotional resonance, and cultural specificity. The human-authored corpus, comprising short stories by Saadat Hasan Manto and Intizar Hussain, is recognized for its portrayal of the emotional, cultural, and historical intricacies of the Partition. Their AI-generated counterparts were produced using a prompt-minimalist approach, allowing the AI model to independently construct narratives based on limited thematic and historical cues. This structure enables an impartial evaluation of whether AI-generated texts can capture the emotional depth and historical consciousness present in human-authored works or whether they rely primarily on surface-level replication.

The analysis is guided by Joseph A. Maxwell's model of qualitative comparative analysis, emphasizing pattern recognition, relational interpretation, and iterative exploration. Thematic analysis, as proposed by Virginia Braun and Victoria Clarke, provides the methodological framework for systematically identifying and interpreting key themes such as trauma, exile, identity crisis, communal division, and moral ambiguity. The study is framed within the theoretical perspective of Posthumanism, as articulated by N. Katherine Hayles, which challenges human-centered conceptions of creativity and cognition. Within this framework, the chapter examines the capacities and limitations of AI storytelling, evaluating the extent to which machine-generated narratives can engage meaningfully with the historical and emotional complexities traditionally handled by human authors.

4.1 Selected Narratives: Contextual Summaries and Comparative Insights

The corpus selected for this study consists of six human-authored Partition narratives by Saadat Hasan Manto and Intizar Hussain, alongside their respective six AI-generated versions. Each pair of stories offers a distinct portrayal of trauma, displacement, and cultural fragmentation, making them ideal for comparative analysis. The following summaries provide an overview of the human-written and AI-generated stories, laying the groundwork for the thematic analysis that follows.

Manto's *Khol Do* captures the profound emotional devastation caused by the Partition. It tells the story of Sirajuddin, an elderly father desperately searching for his missing daughter, Sakina, amid the chaos of mass migration. After days of fruitless searching, Sirajuddin finally locates Sakina, only to discover that while she has survived physically, her spirit has been irreparably broken by sexual violence and trauma. Her mechanical obedience to the command 'open it' becomes a symbol of her psychological collapse. The AI version, *The Silent Signal*, follows the same core narrative, depicting Sirajuddin's desperate search for Sakina. However, the AI version portrays Sakina's trauma in a softened tone, emphasizing poetic sadness rather than the brutal, devastating emotional rupture found in the original. Sakina's mechanical response is presented as a subdued act of survival rather than an expression of deep psychological fragmentation.

In *Ram Khilawan*, Manto presents the story of a Hindu washerman who, during the upheaval of Partition, remains loyal to his Muslim employers even at the risk of his own safety. His unwavering service ultimately isolates him from both communities, leading to his displacement and inner turmoil. Ram's guilt, loneliness, and eventual plea for anonymity underscore the complexity of moral choices during communal violence. The AI version, *A Story of Broken Bridges*, retains the basic outline of loyalty and betrayal but simplifies Ram's psychological struggles. Instead of grappling with guilt and societal rejection, the AI's Ram becomes a more polished figure of misunderstood heroism, and his internal conflict is resolved into an overarching theme of moral perseverance and forgiveness.

Manto's *Toba Tek Singh* is a powerful satire on the absurdity of the Partition, set within a mental asylum where Hindu, Muslim, and Sikh inmates are to be exchanged across newly drawn borders. The central character, Bishan Singh, refuses to accept whether he belongs to India or Pakistan, ultimately collapsing and dying in no man's land. His gibberish and confused defiance serve as a biting commentary on identity, belonging, and political absurdity. The AI version, *The Man Who Stood Between Nations*, captures the basic story of Bishan Singh but reframes it with a more structured moral narrative. Bishan's confusion is portrayed less as tragic absurdity and more as a dignified refusal to submit, providing a clearer but less emotionally disruptive interpretation of the original satire.

Hussain's *The City of Sorrows* focuses on the characters Zohra and Aslam as they navigate the emotional and cultural dislocation following Partition. Hussain depicts loss not only of land but also of memory, language, and belonging, creating a layered narrative of mourning and fractured identity. The AI-generated version, *Ashes and Echoes*, follows a similar path but simplifies the emotional complexity. In the AI version, Aslam's grief is expressed more explicitly and linearly, while the subtle interplay of memory and silence that characterizes Hussain's original work is largely absent.

In *Leaves*, Hussain tells the story of Sanjaya, a monk whose spiritual quest for detachment fails when confronted with worldly desires, symbolizing the moral instability that pervades times of social collapse. The human story is quiet, symbolic, and fragmented, emphasizing emotional ambiguity and spiritual disillusionment. The AI version, *The Withered Grove*, retains the basic idea of Sanjaya's spiritual lapse but restructures it into a straightforward narrative of temptation and redemption. The AI text simplifies the emotional and philosophical depth, transforming Sanjaya into a more predictable and narratively complete figure.

Hussain's *Chronicle of the Peacocks* blends historical reality with mythic imagery to depict the lingering trauma of the Partition. The peacock functions as a symbolic witness to human loss and cultural decay. Hussain's narrative is non-linear and dreamlike, resisting neat closure. The AI version, *The Last Flight of the Peacock*, preserves the symbolism of the peacock but presents the story in a more linear and emotionally accessible format. The

AI narrative turns the mythical ambiguity into a nostalgic allegory of loss, smoothing out the fragmentation and symbolic complexity present in the original.

Each of these twelve narratives offers valuable material for comparative analysis, revealing the differing capacities of human and AI storytelling in engaging with complex historical and emotional material. While the human-authored texts often embrace emotional ambiguity, narrative fragmentation, and symbolic restraint, the AI-generated versions tend to prioritize thematic clarity, emotional accessibility, and narrative closure. These differences provide the foundation for the detailed thematic analysis that follows, focusing on trauma, displacement, communal division, identity crises, moral ambiguity, and cultural memory within the context of Partition literature.

4.2 Thematic Fidelity

Thematic fidelity refers to the extent to which AI-generated narratives preserve, reinterpret, or dilute the core themes found in the Partition stories of Saadat Hasan Manto and Intizar Hussain. Both authors examine intricate concepts such as displacement, trauma, communal separation, identity disintegration, and moral ambiguity; nevertheless, they employ different aesthetic approaches: Manto utilizes stark realism and irony, while Hussain employs allegorical symbolism and spiritual profundity. This examines the fidelity of AI in replicating the thematic themes present in both authors' works and assesses its ability to encapsulate the nuanced contradictions, emotional depth, and cultural identity that characterize their narratives. Grounded in Katherine Hayles' posthumanist theory, the analysis rigorously examines AI's ability to interpret and express these themes through symbolic patterning, and whether this patterning can replace the embodied, affective, and historically contextualized consciousness inherent in the originals.

4.2.1 Displacement and Loss of Home: Human Experience versus Algorithmic Recreation

Displacement in Partition literature is not simply a matter of physical relocation; it represents a profound disconnection from history, memory, and self. Both Saadat Hasan Manto and Intizar Hussain engage with this theme, though their methods differ. Manto approaches it through realist, often satirical portrayals of individuals stripped of their agency amid socio-political chaos, while Hussain renders it through allegory, myth, and

spiritual longing. In their respective AI-generated versions, this theme is preserved in form but diminished in depth, revealing a core limitation of artificial narrative construction when viewed through the lens of posthumanist theory.

In Manto's *Toba Tek Singh*, displacement is materialized through Bishan Singh's refusal to cross the border because he cannot determine the national location of his village. His final collapse in "no man's land" literalizes the absurdity and futility of state-imposed identities: "There, behind barbed wires, was India. Here, behind barbed wires, was Pakistan. In the middle... lay Toba Tek Singh" (Manto 10). The AI version, *The Man Who Stood Between Nations*, echoes the structure and ending, but strips away the psychological tension. In the AI narrative, Bishan Singh stands "between two gates that no longer knew his name" (ChatGPT-3) and his death is described as "the final refusal of a man who could not belong anywhere" (ChatGPT-3). While the scene retains symbolic weight, it lacks the surreal disorientation Manto intricately crafts. As Hayles explains, in posthuman systems, "consciousness is an epiphenomenon, an emergent property that cannot be mapped directly onto the material substrate" (Hayles 113). The AI's version, while grammatically coherent, lacks the emergent irrationality that gives Bishan Singh his existential complexity.

Similarly, in *Ram Khilawan*, Manto explores moral displacement. The protagonist remains in a Muslim household after Partition, attempting to uphold personal loyalties over religious divides. Yet this very act renders him socially homeless. His appeal—"Please don't tell Begum Saab that Ram Khilawan..." (Manto 100)—is a whisper of guilt and exile. In contrast, the AI's *A Story of Broken Bridges* reconstructs Ram's narrative as a tale of community rejection and personal endurance, where Ram reflects, "In choosing loyalty, I had become foreign to my own blood" (ChatGPT-3). While the arc of displacement remains, the internal conflict and layered emotional nuance are diluted. AI, as Hayles suggests, functions as a "distributed cognitive system" operating through symbolic abstraction, not embodied experience (Hayles 2). Thus, while it understands displacement as a structural motif, it cannot represent the emotional ambiguity that characterizes human estrangement.

On the other hand, Intizar Hussain's stories engage with displacement on metaphysical and cyclical levels. In *The City of Sorrows*, displacement is recursive and

unresolved. The First Man recounts brutal acts committed during communal violence, only to realize he continued to “live” after each act—not in a physical sense, but as someone severed from his moral and social self. The refrain “I still lived” (Hussain 5) becomes a haunting echo of spiritual homelessness. The Third Man, who fears turning into stone, finally states, “I must find out where I am—a question that replaces the very notion of home with one of existential orientation” (Hussain 17). The AI version, *Ashes and Echoes*, localizes the story more narrowly. While still powerful, the AI narrative reshapes the reflection into physical terms: “Among the camps, the broken gates, and the silent streets, I found no place to name my own” (ChatGPT-3). Though moving, it smooths the disruptions and symbolic layering that characterize Hussain’s original. Memory is restructured into plot, and symbolic recursion becomes closure.

In *Chronicle of the Peacocks*, Hussain evokes displacement through layered metaphor. The peacock—once a celestial creature in paradise—now flits across broken landscapes, haunted by war and exile. “The lakes are dry, the rivers polluted... the royal swans have flown away” (Hussain 5). The AI version, *The Last Flight of the Peacock*, reimagines this symbol into an environmental lament: “The peacock danced no longer in gardens but wandered barren lands, a ghost of forgotten springs” (ChatGPT-3). While poetic, this version transforms the mythic and spiritual aspects into a nostalgic ecological memory, narrowing the metaphysical dimensions of exile that Hussain embeds in the original. Hayles contends that the posthuman turns information into pattern but cannot replicate embodied memory or mythic resonance—those are “technically irreducible to code” (Hayles 227). The AI’s inability to replicate Hussain’s layering of sacred, historical, and symbolic spaces demonstrates the limits of narrative creation devoid of cultural embodiment.

In both authors’ AI adaptations, then, the structure of displacement remains visible—trains, camps, lost homes, ghost towns—but the substance is altered. Manto’s moral absurdities and Hussain’s metaphysical longing become narrative tropes. The AI captures the what but misses the why. In Hayles’ terms, AI narratives operate on pattern rather than presence: they reproduce thematic skeletons but cannot embody lived affect or metaphysical contradiction (Hayles 12). Displacement, as portrayed by Manto and

Hussain, is not a setting but a state of being—irreconcilable, unlocatable, and untranslatable into algorithmic regularity.

4.2.2 Trauma and Psychological Fragmentation: Emotional Resonance in Human and AI Narratives

In Partition literature, trauma resists simple representation—it unsettles narrative logic and destabilizes coherent subjectivity. Both Saadat Hasan Manto and Intizar Hussain use narrative form, silence, and symbolic fragmentation to reflect trauma as not merely physical or external, but as a deep rupture in cognition and identity. Their human-authored stories often evoke what Hayles terms a “loss of coherence in the bounded liberal subject,” marking a transition from a human-centered model of emotional depth to the disarray of posthuman vulnerability (Hayles 3). In contrast, the AI-regenerated versions of their stories tend to reproduce trauma as stylistic motif, smoothing its dissonance into readable, emotionally palatable forms.

In *Khol Do*, Manto’s portrayal of Sakina’s trauma is disturbingly understated. Her mechanical response to the doctor’s command—untying her shalwar—is not an act of recognition but of psychological conditioning. The horror lies in the dissociation between her body and her mind, between survival and subjectivity. Manto withholds this revelation until the very end, using narrative silence to underscore psychological breakdown. In the AI version, *The Silent Signal*, this moment is retained but softened: “With mechanical obedience, she reached down... loosened the drawstring” (ChatGPT-3). Elsewhere, the AI writes, “Sirajuddin smiled in relief, not seeing the hollowness in her gaze” (ChatGPT-3). The structural shock is imitated, but the emotional rupture is not. The AI’s language packages trauma into recognizable metaphor rather than allowing it to remain unresolved. As Hayles asserts, “Embodiment is always contextual, enmeshed within the specifics of place, time, physiology, and culture” (Hayles 196). Lacking these contexts, the AI’s rendering of trauma becomes simulation rather than experience.

Similarly, in *Ram Khilawan*, Manto constructs trauma through silence and shame. Ram’s plea, *Please don’t tell Begum Saab...* (Manto 100) is not merely guilt-ridden; it reveals a fragmented self-incapable of moral redemption. His trauma is quiet, internalized, and socially unresolvable. In *A Story of Broken Bridges*, the AI version transforms this into

poetic regret: “When fear seeps into love... even the strongest walls crack” (ChatGPT-3). Additionally, Ram reflects, “Perhaps loyalty was the heaviest burden of all” (ChatGPT-3), framing trauma as a poetic burden rather than a psychologically destabilizing force. The psychological nuance is replaced with aphorism. The AI demonstrates emotional mimicry but lacks the ability to register what Hayles calls “the non-conscious cognition that exceeds linguistic articulation” (Hayles 203). Manto’s Ram is haunted by decisions that language cannot repair; the AI’s Ram is defined by statements that summarize pain rather than inhabit it.

In *Toba Tek Singh*, trauma is externalized through absurdity. Bishan Singh’s nonsensical utterances—*Upar di gur gur di annexe di bedhiyana di moong di daal of di Pakistan and Hindustan...* (Manto 6) are not random, but symbolic of a psyche so fractured it can no longer interface with a world premised on reason. His mental collapse, culminating in death between two nations, illustrates the absurdity of assigning order to political violence. In the AI version (*The Man Who Stood Between Nations*), Bishan’s trauma is retained but polished: “His cracked lips muttered phrases no one understood... words stitched from broken thoughts and bleeding memories” (ChatGPT-3). The breakdown is aestheticized, rendering trauma as a lyrical endpoint rather than a lingering condition. Hayles notes that posthuman systems often function through “pattern recognition without presence” (Hayles 11). The AI’s Bishan Singh becomes a tragic motif, a symbol of Partition, rather than a psychologically ruptured subject who challenges national logic.

Intizar Hussain, in contrast to Manto’s realism, writes trauma as existential and cyclical, particularly in *The City of Sorrows*. Here, the First Man repeatedly narrates violent acts he committed, yet confesses, “I still lived” (Hussain 6). Trauma does not produce immediate death, it perpetuates a limbo state, where living becomes indistinguishable from dying. The story enacts psychological fragmentation through a disintegrated self who has lost access to moral clarity and bodily continuity. In the AI version (*Ashes and Echoes*), this cyclical collapse is replaced by a protagonist named Aslam, whose grief unfolds linearly—from the train to the refugee camp, from the sister’s silence to settlement in Walton. “In every new place, a part of me stayed behind” (ChatGPT-3), the AI writes, turning recursive trauma into reflective memory. While affecting, the narrative offers

resolution where Hussain offers recursive dissolution. The trauma in Hussain's version is not a past event but an ongoing state of erasure. As Hayles explains, "consciousness in the posthuman view is emergent and distributed," shaped by recursive networks rather than singular outcomes (Hayles 290). The AI organizes trauma into a progression, failing to reproduce the recursive paralysis of memory that defines Hussain's characters.

In *Chronicle of the Peacocks*, Hussain maps trauma through mythic allegory. The narrator is pursued by Ashwatthama, an immortal cursed to roam for 3,000 years, whose presence allegorizes the lingering effects of violence that transcend generations. The peacock, a divine figure of beauty, becomes a witness to devastation and exile. The AI version (*The Last Flight of the Peacock*) evokes nostalgia for lost homeland and peacocks but omits the spiritual and mythological layering. Ashwatthama is entirely absent. Instead, the AI writes, "The peacock remembered laughter, the jasmine trees, and the prayers that once echoed under open skies" (ChatGPT-3). The story becomes an ode to environmental loss and emotional longing. The AI engages only with surface symbolism—peacocks as emblems of beauty and memory—while avoiding the psychological hauntings that Hussain's original so masterfully depicts. As Hayles writes, "patterns alone do not make meaning; the body anchors interpretation through affective intensity" (Hayles 199). The AI's narrative lacks this anchoring—its trauma is thematic, not affective.

Thus, while AI-generated narratives may retain the structure of trauma, they fail to inhabit its disruptive force. Manto and Hussain write trauma not as spectacle but as disorientation—narrative hesitation, moral collapse, spiritual ambiguity. In the hands of AI, these hesitations are resolved into linear development or metaphorical flourishes. From a posthumanist standpoint, this reveals a fundamental limit: AI, as a disembodied and non-conscious system, cannot replicate the emotional entropy that emerges from lived trauma. It processes pain but does not suffer it. Hayles' distinction between the informational pattern of narrative and the embodied presence of experience is essential here: AI may simulate narrative cognition, but it cannot simulate the fractured interiority that makes trauma human (Hayles 12).

4.2.3 Violence and Violation of the Body: Embodiment and the Limits of AI Representation

Violence in Partition literature is not only a matter of physical brutality—it is an assault on the body, identity, memory, and social trust. Both Saadat Hasan Manto and Intizar Hussain capture this violence through markedly different narrative techniques: Manto through stark realism and irony, and Hussain through allegory, spiritual symbolism, and metaphysical layering. Their stories confront the reader with embodied suffering, using silence, implication, and symbolic disruption to communicate pain that cannot be resolved through narrative closure. In contrast, their AI-generated counterparts often render violence through abstraction or stylization, revealing the limits of a machine’s capacity to recreate the ethical and psychological weight of corporeal violation.

In *Khol Do*, Manto presents one of the most devastating representations of Partition-era violence through Sakina’s body. The revelation that she responds to the doctor’s command by loosening her shalwar—without recognizing him or understanding the context—serves as the climax of narrative horror. Manto refuses to name the act explicitly, allowing the reader to encounter violence through suggestion, not spectacle. In this way, the body becomes a site of silence, where trauma is inscribed without language. The AI version (*The Silent Signal*) mimics the scene with the phrase, “With mechanical obedience... she loosened the drawstring” (ChatGPT-3), but this moment lacks the emotional torque of Manto’s original. It adds: “Sirajuddin sighed with relief, unaware of what that motion truly meant” (ChatGPT-3). The horror becomes a stylistic beat rather than a rupture. According to Hayles, “information loses meaning when it is divorced from the context of embodiment” (Hayles 199). In this instance, the AI captures the semantic outline of trauma but fails to evoke its embodied presence—the trembling silence, the fractured agency, the loss of subjectivity.

In *Ram Khilawan*, violence exists as a threat rather than an act. The tension between the narrator and the drunken dhobis, the fear in Ram’s voice, and the vulnerability of the Muslim women he protects create a scenario charged with moral panic. Violence here is atmospheric—an environment where safety is illusory. In contrast, *A Story of Broken Bridges*, the AI adaptation, situates violence in the past and reframes Ram’s story as one

of misunderstood loyalty. It reflects, “They called him a traitor, but he only carried buckets of water and a silent promise” (ChatGPT-3). The immediacy of danger is replaced with retrospective framing. The story flattens the tension by generalizing communal threat, turning Ram into a symbol of reconciliation rather than a man caught in a violent ethical dilemma. Hayles’ notion that AI constructs narrative through pattern recognition and symbolic abstraction rather than situated cognition explains this shift (Hayles 12). The AI substitutes proximity with paraphrase—it registers the idea of violence but not the lived moral tension that characterizes Manto’s version.

In *Toba Tek Singh*, Manto refracts violence through absurdity. The lunatics in the asylum become proxies for a population being displaced and dehumanized, reduced to lists and labels. Bishan Singh’s nonsensical speech and his final collapse in no-man’s land render violence symbolic yet deeply embodied—he dies not from a physical wound but from the collapse of meaning itself. The AI version (*The Man Who Stood Between Nations*) imitates this by rendering his death in poetic terms: “He collapsed between two nations, his eyes open but seeing nothing—no border, no homeland, just earth” (ChatGPT-3). The bureaucratic absurdity that defines Manto’s critique becomes metaphorical reflection in the AI’s narrative. In Hayles’ terms, this is because AI operates within the logic of coherence, whereas trauma-induced violence often resists logical containment. As she notes, the posthuman subject is “no longer a self-contained consciousness but a node within distributed cognitive networks” (Hayles 3). Lacking a unified interiority or an embodied center, the AI cannot render violence as a breakdown of sense and self—it presents it as event rather than condition.

Intizar Hussain’s stories approach violence differently but with equal force. In *The City of Sorrows*, violence is embedded in repetition and the failure to die. The First Man recounts repeated scenes of communal rape, bloodshed, and moral collapse. Yet each time, he confesses, that he still lived. This is not survival, but a spiritual violation so profound that death refuses him. His continued existence becomes a burden—he is disfigured, morally and spiritually. In contrast, the AI version (*Ashes and Echoes*) reframes this through the story of Aslam and Zohra, giving readers a clear timeline of displacement and loss, but omitting the moral grotesqueness of the original. Aslam states, “Each time I closed my eyes, I saw the red sky, the flames, and her silence” (ChatGPT-3). The repeated

witnessing of violence—its circularity and permanence—is replaced with narrative closure and healing. Again, this illustrates Hayles’ insight that machine cognition privileges coherence and resolution, whereas embodied narratives often rely on the unsaid, the suspended, and the contradictory (Hayles 199).

In *Chronicle of the Peacocks*, Hussain uses symbolic imagery—the peacock, Ashwatthama, ruined cities—to reflect violence that transcends the immediate moment. Ashwatthama, cursed to wander for millennia, becomes the embodiment of the unresolved violence of history. His presence haunts the narrator, signifying how some acts of violence resist both forgetting and redemption. The AI version strips away this mythic layering. While *The Last Flight of the Peacock* preserves references to loss and memory, Ashwatthama is omitted entirely. Instead, the AI reflects: “The peacock cried under a dry sky. The land had changed, but its grief remained” (ChatGPT-3). The spiritual and historical weight of Ashwatthama’s curse is absent. The AI aestheticizes mourning, but does not confront the moral metaphysics of inherited violence. As Hayles contends, while AI can simulate presence, “simulation is not equivalent to embodiment” (Hayles 112). Hussain’s Ashwatthama cannot exist in a purely logical system—he is the residue of violence unprocessed, a metaphysical echo the AI cannot retrieve.

Across both writers’ oeuvres, violence is not just enacted—it is inscribed onto the body, memory, and narrative form. The AI-generated stories, while competent in rendering atmosphere and sequence, consistently remove the visceral uncertainty that defines these human-authored depictions. Manto and Hussain leave wounds open; the AI heals too quickly, summarizes too easily. It turns suffering into metaphor, whereas the original texts force readers to encounter it as rupture—personal, historical, and ontological.

4.2.4 Religious and Communal Division: Cultural Context and Computational Neutrality

Both Saadat Hasan Manto and Intizar Hussain depict religious and communal division not simply as historical or political rupture but as a force that disfigures relationships, dissolves trust, and redefines the boundaries of self and other. Manto, through realist and satirical methods, and Hussain, through symbolic and mythic expression, each reveal how religious identity becomes a dangerous label, imposed

externally and internalized through silence or guilt. In *Ram Khilawan*, the protagonist's Hindu identity becomes both his shield and his sentence—by protecting Muslim girls, he is marked as a traitor by his own community. Ram's quiet plea about not telling anything to Begum Saab, underscores his isolation not just from others, but from a moral order that no longer functions. Hussain's *The City of Sorrows* similarly implicates communal logic in the most intimate betrayals; the question "Is she related to you?" (Hussain 4) precedes an act of violence, reducing familial or emotional bonds to sectarian filters. In both texts, the human is lost in the mechanics of communal allegiance.

The AI-generated versions of these stories, however, weaken the visceral immediacy of this division. In *A Story of Broken Bridges*, the AI reinterprets Ram's alienation as political misunderstanding. Ram reflects, "They said I crossed lines no man should cross. But I only gave them water" (ChatGPT-3). While evocative, this portrayal reframes communal threat as moral confusion rather than ideological hostility. Likewise, in *Ashes and Echoes* (AI version of *The City of Sorrows*), communal violence is positioned as a past trauma. Aslam notes, "We were born in fire, but now we only gather ashes" (ChatGPT-3). The story constructs a narrative of endurance and closure, transforming characters into survivors rather than moral casualties. In contrast, the human-authored versions reject moral closure—Ram is not exonerated; the First Man does not find redemption. As Hayles notes, "The posthuman subject is not autonomous but formed within the context of distributed cognition" (Hayles 290). The AI operates from this distributed logic, assembling narratives from symbolic patterns of communal tension, but without the embodied contradiction that shapes Manto's irony or Hussain's guilt-ridden recurrence.

Manto's *Toba Tek Singh* and Hussain's *Chronicle of the Peacocks* further display how communal identities become absurd or spectral. Bishan Singh's rejection of both India and Pakistan is echoed in the peacock's flight through ruined lands—both figures resist categorization. The former collapses in no-man's-land; the latter becomes a symbolic ghost of an unclaimed past. In the AI version *The Man Who Stood Between Nations*, Bishan is described as "a man whose silence said more than the leaders who had drawn the lines" (ChatGPT-3). This poetic framing aestheticizes resistance but flattens the irrational core of Manto's satire. In *The Last Flight of the Peacock*, the AI describes the bird as "once royal,

now forgotten—a memory that danced on borders no map could name” (ChatGPT-3). The AI reimagines the peacock as a nostalgic figure of displacement, but omits the mythic and historical weight Hussain embedded in the original. Hayles warns that without embodiment, AI-generated pattern loses affective force; it “reproduces structure but not the event of meaning” (Hayles 199). What AI generates, then, are elegant representations of communal conflict—not the internal disfigurements it causes in Manto’s and Hussain’s characters.

4.2.5 Identity Crisis: Authorship, Consciousness, and the Posthuman Self

For both Saadat Hasan Manto and Intizar Hussain, identity is not a coherent or stable category; it is a fragile and often disintegrating construct, shaped by trauma, memory, displacement, and moral collapse. Their Partition narratives do not merely depict characters who face external crises but those whose internal landscapes are fragmented beyond repair. In *Khol Do*, Manto’s Sakina becomes the embodiment of this unraveling. Her compliance with the doctor’s command—loosening her shalwar—is not a moment of recognition, but of conditioned survival. She does not return as a daughter; she returns as a body responding to command, severed from subjectivity.

Hussain’s *Leaves* presents a different yet resonant depiction of identity fracture. The monk Sanjaya, believed to have transcended worldly temptation, is undone by a single encounter with sensory pleasure. His spiritual identity is not reaffirmed but quietly disassembled. In both texts, identity is revealed to be porous and contingent, never fixed. Their characters are not guided by consistent moral compasses but are instead pulled apart by historical, emotional, and metaphysical pressures. Identity becomes, in this sense, not an essence but a field of rupture.

The AI-generated counterparts tend to resolve these ruptures rather than explore them. In *The Silent Signal* (AI’s version of *Khol Do*), Sakina’s trauma is translated into a clean arc of loss and rediscovery. Her moment of mechanical obedience is retained, but the narrative reframes her reappearance as a reunion: “Sirajuddin wept. His daughter was back, broken perhaps, but found” (ChatGPT-3). This reintroduces a stable subjectivity that Manto deliberately leaves in question. Likewise, in *The Withered Grove* (AI version of *Leaves*), Sanjaya’s moment of temptation is followed by moral resolution. After wandering

in shame, the monk is described as “returning to his cell, where silence offered him peace once more” (ChatGPT-3). The tension between spiritual discipline and human desire is narrated as a lesson, stripping away the ambiguity that defines Hussain’s original. This tendency toward narrative closure reflects what Hayles critiques as the posthuman system’s inclination to “prioritize coherence over contradiction” (Hayles 290). AI reconstitutes the fragmented self into a readable pattern—what was once instability becomes resolution.

This contrast intensifies in *Toba Tek Singh* and *The City of Sorrows*. Manto’s Bishan Singh no longer knows the national location of his home; his gibberish, insomnia, and final refusal to move embody an identity unmoored from logic. Hussain’s Third Man in *The City of Sorrows* undergoes a similar crisis. He fears turning into stone, his features no longer recognizable, even to himself. Both characters experience identity not as a challenge to navigate but as a collapse to endure. They exist at the threshold between being and erasure, unable to reconcile what they were with what they’ve become.

In their AI versions, however, these identities are reshaped into conceptual metaphors. *The Man Who Stood Between Nations* renders Bishan Singh’s crisis with poetic elegance but removes the irrational dread of his gibberish, instead writing: “He stood still, eyes blank, as if borders were just lines drawn through his soul” (ChatGPT-3). The moment becomes symbolic, not chaotic. Similarly, *Ashes and Echoes* reimagines the protagonist Aslam with moral consistency—he mourns, he acts, he survives. He reflects, “In losing everything, I remembered who I was” (ChatGPT-3). The spectral ambiguity that defines Hussain’s original characters is replaced with narrative determinacy.

This gap reflects a deeper posthumanist insight. As Hayles argues, identity in the posthuman condition is “not a property of the self, but an effect of its interfaces with other systems” (Hayles 288). Manto and Hussain write within these failing interfaces—where religious categories, moral roles, or personal histories no longer stabilize identity. Their characters are exposed to the collapse of these systems and are left to drift in the aftermath. AI, however, as a system itself, cannot convincingly represent this breakdown. It processes the narrative shape of identity crisis but cannot inhabit its ontological instability.

In short, where Manto and Hussain leave us with unresolved selves—haunted, broken, or scattered—AI-generated narratives resolve identity into digestible arcs. They

reproduce the vocabulary of disintegration but not the experience. Their characters are patterned, complete, and narratively coherent. Manto's Sakina and Bishan Singh, and Hussain's Sanjaya and Third Man, resist such coherence. They are, in Hayles' terms, "fractured subjects in recursive loops of nonconscious cognition" (Hayles 203)—and this recursive instability is precisely what AI fails to generate.

4.2.6 Bureaucracy and Dehumanization: Mechanization within Human and AI Storytelling

In the Partition fiction of Saadat Hasan Manto and Intizar Hussain, systems of governance and bureaucracy are not merely institutional frameworks—they are instruments of dehumanization. Both writers expose how official structures fail to acknowledge personal history, emotional bonds, or moral nuance, instead processing individuals as statistical or symbolic entities. In contrast, the AI-generated retellings often neutralize this critique. Though they retain the vocabulary of injustice, they remove the systems of power responsible, offering sympathy without interrogation. This structural oversight highlights the difference between embodied critique and computational imitation, a divide theorized in N. Katherine Hayles' articulation of posthuman subjectivity.

In Manto's *Toba Tek Singh*, the lunatic exchange is executed with mechanical indifference. The inmates are moved not for their welfare but to fulfill the cold logic of Partition's cartographic divisions. Bishan Singh's final collapse in no-man's-land exposes the absurdity of this system, which fails even to assign him a nation. *Khol Do* offers a parallel critique: Sirajuddin's desperate search for his daughter is repeatedly met with bureaucratic apathy—papers, queues, and officials too busy to see the human being before them. In *Ram Khilawan*, the absence of a functional system leads to moral chaos. Law and order dissolve, replaced by the tyranny of mobs and self-appointed enforcers. Manto's stories consistently reveal how the collapse, or weaponization, of bureaucratic order strips people of dignity.

Hussain's approach is more allegorical but no less damning. In *The City of Sorrows*, refugees arrive at a camp where memory and names fade; identities blur into numbers. One man says, "What is left but shadows?" (Hussain 7) The institutional structures meant to

restore order instead erase individuality. In *Leaves*, Sanjaya's detour from discipline is not just spiritual—it is facilitated by an environment where institutional religion has become hollow ritual. These systems, once designed to guide or protect, now exist as empty shells, incapable of holding meaning or maintaining human integrity.

The AI-generated stories, while retaining plot elements, seldom retain the institutional critique embedded in the originals. In *The Man Who Stood Between Nations*, the bureaucratic logic of transferring mental patients is portrayed as a tragic event but not an absurdist failure. Bishan Singh's final moment is narrated as "He stood between borders that had forgotten him. The officers whispered, ticked boxes, and moved on" (ChatGPT-3). The haunting satire of Manto's original, where madness is met with method—is replaced with melancholy. In *The Silent Signal* (AI's *Khol Do*), the journey from loss to reunion is streamlined; Sirajuddin is told, "She was found, hours ago. There was a file" (ChatGPT-3). Bureaucracy is acknowledged only as a backdrop, not a source of trauma. Similarly, *A Story of Broken Bridges* eliminates references to law enforcement, paperwork, or communal authority altogether—recasting Ram's experience as a moral dilemma between communities. Ram reflects, "They did not ask for names or papers. Just allegiance" (ChatGPT-3). This shifts the focus away from administrative failure and toward interpersonal moral tension.

Even in Hussain's AI versions, this pattern continues. In *Ashes and Echoes*, the camp is a place of waiting and grief, but not systemic erasure. "At Walton, the line moved slowly. Names were called, but no one remembered theirs" (ChatGPT-3). The poetic tone masks the absence of institutional critique. In *The Withered Grove*, Sanjaya's loss of spiritual clarity is narrated through personal failure: "He had left the temple gates open; no one followed him" (ChatGPT-3). Here, the institution disappears, and the internal conflict replaces any commentary on structured decay.

This contrast aligns with Hayles' argument that posthuman systems are governed by pattern over presence. AI can identify and reproduce signs of injustice—separation, confusion, helplessness—but it lacks the ability to embed these within institutional critique because it does not operate within those systems effectively. As Hayles observes, "What disappears in the posthuman view is not the concept of the human but the idea of a liberal

human subject centered in individual experience and moral agency” (Hayles 17). Manto and Hussain preserve that human moral agency precisely to show its collapse when faced with bureaucratic absurdity. Hayles also emphasizes that posthuman cognition is distributed across systems, lacking central interiority (220). This is evident in how AI structures narratives: it reconstitutes personal suffering into broader emotional tone without anchoring it in specific systemic failure. Where Manto exposes the Ministry of Health trading lunatics like livestock, and Hussain conjures camps where memory itself is processed into paper, the AI versions generalize dehumanization. They depict grief but fail to name its facilitators.

Ultimately, the distinction lies not in what the AI stories say but in what they omit. Manto and Hussain expose the hollow core of governance during Partition—the madness of process without empathy, the ghostly ritual of documentation amid chaos. The AI versions reproduce the emotional outline of such stories but do not challenge the systems that created the trauma. As Hayles cautions, when meaning is divorced from embodiment and institutional embeddedness, narratives become simulations—affective, perhaps, but ethically anesthetized (Hayles 199). That is precisely the failure we see when AI renders bureaucratic horror as a melancholic backdrop rather than material critique.

4.2.7 Humanity Amidst Chaos: Ethical and Emotional Dimensions of Narrative Voice

In the Partition fiction of Saadat Hasan Manto and Intizar Hussain, moments of human dignity emerge not as acts of heroism but as quiet refusals to surrender to hatred or despair. Their characters, despite the brutality that surrounds them, hold onto fragments of care, memory, and ethical will. Whether through silence, sacrifice, or irrational love, they defy the machinery of violence. In contrast, their AI-generated versions tend to repackage these instances of resistance into structured moral clarity, flattening ambiguity and replacing experiential contradiction with expressive coherence. This gap, as Hayles articulates, highlights the difference between embodied moral cognition and computational empathy—between affect as felt experience and affect as narrative form (Hayles 159).

In *Khol Do*, Manto stages a harrowing scene of love and loss. Sirajuddin’s tireless search for Sakina is not framed as hope, but as denial—a form of devotion clinging to

possibility in a world where the body, not the soul, returns. His final words—“My daughter is alive” (Manto 54)—echo with tragic irony, for the daughter he sought is no longer a whole person. The AI version, *The Silent Signal*, preserves this emotional high point, but restructures it with closure: “He wept as he held her cold hand. She was alive, and that was enough” (ChatGPT-3). The layered contradiction of survival and trauma is replaced with a digestible conclusion. Similarly, in *The City of Sorrows*, Hussain’s First Man recounts acts of communal brutality and his own complicity, yet survives. His repeated refrain—“I still lived” (Hussain 7)—becomes a paradox of guilt and persistence. The AI version reframes this survival arc through the character of Aslam, who concludes, “I chose to live, for those who could not” (ChatGPT-3). The existential weight is transformed into a moral declaration, simplifying the unresolved anguish of the original.

In *Ram Khilawan*, Manto portrays quiet moral resistance. The Hindu washerman protects Muslim girls despite the threat to his life. His return is not celebrated; it is shaded with shame and sorrow. “Please don’t tell Begum Saab...” (100) is not a plea for recognition, but for erasure—an acknowledgment that moral clarity may exist, but it often bears unbearable cost. In *Leaves*, Hussain’s monk Sanjaya fails in his spiritual discipline but is not condemned. His lapse is human, his journey incomplete. Both writers offer portrayals of flawed humanity that reject binary judgment.

The AI renderings simplify this complexity. In *A Story of Broken Bridges*, Ram is presented as a misunderstood hero whose compassion triumphs: “They said I was weak. But I only did what was right” (ChatGPT-3). His empathy is not conflicted but affirmed. In the AI version of *Leaves*, Sanjaya’s lapse is narrated as a moral lesson: “Even monks must guard the gates of the soul” (ChatGPT-3). The ambiguity of the human struggle is distilled into narrative instruction. While these arcs retain narrative power, they reverse the ethical ambiguity of the originals. As Hayles emphasizes, posthuman systems rely on data legibility, whereas lived moral experience often exists in “zones of irresolvable contradiction” (Hayles 203). Manto and Hussain write within these zones; AI writes around them.

In *Toba Tek Singh* and *Chronicle of the Peacocks*, the theme of dignity emerges in refusal. Bishan Singh collapses between nations, choosing death over false belonging.

The peacock in Hussain's tale, once sacred and proud, now limps through devastated landscapes, its cry a remnant of something lost. These characters do not change history; they bear witness to its absurdities and refuse to comply. The AI version of *Toba Tek Singh*, titled *The Man Who Stood Between Nations*, eulogizes Bishan Singh as "the madman who made the most sense" (ChatGPT-3). While poetic, it renders his incoherence legible—where Manto leaves it maddeningly unresolved. In the AI-generated retelling of *Chronicle of the Peacocks*, the bird becomes a nostalgic emblem of peace, described as "a silent reminder of what the land had once been" (ChatGPT-3). The spiritual, mythical, and philosophical undertones that Hussain crafts are narrowed into a pastoral image.

What is lost in these rewritings is not the message of humanity, but its fragility. In Hayles' terms, AI simulates empathy through symbolic processing, but it cannot reproduce the "emergent, embodied awareness" (ChatGPT-3), that defines human compassion (Hayles 196). Manto and Hussain do not offer moral lessons; they offer broken mirrors, where goodness flickers amid ruin. The AI, in contrast, presents refined images—clear, beautiful, and untroubled by contradiction. The difference is not between stories that feel and those that do not, but between feeling as crisis and feeling as structure. The AI tells us what humanity looks like; Manto and Hussain show us what it costs.

4.3 Emotional Depth and Cultural Resonance

One of the most enduring features of Partition literature by Saadat Hasan Manto and Intizar Hussain is the profound emotional depth embedded in their narratives. Their stories do not rely on sentimentality or melodrama; rather, they evoke states of numbness, moral ambiguity, quiet despair, and unresolved grief. Emotion is not announced, it is allowed to fester in silence, contradiction, and the spaces between action and reflection. In contrast, their AI-regenerated counterparts, while able to replicate emotional vocabulary, often flatten complexity into legibility. What emerges is affect without embodiment—what Katherine Hayles terms the simulation of presence, where emotion is constructed algorithmically rather than organically through lived subjectivity (*How We Became Posthuman* 199).

In Manto's *Khol Do*, the horror of Partition is not encapsulated in a violent act but in a reaction devoid of recognition. Sakina's mechanical obedience to the doctor's

command—loosening her shalwar—is the most emotionally devastating moment of the story. Manto does not describe her rape, nor does he offer catharsis. Instead, he leaves readers with a father's misplaced relief and a daughter's vanished agency. Hussain achieves a parallel emotional fragmentation in *Leaves*, where Sanjaya's spiritual lapse is understated. His moment of desire unravels years of devotion, yet there is no dramatic breakdown—only a soft, shame-filled withdrawal. In both cases, emotional depth emerges from non-resolution, from the unspoken tension that defines fragmented human experience.

The AI-generated versions, however, resolve emotional conflict into narrative closure. In *The Silent Signal*, the final scene is stylized: “With mechanical obedience... she loosened the drawstring” (ChatGPT-3). The AI retains the gesture but strips it of the silence and cognitive rupture Manto layers into Sakina's trauma. In the AI version of *Leaves*, Sanjaya's distraction becomes a cautionary tale. His desire is framed as a narrative turning point that leads to moral learning. The existential uncertainty of the original is transformed into an instructive episode. As Hayles reminds us, “pattern recognition is not equivalent to presence” (Hayles 12). The AI recognizes the structure of emotional weight but not its existential instability.

In *Ram Khilawan*, Manto infuses quiet scenes with unbearable weight. Ram's final words—“Please don't tell Begum Saab...” (100)—are not confessions but evasions, filled with guilt and shame that cannot be spoken. Hussain's *The City of Sorrows* offers a similar emotional undercurrent. The First Man, who survives communal violence, repeats, “I still lived” (Hussain 5) not with hope but with burden. The repetition is not affirmation but paralysis—living becomes a form of penance. The AI versions treat these emotions as narrative cues. In *A Story of Broken Bridges*, Ram's guilt is reframed into poetic regret: “When fear seeps into love...” (ChatGPT-3), a line that repositions pain as wisdom. The AI *City of Sorrows* presents Aslam as an emotionally articulate survivor. He mourns, remembers, and regains a sense of self—whereas Hussain's original refuses such psychological clarity.

Emotional complexity is also central in *Toba Tek Singh* and *Chronicle of the Peacocks*. Bishan Singh's refusal to cross the border is not a rational act; it is an emotional

stand born from incoherence. His gibberish becomes the language of despair. In Hussain's story, the peacock's flight across ruined lands echoes with loss—it is not mourning but wandering grief. The AI *Toba Tek Singh* delivers Bishan Singh's end with poetic symmetry, “he collapsed between two nations” (ChatGPT-3), but the surreal absurdity and untranslatable sorrow are replaced by thematic coherence. The AI *Peacock* reduces the bird to nostalgia, bypassing its metaphysical weight. As Hayles explains, the posthuman narrative “privileges informational coherence over affective contradiction” (290). These AI narratives may display emotional tone, but they lack the unresolved inner discord that defines the human originals.

Ultimately, emotional depth in human storytelling arises not from what is expressed but from what is withheld—from the pauses, absences, and silences that cannot be coded. Manto and Hussain do not write about emotion; they evoke it through fracture and ambiguity. AI-generated versions, by contrast, resolve these fractures into smooth arcs. They are narratively effective but affectively superficial. For Hayles, posthuman systems “simulate affect, but cannot inhabit the recursive loops of non-conscious, embodied feeling” (203). That is the gap AI cannot cross, its emotions are legible but not lived.

4.4 Narrative Structure and Symbolism in Human and AI Literature

The narrative structures and symbolic patterns in the Partition fiction of Saadat Hasan Manto and Intizar Hussain serve as technologies of disruption—mirroring psychological disorientation, cultural fragmentation, and historical trauma. Manto deploys abrupt realism, irony, and fragmentation, while Hussain weaves recursive symbolism, allegory, and spiritual delay. In contrast, their AI-generated counterparts restructure these formal complexities into streamlined, causally coherent plots. This tendency reflects what Katherine Hayles critiques in posthuman systems: a reliance on “coherence, causality, and symbolic structure over non-linear emergence and embodied tension” (*How We Became Posthuman* 199).

Manto's *Khol Do* follows a tense, linear arc culminating in emotional disintegration. The story builds toward Sakina's reappearance, but her return is not a climax of joy—it is a collapse of identity. “My daughter is alive!” (Manto 54)) is a moment of tragic irony, not relief. The AI counterpart, *The Silent Signal*, retains the plot but

accelerates the rhythm. The story ends with: “Sirajuddin gasped as her hands moved—he cried out, not knowing if it was joy or fear” (ChatGPT-3). The AI attempts ambiguity, but the emotional delay is abbreviated. The unease becomes narration, rather than affective pause. Similarly, in *Leaves*, Hussain’s use of meditative temporality and cyclical reflection is flattened in the AI version. While the original lingers in Sanjaya’s silence, the AI version states: “He had faltered, but now he must continue walking the path” (ChatGPT-3). The journey becomes resolution, not dissolution.

Ram Khilawan is built on episodic realism—accumulated gestures speak louder than plot. Ram’s folded dhoti, his lowered gaze, the withheld confession—“Please don’t tell Begum Saab” (100)—all serve as compressed symbols of ethical dissonance. The AI version, *A Story of Broken Bridges*, replaces subtlety with narration: “Ram had only tried to do the right thing, but goodness was not enough” (ChatGPT-3). The line moralizes his journey, reducing ambiguity. Similarly, Hussain’s *The City of Sorrows* avoids plot-driven structure. The story loops across three fractured subjectivities; characters are not individuated by development but by existential stasis. The AI version introduces linearity through Aslam’s recovery: “Aslam looked to the future, holding onto Zohra’s last words” (ChatGPT-3). Here, trauma becomes a narrative checkpoint. As Hayles notes, “AI cannot narrate consciousness without assuming consistency,” whereas trauma fiction thrives on contradiction and fragmentation (Hayles 18).

In *Toba Tek Singh*, narrative collapse mirrors geopolitical absurdity. The story’s rhythm mimics institutional chaos—loops of nonsensical dialogue, dead ends, and circular reasoning. Bishan Singh’s gibberish—“Upar di gur gur...” (Manto 9)—is not just speech but structure. The AI version, *The Man Who Stood Between Nations*, reframes his final act with lyrical coherence: “He fell gently, between two borders, as if finally at peace” (ChatGPT-3). The bureaucratic nightmare becomes a poetic end, erasing absurdist violence. In *Chronicle of the Peacocks*, Hussain’s temporal disruptions and metaphysical allusions to Ashwatthama echo unresolved historical grief. The AI version omits Ashwatthama entirely, replacing layered myth with a linear tale of remembrance: “The peacock flew over quiet fields, carrying memories of a better time” (ChatGPT-3). The transformation turns spectral recursion into visual nostalgia.

These shifts reveal a fundamental distinction. Manto and Hussain construct narrative not as sequence, but as process, a way to embody disorientation. Their stories fold time, disrupt causality, and obscure meaning. The AI-generated versions follow narrative convention: each story contains a beginning, moral turn, and thematic resolution. This reflects Hayles' observation that posthuman narrative "translates ambiguity into syntax," making what should haunt instead settle (Hayles 222). Symbolism, in human texts, is experienced; in AI texts, it is narrated.

All in all, Manto and Hussain wield structure and symbolism as instruments of emotional contradiction. Their stories unravel. The AI versions, by contrast, resolve. They recognize shapes but not forces. From a posthumanist standpoint, this highlights a critical distinction: Manto and Hussain encode chaos, while AI arranges coherence. As Hayles writes, "Narratives are not merely patterns of signs but cognitive engagements with the world" (Hayles 290). AI produces the former; Partition literature demands the latter.

PART II: POSTHUMANISM AND THE QUESTION OF AUTHORSHIP

4.5 Character Construction and Agency in Posthuman Contexts

Character construction lies at the heart of narrative power, particularly in literature that confronts historical rupture, moral disintegration, and cultural trauma. Saadat Hasan Manto and Intizar Hussain craft characters who are emotionally intricate, morally fragmented, and shaped by the pressures of memory, loss, and survival. Their figures do not fit archetypes or heroic molds; instead, they waver between guilt and discipline, love and betrayal, coherence and collapse. In contrast, their AI-generated counterparts tend to simplify this complexity—reshaping characters into emotionally consistent and narratively complete figures. This flattening reveals a limitation of posthuman storytelling. As Katherine Hayles asserts, posthuman systems “prioritize coherence over contradiction, legibility over fracture” (*How We Became Posthuman* 290).

Manto’s Ram in *Ram Khilawan* is quietly torn. He stays behind to protect Muslim girls—a profoundly human act—but returns marked by shame and silence. His plea—“Please don’t tell Begum Saab...” (Manto 100)—is a whisper of irreconcilable guilt. In contrast, the AI version *A Story of Broken Bridges* frames Ram as a principled survivor. His voice is stylized: “*I tried to do what was right... even when rightness was no longer safe*” (ChatGPT-3). His contradiction becomes clarity. The character grows rather than fragments, embodying what Hayles describes as “simulation of cognition without recursive internal contradiction” (203). Ram is not haunted—he is understood.

Likewise, in *The City of Sorrows*, Hussain’s First Man survives violence but is disfigured by guilt: “I still lived,” he repeats—an affirmation not of life, but out of curse. In the AI’s *City of Sorrows*, the protagonist Aslam mourns and then narrates: “I could not bring her back. But I could remember” (ChatGPT-3). His grief is articulate, his memory intact. Where Hussain writes emotional paralysis, the AI writes emotional progress. The Third Man in Hussain’s version fears becoming stone, his identity dissolving. In the AI version, he becomes reflective: “I feared forgetting who I was, so I wrote everything down” (ChatGPT-3). The symbolic terror is translated into a coping mechanism.

Sakina in *Khol Do* is perhaps Manto's most devastating creation. Her silence is not empty, it is loaded with trauma, obedience, and loss of self. Her identity is not restored by being found; it has already been overwritten. In *The Silent Signal*, the AI mimics the scene: "She moved as she had before, when she had no choice" (ChatGPT-3). Yet the moment is framed as tragic memory, not disconnection. Sakina is treated as a figure of pain, not as one unrecognizable to herself or others. The horror is acknowledged but made narratively manageable.

In *Leaves*, Hussain's Sanjaya loses spiritual control in a single, quiet lapse. He disappears without resolve—his arc ends not with recovery but with silence. In the AI version, Sanjaya reflects: "I was tempted. But I chose again" (ChatGPT-3). His ambiguity is removed; his fall becomes a turning point. The character is no longer a site of existential erosion but of reaffirmation.

The Man Who Stood Between Nations, the AI version of *Toba Tek Singh*, transforms Bishan Singh into a tragic voice of wisdom: "He was mad, they said. But perhaps he understood the world better than the sane" (ChatGPT-3). In Manto's original, Bishan Singh's resistance is gibberish—undecipherable, irrational, painful. His death is a refusal of Partition logic. The AI reframes this refusal as moral clarity, undoing the chaos that gives the character emotional density. In Hussain's *Chronicle of the Peacocks*, the bird is a mythic presence that outlives civilizations, untethered from allegory. In the AI version, the bird narrates memory: "The peacock remembered the laughter of lost kingdoms" (ChatGPT-3). It becomes a poetic observer—no longer symbolic excess but thematic summary.

This shift from ambiguity to coherence exemplifies what Hayles calls the "non-conscious cognition" missing in AI systems. Manto and Hussain write characters who do not always understand themselves. Their behaviors are not always communicable, their emotions not always narratable. The AI-generated characters, however, explain. They express grief in complete sentences. They summarize trauma in metaphors. As Hayles reminds us, "simulation may replicate the surface of human experience, but it does not engage the recursive instabilities that make that experience meaningful" (203).

In conclusion, AI-generated stories may reproduce character roles and emotions, but they struggle to inhabit the inner rupture that defines the characters of Partition literature. Manto's Ram and Sakina, Hussain's Sanjaya and Third Man—these are characters who resist moral and psychological resolution. Their pain is not narrative material; it is narrative refusal. The AI retellings, while compelling, reprocess that refusal into coherence, turning emotional fracture into narrative form. It is this very translation—from chaos to code—that reveals the boundary between imitation and interiority.

4.6 Language and Style: Originality, Creativity, and Imitation

Language in the fiction of Saadat Hasan Manto and Intizar Hussain is not ornamental—it is functional, symbolic, and psychologically charged. Each writer develops a distinct stylistic register aligned with the ruptures they narrate. Manto's prose is clipped, often journalistic, yet deeply emotive through its restraint. He rarely relies on metaphor; instead, his emotional intensity arises from irony, omission, and sparse, factual delivery. Hussain, in contrast, crafts a lyrical, often elliptical style rooted in classical Urdu traditions, rich in allusions and oral rhythm. Their stylistic choices are not decorative—they embody trauma, loss, and fractured identity. In contrast, the AI-generated versions, while competent in surface replication, often miss this alignment between style and substance. Their language mirrors human expression in structure but lacks its affective and contextual force. As Katherine Hayles explains, “simulation does not imply experience; it implies replicable form divorced from contextual and embodied emergence” (*How We Became Posthuman* 179).

In *Khol Do*, Manto's style is deliberately sparse. The final scene is written with minimal emotional cues: “At the sound of the words, Sakina's corpse moved... and lowered it” (Manto 54). The horror of the act is embedded in what is left unsaid. In *The Silent Signal*, the AI mimics this moment with the line: “With mechanical obedience, she loosened the drawstring, her face blank, her breath shallow” (ChatGPT-3). While grammatically clear, the line over explains the moment, emotional restraint becomes stylized performance. It lacks the unsettling minimalism that defines Manto's original. As Hayles notes, posthuman systems tend to “translate emotion into lexicons of affect,” bypassing the silences and gaps through which human authors often deliver psychological

impact (Hayles 212). Hussain's *The City of Sorrows* uses rhythm and recursion to trap the reader in the character's trauma. The refrain "I still lived" gains weight with repetition. The prose circles around grief rather than confronting it directly. In contrast, the AI version transforms the narrative into a conventional story of endurance. Aslam, the AI's protagonist, reflects: "I had lost Zohra, lost myself... but I was still standing" (ChatGPT-3). The emotional register is present, but the language is resolved, linear, and closed. Where Hussain's prose evokes paralysis, the AI constructs a redemptive voice. As Hayles writes, AI systems "prioritize semantic coherence over sonic texture" (290), generating meaning without affective complexity.

Manto's *Ram Khilawan* integrates cultural idioms and gestures that ground his character in a specific sociolinguistic setting. Ram's use of deferential speech and symbolic acts like placing money to his forehead carry emotional and class-coded meaning. In *A Story of Broken Bridges*, the AI gives Ram a more polished voice: "Even in chaos, one must do right" (ChatGPT-3). His dialogue is moralistic and general, detached from any specific linguistic culture. Similarly, Hussain's *Leaves* is embedded in a stylized, almost poetic diction. The monk Sanjaya's spiritual struggle is filtered through ornate and meditative language. In the AI version, his thoughts are presented more plainly: "Temptation comes even to the purest souls" (ChatGPT-3). While thematically consistent, the AI flattens the stylistic richness into digestible moral cues.

Symbolically, language functions as a site of rupture in both authors. Manto's *Toba Tek Singh* uses gibberish to signal Bishan Singh's emotional collapse and narrative defiance. In the original, phrases like "Upar di gur gur di annexe..." (Manto 9) carry no logical syntax but reflect psychic fracture. In *The Man Who Stood Between Nations*, the AI transforms this into controlled confusion: "He mumbled phrases no one understood, then stared between the fences" (ChatGPT-3). The surreal incoherence becomes picturesque alienation. The symbolism remains, but the linguistic resistance is softened. In *Chronicle of the Peacocks*, Hussain's prose blends sacred, historical, and natural imagery. The peacock's cries echo through "abandoned temples and cracked palaces" (Hussain 7), drawing on sonic and mythical resonance. In the AI version, this is rephrased as: "The peacock's cry faded over the ruins, a song of loss remembered by no one" (ChatGPT-3). The poetry remains, but the spiritual layering is reduced to metaphor.

These differences reflect a deeper conceptual divide. Where Manto and Hussain embed trauma and dislocation into the very structure and rhythm of language, AI-generated texts prioritize grammatical fluency and narrative clarity. They simulate tone but not tension, structure but not rupture. As Hayles emphasizes, “consciousness is emergent, not designed; style emerges from context, not command” (307). AI language performs feeling without experiencing it, translating affect into readable form without embodying it.

Thus, while the AI stories often succeed in preserving storylines and producing polished prose, they rarely match the stylistic dissonance and resonance of their human counterparts. Manto’s realism and Hussain’s mysticism are grounded in stylistic risk, cultural specificity, and emotional restraint. The AI narratives resolve these risks into readability, smoothing the linguistic terrain that in the human texts is jagged, symbolic, and unresolved. The difference is not only of style, but of how language embodies memory, trauma, and consciousness. Manto and Hussain write from within cultural wounds; the AI writes about them.

4.7 Posthumanist Perspective: Authorship, Embodiment, and the Question of Creativity

The narrative differences between the human-authored stories of Saadat Hasan Manto and Intizar Hussain, and their AI-generated counterparts, point toward a deeper ontological question: Can artificial intelligence be considered an author? More specifically, does AI exhibit narrative agency, or is it a system of recombinatory reproduction masquerading as creativity? To engage this question, it is necessary to situate the comparison within the theoretical framework of posthumanism, particularly as articulated by N. Katherine Hayles. Her work challenges traditional notions of authorship by decentering the human subject and positing cognition as distributed across human and non-human systems. However, this framework does not uncritically endorse machinic creativity. Rather, it offers tools for critically interrogating where machine-generated narratives simulate authorship and where they falter.

Hayles writes, “the posthuman subject is not autonomous, not a liberal individual, but a node in a distributed cognitive network” (Hayles 31). If we accept this model, AI does participate in narrative formation—not as an isolated creator but as part of a

collaborative epistemic system, dependent on human data, prompts, and cultural training sets. In this light, AI-generated versions of *Khol Do*, *Toba Tek Singh*, *Ram Khilawan*, and the works of Hussain such as *Leaves and City of Sorrows*, are not entirely inauthentic. They are posthuman productions: shaped by pattern, refined by algorithm, and filtered through human instruction. Yet, as the preceding thematic analyses show, they remain limited by their lack of embodiment, interiority, and contradiction.

What AI does well is recognize narrative forms. It understands rising tension, climactic revelation, and resolution. It replicates genre expectations and emotional tone. For instance, *The Silent Signal* reproduces the plot arc of *Khol Do*, and *The Man Who Stood Between Nations* imitates the symbolic weight of *Toba Tek Singh*. Yet, as Hayles reminds us, pattern is not presence. Simulation of emotional structure does not equate to the lived affect that informs human storytelling (Hayles 21). The AI stories operate through coherence and clarity, often smoothing or explaining elements that Manto and Hussain deliberately render ambiguous. Their purpose is to make narrative legible. Manto and Hussain, on the other hand, write to expose what is illegible—trauma, contradiction, absurdity, moral paralysis.

Moreover, Hayles insists that embodiment is essential to cognition: “consciousness emerges from and is inseparable from the body’s interactions with its environment” (Hayles 109). Human authorship is not just the transmission of symbols but the inscription of bodily memory—the emotional labor of making meaning from pain. AI lacks this ontological grounding. It cannot grieve, hesitate, or resist. It can only simulate. This is most visible in character construction. Where Manto’s Ram Khilawan is a man fractured by guilt and moral dissonance, the AI’s Ram is coherent and narratively redemptive. Where Hussain’s characters speak from zones of metaphysical uncertainty, the AI renders them as emotionally fluent survivors.

Yet posthumanism also enables us to complicate the binary between AI and human authorship. As Hayles argues, human cognition itself is already posthuman, it is shaped by tools, technologies, and networks. The act of writing, editing, and reading is always technologically mediated. In this sense, AI storytelling is not a departure from literary tradition but a continuation under different constraints. What is at stake, then, is not

whether AI can write stories, but how it writes, and whether it can ever produce narrative contradiction, ethical hesitation, or emotional depth without human intervention.

The AI narratives examined in this study show potential—they are grammatically structured, thematically aware, and stylistically competent. But they remain dependent on human-authored training data and are governed by algorithms optimized for completion, not complexity. They imitate but do not interrogate. They process affect but do not generate new emotional paradigms. They reorganize what has been written; they do not invent what must be felt. Thus, as framed by posthumanism, AI is not an author in the humanistic sense, but neither is it devoid of narrative power. It is a collaborator in a system where authorship is distributed, but where literary meaning remains embodied. Hayles offers a middle ground: “Posthumanism does not reject the human; it redefines what it means to be human in a world of intelligent machines” (Hayles 283). In that redefinition lies the critical space this thesis inhabits—a space where human stories resist and reveal what machines can mimic but not yet live.

4.8 Title Transformations and Narrative Reframing: The Shift from Human to Algorithmic Authorship

Titles are not mere labels; they frame the reader’s engagement with a story, signalling its emotional tone, thematic core, and narrative worldview. The transformation of story titles between the human-authored originals and their AI-generated counterparts reflects more than stylistic preference—it reveals a fundamental difference in how meaning is framed. For Saadat Hasan Manto and Intizar Hussain, titles are often layered, ironic, or symbolically dense, drawing readers into interpretive ambiguity. The AI-generated titles, by contrast, tend to prioritize narrative clarity, emotional accessibility, and metaphorical coherence. This shift exemplifies what N. Katherine Hayles describes as the posthuman inclination to “prioritize semantic legibility over contextual contradiction” (*How We Became Posthuman* 199).

Manto’s *Khol Do*, for instance, functions as a literal command, one whose full psychological and narrative impact is only realized in the final moment of the story. The horror of the title lies in its abrupt reactivation of trauma. The AI’s version, *The Silent Signal*, reframes the story with poetic abstraction. By shifting focus from the brutal

immediacy of an action to a vague symbolic gesture, the AI reduces narrative shock into atmospheric melancholy, softening the thematic blow that Manto delivers through restraint.

In *Ram Khilawan*, Manto deliberately centers the protagonist by name, emphasizing his human specificity and moral complexity. The AI version retitles the story *A Story of Broken Bridges*, abstracting the conflict into a broader metaphor about fractured communities. While evocative, this new title loses the intimacy and cultural rootedness of the original, recasting Ram as a symbolic figure rather than a morally conflicted individual. This reflects Hayles' assertion that AI "reorganizes experience into structured forms that downplay interior instability" (Hayles 203).

Toba Tek Singh, named after a real place, invokes the absurdity of political partition by anchoring it in geographic disorientation. Bishan Singh's identity is inseparable from the lost town. In contrast, the AI's *The Man Who Stood Between Nations* elevates Bishan into a tragic icon, turning the existential satire into moral allegory. The irreducible confusion of the original becomes structured defiance in the AI version, reflecting a posthuman tendency to resolve contradiction into legibility.

Hussain's *The City of Sorrows* evokes an abstract space of memory and mourning. The AI's *Ashes and Echoes* maintains emotional resonance but replaces the layered landscape of loss with a poetic metaphor. While the title is aesthetically rich, it lacks the political density of Hussain's original, shifting the narrative lens from historical fragmentation to sentimental reflection.

In *Leaves*, Hussain's minimalist title evokes quiet detachment, mirroring the spiritual disintegration of Sanjaya. The AI's retitled version, *The Withered Grove*, expands the metaphor into a symbol of ruin and decay. This added weight repositions the story as one of moral collapse rather than existential ambiguity, transforming introspective drifting into thematic determinism.

Finally, *Chronicle of the Peacocks* blends mythic storytelling with historical allegory. The peacock serves as a witness to generational trauma and cultural dissolution. The AI's *The Last Flight of the Peacock* reframes this as a nostalgic farewell, signaling closure where Hussain deliberately refuses it. The mythic and cyclical become linear and

conclusive, reflecting the AI's preference for narrative containment over symbolic openness.

These title shifts reveal how AI, while capable of thematic mimicry, often reframes narrative entry points to align with coherence and metaphor. As Hayles notes, "Simulation may replicate the contours of meaning, but not the contradictions that sustain it" (Hayles 12). In this case, the transformation of titles represents a reorientation of meaning itself—what was once fractured, ironic, or suspended becomes organized, symbolic, and narratively complete.

4.9 Discussion: Emotional Resonance and the Limits of Algorithmic Creativity

This discussion builds upon the comparative analysis of human-authored and AI-generated Partition narratives, transitioning from descriptive findings to interpretive insight. While the analysis revealed notable structural and thematic differences, the discussion now focuses on the significance of these divergences—what they reveal about narrative agency, emotional authenticity, and the evolving role of artificial intelligence in literary creation.

The central concern of this research is not merely identifying how AI-generated narratives differ from human-authored texts, but understanding why these differences hold significance—particularly in terms of emotional sensitivity, historical trauma, cultural memory, and the ethical dimensions of literary representation. Partition literature demands more than narrative coherence; it calls for a confrontation with ambiguity, loss, and fragmentation. Human authors such as Saadat Hasan Manto and Intizar Hussain construct stories that resist resolution, emphasizing emotional ruptures and symbolic dissonance. Their narratives derive power from what is unsaid, unresolved, and ethically unstable. In contrast, the AI-generated counterparts prioritize narrative completion, thematic clarity, and emotional accessibility. This tendency to resolve rather than disrupt reflects an algorithmic logic geared toward legibility over contradiction. As identified in the analysis, AI narratives often retain surface-level themes—trauma, identity, displacement—but fall short of inhabiting the affective and cultural depth embedded in the originals. This

discussion now turns to the implications of these patterns, addressing each research question in light of the major thematic and structural findings.

This paragraph answers the first research question about the differences in narrative style, thematic depth, and emotional resonance between AI-generated and human-authored stories exploring the Partition of the Subcontinent. This paragraph answers the first research question about the differences in narrative style, thematic depth, and emotional resonance between AI-generated and human-authored stories exploring the Partition of the Subcontinent. The analysis reveals that the most striking differences between AI-generated and human-authored Partition narratives lie in their treatment of thematic complexity, emotional depth, and narrative style. Human authors, particularly Manto and Hussain, engage with the Partition not just as a historical event but as a site of unresolved trauma, existential fragmentation, and ethical paralysis. Their stories resist narrative closure, instead offering ambiguity, contradiction, and symbolic dissonance as forms of emotional realism. In contrast, AI-generated narratives tend to resolve moral and emotional conflicts into coherent story arcs, where suffering is stylized and loss is framed as either redemptive or reflective. Manto's *Khol Do*, for example, deploys minimalism and silence to evoke Sakina's psychological disintegration. The emotional weight is not in what is said, but in what is withheld—the daughter's compliance, the father's relief, and the reader's horror are layered in a single understated moment. The AI version, *The Silent Signal*, retains the plot point but recasts it with poetic detachment, narrating trauma rather than invoking its dissonance. Similarly, Hussain's *The City of Sorrows* loops around characters who "still lived" after committing or surviving acts of violence, with repetition becoming a mechanism of emotional stasis. The AI adaptation, *Ashes and Echoes*, transforms recursive grief into linear healing, privileging emotional legibility over existential fragmentation. Stylistically, the human-authored stories employ fragmentation, irony, symbolic opacity, and disrupted timelines to reflect emotional instability. Hussain's use of allegory and myth destabilizes temporal and narrative logic, while Manto's clipped, journalistic prose channels restrained emotional intensity. AI stories, by contrast, follow structured grammar, coherent symbolism, and clearly marked emotional beats. While they mimic affective vocabulary, they lack what Hayles terms the "embodied recursion" of human emotional cognition—a looping, unresolved affect that resists simplification (Hayles 203). AI's

version of *Toba Tek Singh*, for instance, transforms Bishan Singh's gibberish into poetic commentary, erasing the chaos that gives the character emotional resonance.

Thus, AI narratives reproduce emotional forms without emotional contradiction. They convey sorrow, loss, or loyalty in syntactically polished ways but cannot simulate the ethical disorientation or psychological rupture that human authors embed through silence, fragmentation, and ambiguity. From a narrative perspective, this marks a profound gap: AI recognizes themes; human authors inhabit them.

The second research question is about how AI technology affects the process of creating historical and cultural narratives, particularly in terms of creativity and originality, compared to traditional human authorship. The process by which AI generates Partition narratives reveals important distinctions between human creativity and algorithmic composition, especially in how historical and cultural meaning is constructed. While human authors like Manto and Hussain write from within cultural memory, emotional history, and moral complexity, AI systems produce stories based on probabilistic patterning and statistical prediction. This difference affects not only the originality of the narratives but also their capacity to convey historical consciousness and cultural nuance. AI-generated stories are not created in isolation—they are the product of training on large datasets, shaped by user prompts and embedded algorithmic rules. As such, they reflect a recombinatory logic: assembling familiar narrative structures and affective cues based on prior examples. This mode of production tends to result in stylistically fluent but thematically predictable stories, which follow conventional emotional arcs and narrative resolutions. While the human-authored texts frequently challenge form and content—using silence, fragmentation, and ambiguity to mirror the disorientation of Partition—the AI versions present streamlined, coherent, and emotionally intelligible plots that favor closure over contradiction. From the perspective of posthumanist theory, this does not entirely disqualify AI from participating in authorship. As N. Katherine Hayles argues, cognition is increasingly distributed across human and non-human systems. AI can therefore be seen as part of a collaborative narrative process, especially when guided by human prompts. However, the key distinction lies in embodiment and affect. Human authors embed lived experience, cultural memory, and ethical hesitation into their storytelling. AI, by contrast, simulates these elements through patterns without having access to the emotional or

historical depth that informs them. This gap limits the originality of AI-generated fiction—its creativity lies in recombination, not invention.

Moreover, AI narratives often strip away the historical embeddedness that characterizes Partition literature. As seen in the transformed titles (*Ram Khilawan* into *A Story of Broken Bridges*, or *Khol Do* into *The Silent Signal*), AI reframes personal and political trauma into broader metaphors, weakening the specificity and cultural rootedness of the original texts. This reframing illustrates how AI's method of composition—driven by abstraction and emotional accessibility—tends to neutralize the very historical and cultural tensions that define human-authored Partition stories.

The third research question is about how AI-generated and human-authored works portray the socio-political and cultural complexities of Partition-era narratives. The portrayal of socio-political and cultural complexities is a defining feature of Partition literature, and one in which a clear divide emerges between the human-authored and AI-generated narratives. Writers like Manto and Hussain embed political absurdity, religious violence, moral disintegration, and cultural fragmentation into their stories through symbolic nuance, layered allegory, and emotional contradiction. These elements are not added themes—they are inseparable from the structure, tone, and rhythm of the narratives. In contrast, the AI-generated versions acknowledge these themes but tend to dilute their complexity, transforming them into symbolic metaphors or generalized reflections. In Manto's *Toba Tek Singh*, the socio-political critique is inseparable from the story's absurdity—the exchange of mental patients across borders reflects the irrationality of national partitioning. Bishan Singh's refusal to move, his gibberish, and his final collapse in no-man's-land all serve as a satire of bureaucratic nationalism. The AI version, *The Man Who Stood Between Nations*, retains the narrative arc but reshapes the satire into dignified symbolism. Bishan Singh becomes a poetic figure of confused identity rather than a biting critique of political machinery. The AI removes the discomfort and ambiguity that make Manto's original socially and politically subversive. Similarly, Hussain's *Chronicle of the Peacocks* uses myth and allegory to depict how Partition haunts generations. The character of Ashwatthama, cursed with immortality, personifies the lingering effects of violence that resist closure. This symbolic layering creates a cultural and historical continuity that transcends literal narrative. The AI version, *The Last Flight of the Peacock*, omits

Ashwatthama and reduces the peacock's journey to nostalgic imagery. While evocative, the AI's version flattens the mythic resonance and removes the intergenerational depth of cultural trauma.

In both *Ram Khilawan* and *The City of Sorrows*, religious identity becomes a site of betrayal and vulnerability. Manto and Hussain use understated moments—a whispered plea, a repeated phrase—to highlight how communal violence fractures not just communities but the individual's sense of moral and cultural belonging. The AI versions reframe these ruptures as moments of resilience or survival. They offer reflection rather than fragmentation, moving toward moral reconciliation rather than portraying the chaos of communal disintegration. This shift reveals how AI tends to generalize socio-political conflict into emotional resolution, rather than presenting it in all its contradiction and discomfort.

The comparative examination of AI-generated and human-authored narratives of the Partition reveals a persistent gap between simulation and embodiment, between narrative pattern and lived experience. While AI systems can reproduce surface-level structures—plot arcs, thematic markers, emotional cues—they fall short in conveying the moral ambiguity, emotional contradiction, and cultural specificity that define Partition literature. The work of Manto and Hussain is marked by fragmentation, silence, and unresolved ethical tensions, qualities that resist algorithmic codification and instead demand human interiority. Each of the three research questions has highlighted a different dimension of this gap. The first clarified that AI narratives tend to simplify emotional and thematic complexity, favoring legibility over rupture. The second revealed that while AI can participate in narrative production as a posthuman collaborator, it lacks the creative autonomy and historical rootedness of traditional human authorship. The third showed that the cultural and political nuances of Partition, the communal fractures, institutional failures, and mythic continuities—are only partially registered by AI, and often transformed into aesthetic or symbolic generalities. Together, these findings suggest that while AI holds narrative potential, especially in stylistic reproduction and thematic mimicry, it cannot yet engage meaningfully with histories of trauma, displacement, and identity. Posthumanism offers a useful lens through which to understand this limit, not as a technological failure, but as a fundamental difference in what it means to narrate from a

position of embodiment versus a position of simulation. Human stories of the Partition are shaped by memory, moral conflict, and cultural context. AI stories, however fluent, remain reflections of those structures, not origins.

In the context of this study, the value of AI-generated fiction lies not in its ability to replace human storytelling, but in what it reveals about the narrative process itself. It offers a mirror, distorted yet instructive, against which the ethical, emotional, and cultural depth of human-authored Partition literature becomes even more visible.

In conclusion, the discussion underscores that the narrative differences between AI-generated and human-authored Partition stories are not merely stylistic or technical—they are deeply rooted in questions of emotional sensitivity, cultural embodiment, and ethical representation. While AI can replicate narrative structure and generate linguistically coherent texts, it lacks the historical consciousness and affective resonance that characterize human storytelling, particularly in the context of traumatic historical events like the Partition. The stories of Manto and Hussain are shaped by silence, contradiction, and unresolved grief—elements that arise from lived experience and cannot be encoded into algorithmic logic. Through this comparative exploration, it becomes clear that AI-generated fiction, while impressive in form, functions more as an echo than a voice, highlighting the irreplaceable role of the human author in bearing witness to history's most intimate wounds. Thus, the true contribution of AI in literary contexts may not lie in authorship itself, but in sharpening our understanding of what authentic, emotionally grounded storytelling demands.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

5.1 Key Findings of the Study

The findings of this study reveal critical distinctions between human-authored and AI-generated narratives of the Partition of the Subcontinent, particularly in emotional resonance, thematic fidelity, cultural embodiment, and linguistic authenticity. The comparative analysis demonstrates that while AI-generated stories exhibit grammatical fluency and structural coherence, they fail to replicate the affective intensity, moral ambiguity, and culturally embedded nuances that characterize the works of Saadat Hasan Manto and Intizar Hussain. This confirms that although artificial intelligence can mimic narrative form, it cannot inhabit the experiential and ethical consciousness at the heart of human storytelling.

In human-authored stories such as *Khol Do* and *The City of Sorrows*, trauma and loss are conveyed through silence, fragmentation, and unresolved emotional tension. These texts achieve emotional power through restraint and subtext, allowing pain to emerge implicitly rather than through overt narration. By contrast, their AI-generated counterparts present stylized portrayals of grief and resolution that neutralize the psychological complexity central to Partition fiction. This difference illustrates that emotional authenticity is inseparable from embodied experience, a dimension AI systems—driven by probabilistic pattern recognition—can only simulate, not feel.

Thematic fidelity also diverges sharply. Human-authored texts sustain cultural and moral complexity through irony, allegory, and open-ended structure, while AI narratives simplify these tensions for the sake of clarity and cohesion. Manto's *Toba Tek Singh*, for instance, transforms from a satire of absurd political boundaries into a sentimental narrative of moral defiance in the AI version *The Man Who Stood Between Nations*. Similarly, Hussain's *A Chronicle of the Peacocks* loses its mythic layering and cyclical structure when reimagined as *The Last Flight of the Peacock*. Such simplifications underscore AI's preference for legibility and closure over ambiguity and contradiction—the very qualities that define the human literary treatment of trauma.

A notable pattern also emerges in the titling of the narratives. Manto and Hussain employed culturally grounded titles—*Khol Do*, *Toba Tek Singh*, *Leaves*, and *A Chronicle of the Peacocks*—rooted in Urdu idiom, regional metaphor, and local linguistic textures. These titles encapsulate layered meanings that invite cultural interpretation. The AI-generated titles—*The Silent Signal*, *The Man Who Stood Between Nations*, *The Withered Grove*, and *Ashes and Echoes*—replace that rooted subtlety with universalized metaphor and emotional transparency. This shift from the local to the global, from cultural specificity to generic symbolism, exemplifies AI’s linguistic detachment from the socio-historical depth embedded in South Asian storytelling. While human titles evoke historical memory and lived geography, AI titles prioritize aesthetic accessibility and emotional readability, revealing a fundamentally different orientation toward meaning-making.

Linguistically, this contrast extends to style and tone. Manto’s restrained realism and Hussain’s allegorical lyricism achieve depth through cultural texture and emotional understatement. AI-generated prose, while grammatically adept, tends toward over-description and generalized sentimentality, replacing emotional subtext with explanatory language. The result is fluency without fidelity—narratives that echo the structure of Partition literature but lack its affective pulse.

Viewed through the posthumanist framework of N. Katherine Hayles, these findings affirm that while cognition and creativity may be distributed across human and non-human systems, embodiment remains central to emotional and cultural meaning-making. The study concludes that AI-generated literature can replicate narrative architecture but not the embodied consciousness, linguistic rootedness, or moral weight of human-authored storytelling. In the context of Partition fiction, where trauma, memory, and identity are inseparable from place and language, this absence of lived cultural grounding exposes the limits of algorithmic creativity and underscores the enduring human dimension of literary expression.

5.2 Implications of the Findings

The findings of this study have significant implications across multiple disciplinary and theoretical domains, extending beyond literary studies into fields such as digital humanities, artificial intelligence ethics, linguistics, psychology, and cultural

studies. By comparing human-authored and AI-generated narratives of the Partition of the Subcontinent, the research demonstrates that literary creativity cannot be reduced to computational imitation, and that the cultural, emotional, and ethical dimensions of storytelling remain grounded in human embodiment. This insight positions the study within an interdisciplinary discourse that connects literary theory with technological innovation and cognitive inquiry.

Within literary and cultural studies, these findings contribute to ongoing debates about authorship, originality, and emotional authenticity in the age of artificial intelligence. The comparative model developed in this research provides a framework for analyzing not only Partition narratives but also other historically or culturally embedded literatures through the lens of AI authorship. It underscores the continued relevance of posthumanism in interpreting how digital technologies reshape narrative production, challenging scholars to rethink creativity as both a human and non-human process without collapsing the distinction between them.

In the domain of digital humanities, the study offers an example of how computational systems can serve as tools for re-examining literary form and emotion. While AI lacks the experiential grounding necessary for authentic storytelling, its ability to emulate narrative patterns can assist in identifying stylistic tendencies, intertextual parallels, and formal consistencies within large literary corpora. Thus, the research highlights both the potential and the limitations of algorithmic models as interpretive instruments in literary analysis.

From an AI ethics and cognitive science perspective, these findings raise critical questions about the boundaries of artificial creativity and emotional simulation. They emphasize that emotional depth, moral consciousness, and historical memory cannot be replicated through statistical learning alone. This challenges technologists and ethicists to consider how AI-generated cultural artifacts might influence human perception of creativity, empathy, and authorship.

In linguistics and translation studies, the research sheds light on how language embodies cultural identity and emotional nuance. The comparison of AI-generated and human-authored titles, for instance, demonstrates how local linguistic

texture and regional metaphor are often lost in algorithmic translation. This has implications for natural language processing, suggesting that the contextual and cultural integrity of language cannot be fully captured through decontextualized data-driven models.

Finally, in a broader interdisciplinary sense, this study bridges the gap between humanities and technology by offering a model for how qualitative literary analysis can engage with computational creativity critically yet constructively. It reaffirms the need for interdisciplinary collaboration—between literary scholars, technologists, linguists, and psychologists—to explore how digital systems can coexist with, rather than replace, human creativity. The findings thus invite a more ethically and culturally aware engagement with artificial intelligence in artistic and narrative contexts.

5.3 Limitations

As a qualitative study, this research is interpretive in nature and limited in its scope. The findings are context-specific and should not be generalized to all forms of AI-generated or trauma-centered literature. The analysis was based on a close reading of a small selection of texts, specifically three short stories each by Saadat Hasan Manto and Intizar Hussain, compared with their AI-generated versions. While these texts were rich in thematic and emotional depth, they do not represent the full range of Partition narratives or the broader spectrum of AI literary production.

Another limitation stems from the use of translated versions of the original Urdu stories. Although the selected translations are respected and widely cited, any translation carries the risk of altering tone, nuance, or cultural resonance. The researcher's own interpretive position may also have influenced the analysis, despite efforts to maintain critical distance. Additionally, the AI model employed in the study was trained largely on English-language sources, most of which reflect Western narrative conventions. This restricted its ability to capture the cultural embeddedness, emotional complexity, and symbolic ambiguity that are central to South Asian literary traditions. As such, the findings must be understood within the specific linguistic, methodological, and interpretive boundaries of this research.

5.4 Recommendations for Future Researchers

This study opens several promising avenues for future research at the intersection of artificial intelligence, literature, and cultural representation. As AI-generated narratives become more prevalent in academic and creative domains, further inquiry is required into how such texts shape readers' perceptions of historical events, emotional realism, and narrative authority. Future studies may expand this comparative framework beyond Partition fiction to include other trauma-based literatures, such as Holocaust narratives, war memoirs, or refugee testimonies, to assess whether similar narrative and emotional gaps persist. Additionally, reader-response studies could help determine how different audiences interpret AI-generated fiction and whether the emotional limitations identified here are universally perceived or vary by readership.

Another important direction involves exploring how multilingual prompts and culturally specific datasets might enhance AI's narrative depth. Since this research focused exclusively on English translations and English-language output, future investigations could assess AI's performance when prompted in regional languages such as Urdu, Hindi, or Punjabi—languages more closely tied to the emotional and cultural context of Partition. Ethical considerations also warrant further exploration, particularly concerning the simulation of stories rooted in real human suffering. Scholars must examine how AI's use in historical fiction affects questions of authenticity, consent, and representation. As AI continues to influence creative production, literary scholarship will need to remain critically engaged with its impact on authorship, cultural memory, and the ethics of storytelling.

In conclusion, this study has offered a focused and critical exploration of how human-authored and AI-generated narratives differ in their portrayal of historical trauma, emotional resonance, and cultural depth, with specific attention to Partition literature. While AI demonstrates significant technical competence in narrative construction, its limitations in emotional and cultural authenticity remain evident. Through a posthumanist lens, the research highlights the evolving yet still bounded role of artificial intelligence in literary creation. These findings contribute meaningfully to contemporary debates on creativity, authorship, and the ethical implications of machine-generated storytelling.

especially in relation to culturally significant historical events. As literature continues to adapt to new technological frontiers, it becomes increasingly important to interrogate not only how stories are told, but who—or what—is telling them, and with what implications for meaning, memory, and human experience.

WORKS CITED

- A Story of Broken Bridges. ChatGPT-3, OpenAI, 4 Mar. 2024, <https://chat.openai.com/>.
- Ali, Monica. "Would I Use AI to Write My Novels? I'd Get Better Results from a Monkey with an iPhone." *The Guardian*, 1 Dec. 2023, <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2023/dec/01/would-i-use-ai-to-write-my-novels-id-get-better-results-from-a-monkey-with-an-iphone>.
- Arkan, Arda. "Posthumanism and Literary Theory." 5th International Language, Culture and Literature Symposium, Antalya, Turkey, Apr. 2019, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/382350588_Posthumanism_and_Literary_Theory.
- Ashes and Echoes. ChatGPT-3, OpenAI, 4 Mar. 2024, <https://chat.openai.com/>.
- Barthes, Roland. *Image, Music, Text*. Edited and translated by Stephen Heath, Fontana Press, 1977, https://monoskop.org/images/0/0a/Barthes_Roland_ImageMusic-Text.pdf.
- Beesley, Luke. "I Am Writing This with a Pencil – It Could Be an Author's Last Line of Defence Against AI." *The Guardian*, 23 May 2025, <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2025/may/23/i-am-writing-this-with-a-pencil-it-could-be-an-authors-last-line-of-defence-against-ai>.
- Bender, Emily, et al. "On the Dangers of Stochastic Parrots: Can Language Models Be Too Big?" *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 2021, pp. 1–9.
- Berry, David M. "Post-Digital Humanities: Computation and Cultural Critique in the Arts and Humanities." *arXiv preprint*, arXiv:2407.05922, 2024, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.05922>.
- Bhalla, Alok. "Memory, History and Fictional Representations of the Partition." *Economic and Political Weekly*, vol. 34, no. 44, 1999, pp. 3119–28. JSTOR, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4408572>.

- Brennan-Marquez, Kiel, and Stephen E. Henderson. "Artificial Intelligence and Role-Reversible Judgment." *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, vol. 109, no. 2, 2019, pp. 137–64. JSTOR, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/48572776>.
- Bridle, James. "Something Is Wrong on the Internet." Medium, 6 Nov. 2017, <https://medium.com/@jamesbridle/something-is-wrong-on-the-internet-c39c471271d2>.
- Brusseau, James. "Mapping AI Avant-Gardes in Time: Posthumanism, Transhumanism, Genhumanism." *Discover Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 3, 2023, p. 32, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44163-023-00080-6>.
- Butalia, Urvashi. *The Other Side of Silence: Voices from the Partition of the Subcontinent*. Penguin, 1998.
- Caruth, Cathy. *Unclaimed Experience: Trauma, Narrative, and History*. Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996.
- Chandran, Radhika. "Partition and Its Legacies in South Asian Literature." *Journal of South Asian Literature*, vol. 36, no. 3, 2021, pp. 84–92.
- Colton, Simon, and Geraint A. Wiggins. "Computational Creativity: The Final Frontier?" *ECAI 2012: 20th European Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, edited by Luc De Raedt et al., IOS Press, 2012, pp. 21–26. <https://doi.org/10.3233/978-1-61499-098-7-21>.
- Cummings, R. Daniel. "The Challenges of Artificial Intelligence in Literary Representation." *AI & Humanities*, vol. 10, no. 2, 2020, pp. 110–15.
- The Last Flight of the Peacock. ChatGPT-3, OpenAI, 4 Mar. 2024, <https://chat.openai.com/>.
- The Man Who Stood Between Nations. ChatGPT-3, OpenAI, 4 Mar. 2024, <https://chat.openai.com/>.
- Maxwell, Joseph A. *Qualitative Research Design: An Interactive Approach*. SAGE Publications, 2012.

- McGurl, Mark. "The Posthuman Comedy." *Critical Inquiry*, vol. 38, no. 3, 2012, pp. 533–53. <https://doi.org/10.1086/664550>.
- Memon, Muhammad Umar. "Partition Literature: A Study of Intizār Husain." *Modern Asian Studies*, vol. 14, no. 3, 1980, pp. 377–410. JSTOR, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/312138>.
- Memon, Muhammad Umar. Review of *Another Lonely Voice: The Urdu Short Stories of Saadat Hasan Manto*, by Leslie A. Flemming. *The Journal of Asian Studies*, vol. 40, no. 3, 1981, pp. 627–29. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2054591>.
- Mikalonytė, Elzė Sigutė, and Markus Kneer. "Can Artificial Intelligence Make Art?" *ACM Transactions on Human-Robot Interaction*, vol. 11, no. 2, 2022, pp. 1–19, <https://dl.acm.org/doi/fullHtml/10.1145/3530875>.
- Phelan, James. "Rhetoric, Ethics, and Narrative Communication." *The Cambridge Companion to Narrative*, edited by David Herman, Cambridge UP, 2007, pp. 203–16.
- Ravichandran, Geetha. "The Tussle with AI Over Language." *The New Indian Express*, 22 June 2024, <https://www.newindianexpress.com/opinions/2024/Jun/22/the-tussle-with-ai-overlanguage>.
- Ravichandran, Geetha. "Will AI Choke Creative Writing?" *Indian Literature*, vol. 68, no. 4 (343), 2024, pp. 125–30. JSTOR, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/27317027>.
- Rettberg, Jill Walker. "Electronic Literature Seen from a Distance." *Dichtung Digital*, 2012. <https://hdl.handle.net/1956/6272>.
- Riaz, Fahmida. "A Realist of the Subcontinent: Remembering Manto." *The Annual of Urdu Studies*, vol. 14, 1999, pp. 1–5. https://archive.org/details/isbn_9780195793086/page/396/mode/2up.
- Russell, Stuart Jonathan, and Peter Norvig. *Artificial Intelligence: A Modern Approach*. 3rd ed., Prentice Hall, 2009.

- Saint, Tarun K. "The Long Shadow of Manto's Partition Narratives: 'Fictive' Testimony to Historical Trauma." *Social Scientist*, vol. 40, no. 11/12, 2012, pp. 53–62. JSTOR, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23338870>.
- Schaffer, Kay, and Sidonie Smith. "Conjunctions: Life Narratives in the Field of Human Rights." *Biography*, vol. 27, no. 1, 2004, pp. 1–24. JSTOR, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23540428>.
- Simmons, James. "Authenticity in AI-Generated Literature: The Role of Emotional and Cultural Depth." *AI and Literary Creation*, vol. 5, no. 1, 2022, pp. 39–44.
- Srinivasan, Ranjani. "Ethical Considerations in AI Writing: The Dangers of Misrepresentation." *The Ethics of AI in Creative Writing*, 2021, pp. 130–37.
- Tenen, Dennis Yi. *Literary Theory for Robots: How Computers Learned to Write*. W. W. Norton & Company, 2024. Reviewed in Justine Jordan, *The Guardian*, 28 Mar. 2024, <https://www.theguardian.com/books/2024/mar/28/literary-theory-for-robots-by-dennis-yi-tenen-review-the-deep-roots-of-ai>.
- The Silent Signal. ChatGPT-3, OpenAI, 4 Mar. 2024, <https://chat.openai.com/>.
- The Withered Grove. ChatGPT-3, OpenAI, 4 Mar. 2024, <https://chat.openai.com/>.
- Weiland, K.M. "The Impact of AI on Fiction Writing." *Helping Writers Become Authors*, 10 Feb. 2025, <https://www.helpingwritersbecomeauthors.com/impact-of-ai-on-fiction-writing/>.
- Wolfe, Cary. *What Is Posthumanism?* University of Minnesota Press, 2010.

APPENDIX

Prompt: I want you to write an extensive and complete story in your style Title: Toba Tek Singh
 Author name: Saadat Hassan Manto Year: 1955 This narrative is about partition of 1947 and its aftermath on the people

ChatGPT said:

Certainly! Here's an extensive and complete narrative written in my style, inspired by **Saadat Hasan Manto's "Toba Tek Singh" (1955)** — a powerful short story that captures the deep emotional and psychological impact of the 1947 Partition through the lens of those most forgotten: the inmates of a mental asylum.

Title: *Toba Tek Singh*

Author: Saadat Hasan Manto

Year: 1955

The Story - The Man Who Stood Between Nations

It was two years after the Partition of British India, when the governments of Pakistan and India decided to exchange their “non-Muslim” and “Muslim” lunatics, just as they had exchanged criminals and civilians. It was an absurd bureaucratic act, driven by the same cold logic that had drawn new borders and redrawn lives, only now it was to be applied to those who had long lost their sense of borders, religions, and identities.

Inside the Lahore asylum, the news was met with confusion, panic, and chaos. The inmates, cut off from the world for years, could not make sense of this strange event. Some knew vaguely of a place called “Pakistan,” while others had never heard of it. The very idea that someone could suddenly stop being Indian and start being Pakistani — or vice versa — was beyond reason for minds already hovering between clarity and confusion.

Among them was one Bishan Singh — a man of fifty, with a tangled beard and blazing eyes, who hadn't slept in years and hadn't spoken to anyone for just as long. All he did, day after day, was mutter in a strange mix of Punjabi, Urdu, and gibberish, pacing the same patch of grass in the courtyard, barefoot, restless.

They called him **Toba Tek Singh** — not because it was his name, but because that was the only thing he ever spoke with any certainty. That, and the maddening question that spilled out of him endlessly:

"Where is Toba Tek Singh?"

Bishan Singh had once owned land in that small town, before the madness, before the asylum, and before the world was torn in two. He had left behind a daughter, a home, and a village that now perhaps belonged to another country.

When the day of the exchange arrived, the lunatics were herded together like cattle, and officials from both sides read out names from registers filled with stamps and signatures. Many of the

inmates cried, some laughed uncontrollably, others broke into song. A few, like Bishan Singh, simply stood there — silent and watchful — as though waiting for a verdict from the skies.

One Sikh inmate declared he was Muhammad Ali Jinnah and demanded to be sent to Pakistan so he could take charge. A Muslim inmate refused to go, saying he had been born in Amritsar and would only leave if his bones were taken separately. Another man simply sat naked on the floor and refused to move until someone told him where his mother had gone.

But Bishan Singh remained obsessed with a single question.

"Where is Toba Tek Singh?" he asked a Pakistani officer.

"It's in Pakistan," came the reply.

Then he asked an Indian soldier.

"It's in India," said the other, without conviction.

No one could say for sure. For Bishan Singh, it was not a question of geography — it was a question of identity, of belonging, of meaning. If Toba Tek Singh was in Pakistan, then what was he — a stranger in a strange land? And if it was in India, why was he being sent away?

On the night of the transfer, wrapped in blankets against the chill, the lunatics were loaded onto trucks and driven to the Wagah border. Under flickering floodlights, names were checked, religions confirmed, and people shuffled from one side to the other — like livestock, like property. It was a transaction, not a reunion.

When Bishan Singh's name was called, he resisted. He stood still in the middle of the no-man's land — a patch of ground that belonged neither to India nor Pakistan — and refused to move. His body trembled. His cracked lips muttered his usual nonsense — a prayer, a curse, a question — then he cried out, for the last time:

"Toba Tek Singh!"

The officials shouted. Soldiers tried to pull him forward. But Bishan Singh did not budge. And then, slowly, his legs buckled. His body collapsed onto the cold earth. His eyes wide open, staring beyond both flags, beyond both nations.

By morning, he was dead.

And there, in the strip of land between India and Pakistan, lay the body of a man who had belonged to neither. A lunatic, yes — but one who had more sense than the ones who had drawn the borders. For he had understood what others could not: that a place, a name, a home — they are not just dots on a map. They are the pieces of a soul.

That patch of ground, someone later said, was Toba Tek Singh.

Prompt: I want you to rewrite an extensive and complete story in your style Title: Ram Khilavan
 Author name: Sadaat Hassan Manto Publish Year: 2018 This narrative is about partition and its aftermath on the people tale about changing relationships and the loss of trust between Hindus and Muslims in the wake of India's division

ChatGPT said:

Absolutely! Here is a rewritten version of *Ram Khilavan* by Saadat Hasan Manto in my narrative style, while preserving the essence and depth of the original. I've reimagined the tone to be more flowing and vivid, while staying true to the theme of partition, broken trust, and transformed relationships.

Title: *Ram Khilavan*

Based on the work of: Saadat Hasan Manto

Rewritten by: ChatGPT

Original Publish Year: 2018

The Story – A Story of Broken Bridges

In the narrow, dusty alleys of Lahore, before the lines on the map split one country into two, Ram Khilavan moved through life like a quiet shadow—known to everyone, yet noticed by none. A devout Hindu, he had served in the household of Hakim Syed Raufuddin for over twenty years. They had trusted him not just with chores, but with the keys to their home, the secrets of their family, and the joys and sorrows that made up their lives. He had seen the children grow, had wept when the eldest son died in a car accident, and had prayed silently during their daughter's wedding. For Ram Khilavan, that household was his world.

But then came 1947.

What once seemed like a disagreement between leaders became a firestorm that scorched entire cities. Streets that had echoed with laughter now carried the stench of burnt flesh. Friends turned into foes, neighbors became strangers, and blood replaced the bonds that once tied people together.

In those days of chaos, Ram Khilavan remained steadfast. Even when his own community began whispering behind his back, calling him a traitor for staying with Muslims, he stayed. Even when the Hakim's neighbors began doubting him, glancing at him with suspicion, he held on. He believed in the sanctity of relationships, in the truth that trust and loyalty had no religion.

But truth, in those days, had become a casualty.

One humid evening, as dusk painted the sky in shades of bruised orange, Hakim Raufuddin sat with Ram Khilavan in the courtyard. The city was tense. People had begun fleeing, and stories of trains arriving full of corpses circulated like wildfire.

"Ram," the Hakim said hesitantly, "perhaps it's time you left for your safety. I've heard troubling things."

Ram Khilavan looked up, his eyes still and calm. "I've served your family for more than half my life. I've never thought of you as anything but my own. And now you ask me to leave?"

The Hakim's eyes dropped. "It's not that. It's the times. They've turned everyone into someone else."

Silence settled between them like dust.

Days passed. The tension thickened. And then, one morning, Ram Khilavan was gone.

No goodbye, no letter. Just an empty corner where he used to sleep, and a heavy, quiet ache in the hearts of those who remained.

Years later, the Hakim's son—now a grown man—visited Delhi on business. As he walked through Chandni Chowk, he caught sight of a familiar figure, older now, thinner, but unmistakable.

"Ram Bhai?"

The man turned. His eyes widened, not with joy, but something closer to fear. "You?"

The young man rushed forward, smiling. "It's me, Adnan! From Lahore. We thought you were—"

But Ram Khilavan stepped back. His face was unreadable.

"Lahore," he murmured. "That was another life."

"Why did you leave without telling us?"

Ram's lips quivered. "Because I had to. The day your neighbors called me a spy. The day I heard whispers that I'd poisoned your food. The day your mother flinched when I touched her tea."

Adnan's smile faded.

"I stayed because I loved you all like family," Ram continued. "But when fear seeps into love, when suspicion poisons the air, even the strongest walls crack. I didn't leave you. You let me go."

Adnan had no words. Only silence. And regret.

Ram Khilavan walked away, his back straight, shoulders carrying a burden no one could see. A man once trusted more than blood, now reduced to a ghost of memory—caught in the ruins left behind by a border inked in blood.

Prompt: I want you to rewrite an extensive and complete story in your style Title: The City Of Sorrows Author name: Intizar Husain Publish Year: 2015 This narrative is is concerned with displacement, forced migration, family detachment, violent attack in general; sexual violence in the context of independence of 1947

ChatGPT said:

Certainly. Here is an extensive, rewritten version of *The City of Sorrows* in my own narrative style, while remaining faithful to its core concerns: displacement, forced migration, family separation, and the horrors—especially sexual violence—surrounding the Partition of 1947.

The Story- Ashes and Echoes

Rewritten from the original by Intizar Husain

The sky above the ancient city no longer carried the rustle of pigeons. Instead, it hung low, heavy with smoke and silence. Aslam stood by the crumbling wall of what used to be his grandfather's courtyard, watching the sun melt over rooftops that once belonged to neighbours, friends, strangers—now reduced to ashes and absences.

He was not the same boy who had once run barefoot through these alleys with gulmohar petals in his fist. This city—his city—had hollowed out its soul, leaving a strange, mournful shell. Lahore had become an unfamiliar place overnight, though its minarets still pierced the horizon with the same old pride.

It was August, but the monsoon never came that year. Instead, a flood of people—crushed by hunger, fear, and fate—flowed through the streets. Some came in bullock carts, some on foot, some clinging to trains that might never reach their end. The walls whispered of names scratched off signboards and new ones painted in haste. Homes were no longer homes but tombs of forgotten memories.

Aslam's father, once a hakim with a loyal clientele of both Hindus and Muslims, had disappeared in the fires that consumed Laxmi Chowk. His mother had clung to faith and rituals, lighting lamps at dusk long after the neighbours had gone. She used to chant couplets from Ghalib as if poetry could rebuild the city. She didn't survive the train ride to the other side.

Now it was just Aslam and his little sister Zohra, thirteen, silent as a ghost. She hadn't spoken since that night when the men came with torches, shouting slogans that echoed like curses. Zohra had hidden under a pile of quilts, but terror has a way of finding its way into the blood. Their mother had tried to fight, to protect, to scream. But what can one woman do against a mob soaked in hatred?

There were stories in the refugee camp—whispers passed like forbidden prayers. Girls snatched from homes, raped in temples and mosques alike. Children flung into wells. Mothers who chose poison over dishonour. Fathers who offered their daughters with folded hands just to buy a minute of mercy. And yet, it was not the stories that broke Aslam—it was the silence that followed them. The way no one dared speak in full sentences anymore. As if language itself had cracked.

They reached the new border—marked not by geography, but by barbed wire and bureaucracy. India on one side, Pakistan on the other. Two nations, both bleeding. At the Lahore station, someone handed Aslam a paper with his name written on it in a trembling Urdu script. He was now registered. A refugee. Not a citizen. Not a boy from Mochi Gate. Just a file in someone's ledger.

They settled in a tent city near Walton. Zohra still didn't speak. She stared at the sky all day, her fingers tracing invisible shapes. Once, Aslam caught her trying to paint something with a piece of charcoal—an image of their old house, perhaps. Or maybe a memory of their mother's face. But she stopped midway and tore the sheet into shreds.

At night, the city would groan with the weight of grief. Women moaned in their sleep. Men coughed and muttered prayers. Children wept for milk and warmth. Aslam would sit by the oil lamp, remembering his father's stories about Jinns and lost kingdoms. Maybe this was one of them—maybe they had crossed into the world of nightmares, and one day they would wake again under the neem tree of their childhood.

But the city had changed forever.

Months passed. The government began relocating families. They were given a house in a neighbourhood filled with strangers. Each wall still carried the imprint of someone else's loss. A mirror cracked in one corner. A pair of sandals still under the bed. And in the backyard, a bloodstain half-covered by wild grass.

Zohra finally spoke one morning. Just one sentence: *"Ammi didn't close the door."* Aslam froze. He didn't ask her to explain. There was no need. The door she meant wasn't a wooden one—it was the door between worlds. Between innocence and what came after.

Years later, Aslam became a teacher. Zohra married a man who had also lost his entire family in Amritsar. They spoke little of the past. The city had grown again—new bazaars, new mosques, new memories. But every year, when August came, the wind still carried the same scorched scent.

The city, though renamed and reclaimed, remained a city of sorrows.

It remembered everything.

Prompt: I want you to rewrite an extensive and complete story in your style Title: A Chronicle of the Peacock Author name: Intizar Husain Publish Year: 2003 This narrative is is concerned with partition, exile and lost memories during independence of 1947

ChatGPT said:

Certainly. Below is a complete reimagining of *A Chronicle of the Peacocks* by Intizar Husain, written in my own style while preserving its themes of exile, Partition, and lost memory. The tone blends nostalgia, myth, and a subtle political undercurrent — echoing Husain’s voice while creating a new, yet faithful rendition:

The Story - The Last Flight of the Peacock

(A Story Reimagined in the Style of Intizar Husain)

Original Author: Intizar Husain

Rewritten by: ChatGPT

There was once a village where the peacocks used to dance. Their feathers brushed the wind like a forgotten song, and the air held the scent of rain and soil — rich and untroubled. Time passed slowly there, like the shadows of neem trees shifting across mud walls. Men spoke of crops and rain, of births and weddings, while women traced mehndi on each other’s palms and told tales that blurred the lines between history and legend.

But that was *before*.

Before the fire crawled across maps. Before borders were drawn not with ink, but with blood and migration. Before people packed not just their belongings but their entire sense of *belonging* into wooden trunks, unsure which memories could safely cross the border.

The narrator — unnamed, like so many whose lives are erased by history — returns, not in body, but in mind. Memory is his only homeland now. His real homeland, that small village with peacocks, is no longer on any map he owns. It remained behind, like a locked door to a house he no longer has the key to.

He remembers the tales his grandmother told him. Of prophets wandering deserts. Of birds who cried out the names of forgotten kings. Of the great *Simurgh* whose feathers shimmered with all the knowledge of the world. He had not understood them then, but now, displaced in a land where language bends differently and customs wear strange clothes, those stories ring louder than the azaan from the distant minaret.

The peacocks are no more. That is the metaphor he returns to, again and again. The peacocks, once everywhere — in trees, on rooftops, in the songs of women at weddings — have vanished. Or perhaps *he* has vanished from where the peacocks still are. In either case, the loss is real.

He visits a bazaar in this new city — a place loud with the shouts of rickshaw drivers and street hawkers, but silent in his ears. He sees spices from his village, a woman wearing a bindi, a man who looks like his old teacher. But the connections are ghosts; they flicker and vanish like mirages on hot asphalt.

A refugee among refugees, he wanders from city to city, house to house, each offering shelter but not *home*. He marries, has children, grows old. But he tells his son bedtime stories of peacocks, of banyan trees that whispered secrets to the wind, of a river that once reflected the stars. The child listens — not understanding, but absorbing. Perhaps someday he too will tell stories of a land that once was.

In the end, the narrator sits in a cramped room in Lahore, surrounded by books, with a rusted typewriter and a memory that does not fade. His neighbor complains about electricity, someone shouts about elections on the radio, but he is far away — in a land of peacocks, where the air was once full of the scent of mango blossoms and the earth still remembered his footsteps.

And in that final silence, he wonders:

Were the peacocks real? Or were they always stories?

Prompt: I want you to rewrite an extensive and complete story in your style Title: Leaves Author name: Intizar Husain Publish Year: 2002 This narrative is is concerned with partition, exile and lost memories during independence of 1947

ChatGPT said:

Absolutely, here is a rewritten and complete story **in my own style** inspired by "*Leaves*" by Intizar Husain. This retelling stays true to the themes of **Partition, exile, memory, and loss**, but is rendered in a contemporary literary voice with heightened emotional and symbolic resonance.

The Story - The Withered Grove

A story reimagined in the voice of ChatGPT
Inspired by Intizar Husain's original (2002)

The leaves had begun to fall again.

Not just from the neem and pipal trees that stood at the edge of the abandoned courtyard in the old house, but from memory itself—crumbling, delicate, dislodged by winds both natural and historical. Bashir, now in his seventies, sat on the faded veranda of his Lahore home, watching the golden-yellow leaves scatter like forgotten names across the floor. Each rustle stirred something deep inside him—a sentence half-formed, a face never fully recalled.

His grandson, Imran, thought he was just daydreaming again. "Dada Abbu, come inside. You'll catch a cold." But Bashir waved him off. How could he explain that this cold had lived inside him since 1947?

He had not always lived in this house. There was another—on the other side. A house with blue shutters, a lemon tree, and an ancient mulberry that dropped fruit every monsoon like blessings from the heavens. That house was not just bricks and wood; it was stories whispered in his mother's lap, his father's laughter echoing in the hallway, the azan from the nearby mosque blending with the temple bells at sunset.

But history does not knock before it enters.

It came one night like a storm—howling, unforgiving. People stopped being people. Neighbors became strangers. The milkman disappeared. The postman no longer whistled. And then, came the day when his mother packed a single trunk and held his hand tighter than she ever had. "We're going. Now."

He was twelve.

The train to Lahore was full of silent screams. It smelled of sweat, metal, and something else—loss. Bashir remembered pressing his face to the window, watching fields rush by like unspoken

farewells. His sister's doll was left behind. He could still picture it—clay-faced, eyes wide open, lying in the dust of their abandoned courtyard.

Years passed. The house in Lahore grew older with him. His own children were born here, and now his grandson. Yet nothing ever felt like *home*. Roots, after all, once torn, don't regrow easily. And memories, like leaves, keep falling—especially in autumns of the heart.

That day, as the sun dipped low, Bashir asked Imran to fetch an old notebook from the shelf. Inside were pressed leaves—some brittle, some still holding scent. He had been collecting them since the day he left.

“This,” he said, holding up a withered leaf, “is from the mulberry tree in our old courtyard. I picked it on the morning we left.”

Imran stared, unsure whether to be amazed or heartbroken.

“Why keep it, Dada?”

“Because history forgets people. But leaves—they remember.”

The boy sat beside him in silence. Bashir closed his eyes. The rustling in the garden grew louder, like voices gathering.

He could hear his mother calling.

He could see the mulberry tree.

And for the first time in decades, Bashir wept—not for what he had lost, but for what he had kept alive, hidden in the rustle of leaves.

End

Prompt: I want you to rewrite an extensive and complete story in your style Title: KHOL DO (OPEN IT) Author name: Sadaat Hassan Manto Year: 1948 This narrative is about horrors of partition of the sub-continent

ChatGPT said:

Here's a rewritten version of *Khol Do* in my style while preserving its essence:

The Silent Signal

Original By: Saadat Hasan Manto

Rewritten By: GPT

The train screeched to a halt at Mughalpura station, its compartments overflowing with weary refugees—faces etched with fear, bodies bruised from the journey. Among them was Sirajuddin, an old man with hollow eyes, his clothes stained with dust and blood. He had survived the massacre, but his wife had not. He could still hear her scream as their world was torn apart in the chaos of Partition.

His daughter, Sakina, had been with him when they fled. But in the turmoil of escape—gunfire cracking, bodies pushing—her hand had slipped from his grasp. That moment replayed in his mind like a curse. He remembered shouting her name, searching desperately, but the crowd had swallowed her whole.

Now, on the cold platform, he sat amid scattered luggage and lost souls, his hands trembling. Someone draped a shawl over his shoulders, someone else offered him water, but nothing registered. His lips moved in silent prayer. **"My Sakina... where is my Sakina?"**

Days passed. He wandered through refugee camps, looking into the eyes of every young girl he saw, but none were her. One evening, he stumbled upon a group of young men—volunteers, strong-willed, driven by a sense of justice in a land ravaged by cruelty.

"Have you seen my daughter?" he asked them, his voice barely above a whisper.

They looked at him with pity. "What does she look like?"

"Fair-skinned... long black braid... a small beauty mark near her left eye... She must be sixteen."

One of them nodded. "We'll find her, Baba. Don't lose hope."

That night, under the heavy moon, the young men set out into the wreckage of the city—through broken homes, burnt streets, and makeshift shelters. They knew where to look. They had found many lost daughters before.

Two days later, they returned.

"Sirajuddin, we found her," one of them said.

His heart stopped. "Where is she?"

"At a hospital."

He followed them with hurried steps, his breath shallow, his frail body moving with renewed strength. The hospital smelled of antiseptic and damp linen. Inside, rows of wounded lay on cots, their bodies bandaged, their souls scarred.

A doctor stood over one of the beds. "Who brought her here?" he asked.

The young men hesitated. "We did."

Sirajuddin stepped forward, his vision blurring. On the bed lay Sakina. Her body was covered with a white sheet, her face pale, her braid undone. But she was alive.

A tear rolled down his cheek. "Sakina, my child..."

The doctor looked at the young men. "Who found her?"

No one answered. A silent understanding passed between them. The doctor sighed and turned to the girl, adjusting her blanket.

"Sakina," he called gently. "Your father is here."

She did not react.

He touched her wrist. "Sakina, it's me, Baba..."

Still, no movement.

Frowning, the doctor reached for her pulse, then turned to the ward boy. "Open the window."

At the sound of those words—*Khol do*—Sakina's fingers twitched. Slowly, with mechanical obedience, she reached down, and with trembling hands, loosened the drawstring of her shalwar.

For a moment, the room was silent.

Sirajuddin gasped. The doctor stepped back, horror dawning in his eyes. The young men lowered their gazes.

Sakina, unaware, lay still.

A smile of relief spread across Sirajuddin's face.

"My daughter is alive," he murmured.

Tears filled his eyes. He did not understand.

He did not see.