

STRATEGIC AMBIGUITY IN DIPLOMATIC DISCOURSE: THE CASE OF THE ARMENIA-US STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP CHARTER

M. Mkrtchyan¹, A. Martirosyan²

Yerevan State University

m.mkrtchyan@ysu.am, arm.martirosyan@ysu.am

ORCID¹: 0009-0009-1367-0621; ORCID²: 0009-0000-8238-1967

ABSTRACT

Language in diplomatic texts functions not only as a means of conveying policy preferences but also as a strategic instrument through which states manage uncertainty, reconcile competing interests, and sustain cooperation. This article examines the role of strategic ambiguity in the Charter on Strategic Partnership between the Republic of Armenia and the United States of America [1], arguing that ambiguity is deliberately embedded in the document as a functional diplomatic tool rather than a communicative flaw. Drawing on political linguistics, international relations theory, and legal studies, the study conceptualizes strategic ambiguity across three interrelated dimensions – linguistic, legal, and normative. Through a qualitative, section-by-section textual analysis, the article demonstrates how vague and open-ended formulations allow both parties to signal commitment, project shared values, and express cooperation while avoiding binding obligations or politically sensitive clarity. The findings show that ambiguity simultaneously reassures, restrains, and preserves strategic flexibility, particularly in areas related to security, regional stability, democratic governance, and economic cooperation. By focusing on a bilateral

agreement between a small state and a major power, the study contributes to existing research by illustrating how layered forms of ambiguity operate within a single diplomatic text.

Keywords: strategic ambiguity, diplomatic discourse, linguistic ambiguity, legal ambiguity, normative ambiguity.

Introduction

Language plays a key role in international relations, not just as a way to communicate policy decisions, but as a strategic instrument through which states negotiate power, manage uncertainty, and reconcile competing interests. In diplomatic discourse, precision is not always desirable; on the contrary, carefully chosen ambiguity often becomes a prerequisite for agreement [2]. International treaties, charters, and strategic documents frequently rely on vague language that allows actors with divergent priorities to converge on a shared text without resolving underlying disagreements [3]. This phenomenon, commonly referred to as strategic ambiguity, has emerged as a defining feature of contemporary diplomatic communication. Ambiguity is often seen as a barrier to clear communication. However, research in political linguistics and international relations shows that it can have a practical purpose [4]. Strategic ambiguity enables states to preserve flexibility, avoid escalation, and project unity in contexts characterized by geopolitical sensitivity and asymmetrical power relations. By deliberately employing vague, open-ended, or polysemous language, diplomatic actors can signal commitment while postponing contentious interpretations to the implementation stage [5],[6]. As a result, ambiguity functions not as a communicative failure, but as a calculated strategy embedded within the linguistic, legal, and normative architecture of international agreements [7].

Despite the growing body of literature on strategic ambiguity, much of the existing research remains either conceptually abstract or focused on well-established cases involving major powers and global institutions. Less

attention has been paid to how strategic ambiguity operates in bilateral agreements involving small or middle powers navigating complex regional environments [8]. Moreover, studies often treat linguistic, legal, and normative ambiguity as separate analytical domains, rather than examining how they interact within a single diplomatic text to produce layered and mutually reinforcing effects [9].

Existing studies often focus on major powers or treat different forms of ambiguity separately. This article examines the Charter on Strategic Partnership between Armenia and the United States, exploring how linguistic, legal, and normative ambiguities interact to balance reassurance and restraint, commitment and flexibility. Through a section-by-section textual analysis, the study demonstrates that ambiguity is not incidental but instrumental, creating symbolic consensus while preserving strategic maneuverability in sensitive geopolitical contexts [10],[11]. By integrating theoretical insights with close textual analysis, this study contributes to a deeper understanding of how ambiguity operates as a productive and purposeful feature of diplomatic language [12],[13].

Theoretical Background

The primary aim of the language is to transmit information, yet ambiguity challenges this function by diminishing the transparency of meaning. Inherently, ambiguities complicate the study of language and are difficult to define. According to R. Munson [14], an expression is ambiguous when it has more than one meaning and is used in a situation or context in which it can be understood in at least two different ways. Gillon maintains that an expression is considered ambiguous if it has two or more distinct interpretations whose corresponding truth conditions cannot be valid at the same time [15], while Kennedy further expands the notion defining it as a kind of uncertainty that manifests itself as a variation in truth conditions: one and the same utterance token can be judged true of one situation and false of another, or the other way around, depending on how it is interpreted [16]. D. Pehar [17] suggests that an expression can be

considered truly ambiguous when it has not only *at least* two different meanings, but also two *incompatible and unrelated* meanings. It is only then that the expression is truly ambiguous.

Depending on the level of discourse, ambiguity can be classified as semantic (lexical, or referential), syntactic (structural), or cross-textual (contextual). Semantic type of ambiguity is based on the multiple meanings of the word (polysemy or homonymy) and its inherent quality. Syntactic ambiguity, sometimes also called 'grammatical ambiguity' [18] refers to the structure or syntactic relations within the sentence that trigger different and incompatible interpretations. Cross-textual ambiguity is the presence of two or more possible meanings within a body of text rather than within the same sentence [19]. This type of ambiguity presents considerable difficulty as it encompasses semantics of sentences and texts.

Ambiguity may be unintentional; then it is misleading and can result in misunderstanding and create obstacles in communication. Unlike unintentional ambiguity, strategic ambiguity is a highly effective tool employed to fulfill a strategic function. In the realm of diplomacy, strategic ambiguity refers to the deliberate use of unclear or flexible language which is open to multiple interpretations [20] [21]. It can be employed, as a calculated move, in commitments, formal agreements and informal exchanges, allowing countries to maintain strategic flexibility and leave room for interpretation or maneuver while bridging conflicting positions and reducing the risk of escalation [22]. While excessive clarity may sometimes be destabilizing, strategic ambiguity can be considered a valuable tool in diplomatic discourse: calculated vagueness can foster progress and preserve relations even in the absence of full agreement [23],[24]. In practice, political and diplomatic communication often relies on 'strategic vagueness' to maintain politeness and avoid open confrontation. Deliberate ambiguity as a linguistic strategy may facilitate cooperation in sensitive political context [25].

There are two main perspectives scholars put forward while evaluating strategic ambiguity. First, they view it as a discursive strategy, which implies the use of vague language in a diplomatic text aimed at

facilitating agreement [26],[27]. Second, they view strategic ambiguity as a practice of foreign policy which can enable states to achieve balance among other powers preserving impartiality and neutrality [28]. Drawing on these perspectives, scholars further identify three forms of strategic ambiguity – linguistic, legal, and normative – depending on the mechanisms and usage of ambiguous language in achieving strategic goals.

Linguistic ambiguity refers to the wording and intentional use of ambiguous phrases that allow different interpretations by the parties. In linguistic terms, ambiguity evokes in one's mind uncertainty or doubtfulness of the meaning of language [29]. Expressions such as “normalization of relations”, “ceasefire/cessation of hostilities”, “sovereignty”, “territorial integrity”, “demilitarized zone”, “security guarantees” and many others, which are abundant in diplomatic language, sound firm yet they are open to multiple interpretations.

For instance, the ambiguity of the expression “normalization of relations”, frequently encountered in treaties or agreements between previously hostile states, can range from limited communication to the establishment of full diplomatic relations. The term “ceasefire”, which is common in conflict resolution, may imply either the complete cessation of hostilities or limited violence or a pause. The concepts of “sovereignty” and “territorial integrity”, which are foundational to the institutional language of the UN and international law, may imply either the principle of self-determination of peoples (which, in its turn, can mean full independence, autonomy within a state, or cultural recognition) or the inviolability of the state's borders. The notion of “demilitarized zone” may imply not only mere symbolic barriers, or partial restrictions, but the complete withdrawal of forces as well. Likewise, the term “security guarantees” may embrace the wide array of implications ranging from moral assurances to binding military commitments. In essence, diplomatic actors use vague or open-ended wording on purpose, because it lets them agree on terms that look solid while still giving each side room to interpret those same words in the way that best fits its own interests.

Legal ambiguity refers to the structure of legal text within treaty language with intentionally employed vague phrases and open-ended formulations, which leads to a lack of precision and clarity thus creating uncertainty with regard to obligations or enforcement mechanisms. As observed by Abbott and Snidal [30], legal ambiguity performs a pragmatic function as it allows agreements to be concluded when clarity and definitive specification would hinder consensus. In the context of drafting legal texts, ambiguity has been identified as one of three major curable diseases that infect language, the other two being vagueness and generality [31]. Within this perspective, generality is seen as responsible for the regulation of a number of situations under one generalized rule [32]. The most prevailing variations of ambiguity in legal texts, especially when it comes to hard cases, are syntactic ambiguity and polysemous expression in law that entails at least two related senses of one lexical meaning [33].

A clear illustration of legal ambiguity as an inherent feature is evident in the EU law, which provides fertile ground for ambiguity to take root and thrive, yet not every sample of ambiguity has strategic value for the implementation of EU law [34]. Perhaps the most classic example of the intended linguistic ambiguity is found in the Shanghai Communique (1972), which states that *the United States acknowledges that all Chinese on either side of the Taiwan Strait maintain there is but one China and that Taiwan is a part of China*. The disagreement revolved around Taiwan's legal status with reference to the word "acknowledges". From the point of view of China, the United States recognized "One China" principle, yet the United States merely acknowledged China's position without explicitly stating its own position on Taiwan's legal status. This carefully crafted semantic compromise allowed the sides to prevent deadlock and begin cooperation creating the illusion of consensus [35].

Normative ambiguity refers to the deliberate use of flexible or indeterminate normative expressions in diplomatic communication, where underlying principles and values are intentionally left open to multiple interpretations. Unlike linguistic ambiguity, which concerns the phrasing of statements, or legal ambiguity, which involves the structure of obligations,

normative ambiguity operates at the level of shared moral and political norms deliberately avoiding clear ethical, ideological, or political positions. It enables actors to converge around a text that outwardly reflects agreement on fundamental values, such as “justice”, “peace”, “freedom”, or “sovereignty”, while concealing the fact that these concepts may hold divergent meanings for different parties [36] [37]. This practice is especially visible in addressing controversial issues such as “human rights”, “territorial integrity”, and “intervention”.

As a strategic tool, ambiguity is useful because it allows states with conflicting interests to endorse the same agreement while still preventing negotiations from deadlocking. It creates a symbolic sense of unity while keeping space for different interpretations in practice [38],[39]. As Jervis [40] explains, this provides strategic flexibility: states can signal commitment to certain ideals while maintaining space to act according to their own preferences. Pehar [41] calls this the “strategic use of incompatible meanings”, producing what Zartman [42] describes as a “constructive illusion of consensus”.

However, the same flexibility that makes normative ambiguity effective in negotiation can later cause conflict in implementation, when those broad moral concepts must be translated into concrete policies [43]. Still, following Schelling [44], such ambiguity may also stabilize cooperation, because it allows each actor to preserve its own interpretation without openly confronting disagreement.

Overall, normative ambiguity complements linguistic and legal ambiguity as a central dimension of strategic ambiguity in diplomacy, showing that in international politics, clarity can divide, whereas carefully managed ambiguity can unite [45],[46].

Methodology

The present study adopts a qualitative, interpretive approach to examine the role of strategic ambiguity in the *Charter on Strategic Partnership between the Republic of Armenia and the United States of*

America. The research combines insights from political linguistics, international relations theory, and legal studies to understand how ambiguity functions as a deliberate strategy in diplomatic communication [47],[48],[49]

The analysis proceeds in two stages. First, a theoretical framework is established to define strategic ambiguity and distinguish its three primary dimensions: linguistic, legal, and normative [50],[51]. This framework provides the tools to systematically identify and interpret ambiguous language in the Charter. Second, a detailed textual analysis of the Charter is conducted. Each section of the document, ranging from the preamble to thematic areas such as partnership principles, economic cooperation, defense and security, democracy and governance, and people-to-people exchanges, is examined for instances of ambiguity [52],[53]. The analysis identifies how specific expressions, terms, and formulations perform multiple functions simultaneously, including signaling commitment, maintaining flexibility, and accommodating divergent interests [54],[55]. Special attention is given to verbs, adjectives, and normative concepts, as well as the interaction between semantic, syntactic, and contextual ambiguity [56],[57].

Throughout the study, strategic ambiguity is treated not as a flaw in communication, but as a purposeful tool embedded in the diplomatic, legal, and normative architecture of the Charter [58] [59]. The methodology emphasizes the interplay between textual analysis and theoretical insights, aiming to reveal how carefully crafted vagueness enables the two countries to achieve political, legal, and normative objectives without creating binding commitments that could hinder implementation [60],[61].

Analysis and Discussion

This section examines the “Charter on Strategic Partnership between the Republic of Armenia and the United States of America” in the context of strategic ambiguity. It aims at identifying and analyzing the practical implementation of linguistic, legal, and normative ambiguity and its

possible interpretations and strategic function in the language of international agreements.

The Charter comprises preamble and five distinct thematic sections: principles of partnership; economic, trade, transport, and energy cooperation; defence and security; democracy, justice, and inclusion; and people-to-people and cultural exchanges. The declarative and cooperative style of the Charter is characteristic of contemporary strategic documents, while the linguistic wording demonstrates considerable semantic ambiguity coupled with legal and normative indeterminacy through open-ended, non-binding formulations performing political and diplomatic functions.

Through the detailed, section-by-section examination of the key provisions in the selected passages of the Charter, the following analysis demonstrates strategic ambiguity in its linguistic, legal, and normative implications simultaneously.

Preamble. In the opening sentence, “Affirm the importance of our relationship as friends and strategic partners,” the phrase “friends and strategic partners” demonstrates warmth, goodwill, and unity (normative concepts) in relations, while simultaneously blurring the boundary between personal ties and the geopolitical terminology. The term “friends” evokes emotional solidarity, whereas “strategic partners” emphasizes pragmatic cooperation.

The combination of linguistic and legal ambiguity is observed in “intend to deepen our partnership” where “deepen” lacks any measurable criteria, while “intend” implies aspiration rather than obligation, thus functioning as a mechanism which allows flexibility in partnership. From the point of view of legal ambiguity, the phrase “broad spectrum” does not define the exact limits and areas of cooperation. The expression “shared values and common interests” is identified as a combination of normative ambiguity (values are not specified) with pragmatic implication (interests); the phrase being intentionally vague and the notions of “value” and “interests” frequently divergent, may function as mechanisms to strengthen partnership. Similarly, the duality is observed in “democracy and economic freedom”, with the unspecified model of democracy and degree of

economic freedom. The use of the expression “defending sovereignty” merely highlights reassurance without any direct commitment, and does not state whose sovereignty is defended and where the threat comes from. It is usually employed in diplomatic language in conflict-prone, context-sensitive situations to avoid possible negative implications directed at third states. The ambiguity behind the phrasing “supporting innovation and technological advances” lies in the latter being too general, without any specification of fields – education, military, economic, etc. – leaving space for cooperation in a wide range of sectors.

Section I: Principles of Partnership. The opening sentence of this section states, “This Charter is based on core basic principles and beliefs shared by both sides.” Broad phrasing which allows room for ambiguity and flexible interpretation is observed in “core principles and beliefs” as it does not specify either the principles or beliefs. Linguistic ambiguity is seen in the terms “peace and stability” which are semantically flexible notions: peace may denote absence of active conflict, or conflict regulation and formal settlement, while “stability” is perceived as security or control in the broad sense. In the sentence, “The United States supports the peace process between Armenia and Azerbaijan, including in the border delimitation process based upon the Alma Ata Declaration of 1991”, the verb “supports”, being semantically and legally ambiguous, is open to multiple interpretations such as approval, assistance in the process, or mediation. It demonstrates goodwill but does not explicitly state the scope and nature, the level and depth of US involvement, and leaves room for maneuvering adapting to certain political circumstances or interests. Perhaps one of the most classic cases of strategic ambiguity encountered in this section is “normalization of relations” in the sentence, “...the United States also intends to continue to advocate for the normalization of relations between Armenia and its neighbours.” Despite its positive and peace-oriented intent in normative sense, the phrase is inherently ambiguous: ‘normal’ relations can range from cessation of hostilities and limited dialogue to opening of borders, development of trade, and establishment of full diplomatic relations. Another word with ambiguous legal/normative loading is the verb

“advocate” which does not explicitly specify the US role (supporter or guarantor) in the process, thus avoiding legal commitment. The sentence also mentions “neighbours” without clearly stating the countries implied, a widespread practice in politically sensitive and delicate contexts.

Section II: Economic, Trade, Transport, and Energy Cooperation.

The section opens with a sentence: “Armenia and the United States intend to expand cooperation to enhance job creation and economic growth, support economic/market reform and liberalization, promote transport connectivity, improve the bilateral business climate, and improve market access for goods and services.” The examination of the sentence reveals flexibility in linguistically ambiguous expression “support economic/market reform and liberalization” as “reform” and “liberalization” can denote differing degrees of structural change, ranging from limited policy adjustments to extensive privatization. The analysis further demonstrates the fusion of linguistic and legal ambiguities in expressions “intend to expand cooperation” and “promote transport connectivity”: the verbs “intend”, “expand”, and “promote” are highly adaptable to various interpretations as they are undefined in scope and express political intention rather than binding and funding obligation, while “connectivity”, though intended at cooperation yet being vague, fails to specify projects or commitments which may refer to either logistics, or diplomatic coordination. Linguistically and legally ambiguous expression “identify strategic opportunities” is imprecise and may range from political, economic, to technological initiatives without any clarity and obligation, while the verb “identify” suggests tentative and consultative stages, which makes it non-binding without any legal undertakings. Furthermore, in “...Armenia and the United States intend to explore opportunities to increase and diversify Armenia’s energy production and supplies”, the verbs “explore” and ‘diversify’ indicate potential expansion, but are indeterminate as they fail to specify their reference in terms of future investment projects, or new partnerships, thus leaving the scope and depth of cooperation undefined. Similarly, in “...Armenia and the United States intend to deepen cooperation”, the verb “deepen” is inherently imprecise

lacking specification regarding the duration or the extent of cooperation. In “Armenia and the United States intend to initiate a working group...” the ambiguity “to initiate a working group” lies in the procedural sphere and indicates cooperation and dialogue without formal obligations. With reference to normative ambiguity, the section contains such words as “freedom”, “prosperity”, “resilient”, “secure”, which are normative qualitative concepts and values that are flexible, subjective, and therefore, adaptable to various policy frameworks.

Section III: Defense and Security. “Defense and security cooperation between Armenia and the United States...” in Section III introduces the intentionally ambiguous phrase “defense and security cooperation”, which definitely signals collaboration yet fails to identify the scope, depth, and sensitivity of cooperation and may cover a range of activities such as: military training and cooperation through joint exercises and exchange programs, sales of weapons and equipment, intelligence sharing through the exchange of information or mere coordination on terrorism, joint efforts to counter cyber threats, and other activities. The verb “expand” in “expand the scope of defense and security cooperation programs”, though indicating progress and positive movement, avoids concrete promises and lacks clear benchmarks: being flexible and elastic, it does not specify either the extent of cooperation or the inclusion of new strategic areas. From the point of view of legal ambiguity, the term “consultations” in “establishing bilateral defense consultations” expresses soft commitment lacking any enforceable or binding agreement. Normative ambiguity is evident in this section in phrases “professional military assistance training” and “rights-respecting digital future”: the unspecified and vague concept of the word “professional” moderates military cooperation rhetoric, while the undefined human-rights standards in cybersecurity balance individual liberty and security discourses without creating specific obligations. The combination of linguistic and legal ambiguity is discernible in the phrase “Armenia’s integration into Euro-Atlantic institutions”. From the point of view of linguistic ambiguity, it may refer either to cooperation with the NATO, or EU programs, or general Western alignment, thus intentionally softening

the language to avoid negative reaction or resistance from regional actors. From the perspective of legal ambiguity, the expression signals Euro-Atlantic aspirations but omits any binding pathway or timeline, or any specified institutional framework, thereby preserving neutrality regarding NATO expansion, which, in its turn, helps to avoid potential tensions with regional and international partners.

Section IV: Strengthening Democracy, Justice, and Inclusion. The verb “commit” in “...our two countries commit to work together to foster the rule of law buttressed by an impartial, independent judiciary, and to further strengthen freedom of expression, including for the media, good governance and accountability ...” illustrates both linguistic and legal ambiguity: it can mean either active collaboration or general goodwill, and does not clearly specify the actions to be taken, neither it determines who will perform them or in what time limits. Legally, it lacks binding political will or legal responsibilities showing no enforcement, or sanctions. The combination of legal and normative ambiguities in the same sentence is seen in “rule of law” and “independent judiciary”: legally, these concepts represent constitutional norms and principles, but the Charter does not specify legal commitment to institutional reform; normatively, as core symbols of democratic governance, they represent values commonly associated with Western governance. Similarly, the sentence refers to “freedom of expression, including for the media” which combines legal right and normative value. Legally, freedom of expression is a recognized right, yet it does not specify its enforcement mechanisms, possible exceptions, or the scope and limits of this right; normatively, it represents Western democratic values avoiding reference to such controversial issues as the regulation of hate speech. The sentence also contains the normative ambiguity embodied in “good governance”, which reflects Western ideal associated with reform-oriented values and diverse interpretations – openness, transparency, integrity, decentralization, efficiency – but does not specify prescriptive requirements with regard to institutional change, legal timeline or a specific model.

In the sentence “Armenia and the United States plan to work together to improve the legal and regulatory frameworks for human rights protections in Armenia...” the linguistically and legally ambiguous wording “work together” lacks clarity regarding the extent, the exact way, method and the instruments of the cooperation, which makes it undefined. From the legal point of view, the expression permits considerable flexibility in implementation as it does not specify procedural mechanisms, legislative targets, such as joint commissions, or timeframe for achieving these goals.

A combination of linguistic, legal, and normative ambiguities is evident in the sentence “Armenia and the United States plan to work together to increase political pluralism and transparent, fair political competition in Armenia...”, with reference to such values as “political pluralism” and “fair competition” which demonstrate symbolic commitment. Linguistically, “pluralism” is a vague concept, which fails to specify whether it refers to merely additional parties or opposition parties, media diversity or electoral reform. Legally, the notions of “pluralism” and “transparent, fair political competition” relate to constitutional principles and electoral rules regulating the operations of political actors, but being ambiguously formulated, they fail to specify the legal standards, procedures, or enforcement mechanisms thus invoking multiple constitutional and electoral interpretations. Normatively, these expressions refer to democratic values and fairness which signal general ethical commitments such as openness and equal political participation. But the ambiguity inherent in them may lead to each party to rely on different democratic ideals or functional standards.

Similarly, in the sentence “Armenia and the United States recognize the importance of building resilient, inclusive societies...” the term ‘inclusive’ is a combination of linguistic and normative ambiguity which lacks concrete parameters. Linguistically, it is undefined and fails to indicate the target groups, inclusion mechanisms, and the sectors in which this principle should be implemented – education, social welfare, governance, etc. Although normatively it refers to such values as social integration, minority rights, gender equality, which lend them positive

connotation, its content is open-ended so actors may prioritize different dimensions of the inclusion without departing from its general idea.

Section V: Increasing People-to-People and Cultural Exchanges. Section V mainly focuses on cultural diplomacy where strategic ambiguity is used to express goodwill without creating binding or measurable commitments. In terms of linguistic ambiguities, the emotive verbs like “desire”, “promote”, “enhance” are used to convey harmony and shared objectives aimed at public diplomacy audiences. A legally cautious formulation is evident in the sentence: “The United States plans to facilitate the application process for US visas consistent with US laws and procedures...”, which underscores the United States’ full discretion and control over immigration policy, documentation requirements, and the legal conditions for admission. The ambiguous expression “consistent with US laws and procedures” indirectly reaffirms that immigration outcomes are determined by the US and not foreign states, legally safeguarding US sovereignty over immigration matters. The section also employs deliberately open-ended language. For example, “...both sides intend to promote further cultural and social exchanges and activities through initiatives such as the Fulbright Program, and others” doesn’t explain which programs are included, how they will be carried out, or what results are expected. This kind of vagueness allows both countries to show that they want to cooperate, without making any firm promises about expanding or formalizing these initiatives. Legally, such vagueness provides both countries with significant flexibility.

In addition, the general references to “cultural and social exchanges” highlight a focus on soft-power engagement rather than legal obligations. By not specifying funding, program size, or administrative responsibilities, the section allows each country to interpret cooperation in a way that fits their own priorities, resources, and political considerations. At the same time, the broad formulation conveys a shared intention to strengthen social and cultural ties, even though the means and scope of such efforts remain undefined.

Conclusion

The analysis of the Charter on Strategic Partnership between Armenia and the United States illustrates that strategic ambiguity is a functional, purposeful, and multifaceted tool in diplomatic communication. Ambiguity – linguistic, legal, and normative – is incorporated in the text of the Charter to signal goodwill and provide maneuverability for the parties to sustain cooperation without binding obligations. Through expressions such as “defending sovereignty”, “promote peace and stability”, “collaboration”, “support joint initiatives”, deliberately vague language enables each party to align with priorities and maintain strategic flexibility. Legal ambiguity offers procedural and operational freedom, while normative ambiguity intertwines shared values aimed at projecting consensus and unity.

Integrating theoretical insights with close textual analysis of the Charter confirms that ambiguity is a calculated strategy rather than a flaw; it demonstrates how deliberately employed indeterminacy achieves symbolic consensus and effectively promotes cooperation in complex, sensitive regional contexts. Understanding the interaction of linguistic, legal, and normative ambiguity provides insights into the instruments used by states to manage uncertainty in international relations, as well as contributes to broader understanding of diplomatic language.

REFERENCES

1. Strategic Partnership Charter between the Republic of Armenia and the United States of America // Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Armenia. (2025). URL: <https://www.mfa.am/en/press-releases/2025/01/14/the/13032>
2. *Schelling T.* The strategy of conflict // “Harvard University Press”, 1960.
3. *Kurizaki S.* Efficient secrecy: Public versus private threats in crisis diplomacy // “American Political Science Review”, 101 (3), 2007. PP. 543–558.
4. *Jervis R.* Perception and misperception in international politics // “Princeton University Press”, 1976.

5. *Cohen R.* Negotiating across cultures: Communication obstacles in international diplomacy (2nd ed.) // “United States Institute of Peace Press”, 1997.
6. *Zartman I.* Negotiation and conflict management: Essays on theory and practice. Routledge, 2008.
7. *Fischhendler I.* When ambiguity in treaty design becomes destructive: A study of transboundary water // “Global Environmental Politics”, 8 (1), 2008. PP. 111–136.
8. *Hummel P.* Strategic ambiguity and military capacity with multiple adversaries // “Journal of Theoretical Politics”, 27 (2), 2015. PP. 288–300.
9. Ibid.
10. *Jervis R.* Perception and misperception in international politics // “Princeton University Press”, 1976.
11. *Zartman I.* Negotiation and conflict management: Essays on theory and practice. Routledge, 2008.
12. *Cohen R.* Negotiating across cultures: Communication obstacles in international diplomacy (2nd ed.) // “United States Institute of Peace Press”, 1997.
13. *Kurizaki S.* Efficient secrecy: Public versus private threats in crisis diplomacy // “American Political Science Review”, 101 (3), 2007. PP. 543–558.
14. *Munson R.* The way of words. Houghton Mifflin, 1976.
15. *Gillon B.S.* Ambiguity, generality, and indeterminacy: Tests and definitions // “Synthese”, 85, (1990). PP. 391–416.
16. *Kennedy C.* Ambiguity and vagueness // In C. Maienborn, K. von Heusinger, & P. Portner (Eds.), Semantics, 2011. PP. 507–535.
17. *Pehar D.* Use of ambiguities in peace agreements // In J. Kurbalija & H. Slavik (Eds.), Language and diplomacy. DiploFoundation, 2001. PP. 163–200.
18. *Munson R.* The way of words. Houghton Mifflin, 1976.
19. *Awwad M.* The ambiguous nature of language // “International Journal of Social Science and Education”, 7 (4), 2017. PP. 195–201.
20. *Schelling T.C.* The strategy of conflict // “Harvard University Press”, 1960.
21. *Kurizaki S.* Efficient secrecy: Public versus private threats in crisis diplomacy // “American Political Science Review”, 101 (3), 2007. PP. 543–558.
22. *Jervis R.* Perception and misperception in international politics // “Princeton University Press”, 1976.

23. *Cohen R.* Negotiating across cultures: Communication obstacles in international diplomacy (2nd ed.) // “United States Institute of Peace Press”, 1997.
24. *Zartman I.* Negotiation and conflict management: Essays on theory and practice. “Routledge”, 2008.
25. *Allan K., & Burridge K.* Forbidden words // “Cambridge University Press”, 2006.
26. *Fischhendler I.* When ambiguity in treaty design becomes destructive: A study of transboundary water // “Global Environmental Politics”, 8 (1), 2008. PP. 111–136.
27. *Pehar D.* Use of ambiguities in peace agreements // In J. Kurbalija & H. Slavik (Eds.), Language and diplomacy. DiploFoundation, 2001. PP. 163–200.
28. *Hummel P.* Strategic ambiguity and military capacity with multiple adversaries // “Journal of Theoretical Politics”, 27 (2), 2015. PP. 288–300.
29. *Lanius D.* Strategic indeterminacy in the law // “Oxford University Press”, 2019.
30. *Abbott K., Snidal D.* Hard and soft law in international governance // “International Organization”, 54 (3), 2000. PP. 421–456.
31. *Dunahoo K.* Avoiding inadvertent syntactic ambiguity in legal draftsmanship // “Drake Law Review”, 20 (1), 1970. PP. 137–158.
32. *Poscher R.* Ambiguity and vagueness in legal interpretation // The Oxford handbook of language and law // “Oxford University Press”, 2012. PP. 129–144.
33. *Lanius D.* Strategic indeterminacy in the law // “Oxford University Press”, 2019.
34. *Kartalova S.* Ambiguity in EU law: A linguistic and legal analysis. “Routledge”, 2023.
35. *Goh E.* Constructing the U.S. rapprochement with China, 1961–1974 // “Cambridge University Press”, 2005.
36. *Pehar D.* Use of ambiguities in peace agreements // In J. Kurbalija & H. Slavik (Eds.), Language and diplomacy. DiploFoundation, 2001. PP. 163–200.
37. *Fischhendler I.* When ambiguity in treaty design becomes destructive: A study of transboundary water // “Global Environmental Politics”, 8 (1), 2008. PP. 111–136.

38. *Zartman I.* Negotiation and conflict management: Essays on theory and practice. "Routledge", 2008.
39. *Kurizaki S.* Efficient secrecy: Public versus private threats in crisis diplomacy // "American Political Science Review", 101(3), 2007. PP. 543–558.
40. *Jervis R.* Perception and misperception in international politics // "Princeton University Press", 1976.
41. *Pehar D.* Use of ambiguities in peace agreements // In J. Kurbalija & H. Slavik (Eds.), Language and diplomacy. DiploFoundation, 2001. PP. 163–200.
42. *Zartman I.* Negotiation and conflict management: Essays on theory and practice. "Routledge", 2008.
43. *Jervis R.* Perception and misperception in international politics // "Princeton University Press", 1976.
44. *Schelling T.C.* The strategy of conflict // "Harvard University Press", 1960.
45. *Cohen R.* Negotiating across cultures: Communication obstacles in international diplomacy (2nd ed.) // "United States Institute of Peace Press", 1997.
46. *Zartman I.* Negotiation and conflict management: Essays on theory and practice. Routledge, 2008.
47. *Allan K., & Burridge K.* Forbidden words // "Cambridge University Press", 2006.
48. *Kurizaki S.* Efficient secrecy: Public versus private threats in crisis diplomacy // "American Political Science Review", 101(3), 2007. PP. 543–558.
49. *Zartman I.* Negotiation and conflict management: Essays on theory and practice. "Routledge", 2008.
50. *Schelling T.* The strategy of conflict // "Harvard University Press", 1960.
51. *Pehar D.* Use of ambiguities in peace agreements // In J. Kurbalija & H. Slavik (Eds.), Language and diplomacy, DiploFoundation, 2001. PP. 163–200.
52. *Jervis R.* Perception and misperception in international politics // "Princeton University Press", 1976.
53. *Cohen R.* Negotiating across cultures: Communication obstacles in international diplomacy (2nd ed.) // "United States Institute of Peace Press", 1997.
54. *Fischhendler I.* When ambiguity in treaty design becomes destructive: A study of transboundary water // "Global Environmental Politics", 8 (1), 2008. PP. 111–136.

55. *Pehar D.* Use of ambiguities in peace agreements // In J. Kurbalija & H. Slavik (Eds.), *Language and diplomacy*, DiploFoundation, 2001. PP. 163–200.
56. *Munson R.* The way of words. “Houghton Mifflin”, 1976.
57. *Awwad M.* The ambiguous nature of language // “International Journal of Social Science and Education”, 7(4), 2017. PP. 195–201.
58. *Zartman I.* Negotiation and conflict management: Essays on theory and practice. “Routledge”, 2008.
59. *Kurizaki S.* Efficient secrecy: Public versus private threats in crisis diplomacy // “American Political Science Review”, 101(3), 2007. PP. 543–558.
60. *Jervis R.* Perception and misperception in international politics // “Princeton University Press”, 1976.
61. *Cohen R.* Negotiating across cultures: Communication obstacles in international diplomacy (2nd ed.) // “United States Institute of Peace Press”, 1997.

**СТРАТЕГИЧЕСКАЯ НЕОПРЕДЕЛЕННОСТЬ
В ДИПЛОМАТИЧЕСКОМ ДИСКУРСЕ: ИССЛЕДОВАНИЕ
ХАРТИИ АРМЕНИЯ-США**

М.Г. Мкртчян, А.А. Мартиросян

Ереванский государственный университет

АННОТАЦИЯ

Язык в дипломатических текстах выполняет функцию не только средства передачи политических предпочтений, но и стратегического инструмента, посредством которого государства управляют неопределенностью, примиряют конкурирующие интересы и поддерживают сотрудничество. В статье исследуется роль стратегической двусмысленности в Хартии о стратегическом партнерстве между Республикой Армения и Соединенными Штатами Америки и обосновывается положение о том, что двусмысленность намеренно заложена в документ как функциональный дипломатический

инструмент, а не как коммуникативный недостаток. Опираясь на политическую лингвистику, теорию международных отношений и правоведение, исследование концептуализирует стратегическую двусмысленность в трех взаимосвязанных измерениях – лингвистическом, правовом и нормативном. Посредством качественного текстового анализа в статье демонстрируется, каким образом расплывчатые и открытые формулировки позволяют обеим сторонам сигнализировать о приверженности курсу, проецировать общие ценности и выражать готовность к сотрудничеству, избегая жестких обязательств или политически чувствительной конкретизации. Результаты исследования показывают, что двусмысленность одновременно выполняет функции заверения, сдерживания и сохранения стратегической гибкости, особенно в сферах безопасности, региональной стабильности, демократического управления и экономического сотрудничества. Фокусируясь на двустороннем соглашении между малым государством и великой державой, данное исследование вносит вклад в существующую научную литературу, иллюстрируя, как многослойные формы двусмысленности функционируют в рамках единого дипломатического текста.

Ключевые слова: стратегическая неопределенность, дипломатический дискурс, лингвистическая амбивалентность, правовая двусмысленность, нормативная двусмысленность.