

Global AI Governance: Status Quo, Dilemmas, and China's Approach

Liu Yang, Zhi Zheng

(Shenyang Polytechnic College, Dadong District, Shenyang, Liaoning 110045, China)

Abstract: Artificial intelligence is a strategic technology leading a new round of scientific and technological revolution and industrial transformation. Global artificial intelligence governance refers to the regulation and control of the multifaceted issues involved in the entire process of the research, development and application of artificial intelligence, and it plays a key role in guiding science and technology toward good and in shaping a sustainable global artificial intelligence ecosystem. Taking the current state of global artificial intelligence governance as its starting point, and in view of the current dilemmas—insufficient representativeness in participation, insufficient coordination among governance mechanisms, considerable difficulty in coordinating technical rules, and insufficient release of governance dividends—this paper proposes a framework for global artificial intelligence governance from the aspects of deepening the construction of multilateral cooperation mechanisms, focusing on the formulation of technical safety and ethical standards, attending to the construction of rules for cross-border data flow, and accelerating the fulfillment of artificial intelligence governance commitments, in the hope of providing new ideas for global artificial intelligence governance and of promoting the development of the global artificial intelligence governance system in a more open and inclusive direction.

Keywords: artificial intelligence; global governance; governance dilemmas; China's path

1 Introduction

The Decision of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China on Further Comprehensively Deepening Reform and Advancing Chinese Modernization, adopted at the Third Plenary Session of the 20th Central Committee of the Party, points out the need to implement the “three global initiatives,” to participate in and lead the reform and construction of the global governance system, to effectively respond to external risks and challenges, and to lead global governance; it calls for “establishing a safety supervision system for artificial intelligence” and encourages and supports China in promoting international exchange and cooperation on artificial intelligence. As an emerging technology, artificial intelligence requires global governance of vital importance: in today's era of globalization, the rapid development of artificial intelligence transcends national borders, and reasonable global governance can promote the healthy innovation and orderly diffusion of artificial intelligence technology worldwide, drive the global sharing of technological dividends, and support global economic growth and sustainable development. With the rapid development of artificial intelligence, such dilemmas and challenges in global artificial intelligence governance as the widespread absence of developing countries from governance dialogues, the prominent trend toward competitive and weaponized rules, the insufficient coordination among existing governance mechanisms, and the gap between the effects of governance implementation and commitments may hamper the release of the technological dividends of artificial intelligence and are not conducive to building a pattern of global “good governance” for artificial intelligence.

As an active participant in and builder of global artificial intelligence governance, China advocates a spirit of openness and sharing and promotes the exchange of and cooperation on global artificial intelligence research resources. On July 4, 2024, the World Artificial Intelligence Conference in Shanghai released to the world the Shanghai Declaration on Global AI Governance, which put forward a policy framework for improving global artificial intelligence governance in five aspects: artificial intelligence development, artificial intelligence safety, the artificial intelligence governance system, artificial intelligence and society, and social well-being. Against the current

DOI: 10.67762/y4dy3p59

Submission date: August 15, 2026

background of increasingly intense international competition in science and technology, strengthening barriers of technological mechanisms and rules, and a widening gap in scientific and technological development, China's vision and governance framework for global artificial intelligence governance provide a useful policy reference for future global artificial intelligence governance. Therefore, reviewing the current state of and dilemmas in global artificial intelligence governance and, in light of China's policy practice in participating in global artificial intelligence governance, proposing a “Chinese solution” for global artificial intelligence governance is an inherent requirement for promoting artificial intelligence to benefit all humankind and for building a community with a shared future for mankind [1][2][3][4].

In research on global artificial intelligence governance, most studies focus on analysis centering on global artificial intelligence governance initiatives, expounding the core connotations of such initiatives and, on the basis of them, uncovering Chinese wisdom and Chinese solutions [5]. From the perspective of international relations, some advocate building a global consensus on artificial intelligence [6] and, on that basis, propose solutions to its trust dilemma [7]. From the perspective of the global economy, some analyze, based on the characteristics of artificial intelligence, the specific mechanisms through which it impacts the order of global economic governance [8][9][10], and dissect China's implementation path within the framework of global governance [11]. At present, most relevant studies on global artificial intelligence governance discuss its theoretical importance and abstract connotations from a macro perspective and rarely descend to the micro level. In addition, the practical paths proposed for global artificial intelligence governance are mostly concentrated on a domestic perspective, and corresponding governance schemes are rarely proposed from a global angle. Combining macro and micro perspectives, this paper analyzes the emerging challenges facing global artificial intelligence governance and proposes a relatively reasonable and feasible Chinese path from an international perspective.

2 The Connotation and Current State of Global Artificial Intelligence Governance

2.1 The Connotation of Global Artificial Intelligence Governance

In recent years, artificial intelligence has become a decisive force driving humankind into the intelligent era. Looking back at the history of successive industrial revolutions, emerging technologies can both propel human society into a new stage and pose new challenges to socio-economic governance. While artificial intelligence brings epochal change, a series of social problems and hidden safety risks have also continued to breed, and global artificial intelligence governance urgently needs to be improved. Global artificial intelligence governance refers to the process by which the international community, through a series of policies, rules, standards, mechanisms and cooperation, coordinates, supervises and manages the development, deployment and application of artificial intelligence technology on a global scale. How countries respond to the cross-border challenges brought by artificial intelligence and give full play to its advantages to promote fair, safe and sustainable global scientific and technological development and social progress has become the leading direction of global artificial intelligence governance.

The development of artificial intelligence is not confined to any particular industry, which means that global artificial intelligence governance exhibits such negative features as imperfect technological governance, a high risk of diffusion of negative impacts, and large gaps in international governance. First, the technological governance of artificial intelligence is not yet complete. Artificial intelligence algorithms may contain defects or be maliciously tampered with, and large volumes of personal information, corporate secrets and even sensitive national information are at risk of leakage. Throughout the entire life cycle of artificial intelligence—from model defects at the R&D and design stage, to data bias at the training stage, to problems of adaptability and update maintenance after deployment and operation—there is a lack of systematic, institutionalized and mature solutions and governance models [12]. Second, the negative impacts of artificial intelligence carry the risk of global contagion. The application scope of artificial intelligence is broad and it is in a stage of rapid development; under conditions of information asymmetry,

the negative spillover effects and downstream impacts caused by artificial intelligence are global in nature. The achievements of artificial intelligence technology spread and are applied rapidly around the world, and any major breakthrough or mistake made by any country in the field of artificial intelligence will produce a butterfly effect, spreading to other countries through channels such as information exchange. Third, there is a huge gap in global artificial intelligence governance. The ethical, moral and social-fairness problems triggered by artificial intelligence are global in nature, and inequitable and unbalanced problems such as algorithmic bias may lead to unfairness in the distribution of resources such as employment and education across different races and genders [13][14]. Coordination gaps among artificial intelligence initiatives and institutions may split the world into relatively independent artificial intelligence governance systems [15]. National governance policies and regulations differ greatly, and in conducting cross-border artificial intelligence business, countries face regulatory arbitrage and compliance dilemmas. Therefore, ensuring that global artificial intelligence technology develops within a legal, compliant and ethically sound framework has become an inevitable requirement of global artificial intelligence governance.

Against the backdrop of continuously emerging ethical and safety risks related to artificial intelligence technology, global artificial intelligence governance is mainly conducted in the form of laws and regulations, supplemented by industry standards and initiatives and by international cooperation. International legal documents or consensus recommendations on artificial intelligence ethics and data protection are necessary tools for global artificial intelligence governance [16]. In 2023, major economies such as the United States and the European Union advanced the formulation of AI regulatory legislation. The United States focused on the social governance dimension of artificial intelligence and issued the Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Framework 1.0 (AI RMF 1.0) on January 26, 2023, which was formulated with the participation of government departments, private enterprises, scientific research institutions and industry associations, and which regulates artificial intelligence in key areas through legislation. The governance content of AI RMF 1.0 covers the risks of artificial intelligence systems across their entire life cycle, including harm to humans, organizations and ecosystems, and it also pays attention to the trustworthiness of AI so as to ensure that it is effective and reliable. In terms of policy framework, AI RMF 1.0 proposes a “trinity” policy framework of risk assessment, information sharing and adherence to accountability: it establishes a risk-assessment mechanism, under which organizations assess the risks of AI systems and put forward corresponding recommendations so as to determine technical operational and managerial measures; it implements an information-sharing mechanism, strengthening communication and cooperation among all parties and sharing information on risks and decision-making processes within and between organizations; and it adheres to an accountability mechanism, clarifying the responsibilities of each participant and implementing a clear mechanism for dividing rights and responsibilities so that the risks of AI systems can be traced. Meanwhile, in September 2024 the National Technical Committee 260 on Cybersecurity of China (TC260) released the Artificial Intelligence Safety Governance Framework, whose participating drafting bodies include government departments, enterprises, research institutes, civil organizations and the general public, and whose governance content covers both the endogenous safety risks and the application safety risks of artificial intelligence. Compared with the policy framework of the United States, China's artificial intelligence governance framework emphasizes sharing-based development concepts such as inclusiveness and coordinated development. First, it adheres to the principles of inclusiveness and prudence and of ensuring safety, encouraging innovation while strictly guarding the safety bottom line; second, it is risk-oriented and flexible in governance, closely monitoring risk trends and rapidly adjusting governance measures; third, it combines technology and management and responds in a coordinated manner, comprehensively employing technical and managerial means and clarifying the responsibilities of all parties.

2.2 Global Artificial Intelligence Governance Is at a Critical Stage of Order Formation

With the rapid development of science and technology and the continued advancement of global integration, the development of global artificial intelligence governance exhibits four features: the accelerating transformation of the

international regulatory structure, the gradual formation of diversified artificial intelligence frameworks, the shift of policy focus toward multidimensional governance, and the increasing diversification of governance actors. The reconstruction of the global artificial intelligence governance landscape has entered a critical stage [17][18][19].

2.2.1 International Regulatory Legislation Is Gradually Strengthening, While Expansive Policies Are Relatively Decreasing

International regulatory legislation on artificial intelligence is gradually strengthening in the direction of ensuring technological safety and ethics, while expansive policies oriented toward promoting the free development of technology are relatively decreasing. In the past, global artificial intelligence bills were mainly expansive, aimed at enhancing a country's level of artificial intelligence technology; now there is an increasing tendency toward regulatory legislation that imposes restrictions on the use of artificial intelligence and sets clear rules and boundaries for its development. As policymakers pay increasing attention to the potential harms of embedding artificial intelligence into society and recognize the necessity of regulating it, countries have issued a large number of policies on the normative governance of artificial intelligence. Among the 28 AI-related bills passed globally in 2023, 18 were regulatory statutes of moderate relevance, reflecting countries' emphasis on AI risk control. Countries are vigorously developing artificial intelligence in the hope that it will become an important driving force for the growth of national economic and technological strength and even of comprehensive national power. As artificial intelligence technology gradually matures and its integration with various social fields deepens, problems such as data leakage, algorithmic bias and ethical and moral issues have slowly come to the fore. Global competition in artificial intelligence is becoming increasingly intense, and relying solely on expansive policies to enhance competitiveness is no longer sufficient to maintain a competitive position; enacting strict regulatory legislation to raise the thresholds and standards of the artificial intelligence industry is more conducive to the development of national interests. In December 2023 the European Union promulgated the Artificial Intelligence Act, establishing a risk-based regulatory framework that classifies artificial intelligence systems into different risk levels, imposes strict supervision on high-risk systems and requires them to comply with multiple requirements, requires low-risk artificial intelligence to comply with basic transparency obligations, and explicitly prohibits AI systems with excessively high risk. Governments and international organizations are gradually moving toward consensus in the field of global artificial intelligence governance, attaching increasing importance to regulating and supervising the development and application of artificial intelligence technology to ensure that the technology is safe, reliable and in line with ethical and moral standards.

2.2.2 Multilateral Cooperation Frameworks Are Taking Shape, with a Clear Trend of "Divide and Rule"

Multilateral cooperation frameworks for artificial intelligence are being constructed, and there are significant differences in the governance needs of different countries and regions, showing a clear trend of "divide and rule." Based on considerations of common interests, countries actively seek consensus on artificial intelligence governance and promote the gradual construction of multilateral cooperation frameworks for artificial intelligence. Taking the UK AI Safety Summit in November 2023 as an example, 28 countries including China and the United States jointly signed the Bletchley Declaration, marking an initial consensus reached by the international community on AI governance. The United Nations and other relevant international organizations have incorporated issues related to global artificial intelligence governance into their work, committing themselves to promoting global artificial intelligence governance in a more reasonable and orderly direction. In the formation of multilateral cooperation frameworks for artificial intelligence, different governance concepts and interest demands lead to different emphases and positions among countries on artificial intelligence governance; the internal governance models of countries are gradually becoming separated, showing a tendency toward "divide and rule." The General Data Protection Regulation issued by the European Union strictly regulates the rules for enterprises' use of personal data and imposes heavy fines on enterprises that violate the rules, whereas the California Consumer Privacy Act in the United States relies mainly on industry

self-discipline and its data privacy regulations are relatively lenient. Countries differ in their degree of development and in their interest demands: developed countries hope to use artificial intelligence technology to maintain their global technological leadership and economic advantage and to dominate the formulation of international rules on artificial intelligence, and in artificial intelligence governance they emphasize the protection of intellectual property and data security, whereas developing countries pay more attention to the popularization and application of artificial intelligence technology and hope to use it to raise their national level of economic development and social governance capacity and to safeguard national data sovereignty, and in their governance they emphasize the accessibility and fairness of technology. In addition, national interests and values dominate the differences in artificial intelligence governance models. For example, the United States and the West worry that China's rise in the field of artificial intelligence will challenge their long-held technological superiority and affect their dominance in the global economy and technology, and they further exert greater pressure on domestic enterprises, requiring them to restrict the provision of advanced artificial intelligence and semiconductor technology to China [20][21][22][23]. Under such circumstances, countries may pay more attention to protecting their own technological advantages and interests, and their divergences on key issues of global artificial intelligence governance will widen, making it difficult to smoothly establish a global artificial intelligence governance mechanism.

2.2.3 The Focus of Policy Is Shifting toward Multidimensional Governance, and the Fields Covered by Governance Are Continuously Expanding

The orientation of artificial intelligence policy has undergone a significant transformation; the focus of policy has gradually shifted toward multidimensional governance, and the fields covered by governance have shown a trend of continuous expansion. The shift of the policy focus of artificial intelligence toward multidimensional governance means that policy concerns are no longer confined to a single dimension, and that the fields covered by governance have expanded to industries such as healthcare, transportation, finance and education, encompassing the entire life-cycle links from technological R&D and data management to application promotion and social-impact assessment. Since the advent of artificial intelligence, the issues of concern at different stages of development have gradually increased: in the early period the world focused on technological safety and on protecting important strategic resources such as information and data from leakage; today, as artificial intelligence is applied in many fields, the coverage of artificial intelligence governance is also continuously expanding. In the era of artificial intelligence, the scarcity of high-quality educational resources is continuously diminishing and the ways of acquiring knowledge have become more convenient [24][25]. From the norms for data use in the R&D link to market regulation in the application link, artificial intelligence runs through almost the entire process of human production and life, and the complexity and globality of its development require multidimensional and broad-coverage governance to safeguard human interests and social stability. The externality impacts brought by the development of artificial intelligence are enormous; while conducting multidimensional governance, countries are also expanding the fields of governance, and through a series of concrete measures put into practice they compel the developers and operators of artificial intelligence to consider the newly added costs, thereby internalizing the externalities. In July 2023, China issued the Interim Measures for the Management of Generative Artificial Intelligence Services to regulate generative artificial intelligence services, covering multiple fields such as technological R&D, application scenarios and data management. When the state formulates regulations and policies on artificial intelligence, enterprises need to adjust their own business models and management policies to adapt to the policy changes; their compliance costs increase, and artificial intelligence risks are controlled from the production side, internalizing the possible negative externality impacts of artificial intelligence.

2.2.4 Government-Enterprise Cooperative Governance Models Are Emerging, and Governance Actors Are Becoming More Diversified

Government-enterprise cooperative governance models in the field of artificial intelligence have initially emerged,

and governance actors are developing in a diversified direction. As the model of government and enterprises cooperating to jointly promote artificial intelligence governance gradually rises, artificial intelligence governance no longer relies only on a single government or international organization; enterprises, scientific research and academic institutions and social organizations are gradually participating in it [26][27][28]. Governments rely on their advantages in policy-making and regulation, while enterprises rely on technological innovation and practical experience; the two achieve interconnection and join hands to inject new vitality into artificial intelligence governance. In July 2023, seven major AI companies including Google, Microsoft and Meta reached voluntary commitments with the White House, promising to conduct safety assessments and share risk information before releasing AI systems, reflecting a multi-party participatory governance trend^①

3 Dilemmas in Global Artificial Intelligence Governance

3.1 Insufficient Representativeness in Governance Participation, with Developing Countries Generally Absent from Governance Dialogues

In global artificial intelligence governance dialogues, developing countries are generally absent, and this severe lack of representativeness causes governance dialogues to present an imbalanced pattern, making it difficult to build a comprehensive and just framework for global artificial intelligence governance. At present, rule-making and strategic deliberation in the field of artificial intelligence are dominated by a small number of developed countries, and the voices of developing countries are weak at international conferences, standards-setting organizations and relevant decision-making platforms. Because they are relatively weak in artificial intelligence technology R&D, infrastructure construction and professional talent reserves, developing countries lack the technological discourse power needed for in-depth participation in global artificial intelligence governance. Constrained by economic strength, developing countries find it difficult to invest resources on a large scale in related research and international exchange and cooperation, and their influence in the governance system is naturally insufficient. In addition, Western developed countries represented by the United States restrict the diffusion of artificial intelligence technology to other developing countries—for example, using policies and laws to suppress Chinese intelligent technology enterprises and research institutions and to contain China's development in high-tech fields such as artificial intelligence—so that the development direction and innovation path of artificial intelligence technology are mainly controlled by them, and it is very difficult for other countries to participate. Among the 7 major non-UN AI governance initiatives, only 7 countries (Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, the United Kingdom and the United States) participated in all of them, while 118 countries (mainly Global South countries) did not participate in any initiative at all. Developing countries have a huge population base and diverse application scenarios; if their unique needs and perspectives are ignored and special social problems such as poverty remain unsolved, it is easy to trigger differences and conflicts in data privacy and ethical and moral standards among countries at different levels of development. This imbalance in governance representativeness leads to an uneven distribution of the dividends of AI development, widens the technological divide and increases the gaps in comprehensive national strength among countries, hindering the development of the international political and economic landscape in a fair and inclusive direction.

3.2 Insufficient Coordination Among Existing Governance Mechanisms, with a Prominent Trend toward Competitive and Weaponized Rules

Coordination among global artificial intelligence governance mechanisms is insufficient, and the trend toward competitive and weaponized rules is significant. International organizations progress slowly in reconciling the interests of various countries and promoting coordinated governance, and there is also a lack of communication and coordination mechanisms among organizations. Within the United Nations system, although many agencies are involved in AI governance, due to the division of specific responsibilities, no specific agency is able to comprehensively handle or lead AI governance issues. For example, UNESCO mainly focuses on regulating and

guiding artificial intelligence from the perspectives of ethics, education and culture, but is less involved in aspects such as the formulation of technical standards and market supervision for artificial intelligence. The World Intellectual Property Organization, a subsidiary body of the United Nations, mainly focuses on intellectual property issues related to artificial intelligence but cannot handle the ethical and moral issues of artificial intelligence. In addition, countries regard artificial intelligence as a key field of technological competition; when developed countries hold the dominant position, they tend to choose or create exclusive global or regional governance mechanisms that suit their own interests and preferences. Economies with relative technological advantages, such as the United States and the European Union, frequently introduce measures to restrict the export of AI technology and related products and promulgate bills to restrict exchanges of artificial intelligence talent, erecting obstacles in international artificial intelligence cooperation and attempting to dominate the formulation of global AI governance rules, so that rule competition outweighs rule alignment and cooperation and the trend toward weaponizing rules is obvious. This fragmentation trend may split the world into mutually incompatible AI governance systems and make safety problems more prominent. The differentiation of technical standards and the growing difficulty of alignment increase security risks in the process of data transmission, and different regulatory policies lead enterprises to relocate their business to loosely regulated regions in order to evade regulation, creating blind spots in safety supervision and increasing safety hazards. Because artificial intelligence governance mechanisms are uncoordinated, countries face numerous restrictions in technological exchanges on artificial intelligence, hindering technological exchange and the diffusion of innovation. The prominent trend toward competitive and weaponized rules leads countries to establish their own market access standards for artificial intelligence, thereby forming trade barriers and triggering unfair market competition.

3.3 Technical Norms Show a Trend of Diversified Development, Making Coordination Among Technical Rules Difficult

In the process of global artificial intelligence governance, a pattern of diversified development of governance standards and technical norms has gradually taken shape, and the coordination and unification of the various rule systems faces enormous challenges. Multiple governance actors, including many countries and regions around the world as well as international organizations, participate in the formulation of the rules of global artificial intelligence governance; different countries and regions have different understandings of artificial intelligence, different development needs, and different characteristics of the industries in which artificial intelligence is applied, resulting in differences in governance standards and norms. In addition, there is a lack of an authoritative and unified international coordination mechanism to integrate the governance standards and technical norms of various countries, making it difficult to reach a broadly binding international agreement. Institutions such as the International Telecommunication Union, the International Organization for Standardization, the International Electrotechnical Commission and the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers are all formulating AI standards, but these standards lack a common language, and many key concepts such as fairness, safety and transparency have no unified definitions. The main responsibilities, values and governance needs of the organizations of various countries differ, so that the technical norms and industry standards they formulate have a certain limitedness and bias; for example, the International Telecommunication Union, as a specialized agency of the United Nations, gives priority consideration to technical normative issues such as data transmission when formulating standards for artificial intelligence governance, whereas the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, as a non-governmental organization, tends to have governance standards that reflect the interests and technological orientation of leading enterprises and experts in the industry. In the absence of resolutions of international organizations with enforcement power, global artificial intelligence governance standards cannot be effectively integrated. In terms of data privacy, the Data Security Law of the People's Republic of China promulgated by China establishes a legal framework for data security and personal information protection, whereas the data privacy rules of the United States are relatively fragmented, with no unified law at the

federal level. Different governance standards reflect different social values and ethical concepts; different countries have different definitions and measurement standards based on factors such as their own culture and social structure, and the diversification of technical norms and technical standards makes it difficult for the world to reach a unified consensus on artificial intelligence governance, intensifying competition and strategic games among countries, prompting the geopolitical landscape to further divide and reorganize around artificial intelligence governance, and affecting the harmonious, stable and effective operation of the global governance system.

3.4 A Gap Exists Between the Effects of Governance Implementation and Commitments, with Governance Dividends Insufficiently Released

Global artificial intelligence governance is imbalanced between vision and practice, commitments have not been effectively translated into actual results, and the shortcomings of governance effectiveness make it difficult for its dividends to be fully released. Economic globalization, technological globalization, information globalization and even the globalization of governance mechanisms inevitably bring about the globality of artificial intelligence risks. The governance principles put forward by international organizations often remain at the stage of theoretical declaration and lack specific implementing rules and enforcement mechanisms, making it difficult to effectively constrain the behavior of countries and various actors; combined with the inconsistent pace of countries in artificial intelligence governance, this leads to a gap between the effects of governance implementation and commitments. At present, many governance measures remain at the level of voluntary compliance. For example, the AI Principles released by Japan are mostly advocacy recommendations lacking enforcement power, and enterprises and institutions may choose to comply selectively when developing and applying artificial intelligence, so that governance effects are limited and there is an obvious gap between practice and commitments. Governments and international organizations all emphasize the need to ensure the safety and reliability of artificial intelligence systems, but despite safety standards and testing requirements, artificial intelligence systems may still fail in complex real-world scenarios. Because of the lag in artificial intelligence governance, artificial intelligence faces numerous ethical and legal disputes in many application fields; enterprises have concerns about investing in the R&D and application of artificial intelligence, the economies of scale of technological innovation are difficult to form, and governance dividends cannot be fully released. For example, in the field of facial recognition technology, 176 countries are using artificial intelligence surveillance systems, but because its application involves privacy issues, International Business Machines Corporation (IBM) stopped providing technology for large-scale surveillance, so that the promotion and application of facial recognition technology in fields such as security are limited, and the governance dividends in enhancing public safety cannot be fully released either. Artificial intelligence involves knowledge from multiple fields, and there is a shortage of talent with professional competence; at the same time, the complexity of artificial intelligence systems requires advanced monitoring and evaluation technology, yet current regulatory technology finds it difficult to effectively monitor artificial intelligence. Insufficient release of governance dividends makes it difficult for enterprises to make full use of artificial intelligence for innovation, leading to imbalances in the development of the artificial intelligence industry across different countries or regions, continuously weakening the effect of promoting the social benefits of artificial intelligence, encouraging malicious applications of artificial intelligence, and even posing a potential threat to the international security order.

4 Accelerating the Construction of China's Logic and Path for Global Artificial Intelligence Governance

4.1 China's Logic: One Vision, Three Principles and Four Actions

At this critical period of change in the order of global artificial intelligence governance, China's role in the process of global artificial intelligence governance reform is becoming increasingly important. Therefore, based on China's policy experience and practice in artificial intelligence governance, a reform framework of "one vision,

three principles and four actions” should be proposed for the reform of global artificial intelligence governance. One vision refers to the great vision of building an equal, inclusive, jointly built and shared global artificial intelligence governance system that benefits all humankind; the three principles refer to attaching equal importance to development and security, inclusive cooperation, and fairness and justice; and the four actions refer to institutional construction, technological innovation, capacity building and ethical norms.

In 2023, President Xi Jinping attended the opening ceremony of the Third Belt and Road Forum for International Cooperation and, in his keynote speech, put forward the Global AI Governance Initiative, expressing the great vision of building an inclusive, fair and shared global artificial intelligence governance system and promoting artificial intelligence technology for the benefit of all humankind. It aims to break down the barriers between countries and regions in the process of artificial intelligence development, so that countries with different economic levels and scientific and technological strength can all participate in the global cooperation network for artificial intelligence, and so that both the frontier technological R&D achievements of developed countries and the application-scenario exploration experience of developing countries can be freely exchanged and integrated. It calls for strengthening information exchange and technological cooperation in artificial intelligence governance, jointly carrying out risk prevention, forming a governance framework and standards and norms for artificial intelligence with broad consensus, and continuously enhancing the safety, reliability, controllability and fairness of artificial intelligence technology. The Chinese initiative, which embodies new-quality governance capacities such as pragmatism, cooperation and fairness, is both a systematic summary of Chinese and foreign governance experience and a positive attempt to integrate a country's strategy with its global positioning [29].

The three principles of attaching equal importance to development and security, inclusive cooperation, and fairness and justice constitute the core logic for building an order of global artificial intelligence governance. First, uphold the principle of attaching equal importance to development and security, attaching great importance to security issues while promoting the development of artificial intelligence. At the level of national strategy, actively advance AI development and, by strengthening top-level design and overall planning, strive to seize the initiative in the new round of international scientific and technological competition. At the level of national security, strengthen the management and control of the security risks brought by AI, continuously enhance the safety, reliability, controllability and fairness of AI, and ensure that it always develops in a direction conducive to the progress of human civilization. Second, uphold the principle of inclusive cooperation, fully respecting differences in the policies and practices of various countries and building consensus through dialogue and cooperation. The common values of all humankind are deeply attuned to the diversity and differences of human society; although they advocate what is “common,” they do not negate contradictions and differences, but always respect the institutional models and development paths independently chosen by each country and always maintain that all countries should shoulder “common but differentiated responsibilities” in global governance [30][31]. It advocates that countries abandon technological protectionism and geoeconomic competitive thinking, accept with an open and inclusive attitude the diverse development paths and distinctive models of different countries in the field of artificial intelligence, promote the active participation of multiple stakeholders, and form a broad consensus in the field of global artificial intelligence governance. Third, uphold the principle of fairness and justice, ensuring that the dividends of AI development benefit developing countries, narrowing the digital divide and promoting the democratization of global AI governance. Enhance the representativeness and voice of developing countries in global artificial intelligence governance, ensure equality of rights, opportunities and rules in the development and governance of artificial intelligence among countries, carry out international cooperation and assistance oriented toward developing countries, continuously bridge the intelligence divide and the gap in governance capacity, and ensure that the development dividends of the global artificial intelligence industry are reasonably distributed among countries.

The four actions of institutional construction, technological innovation, capacity building and ethical norms

constitute the basic plan for building an order of global artificial intelligence governance. First, institutional construction lays a solid foundation for global artificial intelligence governance. We should actively participate in the formulation of international rules for artificial intelligence governance, promote the establishment of a scientific and reasonable global AI governance framework, and improve the domestic AI regulatory system. Second, technological innovation has become the core engine driving the vigorous development of artificial intelligence. We should strengthen R&D on the core technologies of artificial intelligence, promote the healthy development of the AI industry, and contribute Chinese solutions and Chinese wisdom to global AI governance. Third, capacity building is a powerful support for raising the overall level of participation in global artificial intelligence governance. We should improve the artificial intelligence talent-cultivation system, promote international exchange and cooperation, and help developing countries enhance their AI governance capacity. Fourth, ethical norms set the bottom line for the safety governance of artificial intelligence. We should promote the establishment of an AI ethics framework under the concept of a community with a shared future for mankind, build ethical principles consistent with human values and international norms, share China's experience in the formulation and practice of ethical norms, and guide the sustainable development of global artificial intelligence.

4.2 China's Path for Promoting the Reform of Global Artificial Intelligence Governance

4.2.1 Deepening the Construction of Multilateral Cooperation Mechanisms and, Leveraging the "AI Boom," Improving the Domestic Governance System

Actively engage in the discussion of artificial intelligence issues and the joint deliberation of rules under international multilateral cooperation frameworks, and, seizing the momentum of the global "AI boom," build and improve the domestic artificial intelligence governance system through efforts in multiple dimensions. In international organizations involving artificial intelligence, actively advocate reforming the membership participation mechanisms and increasing the voting rights and voice of developing countries. Actively participate in the formulation of international standards and regularly hold forums on the theme of global artificial intelligence governance, inviting government officials, business people and experts and scholars from developing countries to jointly discuss key issues in global artificial intelligence governance, encouraging representatives of developing countries to share their views and experience, and promoting the exchange and integration of positions and views among different countries. In addition, further strengthen dialogue and cooperation with developed countries, especially in fields such as AI safety and ethics, and learn from the advanced schemes of developed countries in the field of artificial intelligence governance. In the course of the "AI boom," accelerate the improvement of the domestic regulatory framework, promote institutional regulation and enhance intelligent technological governance, so as to enhance trust in global artificial intelligence safety governance by establishing strong and highly adaptable regulatory practice. A special fund for global artificial intelligence governance may be established to support relevant projects and research in developing countries and, based on China's own experience, to help developing countries rationally allocate artificial intelligence resources and improve their domestic artificial intelligence governance systems.

4.2.2 Focusing on the Formulation of Technical Safety and Ethical Standards and Promoting Innovation Cooperation in the International AI Industry

Taking the construction of a system of technical and ethical standards that balances safety and innovation as the foundation, actively lead the establishment of international cooperation platforms and the shaping of rules, pool global wisdom and resources, and promote the sustained innovation of the AI industry. It advocates widely soliciting opinions from all sectors of the world on artificial intelligence safety norms to ensure the scientific validity and reasonableness of the standards. Beneficial elements of traditional Chinese philosophical thought should be incorporated into artificial intelligence ethical standards; for example, the idea of the "unity of benevolence and wisdom" can inspire reflection on the matching of the intelligence level of artificial intelligence with its moral responsibility, thereby providing a unique Chinese perspective and wisdom for the formulation of international standards. The unity of

national governance and global governance of artificial intelligence should be promoted; conforming to the general trend of the global technological and industrial revolution, and on the basis of continuously strengthening the existing advantages in the development of artificial intelligence technology, we should formulate and improve a policy toolbox for supporting advantageous intelligent industries and help enterprises advance digital transformation and intelligent reform. Enterprises should be encouraged to increase R&D investment in deep synthesis and large-model technologies, guided toward healthy competition, and the knowledge spillover effect of artificial intelligence should be enhanced; artificial intelligence innovation cooperation parks or industrial clusters should be established to form technological advantages in fields such as deep synthesis and large models, thus promoting innovation cooperation in the AI industry.

4.2.3 Attending to the Construction of Cross-Border Data Flow Rules to Safeguard National Data Security and Stability

Build a multi-level regulatory framework for cross-border data flow, balancing data openness and security, ensuring that national data sovereignty is not infringed upon, and achieving the coordinated advancement of orderly cross-border data flow and security safeguards. Sign bilateral or multilateral cross-border data flow agreements with major trading partners and data powers, actively participate in the formulation of global data governance rules, and promote the establishment of a fair and reasonable mechanism for cross-border data flow. In addition, a necessary data security review system should be established to ensure the security of key data and core technologies. With classification and grading and risk assessment as the core means, formulate tiered rules for the categorized management of cross-border data flow, dividing data into different categories according to their degree of sensitivity and setting corresponding cross-border flow approval procedures and security assessment standards for each. A national-level regulatory mechanism for cross-border data flow should be established, building a unified architecture for cross-border data flow that combines flexibility and comprehensiveness. Strengthen the construction of domestic data security infrastructure and, at the same time, establish data backup and recovery centers to ensure the integrity and availability of data in the face of unexpected events such as natural disasters and cyberattacks, and to safeguard the stable operation of national data security.

4.2.4 Accelerating the Fulfillment of Artificial Intelligence Governance Commitments and Promoting the Improvement of Multilateral Governance Supervision Mechanisms

Formulate specific implementation plans and timetables to ensure that international organizations and governments fulfill artificial intelligence governance commitments. Promote the joint formulation and implementation of artificial intelligence governance standards and norms by governments and international organizations, reducing the obstacles and risks for enterprises in conducting artificial intelligence business globally. Ensure the safety and reliability of artificial intelligence systems, strengthen the R&D and application of regulatory technology, and improve regulatory effectiveness. Support governments and international organizations in carrying out publicity and education activities on artificial intelligence governance to raise public awareness and understanding of it. At the same time, strengthen the supervision and assessment of the implementation of artificial intelligence governance by enterprises and institutions to ensure that they comply with relevant standards and norms. Accelerate the cultivation of talent with professional competence, promote the R&D and application of artificial intelligence regulatory technology, advance international cooperation and exchange in artificial intelligence governance, and strengthen publicity and education on artificial intelligence governance.

References

- [1] Q. Gao, “Global good intelligence and global collective intelligence: The future of global AI governance,” *World Economics and Politics*, no. 7, 2019.
- [2] W. Sun, “Artificial intelligence and the “new alienation” of human beings,” *Social Sciences in China*, no. 12, 2020.

- [3] Q. Wu, "U.S. artificial intelligence counter-terrorism: Paths, motivations and challenges," *Social Sciences in Xinjiang*, no. 3, 2022.
- [4] Q. Wu, "Technology for good: The core essence and theoretical value of China's global AI governance initiative," *Peace and Development*, no. 5, 2024.
- [5] Y. Bu, "Intelligence leading the future: The realistic dilemmas of global AI governance and the Chinese solution," *Contemporary Economic Management*, pp. 1-19, 2025.
- [6] Q. Gao, "Artificial intelligence, the fourth industrial revolution and the international political and economic landscape," *Contemporary World and Socialism*, no. 6, 2019.
- [7] N. Han and X. Dong, "The trust dilemma in global AI security governance and the path to resolving it," *International Forum*, no. 6, 2024.
- [8] K. Jia and Y. Jiang, "Three basic issues in AI governance: Technological logic, risk challenges and public policy choices," *Chinese Public Administration*, no. 10, 2017.
- [9] Y. Han, F. Zhang, and J. Peng, "Order reconstruction: Global economic governance under the impact of artificial intelligence," *World Economics and Politics*, no. 1, 2023.
- [10] H. Zheng, "Trustworthy artificial intelligence: The governance basis of AIGC under technological ethical risks," *Science & Technology Progress and Policy*, pp. 1-11, 2025.
- [11] X. Guo, "Challenges to global AI governance in the era of large models and the Chinese solution," *Scientific Research*, pp. 1-15, 2025.
- [12] Y. Luo, "The transmutation of sovereignty in the digital age and the reshaping of the international security order," *Global Review*, no. 6, 2024.
- [13] E. Calvano, G. Calzolari, V. Denicolò, et al., "Artificial intelligence, algorithmic pricing, and collusion," *American Economic Review*, vol. 110, no. 10, 2020.
- [14] L. G. Pinheiro, "Protocols of production: The absent factories of digital capitalism," *American Political Science Review*, pp. 1-14, 2024.
- [15] G. Yan and H. Xin, "Power interaction and balanced competition: An international political economy analysis of digital power competition among China, the United States and Europe," *Global Review*, no. 6, 2024.
- [16] J. Zhao, "Upholding the fundamentals and innovating in international law: From the perspective of the normative needs of the transformation of the global governance system," *Social Sciences in China*, no. 5, 2021.
- [17] H. Wu, "Institutional arrangements and legal regulation in the era of artificial intelligence," *Legal Science (Journal of Northwest University of Political Science and Law)*, no. 5, 2017.
- [18] T. Que and J. Zhang, "New trends in the U.S. artificial intelligence strategy and their global impact," *Foreign Affairs Review (Journal of China Foreign Affairs University)*, no. 3, 2020.
- [19] H. Ma, L. Li, B. Sheng, et al., "The impact of global intelligent production on China's trade and welfare," *The Journal of World Economy*, no. 9, 2024.
- [20] R. Liu and W. Xiong, "International competition, standardization strategies and the EU's technological power," *Pacific Journal*, no. 9, 2024.
- [21] T. Wu and H. Liu, "The geoeconomic turn, digital sovereignty and EU artificial intelligence governance," *Journal of International Security Studies*, no. 5, 2024.
- [22] N. Yang, "The weaponization of artificial intelligence and the future of cyber deterrence strategy," *Journal of International Security Studies*, no. 5, 2024.
- [23] X. Chen and Y. Liu, "The impact of digital diplomacy on the contest for international discourse power and China's response," *Jilin University Journal Social Sciences Edition*, no. 5, 2024.
- [24] Y. Li and H. Li, "A comparative study of artificial intelligence regulatory norms in Europe, the United States and China," *Contemporary World and Socialism*, no. 5, 2024.

- [25] P. Ru, J. Su, Z. Han, et al., “Intelligence leading the future: The social impact of generative artificial intelligence and its standardized governance,” *E-Government*, pp. 1-13, 2025.
- [26] Z. Zhi, “Contributing a Chinese solution to the international governance of the Internet,” *Red Flag Manuscript*, no. 2, 2016.
- [27] Z. Wu and Z. Dong, “The transformation of the international system and the reform of global governance,” *Nankai Journal* (Philosophy, Literature and Social Science Edition), no. 1, 2018.
- [28] F. Zhang and J. Yang, “Coordinated governance or divide and rule: A systemic analytical framework for global governance,” *World Economics and Politics*, no. 3, 2021.
- [29] Y. Quan and R. Zhang, “New-quality governance capacity: Institutional innovation in China’s initiative under the tension of global AI governance,” *Media Observer*, no. 11, 2024.
- [30] W. Yin, “Critique and reconstruction: The inherent defects of the global governance system and its transformative turn,” *Socialism Studies*, no. 5, 2021.
- [31] D. Acemoglu and P. Restrepo, “Demographics and automation,” *The Review of Economic Studies*, vol. 89, no. 1, 2022.

