РОЗДІЛ 4. ПОЛІТИЧНІ ПРОБЛЕМИ МІЖНАРОДНИХ СИСТЕМ ТА ГЛОБАЛЬНОГО РОЗВИТКУ

Vinnykova Nataliya Anatoliivna

Global rivalry for artificial intelligence

UDC 327.8:004.8
DOI https://doi.org/10.24195/2414-9616.2025-2.28

Vinnykova Nataliya Anatoliivna
Doctor of Political Sciences,
Associate Professor,
Professor of International Relations Department
V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University
Maidan Svobody, 4, Kharkiv, Ukraine
ORCID: 0000-0001-5941-7562

This study explores the dynamic relationship between international regulatory frameworks and national artificial intelligence (AI) policymaking, focusing on the ongoing techno-rivalry among the United States, China, and the European Union. It aims to uncover the correlation between multilateral and unilateral approaches in AI governance and assess how unilateral strategies might intensify geopolitical tensions. The research employs case studies to examine approaches among global AI leaders: the U.S., China, and the EU. To conduct a comparative analysis, a multidimensional matrix evaluates the regulatory frameworks based on criteria like scope, enforcement, compliance, stakeholder involvement, and adaptability. This comprehensive framework seeks to assess the broader impacts of AI regulations on technological advancement and international dynamics. The analysis reveals divergency in AI policy making, that affect the state of international affairs. The EU emphasizes harmonization and ethical considerations through a comprehensive framework, though its rigidity may hinder innovation and smaller enterprises. The U.S. adopts a decentralized, sector-specific model that fosters flexibility but risks regulatory fragmentation. China's centralized, state-driven strategy enables rapid AI development and geopolitical influence but limits adaptability and diverse stakeholder involvement. Multilateral approaches, like the EU's harmonized framework, promote ethical standards and international collaboration. However, unilateral strategies from the U.S. and China prioritize national interests, exacerbating competition and deterring cooperative efforts for universal norms. The focus on unilateralism fuels geopolitical rivalry, creating a fragmented global regulatory environment that complicates cross-border innovation and amplifies inter-state tensions at the international arena.

Key words: *artificial intelligence, international regulation, unilateral approach, multilateralism, United States, European Union, China, techno-rivalry.*

Introduction. Prospects and perils of the digital age are widely recognized. In the context of escalating armed conflicts worldwide, the utilization of cutting-edge technologies in the international sphere has become a paramount concern on the global agenda. Technological dominance has always been a cornerstone in global power struggles, and today, artificial intelligence (AI) lies at the heart of the strategic competition between major geopolitical powers. This adaptable technology extends beyond traditional military applications, influencing economic policies, intelligence operations, and cyber activities. As it become integral to national security strategies, AI reshapes global power dynamics, fostering both cooperation and rivalry between nations. Furthermore, the dual-use nature of AI – where advancements in civilian domains simultaneously bolster military capabilities – introduces added complexity to the interconnected realms of geopolitics, economics, military strategy, and broader strategic considerations.

The recent advancements in artificial intelligence and machine learning have spurred a surge of scholarly interest in evaluating the impact of this technology on international relations. Consequently, topical discussions within the research and expert communities concerning AI's role in international affairs are increasingly focused on assessing regulatory approaches for harnessing this technology. This discussion aligns with the highly debated issue of technological rivalry between the United States and China, which is a key factor shaping the configuration of the digital world order (Aguiar P. [1], Patil S. and Gupta S. [10]). Indeed, the U.S. and China hold top positions in global AI ranking [14]. That justified by huge investments, diversified global infrastructure, and commercial development and scale of influence. Assessing the starting points of these two «digital empires» reveals the underlying impetus of this rivalry, which is rooted in the pursuit of geopolitical supremacy and the desire to strengthen national defense and security capabilities.

Another narrative in AI studies is the issue of digital sovereignty. This concept delineates on locally owned, controlled and operated innovation ecosystems [9]. This task becomes particularly complex when addressing multilateral structures like the European Union. The idea of «digital sovereignty» has emerged, highlighting the EU's capacity to establish and regulate its digital infrastructure, as well as utilizing digital tools to enhance security governance across Europe [3, p. 337].

Nonetheless, simplifying the rivalry to a «who leads in AI» narrative fails to capture its intricate nature. It is a nuanced and multidimensional con-

test influenced by diverse factors, including geopolitical dynamics, data access, talent pools, regulatory frameworks, and technological resources. However, will global powers be able to restrain the one-sidedness of actions on the production and implementation of artificial intelligence by states and BigTechs and lay the regulatory and institutional basis of the new digital world order? The search for balance between face-paced technical progress and an adequate international regulatory framework is still in progress.

Purpose and objectives. This research investigates the interplay between international regulatory frameworks and the actual policy-making concerning AI governance. The central **purpose** is to reveal the correlation between multilateral and unilateral approaches to AI policymaking within the ongoing techno-rivalry between the United States, China, and the European Union, and to assess how the current emphasis on unilateral strategies may exacerbate geopolitical tensions. The research goal presupposes the following objectives: 1) to investigate the AI-policy-shaping in the United States, China, and the European Union regarding its unilateral or/ and multilateral nature; 2) to compare approaches of these global actors to the AI strategies implementation.

Research methods. This analysis will reveal the complex interplay between international and national AI policymaking, and between developments in AI legal regulatory framework and institutionalization of governance. By employing method of case study, the research aims to track down how AI global leaders – the United States and China – align domestic and foreign policies with international settings. This exploration will devote particular attention to the European Union's role in shaping AI policymaking on international scale. Building on this focus, we will examine the European Union's position as a multilateral organization that has implemented a unique, legally binding regulatory framework.

In order to provide comparative analysis on the unilateral or multilateral entrenched in AI international strategies of the U.S., China and the EU the criteria have to be set. The first and foremost the assessment of various regulatory frameworks and their prioritization of AI-related issues is vital for the identification of gaps and overlaps. Therefore, it can be identified through the *scope,* i.e. the the breadth and comprehensiveness of AI regulations. The next parameter that can be applied should determine how regulations are implemented and monitored – *enforcement.* It also highlights the challenges and strengths of centralized versus decentralized enforcement. The assessment of the enforceability and acceptance of regulations is vital for evaluating their overall impact and effectiveness. Thus, the criteria of *compliance* in order to indicate the extent to which regulations are adhered to by the relevant entities.

In addition, *stakeholder involvement* is a key consideration, as it provides valuable insights into the decision-making process and evaluates the extent to which regulations incorporate diverse perspectives and interests. To assess the adaptability of regulatory frameworks to technological advancements and changing circumstances, the criterion of *innovation and flexibility* is introduced. This parameter is instrumental in understanding how different regulatory approaches either foster or impede technological progress and economic development. By examining these parameters collectively, it becomes possible to evaluate the broader impact of AI regulations on development, deployment, and international dynamics.

Based on the defined criteria, a multidimensional matrix will be applied to analyse the regulatory approaches of the U.S., China, and the EU. Ultimately, this framework aims to provide an analytical foundation for understanding the interplay between AI technological competition and the evolution of international affairs.

Results. The current contest for AI supremacy between major geopolitical powers extends far beyond computing dominance. It represents a battle over which vision for the global order will prevail. For the United States, AI symbolizes a critical frontier where it must uphold its technological leadership on a worldwide scale. While the U.S. policymakers implement stringent regulations to hinder China's technological advancements and secure their position, China is leveraging state resources to bridge the gap. Meanwhile, other international actors, e.g. the European Union, striving to remain independent of either superpower’s influence, along with technology companies committed to global innovation through open markets, view AI development as a pathway toward a more multipolar world.

Addressing to defined analytical parameters the scope of the United States is based on the AI strategy on the assumption that it can preserve its hegemony offensively, through a rate of technological innovation that outpaces the rest of the world, and defensively, through far-reaching technology controls aimed at hobbling China, its biggest geopolitical challenger. American technological and intellectual property assets dominate the AI sector at all levels. Companies such as Nvidia have significantly advanced computational capabilities through AI accelerators that exponentially enhance performance. Moreover, BigTechs such as Anthropic, Google, Meta, OpenAI have established foundational AI models that underpin the development of AI applications globally.

The U.S. regulatory process actively involves stakeholders, including private companies, academic institutions, and civil society, through consultations and public-private partnerships. This inclusive

approach ensures diverse perspectives are considered, enhancing the legitimacy and acceptance of regulations. The U.S. framework emphasizes fostering innovation by avoiding overly prescriptive regulations (see [2]). However, the lack of a centralized strategy may limit the adaptability of regulations to rapidly evolving AI technologies and international standards.

Enforcement is distributed among various federal agencies, such as the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC), and Department of Defense (DoD), and other sturctures, each overseeing AI applications within their respective domains (see [4]). While this decentralized model enables specialized oversight, it poses challenges in achieving uniformity and coordination at a national level.

The scope of the U.S. Artificial Intelligence regulations can be characterized as sector-specific because the regulatory approach primarily targets specific industries or applications rather than establishing a comprehensive, overarching framework. This decentralized strategy allows for tailored regulations that address the unique challenges and risks associated with AI in different sectors.

The United States anticipates that even those allies hesitant to adopt its protectionist approach will ultimately align themselves with its technological framework, prioritizing the advancements of Western AI innovation over the uncertainties associated with China narrowing the technological divide and the potential repercussions of U.S. sanctions.

China's AI strategy is characterized by a centralized, state-driven approach that integrates domestic and international priorities. Domestically, the government fosters AI development through initiatives like the «Next-Generation AI Development Plan» [15], emphasizing self-sufficiency, innovation hubs, and sector-wide integration of AI technologies. These efforts focus on areas such as surveillance, healthcare, and smart cities, with significant government investment and regulatory oversight.

On the international front, China leverages initiatives like the Digital Silk Road (DSR) to export AI technologies and governance models, particularly to developing economies. This strategy amplifies China's influence in global technology standards and practices while promoting AI capacity-building and infrastructure development in the Global South. Artificial Intelligence serving as the critical component that complements the essential infrastructure, such as 5G towers. While hardware establishes the physical framework, AI provides the sophisticated algorithms necessary to fully leverage China’s digital infrastructure across borders. Through the strategic deployment of AI, China seeks to amplify its growing digital influence on a global scale, advancing its vision of an integrated digital ecosystem.

This involves investments in digital infrastructure, telecommunications, e-commerce, and advanced technologies like AI and cloud computing. Between 2017 and 2022, Chinese companies invested approximately US$23 billion across 24 countries of Indo-Pacific region [10, p. 4]. The investments have supported the development of ICT infrastructure, including the establishment of surveillance networks, the installation of undersea cable networks, and the expansion of 4G and 5G connectivity.

The rapid ascent of DeepSeek represents a potential paradigm shift within the DSR. This previously little-known Chinese enterprise emerged as a global frontrunner in early 2025, presenting a viable alternative to Western AI models. Moreover, the company’s open-source approach, streamlined architecture, and reduced operational costs render its AI solutions significantly more affordable.

If implemented effectively, this initiative has the potential to generate significant benefits for both China and its partner nations. By narrowing the digital divide and disseminating AI norms throughout the Digital Silk Road, China stands to solidify its position as a global leader in technology. Such advancements may also mark the emergence of a geopolitical shift, with an increasing number of countries aligning themselves with prominent Chinese technology firms such as Alibaba, Baidu, Huawei, Tencent. The adoption of technology transcends the confines of the digital realm. The United States declined to endorse declarations of «inclusive AI» during the Paris AI Summit, while China and the EU signed it [12]. This development underscores the potential implications of the growing success of Chinese AI, as divergent visions for the future of artificial intelligence risk deepening divisions among global powers.

Recently China has introduced some of the world’s first binding national regulations on artificial intelligence. These measures specifically address recommendation algorithms used for content dissemination, synthetic images and videos, and generative AI systems ([5], [8], [11]). These initiatives are setting the intellectual and administrative foundation for a comprehensive national AI law, which China is likely to enact in the near future. Such a law could represent a transformative step in global AI governance, comparable to the anticipated impact of the European Union’s AI Act. Collectively, these measures underscore China's effort to regulate emerging AI technologies thoughtfully and strategically.

AI enforcement is highly centralized, with key agencies like the Cyberspace Administration of China (CAC) and the Ministry of Industry and Information Technology (MIIT) overseeing compliance. This centralized model ensures uniformity and strict adherence but may limit flexibility in addressing sector-specific challenges. China's strategic deployment

of technological investments abroad fosters spheres of influence that undermine U.S. interests and amplify Chinese political leverage.

Multilateral regulations like those from the EU often cover a wide range of AI applications, ensuring a uniform approach across member states. Counting altogether the average rank for EU member states according to the Global AI Index is approximately 28.5 [14]. The European Union's regulatory framework for artificial intelligence, demonstrates a comprehensive approach to addressing the challenges and opportunities posed by AI technologies.

Recently adopted the AI Act is notable for its breadth, categorizing AI systems based on risk levels – prohibited, high-risk, and minimal-risk applications [13]. It establishes stringent requirements for high-risk systems, such as those used in healthcare, finance, and law enforcement, ensuring safety, transparency, and accountability. The framework employs centralized enforcement through the establishment of the AI Office within the European Commission, tasked with overseeing compliance and implementation. This centralized approach ensures uniformity across member states but may face challenges due to varying levels of AI maturity and resources among countries.

The European Union regulations mandate strict adherence to its provisions, including transparency obligations and risk assessments. However, compliance costs and legal complexities may disproportionately impact startups and small enterprises, potentially hindering innovation. The EU emphasizes stakeholder engagement, incorporating input from governments, businesses, and civil society during the drafting and implementation phases. This inclusive approach ensures diverse perspectives are considered, enhancing the legitimacy and acceptance of the regulations. While the AI Act aims to foster innovation by exempting minimal-risk applications from heavy regulation, its stringent rules for high-risk systems may limit technological progress in certain areas. The framework's adaptability to emerging technologies remains a critical factor in its long-term effectiveness.

The European Commission launched «AI Continent Action Plan», which aims to position the EU as a global leader in artificial intelligence [7]. It emphasizes leveraging Europe's strengths, such as its talent pool and robust industries, to accelerate AI development and deployment. Key initiatives include establishing AI factories and gigafactories to support startups and researchers, increasing access to high-quality data through a unified data market, and promoting AI adoption in strategic sectors like healthcare and science. The plan involves the establishment of a minimum of 13 AI factories across Europe, leveraging the region's advanced supercomputing infrastructure. These facilities are designed to support startups, industries, and researchers in developing state-of-the-art AI models and applications. Additionally, up to five AI gigafactories, which are large-scale facilities equipped with extensive computing power and data centers, will be constructed. These gigafactories will facilitate the training of highly complex AI models on an unprecedented scale. This endeavor requires a combination of public and private investments to solidify the EU’s leadership in cutting-edge AI technologies. Moreover, the InvestAI facility aims to mobilize €20 billion to incentivize private investment in gigafactories. Complementing these initiatives, the proposed Cloud and AI Development Act seeks to stimulate private investment in cloud computing and data center infrastructure. Its objective is to at least triple the EU’s data center capacity within the next five to seven years, with a focus on promoting sustainable operations [7]. These measures are supposed to amplify the AI innovation package «GenAI4EU», which is aimed at assisting startups and small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) in creating trustworthy AI systems that align with EU values and regulations [6].

Collectively, these criteria highlight the EU's commitment to balancing ethical considerations, technological advancement, and economic development in its AI regulatory framework. Amid advantages the European approach to the AI harnessing faces several weaknesses: The AI Act's stringent requirements, especially for high-risk AI systems, may stifle innovation. Smaller companies and startups often struggle to meet these compliance demands, which could hinder their growth and competitiveness; the financial burden of adhering to the regulations can disproportionately affect smaller enterprises, creating barriers to entry and limiting diversity in the AI ecosystem; the EU's strict regulations may place its AI industry at a disadvantage compared to regions with more lenient or adaptive frameworks, such as the U.S. or China, potentially affecting its global leadership in AI.

Thus, the research revealed that the divergent AI policymaking strategies of the United States, China, and the European Union underscore significant correlations between unilateral and multilateral approaches and their impact on techno-rivalry and global dynamics. The United States adopts a sector-specific and decentralized approach, fostering innovation but leading to fragmented regulations, while the EU emphasizes a comprehensive and harmonized framework prioritizing ethics and compliance, albeit at the cost of adaptability. In contrast, China implements a centralized, state-driven strategy that combines strict regulatory oversight with rapid AI development, positioning itself as a global influencer but limiting stakeholder inclusivity (Table 1).

Table 1

The Comparative Dimensions of AI Regulatory Frameworks Across EU, U.S., and China

Dimension	European Union	United States	China
Scope	Comprehensive AI framework	Sector-specific regulations	Broad national AI strategy
Enforcement	Centralized enforcement mechanism	Decentralized enforcement by agencies	Centralized, state-driven enforcement
Compliance	Mandatory for member states	Voluntary guidelines	Strict mandatory compliance
Innovation & Flexibility	Balances regulation with innovation but often slower to adapt	Focus on fostering innovation in agile and responsive manner	State-supported state-controlled innovation and adaptive strategies
Stakeholder involvement	Extensive consultation with member states	Strong involvement from private sector	Dominant state role with some industry collaboration
Impact	Harmonized standards across countries. Focus on international AI regulatory framework evolvement	Varied impact based on strong effect of national priorities and regulations implementation on international affairs	Significant global impact with enforcement global AI ecosystem

Conclusions. The analysis of AI regulatory frameworks in the United States, China, and the European Union reveals distinct approaches shaped by their priorities. Together, these frameworks illustrate how varying regulatory dimensions impact AI deployment, innovation, and global dynamics, shaping the trajectory of AI governance worldwide.

Multilateral approaches, such as the EU's harmonized AI framework, reflect a strong commitment to international cooperation and ethical principles. These frameworks aim to foster consistency and encourage global regulatory alignment. In contrast, unilateral strategies employed by the U.S. and China prioritize national interests, with the U.S.'s sector-specific regulations driving innovation and adaptability, while China's centralized, state-led model asserts geopolitical influence and dominance in AI governance. However, these unilateral approaches often underscore competing priorities, creating friction that hinders efforts to establish universally accepted norms.

The emphasis on unilateral AI strategies exacerbates geopolitical rivalry, as the differing frameworks reveal broader technological and economic ambitions. The U.S.'s innovation-focused approach is at odds with China's prescriptive, centralized system, while the EU's ethics-driven strategy frequently diverges from both. These conflicting priorities highlight a lack of mutual understanding and shared objectives, fuelling competition over collaboration. Additionally, unilateral enforcement of extraterritorial provisions, such as China's generative AI regulations and the EU's AI Act, risks provoking resistance from other nations and businesses, further deepening international discord.

The current emphasis on unilateral policymaking in AI risks creating a fragmented global regulatory environment, where conflicting standards complicate cross-border innovation and economic integration. To mitigate these tensions, a balanced approach combining multilateral dialogue with national priorities is essential. Encouraging shared goals, fostering interoperability among frameworks, and enhancing stakeholder inclusivity could pave the way for a more cohesive and stable global AI governance landscape.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

1. Aguiar P. The Global AI Race: The Geopolitics of DeepSeek situation reports. *Geopolitical Monitor.* 2025. URL: https://www.geopoliticalmonitor.com/the-global-ai-race-the-geopolitics-of-deepseek/

2. AI legislation in the US: a 2025 overview. *Software improvement group*. 2025. URL: https://www.softwareimprovementgroup.com/us-ai-legislation-overview/

3. Bellanova R., Carrapico H., Duez D. Digital sovereignty and European security integration: an introduction. *European Security*. 2022. No. 31(3), P. 337–355. https://doi.org/10.1080/09662839.2022.2101887

4. Bullock Ch., Van Arsdale S., Arnold M., Maas M., Winter Ch. Existing authorities for oversight of frontier AI models. Policy Report. Institute for Law and AI. 2024. URL: https://law-ai.org/existing-authorities-for-oversight/

5. Ethical norms for new generation artificial intelligence released / ed. by B. Murphy. Translation. Center for security and emerging technology. *Etcetera Language Group, Inc.* 2021. URL: https://cset.georgetown.edu/publication/ethical-norms-for-new-generation-artificial-intelligence-released/

6. European Commission. GenAI4EU. European AI Office. 2025. URL: https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/policies/ai-office#ecl-inpage-genai4eu

7. European Commission. Shaping Europe's leadership in artificial intelligence with the AI continent action plan. Communication from the Commission to the Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions. COM(2025) 165 final. Brussels. April 9, 2025 URL: https://commission.europa.eu/topics/eu-competitiveness/ai-continent_en

8. Huang S. et al. Translation: Measures for the management of generative artificial intelligence services (draft for comment). *DigiChina.* 2023. URL: https://digichina.stanford.edu/work/translation-measures-for-the-management-of-generative-artificial-intelligence-services-draft-for-comment-april-2023/

9. Kuner Ch., Zanfir-Fortuna G. Geopolitical fragmentation, the AI race, and global data flows: the new reality. *Future of Privacy Forum.* 2025. URL: https://fpf.org/blog/geopolitical-fragmentation-the-ai-race-and-global-data-flows-the-new-reality/

10. Patil S., Gupta P. The Digital silk road in the Indo-Pacific: mapping China's vision for global tech expansion. *Observer Research Foundation*. January 2024. No. 683. URL: https://www.orfonline.org/public/uploads/posts/pdf/20240103105252.pdf

11. Provisions on the administration of deep synthesis internet information services. *China Law Translate*. November 25, 2022. URL: https://www.chinalawtranslate.com/en/deep-synthesis/

12. The AI action summit statement on inclusive and sustainable Artificial Intelligence for people and the planet. La Maison Élysée. 2025. URL: https://www.elysee.fr/en/emmanuel-macron/2025/02/11/statement-on-inclusive-and-sustainable-artificial-intelligence-for-people-and-the-planet

13. The European Parliament and the Council of the European Union. Artificial Intelligence Act (Regulation (EU) 2024/1689), Official Journal. June 13, 2024. URL: https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=OJ:L_202401689

14. Tortoise. The global AI index. 2024. URL: https://www.tortoisemedia.com/data/global-ai

15. Webster, G. et al. Full translation: China's «New generation artificial intelligence development plan». *DigiChina*. 2017. URL: https://digichina.stanford.edu/work/full-translation-chinas-new-generation-artificial-intelligence-development-plan-2017/

REFERENCES:

1. Aguiar P. (2025). The Global AI Race: The Geopolitics of DeepSeek Situation Reports. *Geopolitical Monitor.* URL: https://www.geopoliticalmonitor.com/the-global-ai-race-the-geopolitics-of-deepseek/

2. AI legislation in the US: A 2025 overview. (2025). Software Improvement Group. https://www.softwareimprovementgroup.com/us-ai-legislation-overview/

3. Bellanova, R., Carrapico, H., & Duez, D. (2022). Digital sovereignty and European security integration: an introduction. *European Security*, 31(3), 337–355. https://doi.org/10.1080/09662839.2022.2101887

4. Bullock, Ch. et al. (2024). Existing authorities for oversight of frontier AI models. Policy Report. Institute for Law and AI. URL: https://law-ai.org/existing-authorities-for-oversight/

5. Center for Security and Emerging Technology. (2021). Ethical Norms for New Generation Artificial Intelligence Released. Translation. Etcetera Language Group, Inc. Ed. by Ben Murphy. URL: https://cset.georgetown.edu/publication/ethical-norms-for-new-generation-artificial-intelligence-released/

6. European Commission. (2025). GenAI4EU. European AI Office. URL: https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/policies/ai-office#ecl-inpage-genai4eu

7. European Commission. (2025). Shaping Europe's leadership in artificial intelligence with the AI continent action plan. Communication from the Commission to the Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions. Brussels, 9.4.2025 COM(2025) 165 final. URL: https://commission.europa.eu/topics/eu-competitiveness/ai-continent_en

8. Huang S. et al. (2023). Translation: Measures for the Management of Generative Artificial Intelligence Services (Draft for Comment). *DigiChina.* URL: https://digichina.stanford.edu/work/translation-measures-for-the-management-of-generative-artificial-intelligence-services-draft-for-comment-april-2023/

9. Kuner, Ch. & Zanfir-Fortuna, G. (2025). Geopolitical fragmentation, the AI race, and global data flows: the new reality. Future of Privacy Forum. URL: https://fpf.org/blog/geopolitical-fragmentation-the-ai-race-and-global-data-flows-the-new-reality/

10. Patil, S. and Gupta, P. (2024). The Digital Silk Road in the Indo-Pacific: Mapping China's Vision for Global Tech Expansion. Observer Research Foundation. Issue 683. URL: https://www.orfonline.org/public/uploads/posts/pdf/20240103105252.pdf

11. Provisions on the Administration of Deep Synthesis Internet Information Services. (2022). China Law Translate. 2022-11-25. URL: https://www.chinalawtranslate.com/en/deep-synthesis/

12. The AI Action Summit Statement on Inclusive and Sustainable Artificial Intelligence for People and the Planet. (2025). La Maison Élysée. URL: https://www.elysee.fr/en/emmanuel-macron/2025/02/11/statement-on-inclusive-and-sustainable-artificial-intelligence-for-people-and-the-planet

13. The European Parliament and the Council of the European Union. (2024). Artificial Intelligence Act (Regulation (EU) 2024/1689), Official Journal version of 13 June 2024. URL: https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=OJ:L_202401689

14. Tortoise. (2024). The Global AI Index. URL: https://www.tortoisemedia.com/data/global-ai

15. Webster, G. et al. (2017). Full Translation: China's 'New Generation Artificial Intelligence Development Plan'. *DigiChina.* URL: https://digichina.stanford.edu/work/full-translation-chinas-new-generation-artificial-intelligence-development-plan-2017/

Глобальне суперництво за штучний інтелект

Вінникова Наталія Анатоліївна

доктор політичних наук, доцент,
професор кафедри міжнародних відносин
Харківського національного університету імені В. Н. Каразіна
майдан Свободи, 4, Харків, Україна
ORCID: 0000-0001-5941-7562

Дослідження розкриває динамічний зв'язок між міжнародними нормативними рамками та національною політикою у сфері штучного інтелекту, зосереджуючись на техно-суперництві між США, Китаєм та Європейським Союзом. Метою є виявлення взаємозв'язку між багатосторонніми та односторонніми підходами до управління штучним інтелектом і оцінка того, як односторонні стратегії можуть посилювати геополітичне напруження. У дослідженні затосовані методи кейс-стаді для роведення компаративного аналізу регуляторних політик США, Китаю та ЄС за такими критеріями, як охоплення, імплементація, відповідність, участь зацікавлених сторін і адаптивність. Ця комплексна структура дозволяє оцінити наслідки регулювання штучного інтелекту для технологічного прогресу та динаміки міжнародних відносин. У ході дослідження виявлено відмінності в підходах глобальних лідерів у сфері штучного інтелекту. ЄС робить акцент на гармонізації та етичних принципах через комплексну нормативну базу, хоча її жорсткість може стримувати інновації та ускладнювати становище невеликих підприємств. США застосовують децентралізовану модель, яка базується на окремих секторах, сприяючи гнучкості, утім створюючи ризики фрагментації регулювання. Централізована, державна стратегія Китаю дозволяє швидко розвивати штучний інтелект і зміцнювати геополітичний вплив, але обмежує адаптивність і участь різноманітних зацікавлених сторін. Мультилатералізм, втілений у гармонізованій регуляторній структурі ЄС, сприяє втелінню етичних стандартів і міжнародній співпраці. Водночас односторонні стратегії США та Китаю, спрямовані на просування суто національних інтересів, загострюють конкуренцію та стримують спільні зусилля для встановлення універсальних норм. Зосередження на односторонніх стратегіях підсилює геополітичне суперництво, спричиняючи фрагментованість глобального регуляторного середовища, що ускладнює транскордонні інновації та підсилює напруження у відносинах між державами на світовій арені.

Ключові слова: *штучний інтелект, міжнародне регулювання, односторонній підхід, мультилатералізм, Сполучені Штати, Європейський Союз, Китай, техноконкуренція.*