EDITORIAL PREFACE: THE USE OF GENERATIVE ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN ACADEMIC WRITING AND ETHICS: THE CONDITION OF HYPER-PLAGIARISM

Dear Readers

We are proud to present to you the 20th issue of the *Cyberpolitik Journal*. It is a great honor for all of us to continue our journey that we started nine years ago without interruption. As the digital world grows every day and every second, new developments and new technologies emerge, we are trying to read and understand this domain within our limitations.

In an era dominated by the omnipresence of technology and interconnected digital ecosystems, the role of artificial intelligence cannot be overstated. The articles featured in the volume 20th issue of the *Cyberpolitik Journal* bring forth a compelling narrative, shedding light on diverse facets of cyber landscapes, from ethical considerations and human rights to human rights, from cybersecurity to data protection in digitally enriched environment.

The use of artificial intelligence in academic writing processes has increased at an unprecedented pace in recent years. While artificial intelligence offers technical conveniences and expanded access to academic literature, it simultaneously carries a serious potential to undermine academic production skills and fundamental principles of academic ethics. Academic production is, by its very nature, required to be original, written in an academic style, and grounded in objective and verifiable scientific evidence. Academic texts are the product of deep intellectual labor and are therefore regarded as reliable and credible.

However, the rapid and largely uncontrolled proliferation of generative artificial intelligence tools has led to the subordination of academic ethics to pragmatic considerations, placing academic writing under serious threat. First and foremost, generative artificial intelligence does not produce original ideas or thoughts. At its core, it merely processes and recombines information already present in existing databases. From a classical perspective, such production is entirely secondary in nature and cannot claim originality. Consequently, the direct and uncritical use of texts generated by artificial intelligence clearly falls within the scope of plagiarism.

This situation is more problematic than traditional forms of plagiarism. Generative artificial intelligence is capable of producing inaccurate, incomplete, or entirely fabricated information while using a highly persuasive and fluent language. Such outputs inherently carry risks of disinformation, misinformation, and information manipulation. If the researcher lacks sufficient expertise in the relevant field or fails to critically examine the generated text, the incorporation of entirely fictional content into academic work becomes almost inevitable. Unfortunately, current observations indicate that such erroneous and unverified uses are becoming increasingly widespread.

A third—and perhaps the most critical—problem concerns the dimension of labor. Even in cases of traditional plagiarism, the researcher typically engages in some level of academic effort: conducting research, accessing sources, and exerting at least a minimal degree of cognitive labor. In contrast, with the extensive use of generative artificial intelligence, even this minimal effort is largely eliminated. The production process is almost entirely delegated to the machine, while the researcher's contribution becomes negligible. In such cases, neither the idea nor the text belongs to the researcher, nor is academic responsibility meaningfully assumed. Academic production thus turns into an ethically problematic activity with an ambiguous or absent subject.

Thus, uncontrolled and unlimited use of artificial intelligence in academic work does not merely result in individual ethical violations; it constitutes a structural threat to the credibility of academia and to the epistemological value of knowledge itself. Although traditional plagiarism and artificial intelligence–based plagiarism are fundamentally different, placing them on the same level is neither accurate nor fair. Artificial intelligence increasingly assumes the role of the first author. Therefore, describing such works simply as plagiarism is insufficient. Instead, it is more appropriate to define these labor-free, error-prone, and ready-made artificial intelligence products as **hyper-plagiarism.** This form of digital plagiarism far exceeds traditional plagiarism in scale and severity and clearly constitutes an unethical practice.

At its core, as argued by many liberal thinkers—most notably John Locke—property is fundamentally grounded in labor. Through labor, individuals mix their efforts with nature and thereby transform something into property. Intellectual property is similarly shaped and constructed through labor. Excessive use of artificial intelligence, however, eliminates this

labor. Under such circumstances, whatever is produced can scarcely be regarded as property at all.

Moreover, artificial intelligence use is largely devoid of the critical thinking that lies at the heart of academic writing. Critical thinking is a driving force of intellectual advancement. Generative artificial intelligence not only undermines critical thinking but effectively eliminates thinking altogether. Researchers increasingly resort to the comfort of artificial intelligence, allowing it to "think" on their behalf instead of engaging in intellectual and especially critical reflection themselves. As this reliance deepens, individuals gradually distance themselves from thinking, resulting in intellectual stagnation and mental passivity. In this sense, artificial intelligence contributes to a form of cognitive regression, contradicting the long-held assumption that human evolution proceeds toward greater intellectual capacity.

Furthermore, artificial intelligence undermines the principle of objectivity, one of the most defining features of academic production. Researchers strive—however imperfectly—to interpret available data as objectively and impartially as possible. Yet artificial intelligence algorithms are typically designed in ways that reflect the preferences, interests, and priorities of those who develop or control them. On many controversial issues, artificial intelligence provides one-sided interpretations, thereby obstructing the distinction between right and wrong and undermining the collective pursuit of more accurate and beneficial knowledge.

Artificial intelligence also erodes the reliability of academic writing. While drawing from existing databases, it can simultaneously generate information that is entirely irrelevant or incorrect, thereby producing disinformation. Disinformation, misinformation, and information manipulation ultimately undermine one of the core purposes of scientific production: contributing to solutions for human problems. Rather than serving this goal, such distorted information generates new problems and deepens existing ones.

That said, it would be incorrect to conclude that artificial intelligence is inherently harmful or entirely unsuitable for academic work. When used correctly and responsibly, artificial intelligence can function as a valuable analytical tool. Scholars may consult it for ideas or use it to enrich their existing arguments. If artificial intelligence is purposefully trained, transparently used, and carefully controlled, it can be beneficial. Researchers are ethically obliged to clearly disclose the extent and manner of its use. This includes specifying whether artificial intelligence was employed for language editing, translation, structuring, or idea generation, and to what degree.

When used transparently and honestly, such practices do not constitute ethical violations and may even enhance the reliability and quality of research. However, in many submissions to journals or edited volumes, authors claim that artificial intelligence was used solely for editing or translation. Yet when subjected to artificial intelligence detection tools, careful scrutiny, and comparison with the authors' previous works, substantial portions of the text are revealed to have been generated by artificial intelligence. This not only fosters intellectual laziness but also encourages dishonesty, resulting in a comprehensive ethical failure.

For these reasons, I argue that academic texts in which artificial intelligence functions as the primary author or is used extensively should not be labeled merely as plagiarism. The appropriate term should instead be **hyper-plagiarism**, and such works should be categorically rejected—at least under current technological conditions. Future developments may allow for clearer distinctions between human and artificial intelligence–generated content, and new ethical frameworks may emerge. However, the present argument is grounded in the existing technological context and the current mode of generative artificial intelligence use. While it remains uncertain whether the concept of hyper-plagiarism fully captures the phenomenon, a conceptual tool is clearly needed to distinguish between traditional, limited, labor-based plagiarism and entirely labor-free, thoughtless artificial intelligence–generated texts. In this regard, the concept of **hyper-plagiarism** may serve as a useful analytical framework.

Contents of the New Issue

In recent decades, the rapid evolution of digital technology has fundamentally transformed the way we live, work, and communicate. As the digital domain continues to expand, it brings with it a myriad of opportunities that promise to enhance our global connectedness, increase access to information, and democratize knowledge. However, alongside these benefits, the digital age also presents significant ethical dilemmas that challenge our moral frameworks and societal norms. As the contributors to this issue of *Cyberpolitik Journal* explore, the ethics of the digital domain are multifaceted and require careful consideration from scholars, policymakers, and practitioners alike.[1]

In this context, the first article of the new issue is handled by Muhammet Ali Demir with the title "*Digital Shield: The Protective Role Against Human Rights Violations in Cyber*

[1] ChatGPT has been used for translation and language polishing purpose in this editorial piece.

Interventions. The article explores the potential of cyber humanitarian intervention within the framework of the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) in preventing and halting mass atrocity crimes. Moving beyond long-standing debates on the sovereignty implications and operational risks of traditional military interventions, the article focuses on the emerging opportunities offered by digital technologies and assesses how cyber operations may contribute to the implementation of R2P. Drawing on a normative analytical framework that integrates international law, cybersecurity, and humanitarian intervention scholarship, the study examines the role of cyber measures in safeguarding access to information, protecting communication infrastructures, and constraining the digital capacities of perpetrators. It further identifies key legal, ethical, and practical challenges- such as sovereignty concerns, attribution problems, limited international cooperation, and accountability gaps- arguing that cyber humanitarian intervention functions as a complementary, rather than a standalone, mechanism for advancing R2P.

Carmen-Gabriela Bostan's Study, *"Artificial Intellienge in Education: Regulation, Ethics, and Security*", offers an in-depth examination of the implications of using AI in digital education, with a particular focus on algorithmic transparency, data protection and institutional responsibility. The author analyses how AI systems influence decision making x processes in teaching and learning, highlighting the need for clear public policies to regulate their implementation. Drawing on international best practices and case studies from Finland, Estonia and Romania, the study proposes strategies for the responsible use of AI, including training teachers in digital ethics, developing governance frameworks based on risk assessment and ensuring human oversight of algorithmic decisions. Through an interdisciplinary approach that combines digital pedagogy, ethical standards and legal safeguards, the research argues for aligning technological innovation with democratic values and human rights, so that AI becomes a tool for support and empowerment in education. Overall, the paper provides a coherent framework for the ethical and safe integration of artificial intelligence into educational systems, advocating for a sustainable and inclusive approach to the use of intelligent technologies in learning environments.

The study, titled "*AI-Driven Disinformation as A Global Cybersecurity Threat to Democratic Systems",* written by Murat Emeç, analysiz that AI-generated disinformation has become a new form of cybersecurity threat that targets not technical infrastructure but the cognitive foundations of democracy—public trust, perception, and informed decision-making. It shows how generative AI amplifies false narratives with unprecedented speed, scale, and realism,

weakening electoral processes and institutional credibility. The study concludes that democracies must adopt a holistic security approach that strengthens cognitive security and societal resilience alongside technical measures.

The article "*Dijital Kapitalizm Çağında Yapay Zekâ, Gözetim ve İnsan Hakları: Mahremiyetin ve Özgürlüğün Geleceği"* by Demet Şefika Mangır argues that author addresses the increasing importance of protecting human rights and freedoms. She particularly emphasizes the growing surveillance systems resulting from the increasing integration of technological tools with AI. She analyzes the threats these systems pose to both fundamental rights and freedoms, as well as the right to privacy. In this context, the author presents a theoretical framework that intersects the economic logic of digital capitalism with the social impacts of surveillance technologies, examining how human rights are transformed in the digital age.

The last article "*Yapay Zeka ve Küresel Güvenlik Mimarisi: Güç Dağılımının Mekanizmaları ve Yapısal Dönüşüm*" by Kürşat Kan examines how artificial intelligence is reshaping the global security architecture. It approaches AI not merely as a technical tool but as a capability that accelerates and reconfigures power relations. The study argues that competition is shifting from model success to strategic resources, including digital infrastructure, data, compute capacity, and advanced chip supply chains. It compares emerging coordination challenges across institutions such as NATO, the EU, and the UN. It also explains this transformation through a traceable analytical framework built around specific mechanisms. Ultimately, it maintains that modular governance instruments are more practical when global regimes become gridlocked. In doing so, the article offers concrete policy options for risk reduction and norm-making .

The first opinion was written by Mihai Sebe, Alexandru Georgescu, and Eliza Vaş. Titled "Democracy in the Age of AI: The Fine Line Between the Known and the Unknown," their opinion paper offers a significant global perspective on AI and democracy, making a substantial contribution to both this issue of the journal and the literature as a whole.

In the second commentary, Merve Suna Özal-Özcan offers fascinating insights with his commentary titled *" World-System Hierarchies and AI-Driven Security Competition."* The second commentary is a powerful and original piece that blends world systems theory with offensive realism in the context of artificial intelligence. In her opinion, the author offers the reader a crucial perspective on the transition between the AI world and the classical world.

Finally, an important book reviews provide valuable insights into ethics. Selim Mürsel Yavuz reviews the book "*Humans in the Cyber Loop: Perspectives on Social Cybersecurity* " (Edited by Dorota Domalewska, Aleksandra Gasztold, and Agnieszka Wrońska) (2025). This study offers a comprehensive overview of the concept of cyber loop in cybersecurity studies.

In summary, the articles, commentaries, and book review in this issue contribute to our better understanding of the opportunities and risks presented by the digital age. These contents, prepared with academic depth and visual integrity, aim to open doors to interdisciplinary thought and new areas of discussion. We hope they inspire our readers and open new horizons.

Nezir AKYEŞİLMEN, Ph.D

Editor-in-Chief