

CRISIS OF PERCEPTION IN A TRANSFORMING WORLD ORDER: THE IMPACT OF AI TRANSLATION ERRORS ON INTERNATIONAL TRUST AND DIPLOMATIC COMMUNICATION

Elvin Talishinsky^{1*}, Tabriz Baghirova², Murad Rustamov³, Zaur Aliyev⁴, Sabina Mammadly⁵

¹Azerbaijan University, Assoc.Prof. Head of Department of the Political and Social Sciences, Baku, Azerbaijan | ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5318-5537> | Email: elvin.talishinsky@au.edu.az

²Nakhchivan State University, PhD Student, Lecturer, Nakhchivan, Azerbaijan | ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0009-7451-4649> | Email: tabrizabaghirova@ndu.edu.az

³Nakhchivan State University, PhD Student, Lecturer, Nakhchivan, Azerbaijan | ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0005-1375-1115> | Email: muradrustamov@ndu.edu.az

⁴ANAS Institute of Philosophy and Sociology, Azerbaijan University, Associate Professor, Baku, Azerbaijan | ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4393-8894> | Email: zaur.aliyev@gmail.com

⁵Azerbaijan University, Ph.D. in Historical Sciences, Baku, Azerbaijan | ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0007-9252-0693> | Email: sabina.mammadly@au.edu.az

***Corresponding Author:** Elvin Talishinsky | Email: elvin.talishinsky@au.edu.az

Abstract

Against the backdrop of accelerating globalization and the intensification of international cooperation, intergovernmental communication and diplomatic correspondence are increasingly conducted in multiple languages. In this context, translation services-particularly artificial intelligence-based automated translation systems such as Google Translate, DeepL, Meta AI Translator, and other advanced platforms-have become an integral part of global diplomacy. While these technologies offer significant advantages in terms of speed and accessibility, their complete reliability in diplomatic correspondence and high-level international meetings remains a matter of debate. Although automated translation systems can ensure a certain degree of accuracy, they still face limitations in areas such as contextual appropriateness, cultural nuances, and terminological precision. Delays or semantic distortions arising during the translation process may lead to serious misunderstandings at the strategic level, and in some cases, even political tensions. Historical examples, such as time lags in simultaneous interpretation at United Nations meetings and misinterpretations during the Able Archer 1983 military exercises, demonstrate that translation errors can influence diplomatic decision-making and generate strategic risks. From this perspective, the use of AI-based translation technologies in diplomatic contexts must be accompanied by careful handling, precise terminology, and the proper consideration of cultural context. This study aims to identify both the advantages of these technologies and the risks associated with their use, as well as potential solutions. Ultimately, the application of AI translation technologies in global diplomacy is not only an inevitable requirement of the modern era but also a crucial tool for ensuring accurate and timely strategic decision-making.

Key words: AI-based translation, diplomatic communication, international trust, information warfare, manipulation, perception crisis, semantic and contextual distortion

Introduction

In the contemporary era, precise and timely exchange of information in international relations and diplomatic correspondence is of decisive importance for global security, mutual trust, and cooperation. In the accelerated globalization of the 21st century, intergovernmental dialogue is often conducted in multiple languages, making translation services an indispensable component of diplomacy. In this context, artificial intelligence-based automated translation systems-such as Google Translate, DeepL, Meta AI Translator, and other similar platforms facilitate the flow of information by enabling the rapid conversion of large volumes of text and speech. However, the use of such technologies is not without drawbacks.

Delays in translation, semantic distortions, and the neglect of cultural context can sometimes lead to serious diplomatic misunderstandings and even political tensions. The phenomenon of translation delay is particularly risky in real-time international negotiations and correspondence. Scientific studies show that even a delay of 1.5–2 seconds in translation can increase cognitive load in the reception process, weaken the semantic integrity of the message, and cause misunderstanding on the part of the interlocutor. In the context of diplomacy, where every expression, word choice, and intonation carries strategic meaning, such technical inconsistencies can lead to the misinterpretation of intentions. Historical examples, including instances at UN meetings where time lags in simultaneous interpretation sharply reduced participant satisfaction and resulted in information loss-confirm this risk. Likewise, events such as the 1983 Able Archer incident illustrate that mistranslation and misinterpretation can create tangible risks of major geopolitical crises. Artificial intelligence-based translation systems undoubtedly possess significant advantages over human translators in terms of speed and accessibility. Yet, the stylistic requirements, terminological precision, and contextual appropriateness inherent in diplomatic correspondence expose the limitations of these technologies. Issues such as delays, inaccurate meaning transfer, and the disregard of cultural nuances can damage mutual trust in intergovernmental relations and disrupt communication processes, negatively affecting strategic decision-making. Therefore, alongside the opportunities these technologies provide, their risks must also be thoroughly analyzed, and specific methodological approaches should be developed for their application in the field of diplomacy.

The growing role of translation technologies in international relations

In the modern era, driven by rapid globalization and the accelerated development of the information society, one of the most notable phenomena is the increasingly pronounced significance of language barriers within the international relations system. The fact that actors more actively represented in global governance speak different languages, and the need to ensure mutual understanding in these interactions, has made the development and application of translation technologies one of the most essential tools in international cooperation. The advancement of these technologies serves not only to convert texts from one language to another but also to accelerate diplomatic and political processes, improve communication quality, and address other related dimensions.

A review of scholarly literature reveals that contemporary translation technologies can generally be grouped into three main categories: machine translation (MT), computer-assisted translation (CAT), and speech recognition and simultaneous interpretation technologies. In the realm of machine translation, programs such as Google Translate, DeepL, and Microsoft Translator stand out with their real-time translation capabilities across numerous languages. These platforms are widely and consistently used by diplomats, journalists, non-governmental organizations, and international corporations (Gaspari, Almaghout & Doherty, 2015). The rapid development of such technologies has, in effect, significantly lowered the practical impact of language barriers, thereby enhancing the efficiency of multilingual negotiations. Today, the swift advancement of technological capabilities-particularly in translation technologies-has led to their broader and more efficient application within various international organizations, most notably the European Union, the United Nations, and other multilateral forums. For

CRISIS OF PERCEPTION IN A TRANSFORMING WORLD ORDER: THE IMPACT OF AI TRANSLATION ERRORS ON INTERNATIONAL TRUST AND DIPLOMATIC COMMUNICATION

example, the European Commission often relies on CAT tools to ensure the simultaneous translation of official documents into the languages of all member states. Such systems are capable of providing considerable assistance to translators by maintaining terminological consistency and preserving the authenticity of documents (Kenny, 2017).

The successful use of translation technologies in diplomatic relations plays an important role in ensuring the smooth conduct of negotiations between parties. It should be noted that when interlocutors or state representatives use digital translation tools, they are able to understand each other more clearly, which helps to significantly reduce the risk of misunderstandings. A recent development of particular interest is the integration of simultaneous interpretation technologies with artificial intelligence, resulting in improved accuracy in live translation at international conferences. Whereas the technological tools available in earlier periods had limited capabilities and produced lower-quality translations, AI-based translation models now offered by companies such as IBM, Meta, and Google are capable of operating with high speed and accuracy (Costa-jussà et al., 2022). At the same time, it is worth emphasizing that the geopolitical influence of translation technologies has become increasingly visible. In particular, these technologies have played a role in promoting information equality among global powers, enabling developing countries to participate more actively in the diplomatic arena, and reducing language asymmetries. Their rapid development has facilitated more active participation of countries in South and Southeast Asia, Africa, and Latin America in international forums (Pym, 2011).

Another important dimension is the capacity of modern translation technologies to adapt to diplomatic ethics and cultural context. In the early stages of machine translation, numerous semantic and contextual errors were observed. However, with advances in technology, these systems have been enhanced through algorithms tailored to cultural codes and diplomatic rhetoric (Jiménez-Crespo, 2013). This aspect is of particular importance in areas where cultural sensitivities must be taken into account—such as interfaith dialogue, the resolution of ethnic conflicts, or discussions of transnational law. Finally, it should be noted that the development of translation technologies has also had an impact on language education and personnel training. Recently, some diplomatic academies and institutes of international relations have begun offering training programs on the use of translation technologies. These initiatives aim to ensure that future diplomats can operate more effectively in multilingual environments. Naturally, all of these technological capabilities serve to enhance the effectiveness of discussions on international law, economic relations, and security issues (O'Hagan, 2016).

Potential perception-level problems caused by delayed translation

In today's increasingly globalized world, the speed and accuracy of international communication processes are undoubtedly considered among the most strategically significant factors. In particular, during diplomatic negotiations, international conferences, and multilateral agreements, the timely and accurate transmission of content to the other party via simultaneous or consecutive interpretation is of critical importance. However, it must be emphasized that delays in translation can create a range of problems in the reception (perception) of information—most notably semantic distortion, loss of context, psychological distraction, and diminished trust (Roy, 2000). In diplomatic meetings and correspondence, translation delays can lead to a series of negative outcomes, often accompanied by dissatisfaction and tension between parties. These problems can be illustrated through three main causes:

1. When translation is delayed, the meaning of the received message may change, or the context may be incomplete or misunderstood. This can result in diplomatic provocations and misinterpretations.
2. If translation is both delayed and of poor quality, the other party may lose trust, and the professional diplomatic impact may be diminished.
3. Delays can make it more difficult to preserve lexical richness and nuance in complex documents.

In this context, “translation delay” refers to the time gap between the delivery of a speech and the moment its translation reaches the audience. Such a gap particularly in diplomatic and political settings—can significantly affect how the translated message is perceived by the interlocutors or listeners. It should also be noted that delays in translation can disrupt the emotional rhythm of communication, reduce the persuasive force of the speaker’s ideas, and cause misunderstandings within the audience (Pöchhacker, 2004). Of particular concern is that idiomatic expressions used in diplomatic texts, when combined with delays and contextual mistranslations, can lead to diplomatic misunderstandings. An example is Nikita Khrushchev’s famous statement “Мы вас похороним!” (“We will bury you!”), which was intended to mean “we will outlive you” or “we will surpass you,” but whose diplomatic meaning was gravely distorted.

From a psycholinguistic perspective, one notable factor is that the temporal gap between the delivery of statements and their interpretation can affect how the human brain processes and assimilates information. This disruption can hinder the fluent comprehension of speech and cause a fragmentation of perceptual focus (Gile, 2009). In such cases, the ability of participants to respond both emotionally and logically during discussions of international legal documents or high-stakes diplomatic debates can be negatively affected. Furthermore, receiving incomplete or distorted information can lead to misguided political decisions, which is an undesirable outcome (Setton, 1999). For example, during a United Nations session in the context of NATO’s 1983 “Able Archer” military exercises, delays in simultaneous translation contributed to a misunderstanding in which the Soviet Union wrongly concluded that the United States was preparing an attack plan. This mistranslation or delay in communication influenced Soviet leadership’s reaction in a way that escalated short-term strategic tensions and even increased the risk of nuclear conflict.

Another critical nuance to consider is the problem of lost context caused by delayed translation, which can both distract listeners and disrupt the translation process itself. When contextual meaning—i.e., the way the meaning of a word or sentence changes depending on the specific situation—is not conveyed in time, the audience may interpret the message differently. Such issues are particularly pronounced in the case of ambiguous or metaphorical expressions (Kussmaul, 1995). One of the negative consequences of delayed translation is the separation of such expressions from their relevant context, increasing the risk that delicate diplomatic messages will be misunderstood during international discussions. For example, during U.S. President Jimmy Carter’s 1977 visit to Poland, his statement “I left the United States this morning” was mistranslated as “I abandoned the United States forever,” creating a serious misunderstanding among diplomats and attracting criticism in the press.

From a socio-psychological standpoint, delayed translation processes can reduce mutual trust between parties, which in turn can lead to insecurity and disrupt the negotiation process. Interruptions in translation, delays in message delivery, and fragmented communication can foster suspicion toward the speaker and undermine the perceived quality of the discussions. This factor is especially critical in highly sensitive negotiations, such as peace processes, meetings on humanitarian crises, or mediation talks between conflicting parties (Angelelli, 2004). In the modern era, advancements in translation technologies—particularly in real-time automatic translation and simultaneous interpretation systems—have partially mitigated these problems. Nevertheless, AI-based translation systems can still experience processing delays. For these reasons, human interpreters’ reflex speed, ability to grasp context, and mastery of communication techniques remain of paramount importance compared to current technologies (Pym, 2011). It can therefore be concluded that the perceptual problems caused by delayed translation should be regarded not merely as a technical issue, but as a complex matter with strategic and diplomatic consequences. One of the essential conditions for delivering timely, accurate, and complete translations is that interpreters possess specialized training and deep familiarity with the relevant context. Ultimately, successful communication in international relations is not limited to overcoming language barriers, but also requires the effective removal of time and context barriers.

Rhetorical and textual provocation of trust crises

CRISIS OF PERCEPTION IN A TRANSFORMING WORLD ORDER: THE IMPACT OF AI TRANSLATION ERRORS ON INTERNATIONAL TRUST AND DIPLOMATIC COMMUNICATION

An examination of the contemporary system of international relations reveals that trust is regarded as one of the fundamental prerequisites for the sustainability of intergovernmental cooperation. Trust, however, is constructed-or eroded-not only at the level of practical politics but also at the discursive level, that is, through rhetorical expressions and textual structures. The linguistic forms employed in diplomatic rhetoric and international documents-particularly styles of expression and structural elements-carry the potential either to strengthen or to undermine trust between parties (Martin & White, 2005). The mechanisms of provocation that operate at the rhetorical and textual levels are often indirect, which makes them more insidious and thus more dangerous. In negotiation processes, the rhetorical provocation of trust crises during translation is primarily linked to tone, emphasis, and semantic strategies. For instance, the use of aggressive rhetoric, ultimatum-like statements, and language constructions that assign blame or responsibility to the other party can weaken existing trust in international relations, thereby placing special responsibility on the translation process (Fairclough, 2001). Numerous examples-from U.S.-Iran, Israel-Turkey, and India-Pakistan relations-demonstrate that rhetorical attacks directed by one side toward another have heightened political tensions and, in some cases, severely disrupted relations, leading to serious political and security crises. Metaphors and analogies in rhetoric are sometimes delivered with a strong emotional charge, which may evoke fear, irritation, or distrust in the audience or opposing party. To prevent such outcomes, the translation process demands particular care and precision (Charteris-Black, 2011).

On the other hand, another significant dimension is the textual provocation factor, which operates in a more structured and systematic manner. In modern practice, the presence of ambiguous formulations, explicit legal loopholes, or clauses allowing for unilateral interpretation in international treaties, statements, and draft resolutions increases the risk of trust crises. This underscores the need for heightened attention to each word and phrase during translation (Koskinen, 2008). Vague formulations such as "if necessary," "it is expected," or "in case of danger" in such texts may conceal legal responsibility and arouse suspicion among parties-an especially serious concern in conflict zones or military-strategic agreements. For example, the use of abstract language in certain provisions of the Minsk Agreements allowed for divergent interpretations by the parties, thereby deepening the existing trust crisis (Menon & Rumer, 2015). Another issue at the textual level is what may be termed "subtextual rhetoric." This refers to situations in which a document or speech appears neutral on the surface but contains hidden messages or political intentions. In such cases, parties focus less on the semantic layer of the rhetoric and more on reading its pragmatic purpose, which often leads to mutual suspicion and subsequent tensions (van Dijk, 1998). Consequently, official statements and documents prepared and disseminated at the international level are analyzed not only at the linguistic level but also from a discursive-strategic perspective.

The rhetorical and textual provocation of an existing trust crisis can damage not only intergovernmental relations but also ties between international organizations and transnational actors. This illustrates that diplomatic discourse should be regarded not merely as informative but also as a tool of strategic communication. In negotiations and translation processes, rhetorical softness, neutrality, mutual recognition, and the inclusion of multilateral perspectives can strengthen trust, whereas rhetorical rigidity and manipulative textual structures can erode it (Zarefsky, 2004). Careful observation of negotiations and correspondence reveals that trust crises often stem not from concrete actions themselves, but from the way these actions are presented-that is, from their rhetorical and textual form. In the execution of intergovernmental relations, the choice of expressions, rhetorical strategies, and structuring methods in diplomatic correspondence and international speeches can significantly increase the likelihood of either consolidating or undermining trust. For this reason, the involvement of experts in strategic communication and rhetoric becomes critically important for safeguarding trust in international relations.

Risk of information loss and misinterpretation in AI-assisted translation

In the modern era, the widespread adoption of artificial intelligence–based translation systems has greatly facilitated multilingual communication in a globalized world. However, the use of such technologies entails a number of significant risks concerning the preservation of information integrity and accuracy of interpretation. These risks are particularly critical in the translation of diplomatic, legal, and scientific documents, where failure to account for contextual meaning, terminological precision, and cultural differences can lead to loss or distortion of information—resulting not only in unprofessional translations but also in serious security risks (Pym, 2011). Currently, most AI-driven automated translation systems—such as Google Translate, DeepL, and models developed by Meta AI—are based on neural networks trained on large-scale linguistic corpora. These systems operate primarily on probabilistic principles, selecting the most statistically frequent translation options for given sentences. Nevertheless, it must be noted that such models do not always succeed in fully grasping deep semantic meaning, cultural context, or discursive nuances (Koehn, 2020). This limitation increases the risk of misinterpretation, particularly in fields characterized by polysemy and highly specialized terminology.

The risk of information loss in AI-assisted translation generally manifests in three main forms: semantic, contextual, and cultural. Semantic loss refers to the change or weakening of meaning in the translated text. For example, in legal contexts, the phrase “*due process*” may be rendered into Azerbaijani as “*müvafiq prosedur*” (“appropriate procedure”), thereby losing its specific meaning within the U.S. legal system (Gonzalez & Vasquez, 2017). Contextual loss occurs when the translation fails to preserve the relationship between preceding and subsequent sentences. Since many AI systems process sentences as independent units, they may neglect the broader context of a paragraph or discourse (Castilho et al., 2017). Misinterpretation arises when the recipient understands the translated content to mean something not intended or present in the original text—a phenomenon particularly common when the translation appears “too correct.” In such cases, although the sentence may be grammatically flawless and stylistically fluent, its semantic meaning may be inaccurate. This phenomenon is known as the “*hallucination*” problem, referring to instances in which AI models generate non-existent or distorted information (Bang et al., 2023). Such occurrences can have serious consequences in international diplomatic correspondence, academic publications, or legal documents.

A further challenge in modern AI translation systems is their frequent inability to account for cultural differences, which can also lead to misinterpretation. For instance, the culturally specific expression “*face-saving*”—common in Eastern cultures—may be inadequately translated or lose its meaning when rendered into Western languages. This can undermine the subtle and indirect nature of diplomatic rhetoric (Cronin, 2013). In such cases, translation errors occur not only at the technical level but also at the level of ideological and cultural interpretation. These risks underscore the fact that AI, in its current state, cannot yet serve as a fully reliable alternative to human translators. Hybrid models—in which human translators work in integration with AI—offer the potential to mitigate some of these problems (O’Hagan, 2016). In such systems, AI typically produces the initial draft translation, which is then subject to final editing and contextual adaptation by a human translator. This approach offers a potential balance between speed and quality in translation.

Information warfare and the risks of manipulation in the context of AI translation

In the modern international context, issues related to translation and distortion of meaning are particularly significant in the context of information warfare and strategic communications. Translation errors, delays, and contextual inaccuracies can be used not only as technical glitches but also as tools for manipulating public opinion and diplomatic perceptions. In information warfare, even a minor mistranslation can alter the interpretation of political statements, heighten tensions between parties, and undermine trust. In this sense, automated translation systems are becoming not only communication tools but also potential agents of information influence, requiring special attention to their use in diplomatic practice.

CRISIS OF PERCEPTION IN A TRANSFORMING WORLD ORDER: THE IMPACT OF AI TRANSLATION ERRORS ON INTERNATIONAL TRUST AND DIPLOMATIC COMMUNICATION

The current stage of societal development is characterized by the growing importance of the information sphere, which represents the aggregate of information, its collection, formation, and dissemination. There are many approaches to studying the information society, its properties, and whether it even exists. Regardless of this, information currently occupies a key position in the modern world. Information is a powerful means of influencing society as a whole and individuals in particular. Information is used to wage an active information war. In this type of warfare, covert aggression is more significant than physical aggression. Information is a fundamental weapon and target, both as an expression of threat and manipulation to achieve competitive advantage over an opponent. To achieve their goals, opposing sides employ the entire arsenal of tools that can influence the information and intellectual resources of the opposing side and enable the management of data and knowledge.

The term "information warfare" was first used in Thomas P. Rona's 1976 report "Weapon Systems and Information Warfare" for Boeing (Thomas, P.Rona. 1976. p.50). It then attracted increased interest from some US intelligence experts and, beginning in 1980, began appearing in documents from the Department of Defense and other similar institutions. It should be noted that information warfare is an ambiguous concept. Broadly speaking, information warfare can be understood as any negative information impact on an adversary. This adversary can also be a state. Such a confrontation can occur between any entities, both private and public. Therefore, the parties to such a warfare are individuals or groups of individuals, acting individually or in an organized manner, spontaneously or by agreement, legal entities, and states. Previously, such influence was referred to as propaganda or ideological warfare, but with the advent of the Internet and the widespread use of electronic communications, the range of participants in such influence, as well as the diversity of its types and forms, has increased dramatically. Such influence can be directed against defense systems, classified information, the banking and financial system, and navigation systems—that is, against objects that constitute a state's national security (Talishinski, E.B. 2020. p. 3-4). Undoubtedly, limiting such influence and introducing liability for it is an object of legal regulation, including international legal regulation; however, this article primarily examines the issue of regulating information warfare in the narrow sense.

In a narrow sense, this is a new type or method of waging armed conflict that does not fit within the definitions of international law. While this blurs the very concept of "armed conflict," the real consequences of information warfare can be significant, leading to significant casualties and destruction. According to K.W. Watkin, such conflicts will lead "to the problem of determining the status of civilians armed with a processor and keyboard and located on another continent, and monitoring their actions" (Watkin, K. 2003). This method of waging armed conflict raises the same problems as classical conflict: distinctions between objects and persons; who is considered a participant in such a war and what characteristics should a combatant possess; are such combatants subject to attack by traditional weapons; do they receive prisoner-of-war status, etc.

The concept of "information warfare" is currently analyzed by military personnel, lawyers, political scientists, international relations specialists, and information technology experts, and is referenced in the military doctrines of all states. This once again underscores the importance of studying information warfare in all areas of life.

In modern international relations, language serves not only as a means of transmitting information but also as a crucial tool of strategic communication, through which political meanings are shaped, state images are constructed, and foreign policy goals are realized. In diplomatic practice, the choice of vocabulary, style, and rhetorical constructions is of fundamental importance, as every statement carries not only informational but also pragmatic implications aimed at achieving a specific political effect.

In this context, translation becomes more than just a technical process of conveying content from one language to another, but a key link in the system of interpreting and communicating strategic messages. The translator—whether human or automated—is effectively involved in the process of creating

meaning, as the recipient's perception of the information depends on the precise choice of terms, the conveyance of tone, and the preservation of context. Thus, translation becomes a mediator in intercultural and interpolitical communication.

From a strategic communication perspective, language also functions as a tool of influence. The use of metaphors, euphemisms, evaluative language, and rhetorical constructions allows states to shape desired interpretations of events and influence international audiences. The works of Dutch linguist and founder of critical discourse analysis Teun A. van Dijk emphasize that discourse is a crucial mechanism for the reproduction of power and ideology (Teun, A. van Dijk. 1998. p.384). In this sense, translation becomes a channel for transmitting not only information but also ideological attitudes, which can amplify or, conversely, distort the original message.

Thus, in the context of the global information space and increasing information warfare, language and translation are acquiring strategic significance. They serve not only as means of communication but also as tools for building trust, managing perceptions, and implementing foreign policy strategies. This, in turn, necessitates high-precision translation, consideration of cultural context, and mandatory professional oversight, especially when using artificial intelligence systems. In this regard, it seems appropriate to highlight the key mechanisms of manipulation implemented through translation.

One of the most common mechanisms is semantic distortion, which involves changing the meaning of key concepts and terms. Even a minor substitution of words or the choice of an imprecise equivalent can lead to a transformation of the meaning of an utterance. This is especially true in diplomatic discourse, where terminological precision plays a fundamental role. As the British translation theorist Peter Newmark notes, translation is always associated with interpretation, not mechanical reproduction of the text, which opens up space for variability and, consequently, for distortion of meaning (Newmark, P. 1988. p.402).

The second important mechanism is contextual reduction, in which the translation process loses connections between individual parts of the text or ignores the broader political and cultural context. Modern machine translation systems, as Australian scholar and specialist in translation studies and intercultural communication Anthony Pym emphasizes, often process sentences in isolation, which leads to a disruption of the logical integrity and semantic coherence of the text (Pym, A. 2011. 1-9). As a result, the recipient may interpret the message outside of its original context, increasing the likelihood of manipulative influence.

The third mechanism is shifting rhetorical emphasis and tone. In diplomatic communication, the tone of a statement—whether neutral, soft, or, conversely, harsh—is strategically important. Changing modality, strengthening or softening evaluative characteristics, and adding or omitting emotionally charged vocabulary can significantly alter the perception of a message. Within the framework of critical discourse analysis, British linguist Professor Norman Fairclough emphasizes that linguistic choices are directly linked to the exercise of power and influence, making such transformations particularly significant (Fairclough, N. 2001).

No less important is the mechanism of cultural transformation associated with the incorrect or incomplete transmission of culturally determined meanings. As the American theorist and historian of translation Lawrence Venuti points out, translation is inevitably linked to processes of “domestication” or “alienation” of the text, which can lead to the loss or distortion of cultural meanings (Venuti, L. 1995. p.344). In a diplomatic context, this is particularly sensitive, as misinterpretation of cultural codes can be perceived as disrespect or even as a political signal.

Thus, manipulation through translation is achieved through a set of interconnected mechanisms, including semantic, contextual, rhetorical, and cultural distortions. In the context of digitalization and the widespread use of AI technologies, these mechanisms are particularly relevant, as the speed of information dissemination increases significantly, while the opportunities for its critical verification may, conversely, decrease. This necessitates the development of methods for monitoring, verifying, and critically analyzing translations, particularly in the fields of international communication and diplomacy.

CRISIS OF PERCEPTION IN A TRANSFORMING WORLD ORDER:
THE IMPACT OF AI TRANSLATION ERRORS ON INTERNATIONAL
TRUST AND DIPLOMATIC COMMUNICATION

Restoring diplomatic trust: the importance of human oversight and hybrid models

Both historically and in the present day, trust within the system of international relations and the sphere of diplomacy has always been considered one of the most sensitive yet essential components. In recent times, the application of information technologies and artificial intelligence in the field of diplomacy-particularly in translation and communication tools-has introduced not only new opportunities but also new risks to the structure of trust. Within this context, the role of human oversight and hybrid models becomes a critical factor, not merely in terms of technical accuracy but also in preserving the political and diplomatic climate of mutual confidence (O'Hagan, 2016). One illustrative example is the incident at the Antalya meeting on 1 December 2016, when the words of Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov were mistranslated. Lavrov intended to say, *"Neither Russia nor Syria has attacked Turkish positions"*, but the translation conveyed the opposite: *"The Syrian Army attacked Turkish positions"*. This mistranslation and the resulting interpretation led to a public scandal both in the Turkish state apparatus and in the Turkish media.

Although modern AI-based automatic translation systems-such as Google Translate, DeepL, and Meta AI Translator-facilitate the technical side of multilingual diplomatic negotiations, their primary risk lies in the potential erosion of trust due to mistranslations or decontextualized information (Castilho et al., 2017). Practitioners in the field know well that diplomacy is not solely about the words themselves; the tone, context, and embedded subtext are equally significant. At present, AI lacks the fully developed capability to grasp such nuances. This, in turn, increases the risk that the receiving party may misunderstand the intended message or conclude that it was deliberately distorted-circumstances that can lead to highly sensitive and potentially dangerous consequences (Pym, 2011). A notable example occurred in the Netherlands in 2010, when a Russian driver received a court summons stating: *"You must appear in court on 28 August"*. However, due to an error in machine translation, the message was rendered as: *"You must avoid appearing in court"*. As a result, the driver was arrested, and the misunderstanding led to serious legal consequences. Such cases underscore the strategic importance of adopting hybrid models-systems in which AI and human translators work in tandem-to preserve and restore diplomatic trust. In the modern era, the integration of human expertise into hybrid models enhances the speed and functionality of the technology while ensuring accuracy and reliability (Koehn, 2020). In such systems, AI typically generates the initial translation, but human specialists are indispensable for the final editing and contextual verification stages. This combination ensures rhetorical coherence, preserves cultural codes, and maintains diplomatic sensitivities (Cronin, 2013).

In recent years, reputable international organizations such as the UN, the European Union, and UNESCO have begun to employ such hybrid systems for the translation of statements and documents (Koskinen, 2008). This trend demonstrates that, when refined, these translation programs can achieve significant success. Such an approach not only improves technical quality but also fosters mutual understanding and trust. Human oversight fills the semantic gaps that AI may create-or potentially create-and resolves emotional or cultural mismatches. Moreover, human involvement allows for a deeper engagement with diplomatic ethics and communicative strategies. For instance, during times of heightened tensions between two countries, even a subtle change in the wording or tone of an official statement can have far-reaching political consequences. In such scenarios, human translators possess the situational awareness to evaluate these factors. In this respect, AI systems and human translation serve complementary functions (Zarefsky, 2004). Thus, the human factor continues to prove that translation in diplomacy is not merely the mechanical conversion of language but an integral part of communication at moral and psychological levels. Restoring diplomatic trust-especially in times of distrust-is far from a straightforward process. It becomes particularly critical in post-conflict negotiations, the drafting of peace treaties, and multilateral forums, where it may require extended periods of engagement. During such times, how the parties understand each other and the reliability of the mediums through which information

is conveyed are of paramount importance, directly influencing outcomes. Hybrid models, therefore, should be regarded not merely as technical tools but as strategic instruments of communication (Gile, 2009).

Conclusion

The conducted research has revealed both the growing role and the associated risks of artificial intelligence-based machine translation systems-such as Google Translate, DeepL, Meta AI Translator, and similar platforms-in international diplomacy. In the context of multilingualism, time constraints, and high accuracy requirements within the global diplomatic environment, these technologies offer significant advantages in terms of speed, accessibility, and cost-effectiveness. However, the study has shown that these advantages do not always align with the core criteria required in diplomatic processes, such as contextual accuracy, consideration of cultural nuances, and terminological precision. In particular, the impact of translation delays emerged as one of the central topics of this research. In real-time international negotiations, even a delay of a few seconds can disrupt the semantic integrity of a message, increase cognitive load, and create misperceptions on the part of the interlocutor. In a diplomatic context, such technical inconsistencies can erode mutual trust, lead to misinterpretations of strategic positions, and even escalate tensions. Historical examples-such as delays in simultaneous interpretation at United Nations meetings and the Able Archer 1983 incident-demonstrate that translation delays and interpretative errors can directly affect not only the quality of communication but also international security.

The study further confirms that AI-based translation systems are more limited than human translators in conveying contextual meaning. For example, the correct interpretation of cultural subtleties, diplomatic rhetoric, and strategic language remains beyond the full capacity of automation. Therefore, the independent use of AI technologies in high-risk diplomatic correspondence and negotiations carries serious risks. At the same time, a complete rejection of these technologies is not advisable. On the contrary, the research indicates that the optimal approach lies in a synergistic collaboration between human translators and AI systems. In this model, AI provides the initial translation and ensures terminological consistency, while humans perform the final editing for context, style, and cultural appropriateness. Such a hybrid approach can minimize diplomatic communication risks while ensuring both speed and accuracy. Based on the findings, the study offers several key recommendations of both theoretical and practical relevance:

1. Human oversight must be ensured in the use of AI translation systems for diplomatic correspondence, in proportion to the strategic significance of the text.
2. Real-time optimization algorithms and more effective synchronization methods should be developed to reduce translation delays.
3. Specialized language models should be enhanced to automatically recognize diplomatic style and cultural nuances.
4. Ethical and security standards for the use of AI translation technologies should be established by governmental institutions.

In conclusion, AI-based translation technologies constitute a powerful tool for contemporary diplomacy; however, their effective and safe use depends not only on technological capabilities but also on strategic approaches, human oversight, and the implementation of professional standards. Accordingly, future research should focus on further improving the accuracy, speed, and contextual adaptability of these technologies, while defining their role in diplomatic communication processes in a balanced manner.

References

- Aliyev, B.** (2025). Sacralizing security: Orthodoxy and securitization in Russia's war on Ukraine. *Journal of Strategic Security*, 18(4), 190–204.
- Angelelli, C.V.** (2004). *Medical Interpreting and Cross-cultural Communication*. Cambridge University Press.
- Bang, Y., Cahyawijaya, S., Lee, N., & Fung, P.** (2023). A Multitask Benchmark for Hallucination Detection in Machine Translation. *Proceedings of the ACL 2023*.

CRISIS OF PERCEPTION IN A TRANSFORMING WORLD ORDER:
THE IMPACT OF AI TRANSLATION ERRORS ON INTERNATIONAL
TRUST AND DIPLOMATIC COMMUNICATION

- Castilho, S., Gaspari, F., Moorkens, J., & Way, A. (2017). Is neural machine translation the new state of the art? *The Prague Bulletin of Mathematical Linguistics*, 108, 109–120.
- Charteris-Black, J. (2011). *Politicians and Rhetoric: The Persuasive Power of Metaphor*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Costa-jussà, M. R., et al. (2022). No Language Left Behind: Scaling Human-Centered Machine Translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.04672*.
- Cronin, M. (2013). *Translation in the Digital Age*. Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and Power* (2nd ed.). London: Longman. p.240.
- Gaspari, F., Almaghout, H., & Doherty, S. (2015). A survey of machine translation competences: Insights for translation technology educators and practitioners. *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology*, 23(3), 333-358.
- Gile, D. (2009). *Basic Concepts and Models for Interpreter and Translator Training*. John Benjamins Publishing.
- Gonzalez, R.D., & Vasquez, H.T. (2017). *Fundamentals of Court Interpretation: Theory, Policy and Practice*. Carolina Academic Press.
- Huseynov, Y., & Shikhaliyev, E. (2025a). Geopolitical doctrine, regional security economics, and the economic determinants of its intervention in Ukraine. *MSW Management Journal*, 35(2), 328–347. <https://doi.org/10.7492/q2tjg256>
- Jiménez-Crespo, M.A. (2013). *Translation and Web Localization*. Routledge.
- Kenny, D. (2017). *Human Issues in Translation Technology*. Routledge.
- Koehn, P. (2020). *Neural Machine Translation*. Cambridge University Press.
- Koskinen, K. (2008). *Translating Institutions: An Ethnographic Study of EU Translation*. Routledge.
- Kussmaul, P. (1995). *Training the Translator*. John Benjamins Publishing.
- Martin, J. R., & White, P.R.R. (2005). *The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Menon, R., & Rumer, E. (2015). *Conflict in Ukraine: The Unwinding of the Post–Cold War Order*. MIT Press.
- Newmark, P. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. Prentice Hall. p.402.
- O'Hagan, M. (2016). *The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Technology*. Routledge.
- Pöchhacker, F. (2004). *Introducing Interpreting Studies*. Routledge.
- Pym, A. (2011). What technology does to translating. *Translation & Interpreting*, 3(1), 1–9.
- Roy, C.B. (2000). *Interpreting as a Discourse Process*. Oxford University Press.
- Setton, R. (1999). *Simultaneous Interpretation: A Cognitive-Pragmatic Analysis*. John Benjamins Publishing.
- Talishinski, E.B. (2020). Information weapons as a new means of armed combat. *Geostrategy: International public-political, scientific-theoretical journal*, 3-4
- Teun, A. van Dijk. (1998). *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach* 1st Edition. SAGE Publications Ltd. p.384.
- Thomas, P.Rona. (1976). *Weapon Systems and Information War*. Boeing Aerospace Co., Seattle, WA, P.50
- Venuti, L. (1995). *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London: Routledge. p.344.
- Watkin, K. (2003). *Combatants, Unprivileged Belligerents and Conflicts in the 21st Century*.
- Zarefsky, D. (2004). Presidential rhetoric and the power of definition. *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 34(3), 607–619.