

AI Colonialism: Are Developing Nations Being Digitally Dominated

Ms. Anushka Singh¹ and Ms. Labdi Tervecha²

Abstract:-

Across the globe, rapid advances in artificial intelligence have shifted balances of influence, stirring debate about equity, national authority, and who holds decision-making power online. Rather than steady progress for all, patterns are emerging where powerful states and large private firms dominate key parts of AI - such as computing resources, datasets, and research pipelines - with weaker economies often left adapting to choices made elsewhere. This work examines what some now call "AI colonialism" - a condition marked by unequal access, uneven benefits, and structural reliance shaped by technological disparity.

Examining through an impartial perspective, this work questions if such disparities reflect technological hegemony or merely represent phases in tech diffusion across interconnected societies. Concentration of artificial intelligence power rests largely within few nations - mainly the U.S. and China - with consequences unfolding unevenly elsewhere. India, among others, faces pressures on control over local data, autonomy in markets, and authority in shaping rules. Instead of broad declarations, attention turns toward current global agreements and non-binding initiatives steered by bodies including the UN and WTO.

Another angle explored here involves contrasting opinions. Although certain voices link AI-fuelled globalisation to progress in innovation, cross-border investment, and collaborative efforts between nations, alternative perspectives highlight downsides - including uneven access to data, embedded biases in automated systems, and pressure on local economic sectors. By applying structured legal reasoning alongside cross-jurisdictional comparisons, shortcomings emerge within existing frameworks covering digital commerce, ownership of intangible assets, and rules guiding information flow.

Instead of taking AI colonialism for granted, this work examines how well it fits within current frameworks of global governance and legal norms. To move the conversation forward, it proposes thinking about innovation through lenses like fairness, shared access, and national control - each grounded in established international rules.

What happens when a few hold most tech power? AI colonialism points to growing imbalances - control over data shifts quietly, national authority weakens without notice, fairness often disappears across digital spaces worldwide. Power tilts where oversight fades. Decisions made far away shape local realities, sometimes without consent. The pattern repeats: innovation advances here, extraction thrives there.

Key Phrases: *AI colonialism reflects the widening gap in technological power, bringing attention to concerns about who controls data, how sovereignty is affected, and whether fairness is maintained in the global digital landscape.*

Received 06 July., 2026; Revised 15 July, 2026; Accepted 17 July, 2026 © The author(s) 2026.

Published with open access at www.questjournals.org

I. Introduction:-

Fast progress in artificial intelligence has quietly changed how data flows through today's world economy, shifting who creates it, how it moves, and who uses it. Instead of staying inside labs and software firms, AI tools like pattern-finding models, prediction engines, or face-scanning tech now shape decisions in public services, markets, surveillance, even personal routines. Despite their potential to spark new solutions,

¹ The Author is a 3rd year Student of BBALLB (H) in Seedling School of Law and Governance, Jaipur National University, Jaipur.

² The Author is a 3rd year Student of BBALLB (H) in Seedling School of Law and Governance, Jaipur National University, Jaipur.

such technologies bring tough questions about fairness, control, and shifts in worldwide influence. Benefits tend to cluster where technology already thrives - wealthy states and giant companies gain most, whereas poorer regions rarely get more than a distant view of change.

Lately, scholars and policymakers have started using "AI colonialism" to describe growing imbalances in technology access. Rooted in past forms of empire, this concept recalls how dominant nations once seized distant lands to exploit materials and people. Today's version operates differently - not through physical conquest but through digital reach. What gets taken now isn't ore or crops; it's streams of personal information collected online. Much of that data flows from users in poorer countries, captured during routine internet activity. Control tends to rest elsewhere - often in corporate hubs far removed from where the information originates. The pattern mirrors old hierarchies, though tools have changed. Power shows up not in governors or garrisons, but in algorithms and infrastructure. Value moves steadily toward a few central nodes while local contexts get shaped without consent. These dynamics repeat familiar cycles under new conditions. Extraction continues, just in code form. Influence hides behind interfaces rather than flags. This information gets gathered, kept, tracked - handled through systems mostly held by organizations rooted in wealthier nations. Because of this setup, rewards from data-based activities often flow into economies already dominant, while areas generating the raw material gain little in return, either financially or strategically.

This imbalance gains strength because advanced tech skills sit mostly within just a few nations and firms. Leading that group, the U.S. and China stand out in building artificial intelligence, helped by strong research networks, heavy funding, and vast amounts of data. Beyond governments, giants like Google, Amazon, and Meta heavily steer how AI evolves. Holding key parts of online structure - cloud services, data centers, and algorithm software - they hold sway over where and how AI spreads across the planet. Some poorer countries depend on outside tech networks simply because they cannot build enough at home. Because local skills and funding are weak, turning elsewhere becomes unavoidable. Yet leaning so heavily on foreign tools often locks them into long-term dependency. Control over digital spaces then slips further away. Without strong internal systems, shaping their own online rules grows harder each year.

What happens when data moves from poorer nations to richer ones? That shift brings money - but mostly for companies based far away. Often, information collected in developing regions fuels ads, smart algorithms, others uses, although local populations gain little income in return. Wealth builds up where tech firms reside, widening the gap between world regions. Who owns personal details becomes a pressing concern. Value drawn from user activity rarely circles back fairly. Control slips - governments find it hard to regulate something invisible, fast-moving. Laws lag behind how quickly information travels online. Power hides within private systems not built for public oversight. Fairness fades when rules come from boardrooms instead of communities.

Though economies draw attention, AI growth pushes tough questions about law and fairness into view. Shaped by data and design settings, artificial intelligence carries hidden leanings instead of standing impartial. Because training inputs hold assumptions, automated decisions often tilt against some communities - race, income level, location, or native tongue widening the gap. Where people lack power already, like across many poorer regions, skewed results deepen existing gaps even more. On top of that, unclear rules around personal information make oversight shaky, particularly where laws exist only on paper without real enforcement behind them.

Across the world, control over artificial intelligence lacks cohesion. Though certain areas - like the European Union - have moved forward with broad rules using tools such as the GDPR and the suggested AI Act, no single agreed-upon system guides how AI should be built or used everywhere. Without unified global efforts, weak spots emerge in oversight. These openings let dominant players function freely across borders where scrutiny differs widely. In poorer countries, the result tends to be weaker leverage and fewer resources to help decide standards affecting the worldwide digital landscape.

Looking sideways at today's tech landscape, this study asks if artificial intelligence is advancing in ways that mirror historical colonial structures. Where power flows often follows old global divides, shaping who benefits and who gets left behind. Driven by evidence, not assumption, it traces how raw data moves from Global South regions into systems built elsewhere. Control over networks and platforms tends to cluster in few hands - often tied to wealthy nations or corporations. Bias baked into algorithms reflects uneven priorities, filtering opportunity through skewed lenses. Profits accumulate in specific hubs while labor and risk scatter across borders. Existing laws appear fragmented when tested against these dynamics, struggling to keep pace with speed and scale. Institutions designed long ago now face tasks they were never meant to handle. Some rules adapt slowly; others collapse under pressure. New frameworks may need to emerge - not copied from past models - but shaped by present inequities. The question lingers: can fairness grow within systems wired for extraction?

One key concern stands out: failing to actively shape fairer global AI rules could worsen current imbalances, leading to a modern kind of dominance - built on data movement, tech ownership, and reliance on digital systems instead of land grabs. Progress here depends less on isolated national policies in poorer nations,

more on collaborative cross-border efforts aimed at spreading AI's advantages more evenly. This work aims to add weight to conversations around equity, self-determination, and balance in a world where technology binds societies ever closer.

II. Literature Review and Background:-

What began as conversations about global tech imbalances slowly shaped a term now known as "AI colonialism." Rooted in older critiques around digital control, it connects strongly to what some call "data colonialism," an idea explored by thinkers like Nick Couldry and Ulises A. Mejias. From far corners of the internet, personal information flows outward - often pulled without fair return. These patterns echo past eras when raw materials were shipped away for profit elsewhere. Processing happens thousands of miles from where data originates. Profit rarely circles back to the communities involved. Instead, corporate hubs in wealthier countries refine and monetise what others produce. Power tilts subtly but steadily toward those already equipped with infrastructure and capital.

Nowhere is the imbalance more visible than in global AI development. Work by researchers including Kate Crawford and Shoshana Zuboff shows how artificial intelligence relies heavily on vast data pools and advanced computing resources. Since most of these assets sit within nations like the United States and China, influence tilts sharply toward them. As a result, less industrialized regions often adopt imported tech without solid oversight of local digital ecosystems. Power gaps widen when access does not match dependency.

Looking at things through a legal lens, some researchers question if current global systems can really handle new technological shifts. Discussions within groups such as the United Nations and the World Trade Organisation touch on digital oversight, movement of data across borders, alongside responsible uses of artificial intelligence. Still, rules differ widely between regions, relying mostly on guidelines that lack enforceability. Areas long covered by international agreements - trade, ownership of ideas, protections for individuals - are now being re-examined under the light of AI advances, though interpretations vary sharply from one place to another.

While some research takes a hopeful view of AI-powered globalization, others highlight its uneven effects. A different group of academics argues that spreading artificial intelligence may spark new ideas, boost economies, and strengthen skills in countries such as India. International cooperation, funding flows, and shared learning take center stage here - seen as tools to narrow tech gaps. Integration across borders, under this lens, opens real pathways rather than just risks.

Some studies point to problems in AI systems - like biased algorithms, lack of clarity, or uneven tech availability. Developing nations face sharper challenges because rules around AI continue changing there. When proper protections go missing, artificial intelligence may deepen inequality across societies at larger levels. Few checks mean wider gaps could grow unnoticed.

One way scholars see AI colonialism is through old power structures replaying online. Others argue it simply follows the expected path of tech growth across borders. Looking at weak spots in today's laws helps shape this discussion further. Different routes emerge when searching how fairness might take root in AI oversight. Perspectives shift once regulation stops assuming neutrality.

Research Questions:-

The following research questions are designed to guide the inquiry into the emerging concept of AI colonialism and its impact on developing nations. They aim to examine the structural, legal, and economic dimensions of digital domination in the age of artificial intelligence. By addressing these questions, the paper seeks to critically evaluate whether current AI practices reinforce global inequalities. Together, they provide a framework for analysing both the risks and potential pathways for equitable AI governance and the following questions are answered in this research paper:-

- 1) To what extent does artificial intelligence contribute to a new form of colonialism through digital domination of developing nations?**
- 2) How are data resources from developing countries being extracted, controlled, and monetised by global powers and technology corporations?**
- 3) Does the current AI ecosystem create technological dependency that undermines the digital sovereignty of developing nations?**
- 4) Are existing legal and regulatory frameworks adequate to protect developing countries from exploitation in the AI-driven digital economy?**
- 5) What policy and legal reforms are necessary to ensure fair, inclusive, and equitable global AI governance?**

III. Methodology:-

This work uses qualitative analysis, legal reasoning, and structured critique to examine AI colonialism and its consequences for low-income countries. Because the subject shifts across fields, findings draw mainly from existing materials instead of new experiments. Information comes from scholarly articles, published studies, official guidelines, state documents, releases by global bodies like the United Nations or OECD, plus trustworthy digital archives. Such a method supports wide-ranging but careful insight into where machine intelligence meets regulation, wealth distribution, and worldwide hierarchies.

Examining established legal structures forms the foundation of this study. Through scrutiny of statutes like India's Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023, alongside the EU's GDPR and global AI governance principles, clarity emerges on how well these rules respond to challenges posed by artificial intelligence. Court rulings - especially around privacy and data rights - influence understanding of judicial responses to comparable dilemmas. Because technology advances rapidly, some legal standards fall short; spotting those shortcomings becomes possible only through close review. Where laws fail to align with innovation, weaknesses surface, demanding attention.

Looking beyond narrow analysis, this work includes conceptual exploration through theoretical lenses. From post-colonial thought, insights emerge that link past colonial systems to current forms of digital control. Instead of viewing AI-related domination as only technological, attention shifts toward social and political frameworks. Power dynamics, mechanisms of influence, and extraction practices take shape differently now - yet familiar patterns persist. Such reflection opens space to question: does calling it "colonialism" capture real systemic continuity, or just suggest symbolic resemblance?

Looking closer, the study applies comparison to reveal gaps among rich and poor countries regarding artificial intelligence skills, access to information, control over data, and rules enforcement. Instead of assuming uniformity, it examines distinct styles of oversight - one guided by commerce in the U.S., another shaped by government priority in China, while Europe builds regulation around individual entitlements - to show how authority shapes technology growth. Through such contrasts, space opens to see where less wealthy nations fit in this range, along with obstacles blocking their full autonomy in digital domains.

Examining real cases helps anchor the conversation in tangible situations. From Big Tech's handling of personal information to artificial intelligence deployed in underserved areas, each instance reveals deeper trends. Instances like surveillance debates or privacy breaches appear not as one-off events, but reflections of systemic dynamics. What emerges is a pattern - repeated, persistent - shaping control within digital spaces. Through these lenses, theory meets reality, showing how power operates behind everyday technology.

Looking ahead, the work takes a critical stance tied closely to real-world policy when exploring reform questions. Rather than just outlining issues, it weighs potential answers through active involvement in present conversations around governing artificial intelligence. Starting from concerns like who controls data, fairness in automated systems, supervision frameworks, and cross-border collaboration, each idea is tested against practical conditions faced by less wealthy countries. Ending here, the analysis does more than spotlight difficulties - it adds substance to evolving dialogues aiming at a fairer digital landscape.

Putting different fields into conversation shapes this study's core design - law mixes with geopolitical reasoning, economic patterns, and tech-focused inquiry. Not one angle alone captures what happens when power imbalances shift into digital spaces. The method stays open-ended by intent, allowing room to track subtle dynamics behind AI-driven influence. Seeing global inequalities through varied viewpoints helps expose underlying structures at play. What emerges is less about isolated facts, more about connections between technological reach and historical dependencies. Examination unfolds across layers, avoiding fixed conclusions while tracing how control may form in unseen ways. Complexity demands tools beyond traditional frameworks. Insight grows from juxtaposing contexts usually kept apart. Rather than simplify, the work leans into messiness where real-world effects surface. Understanding follows circuitous paths instead of straight lines

Legal and Institutional Framework:-

Across overlapping fields like international law and tech policy, "AI colonialism" emerges amid unclear legal boundaries - no central framework exists to define it. Right now, no enforceable global agreement controls how artificial intelligence gets developed or used. Regulation spreads unevenly, stitched together from strict laws, loose recommendations, and shifting organizational habits. Power imbalances grow quietly where oversight thins out. Some countries fill voids with influence, setting standards others must follow even if they lack equal say.

Looking at laws globally, human rights frameworks offer key guidance when tackling issues tied to artificial intelligence. Documents including the Universal Declaration of Human Rights along with the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights set boundaries meant to safeguard privacy, fair treatment, personal worth, and free speech. As AI spreads, these entitlements surface more often - especially where monitoring reaches wide, choices turn automatic, or algorithms treat people unfairly. Take how constant

gathering of personal information pushes against private life; meanwhile skewed software risks deepening gaps for underrepresented communities across poorer regions. Still, applying such rights consistently proves difficult, mainly because borders complicate oversight and digital tools operate beyond any single nation's reach.

Although human rights law matters, economic agreements worldwide also help shape how artificial intelligence spreads across borders. Under the WTO, certain rules cover online transactions, movement of information between countries, and entry into foreign markets. These guidelines aim to ease commerce - yet typically favor states already strong in technology, tilting conditions unevenly. Nations with fewer resources struggle to set boundaries on data transfers or demand storage within national borders, weakening grip over homegrown digital assets. Questions emerge about fair inclusion and who truly decides when it comes to power in today's connected world.

When intellectual property rules apply through agreements like TRIPS, they add layers to how laws interact globally. Although tight IP controls might encourage new ideas, at the same time they can limit who gets to use key technologies - AI systems included. Countries still building their tech sectors often face pressure: grow local expertise while sticking to global standards shaped by wealthier states. Since most advanced tools and patented methods sit within just a handful of regions, others struggle to develop independent artificial intelligence capacity. This imbalance tends to deepen reliance rather than reduce it.

One key domain involves state responsibility in international law - potentially covering damage from artificial intelligence. Still, assigning blame when AI is involved brings serious legal hurdles. Depending on circumstances, fault might lie with governments, companies, creators, or those operating the system. Without consistent rules for tracing harm, uncertainty grows. Because some AI acts independently, older legal ideas struggle to fit. This mismatch highlights a notable shortfall in how global oversight handles such cases.

Though global and regional groups shape how artificial intelligence is governed, most of their influence comes through guidance instead of rules that must be followed. Central to talks about digital collaboration, the United Nations has led conversations around fair AI and technology's effect on society. Different UN committees have stressed linking AI progress to human rights and long-term environmental aims, even if what they suggest cannot be enforced. What stands out is the gap between ideals promoted at high levels and actual implementation worldwide.

Just like that, UNESCO laid out ethical rules for artificial intelligence, built around ideas like openness, responsibility, wide access, because fairness matters too. Even though these standards offer clear guidance, countries choose whether to follow them on their own. At the same time, the OECD introduced its own AI principles aimed at encouraging careful progress, yet mostly richer nations have taken them up, so they do not reach everywhere equally. Although the World Trade Organisation does not manage AI directly, it still affects how digital systems evolve globally - through talks about online trade and movement of information - that quietly reshape how AI spreads across borders.

Different regions and countries adopt distinct rules based on unique political, economic, and social values. While some governments act early, the EU builds systems grounded in personal rights, focusing on how data is handled and who answers for it. Its approach uses tools like GDPR and the upcoming AI legislation to set clear duties. Rather than waiting, officials shape expectations now - placing responsibility on companies and agencies alike. What matters most here is protecting people, not just enabling technology.

Unlike others, the U.S. leans toward market forces and targeted rules, letting private players lead progress while keeping government oversight light. Because breakthroughs come fast here, some worry protections lag behind, opening doors to unchecked power. Meanwhile, China builds its AI path around central control - technology moves in step with defense goals, growth strategies, and public order needs. Even though systems roll out quickly under this setup, personal data and freedoms tend to take a back seat.

Though nations like India continue building regulatory systems, progress shows in recent laws such as the 2023 Digital Personal Data Protection Act. This marks movement forward on data oversight - yet execution gaps linger, especially when it comes to threats tied to artificial intelligence. While aiming for innovation and stable economies, these states also strive to guard national priorities, even though structural resources and influence in worldwide discussions tend to be scarce.

Even with diverse initiatives underway, today's legal and institutional systems face deep-rooted flaws. Without a globally enforceable treaty on artificial intelligence, inconsistent national rules open doors to ambiguity and uneven application across borders. While richer countries shape standards, poorer ones frequently lack voice - tilting outcomes away from equity. Reliance on goodwill instead of law weakens oversight, leaving key norms unenforced. What stands as policy often crumbles when accountability fades into choice.

Challenges and Counter-arguments:-

The discussion surrounding AI colonialism highlights several significant challenges along with notable counterarguments. A major concern is the concentration of AI capabilities within a limited number of technologically advanced countries, particularly the United States and China, which may lead to increased dependence of developing nations and reduce their control over digital assets. This imbalance is further

intensified by issues of data extraction, where data produced in developing regions is frequently collected and utilised by foreign entities, raising concerns regarding ownership, consent, and equitable distribution of benefits. Moreover, the lack of a cohesive global regulatory framework—despite initiatives by institutions such as the United Nations and the World Trade Organisation—results in fragmented governance and limited enforcement. Developing countries also encounter challenges such as inadequate representation in global decision-making processes, as well as infrastructural and technical limitations that restrict their ability to compete effectively. Additionally, concerns about algorithmic bias and the potential reinforcement of existing inequalities underscore the broader risks associated with AI technologies.

On the other hand, several counterarguments present a more balanced outlook. Some scholars consider AI to be a catalyst for economic development and innovation, with the potential to enhance sectors like healthcare, education, and public administration in developing nations. Others suggest that the concentration of technological resources reflects a natural phase in the evolution of new technologies rather than intentional dominance. Increased opportunities for international cooperation, investment, and knowledge sharing may gradually help bridge the technological divide. It is also argued that internal factors, such as national policies and governance frameworks, play a critical role in shaping technological progress, indicating that dependency may not be entirely externally driven. Furthermore, strong intellectual property protections are often viewed as essential for promoting innovation, while ongoing initiatives by organisations like the OECD demonstrate that regulatory approaches are continuing to evolve. Overall, the issue represents a complex interaction between concerns of inequality and the potential advantages of technological advancement, requiring a careful evaluation.

Critical Analysis:-

The idea of AI colonialism raises a significant question about whether current technological inequalities represent a new form of global dominance or simply a stage in the evolution of international development. The concentration of AI capabilities in countries such as the United States and China points to an imbalance in the global digital landscape. Control over data, advanced computing systems, and research capabilities gives these nations and their corporations considerable influence, which may restrict the independence of developing countries. This situation is further shaped by international legal structures, particularly in intellectual property and digital trade, which may unintentionally advantage technologically advanced states. As a result, developing nations may face increasing reliance on external technologies, raising concerns about sovereignty and fair participation in the digital economy.

At the same time, comparing AI colonialism directly with historical colonial practices requires careful consideration. Unlike traditional colonial systems, AI-driven globalisation does not involve direct territorial control or political domination. Instead, it functions through differences in economic strength, technological capacity, and access to information. This suggests that while inequalities are evident, they may not always reflect intentional or systematic domination. In many instances, the concentration of technological power can be linked to varying levels of investment, innovation, and policy focus among different countries. From a legal standpoint, the absence of a unified international framework for AI governance presents both difficulties and opportunities. Organisations such as the United Nations and the World Trade Organisation have initiated discussions on digital governance, but their efforts remain largely non-binding and fragmented. This gap allows dominant players to influence global standards, often without sufficient input from developing nations. At the same time, it offers flexibility for countries to design regulations that align with their specific domestic priorities.

Data plays a central role in this discussion. Concerns about data extraction and misuse are valid, yet data flows are also essential for the functioning of the global digital economy. Limiting these flows entirely could slow innovation and economic progress, particularly for countries aiming to integrate into global markets. The key challenge lies in creating fair, transparent systems for data use that ensure accountability and equitable sharing of benefits.

The perspective of dependency can sometimes overlook the active role of developing nations. Countries like India are increasingly investing in digital infrastructure, AI development, and regulatory policies, showing that technological gaps can be reduced through strategic efforts. International cooperation, skill development, and knowledge exchange also provide avenues for narrowing these differences over time. At the same time, concerns such as algorithmic bias, unequal access to technology, and limited participation in global governance remain significant. Without proper safeguards, AI systems may deepen existing inequalities and exclude less-developed regions from meaningful participation. This underlines the importance of building inclusive governance frameworks that incorporate diverse viewpoints and interests.

In essence, AI colonialism should be understood as a lens to examine emerging imbalances in the digital era rather than as a definitive condition. A balanced approach requires recognition of both the challenges and the opportunities associated with AI. Strengthening legal systems, ensuring fair access to technology, and

promoting equitable distribution of benefits are essential steps toward preventing the widening of global disparities.

Proposed Reforms:-

To tackle AI colonialism, we need a clear and balanced plan—one that protects each country's digital independence, but still encourages everyone to work together and innovate. Here are some reforms drawn from global examples and current laws:

1. Set Up an International AI Governance Group

We should create an official body under the UN to guide AI development and make sure every country, whether wealthy or not, gets a real say. Bring in not just government reps, but also experts and voices from civil society. It's important this body operates openly, works through consensus, and doesn't let the most tech-advanced countries run the show.

2. Strengthen Data Sovereignty and Fair Data Sharing

Laws need to spell out how data moves across borders so each nation controls its own data. When countries share data, the deals should be based on consent, fair payment, and equal benefits—especially so developing countries can actually gain from their own information.

3. Give Developing Countries a Bigger Role

Countries that usually get sidelined need stronger voices in places like the WTO and global digital groups. More equal participation and better voting rules help make sure AI standards speak for everyone, not just the world's powerhouses.

4. Build Skills and Share Knowledge

We need more global efforts—like funding, training, and sharing expertise—to help developing countries build up their own AI talent and tools. Government and business partnerships can open doors to better infrastructure and research, which cuts long-term dependence.

5. Rethink Intellectual Property Rules

Intellectual property laws should protect inventors, but also let developing countries access and grow their own AI sectors. Things like flexible licensing, compulsory licenses in key situations, and team-based innovation models can help new AI ecosystems develop faster.

6. Set Ethical Standards and Enforce Accountability

We need broad, universal AI ethics guidelines that everyone follows—focusing on transparency, fairness, and being held accountable. Independent regulators should keep watch, deal with algorithmic bias, and make sure AI doesn't worsen inequalities.

7. Invest in Digital Infrastructure

Let's push for more investment in things like data centers, cloud tools, and reliable internet in developing countries. Good infrastructure is the bedrock of tech independence and lets these countries take part in the global digital economy.

8. Demand Transparency in AI

AI systems need to be more open—people should know how they work, make decisions, and handle risks. With clear summaries and impact reports (but still guarding sensitive info), we can boost trust and keep developers accountable.

9. Make Rules That Can Evolve

Keep reviewing AI laws, both at home and globally. Regular oversight from expert groups ensures we can tweak the rules as technology shifts and new challenges emerge.

10. Find the Right Balance: Innovation and Fairness

Regulation shouldn't slam the brakes on innovation, but it needs to address inequality head-on. A solid framework has to support tech progress while championing fairness, inclusion, and respect for national independence.

Policy Implications:-

AI colonialism forces policymakers—everywhere—to rethink how we run the digital world. A big takeaway is that data systems need to be stronger: especially in developing countries, governments have to set clear rules for who owns data, where it can go, and how it's handled across borders. Without that, valuable data keeps slipping out of their hands, deepening inequality.

At the same time, international cooperation matters more than ever. Groups like the UN and WTO play a key part in shaping the rules, but those rules have to be fair and give everyone a seat at the table. Otherwise, the usual tech giants just keep calling all the shots. Building up local know-how and infrastructure is also crucial. Countries like India need to put energy into better digital infrastructure, stronger education, and supporting AI research. When policymakers back innovation and skill-building, and help people collaborate across public and private sectors, countries get less reliant on outside tech and move closer to real self-reliance.

Regulating major multinational tech firms matters, too. These companies—mostly from the US and China—need to be held accountable. Governments can bring in transparency rules, competition guidelines, and ethical standards for AI. Antitrust laws and similar policies help keep power from getting too concentrated. Ethics and human rights can't be an afterthought. Lawmakers must guard against algorithmic bias, privacy breaches, and discrimination, so AI lines up with fundamental rights and justice. But here's the catch: go overboard with regulation and you could kill innovation; do too little and the gap between rich and poor countries gets even wider. That's why regulations need enough flexibility to adjust as technology races ahead.

In short, tackling AI colonialism means investing in coordinated action—globally and locally—so everyone can access AI's benefits and no one gets left behind.

IV. Conclusion:-

AI colonialism really puts a spotlight on how digital power shifts in today's world. Control over data and technology is starting to decide who has the upper hand globally. This study has explored whether the current dominance by rich, tech-heavy nations is just part of progress or represents a whole new layer of global inequality. The way top countries, especially the US and China, concentrate AI resources raises real worries about dependence and sovereignty. Still, it's not the same as old-school domination.

Existing global rules and organizations—think the UN or WTO—haven't quite caught up with the challenges that AI brings. But developing countries aren't just standing by. With the right policies, infrastructure investments, and smart partnerships, they can cut the digital divide and claim more say in shaping tech's future. AI brings tough problems, like data misuse and bias, but it also opens big opportunities for growth and better governance. We need to regulate carefully, staying open to innovation while putting boundaries in place. This means seeing AI colonialism as a way to understand new inequalities, not as an unchangeable fact.

Looking forward, the answer is to build stronger, more inclusive legal systems, push for fair access, and work together across borders. If countries commit—nationally and globally—to fairness, transparency, and respect for each society's independence, we can spread AI's benefits more evenly and avoid making today's dividing lines even deeper.

References / Bibliography:-

Primary Sources

1. Charter of the United Nations (1945).
2. Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), 1948.
3. International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), 1966.
4. Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS), 1995.
5. Reports and resolutions concerning digital cooperation and AI governance issued by the United Nations (2018–2024).
6. Frameworks governing e-commerce and digital trade under the World Trade Organisation.
7. Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence adopted by UNESCO, 2021.
8. Principles on Artificial Intelligence formulated by the OECD, 2019.

Secondary Sources

1. United Nations, *Report of the High-Level Panel on Digital Cooperation* (2019).
2. UNDP, *Human Development Report: Technology and Inequality* (2021).
3. World Bank, *World Development Report: Data for Better Lives* (2021).
4. World Economic Forum, *Global Risks Report* (2023–2024).
5. OECD, *AI Policy Observatory Reports* (2022–2024).
6. Government of India, *National Strategy for Artificial Intelligence (NITI Aayog)* (2018).
7. European Union, *Artificial Intelligence Act* (proposed/adopted framework, 2023–2024).

Books and Journal Articles

1. Nick Couldry and Ulises A. Mejias, *The Costs of Connection* (Stanford University Press, 2019).
2. Shoshana Zuboff, *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism* (PublicAffairs, 2019).
3. Kate Crawford, *Atlas of AI* (Yale University Press, 2021).
4. Yuval Noah Harari, *21 Lessons for the 21st Century* (Penguin, 2018).
5. Sundar Pichai, "AI and the Future of Global Governance," *Foreign Affairs* (2020).
6. Jack Balkin, "The Path of Robotics Law," *California Law Review* (2015).
7. Lawrence Lessig, *Code and Other Laws of Cyberspace* (Basic Books, 2006).
8. Timnit Gebru, "Algorithmic Bias and Ethical AI," *AI Ethics Journal* (2020).
9. Amartya Sen, *Development as Freedom* (Oxford University Press, 1999).
10. Thomas Piketty, *Capital in the Twenty-First Century* (Harvard University Press, 2014).

Web and Institutional Reports

1. World Economic Forum, *AI Governance Alliance Reports* (2023).
2. UNESCO, *Global AI Ethics Observatory* (2022–2024).
3. OECD, *AI Policy Observatory Portal*.
4. European Commission, *White Paper on Artificial Intelligence* (2020).
5. NITI Aayog, *Responsible AI for All Strategy Document* (India, 2021).
6. Brookings Institution, reports on AI and global inequality (2022–2024).
7. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, studies on AI and geopolitics (2023).
8. "AI Colonialism and Global Power Structures," *MIT Technology Review* (2022).
9. "Regulating Big Tech and AI Governance," *The Economist* (2023).

10. "Data Sovereignty and the Future of AI," *Harvard Business Review* (2023).

References / Bibliography:-

Primary Sources

9. Charter of the United Nations (1945).
10. Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), 1948.
11. International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), 1966.
12. Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS), 1995.
13. Reports and resolutions concerning digital cooperation and AI governance issued by the United Nations (2018–2024).
14. Frameworks governing e-commerce and digital trade under the World Trade Organisation.
15. Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence adopted by UNESCO, 2021.
16. Principles on Artificial Intelligence formulated by the OECD, 2019.

Secondary Sources

8. United Nations, *Report of the High-Level Panel on Digital Cooperation* (2019).
9. UNDP, *Human Development Report: Technology and Inequality* (2021).
10. World Bank, *World Development Report: Data for Better Lives* (2021).
11. World Economic Forum, *Global Risks Report* (2023–2024).
12. OECD, *AI Policy Observatory Reports* (2022–2024).
13. Government of India, *National Strategy for Artificial Intelligence (NITI Aayog)* (2018).
14. European Union, *Artificial Intelligence Act* (proposed/adopted framework, 2023–2024).

Books and Journal Articles

11. Nick Couldry and Ulises A. Mejias, *The Costs of Connection* (Stanford University Press, 2019).
12. Shoshana Zuboff, *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism* (PublicAffairs, 2019).
13. Kate Crawford, *Atlas of AI* (Yale University Press, 2021).
14. Yuval Noah Harari, *21 Lessons for the 21st Century* (Penguin, 2018).
15. Sundar Pichai, "AI and the Future of Global Governance," *Foreign Affairs* (2020).
16. Jack Balkin, "The Path of Robotics Law," *California Law Review* (2015).
17. Lawrence Lessig, *Code and Other Laws of Cyberspace* (Basic Books, 2006).
18. Timnit Gebru, "Algorithmic Bias and Ethical AI," *AI Ethics Journal* (2020).
19. Amartya Sen, *Development as Freedom* (Oxford University Press, 1999).
20. Thomas Piketty, *Capital in the Twenty-First Century* (Harvard University Press, 2014).

Web and Institutional Reports

11. World Economic Forum, *AI Governance Alliance Reports* (2023).
12. UNESCO, *Global AI Ethics Observatory* (2022–2024).
13. OECD, *AI Policy Observatory Portal*.
14. European Commission, *White Paper on Artificial Intelligence* (2020).
15. NITI Aayog, *Responsible AI for All Strategy Document* (India, 2021).
16. Brookings Institution, reports on AI and global inequality (2022–2024).
17. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, studies on AI and geopolitics (2023).
18. "AI Colonialism and Global Power Structures," *MIT Technology Review* (2022).
19. "Regulating Big Tech and AI Governance," *The Economist* (2023).
20. "Data Sovereignty and the Future of AI," *Harvard Business Review* (2023).