MEGA INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Journal of Arts and Linguistics Studies
ISSN Print 2959-0957 ISSN Online 2959-0965
Volume 4 Issue 7 2026
Pages 587-607
Open Access

The Un-Curated Past: Cultural Memory and Power in AI-Generated Geopolitical Narratives

Publication Details
Paper Received:
May 20, 2026
Paper Accepted:
July 24, 2026
Paper Published:
July 26, 2026

Umar Mahdi
Department of English, Government Post Graduate College, Mardan.
Email: umarmahdi269@gmail.com
Zulqarnain Amin
Assistant Professor of English, Department of English, Govt Post Graduate College Mardan.
& PhD Scholar Department of English University of Malakand.
Email: zulqarnainsikander86gmail.com
Dr. Shaukat Ali (Corresponding Author)
Associate Professor, Department of English, University of Malakand. Email: shaukat143all@uom.edu.pk

Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.71281/jals.v4i7.753

Abstract
This study interrogates the epistemological status of geopolitical narratives generated by large language models such as ChatGPT, challenging the prevalent assumption that artificial intelligence constitutes a neutral or objective source of truth. Rather than producing experiential knowledge, these systems operate as probabilistic language models that recombine and reproduce linguistic structures derived from human-generated corpora including books, news media, websites, and social platforms. The paper examines the operation of cultural memory and discursive power within AI-generated texts addressing geopolitical themes, specifically terrorism, border conflict, and religious extremism. Through a qualitative analysis of selected ChatGPT narratives, the study employs a combined methodological framework of Post-Humanist Discourse Analysis (PHD) and Norman Fairclough's three-dimensional Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). This framework facilitates examination at three interrelated levels: (1) the micro-linguistic features of the generated texts; (2) the interdiscursive relationships between AI outputs and established media and political discourses; and (3) the macro-social significance of ideology and cultural memory in shaping geopolitical representation. The findings indicate that AI systems do not generate original geopolitical meaning but instead statistically reproduce the most dominant and recurrent patterns present in their training data. In doing so, these models function as conduits of cultural memory and as discursive apparatuses embedded within broader systems of power. The paper concludes by arguing for the cultivation of critical literacy in AI engagement, particularly in contexts concerning geopolitics, identity, and collective memory.
Keywords: AI narratives, cultural memory, post-humanism, digital humanities, geopolitics.

Published by MIARD. Copyright: © the author(s). This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY NC) license (https:// creativecommons.org/licenses/by/ 4.0/).

1. Introduction

AI has become a part of our everyday lives. It is employed by students for homework, educators for lesson planning, and a host of individuals seeking answers to history, politics and world events, including ChatGPT. Answers are often well structured, clear and confident. For this reason, they are trusted by people. If we stop for a moment and take a look at it, however, an important question emerges—where does this information come from? AI is not experiencing life in the way that a human does. It reads a vast amount of human text (books, newspapers, academic papers, websites and social media). The new text that it makes is also created from the old text.

This is particularly relevant in geopolitics. Interpretations of stories of terrorism, national identity, border conflicts and religious extremism already exist in the political sphere. Some countries continue to be classified as being in a state of violence/danger. Other nations are represented as rational, defensive or right. The images are resurfaced and reoccurring in the press and become "normal." This type of information is used to train AI algorithms which then receive the same patterns. It is not asking them any questions. It merely foretells the following most probable words. This means that AI can spread and repeat the same misguided and distorted worldviews. In this respect, researchers of critical digital media and critical AI have already established that this is the case, as algorithms are seen to be permeated by the biases within the data upon which they are trained (Benjamin, 2019; Noble, 2018; Crawford, 2021). As stated by Bender and others (2021), LLM's are referred to as "stochastic parrots". This means that the models simply shuffle around and rearrange existing language without comprehending it. These critiques are useful, but they mostly focus on technical bias or ethics. Less

emphasis on the texts of the AI as stories, or as a sort of cultural memory. Cultural memory is the collective memory of the society about the past in a medium (Erll, 2011). The role of AI is massive here as it can take in archives in a digital form and regenerate them. The concepts of post-humans are also incorporated in this paper. As with the theorists, Rosi Braidotti (2013) and N. Katherine Hayles (1999) believe that meaning is not only made by humans. Technology, data and machines are also at play. This perspective redefines AI as something that humans can utilize. It is a product of a larger network of humans, data and technology that create knowledge and stories. Once again we can make use of one of the ideas introduced by Michel Foucault in his discourse on the archive. For Foucault (1972) the archive is more than a repository of documents. It is a collection of rules which determine what is possible to say and know in a specific time. The data to train AI can be considered the archive. The more an AI knows the more it can say.

The other important basis for this study is CDA of Norman Fairclough. It is not as if language existed in a vacuum, as Fairclough (1995) shows. Language for describing events, group names and stories is all social/political. Texts are connected with other texts and through these connections they help to recreate some representations of the world. AI is also participating in the same process to generate stories. It is not in parentheses that are not used in people's speech. It is not in parentheses that are not used in people's conversations. It is an artifact of, and an iteration on, the media, politics and everyday talk that already exists.

The key argument of this study is that geopolitical stories created by AI are not entirely objective nor truly original. They are non-human systems that reconfigure and rehash the past, but they are also human discourses, expressions of power, identity and threat, reconfigured and rehashed. This is significant as there is increasing reliance on AI for information on sensitive topics. It should not be surprising that AI's narratives are tainted by some of the same biases in the data,

which is likely to find its way into worldview in a quiet manner. The paper recommends a more nuanced and reflective attitude towards the outputs of AI, especially in the fields of geopolitics, conflict, and identity.

The technical problem is not the only one in short. It is cultural and political. The bias of the Artificial Intelligence systems is inherent and is a reflection of human discourses. If such discourses are about geopolitics, the imbalances may impact the understanding of conflict, identity and responsibility. Therefore, discourse analysis and cultural memory should not only be considered for a critical approach to AI but be at its very center.

1.1. Research Objectives

- To identify how cultural memory and historical narratives are represented in AI-generated geopolitical narratives.
- To examine how dominant geopolitical representations of identity, conflict, and power are reproduced and naturalized in AI-generated discourse.

1.2. Research Questions

1) How are cultural memory and historical narratives represented in AI-generated geopolitical narratives?
2) How are dominant geopolitical representations of identity, conflict, and power reproduced and naturalized in AI-generated discourse?

2. Methodology

This is a qualitative research. It is not about numbers but it's about meaning. The research does not consider language as merely a means of revealing information, but as a language which forms a way of understanding the world. Also, inspired by post-humanist theory which challenges the notion that meaning is only made by humans. In this perspective technology and data also engage actively (Braidotti,

2013). AI is therefore not considered a neutral machine, or the author in its own right. It is regarded as part of a bigger network of data, history and technology.

This study's data are from ChatGPT. The researcher communicated with the chatbot using the prompts pertaining to cross-border terrorism, religious extremism, minority repression and geopolitical realism. The questions were for stories based on real or familiar political settings, particularly those from South Asian border areas. The sample is a limited number of narrative texts in their entirety, all related to similar themes: terrorism, state involvement, religious identity, and a definite hero-villain structure. The texts are selected based on their purpose, not all possible AI outputs, and were selected because they are relevant to the research questions.

The analysis is an interplay between the Critical Discourse Analysis by Norman Fairclough and the concepts from the field of cultural memory studies and the concepts from post-humanism. This is an integrated approach which is called Post Humanist Discourse Analysis. The three levels Fairclough considers are: The first one is the text level, which on words, grammar and how participants are represented as active or passive. The second concerns the discourse levels and how the text relates to other texts and discourses – e.g. media discourses, political and security discourses. The third is the social practice level where the discourse is analysed in terms of ideology, power and the broader social consequences. Astrid Erll (2011), focusing on cultural memory theory, contributes to the understanding of the process of stories becoming a part of shared knowledge. Foucault's conception of the archive can shed light on the data that is available to AI and how this data influences what it can say.

This analytical procedure was simple. Firstly, the AI stories were read thoroughly and the crucial lexical items, roles played by participants and modal items were recorded. Second, these stories were analyzed to see if intertextual

connections could be found with the other stories that were familiar to them in media and political writing. Third, the broader socio-cultural impact of the narratives was explored in the context of cultural memory and power. At all stages of the process the researcher was conscious that this was a qualitative interpretation, open to other interpretations.

This research is like any qualitative research in nature, and has its limitations. The analysis is interpretive and may be different if seen by other readers. The volume of texts is limited and its only English language outputs of one model are discussed. The results may not be generalizable to all AI systems and all geopolitical issues. They are provided as a careful reading of a particular group of narratives. Ethical issues were minimal, as the data are artificial texts generated by AI and not from human subjects. The analysis will be critical but not judgemental in nature of the model.

3. Analysis

This section presents a detailed analysis of five AI-generated stories. The stories are titled *The Mirror Frontier*, *The Line of Dust*, *Operation Black Veil*, *Frontier Skies* and *The Doctrine of Fire*. Each story was produced by ChatGPT in response to prompts that asked for geopolitical realism, cross-border terrorism, religious extremism and clear good-versus-bad structures. The analysis moves through the three levels of Fairclough's model, while also paying attention to cultural memory and the post-human role of AI.

The Mirror Frontier

In *The Mirror Frontier*, the language immediately sets up a strong contrast. Phrases such as "rogue state," "used terrorism as official policy" and "ISI proxy war" appear early and shape how the reader is invited to understand the situation. The expression "Bleed India" is presented as a low-cost strategy. These lexical choices are not neutral descriptions. They discursively position Pakistan as a state

that deliberately supports terrorism. India's role is constructed differently. India is associated with moral statehood and defensive action. The story therefore builds a clear moral geography in which one side is the source of violence and the other side is the responder.

At the level of discursive practice, this story draws heavily on Indian military and think-tank discourse, as well as on television narratives that have long treated cross-border militancy as a central security problem. The idea of ISI-backed groups has been repeated so often in certain media environments that it has become a familiar template. AI, which learns from frequency, selects this template because it is statistically common. The story does not invent the frame; it re-uses it. At the social level, the narrative helps justify ideas of retaliation and national superiority. It contributes to a security discourse in which Pakistan is fixed as a source of violence. The story is not a simple reflection of events. It is a re-performance of a geopolitical narrative that has already circulated widely.

The Line of Dust

In *The Line of Dust*, the setting itself carries meaning. Words such as "refugee camp near Peshawar," "radical preacher," "taken across mountains" and "ordered to attack shrine in Pakistan" construct a particular image of space. The border region is shown as a zone of radicalisation and recruitment. Afghanistan is mentioned, but Pakistan remains the central location of threat. Young people are shown as being drawn into violence through religious influence. The language of the story leaves little room for alternative explanations of why people might move or why violence occurs.

Discursively, this narrative is closely linked to post-9/11 "war on terror" language and to Western and regional security discussions about the Pakistan–Afghanistan border. Research and media coverage of madrasa radicalisation have also contributed to this archive of representations. Because these discourses have

been repeated for years, they are densely present in the data that trains large language models. AI therefore has a high probability of reproducing them. At the social level, the story participates in a wider pattern in which certain border areas of South Asia are treated as permanent sites of instability. This feeds into global security discourses that place the global South under continuous watch. The story does not simply report a local situation. It helps keep alive a particular image of a region as a problem that requires external attention.

Operation Black Veil

In *Operation Black Veil*, the textual patterns continue the same direction. Phrases such as "state-backed," "military protection" and "orchestration" present Pakistan as the active planner of violence. The character structure is also revealing. A figure associated with Pakistan is shown directing operations, while an Indian character is shown reacting and defending. The story therefore maintains a clear division of roles: one side initiates, the other responds. The language of planning and control is applied to one side; the language of reaction and investigation is applied to the other.

This structure resembles popular and official Indian security narratives, as well as certain styles of war-related storytelling in film and television. Archives of such material are large and frequently accessed. AI models trained on English-language sources therefore encounter these patterns often and are likely to reproduce them. At the social level, the story reinforces the idea that Pakistan functions as a base for terrorism and that its relations with neighbours are shaped by the use of proxy groups. The narrative helps keep this picture available as a ready-made explanation for regional conflict.

Frontier Skies

In *Frontier Skies*, the language turns toward religion and minority issues. Phrases such as "charismatic leader in Islamabad," "religious fervour," "pure nation" and

"infidel" appear. These words present Pakistan as a place where religion is politicised and where religious language is used to justify exclusion or violence. The story focuses on the exploitation of minorities and marginalised communities. At the same time, it tends to treat certain religious expressions as signs of extremism rather than as complex social phenomena. The lexical choices create a picture of a society organised around religious purity and hostility to outsiders.

Why does this representation appear so readily? One reason is the heavy presence of certain kinds of English-language media reporting that have associated Pakistan with religious extremism over many years. Indian English-language media, as well as some international coverage, have contributed to this archive. AI models do not independently decide that Pakistan should be shown this way. They reflect the frequency of such associations in the data they have been trained on. At the social level, the story participates in the naturalisation of a cultural and political image of Pakistan as a sponsor of terrorism and as a society organised around religious confrontation. The dramatisation of these themes makes the narrative feel vivid and familiar, which in turn makes the underlying ideology harder to notice.

The Doctrine of Fire

In *The Doctrine of Fire*, the textual patterns return to themes of indoctrination and radicalisation. Words such as "indoctrination," "madrasa outside Peshawar," "systemic radicalisation" and "state-enabled radicalisation" present Pakistan as a theocratic space in which young people are systematically prepared for violence. Character roles follow a familiar pattern: one character is shown as indoctrinated, while another is shown as the investigator or the figure of moral clarity. Religious language that might carry positive or complex meanings is stripped away or made to serve the theme of threat. The sequence of the story—training, indoctrination, and then attack—reinforces a simple causal chain.

Discursively, the story is closely connected to the language of the post-9/11 period, when Pakistan was frequently discussed in international media as a country that both cooperated with and harboured elements of the "war on terror." Events such as the killing of Osama bin Laden in Abbottabad added to a negative image that circulated widely. More recent developments, including Pakistan's own counter-terrorism efforts or the role of other regional actors, receive less weight in this narrative because they are less densely present in the older layers of the training data. At the social level, the story continues to present Pakistan as a cultural and foreign-policy problem associated with the harbouring of terrorists. The older image is kept in circulation even when the political situation has changed in important ways.

This understanding of AI as a memory technology has practical consequences. If AI is involved in the circulation of cultural memory, then the quality and diversity of that memory matter. Training data that over-represents certain media economies will tend to over-represent certain memories. Efforts to make AI more "accurate" or less "biased" need to take narrative and discursive form into account, not only factual correctness or demographic balance. The stories analysed here suggest that the form of geopolitical narrative—who acts, who reacts, what is certain, what is left out—is itself a carrier of power.

Bringing the three levels of analysis together, the five stories show AI operating as a site of cultural memory. The model does not remember in the human sense. It does not have experiences or emotions. Yet it stores, selects and re-generates patterns that societies have already circulated as ways of remembering and explaining conflict. In this limited but powerful sense, AI participates in the ongoing production of shared memory. The memory it produces is shaped by the archives available to it, by the frequency of certain narratives, and by the algorithmic preference for common patterns. The result is a form of memory that

is automated, scalable and often invisible as memory. Users may experience the output as information or as storytelling, without noticing that they are also encountering a selective re-performance of the past.

AI as a Site of Cultural Memory

This is one reason why critical literacy is necessary. The problem is not only that some associations are over-represented. It is also that the form of the language—its certainty, its narrative completeness, its familiar plot shapes—makes those associations feel natural. Discourse analysis helps make the construction visible. Once the construction is visible, the reader can ask different questions: Whose perspective is centred? Whose is backgrounded? What would a story organised around different agents and different timelines look like?

A further textual feature that runs through the corpus is the use of high-modality language. Statements are often presented with strong certainty. Phrases that suggest doubt or alternative interpretation are rare. This creates an effect of facticity: the story sounds as if it is reporting what is known rather than constructing a particular version of events. For a reader who is not trained to notice modality, the difference between a contested claim and a settled fact can disappear. AI's fluent, confident style reinforces this effect. The model is designed to produce coherent, well-formed text. Coherence and fluency can be mistaken for reliability.

Certainty, Facticity and the Sound of Authority

Narrative closure is also important. The stories tend to move toward a clear resolution in which the threat is identified and the defensive side acts. Ambiguity, shared responsibility, or the possibility that multiple actors contribute to violence are less common. This preference for clear roles and clear endings makes the stories feel satisfying and readable. At the same time, it reduces the space for more complex readings of regional conflict. In Fairclough's terms, the textual and

discursive choices support a social practice of simplifying geopolitics into a moral binary.

Another consistent feature of the five stories is the use of a hero–villain structure. In each case, the plot organises characters into opposing moral roles. One side plans, sponsors or carries out violence. The other side investigates, defends or responds. This structure is not unique to AI. It is a familiar pattern in political storytelling, news drama and popular culture. What matters here is that AI selects and reproduces this pattern with high consistency when the prompt asks for geopolitical realism and conflict. The model does not invent the structure. It finds it ready-made in the data and re-uses it because it fits the statistical patterns of the training material.

Hero–Villain Structures and Narrative Closure

This selective silence is part of how cultural memory works in digital systems. Memory is not only about remembering. It is also about forgetting, or at least about leaving certain things in the background. When AI repeatedly generates stories that centre one set of associations and leave others aside, it participates in a form of algorithmic forgetting. The past that is re-circulated is a curated selection, even if no human editor has consciously chosen it for each new output. The curation is statistical. It is the product of frequency, visibility and the historical weight of particular media economies.

One of the most important findings of the analysis is not only what the stories say, but what they leave out. Across the five narratives, there is little or no attention to more recent developments that complicate the older picture. For example, the stories do not dwell on Pakistan's own experience as a target of terrorism, including attacks carried out by groups that have operated from neighbouring territories. They do not give significant weight to counter-terrorism operations that have been undertaken inside Pakistan. They also do not explore the role that other

regional actors may play in supporting or tolerating militant groups. These absences are not accidental. They reflect the unequal density of certain narratives in the English-language media archives on which large language models are trained. What is said often becomes what is sayable. What is said less often becomes harder for the model to produce.

A Note on What the Stories Leave Out

Overall Patterns across the Stories

This chapter sets out how some of the AI stories are analysed using Post-Humanist Discourse Analysis (PHDA) to illustrate how they depict cultural memory and ideology, and global political agendas. This is at the level of the textual (words, sentences and certainty), discursive (the connections of these stories with other ideas and texts) and social (power, ideology and cultural memory). The stories *(The Mirror Frontier, The Line of Dust, Operation Black Veil, The Doctrine of Fire and Shadows on the Frontier*) are thought to be created by and belong to the social, not individuals. The textual analysis reveals that there are repeated words (for instance *"rogue state", "state-sponsored terrorism" and "proxy war")* and that the words are not neutral in that they offer a particular representation of the world, where one side is the evil and the other side is the good. They are very certain words, for example *"There was no doubt"* to make them sound as facts. There are also verbs to make the distinction between one side is the action and the other the reaction. At the discourse level, the stories have ideas from the media, politics, military and the global war-on-terror and so demonstrate AI can use ideas from these domains to create the stories instead of coming up with new ideas. The stories also have language from a variety of sources, such as military, political, cyber security and religious and are thus realistic. The ideas are also more frequently repeated in the media and social media (and so have a larger chance of occurring in the stories). Well, im not claiming here that Pakistan is cleaned of all

these things ,Pakistan does have a past with those things but the recent history has changed and we have almost purged ourselves from those activities but those steps does not get enough highlighting and demonstration on media level that's why no contribution adds to the big data on which these language models function and its narratives about Pakistan are stuck in its past and it is unfortunate to label Pakistan with any misadventure that unraveling in some neighbor country like the recent *Pahalgam Attack in Indian Occupied Kashmir* which ChatGPT claimed that Pakistan most probably would have done it which is totally not the case. The steps Pakistan have undertaken in terms of to disassociate themselves from any proxy which once they were backing has not got enough mentions. Although some neighbor countries like India, Afghanistan and Iran have backed their terror proxies to carry out terrorism in Pakistan and are still doing it, Pakistan topped the terrorism index in 2025, the most terror incidents happened in Pakistan since the start of 2025 and all the perpetrators evidences goes back these countries like the BLA were getting its support from Iran and India, now TTP, IS, and several other terrorist organization are enjoying safe havens in Afghanistan and inflicting terrorism on Pakistan but that is rarely get mentions. In terms of social, the analysis shows the stories are based on ideological ideas, such as superiority and nationalism, of good and evil. This is related to the idea repetition leads to "common sense". The disproportionate balance of the two is about geo-political imbalance in the world and some stories are more popular, therefore more likely to be saved and shared. Stories are also related to cultural memory so they have been affected by repetition and the past and AI is a cultural memory system. From a posthuman perspective AI is not a new author but part of a human, data and technology system so the stories that AI writes are stories from stories. So, the research illustrates that AI is repetitive of dominant ideas of the world, is influenced by cultural memory and normalises ideas through the language and

makes them seem normal, natural and common. So, AI is not a thing but part of the meaning and power system. This chapter shows that AI stories are stories of the world and dominant ideas of the world in digital archives and the next chapter will discuss the findings' recommendations and conclusion.

4. Discussion

The results of this study indicate that according to the stories produced by AI, there is no window to an independent reality, but rather to the pre-existing discourse. This discovery dovetails with past criticisms of algorithmic bias, but importantly, is new. Existing research focus has been on the technical bias in the model, racial/gendered bias in the model, or the lack of transparency in the model decision-making process (Noble, 2018; Benjamin, 2019; O'Neil, 2016; Birhane, 2021). The focus of this research is however on the strategies used in the narrative of the reproduction of power. The use of the language of certainty, both in terms of its active and passive use, enhances the relativity of one geopolitical picture while aggravating the other.

The study also finds that AI will be able to "freeze" certain moments in time in the past. Even with the variation of material density/availability in a region, the densest and most common material in the training set is still used in the model. The more recent the linkage(s) and/or the more complex the linkage(s) the less likely it is that the story will appear. In this aspect, AI does more than just a report on the current state. It selectively recycles a part of the past, and dispenses it as current knowledge. In the title 'un-curated past' it is meant to indicate the following:

The things remind us of a post-humanist perspective that meanings are no more the exclusive creation of human authors. AI is not just a subset of data and code, but also a part of institutions and geopolitical interests (Braidotti, 2013; Hayles, 1999; Crawford, 2021). It has a mixed bag of stories. They are

algorithmically chosen, sorted and include traces of language and ideology. This hybridity of all AI users, especially the educators, learners, journalists, and policymakers, is something that has to be recognized. Do not assume that AI created content is the truth. To recognize it as another type of discourse and, thus, another text that needs to be read critically is responsible. The talk also opens for a theoretical reflection in the field of the digital humanities and discourse studies. It is important that the analysis of AI is not limited to the discussion of biases which can be measured and mitigated, but the discussion of AI as a discursive practice as part of the circulation and naturalisation of cultural memory. AI texts can be analysed as discourse, which opens the door to critical discourse analysis and other critical approaches traditionally used in analysing other forms of cultural text such as Critical discourse analysis, memory studies and related approaches, to a relatively new and growing body of cultural text. The stories created by AI are not out of the culture. These are the result of the present cultural memory in a digital age.

From a practical standpoint, the results indicate that critical literacy is needed among the users of AI. When students are reading texts produced by AI, teachers can help them navigate the text as they would any other ideologically constructed text. Policymakers and developers should not only be mindful of technical correctness and population bias, but also the storylines that give rise to normal understandings of geopolitics. Along with some technical solutions, such as the use of diversity in the training data, understanding the properties of discourse is also a crucial factor.

Finally, the results will provide an answer to the first research question and the second research question. AI-generated content may include cultural memory and historical narratives, but they are presented in a filtered and mediated way. The past that emerges is the past that has been much represented in digital and

media repositories already. AI is not a way to create a clean slate history. It recreates a past, already 'tempered' by the conditions of its own recording and circulation. Being aware of it is a step towards more reflective relationship with AI as a cultural technology. This distributed responsibility does not take the place of critique. It shifts the focus for criticism.Questions may be raised regarding the interaction of the output to larger discursive/mnemonic processes, but not on the truth or falseness of the output. We can ask: Who is being privileged with which archives, or which narrative templates are being preferred? And who would be made less likely to be privileged with which alternative stories, or with any archive at all? In these questions technical design is related to cultural and political analysis. They also relate the everyday relationship with a Chatbot to the story of societies' memory of conflict and identity.

The second research question of the relationship between technology, narrative and power can now be further elaborated as follows: How can we describe and analyze the relation between technology, narrative and power? Technology—the large language model is not apart from narrative. It picks up, arranges and re-circulates storylines with power. Power in this instance does not only refer to the power of states or institutions. But it is also the way that some stories become so commonplace, so natural, so inevitable, so fact. AI takes that power to the next level, enabling the creation of such stories to be quick, sustainable and ubiquitous. However, the nature of AI is being hybrid which causes responsibility to be fragmented. However, the model is not the human author who has an intention, but rather the systems that produce, educate and apply the model will be affected by human decisions regarding data, assessment, and usage.

5. Conclusion

This research explored the potential of an AI-generated geopolitical narrative as a space of cultural memory and power and not simply one of information. It analysed narrative components on ChatGPT stories related to terrorism and religious extremism with a qualitative method, and found that the stories systemically repeat dominant patterns from their training narratives in the context of religious extremism and cross-border conflict. Utilizing charged vocabulary and unequal roles of the agents, clear good and bad structures are created. The links with media and security discourses re-connect the stories with the wider political discourse. The overall impression is the creation of a geopolitical sensibility that ontologises a sense of threat that comes from some States while others assert a sense of rationality as a defender of order. AI is not a stand-alone storyteller, nor is it a straightforward reflection of facts. A memory technology and a socio-technical agent that recirculates the un-curated past. Critical literacy is becoming more pressing as its applications are increasingly integrated into education, the media and public discourse, and as large language models gain more widespread use. As with any text that is created with an ideologically motivated purpose, users should take AI-created texts with a grain of salt. Technical correctness and demographic bias are not the only things that needs to be taken into consideration when developing such modelling tools or when building institutions, the narrative patterns should be taken care of as well that drive what is considered as common sense regarding geopolitics.

The study could be expanded to include other languages besides English, as well as a qualitative discourse analysis or the incorporation of corpus analysis, and a comparison of outputs from various models and training regimes. This kind of activity would contribute to a better understanding of the relationship between digital archives and algorithms and their co-production of the stories that constitute

the contemporary world, alongside human communities. In the present study, one step towards this direction is taken, as it is shown that AI stories are not immune to culture and power. They are part of the ongoing work of cultural memory in a digital age.

References

Benjamin, R. (2019). Race after technology: Abolitionist tools for the new Jim code. Polity Press.

Bender, E. M., Gebru, T., McMillan-Major, A., & Shmitchell, S. (2021). On the dangers of stochastic parrots: Can language models be too big? Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency, 610–623.

Birhane, A. (2021). Algorithmic injustice: A relational ethics approach. Patterns, 2(2), 100205.

Braidotti, R. (2013). The posthuman. Polity Press.

Crawford, K. (2021). Atlas of AI: Power, politics, and the planetary costs of artificial intelligence. Yale University Press.

Erll, A. (2011). Memory in culture. Palgrave Macmillan.

Fairclough, N. (1995). Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language. Longman.

Foucault, M. (1972). The archaeology of knowledge. Pantheon Books.

Hayles, N. K. (1999). How we became posthuman: Virtual bodies in cybernetics, literature, and informatics. University of Chicago Press.

Noble, S. U. (2018). Algorithms of oppression: How search engines reinforce racism. NYU Press.

O'Neil, C. (2016). Weapons of math destruction: How big data increases inequality and threatens democracy. Crown Publishing Group.

Kouros, T. (2026). From 'objectivity' to obedience: LLMs as discourse, discipline, and power. AI & Society, 41, 5883–5892.

Pacheco, A. G. C., Cavalini, A., & Comarela, G. (2026). Echoes of power: Investigating geopolitical bias in US and China large language models. Humanities and Social Sciences Communications, 13, 675.

Cap, P. (2023). Narratives of geopolitical representation in the discourse of the Russia–Ukraine war. Journal of Pragmatics, 218, 133–143.

Horvat, M., Koražija, J., Babnik, J., et al. (2026). Mapping contested cultural memory: An LLM-supported approach to analysing narrative structures, discursive modes and discourse functions. ANNALES, Series Historia et Sociologia, 36(2), 183–204.

Language and the framing of historical narrative in large language models: The case of Asia Minor (1922). (2026). AI and Ethics.

How latent and prompting biases in AI-generated historical narratives influence opinions. (2026). PNAS Nexus.

Landwehr-Matlé, J., Oppermann, K., & Lambach, D. (2026). Great power competition for global leadership in artificial intelligence (AI): Reconstructing AI narratives of the United States, China, and the European Union. Review of International Studies.

Saqr, K. (2025). Narratives of divide: The polarizing power of large language models in a turbulent world. APSA Preprints.

He, Y., & Heeks, R. Analysing the US-China “AI Cold War” narrative.

Handling the hype: Demystifying artificial intelligence for memory studies. (2025). Memory, Mind & Media.

Pacheco, A. G. C., Cavalini, A., & Comarela, G. (2025). Echoes of Power: Investigating Geopolitical Bias in US and China Large Language Models. arXiv preprint.

Discursive behavior of generative language models in geopolitical and humanitarian contexts. (2026). Discover Artificial Intelligence.