Nnamdi Azikiwe University Journal of Private and Property Law **Volume 3(1) January, 2026**

TAMING INTELLIGENCE: WHY AI REGULATION MUST BE UNIFORM AND UNIVERSAL

Rapuluchukwu E. Nduka*

Abstract

Artificial Intelligence (AI) has rapidly evolved from a technological innovation within a niche/industry and into a global infrastructure that boosts governance, trade, communication, education, national security, and daily social interactions. Sadly, the legal and ethical frameworks governing Artificial Intelligence remain fragmented, inconsistent, largely industry-specific and heavily dependent on domestic political priorities. The present fragmentation produces regulatory arbitrage, inconsistent protection for human rights, and global vulnerabilities. This paper argued that the scale, speed, and cross-border influence of Artificial Intelligence necessitate a uniform regulatory structure, one based on shared global ideas, standards, and coordinated execution. Using a doctrinal research methodology by reliance on both primary and secondary sources such as international law, human rights standards, cyber governance, and economic regulation, the paper looked at the problems with current models, identified opportunities for global partnership, and suggests paths to a global AI regulatory structure that can protect humanity and still allow for innovation. it recommended amongst others, that a universal uniform global AI regulatory scheme be evolved, as a panacea to dealing with the negatives issues an unregulated Artificial Intelligence structure portends.

Keywords: Cyberlaw, Artificial Intelligence, AI, Regulation, Ethical framework

1. Introduction

Human endeavors and innovations devoid of regulations are susceptible to abuse. Artificial Intelligence, being a creation that revolves around computer systems capable of performing tasks typically requiring human intelligence, needs intelligent, effective regulatory frameworks that will restrain the innovation from abusive use.[1] Regulations that govern the development, deployment and use of artificial intelligence are desirable in forestalling imminent abuse. Legislative interventions that address ethical use, privacy and data protection, safety and reliability of the AI system, bias and discrimination, accountability, economic impact of AI, security of the AI systems and other attendant concerns are essential.[2]

[1]**Rapuluchukwu Ernest Nduka** LL.D (South Africa), LL.M (Strathclyde), LL.B, BL. Senior Lecturer Dept. of Commercial & Industrial Law, Nnamdi Azikiwe University Awka, Anambra State Nigeria. 08103692233, ra.nduka@unizik.edu.ng

RE Nduka, CB Nwankwo, CV Nduka and VC Arinze 'Regulating Artificial Intelligence: The Need to Safeguard the Future' Nnamdi Azikiwe Journal of Commercial and Property Law Vol. 11, 2024, 97 – 106.

[2] E Amdur "6 Critical- and Urgent Ethical Issues with AI" <6 Critical – And Urgent – Ethics Issues With AI (forbes.com)> accessed 21 July 2024.

Coincidentally, the law mostly tries to catch up with technology, trailing behind in providing the required protection from the negative impacts of technology. Reining in the negative impacts of advancements in technology becomes more daunting when abuse has already been set in motion.

It therefore becomes imperative that comprehensive legislative interventions must be enacted to curb the negative use of these AI systems. However, these interventions cannot be the sole prerogative of a national precinct or regional jurisdictions because Artificial Intelligence, being an advancement on computer systems and the internet, is ubiquitous, breaking the confines of national boundaries and jurisdictions. The implication is that countries and regions that regulate AI may not be immune from the effects of the abuse of AI systems emanating from countries that do not regulate AI.

2. The Regulatory Dilemma

Artificial Intelligence (AI) in revolutionizing industries, enhancing productivity, and transforming daily life has outpaced legal and regulatory frameworks, leading to a regulatory dilemma.[3] This dilemma refers to the challenge of balancing innovation and growth with the need to ensure ethical, legal, and safe deployment of AI systems.[4] The regulatory vacuum poses risks of misuse, bias, surveillance, and inequality, while overly rigid laws may stifle innovation.

At the heart of the regulatory dilemma is a dual quagmire of how to govern AI effectively without undermining its potential. Unlike traditional technologies, AI systems can evolve through self-learning algorithms, often in opaque or unpredictable ways.[5] This creates difficulties for conventional legal structures, which typically rely on predictability, accountability, and jurisdictional clarity.[6] Thus, regulators must contend with a moving target. As new AI models[7] emerge, the capabilities, risks, and societal implications shift.[8] Besides, AI's integration across multiple domains like healthcare, finance, law enforcement and the like, makes it harder to apply one-size-fits-all rules.[9]

[3] "The ethical dilemmas of AI: Balancing innovation with responsibility" <AI Ethics: Balancing Innovation with Responsibility> accessed 21 October 2024.

[4] B Aggarwal "Ethical dilemmas in Artificial Intelligence: Balancing innovation with responsible development" <50901.pdf> accessed 10 September 2025.

[5] *Ibid.*

[6] *Ibid.*

[7] For example, OpenAI's GPT-5 or Google's Gemini.

[8] B Aggarwal "Ethical dilemmas in Artificial Intelligence: Balancing innovation with responsible development" <50901.pdf> accessed 10 September 2025.

[9] *Ibid.*

The lack of global consensus further exacerbates this impasse,[10] while opacity,[11] and the lack of alignment creates room for AI regulatory arbitrage, where company seek to operate in jurisdictions with looser controls.[12] Accountability, in the assignment of legal responsibility when AI causes harm, poses a challenge.[13] Bias and discrimination are often reflected in the AI system,[14] with rapid technological advancement, propelled by the speed of AI innovation, sadly outpacing the legislative process.[15]

3. Current legislative landscape

As an emerging technological advancement, Artificial Intelligence regulation is still in constant flux with several regulatory interventions being set in place to address various novel challenges that come up from the development, deployment and use of artificial intelligence.[16]

The European Union (EU) is at the forefront of AI regulation, aiming to establish a comprehensive framework. The EU in proposing the establishment of the first EU regulatory framework to guide AI, stated that the regulation is aimed at ensuring that the "AI systems used in the EU are safe, transparent, traceable, non-discriminatory and environmentally friendly".[17] The EU stated that its intention in regulating Artificial Intelligence is to ensure that AI systems within the EU should be superintended by humans, rather than by automation, in order to avoid harmful consequences.[18] The new regulation designed for the establishment of harmonised rules within the European Union,[19] is aimed at prohibiting AI practices that pose unacceptable risks, determining a list of high-risk AI applications, setting clear requirements for AI systems for AI high-risk applications, defining specific obligations for deployers and providers of high-risk AI applications, requiring a conformity assessment prior to putting a given AI system into service on the market, putting

[10] R Matulionyte "Regulating Transparency of AI: A Survey of Best Practices" <ssrn_id4554868_code2249469.pdf> accessed 22 July 2024.

[11] AI tech spans the globe, yet rules for it are mostly local or regional. For one, the EU's AI Act plans to sort and control AI systems by how risky they are. The US leans toward a sector-specific system, putting innovation first and keeping a low-key watch. China, on the other hand, controls AI with strong state surveillance. *Ibid.*

[12] S Chandru "Challenges of Regulating Artificial Intelligence: A Global Perspective" <Challenges of Regulating Artificial Intelligence: A Global Perspective | by Sasi Chandru | Medium> accessed 21 May 2025.

[13] *Ibid.*

[14] *Ibid.*

[15] *Ibid.*

[16] "AI regulations around the world: Trends, takeaways & what to watch heading into 2025" <AI regulations around the world | Diligent> accessed 27 October 2024.

[17] "EU AI Act: First regulation on artificial intelligence" <EU AI Act: first regulation on artificial intelligence | Topics | European Parliament (europa.eu)> accessed 22 July 2024.

[18] *Ibid.*

[19] "Preparing for change: How businesses can thrive under the EU's AI Act" <Preparing for change: How businesses can thrive under the EU's AI Act | Global law firm | Norton Rose Fulbright> 22 July 2024.

appropriate enforcement in place after a given AI system is placed into the market and establishing a governance structure at European and national level.[20]

Additionally, the EU General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) though not specific to AI, significantly impacts the AI systems by enforcing stringent data protection and privacy requirements, allowing the traditional data protection principles of purpose limitation, data minimization, the special treatment of 'sensitive data', and the limitation on automated decisions,to be applied to AI systems within the European Union.[21] However, a study conducted on the extent AI fits into the GDPR conceptual framework found that whereas the GDPR can be utilized to control AI, it does not provide controllers sufficient guidance, and its provisions have to be extended and concretized.[22]

Equally, the Digital Services Act (DSA) which is regulatory initiative focusing on consumer protection targeting online intermediaries and platforms and ensuring a safer online environment, and the Digital Markets Act (DMA) which focuses on creating a stable and competitive digital market; also, can be relied upon in providing some regulations to the AI system within the European Union.[23]

In the United States of America, AI regulation is also at an evolving stage. According to White and Case LLP, there is currently no comprehensive federal legislation or regulatory framework that directly regulates the advancement of AI or precisely prohibit or control their use.[24] The Federal Government has focused more on guiding principles than providing strict regulatory schemes for AI.[25] However, there are some federal laws that touch on some aspects of AI albeit with limited application. For example, the Federal Aviation Administration Reauthorization Act, directs the Federal Aviation Administration to "conduct a review of artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning technologies to improve airport efficiency and machinery which includes language requiring review of AI in aviation",[26] while the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year

[20] "AI Act" <AI Act | Shaping Europe's digital future (europa.eu)> accessed 22 July 2024.

[21] "The impact of the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) on artificial intelligence" <EPRS_STU(2020)641530_EN.pdf (europa.eu)> accessed 24 July 2024.

[22] A Baig "The impact of the GDPR on Artificial Intelligence" <The Impact of the GDPR on Artificial Intelligence - Securiti> accessed 24 July 2024.

[23] "The Digital Service Act package" <The Digital Services Act package | Shaping Europe's digital future (europa.eu)> accessed 27 July 2024.

[24] "AI Watch: Global regulatory tracker – United States" <AI Watch: Global regulatory tracker - United States | White & Case LLP (whitecase.com)> accessed 15 August 2024.

[25] *Ibid.*

[26] H. R. 3559 – FAA Research and Development Act of 2023 Text - H.R.3559 - 118th Congress (2023-2024): FAA Research and Development Act of 2023 | Congress.gov | Library of Congress> accessed 15 August 2024. See also, JL Ritcher, VH Antypas, NE McFarland and S Sriram "2024 FAA Reauthorization – Key developments in emerging aviation" <2024 FAA Reauthorization – Key Developments in Emerging Aviation | Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld LLP> accessed 15 August 2024.

2019 directed the Department of Defense to undertake joint AI research and diverse AI-related activities, including the establishment of a commission to oversee AI activities.[27] Equally the United States has the National AI Initiative Act of 2020, aimed at expanding AI research and development, created the National Artificial Intelligence Initiative Office saddling it with the responsibility of managing and executing the US national AI strategy.[28]

Additionally, the United States has developed a set of guiding principles designed to aid in the development of policies that would guarantee effective AI strategies. The White House Office of Science and Technology Policy, for instance, unveiled the Blueprint for an AI Bill of Rights, which lays out guidelines for protecting Americans in the AI era with a primary emphasis on privacy, responsibility, and transparency.[29] Additionally, the United States' proposed Accountability Act would mandate that businesses evaluate and reduce the risks associated with automated decision systems by being open and honest about the algorithms they employ and making sure those algorithms are impartial, transparent, and fair.[30] Similarly, as a federation, the United States has a number of states, including California, Colorado, and Illinois, that have passed legislation pertaining to artificial intelligence, many of which safeguard biometric data and privacy.[31]

AI regulation trackers posit that countries like Canada amongst a few regulations on AI, is advancing its Artificial Intelligence and Data Act,[32] while Brazil is actively developing a comprehensive AI Law,[33] and Switzerland has opted against introducing a standalone AI regulation[34] but seeks to amend its existing laws to accommodate AI.[35]

---

[27] Sec. 238 and Sec. 1051 H. R. 5515 – National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 <BILLS-115hr5515enr.pdf (congress.gov)> accessed 15 August 2024.

[28] H. R. 6216 – National Artificial Intelligence Initiative Act < H.R.6216 - 116th Congress (2019-2020): National Artificial Intelligence Initiative Act of 2020 | Congress.gov | Library of Congress> accessed 15 August 2024. See also, "AI Watch: Global regulatory tracker – United States" <AI Watch: Global regulatory tracker - United States | White & Case LLP (whitecase.com)> accessed 15 August 2024.

[29] "Blueprint for an AI Bill: Making automated systems work for the American people" <Blueprint for an AI Bill of Rights | OSTP | The White House> accessed 18 August 2024.

[30] "The Algorithmic Accountability Act: The essential guide" <Algorithmic Accountability Act: The Essential Guide | Nightfall AI Security 101> accessed 18 August 2024.

[31] "US State-by-State AI legislation snapshot" <US state-by-state AI legislation snapshot | BCLP - Bryan Cave Leighton Paisner (bclplaw.com)> accessed 19 August 2024.

[32] "The Artificial Intelligence and Data Act (AIDA) – Companion document" <The Artificial Intelligence and Data Act (AIDA) – Companion document (canada.ca)> accessed 1 September 2024.

[33] "Access Alert/Brazil new AI Bill: A comprehensive framework for ethical and responsible use of AI systems" <Access Alert | Brazil's New AI Bill: A Comprehensive Framework for Ethical and Responsible Use of AI Systems - Access Partnership> accessed 1 September 2024.

[34] "A legal framework for Artificial Intelligence" <First DSI Strategy Lab | Digital Society Initiative | UZH> accessed 1 September 2024.

[35] K Ponomarov "Global AI regulations tracker: Europe, Americas & Asia-Pacific overview" <Global AI Regulations Tracker: Europe, Americas & Asia-Pacific Overview (legalnodes.com)> accessed 1 September 2024.

China, is engaged in drafting a holistic AI framework but already has several specific rules governing specific AI applications.[36] Japan does not have a strict AI regulatory framework but places reliance on guidelines and allows the private sector manage their AI use.[37] India has proposed its Digital India Act,[38] to regulate high-risk AI applications, while relying on a task force established to address ethical, societal and legal AI issues.[39] Additionally, Australia progressively evolved from its voluntary regulatory standards to integrating mandatory regulatory guardrails for high-risk AI settings within its existing regulatory frameworks.[40]

It is evident that the existing steps taken by some countries in providing some regulatory frameworks are steps taken by countries that are major players in the AI industry, with the understanding that the absence of some regulatory frameworks will lead to more abuse. Developing countries, which are mostly not players in the AI scheme, still lag in taking proactive steps in putting together some regulatory frameworks. Ironically, AI users are found within these developing nations, and the effects of the AI system can emanate from or penetrate national precincts without regulatory frameworks, regardless of the extent of their involvement in the development, deployment and use of artificial intelligence.

4. Importance of a Uniform and Universal Regulatory AI Framework

AI systems, by their very nature, operate without regard for national borders.[41] The use of cloud-based models, the flow of data across different legal jurisdictions, the collaboration of multinational development teams, and the presence of global user groups mean that traditional ways of regulating within specific territories are no longer enough.

When laws vary across jurisdictions, several problems arise. For example, Companies may try to avoid strict rules by moving their operations to places where regulations are less stringent.[42] Protection for varying users may be uneven, leaving some groups at risk.[43] Equally, differences in

[36] *Ibid.*

[37] "Governance guidelines for implementation of AI principles" <20220128_2.pdf (meti.go.jp)> accessed 1 September 2024.

[38] "Digital India Act" <Microsoft PowerPoint - DIA_Presentation 09.03.2023 (meity.gov.in)> accessed 1 September 2024.

[39] K Ponomarov "Global AI regulations tracker: Europe, Americas & Asia-Pacific overview" <Global AI Regulations Tracker: Europe, Americas & Asia-Pacific Overview (legalnodes.com)> accessed 1 September 2024.

[40] N Boyle, A Moore and C Kermond "Australia launches new AI guidance' <Australia launches new AI guidance | White & Case LLP> accessed 21 December 2025.

[41] M Nair, P Svedberg, I Larsson and JM Nygren "A comprehensive overview of barriers and strategies for AI implementation in healthcare: Mixed-method design" <A comprehensive overview of barriers and strategies for AI implementation in healthcare: Mixed-method design - PMC> accessed 24 September 2024.

[42] S Chandru "Challenges of Regulating Artificial Intelligence: A Global Perspective" <Challenges of Regulating Artificial Intelligence: A Global Perspective | by Sasi Chandru | Medium> accessed 21 May 2025.

[43] *Ibid.*

ethical standards can weaken trust on a global scale.[44] It can be hard to enforce rules, given that harmful AI outcomes can start from any jurisdiction and are not restricted by national boundaries.[45] A common set of rules that everyone follows would help reduce disagreements across borders and keep countries from becoming safe havens for harmful developments in AI.

Secondly, AI Risks are Global and are not limited to specific areas. Threats that arise from AI tend to spread across the globe. For example, Deepfakes can damage elections and spread false information worldwide,[46] Cyberattacks powered by AI can target financial and energy systems across the globe. [47] Autonomous weapons can increase tensions between countries,[48] while discrimination caused by algorithms can have an impact on people living in different parts of the world.[49] AI can be used to manipulate markets, which can then disrupt financial stability across the world.[50] These risks cannot be reasonably reduced without cooperation from all countries.

Thirdly, unequal regulations exacerbate global inequality. Weaker AI governance in lower-income countries can lead to exploitation, the extraction of data from local sources without providing fair payment and the installation of experimental systems without proper safety measures.[51] Also, the inequality helps widen the divide between those who have access to technology and those who do not, while causing harm to workers as a result of automation that is not properly regulated.[52]
On the flip side, having standards that are the same for everyone would protect economies that are at risk, while also supporting their own ability to develop technology.[53] Basic values shared across the world, like treating people with respect, allowing them to make their own choices, and ensuring fairness, equality, and privacy, are the basis of modern society.[54]

It is submitted that ethical concerns demand shared normative foundations, since Artificial Intelligence can potentially threaten these values. It is imperative that a shared moral understanding that goes beyond political climes or economic competition within countries be enacted. A uniform AI governance structure is imperative because

---

[44] *Ibid.*

[45] *Ibid.*

[46] M Thomas "15 Risks and Dangers of Artificial Intelligence (AI)" <https://builtin.com/artificial-intelligence/risks-of-artificial-intelligence> accessed 11 November 2025.

[47] *Ibid.*

[48] *Ibid.*

[49] *Ibid.*

[50] *Ibid.*

[51] "The AI governance gaps in developing countries" <The AI governance gaps in developing countries — LessWrong> accessed 11 November 2025.

[52] M Shahvaroughi and FG Ghasemi "Artificial Intelligence and Inequality: Challenges and Opportunities" <(PDF) Artificial Intelligence and Inequality: Challenges and Opportunities> accessed 12 November 2025.

[53] *Ibid.*

[54] *Ibid.*

a. Shared ethical standards for fairness, transparency, accountability, and human dignity are supported by consistent, uniform AI regulation.[55] Without a shared structure, AI tech might be used to weaken these values, mainly in authoritarian or poorly regulated areas. A consistent strategy makes sure that basic human rights are protected everywhere, no matter the legal system.
b. Regulatory fragmentations create confusion for innovators, making it difficult for innovators who face uncertain or conflicting legal obligations to be unsure about what the rules are.[56] If the rules were uniform, it would be less confusing, and those creating new things could concentrate on making their creations safe and easy to understand, without worrying about changing them for different jurisdictions. This can also enhance consumer trust, which is very important for widespread adoption of these innovative systems.
c. The absence of uniformity, may cause nations to weaken regulations to attract AI businesses, creating a "race to the bottom" in terms of safety and ethics.[57] Like tax havens, AI havens could emerge with very little monitoring, which would encourage dangerous uses of AI with global implications. Coordinated uniform regulations can prevent this race to the bottom, by setting baseline standards that no country can undercut.

d. AI often operates across borders, making it imperative that uniform regulations that transcend jurisdictional borders be evolved. Uniform regulation would simplify data sharing, research collaboration, and policy enforcement across nations, helping to support joint efforts to combat AI-driven challenges such as cybercrime, misinformation, and autonomous weapons.

It must be pointed out that there are existing efforts underway seeking to create some uniform regulations. For example, the OECD's AI Principles seek to promote inclusive growth, human-centred values, transparency, and accountability.[58] UNESCO's Recommendation on the Ethics of AI provides the first global standard-setting instrument on AI ethics.[59] The Global Partnership on AI (GPAI) encourages international cooperation on policy, research, and responsible innovation.[60] These initiatives are non-binding; however, they provide a foundation for future legal harmonisation.

[55] E Papagiannidis, P Mikalef and K Conboy "Responsible artificial intelligence governance: A review and research framework" <Responsible artificial intelligence governance: A review and research framework - ScienceDirect> accessed 12 November 2025.

[56] *Ibid.*

[57] *Ibid.*

[58] *Ibid.*

[59] "Ethics of Artificial Intelligence" <Ethics of Artificial Intelligence | UNESCO> accessed 12 November 2025.

[60] "About the Global Partnership on Artificial Intelligence (GPAI)" <About the Global Partnership on Artificial Intelligence (GPAI) - OECD.AI> accessed 13 November 2025.

5. The dire costs of fragmented AI Governance

A fragmented governance structure that varies within jurisdictions, has a lot of negative consequences for a ubiquitous system that is not restricted by jurisdictional boundaries. Firstly, when countries have different standards, companies will naturally be drawn to those with the weakest rules or where rules are nonexistent.[61] This leads to a situation where countries compete to lower their standards in order to attract investment.[62] It also creates an incentive to put systems in place that are not safe or have not been fully tested.

Secondly, a fragmented governance structure encourages cross-border data exploitation because when data protection laws are not the same across different regions, companies can move data through places where the rules are more lenient.[63] This weakens global data protection standards and allows surveillance to spread.[64]

Thirdly, a fragmented governance structure leads to inefficiencies in national enforcement, because no national regulator can enforce its rules globally. For example, an algorithm that contains biases developed in one country can lead to discrimination in another, while AI models from other countries can have an impact on political discussions within a country, and harmful content created by AI can spread widely across the internet.

Fourthly, a fragmented structure further exacerbates geopolitical fragmentation and competition, because AI has become a key point of competition between countries.[65] Different regulatory approaches can create digital spheres of influence, which can lead to divisions on the internet and the digital economy worldwide.[66] Having consistent regulations would prevent AI governance from turning into a tool for geopolitical competition.

Fifthly, a fragmented regulatory structure creates barriers to innovation, producing uncertainty for innovators who struggle to meet the different requirements. A harmonized governance structure would lower the costs of meeting regulatory requirements and encourage cooperation around the world.[67]

6. Challenges in AI Regulation

Regulation of this ubiquitous innovation comes with a number of challenges.

---

[61] S Chandru "Challenges of Regulating Artificial Intelligence: A Global Perspective" <Challenges of Regulating Artificial Intelligence: A Global Perspective | by Sasi Chandru | Medium> accessed 21 May 2025.

[62] *Ibid.*

[63] S Chandru "Challenges of Regulating Artificial Intelligence: A Global Perspective" <Challenges of Regulating Artificial Intelligence: A Global Perspective | by Sasi Chandru | Medium> accessed 21 May 2025.

[64] *Ibid.*

[65] F Lancieri, L Edelson and S Bechtold "AI Regulation: The Politics of Fragmentation and Regulatory Capture" <AI Regulation: The Politics of Fragmentation and Regulatory Capture | Oxford Law Blogs> accessed 13 November 2025.

[66] *Ibid.*

[67] *Ibid.*

a. Lack of global consensus poses a major challenge to AI regulation because AI is a global technology, but regulations remain nationally or regionally defined. For instance, the European Union's AI Act aims to classify and regulate AI systems based on risk tiers, while the United States has favoured a sector-specific, innovation-first approach with lighter oversight.[68] Meanwhile Nations like China, pursues AI governance with strong state surveillance components. This lack of alignment as earlier on pointed out creates room for "AI regulatory arbitrage", where companies may operate in jurisdictions with looser controls.

b. Opacity and lack of accountability pose another challenge to AI regulation because modern AI systems, particularly deep learning models, are often "black boxes."[69] Their decision-making processes are not always explainable, even to their creators.[70] This poses a challenge for assigning legal responsibility when AI causes harm, whether in autonomous vehicle accidents or discriminatory hiring algorithms.

c. Bias and discrimination further pose another challenge to AI Regulation. AI systems often reflect the biases present in their training data.[71] Algorithms used in predictive policing, credit scoring, or hiring have been shown to disproportionately disadvantage minorities and marginalised groups.[72] Regulatory frameworks must ensure transparency and fairness while recognising the technical limitations of current mitigation methods.

d. Rapid technological advancement again poses further challenges because the speed of AI innovation outpaces the legislative process.[73] Drafting, debating, and implementing comprehensive laws can take years, and when these laws are eventually enacted, the technologies they aim to govern may have evolved or become obsolete. This regulatory lag risks leaving societies vulnerable to harms that the law is not yet equipped to address.

---

[68] R Calo (2020). *Artificial Intelligence Policy: A Primer and Roadmap*. U.C. Davis Law Review, 51, 399–435

[69] BC Cheong "Transparency and accountability in AI systems: safeguarding wellbeing in the age of algorithmic decision-making" <Frontiers | Transparency and accountability in AI systems: safeguarding wellbeing in the age of algorithmic decision-making> accessed 13 November 2025.

[70] *Ibid.*

[71] "The Ethical Considerations of Artificial Intelligence" <The Ethical Considerations of Artificial Intelligence | Washington D.C. & Maryland Area | Capitol Technology University> accessed 13 November 2025.

[72] *Ibid.*

[73] S Greenstein and M Zamboni "Navigating the legislative dilemma: evaluating the EU AI Act's approach to regulating emerging technologies" <Full article: Navigating the legislative dilemma: evaluating the EU AI Act's approach to regulating emerging technologies> accessed 13 November 2025.

7. Obstacles to achieving universal and uniform regulation

Currently, AI regulation is marked by disparity and divergence. This patchwork of regulations creates several critical issues ranging from Compliance burdens for multinational companies that must adhere to different, sometimes conflicting, legal standards, to regulatory arbitrage, where developers move operations to jurisdictions with weaker oversight and uneven protection of human rights, such as privacy and non-discrimination, depending on geographic location. Achieving uniform AI regulation has a number of obstacles ranging from sovereignty concerns,[74] geopolitical tensions,[75] and technological disparities.[76] Divergent national interests,[77] power asymmetries,[78] geopolitical competition,[79] corporate influence,[80] and technological complexities[81] all add to the complexities, making the attainment of uniform regulatory intervention daunting. Sadly, without equitable participation, universal regulation will be neither fair nor legitimate.

Nevertheless, these challenges can be mitigated through inclusive dialogue, capacity building, and adaptable frameworks that respect local contexts while upholding shared global principles. The rise of AI presents both profound opportunities and existential risks. Sadly, fragmented regulations cannot keep pace with a technology that is global by design and impact. While uniform AI regulation offers a path forward that ensures safety, protects rights, fosters innovation, and builds trust, geopolitical and logistical barriers remain. However, it is clear that in an interconnected world, only a harmonised approach can steer AI toward the common good. As previously pointed out, uniform AI regulation helps establish shared ethical norms around fairness, transparency, accountability, and human dignity, because without a common framework, AI technologies could be deployed in ways that undermine these values, particularly in authoritarian or under-regulated regions.[82] A unified approach ensures that core human rights are protected universally, regardless of jurisdiction.

---

[74] Nations may resist international rules that infringe on their regulatory autonomy.

[75] Strategic competition, especially between the United States, Russia and China, complicates consensus, because these Nations are mostly at cross-purposes.

[76] Developing countries may lack the infrastructure or expertise to implement advanced regulations.

[77] Countries prioritize innovation, security, or human rights differently. This leads to incompatible regulatory priorities.

[78] Wealthier nations dominate AI research and infrastructure, while developing states lack capacity to shape global rules.

[79] US-China rivalry, EU regulatory assertiveness, and other strategic tensions complicate cooperation.

[80] The largest AI companies wield economic and political power exceeding that of many states. Their resistance to stringent regulation complicates global standard-setting. See further

[81] The technical opacity of AI systems makes standardization challenging. Global regulators require unprecedented technical expertise.

[82] A Tadimarri, BK Konidena and JNA Malaiyappan "Ethical Considerations in the Development and Deployment of AI Systems" European Journal of Technology Vol. 8 No. 2, 2024.

8. Areas Requiring Urgent Uniform Regulation

As the nations, regions and international communities tinker with the evolution of a uniform regulatory governance structure, some areas deserve immediate uniform regulation.

Some of these areas deserving urgent uniform regulation include:

a. Biometric Surveillance and Facial Recognition, because without global rules, mass surveillance will expand rapidly, violating privacy and civil liberties.
b. Deepfakes and synthetic media. The increase and the severity of the harm caused by deepfakes and synthetic media make it urgent that uniform standards be evolved to prevent election interference, reputational harm, fraud, cyber extortion, social instability and the like.

c. Autonomous weapons systems also fall within the class of AI systems that require urgent regulation. Autonomous weapons, being capable of selecting and engaging targets without human oversight, pose existential risks, and only international rules can prevent unchecked militarisation.

d. Algorithmic decision-making in healthcare, criminal justice, financial services, and transportation must meet universal safety and fairness standards and the increase in reliance on these systems, makes urgent regulation imminent.
e. AI-Generated misinformation also requires urgent regulation, because of the increase content provenance, watermarking, and platform responsibility, left unchecked, undermines democratic processes.

9. Conclusion and Recommendations

The emergence of uniform and universal AI regulation comes with a lot of benefits. It will engender enhanced global safety because harmonised safeguards reduce risks of catastrophic AI failures or weaponisation. Uniform standards will strengthen global trust in AI technologies and the organisations that deploy them, ensure a level playing field to assist companies to compete on innovation and not on regulatory loopholes. Universal human rights-based rules protect individuals regardless of geography, while clear global frameworks will support research and product development without fear of regulatory uncertainty.

Artificial intelligence presents both a great chance and a new difficulty. Because it has no borders, has great transformative potential, with capacity for harm, an efficient regulatory approach, unlike any the world has previously undertaken, is vital. Fragmented national laws cannot really protect people from the dangers that AI creates. Additionally, simple ethical guidelines cannot adequately protect vulnerable individuals or ensure equitable access to technological advancements. A uniform and universal regulatory scheme is not just a good idea or a mere policy preference, but a necessity for global stability, human rights protection and responsible innovations. Achieving this regulatory intervention will require international collaboration and coordination, multilateral diplomacy, and a shared commitment to human dignity and its protection. What happens with AI will determine what happens to humanity. Taming intelligence demands nothing less than a unified global response.

The argument for uniform AI legislation is rooted in the belief that ethics should not stop at national borders. AI systems that make decisions affecting people's lives, such as hiring algorithms, predictive policing tools, and health diagnostics must be held to consistent ethical standards, regardless of where they are developed or deployed.

Without uniformity, the same AI application could uphold privacy rights in one country while violating them in another, be banned for bias in one jurisdiction but legally operational elsewhere, be subject to human oversight in Europe but run autonomously in other regions. This discrepancy leads to moral relativism in technology, where users receive uneven protections, and developers operate under inconsistent obligations.

It is therefore submitted that a universal uniform global AI regulatory scheme be evolved, as a panacea to dealing with the negatives issues an unregulated Artificial Intelligence structure portends. The evolution of a global AI regulatory scheme can be attained by:

a. Evolving a Global AI Treaty. A universal treaty administered by a new or existing international body could define global standards, mandate human rights protections, require reporting and transparency, classify AI systems by risk, regulate cross-border data flows, establish liability rules and create global audit mechanisms.
b. Establishing an International AI Agency (IAIA). A global agency could provide certification of high-risk systems, harmonized testing and auditing, global monitoring of emerging risks, sanction mechanisms, research collaboration, model registries and ethical guidelines, preventing unilateral regulatory approaches from dominating global norms.
c. Evolving harmonized ethical principles. Currently, the UNESCO's Recommendation on the Ethics of AI already provides a baseline set of obligations. A universal framework mandating hamonised ethical principles should include transparency, fairness, privacy, accountability, security, human oversight, sustainability and inclusion, making the principles operationalized, and not merely aspirational.
d. Building regional Hubs under a global umbrella. Regions could implement shared guidelines tailored to local contexts while adhering to global standards, similar to the Paris Agreement's structure.[83]

Equally, a uniform global AI Regulation cannot be attained without shoring up the capacity for developing States. Thus, universal regulation must ensure access to technical resources, training of regulators, equitable digital infrastructure, inclusion in standard-setting, technology transfer frameworks, because lack of capacity can exclude nations from shaping AI's future from within their jurisdictional precincts.

[83] The Paris Agreement structure is a climate change commitment that creates Regional Collaboration Centres (RCCs) and other regional bodies hubs that act as crucial operational arms, providing technical support, building capacity, and fostering partnerships in helping countries effectively implement their climate commitments (Nationally Determined Contributions - NDCs) under the Paris Agreement. See "The Paris Agreement" <The Paris Agreement | UNFCCC> accessed 21 November 2025.

Also, effective uniform regulation requires a multi-stakeholder governance posture getting contributions from governments, industry-players, academia, civil societies, independent experts, international organizations, in order to ensure legitimacy and practicality.

Lastly, uniform benchmarks for safety, robustness, and alignment, hinged on global AI safety benchmarks which revolved around standardized testing protocols, should be binding for all AI developers and deployers.[84]

[84] I Duan "Race to the Top: Benchmarks for AI safety" <Race to the Top: Benchmarks for AI Safety — LessWrong> accessed 21 November 2025.