DOI: https://doi.org/10.30525/2661-5169/2025-2-5

THE DUAL ROLE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN DIGITAL DIPLOMACY AND TECH DIPLOMACY: GLOBAL IMPLICATIONS

Liana Moskalyk[1], Yaroslav Revera[2]

Abstract. Artificial Intelligence (AI) is increasingly recognized as a transformative force in contemporary diplomacy, fulfilling a dual role as both an operational tool and a central subject of international discourse. On the one hand, AI serves as a powerful instrument within digital diplomacy, enabling states and international organizations to enhance the efficiency, scope, and agility of their diplomatic operations. On the other hand, as the focus of tech diplomacy, AI has become a key topic in international negotiations and norm-setting, shaping the global governance landscape. This study aims to develop a comprehensive conceptual framework for analyzing the dynamic intersection between diplomatic practice and AI, with a particular emphasis on how technological innovation is reconfiguring international policy, governance mechanisms, and patterns of global economic growth. Through a comparative theoretical analysis, this research investigates the multifaceted impact of AI on diplomatic communication, conflict prevention, and global coordination. It further explores how AI influences the evolution of international norms, the design of institutional structures, and the dynamics of geopolitical competition. In the context of digital diplomacy, AI-driven tools such as chatbots for consular assistance, predictive analytics for real-time crisis monitoring, and advanced disinformation detection systems – exemplified by Ukraine's Osavul and NATO's digital initiatives – significantly enhance the speed, reach, and responsiveness of diplomatic activities. These innovations not only streamline traditional diplomatic processes but also create new opportunities for creative statecraft and international engagement. Conversely, in the domain of tech diplomacy, AI has emerged as a central subject of multilateral negotiations and regulatory discussions. Conceptual frameworks presented in this study underscore AI's dual function as both a geopolitical lever and a catalyst for international cooperation, necessitating robust regulatory alignment and the establishment of export controls on advanced AI technologies. The study identifies several critical challenges associated with the integration of AI into diplomacy, most notably the urgent need for global consensus on AI governance and the effective management of its strategic risks. The complexity of these challenges is compounded by the rapid pace of technological development and the divergent interests of state and non-state actors. In response, public-private partnerships (PPPs) are emerging as vital enablers, fostering collaboration across sectors, bridging knowledge gaps, and mobilizing resources for the responsible and inclusive development of AI on a global scale. PPPs play a crucial role in advancing standardization, policy harmonization, and the equitable distribution of AI benefits, thereby reinforcing the capacity of states and international organizations to address emerging challenges. Ultimately, AI is not only redefining the functions and practices of diplomacy but also transforming the broader landscape of international relations. By necessitating new frameworks for cooperation, regulation, and ethical oversight, AI is reshaping the foundations of global order and stability. The findings of this study highlight the strategic importance of aligning AI development with core values of global stability, equity, and shared prosperity. As AI continues to evolve, diplomatic efforts must adapt to ensure that technological progress serves the collective interests of the international community, fostering a future in which AI-driven diplomacy contributes to peace, security, and sustainable development.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence (AI), cooperation, digital diplomacy, emerging technologies, international relations, global economics and governance, geopolitics, tech diplomacy.

JEL Classification: O33, F50, K39

[1] Ivan Franko National University of Lviv, Ukraine *(corresponding author)*
E-mail: liana.moskalyk@lnu.edu.ua
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0664-7422
[2] Ivan Franko National University of Lviv, Ukraine
E-mail: yaroslav.revera@lnu.edu.ua
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0006-6395-193X

1. Introduction

The rise of artificial intelligence (AI) has significantly impact on different sectors, including international relations and global economics. AI technologies have equipped governments and organizations with sophisticated capabilities, enabling them to influence diplomatic outcomes, formulate economic policies, and optimize international trade. AI occupies a unique and increasingly critical dual role within the evolving landscape of modern diplomacy, serving simultaneously as both a transformative tool for digital diplomacy and a central subject of tech diplomacy.

On one hand, AI profoundly enhances **digital diplomacy** by augmenting the capacity of diplomatic actors to engage, analyze, and communicate in the digital sphere. It empowers foreign ministries and missions to conduct sophisticated data analytics for public sentiment, automate routine communications, improve cross-cultural understanding through advanced translation, and bolster defenses against digital disinformation campaigns. In this capacity, AI functions as a powerful technological enabler, optimizing the efficiency and reach of diplomatic outreach and information management.

On the other hand, the very nature and implications of AI itself constitute a paramount concern for **tech diplomacy**. As a frontier technology with profound geopolitical, economic, ethical, and societal ramifications, AI necessitates dedicated diplomatic engagement to establish international norms, standards, and regulatory frameworks. Tech diplomacy concerning AI addresses critical issues such as the governance of autonomous weapons systems, the ethical development and deployment of AI, cybersecurity, data sovereignty, and the strategic competition for AI dominance (DiPLO, 2021).

Resource-saving technological progress, largely driven by AI and other digital technologies, offers significant potential for increased output with reduced natural resource consumption and lower carbon emissions. While these innovations promise environmental and efficiency gains, they also pose potential adverse distributional effects, particularly for developing countries that specialize in natural resource exports (Schindler, 2021). This critical juncture highlights a pivotal role for tech diplomacy and policy.

Tech diplomacy becomes instrumental in navigating these complexities. It facilitates the equitable transfer of resource-saving AI technologies to resource-dependent nations, empowering them to diversify their economies and pursue more sustainable industrialization beyond raw material extraction. Furthermore, tech diplomacy is crucial for negotiating international policy frameworks that proactively address the economic vulnerabilities arising from diminished demand for exhaustible resources. This includes establishing norms for technology diffusion, promoting collaborative research and development in resource-efficient AI tailored to diverse national contexts, and ensuring that the global shift towards resource optimization does not disproportionately disadvantage developing economies with a comparative advantage in natural resources (Schindler, 2021). In essence, robust tech diplomacy and policy are vital for ensuring that the benefits of resource-saving technological progress are equitably distributed, preventing increased economic disparities, and fostering a more inclusive and sustainable global transition.

The theoretical foundations for the application of AI in policy, diplomacy, and international relations are extensively explored in the prominent works of numerous authors (Mostafaei, Kordnoori, Ostadrahimi, and Banihashemi, 2025), (Ndzendze and Marwala, 2023), (Korinek and Stiglitz, 2021), (Amaresh, 2020), (Krzyzanowski, 2020), (Darrel and Allen, 2018), (Cath, 2018), (Baele, Bukhari, Whyte, 2024), (Brasioli, Guercio, Gnerre, Landini, de Giorgio, 2023), (Höne, 2018), (Kania and Fedasiuk, 2021).

This article's novelty lies in its examination of AI's dual role in digital and tech diplomacy, providing a comprehensive analysis of its impact on global technology governance and geoeconomic realignment. Through comparative analysis, we aim to identify the main differences and characteristics of AI application in diplomacy within a global context.

The research goal of this article is to analyze the evolving dual role of AI as both a tool for and a subject of diplomacy, with a specific focus on its implications for global technology governance and geoeconomic realignment in a multipolar world. To achieve this goal, the following research tasks are set:

– to delineate the conceptual distinction and interrelationship between AI's application in digital diplomacy and its role as a subject of tech diplomacy;
– to examine how emerging powers and smaller digitally advanced states are leveraging AI to assert influence and innovate in diplomatic and developmental spheres;
– to identify key strategic imperatives for the effective application of AI in international relations, particularly in the context of emerging global governance challenges.

The research methodology employed in this study is a qualitative, comparative analytical approach. It involves a systematic review of contemporary academic literature, policy documents from international organizations and national governments, and expert reports concerning AI, digital diplomacy, tech diplomacy, and global governance. Limitations of this research include its reliance on publicly available documents and scholarly works, which may not capture the full scope of classified or nascent diplomatic initiatives. This study primarily focuses on the high-level strategic implications of AI for diplomatic practice and international relations, rather than providing detailed technical analyses of AI systems.

2. Comparative Analysis of AI in Digital and Tech Diplomacy

The application of AI in international affairs is evolving along two distinct, yet interconnected, dimensions: **digital diplomacy** and **tech diplomacy. Digital diplomacy** emphasizes the operational use of AI-driven tools – such as natural language processing, sentiment analysis, and deep learning algorithms – to enhance the efficiency, responsiveness, and reach of diplomatic communication and public engagement. Its core objective is to optimize outreach efforts and counter disinformation through applications including AI-based chatbots for consular support, predictive analytics for crisis response, and deepfake detection systems. Key actors in this domain include foreign ministries, public diplomats, and non-governmental organizations, who must navigate challenges such as algorithmic bias, over-reliance on AI in sensitive decision-making, and susceptibility to adversarial AI attacks. Notable implementations include Ukraine's deployment of AI technologies to counter propaganda campaigns (Uacrisis, 2023), (Sobchuk, 2024) and the U.S. State Department's use of social media analytics to monitor and influence public opinion (Department of State AI Inventory, 2024). In contrast, **tech diplomacy** operates at a strategic level, employing diplomatic principles to shape the global governance of emerging technologies, particularly AI. This includes negotiating international standards, establishing ethical and regulatory frameworks, and fostering cooperation between states, international organizations, and technology corporations. Tech diplomacy aims to create inclusive, stable, and forward-looking policy structures that guide the development and application of AI in ways that are aligned with global public interest. Its principal stakeholders include national technology envoys, multinational firms, regulatory bodies, and defense institutions. The domain faces complex challenges such as jurisdictional tensions over data governance, geopolitical competition – particularly between major AI powers – and resistance from private actors to enforceable regulation. Illustrative examples include the U.S.-EU Trade and Technology Council's negotiations on AI risk management (Futurium, 2025) and China's engagement in United Nations debates on the governance of lethal autonomous weapons systems (Charukeshi, Bharadwai, 2024). In the current geopolitical context, tech diplomacy functions as a critical interface between states and the global technology sector, focusing on harmonizing technological innovation with the imperatives of security, human rights, and socioeconomic development. As AI and digital technologies increasingly influence global economic, political, and security dynamics, both digital and tech diplomacy are undergoing rapid transformation (Table 1).

The comparative analysis clarifies the evolving interplay between digital diplomacy and tech diplomacy, highlighting the distinct ways in which each dimension engages with technology within the realm of international relations. Although these fields overlap in areas such as cybersecurity and artificial intelligence, they diverge significantly in their focus, scope, and principal actors. Digital diplomacy primarily aims to optimize foreign policy outreach and public engagement, whereas tech diplomacy is oriented toward establishing sustainable, secure, and inclusive global technological ecosystems.

Table 1

Comparative Analysis of AI in Digital Diplomacy and Tech Diplomacy

Dimension	Digital Diplomacy (DD)	**Tech Diplomacy (TD)**
1	2	3
Definition*	**Digital diplomacy** refers to the use of technologies, platforms, and digital tools (such as social media, data analytics, and **AI**) to conduct and enhance diplomatic activities, and achieve foreign policy objectives. It encompasses **traditional diplomatic practices and environment** and transforms them by integrating **digital technologies and new communication tools** into the established framework of diplomacy for more direct engagement with foreign publics and global audience, faster information exchange, real-time respond to geopolitical developments (for example, crisis response) and the ability to shape international norms and policy in an increasingly interconnected world.	**Tech diplomacy** is an emerging field within international relations that involves the strategic application of diplomatic principles and practices, technology policy, international cooperation to govern, develop, regulate emerging technologies and emerging technological issues (such as ethical use, standards) on a global scale among states, and non-state actors (international organizations, private sector, civil society, and other innovation ecosystem groups).
Scope	**Tactical** (how tech enables diplomacy)	**Strategic** (how diplomacy shapes tech governance)
Primary Objective and Goal	**Optimization of diplomatic outreach**, communication, improving public engagement, managing cyber norms, countering disinformation. DD addresses substantive issues such as *cybersecurity, data governance, internet governance, e-commerce rules, human rights issues*	Establishing international norms, regulatory alignment, and cooperative frameworks for **governing technology, fostering innovation, and managing global supply chains.** TD addresses substantive issues such as ***AI,*** *cybersecurity, blockchain, quantum computing, biotechnology,* and the *regulation of emerging technologies.*
Main Focus	Digital tools for communication, public engagement, and crisis management.	Policy, governance, and negotiation on tech-related issues (**standards, infrastructure, partnerships**).
Key AI Applications and Examples	**Crisis detection and response, communication, disinformation tracking:** - **Predictive analytics for crisis response** (for example, tracking conflict zones via social media; Ukraine's Osavul for countering propaganda) (Osavul, 2025) - **AI-powered chatbots for consular services** (such as Canada's virtual assistant) (ETTravelWorld, 2025), (U.S. Department of State, 2024), (Immigration News Canada, 2021) - **Deepfake detection in hybrid warfare** (NATO's counter-disinformation efforts and hybrid warfare tools; Ukraine`s AI against propaganda) (Ukraine Crisis Media Center, 2023), (NATO, 2025), (Sobchuk, 2024)	**Regulatory alignment, export controls, standards:** - **Multilateral AI Ethics Agreements** (such as OECD Principles; U.S.-EU Trade and Technology Council (TTC) talks on AI risk management; China's and India's participation in UN debates on lethal autonomous weapons (LAWS)) (Bhatt et al., 2024), (Futurium, 2025), (GPAI, 2024), (UN, 2021), (OECD, 2024), (OECD, 2025), (Russo, 2023), (European Commission, 2022) - **Export Controls on Tech** (such as U.S.-China semiconductor restrictions; **Dutch ASML Lithography Machine Controls**) (Allen et al., 2025), (ASML, 2023) - **Standardization and Regulation** (such as EU AI Act negotiations; **Global Partnership on AI (GPAI); Brazil's draft AI bill; Japan`s AI Bill**) (EU Artificial Intelligence Act, 2024), (Brazil AI Act, 2024), (European Parliament, 2024), (Tatsuno, 2025)
Mission	To enhance communication, counter disinformation, and improve crisis response and resilience.	To foster responsible innovation, address cross-border challenges, and ensure technological progress for sustainable and inclusive society (via shaping global tech governance, managing supply chains, and mitigating geopolitical risks).

(End of Table 1)

1	2	3
Outputs	Communication campaigns, crisis responses	Treaties, standards, export controls
Stakeholders	States (foreign ministries), diplomats, society (NGOs), media	States, national tech envoys (diplomats or representatives), multinational corporations and tech companies, tech regulators, defense agencies and other innovation ecosystem.
Challenges	**Ethical dilemmas, cybersecurity, misinformation, cultural barriers, trust issues,** for example: - Algorithmic bias in diplomatic messaging - Over-reliance on AI for sensitive decision-making - Vulnerability to adversarial AI	**Regulatory gaps, multi-stakeholder complexity, technical expertise, geopolitics,** for example: - **Sovereignty conflicts in data governance** (for example, GDPR vs. U.S. data laws) (Subramani, 2025), (Wolford, 2025) - **Geopolitical competition in AI supremacy** (such as U.S.-China AI rivalry) (Uekert, 2025) - **Corporate resistance to binding regulations** (Lee, 2023)
Future Directions	Moving toward interdisciplinary, adaptive, and collaborative approaches; integrating digital tools (AI, AI-assisted, AI-powered, AI-driven) into all aspects of diplomacy (DiPLO, 2021), (Balme, 2025)	Reframing tech diplomacy as a central pillar of international relations, with emphasis on containing corporate dominance and ensuring public interest

* Definitions proposed by the authors

Source: Developed by the authors

Emerging trends indicate a growing convergence between the two domains, with digital diplomacy adopting a more interdisciplinary approach and tech diplomacy assuming a pivotal role in the formulation of international norms and the management of geopolitical tensions related to technology. Anticipated future developments include the establishment of institutional frameworks designed to support AI diplomacy within the architecture of statecraft, the formation of specialized multilateral forums dedicated to digital governance, and the negotiation of binding international agreements governing emerging technologies and the ethical deployment of AI. Furthermore, digital diplomacy is expected to increasingly contribute to real-time crisis management efforts, while tech diplomacy will play a critical role in shaping transnational regulatory regimes and facilitating public-private partnerships that promote shared global values in technological innovation and governance.

3. Strategic Imperatives of AI in Diplomacy: Leveraging Multipolarity

The accelerated development of digital technologies, particularly AI, has fundamentally transformed global economies and societies, concurrently reshaping the landscape of international relations. The pandemic of 2019 underscored the imperative for secure and effective digital solutions to foster accessibility, equity, and inclusivity. This period also coincided with an increasingly complex international and security environment, further exacerbated by Russia's full-scale war of aggression against Ukraine. In this volatile context, emerging and digital technologies are not merely drivers of economic change but have become significant vectors of geopolitical competition and indicators of global influence.

Moreover, these technologies are increasingly weaponized by state and non-state actors to compromise national security and integrity, manipulate information environments, and interfere in democratic processes. Such actions heighten threats to human rights-based and human-centric models for digital transformation. Consequently, the imperative for proactive digital diplomacy, to counter information warfare and leverage digital tools for strategic communication, and robust tech diplomacy, to forge international norms and manage geopolitical competition in the technological sphere, has become paramount. The leadership of the EU and its Member States in shaping a comprehensive global digital governance policy is therefore increasingly crucial to address these multifaceted challenges (DiPLO, 2021), (UN, 2020).

In response to these challenges, the EU has strategically bolstered its external engagement on digital issues. Following the Council Conclusions on EU Digital Diplomacy in July 2022, a strong foundation was established, which was further reinforced by subsequent Council Conclusions in June 2023. These call for a "Team Europe" approach, urging both the EU and its Member States to implement priority actions: enhancing coordination and strategic engagement within multilateral and multi-stakeholder fora, developing bilateral and regional partnerships (especially concerning critical and emerging technologies), strengthening cooperation with global partners on digital connectivity and addressing digital divides, and scaling up EU leadership on global digital rules while improving the efficiency of digital resources and dialogue with the tech sector. This commitment was reaffirmed during the Foreign Affairs Council's annual exchange on EU Digital Diplomacy on July 22, 2024, highlighting the shift of digital issues from purely technical concerns to matters of key strategic and political importance with immediate implications for democracy, economy, and society, emphasizing the need for a unified "Team Europe" approach (UN, 2020).

As a direct illustration of this strategic commitment, the European External Action Service (EEAS) exemplifies how Artificial Intelligence (AI) serves as a critical technological enabler in advancing digital diplomacy's capacity to counter disinformation. Facing pervasive and sophisticated disinformation campaigns aimed at undermining democratic institutions, the EEAS and its partners actively deploy AI-driven tools, utilizing machine learning and Natural Language Processing (NLP). These systems enable scaled monitoring, precise narrative and trend detection, mapping of influence networks, and multilingual content analysis across vast digital landscapes. The practical outcomes include significantly enhanced identification of information threats, the formation of a robust foundation for proactive and evidence-based strategic communication, improved understanding of societal vulnerabilities, and optimized analytical resource allocation for EU diplomats. This case robustly illustrates AI's pivotal function in transforming digital diplomacy from a reactive communication channel into a proactive analytical and defensive strategy, thereby strengthening the protection of collective interests in the digital information sphere (West, 2025).

These strategic imperatives find further practical manifestation in the advanced applications of AI by individual states. The multifaceted role of AI in digital diplomacy is evident when examining Estonia's pioneering efforts in e-governance and its broader digital diplomacy strategy. Estonia has leveraged advanced digital solutions – including AI-driven technologies – not only to enhance domestic governance and cybersecurity but also to forge international partnerships and project soft power abroad, especially within the Nordic region and beyond.

Estonia's digital diplomacy extends beyond conventional public messaging and social media engagement. It encompasses the development and export of interoperable e-governance platforms, such as the X-Road digital ecosystem, which enables secure data exchange between public institutions across borders. AI plays a crucial role in these systems by improving data processing, threat detection, and service personalization, thereby supporting the core principles of confidentiality, integrity, and availability that underpin robust digital diplomacy (Hardy, 2024).

AI also contributes to the geopolitical dimension of digital diplomacy. It helps states like Estonia respond to hybrid threats – such as cyberattacks and disinformation campaigns – by enabling real-time monitoring, rapid incident response, and the protection of critical digital infrastructure. The 2007 cyberattacks against Estonia highlighted the need for resilient digital systems, prompting innovations like the data embassy initiative, which uses advanced data management and AI-driven security protocols to safeguard national information assets abroad. Moreover, AI supports the broader objectives of digital diplomacy by facilitating cross-border cooperation and interoperability, as seen in Estonia's collaboration with Finland and Iceland through the Nordic Institute for Interoperability Solutions (NIIS). By integrating AI into these frameworks, Estonia not only enhances its own resilience but also builds trust and shared standards among partner nations, setting a precedent for digital diplomacy that prioritizes both technological innovation and collective security (Hardy, 2024).

In summary, AI in digital diplomacy serves multiple roles: it is a tool for advancing e-governance, a shield against cyber threats,

and a catalyst for international cooperation. Estonia's case demonstrates how AI-driven digital solutions can be used to project influence, foster interoperability, and strengthen state resilience in an increasingly digital and geopolitically complex world.

The prospect of Singapore evolving into the world's first AI-powered nation-state by 2075 starkly underscores AI's profound dual role in contemporary diplomacy: both as *a transformative tool for governance* and *a disruptive force* demanding urgent global regulation. Singapore's incremental integration of AI – from algorithmic policymaking to AI-driven diplomacy – exemplifies its potential as a diplomatic force multiplier, optimizing real-time diplomatic processes, enhancing crisis response through predictive analytics, and reinforcing small-state influence by outsourcing analytical heavy lifting to AI (RAVI VS, 2025).

However, this ambitious vision simultaneously exposes critical tensions that form the core of tech diplomacy. AI emerges as a geopolitical flashpoint, raising fundamental dilemmas concerning sovereignty versus interdependence due to reliance on global data flows and hardware supply chains, creating vulnerabilities to extraterritorial control (for example, U.S.-China chip wars) (Allen, Gregory, Goldston, 2025). Furthermore, the prospect of algorithmic legal systems introduces challenges of ethical fragmentation that could clash with diverse global AI ethics frameworks, complicating multilateral norm-setting. Critically, potential accountability gaps arise if AI autonomously enacts binding diplomatic decisions, challenging existing protocols and necessitating new mechanisms to contest "algorithmic acts."

Therefore, Singapore's hypothetical experiment amplifies a pressing diplomatic imperative: to govern AI before it governs us. This demands the urgent development of new diplomatic frameworks, akin to nuclear nonproliferation treaties, for algorithmic governance, the establishment of clear red lines for AI systems unilaterally enacting binding diplomatic decisions, and a commitment to inclusive governance to prevent the marginalization of non-technocratic states or civil society voices. Ultimately, Singapore's 2075 vision serves as a stress test for digital diplomacy, compelling the world to decide whether AI will function as a neutral arbiter of global relations or merely codify the biases and power asymmetries of its creators. For nations like Ukraine, navigating this dual role is existential, presenting both opportunities to counter disinformation and model post-war reconstruction, alongside risks of unchecked digital authoritarianism, underscoring that diplomacy must decisively shape AI, not the reverse (RAVI VS, 2025).

The rapid advancement and profound transformative implications of AI have positioned it as a central subject of tech diplomacy, necessitating coordinated international efforts to establish norms and regulatory frameworks. A salient example is the initiative that began with the Bletchley Declaration in November 2023, and has continued through a series of AI Safety Summits (including South Korea in 2024 and in France in 2025) (UK Government: Department for Science, Innovations and Technology, 2023), (AI Seoul Summit, 2024), (Paris AI Summit, 2025).

The Artificial Intelligence Action Summit, held in Paris in February, represented a critical juncture in global discussions surrounding AI governance (AI Action Summit, 2025). The summit highlighted an increasing divergence between approaches favoring stringent regulatory frameworks and those advocating for a more flexible, market-driven model. As artificial intelligence continues its rapid evolution, governments face escalating pressure to establish guidelines ensuring the ethical, safe, and equitable deployment of AI. Despite this imperative, a global consensus on achieving this balance remains elusive. Central to this debate are two contrasting philosophies: one posits the necessity of strict regulations to mitigate AI-related risks, while the other prioritizes innovation and economic expansion through a more adaptable, market-oriented paradigm (Tiwari, 2025).

In contrast to prior AI summits in the U.K. (2023) and South Korea (2024), which primarily addressed long-term existential threats, the Paris Summit reoriented discussions towards more immediate concerns, including employment displacement, ethical oversight, and AI's influence on global power dynamics. The AI Action Summit was organized around five dedicated work streams: public service AI, the future of work, innovation and culture, trust in AI, and global governance (Skelton, 2025). However, the discourse in Paris did not yield a unified

vision; instead, it exposed deepening geopolitical divisions and competing national interests that impede the formation of a cohesive global AI governance framework. This divergence was particularly evident between proponents of stringent regulation, exemplified by the European Union, and advocates for less restrictive policies, such as the United States (Lilyanova, 2024). A major outcome of the summit in France was the Paris Declaration, signed by 61 states and organizations, intended towards promoting inclusivity and sustainability in AI development (Tiwari, 2025).

The Paris AI Action Summit underscored a significant global divergence in AI governance philosophies, primarily between the United States' preference for light regulation to foster innovation and economic competitiveness, and the European Union's advocacy for robust oversight emphasizing ethical development and sustainability. Despite a shift towards immediate concerns like job displacement and ethical oversight, the summit failed to establish a unified global framework, largely due to the prioritization of national interests over collaborative governance. The resulting "Statement," rather than a binding declaration, lacked concrete policy measures, reflecting diminished ambition and suggesting a continued trajectory of independent national AI policy development. Furthermore, calls for "inclusive" and "diverse" AI development faced skepticism due to vague commitments and limited private sector engagement, raising concerns that current AI governance efforts remain aspirational rather than evolving into a practical and actionable multi-stakeholder framework.

Principal criticisms included the lack of practical detail on global AI governance mechanisms and insufficient attention to national security risks. The limited engagement of the private sector, with government representatives dominating discussions and major technology companies participating only in closed-door sessions on the second day, further highlighted a top-down approach. This ambiguity, coupled with the aforementioned limitations, raises concerns regarding whether global AI governance will transcend aspirational ideals to become a realistic and actionable framework involving all key stakeholders (Milmo, 2025).

Global diplomatic initiatives unite representatives from leading governments, technology corporations, academic institutions, and civil society. Their primary objective is to develop international, consensus-based strategies for comprehending and mitigating the risks posed by frontier AI, particularly those with the potential for existential impact on humanity. Diplomatic efforts are focused on developing shared definitions, safety principles, and cooperation mechanisms to ensure the safe, responsible, and ethical development and deployment of AI systems. This extends beyond the mere use of digital tools, addressing issues such as data sovereignty, the formation of regulatory policies, control over autonomous weapon systems, and preventing strategic competition for AI dominance that could destabilize international relations. The AI Safety Summits represent a critical development in tech diplomacy, actively shaping global governance for groundbreaking technologies. These summits elevate AI from a purely technical matter to a key priority on the international political and diplomatic agenda.

In alignment with this strategic focus, European public and private entities have jointly committed approximately €200 billion towards AI-related investments, which is currently the largest public-private investment in the world (European Commission, 2025). This significant public-private initiative, formally announced in February 2025 as "InvestAI," comprises €50 billion from EU public funds (Digital Europe, Horizon Europe, InvestEU) and an anticipated €150 billion from private capital (European Commission, 2021), (National Institute for Strategic Studies, 2025).

A core component of this strategy involves allocating €20 billion for the development of four large-scale AI computing infrastructure facilities across the EU, each projected to house substantial quantities of next-generation AI chips. These facilities aim to provide accessible, high-performance computing resources essential for training complex AI models for research and commercial applications. Beyond infrastructure, InvestAI targets accelerated AI application development in strategic sectors (such as healthcare, climate adaptation, mobility, industrial automation, public services) and seeks to bolster the European AI talent pool through educational and research programs, including the establishment of a European AI Research Council to define strategic research agendas. Structured as a layered investment fund, InvestAI utilizes public funds

to de-risk private capital, projecting a multiplier effect to stimulate approximately €2 trillion in additional private investment within the European AI ecosystem by 2030 (European Parliament, 2024). This demonstrates a concerted effort to not only manage AI risks but also to strategically foster its development and widespread adoption.

Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs) are essential for effectively bridging the global AI divide, uniting diverse stakeholders to ensure the ethical, sustainable, and inclusive development of artificial intelligence. In the realm of digital diplomacy and global policy, these collaborations are instrumental in addressing the substantial resource and expertise gaps inherent in AI innovation. Governments contribute essential funding, regulatory frameworks, and access to public data, which, when combined with the private sector's technical expertise, creativity, and market solutions, significantly accelerates the development and deployment of AI technologies. This synergistic approach, exemplified by initiatives such as Singapore's National AI Strategy 2.0, facilitates the creation of trusted AI ecosystems by mobilizing collective investment towards global challenges like health and climate change (Sharma, 2024).

Furthermore, PPPs are critical in fostering cross-border collaboration, a cornerstone of effective tech diplomacy. Recognizing that AI development is inherently a global endeavor with varying national expertise and resource availability, PPPs facilitate international knowledge sharing, technology transfer, and the establishment of common ethical standards. This ensures that AI benefits are distributed more equitably globally, rather than concentrated within a limited number of regions or corporations. The multi-stakeholder engagement inherent in PPP models, extending beyond public and private sectors to include civil society and local communities, is vital for integrating diverse ethical, social, and cultural considerations from the inception of AI design and deployment. These comprehensive approaches collectively underscore the profound value of PPPs in driving responsible AI development through converged expertise, shared resources, and robust international cooperation, thereby directly supporting the objectives of digital and tech diplomacy (Sharma, 2024). Future diplomatic models may embed structured PPP mechanisms into multilateral organizations and bilateral relationships through digital attachés or tech envoys who serve as bridges between governments and the private sector.

Artificial intelligence exerts an increasingly profound influence on diplomacy, not merely as a digital instrument but as a transformative force reshaping the diplomatic agenda itself. The governance of AI has emerged as a core objective of international relations, necessitating new frameworks for cooperation, regulation, and ethical oversight. AI occupies a dual role within contemporary diplomacy: it functions both as a powerful enabler of diplomatic practice and as a critical subject of international policy discourse. This dual engagement amplifies AI's impact across key domains, including economic development, global stability, and peacebuilding.

As a tool, AI enhances economic forecasting, optimizes mechanisms of international trade, and informs resource management strategies – thereby shaping economic trajectories and contributing to macro-level stability. In the context of peacebuilding, AI-driven predictive analytics and machine learning models are leveraged to forecast geopolitical tensions, detect misinformation, and improve humanitarian interventions and post-conflict recovery (Korinek, Stiglitz, 2021), (Pasupuleti, 2025).

These applications exemplify how AI can augment diplomatic efforts in complex and volatile environments. Effectively managing AI's dual role requires diplomatic strategies that both leverage its capabilities for national and international advantage and address its associated risks. This includes fostering multilateral agreements on AI ethics and governance, ensuring equitable access to AI technologies, and aligning AI development with shared values and norms that underpin international stability.

4. Conclusions

1. The integration of AI into diplomacy presents both strategic opportunities and significant challenges. Navigating this evolving landscape requires coordinated efforts to leverage AI's capabilities while ensuring its responsible governance, ethical application, and alignment with coherent international policy – positioning AI as a foundational pillar of 21st-century statecraft.

2. Comparative analysis reveals that AI functions as a transformative enabler in both digital diplomacy and tech diplomacy, though it operates at distinct levels of intent and systemic impact within the global diplomatic architecture.

3. In digital diplomacy, AI is deployed tactically to enhance the speed, reach, and responsiveness of traditional diplomatic practices. States utilize AI-powered chatbots for consular services, predictive analytics for crisis monitoring, and disinformation detection systems – such as Ukraine's Osavul platform and NATO's hybrid warfare tools – to manage geopolitical narratives and improve public engagement. In this domain, AI facilitates real-time interaction, risk mitigation, and strategic communication.

4. In contrast, tech diplomacy treats AI as both the subject and tool of international negotiation and norm-setting. AI governance now ranks high on diplomatic agendas, evidenced by initiatives such as the OECD AI Principles, the EU AI Act, and multilateral dialogues under frameworks like the GPAI. Export controls on AI technologies and ongoing debates over standards and ethics illustrate AI's role as a geopolitical lever, requiring robust international cooperation and regulatory alignment.

5. The growing importance of AI in both digital and tech diplomacy reflects a broader shift toward multipolarity in global technology governance. While the Global North continues to lead in standard-setting, emerging powers – such as China, India, and Brazil – are asserting strategic influence, contributing to a reconfiguration of international alliances and policy agendas. Concurrently, smaller states with advanced digital infrastructures (Estonia, Singapore) and Global South actors are using AI to innovate in diplomacy and development alike, underscoring AI's capacity to both level and exacerbate global asymmetries.

6. As AI becomes more embedded in diplomacy, the distinction between digital diplomacy and tech is increasingly fluid. A convergence is calling for a hybrid diplomatic framework that integrates communication technologies with governance capabilities. This demands a diplomatic corps that is digitally competent, technologically informed, and geopolitically attuned – one that treats AI not as a peripheral issue but as a central foreign policy concern.

7. In the contemporary international system, AI is both a means and an object of diplomacy. While digital diplomacy utilizes AI to optimize engagement and statecraft, tech diplomacy employs diplomatic channels to shape AI's global trajectory, governance structures, and ethical foundations. Collectively, they position AI as a diplomatic frontier that intersects with questions of sovereignty, security, equity, and global order.

8. Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs) are emerging as foundational enablers of this dual role of AI in diplomacy. In the context of digital diplomacy, PPPs enhance state capacity for digital communication, crisis response, and resilience. In tech diplomacy, they facilitate international AI governance through shared innovation, standardization, and policy harmonization. By bridging knowledge gaps and mobilizing cross-border resources, PPPs support the responsible, inclusive, and globally distributed development of AI – making them an essential component of a modern, AI-informed diplomatic architecture.

References:

AI Action Summit Paris, 6–11 February 2025 (2025). Élysée. Available at: https://www.elysee.fr/admin/upload/default/0001/17/786758b38da7b4c16f26dc56e51884b3346684aa.pdf

Allen, G. C., & Goldston, I. (2025). Understanding U.S. allies' current legal authority to implement AI and semiconductor export controls. Center for Strategic and International Studies. Available at: https://www.csis.org/analysis/understanding-us-allies-current-legal-authority-implement-ai-and-semiconductor-export

Amaresh, P. (2020, May 13). Artificial intelligence: A new driving horse in international relations and diplomacy. The Diplomatist. Available at: https://diplomatist.com/2020/05/13/artificial-intelligence-a-new-driving-horse-in-internationalrelations-and-diplomacy/

Artificial Intelligence Act. (2024). Brazil AI Act. Available at: https://artificialintelligenceact.com/brazil-ai-act/

Artificial Intelligence Act. (2024, February 27). High-level summary of the AI Act. Future of Life Institute. Available at: https://artificialintelligenceact.eu/high-level-summary/

Baele, S. J., Bukhari, I., & Whyte, C. (2024). AI IR: Charting international relations in the age of artificial intelligence. *International Studies Review*, 26(2), 1–25. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1093/isr/viae013

Balme, S. (2025, May 15). Evolving paradigms in science and tech diplomacy. Global Challenges. Available at: https://globalchallenges.ch/issue/17/evolving-paradigms-in-science-and-tech-diplomacy/

Bhatt, C., & Bharadwaj, T. (2024). Understanding the global debate on lethal autonomous weapons systems: An Indian perspective. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Available at: https://carnegieendowment.org/research/2024/08/understanding-the-global-debate-on-lethal-autonomous-weapons-systems-an-indian-perspective?lang=en

Ndzendze, B., & Marwala, T. (2023). Artificial intelligence and international relations (pp. 33–54). DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-4877-0_3

Brasioli, F., Guercio, M., Gnerre, M., Landini, F., & de Giorgio, A. (Eds.). (2023). The Routledge handbook of artificial intelligence and international relations. Routledge. Available at: https://www.routledge.com/The-Routledge-Handbook-of-Artificial-Intelligence-and-International-Relations/Brasioli-Guercio-Gnerre-Landini-deGiorgio/p/book/9781032850139

Bureau, Online, & ET TravelWorld. (2025, April 22). BLS International launches AI-powered voicebot for visa assistance in Canada. ETTravelWorld.com. Available at: https://travel.economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/technology/bls-international-launches-ai-powered-voicebot-for-visa-assistance-in-canada/120516932

Cath, C. (2018). Governing artificial intelligence: Ethical, legal and technical opportunities and challenges. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences, 376(2133). DOI: https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.2018.0080

United States Department of State. (2024, December 16). Department of State AI Inventory 2024. Available at: https://2021-2025.state.gov/department-of-state-ai-inventory-2024/

European External Action Service. Digital diplomacy | EEAS website. Available at: https://www.eeas.europa.eu/eeas/digital-diplomacy_en

DiploFoundation. (2021). Digital diplomacy in 2021: What is? How to develop? Where to learn more? Available at: https://www.diplomacy.edu/topics/digital-diplomacy/

European Commission. (2021). Digital programme | Shaping Europe's digital future. Available at: https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/activities/digital-programme

European Commission. (2021). Horizon Europe. Available at: https://research-and-innovation.ec.europa.eu/funding/funding-opportunities/funding-programmes-and-open-calls/horizon-europe_en

European Commission. (2025). EU launches InvestAI initiative to mobilise €200 billion of investment in artificial intelligence. Available at: https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/news/eu-launches-investai-initiative-mobilise-eu200-billion-investment-artificial-intelligence

European Parliament. (2024, September 4). Foreign interference: How Parliament is fighting the threat to EU democracy. Available at: https://www.europarl.europa.eu/topics/en/article/20240404STO20215/foreign-interference-how-parliament-is-fighting-the-threat-to-eu-democracy

Fedasiuk, R., & Kania, E. (2022). Silicon twist: Managing the Chinese military's access to AI chips. Center for Security and Emerging Technology (CSET). Available at: https://cset.georgetown.edu/wp-content/uploads/CSET-Report-on-a-Page-Silicon-Twist-2.pdf

European Commission. (2025). Futurium | EU–US Trade and Technology Council – EU–US Trade and Technology Dialogue. Available at: https://futurium.ec.europa.eu/en/EU-US-TTC/pages/eu-us-trade-and-technology-dialogue

Future of Life Institute. (2025, March 11). AI safety summits. Available at: https://futureoflife.org/project/ai-safety-summits

Garrido Rebolledo, V. (2025). Impact of artificial intelligence on international relations: Towards a global algorithms governance. Rey Juan Carlos University. Available at: https://www.unisci.es/wp-content/uploads/2025/01/UNISCIDP67-1GARRIDO.pdf

Global Partnership on Artificial Intelligence. (2024). GPAI. Available at: https://gpai.ai/

Mostafaei, H., et al. (2025). Applications of artificial intelligence in global diplomacy: A review of research and practical models. *Sustainable Futures*, 9, 100486. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sftr.2025.100486

Hardy, A. (2024, July 22). Estonia's digital diplomacy: Nordic interoperability and the challenges of cross-border e-governance. *Internet Policy Review*, 13(3). Available at: https://policyreview.info/articles/analysis/estonias-digital-diplomacy-nordic-interoperability

Höne, K. (2018). Mapping the challenges and opportunities of artificial intelligence for the conduct of diplomacy. Diplo Resource. Available at: https://www.diplomacy.edu/resource/mapping-the-challenges-and-opportunities-of-artificial-intelligence-for-the-conduct-of-diplomacy/

Immigration News Canada. (2021, August 17). INC - Immigration News Canada. Available at: https://immigrationnewscanada.ca/about-us/

Kania, E., & Fedasiuk, R. (2021). Harnessed lightning: How the Chinese military is adopting artificial intelligence. Center for Security and Emerging Technology (CSET). Available at: https://cset.georgetown.edu/publication/harnessed-lightning/

Korinek, A., & Stiglitz, J. (2021, February 4). Artificial intelligence, globalization, and strategies for economic development. *Institute for New Economic Thinking Working Paper Series,* 1–53. DOI: https://doi.org/10.36687/inetwp146

Krzyzanowski, M. (2020). Digital diplomacy or political communication? Exploring social media in the EU institutions from a critical discourse perspective. In Digital diplomacy and international organisations: Autonomy, legitimacy and contestation (pp. 52–73).

Lee, A., et al. (2023, July 19). Barriers to regulating AI: Critical observations from a fractured field. Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/372462023_Barriers_to_Regulating_AI_Critical_Observations_from_a_Fractured_Field

United Nations. (2025). Lethal autonomous weapons systems report of the Secretary-General. Available at: https://docs.un.org/en/a/79/88

Lilyanova, V. (2024). Briefing Next Generation EU (NGEU) delivery – sectoral focus. Available at: https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2024/762288/EPRS_BRI(2024)762288_EN.pdf

Thunø, M., & Nielbo, K. L. (2023, March 29). The initial digitalization of Chinese diplomacy (2019–2021): Establishing global communication networks on Twitter. *Journal of Contemporary China*, 1–23. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/10670564.2023.2195811

Milmo, D. (2025, February 14). Global disunity, energy concerns and the shadow of Musk: Key takeaways from the Paris AI Summit. The Guardian. Available at: https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2025/feb/14/global-disunity-energy-concerns-and-the-shadow-of-musk-key-takeaways-from-the-paris-ai-summit

National Institute for Strategic Studies. (2025, April 28). AI frontiers: Innovations, breakthroughs, challenges. Available at: https://niss.gov.ua/en/news/statti/ai-frontiers-innovations-breakthroughs-challenges

NATO. (2025). NATO's approach to counter information threats. Available at: https://www.nato.int/cps/ru/natohq/topics_219728.htm?selectedLocale=en

UK Government. (2023). NOT a statement of government policy: Future risks of frontier AI. Technology & Science Insights and Foresight. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/653bc393d10f3500139a6ac5/future-risks-of-frontier-ai-annex-a.pdf

OECD. (2024). AI principles. Available at: https://www.oecd.org/en/topics/ai-principles.html

OECD. (2025). OECD legal instruments. Available at: https://legalinstruments.oecd.org/en/instruments/OECD-LEGAL-0449#mainText

Osavul.cloud. (2025). All about Osavul company: History and success story. Available at: https://www.osavul.cloud/about-us

European Parliament. (2023, June). Parliament's negotiating position on the Artificial Intelligence Act. Available at: https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/ATAG/2023/747926/EPRS_ATA(2023)747926_EN.pdf

Pasupuleti, M. K. (2025, February 6). AI's role in global stability, diplomacy, and peacebuilding. *AI-Powered Diplomacy and Conflict Resolutions,* 1–11. DOI: https://doi.org/10.62311/nesx/32268

Ravi, V. S. (2025, February 19). The dawn of AI governance in Singapore by 2075. Linkedin.com. Available at: https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/singapore-2075-first-ai-powered-nation-state-ravi-vs-wnatc

Russo, L., & Oder, N. (2023, October 31). How countries are implementing the OECD principles for trustworthy AI. OECD.AI. Available at: https://oecd.ai/en/wonk/national-policies-2

Schindler, M., et al. (2021, June). Technological progress, artificial intelligence, and inclusive growth. *IMF Working Papers*, 2021(166), 1. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5089/9781513583280.001

UK Government. (2024). Seoul ministerial statement for advancing AI safety, innovation and inclusivity: AI Seoul Summit 2024. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/seoul-ministerial-

statement-for-advancing-ai-safety-innovation-and-inclusivity-ai-seoul-summit-2024/seoul-ministerial-statement-for-advancing-ai-safety-innovation-and-inclusivity-ai-seoul-summit-2024

Sharma, R. (2024, November 19). How public-private partnerships can ensure AI for good. World Economic Forum. Available at: https://www.weforum.org/stories/2024/11/public-private-partnerships-ensure-ethical-sustainable-inclusive-ai-development/

Skelton, S. K. (2025). AI Action Summit review: Differing views cast doubt on AI's ability to benefit whole of society. ComputerWeekly.com. Available at: https://www.computerweekly.com/news/366620444/AI-Action-Summit-review-Differing-views-cast-doubt-on-AIs-ability-to-benefit-whole-of-society

Sobchuk, M. (2024, February 12). How Ukraine uses AI to fight Russian information operations. GlobalGovernance.eu. Available at: https://www.globalgovernance.eu/publications/how-ukraine-uses-ai-to-fight-russian-information-operations

ASML. (2023, September 1). Statement regarding export control regulations Dutch government. Available at: https://www.asml.com/en/news/press-releases/2023/statement-regarding-export-control-regulations-dutch-government

Subramani, K. (2025, January 13). GDPR vs. data privacy laws in the U.S.: Key differences. Ampcus Cyber. Available at: https://www.ampcuscyber.com/blogs/gdpr-vs-

Tatsuno, D. (2025, May 27). Japan's AI bill advances toward enactment. Connect on Tech. Available at: https://connectontech.bakermckenzie.com/japans-ai-bill-advances-toward-enactment/

Tiwari, A. (2025, February 25). Paris AI Summit 2025 | India's World. Indiasworld.in. Available at: https://indiasworld.in/paris-ai-summit-2025/

European Commission. (2022, December 2). TTC joint roadmap for trustworthy AI and risk management. Available at: https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/library/ttc-joint-roadmap-trustworthy-ai-and-risk-management

Uacrisis.org. (2023, November 24). Deepfakes: AI in the hands of propaganda. Available at: https://uacrisis.org/en/deepfakes-ai-in-the-hands-of-propaganda

Uekert, R. (2025, January 14). The geopolitics of AI dominance: Stunning facts on competing for supremacy. The Inclusive AI. Available at: https://theinclusiveai.com/geopolitics-of-ai-dominance-global-race/

UK Government. (2023, November 1). The Bletchley Declaration by countries attending the AI Safety Summit, 1–2 November 2023. GOV.UK. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/ai-safety-summit-2023-the-bletchley-declaration/the-bletchley-declaration-by-countries-attending-the-ai-safety-summit-1-2-november-2023

United Nations. (2020). The impact of digital technologies. Available at: https://www.un.org/en/un75/impact-digital-technologies

Medium. (2025, January 17). Understanding AI-powered, AI-enabled, AI-driven, and AI-assisted: A breakdown. Available at: https://medium.com/@t79877005/understanding-ai-powered-ai-enabled-ai-driven-and-ai-assisted-a-breakdown-be87b2ccd6f8

West, D. M. (2025, April 15). How AI can enable public surveillance. Brookings. Available at: https://www.brookings.edu/articles/how-ai-can-enable-public-surveillance/

Wolford, B. (2025). What is GDPR, the EU's new data protection law? GDPR.eu. Available at: https://gdpr.eu/what-is-gdpr/

Received on: 29th of May, 2025
Accepted on: 27th of June, 2025
Published on: 14th of July, 2025