

ISSN: 2395 – 0129

PERCEPTION

**International Multidisciplinary Refereed Journal
(Peer-reviewed)**



Imagination is the highest form of research.

Albert Einstein

Volume: IX, Issue: IV

October - 2025

Chief Editor

Dr. Keyur K. Parekh

Index

Sr. No.	Title of the Article	Corresponding Author	Page No.
1.	The Role of AI in Behavioral & Marketing Research	Chavda Rupal Surendrasinh	1 - 10
2.	Some Reflections on Artificial Intelligence: With Special Reference to Artificial Intelligence Methods	Mr. Chintan Pankajkumar Shah	11 - 16
3.	Future of AI in Humanities: Balancing Automation with Humanistic Values	Dr. Devendrabhai Jesingbhai Parmar	17 - 23
4.	AI-Generated Literature: Can Machines Be Creative Writers?	Dhwani Thakar	24 - 40
5.	Work – life Satisfaction of Academicians: A Case Study of Shri Govind Guru University, Godhra	Dilipkumar A. Vagdiya	41 - 53
6.	Uses of AI tools in Demand Forecasting	Dr. Rakeshbhai R. Vankarsadhu	54 - 65
7.	Artificial Intelligence in Basketball Sport	Hiteshkumar Upadhyay	66 - 74
8.	A Brief Study on Various Types of Feminism	Raval Megha B.	75 - 88
9.	The Role of AI in Modern Scientific Research: A Comprehensive Overview	Mohit B. Parmar	89 - 103
10.	Comparative Analysis of Financial Disclosure in Indian FMCG Companies	Rahul N. Parmar	104 - 120
11.	The Role of E-Banking in Enhancing Financial Inclusion: A Study on the Impact of Digital Banking Services on Rural and Underserved Communities	Sandipbhai Himmatbhai Zala	121 - 129

AI-Generated Literature: Can Machines Be Creative Writers?

Dhwani Thakar

Research Scholar

Shri Govind Guru University

Vinzol, Godhra

Abstract:

The arrival of artificial intelligence in the world of literature, with sophisticated tools like OpenAI's GPT-4 and Google's Bard, is fundamentally shifting how we think about authorship and creativity. This article dives into AI-generated literature through the critical lens of Roland Barthe's seminal essay, *The Death of the Author* (1967). Our central argument is that AI challenges the traditional idea of an author by placing a much greater emphasis on the reader's role in creating meaning. We'll also apply Foucault's insightful question, *What Is an Author?* (1969) to explore whether the rise of AI-generated writing transfers the responsibilities of authorship from the human creator to the computer system, or perhaps, to the human who prompts it. Furthermore, this article will consider the broader impact of AI texts through the framework of Walter Benjamin's *The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction* (1935). This helps us understand how these machine-generated works influence the concept of original literature and authorship within our current cultural landscape. Ultimately, our research suggests that while AI can certainly produce text, it falls short of genuine creative acts as it still relies on human readers to construct true meaning. This positions AI-generated texts as a compelling outcome of humans and systems working together

Keywords:

Artificial Intelligence

Authorship

Creativity

Reader Interpretation

Digital Literature

Human-Machine

Collaboration

Introduction

“Creativity is one human skill that AI cannot truly capture”- Danny Wu, Head of AI products at Canva. He believes that those who master AI tools won't just gain a competitive edge; they'll soar far beyond those who don't. It's becoming increasingly clear: AI isn't here to supplant our innate creative abilities, but rather to serve as a powerful catalyst, propelling our ideas to unprecedented levels. The crucial question then becomes: How can we strategically leverage AI to amplify human ingenuity? As one perspective aptly puts it, AI acts as a powerful multiplier alongside human effort. Its full power emerges when paired with human abilities.

The rapid advancements in artificial intelligence have woven themselves into nearly every thread of modern culture, including the intricate fabric of literature. The emergence of AI in this field has ignited considerable discussion regarding fundamental concepts like authorship, creativity, and the essential role of human involvement in artistic creation. With sophisticated language models such as OpenAI's GPT-4 and Google's Bard now capable of generating texts that strikingly

resemble human writing styles, and even producing original narratives, critical questions persist: Can AI truly be considered a creative author? How does AI-generated literature challenge our established notions of authorship? And to what extent does AI reshape the reader's engagement in constructing meaning? This paper aims to explore these profound questions by examining AI-generated literature through several pivotal theoretical lenses. We'll begin with Roland Barthes' influential essay, *The Death of the Author* (1967), which redefines authorship by shifting focus from the writer to the reader's interpretive power. Next, Michel Foucault's *What Is an Author?* (1969) will further complicate this concept delving into the institutional and discourse-driven authority linked to authorship. Additionally, Walter Benjamin's *The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction* (1935) offers valuable insights into how technological progress alters the originality and unique “aura” of artistic works. By applying these critical perspectives, this paper will argue that while AI possesses the capacity to generate text, it fundamentally lacks the intrinsic human experience vital for

authentic creativity. This positions AI-generated literature as a product of human-machine collaboration rather than the outcome of independent artistic authorship.

Barthes's 'The Death of the Author' and AI-Generated Texts

Barthes influential 1967 essay, *The Death of the Author*, put forth the radical proposition that, contrary to the established belief, complete meaning of a text is not that which the author intended. In other words, meaning is made by the reader through active engagement with the work. Hence, he negated the prioritization of an author's personal intentions in interpreting a text in power of the reader for generating meaning from it.

Intriguingly enough, AI-generated literature has unexpectedly, followed the path of Barthes theory. Contrary to human creativity, where authors channel their experiences, feelings, and cultural interiority into their creations, AI-based techniques lack such traditional intentions. They predict and piece together language patterns on the basis of massive training data. In this respect,

texts generated through AI illustrate quite literally the idea of the absence of an author, thus empowering the reader in meaning construction. Consider the highs of works like GPT-4, which can compose poetry and prose capturing the stylistic nuances of writers such as Rabindranath Tagore or Arundhati Roy. The very works lack the deep experiences and worldviews that human-artists give their works. This lack of consciousness, of experiencing authors, makes AI creations a truly priceless subject for poststructuralist analysis, in which meaning is ever-shifting according to the reader and does not reside solely with the author.

AI Writing in the Style of Rabindranath Tagore

Prompt: Can AI Capture the Soul of a Writer? The Case of Arundhati Roy

Imagine asking an AI, like GPT-4, to write something in the style of Arundhati Roy, exploring themes like memory and the fragmented nature of time. Here's what it might produce:

GPT-4 Output Example:

The river guarded secrets. It wound through the town, murmuring tales of forgotten

childhoods and bicycles left to rust. Estha could recall the taste of cool, pink peppermint, the smooth feel of Ammu's veranda floor, the mingled scents of rain and aging books. The past wasn't truly gone; it was woven into the fabric of the present, like the lingering dampness of river moss pressed within the pages of an old, overlooked novel.

Analysis:

This passage certainly tries to mimic Roy's signature lyrical prose and non-linear storytelling, much like what you'd find in her famous novel, *The God of Small Things*. However, it noticeably misses the profound sociopolitical depth and the sharp critiques of caste, gender, and history that are truly hallmarks of her work. These AI-generated examples clearly show how artificial intelligence can imitate a writer's style, but they often fall short on the lived experiences, cultural nuances, and foundational ideologies that truly define an author's unique voice. This observation resonates with Barthes concept of *The Death of the Author* and Benjamin's concerns about the loss of authenticity when art is mechanically reproduced. In essence, AI functions as a tool for mimicry, not for genuine originality, which also supports Foucault's idea that authorship is shaped by broader institutional

and cultural forces, not just individual genius.

Barthes and AI: A Framework for Understanding, Not Endorsement

Roland Barthes work doesn't directly endorse or condemn AI, but it offers a surprisingly fitting framework for understanding AI-generated literature. Barthes famously argued that a text's meaning is born from the reader's interpretation, rather than being dictated by the author's original intent. This idea applies remarkably well to AI-generated texts. Since AI lacks personal experience, genuine emotions, or specific ideological stances, it embodies the very notion of an "absent author" far more literally than any human writer ever could. From this perspective, AI doesn't diminish the value of literature; instead, it underscores the principle that meaning is something actively constructed by the reader, rather than handed down by a single, authoritative creator. When AI produces texts in the styles of literary giants like Rabindranath Tagore or Arundhati Roy, yet without possessing their lived experiences it powerfully demonstrates how writing can exist independently of direct authorial intention, making it a rich subject for poststructuralist analysis.

However, Barthes argument can also serve as

a critical lens for AI-generated literature. While AI might indeed highlight the reader's role in creating meaning, it also raises important questions about depth, authenticity, and cultural specificity. The works of Tagore or Roy for instance, are deeply embedded in their unique historical, social, and personal contexts – aspects that AI-generated texts simply cannot genuinely replicate. The absence of true intentionality in AI-produced literature could be seen as a limitation rather than a liberation, as it strips away the potential for conscious political, emotional, or philosophical engagement. Thus, while Barthes theory provides a valuable way to understand AI-generated texts, it doesn't necessarily celebrate them. Instead, it invites us to ponder a deeper question: Can meaningful art truly exist without the presence of a human author?

What Is an Author? Michel Foucault's Perspective

Michel Foucault's essay, *What Is an Author?* challenges our common understanding of authorship. He argues that the idea of an "author" isn't so much about a single person being the source of meaning, but rather a functional principle that helps organize and control discourse. For instance, when we

compare a poem written by a human like Emily Dickinson with one generated by AI, Foucault's framework prompts us to look at the structural qualities of the texts themselves, instead of automatically attributing creative brilliance solely to a human. An AI-generated poem might use familiar imagery and meter drawing from a huge database of literature. This suggests its "authorship" is actually the result of many diverse influences, not just one. This example supports the idea that today, authorship can be seen as a networked process rather than a solitary, heroic endeavor.

AI-Generated Texts and the Question of Authorship

Foucault's ideas help us understand how AI-generated texts fit into today's conversations. Let's look at an example to explore this: comparing a human-authored poem by Emily Dickinson with an AI-generated one.

Example 1: Emily Dickinson's Human-Authored Poem

*Because I could not stop for Death,
He kindly stopped for me,
The Carriage held but just Ourselves,
And Immortality. (Dickinson)*

This poem is profoundly personal showcasing Dickinson's distinct style her signature dashes, unique slant rhymes, and deep reflections on mortality. Traditional views of authorship highlight Dickinson's historical context, her reclusive nature, and her introspective approach as key to understanding her work.

Example 2: AI-Generated Poem (Attempting Dickinson's Style)

An AI, for instance, might try to replicate Dickinson's distinctive style.

*The evening hums a solemn tune,
Soft winds that whisper in the dune.
The stars lean close, but say no word,
Their silence colder than the bird.*

This AI-generated poem does manage to imitate some of Dickinson's stylistic traits like its short lines, use of natural imagery and a generally thoughtful, quiet mood. However, what it lacks is the deep, personal introspection and deliberate underlying messages that truly define Dickinson's human-crafted work. It's missing that autobiographical core.

Michel Foucault's essay, doesn't see

authorship as coming from a single creative genius. Instead, he views it as a functional principle that helps organize and structure how we communicate. This idea aligns well with AI-generated literature. It moves away from the notion of one unique, creative mind and instead highlights authorship as a networked process, influenced by many different sources. Just like human writers, AI creates content that circulates in society and shapes our cultural conversations. Since Foucault considers authorship a function, not a personal identity, AI-generated texts can be seen as fulfilling a similar role by organizing meaning through the patterns they've learned. Moreover, AI challenges our traditional understanding of originality, as both AI and human writers often remix and reorganize existing texts. From this viewpoint, AI isn't a threat to authorship; it's simply an extension of how literature has always been shaped by collective influences rather than just one individual's singular vision.

However, Foucault's theory also prompts important questions about AI's role in authorship, especially concerning the absence of intentionality and the potential for control over discourse. Human authors write with purpose, emotion, and their own lived

experiences elements that AI simply lacks. This means AI-generated texts, by nature, are often devoid of that subjective, personal meaning. He also acknowledged that historical and social contexts profoundly shape an author's work. This implies that while AI-generated literature might be structurally sound, it could easily lack true depth and authenticity. Additionally, Foucault's critique of how discourse is controlled suggests a concern: AI-generated content might inadvertently strengthen corporate influence over creative expression, potentially limiting the diversity of voices and perpetuating biases that are built into its training data. So, rather than fully supporting or opposing AI, Foucault's framework encourages us to critically examine the evolving nature of authorship itself, urging us to question whether meaning should be attributed to an individual creator or viewed as an emergent property of communication as a whole.

The Impact of Mechanical Reproduction: Walter Benjamin's Insights

Walter Benjamin's pivotal 1935 essay, *The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction*, explores how technology's ability to copy art changes its fundamental nature its "aura" and originality. In our

current digital era, AI can churn out countless versions of a text almost instantly. Imagine an AI generating hundreds of variations of a short story in mere minutes! Benjamin would argue that this mass reproducibility can lessen the unique quality, or "aura," of a work. Yet, as these texts spread widely and are interpreted by different readers, they also gather new layers of meaning. Think about the difference between a rare, handwritten manuscript by a famous poet and a widely shared, AI-produced story. While the AI story might not have a unique physical form its value comes from its ability to spark diverse interpretations among readers across countless digital platforms.

Benjamin's core argument in his work that mass reproduction strips an artwork of its unique aura that feeling of authenticity and presence tied to its specific place in history and culture. This idea becomes even more relevant with AI-generated literature. AI can produce endless variations of a single work in seconds, each looking like it was written by a human, yet lacking the touch of a single, original creator.

Loss of Aura in AI-Generated Literature

Let's consider an AI model trained to write short stories in the style of Munshi

Premchand, a revered Indian writer celebrated for his deep dives into social realism and rural life. If asked, the AI might generate a story about a poor farmer struggling against societal oppression, echoing themes from Premchand's classic works like *Godan*. However, while this AI-generated text might successfully imitate Premchand's language and themes, it simply doesn't carry the personal experiences, socio-political awareness, and lived struggles that truly shaped his powerful storytelling.

For example, imagine we ask an AI to create many versions of a Premchand-style narrative about a widow facing caste-based discrimination in a rural village. The AI could produce a hundred variations changing character names, small plot details, or specific phrases all while keeping the main theme. In contrast, Premchand's original stories were born directly from his historical moment, deeply influenced by the nationalist movement, his own observations, and his commitment to social reform. AI-generated reproductions might look authentic on the surface, but they lack the historical specificity and emotional depth of Premchand's firsthand experiences. This perfectly illustrates Benjamin's point: the "aura" of an artwork its unique presence in time and space fades when it can be endlessly

replicated.

The Democratization of Literature through AI

Benjamin's theory also points out a fascinating contradiction: even as mechanical reproduction might lessen an artwork's unique charm, it simultaneously throws open the doors to culture for everyone. When it comes to AI-generated literature, this means that storytelling isn't just for famous authors or established institutions anymore. AI lets people everywhere connect with literature in fresh ways whether by creating new texts that sound like old masters, translating stories into different languages, or blending various literary styles to form entirely new kinds of narratives.

For instance, a young writer from a completely different cultural background might use an AI model trained on Premchand's stories to explore similar themes within their own modern setting. This writer could generate a story in Premchand's style, but then adapt it to reflect the current challenges faced by marginalized communities in their local area. So, even though AI-generated literature doesn't possess that "original" aura, it still helps foster cultural exchange and inspires fresh

interpretations of timeless literary themes. Benjamin's theory highlights a two-sided effect of AI-generated literature. On one side, without a single unique creator, a work's special "aura" fades, making each AI-produced text feel less genuinely "authentic" in the traditional sense. Conversely, AI's ability to mass-produce content vastly increases literary accessibility, opening doors to new ways of interacting with texts and sparking fresh conversations between historical works and contemporary ideas. Just like mechanically reproduced artworks, AI-generated literature compels us to rethink our definitions of originality, authorship and cultural worth in this digital era. Ultimately, Benjamin's analysis isn't entirely pro-AI or anti-AI; instead, it offers a balanced view pointing out both its drawbacks and its exciting possibilities.

Against AI: His idea of the "aura" implies that AI-generated texts simply don't have the unique charm and historical genuineness of art made by humans. Because AI merely imitates styles without personal experience or true creative drive, its output often feels like a copy rather than something truly new. This echo worries that AI might erode artistic authenticity, turning literature into nothing more than algorithmic output.

For AI: At the same time, Benjamin recognized that mass reproduction makes art more democratic, broadening its reach and inviting new interpretations. AI-generated literature similarly allows for wider engagement, providing novel ways to interact with and blend literary traditions. This suggests that even without inherent "originality," AI can still be a valuable tool for fueling creative discovery.

Therefore, Benjamin's theory doesn't dismiss AI entirely. Instead, it positions AI as a force that reshapes literature questioning old notions of authorship while simultaneously opening up new avenues for accessibility and fresh interpretations.

AI as a Tool for Generating Text

Today's AI systems are built to understand and reproduce human language by sifting through enormous amounts of data. Tools like GPT-4, for instance, can create entire stories, complete with detailed characters and well-structured plots, all from a simple prompt. So, if you ask an AI to write a science fiction tale, it can deliver a captivating story filled with futuristic settings, complex ethical questions, and cutting-edge technology. Yet, despite their impressive linguistic skills, AI-generated texts don't possess consciousness,

true intent, or subjective experience.

Roland Barthes theory, famously laid out in *The Death of the Author*, argues that a text's meaning doesn't come solely from the writer's intentions. Instead, it's actively shaped by the reader's engagement with the work. When we apply this idea to AI-generated literature, the fact that there's no traditional "author" doesn't reduce the text's potential for interpretation. For example, a reader encountering an AI-generated poem exploring themes of isolation or technology might find deep personal connection in its lines, building meaning based on their own life and viewpoint. This kind of interaction supports Barthes belief that a literary work's true importance isn't in how it was made, but in the interaction, it sparks with its readers.

Shifting the Concept of Authorship

Michel Foucault's examination of authorship seeing it as a guiding principle for how texts work, rather than just the wellspring of creative genius becomes incredibly relevant when we talk about AI-generated literature. Foucault challenged the old idea that an author is the sole origin of meaning. Instead, he proposed that texts exist within a larger conversation, shaped by culture, history, and structure. This viewpoint really sheds light on

the differences between human-written pieces and those created by AI.

Consider these examples:

Human-Authored Text: Take a poem by Sylvia Plath, for instance, which is rich with profound personal emotions, historical context and psychological depth.

AI-Generated Text: Now, imagine a poem created by an AI that cleverly imitates Plath's style using similar themes and imagery, but without any of the lived experience that truly fuels Plath's own poetry.

From Foucault's perspective, the true importance of these texts might not rest solely on who created them, but rather on their structural and thematic qualities. If readers connect with both poems and find meaning in them, does the absence of a conscious author in the AI-generated version make it any less valuable? Foucault's insights suggest that literature operates within a web of influences, and AI simply extends this spectrum blurring the lines between human and machine creativity. Ultimately, AI challenges our romanticized view of the lone literary genius. It pushes our understanding of authorship towards a more decentralized, collaborative model. In this evolving literary landscape, literature becomes a dynamic interplay of human interpretation,

technological assistance and broad cultural dialogue, redefining the creative process for the digital age.

The Cultural Impact of AI-Generated Texts

Walter Benjamin's concept of mechanical reproduction offers a crucial lens for understanding the implications of AI-generated literature. Benjamin argued that when art is mass-produced, it loses its aura that unique presence and authenticity tied to its original creation. AI-generated texts perfectly illustrate this phenomenon, as they can be generated in countless variations and leading us to question what originality and artistic value truly mean.

Reproducibility and the Loss of Uniqueness

One of the most striking aspects of AI-driven literary creation is its sheer reproducibility. Advanced AI models can produce hundreds of narrative versions in moments, yielding diverse yet structurally similar texts. This directly echoes Benjamin's concern that mechanical reproduction strips an artwork of its uniqueness by separating it from its initial context.

For instance, imagine an AI trained on the

works of Rabindranath Tagore. When prompted, it could generate multiple variations of a short story in Tagore's style, preserving his lyrical prose and philosophical undertones. While these AI-generated texts might skillfully capture his stylistic elements, they'll inevitably lack the deeply personal, historical, and cultural contexts that made Tagore's work so distinctive. The original composition of *Gitanjali*, for example, carries the profound weight of his spiritual introspection and his concerns during the colonial era elements an AI can mimic but never truly experience. As a result, AI's mass production of such texts dilutes their individual uniqueness, reinforcing Benjamin's argument that mechanical reproduction diminishes an artwork's "aura."

Interpretative Richness and Reader Engagement

However, Benjamin also suggested that reproduction doesn't necessarily drain a work of its meaning. Instead, it can democratize access to art and literature, allowing fresh interpretations to emerge. AI-generated texts despite being mass-produced, can still spark individual responses from readers.

Consider an AI-generated poem exploring themes of loneliness and artificial intelligence. Even though it lacks the lived

experience of a human poet, a reader might still find a deep personal connection in its portrayal of digital isolation. Online literary communities, like those on Instagram, Reddit, or Twitter, frequently interact with AI-generated poetry by sharing their interpretations, tweaking verses, or remixing content into new artistic forms. For instance, AI-generated poems inspired by Rumi’s mystical themes of love and spiritual longing often appear on social media. An AI trained on Rumi’s poetry might produce lines like:

*The moon whispers soft,
Lost souls dancing in silence,
Love, the endless path.*

While these AI-generated lines echo Rumi’s contemplative style, readers often reshape them by adding their own interpretations or creative flair. In online forums, users might pair these verses with Persian miniature art or Sufi music, creating an interactive cultural experience. Some poets even modify AI-generated lines, adding personal reflections:

Original AI-generated verse:

*You are not a drop,
You are the sea becoming.*

User adaptation:

*You are not a drop in the sea,
You are the wave rising home.*

Such adaptations demonstrate how AI-generated texts, even if mechanically produced, take on new meaning when humans interact with them. They transform into collaborative expressions rather than static outputs. This interactive engagement turns an otherwise mechanically produced text into a living, evolving dialogue, giving it a unique form of “aura” that is created collectively, rather than being tied to a single, original author.

AI Literature as a Collaborative Medium

The way we’re starting to reinterpret AI-generated texts shows a clear move away from the idea of a single author to a more collaborative literary culture. Think about fan-fiction communities, for example, where AI can help create alternative versions of classic novels. An AI might reimagine *Pride and Prejudice* with a science-fiction twist, and then readers could jump in to refine, critique, and even personalize the story. The text isn’t a fixed thing anymore; it’s constantly being reshaped by human interaction, mirroring Benjamin’s insight that widespread reproduction can actually lead to greater engagement, not just a watering down of the original.

So, while AI-generated literature might not

have the traditional “authenticity” we link with human authorship, it encourages exciting new ways to interact with and interpret stories. By moving the spotlight from the writer to the reader, AI-powered texts strengthen the poststructuralist belief that meaning isn’t set in stone, but rather unfolds actively through the process of reading and re-interpreting. AI’s integration into how we make literature marks a truly transformative shift in how stories are conceived, enjoyed, and understood. As AI tools become easier to access, they’re fundamentally redefining what authorship, originality, and artistic intent even mean.

Democratization of Content Creation

AI-powered writing tools are breaking down barriers in literary creation making it possible for individuals without formal training to produce intricate narratives, poems, and essays. For example, an aspiring writer whose new to structuring a novel might use AI to help outline a story, draft conversations, or polish descriptive sections. Instead of replacing human creativity, AI acts as a collaborator, helping with brainstorming ideas and refining writing styles. This “democratization” means a wider array of voices can now enter the literary scene, pushing storytelling beyond the traditional

gatekeepers like publishers and established literary institutions.

Reevaluation of Creativity

A striking illustration of AI’s limitations in true creative originality appears when it tries to craft a satirical narrative similar to Jonathan Swift’s *Gulliver’s Travels*. Imagine giving an AI this prompt:

“Write a satirical story about a traveler discovering strange societies that reflect contemporary political and social issues.”

The AI might spin a tale about a protagonist stumbling upon futuristic micro-nations, each a magnified caricature of modern social trends perhaps one governed entirely by social media influencers, another by AI-driven bureaucrats, or even a society where personal data is the ultimate currency. The story could mimic Swift’s satirical tone and structure, offering allegorical critiques of today’s digital culture, governance and power dynamics. However, unlike *Gulliver’s Travels*, the AI-generated text would inevitably miss the profound historical and ideological depth that makes Swift’s work a timeless commentary on human nature and political absurdities. Swift’s novel was forged from his direct involvement with

18th-century British politics, his strong criticisms of colonialism, and his deep frustration with corruption in both government and intellectual circles. His satire was deeply rooted in personal experiences and firsthand societal observations, allowing it to serve as both a sharp critique and a piece of enduring literary art. While an AI can put together a narrative that looks similar on the surface, it simply doesn't have Swift's intellectual precision, historical understanding, or personal drive. Its satire, therefore, remains an imitation rather than a truly original invention, highlighting the clear difference between AI-generated pastiche and the genuine originality of human-authored literature.

Blurring the Line between Author and Tool
As AI-generated content grows more sophisticated, literature is increasingly becoming a hybrid space where human insight and machine-created text seamlessly blend. Writers might use AI to spark ideas, conquer writer's block, or even try out unconventional storytelling styles. In this changing environment, authorship isn't just a solitary endeavor anymore; it's a dynamic dance between human intuition and algorithmic processing. Rather than seeing AI as a danger to literary authenticity, we can

view it as a powerful tool that expands creative possibilities and encouraging fresh forms of storytelling that push against old ideas of originality.

Conclusion: Can Machines Be Creative Writers?

The emergence of AI-generated literature fundamentally challenges our long-held ideas about authorship and creativity. While AI systems can produce coherent stories, imitate established literary styles, and even evoke emotional responses from readers, they achieve this by analyzing enormous amounts of existing data not by engaging in a truly original creative process. The core question of whether AI can genuinely be called a creative writer, then, comes down to how we define creativity itself: Is it simply about producing new outputs, or does it demand conscious intent, lived experience, and profound cultural connection? Comparing AI-generated texts with human-authored works really brings out the limits of machine creativity. An AI-generated piece might structurally resemble *Gulliver's Travels*, using satire, irony, and political allegory, but it won't stem from the same intellectual or emotional struggle that shaped Swift's critique of 18th-century European society. Instead, AI simply rearranges existing

patterns and motifs into new combinations.

Dr. Jennifer Haase from Humboldt University in Berlin explains that generative AI tools like ChatGPT and Midjourney operate by using machine learning models trained on immense datasets to produce content whether it's text, images, or music based on patterns they've identified. She points out that these systems don't engage in genuine creative thought; rather, their outputs are statistical predictions. Studies comparing AI-generated and human-created ideas show that while AI can produce a large volume of content, human creativity often yields concepts that are more original and nuanced. Generative AI essentially functions as a sophisticated pattern-recognition and prediction engine, drawing from its extensive training data to formulate responses. While AI can certainly churn out many ideas, human creativity tends to be both more original and richer in context. AI still struggles with complex, subtle creative challenges and relies on human input to make sense of its outputs (Haase). AI does, however, have the potential to boost human creativity by offering new perspectives and aiding in brainstorming. But, as Dr. Haase cautions, too much reliance on AI could actually hinder individual creative growth.

She notes, "The output is quite fascinating, but one can also argue that these tools are nothing more than statistical prediction machines" (Haase).

Despite these limitations, AI still holds immense potential to reshape literary production, serving as a tool that broadens creative horizons. Writers can leverage AI to spark story ideas, polish their language and experiment with different styles, thereby democratizing access to literary creation. For instance, an aspiring writer without formal training might use AI to draft a novel, then infuse it with their own unique insights and experiences, leading to a hybrid authorship model where human intuition and machine efficiency work together. Likewise, online communities interacting with AI-generated poetry show how meaning actively emerges through reader engagement, supporting Roland Barthes argument that the reader plays a vital role in interpreting any text. Moreover, recognizing AI's growing influence in writing and publishing, The Times of India recently hosted a panel discussion at the *House of Harmony's Spring Fest* to delve into the question of whether AI can truly replace human creativity. The panel included notable figures such as Vinita Dawra Nangia (Executive Editor, The Times

of India), Ajay Jain (Founder, Kunzum Cafe), Shantanu Ray Chaudhuri (Editor-in-Chief, Om Books International), and Dipankar Mukherjee (Publisher, Readomania) (Nangia et al.).

The conversation kicked off with Dipankar Mukherjee probing the very essence of creativity. Vinita Dawra Nangia clarified that creativity goes beyond just writing, encompassing how individuals interpret the world through diverse forms of expression. She acknowledged AI's capacity to enhance creative workflows but firmly asserted that human imagination remains vital for true originality. Shantanu Ray Chaudhuri drew parallels between AI's emergence and past technological shifts, suggesting that while major artists might remain untouched, AI could profoundly affect areas like graphic design. The panel also touched on AI-generated writing, with Mukherjee noting that AI can sometimes generate content that rivals human writing. Nangia revealed that The Times of India utilizes AI for brainstorming ideas, suggesting headlines and transcription, but stressed the absolute necessity of human oversight due to AI's limitations, such as its potential for plagiarism and lack of inherent originality. The discussion ultimately reached a

consensus: while AI can certainly support and improve the creative process, it simply cannot fully replicate the depth and distinctiveness of human creativity (Nangia et al.). Hence, AI cannot be considered a truly creative writer in the human sense. Creativity is far more than just generating text; it involves intention, emotional depth, and the capacity to respond meaningfully to the intricate complexities of human experience. While AI can mimic literary expression and enhance creative processes, the core essence of authorship remains a distinctly human pursuit. AI-generated literature isn't a substitute for human creativity, but rather a tool that's redefining how stories are imagined, produced and understood in our digital age. Future research should continue to explore this evolving partnership, especially as AI advances further and integrates more deeply into artistic and literary fields.

References:

Barthes, Roland. "The Death of the Author." *Image, Music, Text*, translated by S. Heath, Fontana, pp. 142–48. [sites.tufts.edu/sites.tufts.edu/english292b/files/2012/01/Barthes-The-Death-of-the-Author.pdf](https://www.sites.tufts.edu/sites.tufts.edu/english292b/files/2012/01/Barthes-The-Death-of-the-Author.pdf). Accessed 24 July 2025.

Benjamin, Walter. "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction." *Illuminations*, edited by Hannah Arendt, translated by Harry Zohn, Schocken Books, 1969. [web.mit.edu, web.mit.edu/allanmc/www/benjamin.pdf](http://web.mit.edu/web.mit.edu/allanmc/www/benjamin.pdf). Accessed 24 July 2025.

Foucault, Michel. "What Is an Author?" 1969. *Open University*, www.open.edu/openlearn/pluginfile.php/624849/mod_resource/content/1/a840_1_§_michel_foucault.pdf. Accessed 24 July 2025.

Gass, William H. "The Death of the Author." *Salmagundi*, no. 65, 1984, pp. 3–26. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/40547668. Accessed 14 Mar. 2025.

"A Summary and Analysis of Roland Barthes' 'The Death of the Author.'" *Interesting Literature*, 21 Mar. 2023, interestingliterature.com/2021/10/barthes-death-of-the-author-summary-analysis/. Accessed 24 July 2025.

McKendrick, Joe. "AI Can't Replace Creativity, But Certainly Can Enhance It." *Forbes*, 12 Sept. 2024, www.forbes.com/sites/joemckendrick/2024/09/12/ai-cant-replace-creativity-but-

certainly-can-enhance-it/. Accessed 24 July 2025.

"The Future of AI in Creative Writing: Can Machines Replace Human Authors?" *Medium*, Dailymissions, 24 July 2023, dailymissions.medium.com/the-future-of-ai-in-creative-writing-can-machines-replace-human-authors-3fef2dbe1358. Accessed 24 July 2025. (Note: Assuming Dailymissions is the author/publisher given the URL structure. If there's an individual author name on Medium, that would go first).

"Generative AI: Never Truly Creative?" *Medium*, Axel Schwanke, 15 July 2023, medium.com/@axel.schwanke/generative-ai-never-truly-creative-68a0189d98e8. Accessed 24 July 2025. (Note: Assuming Axel Schwanke is the author).

"Creativity in the Times of AI: Can AI Replace Writers and Their Creativity?" *The Times of India*, 23 Apr. 2023, timesofindia.indiatimes.com/life-style/books/features/creativity-in-the-times-of-ai-can-ai-replace-writers-and-their-creativity/articleshow/99725412.cms. Accessed 24 July 2025.