National Imperatives and Technological Power: Trump's Second-Term AI Agenda and Its Global Ripple Effects

Ms. Marianne SINGH
Analyst, New York University

This essay examines how President Trump's second-term AI policies are reshaping the global AI ecosystem, with contrasting effects across the United States, Europe, and Asia. In the United States, rapid deregulation and security-driven investment accelerate frontier and military-aligned AI but prioritize speed over long-term research, ethical safeguards, and market-led spillovers. Europe emphasizes regulatory sovereignty, ethical oversight, and strategic autonomy, protecting societal values while slowing adoption and limiting influence. Across Asia, middle powers and China pursue infrastructure-intensive, nationally embedded strategies, treating self-sufficiency as a structural factor while hedging between economic engagement and security alignment.

Through a comparative assessment, this essay evaluates the benefits and risks of these divergent approaches and their cumulative impact on the global AI order. It argues that fragmentation, regional divergence, and structural vulnerabilities create opportunities for China and other states to shape norms and innovation trajectories. The essay concludes by envisioning an AI ecosystem that balances national self-sufficiency, selective interoperability, shared standards where feasible, and

context-specific ethical safeguards in the context of Trump's second-term policies.

U.S. DOMESTIC POLICY AND AI ECOSYSTEM SHIFTS

The Trump administration's AI strategy emphasized rapid deployment and deregulation, prioritizing speed over ethical or safety safeguards in the global AI race, particularly with China. Federal initiatives, including investments in infrastructure, workforce training, ideological neutrality of AI, and export promotion, aimed to accelerate innovation and commercialization. Flexible regulatory conditions, federal and private pilot programs, and reforms such as the U.S. Tech Force sought to channel demand toward government-driven applications like surveillance, drone swarms, and cyber capabilities. While defense-led innovation historically spilled over into civilian markets, current policies risk concentrating AI development within the national security state, limiting broader economic benefits. Executive orders further preempted state-level regulation and fast-tracked procurement, but regulatory uncertainty could still deter investment and slow adoption.

At the same time, restrictive immigration policies, including higher H-1B fees and wage-based selection, created a self-inflicted talent shortage. With foreign nationals accounting for the majority of AI and computer science roles, these restrictions directly undermined innovation capacity and patent production, while the domestic STEM pipeline remains insufficient to fill the gap. Historical evidence shows that limiting visas reduces patenting and drives R&D offshore. Combined with slow AI adoption among U.S. firms, these constraints delay measurable economic gains from AI, which are unlikely to materialize before 2027.

Cuts to federal research funding further weaken long-term innovation. Reductions at the NIH, NSF, and other agencies narrow the scientific base, undermine cross-disciplinary breakthroughs, and accelerate talent outflows to countries offering stronger research support, including Canada, the UK, and Singapore. This erosion of foundational research not only threatens civilian innovation but also long-term national security, as U.S. competitiveness increasingly depends on advances in adjacent fields such as materials science, quantum computing, and synthetic biology.

Energy and infrastructure policies have been reframed to support AI deployment, emphasizing domestic nuclear and advanced materials research to secure high-performance computing capacity and reduce foreign dependencies. While this strengthens U.S. technological and military resilience, it reflects the broader trend of a government-driven, security-focused AI ecosystem.

These first-year policies aim to reinvent the U.S. innovation model. In certain respects, the U.S. AI ecosystem is shifting from a globalized market to a state-focused, security-driven framework. This shift is further accelerated by relaxed antitrust enforcement, creating a small number of powerful "national champion" firms that are easier for the government to work with on security goals, even if this reduces competition and innovation. The near-term effect is a strong, focused push to compete with other countries. The unresolved question, however, is whether an AI ecosystem tied to the government can remain as flexible and innovative as the market-driven approach that has historically sustained U.S. technological leadership in key areas such as the information revolution and aerospace, among many others, and how the United States can balance strategic speed with long-term innovation.

U.S.–EUROPE RELATIONS AND TRANSATLANTIC TECH DYNAMICS

The second Trump administration is compelling Europe with a fundamental dilemma: align with a U.S. security-first approach and a deregulated tech model to preserve the transatlantic alliance, or defend Europe's regulatory sovereignty and strategic autonomy, at the risk of economic or technological marginalization. So far, Europe's response has been an uneasy balancing act rather than a clear pivot, with an emphasis on regulatory resistance. While there are deviations within the European Union (EU) on how best to navigate the AI landscape, Europe is far less enthusiastic about U.S. deregulation through a "neutral AI" policy with matching executive orders and minimal oversight. These points directly conflict with the EU AI Act's binding, risk-based framework. Brussels, thus far, has refused to dilute its flagship regulation and affirming its role as a global "standards-setter". This stance is backed up by enforcement. For example, in 2025, the European Commission issued the Digital Markets Act (DMA) and Digital Services Act (DSA) that levied fines against U.S. platforms (including Apple, Meta, and X) and continued transparency investigations on major U.S. big tech firms. This enforcement-based approach highlights the growing mismatch between Europe's normative authority and its material capacity to shape frontier AI development.

While Europe's enforcement actions hold U.S. platforms accountable and ensure safety, ethics, and fair competition, it carries growing costs. U.S. retaliation, including tariff threats and investigations, visa restrictions for European regulators, and potential trade sanctions, raises the risk of a formal tech trade conflict and strains cooperation on digital standards (with the possible disruption of the U.S.-EU Trade and Technology Council), competition, data governance, and security. Operationally, U.S. firms increasingly design dual systems to satisfy both U.S. deregulation and EU compliance, delaying AI deployment in Europe and sidelining EU innovators with a widening innovation gap. U.S. firms have signaled that EU compliance costs and dual-market regulatory burdens could affect product deployments and market prioritization.

THE SECURITY DILEMMA

U.S. policy explicitly links technology collaboration to alignment against China, deepening Europe's internal divide. More Atlanticist states, such as Poland, the Baltics, and Nordic states, see advantages in strengthening bilateral tech-security ties with the United States, such as enhancing NATO's technological edge in autonomous systems, defense AI, and intelligence analytics. Conversely, more autonomist states such as France, and more recently, even Germany, resist deeper dependence, citing risks to strategic autonomy. This divide is compounded by digital policy fragmentation, including resistance from several member states to binding elements of the Digital Networks Act, which aims to boost Europe's competitiveness in telecoms infrastructure by integrating a voluntary framework rather than binding rules for tech giants.

The result is a "two-speed Europe" that complicates the EU-wide AI defense strategy. For example, existing cyber-defense integration, with ENISA and NATO-led cyber exercises, anchors European security planning within U.S. technological frameworks. While these initiatives are not direct responses to Trump's AI deregulation, they also structurally limit Europe's room for maneuver: civilian AI can be tightly regulated, but defense-adjacent and critical-infrastructure AI must remain interoperable with U.S. standards.

Hence, European disunity increases regulatory fragmentation, undermines transatlantic cooperation on secure AI standards, complicates uniform interpretation and implementation of AI rules, and hinders the interoperability of AI systems globally, while creating openings for Russian and Chinese divide-and-rule strategies. Unlike the United States, where defense-driven AI innovation spills over into civilian applications, Europe's stricter separation between military and civilian AI ecosystems limits diffusion effects, further widening the innovation gap despite ethical ambition.

THE SOVEREIGNTY SCRAMBLE: TOO LITTLE, TOO LATE?

Alarmed by capital flight and talent diversion, Europe is trying to accelerate its tech sovereignty agenda. Initiatives such as the €10 billion European Tech Champions Initiative and the sovereign cloud project GAIA-X signal overdue momentum. This crisis-driven investment is a positive, if overdue, step toward self-reliance. Yet, these programs remain insufficient relative to the U.S. scale as private U.S. capital dwarfs European pools. GAIA-X faces governance disputes and lacks compelling services, failing to match AWS or Azure capabilities, further risking EU dependence on foreign core technologies and consigning its champion companies to niche roles. Fiscal constraints, including Germany's debt brake and uneven state-aid flexibility, further limit rapid, centralized investment.

Talent competition also intensifies the challenge. While restrictive U.S. immigration policies open a narrow window for Europe to attract AI researchers and entrepreneurs, measures such as the EU Blue Card and national tech visas (such as Germany's Chancenkarte) struggle against lower compensation, bureaucracy, and the absence of a Silicon Valley-style cluster. The result is not a European brain gain, but a diversion of talent to secondary hubs such as Canada, the UK, and Singapore, with nearly 25% of leading EU AI startups considering relocation, and Europe's inflow of tech professionals shrinking from 52 000 in 2022 to 26 000 in 2024.

European firms increasingly adopt dual strategies: complying with EU rules for domestic deployment while relocating compute-intensive R&D or model training to the United States or the United Kingdom. This blurs the line between regulatory sovereignty and industrial leakage. Europe also seeks partnerships in Asia (including Japan, South Korea, Singapore, and India) and the Gulf and emphasizes open-source and open-weight AI as a partial counter-strategy. However, without sustained compute investment and coordinated industrial uptake, open-source leadership risks remaining symbolic.

U.S. AI POLICY AND ASIA: DEREGULATION, TRADE FRICTION, AND GEOECONOMIC COMPETITION

U.S. AI deregulation and renewed trade friction under President Trump's second term have accelerated geoeconomic competition across Asia. Oscillations in U.S. export controls and regulatory posture have introduced persistent uncertainty into Asian supply chains, investment planning, and governance choices. The U.S.–China technology rivalry remains the central axis shaping East Asian AI ecosystems, but deep uncertainty remains. By targeting hardware ownership rather than compute access, early U.S. restrictions on chips, attempting to target Chinese capabilities, triggered increases in black-market chip circulation and cloud-based workarounds, thus limiting the effectiveness of unilateral containment strategies. U.S. deregulation and fluctuating export controls redistribute global governance, accelerating Asian capacity-building

and pushing AI development toward infrastructure-heavy, nationally embedded models.

China's response to U.S. AI and semiconductor policy remains anchored in long-term self-reliance rather than short-term competition. Indigenous development across AI chips, foundation models, cloud infrastructure, and applications reflects a national strategy that predates, and will outlast, any single U.S. administration. Temporary easing of U.S. export controls does not reverse China's structural drive toward technological autonomy. Simultaneously, China's export controls on rare earths and critical minerals have become a systematic geopolitical tool, mirroring, but not merely reacting to, U.S. technology controls. China emphasizes cost-efficient inference, model distillation, and domain-specific AI in manufacturing, logistics, surveillance, and governance over benchmark leadership. This strategic divergence suggests that U.S. deregulation favors frontier competition, while China considers AI as a general-purpose industrial input, prioritizing scale, reliability, and integration. China is re-architecting the AI stack through substitution and optimization rather than full technological replacement, combining older-node chips with software efficiency, domestic cloud orchestration, and specialized accelerators. These adaptations weaken assumptions that export controls linearly translate into capability loss.

Japan, South Korea, and Singapore are recalibrating in response to U.S.–China competition. While approaches differ, a common pattern is emerging: increased domestic AI investment, selective security alignment with the U.S., and continued economic engagement with China. Rather than choosing sides, these states pursue strategic autonomy through indigenous capability development, while managing trade-offs between security alignment and commercial competitiveness.

Japan's technological influence resides not in frontier model development, but in precision manufacturing equipment, advanced materials and sensors, robotics, and hardware-software integration. As U.S. deregulation shifts governance downstream, these hardware choke points become critical sources of de facto rule-setting power. In a deregulated AI environment, manufacturing reliability and system integration shape safety practices and deployment norms, granting Japan a quiet but durable influence. These nationally embedded strategies reinforce regulatory divergence across the region.

Unlike Europe, the U.S. lacks binding federal AI safety standards capable of anchoring global norms. This absence weakens U.S. governance-based critiques and allows Beijing to frame AI regulation as a matter of national sovereignty, rather than universal risk management, an underappreciated advantage in global norm-setting debates. China's adaptive strategies intensify strategic pressure on neighboring economies as they recalibrate their own AI policies.

U.S. AI deregulation has accelerated regulatory divergence across Asia. Rather than aligning with a unified standard, Asian governments are developing independent frameworks, illustrated by South Korea's AI Act, balancing innovation with risk mitigation. Governance has not disappeared; it has shifted downstream to hardware standards, manufacturing norms, procurement rules, and deployment practices, areas where East Asian firms wield disproportionate influence. In this context, governance increasingly operates through infrastructure, standards, and deployment constraints rather than through formal multilateral rule-making.

The absence of U.S. leadership on multilateral AI safety norms pushes Asian states toward internal regulations or alternative European and Chinese governance models. This exacerbates regulatory fragmentation, increasing compliance costs, constraining cross-border collaboration, and weakening collective risk management for frontier AI systems.

Export controls remain central to U.S.–China competition. While some Biden-era restrictions have eased, allowing U.S. firms such as Nvidia and AMD greater access to Asian markets, speculation about future controls continues to unsettle investors and planners. Clearer export rules have enabled data-center investment in countries such as Malaysia and Thailand, but persistent policy volatility forces infrastructure planning under strategic ambiguity.
Policy instability disproportionately harms smaller Asian firms, while large U.S. incumbents absorb uncertainty more easily, reinforcing market concentration and shifting bargaining power. Meanwhile, accelerated hyperscale expansion collides with constraints on energy, water, and land across Japan, South Korea, Singapore, and Taiwan. AI development is increasingly shaped by industrial planning and sovereign compute strategies rather than market scaling alone, with Southeast Asia facing the sharpest constraints.

Other Southeast Asian economies, including Vietnam, Malaysia, and Thailand, bear disproportionate adjustment costs from supply-chain reconfiguration, regulatory arbitrage, and geopolitical pressure. Lacking the fiscal or technological capacity to replicate full AI stacks, they face heightened risks of forced alignment, technological dependency, and political vulnerability.

Trump's second-term AI policies reorder the global AI ecosystem. In Asia, this has produced a fragmented, infrastructure-constrained, and nationally embedded AI landscape, defined by hedging, silent rule-setting, and uneven adjustment costs. Governance resides in hardware, infrastructure, and deployment decisions, areas where Asian influence is growing, but unevenly distributed across the region.

CONCLUSION

President Trump's second-term AI policies are reshaping the global AI ecosystem in uneven and potentially destabilizing ways. In the United States, rapid deregulation and a security-driven approach accelerate frontier and military-aligned AI deployment but constrain civilian diffusion, market-led spillovers, foundational research, and talent pipelines, creating long-term vulnerabilities beyond short-term advantages. Europe emphasizes strong regulation, ethical safeguards, and strategic autonomy, protecting societal values but slowing adoption, limiting market influence, and exposing structural vulnerabilities that allow external actors to exert pressure and increase dependence. Across Asia, infrastructure-intensive, nationally embedded strategies preserve autonomy but fragment regional governance and complicate interoperability.

The cumulative effect under Trump 2.0 is a contested, fragmented AI ecosystem. U.S. constraints in civilian diffusion and foundational research, combined with Europe's regulatory divergence and Asia's alternative pathways, allow China to consolidate influence, advance a self-reliant AI ecosystem, and increase the probability of upstream innovation while operating within its sphere. Global governance and norm-setting are weakened, as national priorities and industrial capacities increasingly shape the system.

Looking forward, the emerging AI ecosystem will likely be defined less by unified norms than by a patchwork of security priorities, regulatory philosophies, and sovereign capacities. A resilient future system would recognize self-sufficiency as a baseline, preserve selective interoperability and shared standards where feasible, and incorporate context-dependent ethical safeguards. Without such synthesis, technological adoption, strategic alignment, and innovation will remain uneven, leaving the world vulnerable to widening disparities in AI capabilities.

Ms. Marianne SINGH

Ms. Marianne SINGH is a policy and risk analyst and geopolitical researcher focused on AI, emerging technologies, and global political, economic, and social risks. She holds a Master's in International Relations from New York University (NYU) and a Bachelor's in Economics from Université du Québec à Montréal (UQAM).