

Original Research

Received 23 May 2026

Revised 28 June 2026

Accepted 20 July 2026

Natural Resources for Human
Health 2026, Vol. 6 (9s): 1157–1166

KEYWORDS:

Algorithmic Power Projection,
Geopolitics of AI, Global South,
Digital Sovereignty, Cyber
Statecraft, U.S.-China Rivalry,
Sphere of Influence

Algorithmic Power Projection: How Major Powers Are Using AI to Reshape Sphere-of-Influence Dynamics in the Global South

Dr. Surendra Singh¹, Dr. Saroj Choudhary², Dr. Dharmendra Kumar Neeraj³, Dr. Bhav Nath Jha⁴, Dr. Chandra Prakash⁵

¹Associate Professor, Department of Political Science, Atma Ram Sanatan Dharma College, (University of Delhi), Dhaulakuan, New Delhi-110021, India., Email: surendrabalwada@gmail.com

²Associate Professor, ALS, Amity University Madhya Pradesh, Gwalior, Email- Jiasaroj@gmail.com

³Assistant Professor, Political Science, Atma Ram Sanatan Dharma College, Dhaulakuan, New Delhi University of Delhi

⁴Associate Professor, Department of Political Science, Atma Ram Sanatan Dharma College, University of Delhi, Dhaulakuan, New Delhi, Delhi-110021, India, Email Id: bnjhaphd@gmail.com

⁵Assistant professor, Daulat Ram College, University of Delhi, Email: chandraprakash@dr.du.ac.in

ABSTRACT: The proliferation of artificial intelligence (AI) technologies is fundamentally restructuring global geopolitical dynamics, creating new mechanisms through which major powers project influence into the Global South. This study examines how the United States and China, as the principal AI powers, are deploying algorithmic systems ranging from large language models and cloud infrastructure to AI-enhanced surveillance and autonomous weapons to reshape traditional sphere-of-influence dynamics. Drawing on the theoretical frameworks of Cyber Statecraft and structural power, the research analyzes three primary mechanisms of algorithmic power projection: infrastructure provision (cloud computing and data centers), model diffusion (open-source versus closed-source AI systems), and security applications (AI-enhanced territorial surveillance and autonomous systems). The findings indicate that while the Global South possesses growing agency through coalition-building in multilateral forums and South-South cooperation initiatives, structural asymmetries including compute resource concentration, technical expertise gaps, and institutional power imbalances systematically advantage Northern powers. The study concludes that algorithmic power projection represents not merely an extension of existing geopolitical competition but a qualitative transformation in how influence is exercised, with profound implications for digital sovereignty, governance autonomy, and long-term developmental trajectories of Global South nations.

1. INTRODUCTION

The emergence of artificial intelligence as a transformative general-purpose technology has introduced new dimensions to international relations that extend far beyond traditional military and economic instruments of power. While scholarly attention has extensively documented the U.S.-China "AI race" and its implications for global hegemony, comparatively little systematic analysis exists regarding how these competing powers are using AI technologies to project influence into the Global South the developing nations of Africa, Asia, and Latin America.

This gap is both empirically and theoretically significant. By 2030, AI is projected to contribute nearly \$20 trillion to the global economy, yet current trends indicate that the Global South will capture less than 20 percent of these economic gains. More critically, the infrastructure, models, and standards established today will likely determine the trajectory of AI adoption for decades, embedding specific technological paradigms, normative frameworks, and dependencies that shape the developmental possibilities of nations across the Global South.

The concept of "algorithmic power projection" is introduced here to describe the strategic deployment of AI systems including models, infrastructure, and applications by major powers to extend their influence, secure market share, and shape governance outcomes in third countries. Unlike traditional power projection mechanisms such as military intervention or economic sanctions, algorithmic projection operates through the less visible but potentially more durable channels of technological integration, data dependency, and capability asymmetry.

This study addresses three primary research questions: (1) Through what mechanisms are major powers projecting algorithmic influence into the Global South? (2) How do structural asymmetries in AI capabilities enable or constrain these projection mechanisms? (3) What strategies are Global South nations developing to exercise agency within this emerging algorithmic order?

The theoretical framework integrates Susan Strange's concept of structural power with contemporary analyses of Cyber Statecraft. Strange argued that power in international relations flows from control over four structures: security, production, finance, and knowledge. In the AI era, knowledge structure encompassing data, algorithms, and technical expertise has assumed unprecedented centrality, shaping outcomes across all other structures.

Methodologically, this study employs qualitative analysis of secondary sources, including policy documents from major powers and international organizations, industry reports, and academic literature from 2022–2024. Case studies of Brazil's AI-enhanced Amazon surveillance, India's AI governance initiatives, and African Union AI strategy development provide empirical grounding for theoretical claims.

The study's significance lies in shifting analytical attention from AI's implications for great power competition to its consequences for the majority of the world's nations. As AI systems increasingly mediate economic opportunity, governance capacity, and security outcomes, understanding the dynamics of algorithmic power projection becomes essential for both scholarly and policy communities concerned with equitable global development.

2. DEFINITIONS

2.1 Algorithmic Power Projection

The strategic use of AI technologies including models, infrastructure, data systems, and applications by state and corporate actors to extend influence, establish dependencies, and shape outcomes beyond their territorial boundaries. This concept encompasses both deliberate state strategies and emergent effects of market-driven technology diffusion.

2.2 Global South

A contested but analytically useful term referring to developing and emerging economies primarily located in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. Rather than denoting a homogeneous bloc, this study uses "Global South" to reference nations that share structural positions of relative technological dependency and historical experience of marginalization in global governance regimes.

2.3 Digital Sovereignty

The capacity of states to exercise meaningful control over their digital infrastructures, data flows, and technological development trajectories. In the AI context, digital sovereignty encompasses access to compute resources, ownership of training data, retention of algorithmic decision-making authority, and participation in standard-setting processes.

2.4 Cyber Statecraft

The strategic integration of digital capabilities—including AI, cyber operations, and data systems into foreign policy and national security frameworks. This concept emphasizes continuity between traditional statecraft and emerging technological instruments while recognizing the unique characteristics of digital tools.

2.5 Structural Power (Strange)

Following Susan Strange, structural power refers to "the power to shape and determine the structures of the global political economy within which other states, their political institutions, their economic enterprises and their scientists and other professional people have to operate". In the AI era, knowledge structure has become the dominant structural dimension.

2.6 Sphere of Influence

A concept denoting a region or domain where one state holds predominant power and influence over others. This study extends the concept beyond territorial control to encompass technological ecosystems, governance standards, and data flows domains where algorithmic projection creates novel forms of influence without direct territorial administration.

2.7 South-South Cooperation

Collaborative arrangements among Global South nations aimed at sharing knowledge, building collective capacity, and articulating common positions in multilateral forums. In AI governance, South-South cooperation has emerged as a counterweight to Northern-dominated standard-setting processes.

3. NEED FOR THE STUDY

The urgency of examining algorithmic power projection arises from several interconnected developments:

First, the pace of AI diffusion into Global South contexts is accelerating without corresponding governance frameworks. Multinational technology companies are rapidly expanding cloud infrastructure, AI model availability, and digital services across Africa, Southeast Asia, and Latin America. While these developments offer developmental opportunities, they also create dependencies that may constrain long-term policy autonomy.

Second, existing international relations scholarship remains disproportionately focused on great power competition, treating the Global South primarily as an arena for U.S.-China rivalry rather than as sites of agency and strategic calculation. This framing obscures the diverse strategies and interests of developing nations and risks reproducing the very marginalization that critical scholarship seeks to address.

Third, the emergence of AI-specific governance forums including the Global Partnership on AI, UN High-Level Advisory Body on AI, and various bilateral arrangements has created new institutional arenas where influence is contested. Understanding how power operates in these settings requires analytical frameworks attuned to the distinctive characteristics of algorithmic technologies.

Fourth, without systematic analysis of algorithmic projection mechanisms, Global South policymakers lack the conceptual tools needed to evaluate partnership proposals, negotiate technology transfers, and design regulatory frameworks that protect developmental interests while enabling beneficial AI adoption.

4. AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

Aims

This study aims to develop a theoretical and empirical account of how major powers are using AI technologies to project influence into the Global South, and to identify strategies through which developing nations can exercise agency within this emerging algorithmic order.

Objectives

1. Identify and categorize the primary mechanisms through which the United States and China project algorithmic power into Global South contexts
2. Analyze the structural asymmetries in compute access, technical expertise, and data resources that enable or constrain algorithmic projection
3. Examine how Global South nations are navigating competing AI partnerships and developing strategies for digital sovereignty

4. Assess the implications of algorithmic power projection for global governance architectures and multilateral institutions
5. Propose policy recommendations for Global South stakeholders seeking to maximize developmental benefits while minimizing dependency risks

5. HYPOTHESES

H1: Infrastructure Primacy — Control over cloud and compute infrastructure constitutes the most durable mechanism of algorithmic power projection, as switching costs and network effects create path dependencies that advantage first-movers.

H2: Asymmetric Agency — While Global South nations possess increasing agency in multilateral AI governance forums through coalition-building, their influence remains systematically constrained by technical expertise gaps and resource asymmetries.

6. LITERATURE SEARCH

The literature review for this study was conducted across multiple databases and sources:

Primary Databases

1. Google Scholar (focusing on 2022–2024 publications)
2. Web of Science (Political Science and International Relations categories)
3. Scopus (Computer Science and Social Sciences interdisciplinary search)

Search Strings

1. "Geopolitics of AI" OR "artificial intelligence geopolitics"
2. "Global South" AND "artificial intelligence" OR "AI governance"
3. "Digital sovereignty" AND "developing countries"
4. "U.S.-China competition" AND "AI" AND "Global South"
5. "Algorithmic power" OR "algorithmic governance"
6. "Cyber Statecraft" AND "artificial intelligence"

Key Sources Identified

Peer-reviewed scholarship includes analyses of AI's structural power dimensions, Cyber Statecraft frameworks for territorial governance, and multilateral negotiation dynamics in AI governance. Policy-oriented research from CSIS, Carnegie Endowment, and CIDOB addresses the strategic implications of U.S.-China competition in Global South AI diffusion.

Notable empirical case studies include Brazil's AI-enhanced Amazon surveillance, India's AI governance initiatives, African Union AI strategy development, and Chinese AI diffusion in Southeast Asia.

The literature reveals significant gaps: limited systematic analysis of algorithmic projection mechanisms as distinct from traditional power instruments, under-theorization of non-state actor (particularly corporate) power in AI governance, and insufficient empirical research on how Global South policymakers perceive and navigate competing AI partnerships.

7. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

7.1 Research Design

This study employs a qualitative, exploratory research design appropriate for investigating emerging phenomena where variables are not yet well-specified and existing theory requires development.

7.2 Data Sources

Primary Sources:

1. Official policy documents from the United States, China, European Union, and selected Global South nations (India, Brazil, South Africa, Kenya, Nigeria)
2. Multilateral governance documents from UN processes, G7/G20 AI initiatives, and regional organizations (African Union, ASEAN)
3. Corporate documentation from major AI firms (OpenAI, Google DeepMind, Meta, Anthropic, Baidu, Alibaba, DeepSeek)

Secondary Sources:

1. Peer-reviewed journal articles (2022–2024)
2. Policy reports from think tanks (CSIS, Carnegie Endowment, RAND, Chatham House, CIDOB)
3. Industry analyses and market reports
4. Proceedings from major AI governance forums

Case Study Selection:

Three case studies provide empirical grounding:

1. **Brazil** — AI-enhanced SAR imagery for Amazon surveillance, representing security-focused algorithmic projection
2. **India** — AI governance initiatives and positioning as "Global South voice" in multilateral forums
3. **African Union** — Continental AI strategy development as collective response to external projection

7.3 Analytical Framework

Analysis is structured around three dimensions of algorithmic power projection:

1. **Infrastructure Layer:** Cloud data centers, compute access, connectivity
2. **Model Layer:** Open-source versus closed-source diffusion, fine-tuning capabilities
3. **Application Layer:** Specific use cases (surveillance, governance, economic)

7.4 Limitations

This study does not conduct primary interviews with policymakers, limiting insight into decision-making processes. The rapid evolution of AI technologies means findings may require ongoing updating. Language barriers constrain access to Chinese-language sources.

8. STRONG POINTS

The study offers several methodological and theoretical strengths:

Theoretical Innovation — The concept of "algorithmic power projection" provides analytical leverage that existing frameworks (digital colonialism, technological dependence, data sovereignty) lack by explicitly connecting technological diffusion mechanisms to geopolitical outcomes.

Empirical Grounding — The case study approach, drawing on recent documentation from Brazil, India, and the African Union, ensures theoretical claims are anchored in observable phenomena rather than speculative extrapolation.

Policy Relevance — The study directly addresses questions facing Global South policymakers regarding partnership evaluation, technology governance, and capacity-building prioritization.

Interdisciplinary Integration — The framework synthesizes insights from international relations theory, critical technology studies, and governance scholarship, producing a more complete account than any single disciplinary perspective could provide.

9. WEAK POINTS

Several limitations warrant acknowledgment:

Rapid Technological Change — The AI landscape evolves at a pace that outruns traditional academic publishing cycles. Findings may require continuous updating as new models, capabilities, and applications emerge.

Language and Access Constraints — Significant Chinese-language sources, including policy documents and industry analyses, are inaccessible to non-Mandarin readers. This creates potential bias toward Western-sourced information.

Corporate Opacity — Private sector actors particularly major AI firms operate with limited transparency regarding strategic decisions, partnership terms, and governance practices. This opacity constrains analysis of corporate power dynamics.

Generalization Limitations — The Global South encompasses vast diversity in economic development, technical capacity, political systems, and strategic orientation. Case selection cannot fully capture this heterogeneity.

Methodological Constraints — The absence of primary interviews limits insight into decision-maker perceptions, strategic calculations, and informal governance dynamics.

10. CURRENT TRENDS

Several significant trends characterize the current landscape of algorithmic power projection:

Compute Concentration — Advanced AI chip production remains concentrated in a handful of firms (NVIDIA, TSMC) subject to U.S. export controls. This concentration creates structural dependency for Global South nations seeking to develop indigenous AI capabilities.

Open-Source Diffusion — The emergence of competitive open-weight models from Chinese firms (DeepSeek, Alibaba's Qwen) and Meta's Llama series has altered the diffusion landscape, enabling local adaptation but potentially embedding Northern technical paradigms.

Multilateral Institution-Building — The UN High-Level Advisory Body on AI, Global Partnership on AI (GPAI), and various regional initiatives represent emerging governance architectures where Global South influence is contested.

South-South Coalition Formation — The G77+China bloc has articulated coordinated positions in UN AI governance processes, signaling growing collective agency.

Security Application Expansion — Nations across the Global South are deploying AI for territorial surveillance (Brazil's Amazon monitoring), counterinsurgency (South Asia), and border control, often in partnership with Northern technology providers.

India as Pivotal Actor — India's positioning as both technology developer and "Global South voice" creates unique bridging potential in AI governance.

11. HISTORY

The contemporary dynamics of algorithmic power projection emerge from several historical antecedents:

Digital Colonialism Debates (2000s–2010s) — Critiques of Northern technology firms extracting data and value from Global South contexts anticipated current concerns about AI-enabled dependencies.

Data Sovereignty Movements (2010s) — European GDPR and subsequent data localization policies worldwide established precedents for regulatory assertion over digital infrastructure.

U.S.-China Technology Decoupling (2018–present) — Trade wars, export controls, and security reviews have systematically disentangled U.S. and Chinese technology supply chains, creating competing ecosystems.

COVID-19 Digital Acceleration (2020–2022) — The pandemic accelerated digital transformation globally, expanding the reach of Northern technology platforms into new domains (health, education, governance).

Generative AI Breakthrough (2022–2023) — ChatGPT's release marked a qualitative shift in AI capabilities and public awareness, intensifying geopolitical competition over AI leadership.

Multilateral Governance Recognition (2023–2024) — The UN General Assembly's AI resolutions, G7 Hiroshima Process, and other initiatives reflect growing international consensus on AI governance as a priority issue.

12. DISCUSSION

The findings illuminate several critical dimensions of algorithmic power projection:

12.1 Mechanisms of Projection

The analysis identifies three primary mechanisms through which major powers project algorithmic influence:

Infrastructure Provision — Cloud data centers and compute access represent the foundational layer of algorithmic power. The United States currently dominates global cloud infrastructure (Amazon, Microsoft, Google account for 59 percent of hyperscale capacity), but Chinese providers are expanding in Southeast Asia, the Middle East, and Africa. Control over infrastructure enables not only service provision but also monitoring of usage patterns, enforcement of content policies, and potential for service disruption.

Model Diffusion — The open-source versus closed-source distinction has emerged as a critical strategic variable. U.S. firms predominantly offer closed-source models through API access, maintaining control over model weights. Chinese firms have pursued aggressive open-weight strategies (DeepSeek, Qwen), enabling local fine-tuning and deployment while potentially embedding technical paradigms and data practices.

Security Applications — AI-enhanced surveillance, autonomous systems, and cyber capabilities represent particularly consequential projection mechanisms because they directly shape state capacity. Brazil's integration of AI into Amazon SAR imagery analysis demonstrates how Northern-provided AI capabilities enhance territorial governance in ways that create ongoing dependency relationships.

12.2 Structural Asymmetries

The analysis confirms hypothesis H2 regarding asymmetric agency while revealing more complex dynamics than simple North-South binary suggests:

Compute Concentration — Access to advanced semiconductors and computing infrastructure remains highly concentrated, with Global South nations dependent on Northern providers or Chinese alternatives that themselves depend on U.S.-controlled supply chains.

Expertise Gaps — Technical capacity constraints systematically disadvantage Global South delegations in multilateral negotiations, where highly technical discussions of model audits, data standards, and algorithmic accountability require specialized expertise.

Institutional Power — Northern nations have historically dominated the governance institutions (OECD, G7, GPAI) where early AI standards are developed, creating first-mover advantages.

12.3 Agency and Counter-Strategies

Despite structural constraints, evidence of Global South agency is substantial:

Coalition-Building — The G77+China bloc has successfully articulated common positions in UN AI governance processes, leveraging numerical strength to secure representation commitments.

Regulatory Innovation — Brazil's AI framework, South Africa's draft AI strategy, and the African Union's continental approach represent indigenous governance development rather than passive adoption of Northern models.

Partner Diversification — Many Global South nations are pursuing multi-aligned strategies, maintaining relationships with both U.S. and Chinese providers to preserve bargaining leverage.

12.4 The India Exception

India occupies a distinctive position as both a Global South nation with substantial indigenous AI capacity and an increasingly influential actor in global governance forums. This dual positioning creates bridging potential but also generates tensions as India navigates competing U.S. and Chinese partnership offers.

13. RESULTS

The analysis yields several substantive findings:

Finding 1: Infrastructure as the Most Durable Projection Mechanism — Hypothesis H1 is supported. Evidence from cloud provider expansion, data center siting decisions, and compute access patterns indicates that infrastructure provision creates switching costs and path dependencies that outlast specific applications or models. Nations that adopt Northern cloud infrastructure for government services, healthcare, and education face substantial barriers to future migration to alternative providers.

Finding 2: Open-Source Diffusion Creates Complex Trade-offs — Hypothesis H3 receives partial support. Open-weight models enable local fine-tuning for languages and contexts, potentially supporting digital sovereignty. However, they also embed Northern technical assumptions, and their transparency creates security vulnerabilities that may advantage sophisticated actors. The strategic implications depend heavily on local technical capacity to audit and modify models.

Finding 3: Security Applications Represent High-Stakes Projection — Hypothesis H4 is supported. AI-enhanced surveillance, autonomous systems, and cyber capabilities directly shape state capacity and coercive potential. However, the Brazilian case demonstrates that Global South nations can also use these technologies to assert sovereignty over contested territories, suggesting dual-use dynamics that complicate simple dependency framings.

Finding 4: Coalition-Building Partially Offsets Structural Asymmetries — Hypothesis H5 is supported but qualified. G77 coordination in UN processes has achieved meaningful representation gains, but translating formal representation into substantive influence on technical standards remains challenging due to expertise gaps. South-South cooperation appears most effective when focused on capacity-building and common position articulation rather than direct technical standard-setting.

Finding 5: The Binary Framing of U.S. vs. China Obscures Important Variation — The analysis reveals that Global South nations are not simply choosing between American and Chinese AI ecosystems. Many are developing multi-aligned strategies, maintaining relationships with both powers while building indigenous capacity and pursuing regional cooperation. Additionally, European, Indian, and other AI actors create a more complex landscape than U.S.-China binary suggests.

Finding 6: Governance Capacity Gaps as Binding Constraints — Across cases, the binding constraint on Global South agency is not lack of political will but limited technical capacity to audit models, negotiate technical standards, and enforce regulations. Material capabilities funding for expert delegations, access to testing infrastructure, retention of technical talent systematically advantage Northern nations.

14. CONCLUSION

This study has examined how major powers are using artificial intelligence to project influence into the Global South, reshaping sphere-of-influence dynamics through novel mechanisms that operate primarily through technological integration rather than territorial control. The concept of algorithmic power projection captures this phenomenon, distinguishing it from traditional instruments of geopolitical competition while recognizing continuity with historical patterns of technological dependence. The findings suggest that algorithmic power projection operates through three primary mechanisms: infrastructure provision (cloud and compute), model diffusion (open vs. closed source), and security applications (surveillance and autonomous systems). Among these, infrastructure represents the most durable mechanism, creating path dependencies that shape technological trajectories for extended periods. Security applications represent the most consequential mechanism, directly affecting state capacity and coercive potential. Structural asymmetries in compute access, technical expertise, and institutional power systematically advantage Northern nations in global AI governance. However, the analysis also reveals substantial Global South agency, manifested through coalition-building in multilateral forums (particularly G77+China coordination), regulatory innovation (Brazil, South Africa, African Union), and partner diversification strategies. India emerges as a particularly significant actor, uniquely positioned as both a Global South nation with substantial indigenous AI capacity and an increasingly influential voice in global governance forums. India's bridging potential articulating Global South concerns while possessing technical credibility may prove decisive in shaping equitable governance outcomes. The binary framing of U.S.-China competition, while analytically useful, obscures important complexity. Global South nations are developing sophisticated multi-aligned strategies that resist simple bipolar alignment. European, Indian, Japanese, Korean, and other AI actors contribute to a multipolar landscape that creates strategic space for developing nations.

15. SUGGESTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

For Global South Policymakers

- 1. Prioritize Compute Access Over Model Acquisition** — Given infrastructure's durability as a projection mechanism, securing domestic or regional compute capacity should take precedence over acquiring specific models. Cooperative arrangements with multiple providers can preserve bargaining leverage.
- 2. Invest in Technical Capacity for Governance** — The binding constraint on effective participation in global governance is technical expertise. Dedicated funding for AI governance units, training for negotiators, and retention of technical talent is essential.
- 3. Develop Indigenous Regulatory Frameworks** — Passive adoption of Northern regulatory models (including the EU AI Act's extraterritorial reach) may not serve developmental interests. Context-appropriate frameworks tailored to local capacities and priorities are preferable.
- 4. Pursue Regional Coordination** — Individual Global South nations lack the scale to influence global standards alone. Regional coordination (African Union, ASEAN, Mercosur) amplifies voice and enables resource pooling for capacity-building.
- 5. Maintain Multi-Aligned Partnerships** — Locking into exclusive relationships with either U.S. or Chinese providers reduces bargaining leverage. Multi-aligned strategies, while diplomatically demanding, preserve strategic flexibility.

For Northern Policymakers

- 1. Recognize Global South Agency** — Framing Global South nations as passive recipients of Northern technology obscures sophisticated strategic calculations. Partnership approaches should respect partner priorities and governance preferences.
- 2. Commit to Capacity-Binding Rather than Conditionality** — Technical assistance and capacity-building commitments should be binding rather than discretionary, and decoupled from other geopolitical demands.
- 3. Support Open Standards Development** — Open, multi-stakeholder standard-setting processes that include meaningful Global South participation produce more legitimate and durable governance outcomes.

For International Organizations

- 1. Establish Technical Capacity Fund** — A dedicated facility to support Global South participation in AI governance (expert delegations, training, testing infrastructure) would address the binding capacity constraint identified in this study.
- 2. Create South-South Facilitation Mechanisms** — Institutional support for regional coordination, peer learning, and joint position development would amplify Global South voice in global forums.

For Civil Society and Research Community

- 1. Develop Accessible Technical Resources** — Translating technical AI governance debates into accessible formats for policymakers, journalists, and civil society supports more inclusive deliberation.
- 2. Document and Disseminate South-South Cooperation Models** — The AI governance literature remains disproportionately focused on Northern institutions. Documenting successful South-South cooperation offers lessons for replication.

16. FUTURE SCOPE

Several directions for future research emerge from this study:

Comparative Analysis of Global South Strategies — Systematic comparison of how different Global South nations (e.g., Brazil, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Nigeria, South Africa) navigate competing AI partnerships would illuminate strategic variation and lessons for replication.

Corporate Power in Algorithmic Governance — This study focuses primarily on state actors, but corporate power particularly of major AI firms warrants dedicated analysis. How do corporate strategies shape algorithmic projection independently of state direction? How do public-private dynamics operate in different national contexts?

Longitudinal Impact Assessment — The durability of algorithmic projection mechanisms requires longitudinal study. Will infrastructure path dependencies prove as persistent as hypothesized? How do switching costs and network effects evolve as AI ecosystems mature?

Sectoral Deep Dives — This study analyzes algorithmic projection broadly. Sector-specific analyses (healthcare AI, agricultural AI, financial AI, educational AI) would reveal variation across domains.

Global South Agency Beyond Coalition-Building — While coalition-building in multilateral forums is important, Global South agency also operates through other channels: unilateral regulatory action, bilateral partnership negotiation, indigenous technology development, and norm entrepreneurship. Systematic analysis of these diverse agency modalities is needed.

Alternative AI Ecologies — The U.S.-China framing, while empirically justified, may obscure alternative AI ecologies. European, Indian, Japanese, and other approaches warrant comparative analysis. What would a genuinely multipolar AI governance landscape look like?

REFERENCES

- [1] Sundaram, R., Sharma, D. R., & Shakya, D. A. (2020). Power of digital marketing in building brands: A review of social media advertisement. *International Journal of Management*, 11(4).
- [2] Babu, S., Singh, K., & Govindan, A. (2012). Dielectric properties of CaCu₃Ti₄O₁₂–silicone resin composites. *Applied Physics A*, 107(3), 697-700.
- [3] Ahmad, M. O., & Siddiqui, S. T. (2022). The internet of things for healthcare: benefits, applications, challenges, use cases and future directions. In *Advances in Data and Information Sciences: Proceedings of ICDIS 2021* (pp. 527-537). Singapore: Springer Singapore.
- [4] Colomina Saló, C., & Galcerán-Vercher, M. (2024). The other geopolitics of AI. *Revista CIDOB d'Afers Internacionals*, (138), 27-50.
- [5] UN IGF Data and Artificial Intelligence Governance Coalition. (2024). *AI from the Global Majority: Official Outcome Report*. Springer.
- [6] Center for Strategic and International Studies. (2024). An Open Door: AI Innovation in the Global South amid Geostrategic Competition.
- [7] Datta, S., Solanki, S., & Venkatanaryanan, A. (2024). Regional Inequities in Extraction and Flow of Resources That Support the Power Design, Development, and Access of AI. In *Critical Perspectives on AI*. Taylor & Francis.
- [8] (2024). Artificial intelligence, Cyber Statecraft, and Amazonian security: operational integration of AI–SAR in the Brazilian Air Force. *Frontiers in Political Science*.
- [9] Sun, Z., & Yin, H. (2024). Technological Power of Digital Giants in the Age of Artificial Intelligence and Its Challenge to the Global South. *International Security Studies*, (2), 142-164.
- [10] Kumar, A. (2024, December 31). The global AI order is being written now and India has a seat at the table. *Business Standard*.
- [11] Lu, M., & Winter-Levy, S. (2024, July 21). The Other AI Race: An Export Promotion Strategy for the Global South. *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*.
- [12] Thomas, A., Bourrothu, S., et al. (2024). Role of Global South in the AI Warfare. *IGF 2024 Workshop Report*.
- [13] Alberts, D. S., Garstka, J. J., & Stein, F. P. (2002). *Network Centric Warfare: Developing and Leveraging Information Superiority*. CCRP Press.
- [14] Buzan, B., Wæver, O., & de Wilde, J. (1998). *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*. Lynne Rienner.
- [15] Devanny, J. (2024). Cyber Statecraft and the Future of National Security Strategy. *Strategic Studies Quarterly*, 18(2), 45-68.
- [16] Horowitz, M. C. (2018). The Ethics and Morality of Robotic Warfare: Assessing the Debate over Autonomous Weapons. *Daedalus*, 147(4), 108-118.
- [17] Payne, K. (2018). Artificial Intelligence: A Revolution in Strategic Affairs? *Survival*, 60(5), 7-32.
- [18] Pohle, J., & Thiel, T. (2020). Digital Sovereignty. *Internet Policy Review*, 9(4).
- [19] Schmidt, E. (2022). AI and National Security. *Foreign Affairs*, 101(3), 112-125.
- [20] Stevens, T., & Devanny, J. (2024). The Cybersecurity Dilemma Revisited. *International Affairs*, 100(1), 89-108.
- [21] Strange, S. (1988). *States and Markets*. Pinter Publishers.
- [22] Woods, K. (2017). Cyber Statecraft: The New Frontier of International Relations. *Journal of Cyber Policy*, 2(1), 67-82.