



DOES WHO FUNDS ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE MATTER? FOREIGN INVESTMENTS, NATIONAL SECURITY, AND INTERGENERATIONAL RISKS

Dérigue Soares Crestane¹
Alessandro Paccione²

The advancement of artificial intelligence technologies has intensified debates on their regulation, particularly in light of their non-neutral character and their capacity to embed political and institutional values derived from their contexts of development. In this scenario, the growing presence of foreign investments in strategic technological sectors raises new concerns related to national security, understood in an expanded sense that encompasses not only military aspects but also economic, informational, and technological dimensions.

Recent scholarship has highlighted that artificial intelligence systems tend to reflect the normative structures and decision-making patterns of the environments in which they are developed. This becomes especially relevant when such technologies originate from distinct institutional contexts, particularly in the comparison between democratic and non-democratic regimes. When combined with foreign investment flows, these dynamics may contribute to the formation of technological and informational dependencies capable of producing long-term structural effects (Barfield, 2025).

The debate surrounding artificial intelligence regulation cannot be limited to traditional concerns such as consumer protection, data privacy, or market competition. Although these dimensions remain relevant, artificial intelligence systems increasingly operate as infrastructures of social, political, and informational power. AI technologies influence how individuals communicate, consume information, form social relationships, and perceive reality itself, while simultaneously depending on extensive structures of data extraction and processing capable of reinforcing global asymmetries of power (Guihot, 2025).

Algorithms do not merely organize information in a neutral manner. They actively shape and filter social reality according to specific logics and priorities, influencing political narratives and public perception. The concentration of computational resources and data-

¹ PhD Candidate in Law at the University of Santa Cruz do Sul (UNISC) with a PROSUC/CAPES Scholarship. Member of the ICCAL Brazil Network, affiliated with the Max Planck Institute for Comparative Public Law and International Law, based in Heidelberg, Germany. E-mail: dscrestane@gmail.com

² PhD at the University of Tuscia, attorney at law in Italy and USA (NY Bar). E-mail: Alessandro.Paccione@pavia-ansaldo.it



processing capabilities in large technology corporations intensifies these dynamics. Companies such as Alphabet, Meta, Amazon, Apple and Microsoft have consolidated extraordinary levels of technological and economic influence through the large-scale integration on artificial intelligence systems into global digital ecosystems (Guihot, 2025).

Against this backdrop, the research addresses the following question: to what extent can the geopolitical origin of foreign investments in artificial intelligence generate risks to national security not only in the present but also from an intergenerational perspective, and how can a computational thinking-based approach contribute to the development of regulatory criteria capable of identifying and mitigating such risks?

The general objective of this study is to analyze how the geopolitical origin of foreign investments in artificial intelligence influences the configuration of national security risks, proposing regulatory parameters grounded in computational thinking for their identification and mitigation. The specific objectives are: (i) to examine the relationship between the development of artificial intelligence technologies and the incorporation of political and institutional values from their countries of origin; (ii) to investigate how foreign investments in strategic AI sectors may affect national security from a contemporary perspective; and (iii) to analyze the intergenerational effects arising from technological dependence associated with such investments, with a view to developing more adequate regulatory criteria.

The analysis will stem from the attempt to observe and describe the broadening concept of national security.

The latter, in fact, is a concept that has always exhibited some margins of inconsistency, often lacking a clear and unambiguous definition in positive law. There is a contiguity — but not a complete overlap — with the concept of public safety. It ultimately refers to the survival of the State and the integrity of its borders. It may be framed as a supreme interest in the security of the State in its international personality. Viewed from this perspective, national security constitutes an essential element of sovereignty — the assertion of a national community's prerogatives of independence and autonomy in the global arena. The reference to the survival of the State has historically projected national security into a domain dominated by the substantially unconstrained action of political power in pursuing its ends. The public powers connected to security thus appear shrouded in an aura of marked (and tendentially unreviewable) political character (Esplugues, 2018). This strong political connotation helps explain why, despite definitional attempts, the concept remains nebulous to this day. The survival of the State, in turn, appears to refer back to a rather elastic category: can it be confined



to territorial integrity, or might it extend, for instance, to the protection of a country's industrial base (including AI technologies and the materials instrumental to their production)?

The answer to this question varies depending on the approach adopted. If one takes a subjectivist perspective, national security encompasses everything that public authorities deem it to be, in relation to changing societal conditions, shifting global balances, or prevailing sensibilities. If, instead, one follows an objectivist perspective, the notion is delimited according to parameters established by positive law.

The second perspective is now being called into question by the substantive "*big bang*" that is transforming the notion of national security worldwide, making it arduous to defend the objectivist model founded on the primacy of the positive datum fixed *ex ante* over the "raw" political will.

The crisis of globalization is, in fact, bringing the role of States back to the center as protectors of their respective communities from the risks of an interconnected world (Jacobs, 2019). Several factors have fractured the neoliberal system of thought, founded on the promise of universal material well-being made possible by the free market. This ideological system, which elevated competition to the rank of a regulatory principle governing virtually every sphere of social organization, progressively weakened the role of public authorities, reducing them — at least in theory — to the role of arbiters of the flows of persons, goods, and capital within a harmonious system of multilateral relations and institutions (global administrative law?). A sign of the ongoing transformation is precisely the general crisis of legitimacy or effectiveness that is engulfing multilateral institutions (especially in the economic sphere — the WTO being a case in point) to the advantage of individual States (Benton Heath, 2019).

The hypothesis underpinning this research project is that the expansion in meaning of the formula "*national security*" — to the point that it is now described as a "*semantic jungle*" (Drezner, 2024) — represents the conceptual container onto which the principal tensions of the current phase of deglobalization and great-power competition are most conspicuously discharged. The rise of artificial intelligence epitomizes this dynamic: AI is simultaneously a driver of economic competitiveness, a critical military capability, and a potential vector of systemic vulnerability, thereby concentrating in a single technological domain the very anxieties — over industrial sovereignty, strategic autonomy, and the adequacy of existing regulatory frameworks — that are fueling the ongoing redefinition of national security. Indeed, the race among States to control AI supply chains, restrict the transfer of advanced chips and models, and establish domestic regulatory regimes illustrates how the "semantic jungle" of



national security is being colonised by imperatives that would have been regarded, only a decade ago, as matters of ordinary trade or innovation policy.

The research adopts a deductive method, proceeding from general premises related to AI regulation, national security, and the protection of future generations, and applying them to the context of foreign investments in strategic technologies. It also employs an analytical approach, decomposing the central elements of the problem, geopolitical origin of technology, embedded values, and intertemporal risks, in order to understand their interrelations. The research technique consists of a bibliographic review based on specialized national and international scholarship, combined with an interdisciplinary perspective that integrates contributions from law, political science, and technology studies.

The expected results include demonstrating that the geopolitical origin of artificial intelligence technologies constitutes a legally relevant variable in the assessment of foreign investments in strategic sectors, particularly when considering their long-term effects. The study also aims to show that such investments may generate forms of technological dependence with intergenerational implications, thereby justifying the incorporation of the protection of future generations as a normative element in regulatory frameworks. Finally, it seeks to propose an analytical model inspired by computational thinking, capable of assisting in the identification, classification, and evaluation of risks associated with foreign investments in artificial intelligence, contributing to the development of more effective regulatory tools for contemporary national security.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence; Foreign Investment; National Security; Intergenerational Justice; Technology Regulation

REFERÊNCIAS

BARFIELD, W. A computational thinking approach for law and artificial intelligence. In: *Research Handbook On The Law Of Artificial Intelligence: Current And Future Directions*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing, 2025.

BENTON HEATH, J. *The New National Security Challenge to the Economic Order*, in *Yale Law Journal*, vol. 129, n. 5, 2019, pp. 1020 e ss.

DREZNER D. W. *How Everything Became National Security*, in *Foreign Affairs*, 2024, vol. 103, n. 5, pp. 122 e ss.



ESPLUGUES C. *United States: The Paradigm of Review on National Security Grounds*, in *Foreign Investment, Strategic Assets and National Security*, Intersentia, Cambridge, 2018, pp. 263 e ss.

GUIHOT, M. Control, influence, and manipulation: AI has a power problem. In: *Research Handbook On The Law Of Artificial Intelligence: Current And Future Directions*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing, 2025.

JACOBS J. *Tiptoeing the Line Between National Security and Protectionism: A Comparative Approach to Foreign Direct Investment Screening in the United States and European Union*, in *International Journal of Legal Information*, 2019, vol. 47, n. 2, pp. 105 e ss.

THOMPSON, D. F. Representing future generations: political presentism and democratic trusteeship. *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy*, v. 13, n. 1, p. 17–37, 2010. Disponível em: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13698230903326232>.