

AI-Driven Climate Change Communication Strategies in International Diplomacy

Irfan Ali Pitafi ¹ Mahroz Ali Lak ² Nemat Ullah Pitafi ³ Muhammad Azhar Ul Deen Pitafi ⁴

ABSTRACT: The article explains the wide implications of artificial intelligence (AI) to the transformation of how the issue of climate change is being communicated at the international diplomatic level. As the role of climate change in international governance continues to grow, there is a need to devise efficient communication policies that will support international cooperation and the successful negotiation and implementation of climate agreements. This paper attempts to describe how artificial intelligence (AI) technologies (natural language processing (NLP), machine learning, and high data analytics) may be applied to diplomatic speech. Not only to improve communication but also to adapt the communication to various cultural, political, and socio-economic environments is the focus. In order to be more effective and prove clearly and convincingly why the climate crisis can be called a serious issue, refute fake facts, and engage various stakeholders, including governments, non-governmental organizations, and civil society in a successful dialogue, the governments, policymakers, and international organizations can resort to the power of artificial intelligence (AI). The article describes the application of AI to enhance the provision of messages related to climate in a manner which is sensitive to the values and norms of various countries. The paper concludes by adding to the existing body of knowledge the question whether the concept of artificial intelligence (AI) can be deployed in a strategic manner in order to better global climate governance and assist all people in recognizing the potential and rational climate solutions.

KEYWORDS: Artificial Intelligence (AI), Climate Change Communication, International Diplomacy, Global Governance, Natural Language Processing (NLP)

¹ M.Phil. Scholar, Department of Politics and International Relations, University of Sargodha, Sargodha, Punjab, Pakistan.
Email: pitaifiirfan45@gmail.com

² Bachelor in Sociology, Department of Sociology and Criminology, University of Sargodha, Sargodha, Punjab, Pakistan.
Email: Pakistanmahrozlak@gmail.com

³ Bachelor in Political Science, Department of Politics and International Relations, University of Sargodha, Sargodha, Punjab, Pakistan.
Email: sahabbaloch600@gmail.com

⁴ Bachelor in International Relations, Department of International Relations, Shah Abdul Latif University, Khairpur Mir, Sindh, Pakistan.
Email: pitaifizhar@gmail.com

Corresponding Author: Irfan Ali Pitafi
✉ pitaifiirfan45@gmail.com

Introduction

Climate change has not only emerged as a serious environmental challenge, but also as an issue of international relations and global diplomacy. Climate-induced risks are complex and transboundary, encompassing extreme weather events, biodiversity loss, economic instability and geopolitical tensions, among others, that will need to be addressed through concerted efforts among states and non-state entities. With the development of scientific knowledge on anthropogenic climate change, the success of international climate diplomacy has become dependent on a certain degree of skillful communication to obtain cooperation, legitimacy and popular acceptance (Dryzek & Stevenson, 2011). With the creation of diplomatic

tools for communication, and more specifically in combination with artificial intelligence (AI), the dynamics of the issue of climate change have changed their form, structure, negotiation and communication at the global level. As the diplomatic sector continues to adapt to the onslaught of artificial intelligence, the way it collects, processes, and disseminates information in real time is being transformed. Previously, it has leveraged its skillset in predictive analytics, sentiment analysis, automatic translation, chatbot diplomacy, media monitoring and real-time public opinion tracking as part of its entry into the climate diplomacy space. All these tools will allow diplomats and international agencies to produce a less abstract and more data-oriented policy of communication that can be actively reconfigured in the shadow of the various discourses and changing geopolitical situations. The sentiment analysis of the messages, which the COP26 players had blocked in Glasgow, was performed by social media using AI-supported applications, after which any message alteration could impact negotiations and seek the assistance of the population. The second benefit of AI is that it can take millions of climate variables and convert them into deployments of various types (Taddeo & Floridi, 2018). New and important issues of power, legitimacy, transparency and elusiveness, however, are raised by the (admittedly) promising introduction of AI to communicate climate change. The vast majority of AI systems are developed and implemented by the Global North actors who might possess certain ideological, technical, and cultural assumptions. This mediatization gives little or no attention to the voices of the Global South and Indigenous people and to the interests of the marginalised parties in the process of creating narratives about global climates. In addition, the effects of the introduction of the non-transparent algorithms to the diplomatic scenes will also be present as the motive which helps to continue the current prejudice and break the ideas of democracy that multilateralism is based on. AI-informed or AI-helpful climate communication relies not only on the rational rightness of the information, but also on the ethical background and political responsibility of the same and the understanding of the legitimacy of the same in international negotiations. Earlier studies of AI in international relations were carried out with the primary topic of cybersecurity, surveillance, autonomous weapons, and strategic stability. There is a growing but smaller body of literature on the problem of AI and global governance within the larger context of digital diplomacy and global institutions. But this is a key fact that is missing in the debate on the way AI can be applied in the climate change communication strategy in the diplomatic sector. Here it is not only the utilization of information facilities, but also the generation of meanings, the creation of legitimacy and bargaining of values between culturally differentiated and politically partitioned stake-holders (Adler, 1997). Within that context, the process of achieving AI-mediated communication in climate diplomacy presupposes the existence of a multidisciplinary opinion to develop the research on the phenomenon that combines the theory of international relations, the study of communication, and AI ethics. In this paper, I fill that gap by critically analyzing how artificial intelligence is redefining the climate change communication approaches of international diplomacy.

Evolution of Climate Change Communication in Diplomacy

With a move of problems of the environment that were originally located on the periphery of the international regime to the centre of the international regime, the process can be viewed as the history of climate change communication in international relations. During the last years of the climate negotiations, the message was received in a more conventional diplomatic manner, with confidential conferences, legalistic treaty language, and very technical reports being shared with policy makers, but not with the people. It was embodied in the

United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) of 1992 (most communication was textual and administrative), and entailed codification of commitments in a regime of treaties. But as soon as the first goal of creating a platform of cooperation has been a success, this paradigm could not permit itself to provide the integration of masses and provided the paradigm of an asymmetry to the industrialised world, the core of which might be climate diplomacy (Bodansky, 2010). Such short-term communication was manifested in the long-run. As scientific knowledge on the threat of climate change has since accrued, especially with the release of reports by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) in the 1990s and in the early 2000s, a sense of urgency to communicate the threat of climate change began to circulate internally and externally within the science and energy policy establishment. Diplomatic actors now realise that the legitimacy of such climate agreements was also a question of recognition, besides the interpretation of such agreements by the audience. It has been this realisation that has drawn a line between the elite-based exchange and a much more participatory exchange where the government, the non-governmental organisations and the scientific institutions tried to reach the stakeholders. The second example is the Kyoto Protocol of 1997; the implementation of this program relied on the ability of diplomats to persuade their domestic citizens and corporate executives about the importance of their emission quotas.

Their elimination, however, made futile the preparations and their weak character of being incapable of involving them in practical and real communication methods with the view of keeping the people and the political leaders concerned (Grubb, 1999). The twenty-first century has seen the communication policies of the weather matters turn where diplomacy cannot be separated from people diplomacy. The climax of climate negotiations was likely the COP 15 in Copenhagen in 2009, when there were the most journalists covering the conferences and when civil society was on the streets. Even though a legally binding treaty was not drawn up on that occasion, the conference was used to portray the nature of communicating expectations insofar as effective communication is involved, and how digital media platforms were being used to outline a story of what diplomacy had succeeded or failed. This change of communication later became codified into the Paris Agreement of 2015 that bestowed significant weight to the openness, voluntary contributions and availability of the country-based plans (NDCs). The emphasis behind the Paris structure compared to the old treaties is based on the capacity of the states to report the progress to the international community and to the local citizens, where communication is another accountability vehicle (Falkner, 2016). Parallel to the developments in the institutional changes are the developments in the communication technologies, which profoundly changed climate diplomacy. In the context of the internet, social media and online platforms, climate science and negotiations have transformed the manner in which it is shared. The key channels through which the language surrounding the world could be influenced by the climate negotiators, NGOs and youth activists are Twitter, YouTube and live-streamed press conferences. It has turned the climate into an agenda issue and into the agenda of the global negotiations and pressure on governments through the power of opinion, rather than non-state actors (such as indigenous or youth activists), as in the case of Fridays for Future (de Moor et al., 2020). Communication has, as a result of this, not only become open at the diplomatic table but has spread to the world of the global public sphere, where legitimacy is negotiated online as in formal diplomatic halls.

Moreover, the delivery of climate change in the diplomatic arena has begun to entail additional images and data-driven scripts. Advancements in satellite monitoring, climatic modelling and interactive data networks have enabled diplomats to base their messages on convincing evidence. Other programs, such as

the Global Carbon Atlas or Climate Action Tracker, have become the most significant components of climate diplomacy because open access to knowledge about climate science, when it is turned into diplomatic messaging by informing talking points. They are the tools which will be capable of sending the signal that the withdrawal will be moving to the dynamic platforms, with the assistance of which the policy makers themselves and society will be able to track the progress in near real time (Hickmann, 2017). The upgrading of climate change in general, not the issue of the environment per se, but a phenomenon endangering security, human rights and stability of the economy, has been one of the most crucial elements of this process of communication. This has, in turn, expanded diplomatic communication to cover climate change as part of climate security in the United Nations Security Council, climate justice in talks with small island developing states and green economic opportunity to trade and development forums. In all the above frames, there are different communicative aims for different groups in order to find coalitions and legitimacies in doing something about climate change (Betzold et al., 2012). The following modern reports address the formation of the communication strategies in the field of diplomacy, where the semantics of the climate change approach is no less important than the negotiations. Also present in the development of a climate change communications process are transfers of power in the Global South and the disequilibrium of power. One of the initial criticisms of climate diplomacy was that it provided over-representation and too much of an agenda to the industrialized countries and under-representation and too little agenda to the developing countries. This has seen the establishment of communication approaches that will seek to provide a voice to the issue of challenged nation-states, particularly the small island countries that are threatened by the rise in sea level. The formation of the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS) into an active block is not just another exemplar of how effective communication can bring voices to the margins of the international bureaucracy (Barnett & Campbell, 2010). That climate justice and loss-and-damage discussion has become more relevant with each subsequent COP seems to indicate that these communicative acts have been functioning as a way of altering the conversation.

In the past several years, not only has communication become more participatory and more transparent, but it has also become quite an issue of debate. The existing levels of skepticism and increasing levels of misinformation and disinformation campaigns against climate science are creating serious challenges to the art of diplomacy. The fact has been established that misinformation about climate spreads through social media in minutes and kilometres and far more extensively than verified information, which makes the attempts of diplomats and scientists to cultivate confidence and legitimacy more complicated (Lewandowsky et al., 2017). The problem with fighting misinformation has brought the concepts of credibility, fact-checking, and coordinated communication campaigns to the forefront of international diplomacy.

AI-Driven Climate Communication in International Diplomacy

The specified section suggests the comparative discovery of the battle to introduce artificial intelligence to the process of developing the scheme of communication about climate change by the three representatives of international diplomacy, the European Union, the United Nations, and the People's Republic of China. All of them have some kind of fit between technology, narrative, and geopolitical agenda in the sense of the AI learning to practice the art of diplomacy and gaining symbolic power. The EU has been astute enough to frontload global climate diplomacy, in particular, its policy flagship, the European Green Deal. During COP26

and COP27, the EU too deployed several AI applications to help with real-time communication, to engage more civically and to see itself as a climate leader. To be more precise, the sentiment analysis of the conversation in social media that took place between the members and other regions and between the EU External Action Service, was only possible through AI and could implement changes to the messages that would be sent to the negotiation partners based on the result. The EU communication plan was based on the requirement to make climate action a perceived economic need and a moral need, through the use of automated digital media. Among these efforts that have been supported by AI-driven dashboards and translation bots is Green Deal Going Local, which tailored messages to the requirements of subnational stakeholders. Even the Commission was deploying machine learning, through its Joint Research Centre, to assist in keeping climate policy paperwork more human-friendly with easy-to-read infographics that were disseminated through diplomatic and non-diplomatic means. As it is demonstrated in this case, the concept of aid of AI may be utilised in the success of the communication process and in norm entrepreneurship, which assumes reproduction of a specific image of the EU as a state of rules and progressive nature. Nevertheless, excessively data-based messages might unintentionally marginalise more controversial or justice-related climate messages, particularly in non-EU sources. This implies that, in addition to making climate governance more strategically coherent, AI can also strengthen the Eurocentric approaches to climate governance.

Moreover, the United Nations, especially on the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), has advanced more in embracing AI technologies to gain further global communication coverage. At COP27, the UN launched a virtual assistant, with a variety of languages and powered by AI (developed in partnership with IBM Watson), which could respond to questions related to the climate and direct the participants through the negotiation agenda. In the same way, the Department of Global Communications has also introduced AI-assist applications to create real-time climate tales using satellite reports and render them also open to external viewers. The key problem of the inclusion of international diplomacy language is resolved with AI, too. The latter was possible due to AI-based real-time translation features, whereby the influence of non-English actors and civil society NGOs can be extended, and the quantity of voices can be added to the climate discourse (with restrictions). Such systems played a vital role in amplifying the voices of the Global South on adaptation, loss and damage, and climate justice at a tense round of funding negotiations at COP27. Further consideration, however, reveals that the authenticity of these fragments of AI devices will be anthropocentric until a third-party control and normative practice is eliminated. These areas are some of the fields in which AI can be applied; it is not culture or power-based, as in the diplomatic discussion. Second, none of the algorithms applied during proceedings and prioritisation procedures is revealed in the literature; it concerns the problem of information transparency and control. Thus, in this regard, though the case study of inclusive digital diplomacy is the UN, institutional vested interests and technical inexplicability of AI processes continue to limit the efficiency thereof. The other part of AI as a judge of what a fair climate communication is can, however, be observed in the case about the state of moral responsibility and through an eye.

However, in China, we also find a different, diametrically opposite, form of AI-based climate diplomacy, inherently embedded in its general conceptualisation of digital sovereignty and technology as a project of the state. The other way in which China has applied AI is to regulate communication worldwide in such a way that the country is brought to be among the primary climate controllers within the Belt and Road Initiative (BRI).

The decisions on the content and the presenter in the production of the climate content, where green investments and environmental modernisation by China or, at least in Africa, Southeast Asia and Latin America, are the focus, are made by the propaganda engine of Xinhua and CGTN AI-editing content selections and presenters. The Ministry of Ecology and Environment teaches that it has to partner with technological firms such as Baidu and Huawei to create AI, which can replicate the extent of carbon emissions, and forecast politically the result, which lies hidden in the text of the international laws and diplomatic briefs. In 2023, the Chinese Foreign Ministry launched an AI-powered social media campaign to defeat the Western discourse that has made China a climatic laggard. By popularising ecological civilisation through multilingual AI texts, China has managed to rebrand itself as a good member of the international family. We can talk about the example of China, where it is possible to create the model of nationalism according to algorithms; it is a country where AI is a source of state technology and the creation of discourses. AI is a strategic communicative instrument to shape climate into the administration of the discursive balancing plan; i.e. to be conscious of the disparagement with its values by adhering to the global regulations, but to be protective of its own values. But the practices are outrageous, as they are associated with the imitation of the example of the activity of the states, censorship, and even a threat to create an environmental disinformation movement. Chinese AI diplomacy is not, in any way, a country-to-country conversation in the sense of the EU and UN, but an agenda and a geopolitical statement. Besides that, Comparative Insights between three cases, one can also mention the term AI as a means of technical and symbolic climate diplomacy. This is why the EU mainly focuses on coherence and legitimacy promoted by the adoption of AI-assisted messaging, the UN upholds inclusivity and participation via AI, and China employs the concept of AI as a strategic method of image-building and digital influence. The difference is not just political, but ideological on the question of global climate governance. What unites the three cases, however, is the developmental trajectory to increasingly rely on AI to make sense of climate communication. There are also threats to dependence, however, including uncertainty in algorithms, blind moralism, and marginalisation of non-conformers. According to them, the ability to construct a climate discourse is increasingly dependent on the ability to gain access to and exercise power over AI systems, and the digital infrastructure is becoming a novel source of interstate competition.

Transforming Diplomatic Practices with Artificial Intelligence

Artificial intelligence (AI) is contributing to transformations in the logic of international diplomacy and climate change negotiations, specifically. Above-the-line diplomatic relations were anchored in personal contact negotiation, soft power and normative authority. However, the magnitude of the rate of development, complexity and globality of the issues related to climate of the present day demand more specific varieties of communication, negotiation, and conciliation. The use of AI technologies is not associated with the introduction of climate diplomacy and directly shifts the character of work in this process, permitting faster decisions, acting in the moment and thinking in advance. Alterations in the domain of information search and interpretation could be taken as one of the most significant. Those scientific reports prepared by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) are complex and technical in nature and form the basis of climate diplomacy. Converting such documents into actionable intelligence may be cumbersome and time-consuming for translators/diplomats who are not specialists in the subject matter. AI-based technologies (and natural language processing and machine learning, in particular) are currently being deployed to derive this

information and convert technical output into policy-friendly reports, and refine advice to the national interest. This will allow negotiators to step out and negotiate to a higher level with greater confidence and in a more timely fashion through the use of scientific evidence (Vinuesa et al., 2020). The AI supports language and cross-border knowledge as well. One such problem in which language and culture players might be involved is climate diplomacy. This is where graphic neural networks and neural networks come in, as these two neural networks can be used to overcome these obstacles to translation by offering students AI-based translation systems, which can be accessed in real-time. During large conferences such as the annual conference of parties (COP), the tools have been used to make the process of communication more open and effective in order to minimise misunderstandings and hear and accept a very important message on climate.

Moreover, AI may determine the presence of minor shifts in speech and track the transforming character of a particular policy frame and, besides, may compute sentiment in various locations and, thus, can offer helpful strategic information to the representatives at the negotiation table. The additional contribution of AI to climate diplomacy is not limited to the application of AI in interpretation and language. With the unification of predictive analytics with the AI-based simulation models, the diplomatic teams can experiment with the scenario, the negotiation, its potential coalition, and the potential outcomes versus the impact of the various climate commitments. Similarly, a nation may simulate the outcomes of setting a suggested quantity of emissions or the allocation of investment to environmental or political purposes. The competencies will enable the diplomats to negotiate with a more balanced view of risks, trade-offs, and strategic opportunities. According to the World Economic Forum (2023), technologies are most effective in high-stakes scenarios, where a significant amount of uncertainty prevails, and stakes are high - in case things go wrong. But the transition has negative effects. The technological gap between the developed and the developing countries is arguably one of the hottest topics. Only the most developed organisations and states can afford AI because only they can perform the complex analysis and employ it to put pressure on their allies with the help of their diplomacy; the majority of the developing countries lack access to it, and they are not aware of how to adjust it in their favour. Although the digital divide can be a contributing factor to an imbalance in the ability of developing and developed countries to be present at the climate negotiations, it is also true that less-equipped countries may be locked out of the agenda-setting process and even the decision-making process.

In addition to this, the democratisation of artificial intelligence in the sphere of diplomacy should also be among the priorities, as in this manner, the status quo of inequality to date on the planet could be enhanced. It also shares the ethical and transparency issue that comes with AI diplomacy. Most AI systems are commonly called black boxes, and, especially with deep learning systems, it is difficult to follow the route that the system has taken to reach a specific decision or recommendation. Due to the abstract nature of such knowledge, there might be less trust between the parties in the context of a negotiation, particularly when they are making life or death decisions using AI-generated knowledge. Moreover, it is easy to explain the problem of algorithm bias by the fact that available datasets can be trained to meet the existing inequalities or unequal distribution of climate vulnerability (Eubanks, 2018). Even those, however, appear to be a one-way road to the application of AI in climate diplomacy. In the future, AI will play an increasingly prominent role in establishing international diplomatic practice, as it will continue to allow climate information to be interpreted, framed, and negotiated, hence becoming an inevitable part of international relations. The most important issue is that it should be ethical, inclusive, and oriented to the principles of transparency and worldwide equity of its usage.

Ethical Implications of Artificial Intelligence

The disruptive and controversial feature of artificial intelligence in climate diplomacy can be demonstrated by empirical research on the EU, UN, and Chinese experience of trying to implement AI in their international climate policy. This part aims to define the transformation of the relationship of norm construction, discursive power, and ethical responsibility on the global level of AI in climate change governance. Critical paradox, constructed within the findings, lies in the fact that, as AI technologies can be employed to accelerate, distribute, and individualize climate communication, they also introduce new asymmetries in the determination of who tells the story, whose voices are most prominent, and how the right to speak can be constructed. A constructivist does not consider an AI an objective machine, but a social player in climate reality construction. Again, as in the example with the EU and the UN, AI belongs to the establishment of new signification in sorting and staging climate actors and content into either an EU institutional sense of a sustainable future or a UN institutional sense of an inclusive agenda. These framings are not, however, universal. Acquired and historicized institutional rationality vis-a-vis the AI panels and their programmed behaviour has a manneristic of stressing primary wording and de-emphasising others, in this instance, of the Global South.

Another school of thought is technological determinism, as the desire to use AI in a diplomatic setting grows, and the belief in data-driven thinking and mechanised performance can be seen as an extension of a philosophy. But such techno-optimism has the potential to be blind to the political character of climate diplomacy itself. Chinese strategic AI application in the construction of a so-called green BRI discourse can serve as an example of how AI can become a system that generates geopolitical messages that can be utilised in an abusive way as an instrument to legitimise policy and to avoid contradiction. This deployment of the AI as a means of communication, therefore, restores the order of the world powers, only that this time, it is only in the digital sovereignty of particular territories, and others turn into a passive receiver of messages that are systematically produced. With regard to the ethical component of AI usage in the field of foreign affairs correspondence, there were numerous unanswered questions. To begin with, the level of transparency and accountability of diplomats or organisations that have access to proprietary AI platforms, the algorithm of which is not publicly available, is horrendous. This is particularly so when done in multilateral arenas like the UN, where the processes ensure the establishment of trust and legitimacy on the basis of openness. This is one of the reasons why muddy attribution occurs and why climate misinformation is being promoted and key messages are being suppressed. Blame can be distributed among programmers, institutions, and even among programs themselves. It is this type of irresponsible algorithm, (some researchers feel) that is challenging the very essence of the core notions of democracy and of morality (Crawford, 2021; Eubanks, 2018). Equity and representation are the next ideas that should be brought up regarding climate diplomacy and AI use. Not only are AI systems linguistically, culturally, and epistemically biased, but they can also be discriminatory to knowledge systems, not only in the West, but also to underserved populations. Although the launch of AI to the UN will mark a significant milestone of multilingual interaction, the most inclusive AI could remain limited to its own underlying datasets that it is being trained on and designed to work with. The acute questions that the situation poses are: who narrates about the climate in the world? And whose voices are to be heard and whose are not to be heard? In addition, as the influence of AI on the diplomatic world increases, it can easily be detached from the human component of the decision-making and decision deliberation

process. Where this may assist in creating a more effective solution to problems, on the other hand, this may desensitize urgent climate problems by lowering normative values to be solved with technical problems through calculative logics.

The negotiation text may be paraphrased, replacing moralistic words with less moralistic and more bureaucratized words, since, on the one hand, this is a slight change of wrapping culpability and urgency, and, on the other hand, it is done because, on the most basic level, it is a search for an example of this. Such decontextualization takes away the emotive, moral compulsion, which must always be marshalled to do something about climate. Moreover, the rise of AI as a discursive force poses many threats to the classic vision of agency in diplomacy. By means of message production, or communication, AI tools act on either face of an instrument-speaker continuum and create a blur zone. This demands a re-evaluation of the idea of diplomatic communication, agency and authorship in the new age of digitality. Are statements made in AI of equal normative weight as those made by human beings? To whom is it accountable for its impacts on negotiations, policy discourse or individuals? Finally, the fact that AI-based climate communication has already become a component of soft power, and China is one of the instruments in this category, implies that the issue of the digital infrastructure dimension has become the focal point of geopolitical rivalry. The informational superiority and symbolic authority produced by an aptitude to frame the climate predicament by arranging the mediation of the AI does not presuppose merely the aptitude to determine what to realise, but an aptitude to determine who could plausibly, reliably, or progressively act upon climate. A new dimension to the already existing inequality in the sphere of climate governance is that the digital impact may be overlaid with economic and political resources.

Policy Recommendations

Based on the comparative study of the EU, UN, and China and resting on technology, attention to the following policy recommendations will facilitate rationalising ethical and strategic implementation of AI in climate diplomacy. The official principles of AI in diplomacy, including the aspects of description of the diplomacy, the transparency of the diplomacy, description of the algorithms, and impartiality, should be constructed by the international organisations, i.e. the United Nations, UNESCO or the OECD. The applications of AI tools in the context of discursive construction of the multitude, history of discussions, and moderation of the global climate talks were related to the following recommendations: The AI-driven technologies used in climate diplomacy will require multilingual, cross-linguistic and culturally diverse datasets to be created. It is recommended that states and MNEs consult with researchers and members of civil society, i.e., those belonging to the Global South, to ensure that the AI systems do not institute epistemic or linguistic hierarchies.

Personality of the diplomatic protagonists who will use AI instruments in the context of preparedness of communication or assistance of the negotiation process must be conditioned by clear criteria. It is the discharge of the algorithm design, the database and communication parameters and third-party evaluation of the likelihood of bias or manipulation possibility. So that we do not place too much faith in AI systems, or make hasty applications of AI systems, we need to begin to train and educate diplomats, negotiators and policy experts on a regular basis. This type of training must focus on technical competence and the useful knowledge of political and ethical aspects of AI. It can be beneficial to apply AI to the diplomatic process, and there should be some fundamental considerations and norm-setting roles that would be beyond the reach

of human capabilities. A human sensitive issue like the problem of the decision-making process should be revealed to a principle of human-in-the-loop that cannot disenchant the layer of ethical as well as emotional issues. Due to the fact that AI-produced fake information or propaganda, at least in the sphere of online diplomacy, cannot be excluded, coordinated observational devices and immediate counter-measures should be implemented. This also includes how it will work with the digital platforms and fact-checking agencies to make climate diplomacy an integrity initiative.

Conclusion

Artificial Intelligence is no longer an engineering machine at the outskirts of a system, but is already rapidly becoming a system of climate crisis narrative, perception and global political negotiation. The paper has condemned the application of AI-based tools of communication by the European Union, the United Nations and China and has created critical comparisons and contrasts on the international level on how AI is integrating the symbolic and strategic aspects of international climate negotiations. The most valuable lesson that we are going to get in this paper is that, to some extent, AI is a meaning-maker and a communicator. One way or another, AI technologies presuppose a priori what reasonable information should be, who should be prioritised as a voice, and in what way urgency or authority should be presented. The predisposition towards deploying AI-fueled communication infrastructure in the EU is a sign of the will to make Africa look like a respectable force in the climate sphere and a sign of the need to speak in a multinational context to the UN, which would be facilitated by multilingual AI chatbots and live data screens.

In the meantime, the appearance of the climate stories, the development of which in China is facilitated by the algorithm, may be deemed a great example of such rational implementation of AI to project soft power and discursive power, in general, in the country of the Global South. The convergence between the more heterogeneous political stance and institutional field, instrumentalisation of AI as simply a methodology that might lead to the formalisation of the asymmetries of voice, access to and agency in climate governance, has been addressed. A critical constructivist approach to this would suggest that the AI is a new interface of struggle in the game of climate narrative, where the prerogative to narrate the story of the digital infrastructure may be exercised to determine who is permitted to narrate the issue and bring the solution, as well. In addition, the ethical implications of AI affect diplomatic communication in an overwhelming manner. Combined, as they are shown throughout this paper, all these components undermine the deliberative nature of diplomacy because of their invisibility, the existence of bias in gathered information, and the semi-autonomous nature of morally-charged language. Framing of narratives is becoming automated, a novel technique that can quietly erode the participatory and dialogical ethos of multilateral climate meetings. Until effective ethical safeguards and inclusive design approaches exist, AI will accelerate the impoverishment of climate-vulnerable societies, become embedded in Western-based knowledge ideologies, and continue to enclose climate discourse on equity, responsibility, and justice in a political space. Another important point made in this study is that the future of digital diplomacy needs to be reinvented urgently. It refers to the regulation of AI tools, along with investment in diplomatic capacity, greater digital literacy, and embedding values of justice, transparency, and recognition of cultural diversity into the construction of the climate communication machinery.

Regulating AI in diplomacy needs to be viewed as a byproduct of the bigger battle over climate justice, in which the politics of legitimacy and discursive inclusion are as crucial as emissions reduction or funding adaptation. In a few words, we may say that this work leads to the evolution of international relations, which makes a conceptual and professional contribution to the question of awareness of the dependence on AI and global governance, persuasiveness of narrative and responsibility of morality. It is a middle and ambitious stance between concern about the topicality of the communicative possibilities of AI and another that will be mindful of the counterproductivity of its practice. The procedure according to which it will be discussed, which voices will be heard, who will listen, and according to which technologies the development of the situation with the climate crisis will be continued. The diplomatic and moral imperative of the 21st century is to ensure that AI increases the voices of the change that is to be, rather than quiesces them.

References

- Adler, E. (1997). Seizing the middle ground: Constructivism in world politics. *European journal of international relations*, 3(3), 319-363. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354066197003003003>
- Betzold, C., Castro, P., & Weiler, F. (2012). AOSIS in the UNFCCC negotiations: from unity to fragmentation. *Climate policy*, 12(5), 591-613. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14693062.2012.692205>
- Bodansky, D. (2010). The Copenhagen climate change conference: A postmortem. *The American Journal of International Law*, 104(2), 230-240. <https://doi.org/10.5305/amerjintelaw.104.2.0230>
- Campbell, J., & Barnett, J. (2010). *Climate change and small island states: power, knowledge and the South Pacific*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781849774895>
- Crawford, N. C. (2021). Democracy and the Preparation and Conduct of War. *Ethics & International Affairs*, 35(3), 353-365. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0892679421000381>
- De Moor, J., Uba, K., Wahlström, M., Wennerhag, M., & De Vydt, M. (2020). *Protest for a future II: Composition, mobilization and motives of the participants in Fridays for Future climate protests on 20-27 September, 2019, in 19 cities around the world*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/ASRUW>
- Dryzek, J. S., & Stevenson, H. (2011). Global democracy and earth system governance. *Ecological Economics*, 70(11), 1865-1874. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2011.01.021>
- Eubanks, V. (2018). Automating inequality: how high-tech tools profile, police, and punish the poor. (No Title).
- Falkner, R. (2016). The Paris Agreement and the new logic of international climate politics. *International Affairs*, 92(5), 1107-1125. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2346.12708>
- Grubb, M. (1999). The Kyoto Protocol-A guide and assessment. *Nature*, 402(6759), 233-234. <https://cir.nii.ac.jp/crid/1570291226457072896>
- Hickmann, T. (2017). The reconfiguration of authority in global climate governance. *International Studies Review*, 19(3), 430-451. <https://doi.org/10.1093/isr/vix037>
- Lewandowsky, S., Ecker, U. K., & Cook, J. (2017). Beyond misinformation: Understanding and coping with the "post-truth" era. *Journal of applied research in memory and cognition*, 6(4), 353-369. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jarmac.2017.07.008>
- Taddeo, M., & Floridi, L. (2018). How AI can be a force for good. *Science*, 361(6404), 751-752. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aat5991>
- Vinuesa, R., Azizpour, H., Leite, I., Balaam, M., Dignum, V., Domisch, S., ... & Fuso Nerini, F. (2020). The role of artificial intelligence in achieving the Sustainable Development Goals. *Nature communications*, 11(1), 233. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-14108-y>
- World Economic Forum. (2023). *Top 10 Emerging Technologies of 2023 report*. World Economic Forum. <https://www.weforum.org/publications/top-10-emerging-technologies-of-2023/>