Vol. 2, No. 1, 2026 - Kwararafa University Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation
Pub. Link: https://aa.unij.co.uk/index.php/kujmri/issue/view/6 - E- ISSN: 3156-5492 | P- ISSN: 3156-5514

Communicating Power and Resistance: Africa in the Era of Artificial Intelligence

[1]ALEGU, Johnson Chinasa, Ph.D
johnsonalegu@gmail.com / +2347061062229
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5763-7745

[2]AJAH, Philemon Chukwu
Ajahpc4sure@gmail.com / 2348030741241
https://orcid.org/0009-0008-5044-5856

[3]EZEH, Chima Denma
Jamesezeh2008@gmail.com / +2348063383113
https://orcid.org/0009-0006-2970-4388

[1,2,3] Department of General Studies,
Federal College of Agriculture, Ishiagu

DOI : https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22901829

Abstract
Globally, the domination of one group by another has usually been met with resistance because humans were born free and desire to exercise their political, economic, and religious freedom without restriction. This informed the declaration of American States in 1776 that men were created equal and endowed by their maker with certain inalienable rights among which are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. This study analysed power and resistance in Africa in relation to the Western world from the lens of Artificial Intelligence which extant literature has shown is a tool for domination and digital colonialism by the advanced nations against the developing nations like African countries. The study is anchored on Technological Determinism theory and adopted library research method. The study argues that while historical colonialism was concerned with territorial acquisition, domination, exploitation of the colonized people and appropriation of their land by the coloniser, digital colonialism seeks total control of the lives of the people in a subtle way by acquiring their data for the benefits of the global technology companies and corporations. The study recommends that Africa should adopt alternative technologies, ideologies and models that promote democracy, human rights and socio-economic justice among other things.

Key words: Communication, Power, Domination, Resistance, Artificial Intelligence

Vol. 2, No. 1, 2026 - Kwararafa University Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation
Pub. Link: https://aa.unij.co.uk/index.php/kujmri/issue/view/6 - E- ISSN: 3156-5492 | P- ISSN: 3156-5514

Introduction

The place of Africa in relation to Western Nations with regards to Artificial Intelligence (AI) can be likened to the New World Information and Communication Order (NWICO) debate in which the countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America argued that it was impossible to have a free and balanced flow of information between unequal partners (Udeze, 2005). This, according to them, stems from the sophisticated communication infrastructure at the disposal of the Western World but lacking in the Third World (Udeze, 2005). The global power understands the vulnerability of Africa and Third World nations and this accounts for "the social classification of world's population around the idea of race, a mental construction that expresses the basic experience of colonial domination and pervades the more important dimensions of global power, including its specific rationality: Eurocentrism" (Quijano 2000, p. 533). Quijano (2000) observes that this model of power that prevails in the world today is reminiscent of colonialism. Historians recognize three ages of colonialism with first corresponding with the period of mercantilism and the second being the outcome of the Industrial Revolution whereas the third resulting in the partition of Africa, among other things (Mbembe, 2021) .

Accordingly, Mollema (2024) contends that the development and deployment of Machine Learning and Artificial Intelligence culminates in AI colonialism and passes as a form of injustice. While using AI colonialism and data colonialism interchangeably, Mollema (2024) notes that there is the need to decolonise AI for political, ecological and epistemic reasons. The scholar observes that, politically, AI colonialism enforces digital capitalism's hegemony, ecologically, impacts the environment adversely through the intensification of the extraction of natural resources and energy consumption and epistemic ally, reinforces Western universalism on the global South through the imposition of Western colonial values which reflect in the digital ecosystem as a form of capitalism. Mbembe (2022) is right when he argues that the situation of Africans seems to equate with living in the periphery of extremes culminating in both irreversible environmental metamorphosis and the increase in a new form of colonialism- techno-molecular colonialism. Corroborating Mbembe (2022), Mollema (2024) observes that most powerful companies and states globally reinforce themselves through the development and deployment of AI technologies.

Kwet (2019) describes digital colonialism as a structural form of domination implemented through centralised ownership and control of the three main pillars of digital ecosystem namely hardware, software and network connectivity which afford the United States tremendous political, economic and social power. This suggests that the enormous power wielded by the United States and other dominant global power centres in the digital environment enable them to subjugate Africa and other countries in the Global South on political, economic and social fronts. Kwet (2019) observes that assimilation into the technology products, models and ideologies of foreign powers are tantamount to 21st century colonialism but notes the existence of alternative technologies, models and ideologies for fashioning out a digital society that is in tandem with democracy, human rights and socio-economic justice with decentralized ownership and control of the three main pillars of digital ecosystem as criteria. Kwet (2019) asserts that while the colonialism of the old concentrated on land conquest, the current colonisation is corporate in nature in which case big technology corporations colonise digital technology. In fact, United States multinational corporations dominate the digital space with Goggle, Alphabet, Facebook,

Vol. 2, No. 1, 2026 - Kwararafa University Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation
Pub. Link: https://aa.unij.co.uk/index.php/kujmri/issue/view/6 - E- ISSN: 3156-5492 | P- ISSN: 3156-5514

Apple and Microsoft (GAFAM) standing as the five wealthiest corporations globally with a combined market cap above $3 trillion (Kwet, 2019).

In addition, while the imperialist powers are protecting their technologies, on the contrary, the exploited nations grant unhindered access to their most priceless 21st century commodity-technology **(**De Melo, 2025), a situation that calls for the resistance of the imperialist domination by the dominated. This was why Spivak (1990) described the erstwhile colonies as the post-colonial neo-colonised world in relation to the Global North because the Western World occupies the pride of place in the global power hierarchy while the Global South remains at the bottom (Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2013). Ndlovu-Gatsheni (2013, p. 4) observes that in the post-colonial neo-colonised world, Africa and the Western world "meet under highly racialised, hegemonic, hierarchical and unequal terms". Consequently, this study attempts to explain this unequal relations between the Western nations and African nations with a view to showing what Africa should do to liberate herself and relate with Western world as an equal partner in the AI industry.

Conceptual Clarifications

Power

Many scholars have defined power in several ways. Wrong (2017, p. 2) conceptualises power as the "the capacity of some persons to produce intended and foreseen effects on others". This presupposes that, in the exercise of power, people's actions affect others in some kind of way. However, Wrong (2017) notes that five problems are associated with the conceptual analysis of power such as the intentionality of power, the effectiveness of power, the latency of power, asymmetry and balance in power relations as well as the nature of effects produced by power. Taking his cue from the dictionary which defines power as the capacity to do things and the possession of the capabilities to affect the behaviour of others to get those things done, Nye (2004) observes that power is the ability to influence the behaviour of others in order to get one's desired outcomes.

Corroborating Nye (2004) who argues that influencing others' behaviour to achieve desired outcomes can be realised through threats, inducements, attraction or co-opting, Wrong (2017, p. 21) notes that many writers have conceptualised power "as the capacity to impose, or to threaten successfully to impose, penalties or deprivations for noncompliance". Power therefore has two faces namely hard power and soft power. Whereas hard power relies on threats or inducements (stick or carrot approach), soft power depends on the attractiveness of the person, organisation or country influencing the behaviour of others which is anchored on their culture and values that those whose behaviour is being influenced desire or work towards attaining. Power relations are expressed through three models such as power over, power with and power to (Berger, 2005). Power over relations takes the traditional dominance model of decision-making epitomised by control, instrumentalism and self-interest. This type of power relations exemplifies a win-lose situation in which one takes the power from another person and deploys it as an instrument of domination while preventing others from having it (Nwodu & Emechebe, 2023). By contrast, power with scenario depicts an empowerment model characterised by inclusion, dialogue, negotiation and shared power (Berger, 2005). This type of power relations epitomises democratic power relations as it provides room for inclusivity and democratic practices. The power to relations challenges the power over relations dominance model because it takes the form of

Vol. 2, No. 1, 2026 - Kwararafa University Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation
Pub. Link: https://aa.unij.co.uk/index.php/kujmri/issue/view/6 - E- ISSN: 3156-5492 | P- ISSN: 3156-5514

activism and resistance which Africans can deploy to resist the colonial and imperialistic tendencies embedded in Artificial Intelligence.

Resistance

Scott (1985, p. xvi) conceptualises everyday form of resistance as "the prosaic but constant struggle between the peasantry and those who seek to extract labor, food, taxes, rents, and interest from them". Although this form of resistance avoids open confrontation with the authority, it requires little or no co-ordination or planning but deploys implicit understandings and informal networks, represents self-help and weaponises foot dragging, dissimulation, desertion, false compliance, pilfering, feigned ignorance, slander, arson, sabotage among others (Scott, 1985). Even with its deficiencies, the scholar notes that this form of resistance has proved to be the most significant and most effective in the long run. This means that resistance goes beyond demonstrations or protests. In Africa, the history of resistance is seldom separated from the history of colonialism in which case, the history of Africa was written as the history of White men's mission to 'civilise' the 'natives' who were engrossed with tradition (Willems & Obadare, 2014).

However, a new wave of historiography emerged to challenge the Eurocentric or Westernised history of Africa that ended up glorifying the West and demonising Africa by emphasising the contributions of Africa to global civilisation. Consequently, postcolonial African historiography accentuated the heroic attempts of Africans in resisting oppression, domination and subjugation and liberating themselves from colonialism (Willems & Obadare, 2014). According to Willems & Obadare (2014), whereas the anti-colonial resistance dominated 1960s and 1970s in Africa, a new paradigm surfaced in the 1990s to challenge the postcolonial indigenous governments that were majorly intolerant of opposition and reminiscent of the colonial state. As a result, a new wave of resistance namely civil society dominated the 1990s. Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) also called not-for-profit organisations, Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) and Community Based Organisations (CBOs) served the purposed of resisting autocratic regimes in Africa (Willems & Obadare, 2014).

Artificial Intelligence

Artificial Intelligence denotes systems that act intelligently through the analysis of their environment and responding with a measure of autonomy in order to achieve specific goals (European Commission's Communication on AI, 2018). The Commission argues that AI systems could be software-based such as voice assistants, image analysis software, search engines, speech and face recognition systems or embedded in hardware devices like advanced robots, autonomous cars, drones or Internet of Things applications. It observes that expansion in computing power, availability and progress in algorithms have transformed AI into one of the most strategic technologies of the 21st century. Similarly, Leslie, Burr, Aitken, Cowls, Katell and Briggs (2021) conceptualize AI systems as algorithmic models which perform cognitive and perceptual functions which were tasks previously reserved for thinking, judging and reasoning humans. Jaldi (2023) observes that AI technology is growing across Africa with over 2,400 companies specialising in AI 41% of which are startups. In fact, South Africa, Nigeria, Egypt, Kenya, Morocco, Ghana and Tunisia have 726; 546; 246; 204; 126; 115 and 103 companies each

Vol. 2, No. 1, 2026 - Kwararafa University Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation
Pub. Link: https://aa.unij.co.uk/index.php/kujmri/issue/view/6 - E- ISSN: 3156-5492 | P- ISSN: 3156-5514

specialising in AI (Jaldi, 2023). While the numbers look good and encouraging for the continent, AI systems have colonial values embedded in them. It therefore becomes necessary to decolonise them by developing homegrown AI systems that cater to the needs and aspirations of Africans and protect and promote African values.

Theoretical Foundation

This study is anchored on Technological Determinism theory. Originally attributed to Thorstein Veblen, the theory holds that technology is the main initiator of societal metamorphosis (Hauer, 2017). Therefore, the proponents of technological determinism contend that technology, communications technology, technological development and the media control social changes (Hauer, 2017). Two brands of technological determinism theory have been identified such as radical or hard technological determinism and moderate or soft technological determinism. Whereas radical version of the theory holds that technologies represent a criterion for societal transformation, the moderate version holds that technology serves only as a factor which may or may not initiate societal changes (Hauer, 2017). Héder (2021) identifies two pillars of technological determinism. The first pillar, according to the scholar, is the perceived unavoidability of technological progress with a tendency for higher efficiency and any long term attempt to resist it will amount to a wild goose chase. The second pillar, the scholar observes, is that the predetermined nature of the evolution of technology serves as an external force that causes societal transformation. Technological determinism explains the relationship between technology and society as well as the impact of technology on society (Koniakou, 2019). This theory was adopted for this study because Artificial Intelligence is the prevailing technology which shapes the political, social and economic relations between Africa and the countries in the Global South.

Methodology

This study adopted library research method. This is because it is an analytical study. Therefore, it relied on books, journal articles and other documents as sources of information used. The secondary data obtained from the scholarly works utilized in the study provided the basis for the position taken in the discourse.

Artificial Intelligence: An Equaliser or a Hegemonic Tool?

Communication today is automated with machines such as interactive programmes like chatbots, translation applications and ChatGPT among others assisting humans or working independently in the communication activities (Wee, 2025). It has been argued that the most powerful companies and states globally reinforce themselves through the development and deployment of various AI technologies thereby producing a combination of the exploitative and extractive inclinations of colonialism (Mollema, 2024). Colonialism according to Butt (2013) denotes domination, cultural imposition and exploitation. Similarly, Mohamed, Png and Isaac (2020) characterise colonialism with territorial appropriation, exploitation of the natural environment and human labour as well as direct control of social structures. Elucidating on the subject further, Butt (2013) contends that colonialism involves the imposition of the colonial power's cultures and customs on the colonised as a result of the belief in either racial and or cultural superiority of the coloniser, the evangelical motive of spreading religious or cultural practices or a

Vol. 2, No. 1, 2026 - Kwararafa University Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation
Pub. Link: https://aa.unij.co.uk/index.php/kujmri/issue/view/6 - E- ISSN: 3156-5492 | P- ISSN: 3156-5514

mechanism for putting in place or consolidating political control over the colonised. The United Nations General Assembly's Resolution 1514 of 1960 demolishes colonialism when it declares among other things that, "The subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights", as "all peoples have the right to self-determination" in order to "freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development" and therefore, "inadequacy of political, economic, social or educational preparedness should never serve as a pretext for delaying independence" under any guise. Yet, apologists for colonialism have tried unsuccessfully to rationalise and justify colonialism but Césaire (1972) contends that colonialism was neither aimed at evangelisation, philanthropy, entrenchment of rule of law nor efforts to checkmate ignorance, disease or tyranny among the colonised by the coloniser. Césaire was right because evidence abounds of how the colonial powers ended up appropriating the resources of the colonised peoples and deploying them to develop their own countries to the detriment of the colonised nations. We argue that the creation and deployment of Artificial Intelligence currently negates the ideals of inclusive institutions advanced by Acemoglu and Robinson (2012) as responsible for the prosperity of nations but promote the extractive institutions which the scholars note, account for the poverty of nations. Therefore, Africa is disadvantaged in its power relations with the Western powers with regards to Artificial Intelligence.

Similarly, Butt (2013) observes that international relations is replete with violent efforts of a community to subjugate another. While this captures colonialism during the period the Western World colonised African nations and other places, colonialism through AI is subtle unlike what obtained in the past. Whereas Césaire (1972) recognises the historical coloniser as the adventurer, the pirate, the ship owner and the gold digger etc., Couldry (2023) notes that today's colonisers are not conquistadors, governors of provinces but those corporations that offer what appear like services for living like social media platforms, platforms for children learning and for our health monitoring among others. Moreover, Hao (2022) argues that just as the European colonialism centred on violent capture of land, extraction of resources, and exploitation of the people through slavery for the economic benefit of the colonising country, the AI industry is re-enacting the same violence today through a more insidious way for the economic enrichment of the wealthy and powerful nations to the detriment of the poor ones. Couldry and Mejias (2019) argue that four components underpin historical colonialism such as appropriation of resources, unequal economic and social relations, unequal global allocation of the benefits of the appropriated resources and the spread of ideologies to explain the pernicious enterprise of colonialism. Differentiating historical colonialism from data colonialism, Couldry and Mejias (2019) observe that whereas historical colonialism enlarged by appropriating geographical territory and the resources of the area for exploitation, data colonialism enlarges by appropriating the layers of human life for exploitation. They however note that mere appropriation of data does not constitute data colonialism as one can approve the appropriation of one's data for one's purposes but once there is an external appropriation of one's data on terms that are partly or wholly beyond the control of the person to whom the data belong, it becomes data colonialism. They further note that resisting data colonialism is the sure means to guarantee a future of human freedom that capitalism claims to avail.

Vol. 2, No. 1, 2026 - Kwararafa University Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation
Pub. Link: https://aa.unij.co.uk/index.php/kujmri/issue/view/6 - E- ISSN: 3156-5492 | P- ISSN: 3156-5514

During historical colonialism, the colonial powers dispossessed the natives of valuable resources, took control and ownership of their infrastructure, extracted their raw materials through exploited labour and shipped to the country of the coloniser while importing cheap machine-made products to the country of the colonised (Kwet, 2019). But under digital colonialism, colonising powers led by the United States are planting digital infrastructure designed to suit their needs of economic and cultural domination of the countries in the Global South by producing digital technology that guarantees their dominance of the critical functions in the technology ecosystem (Kwet, 2019). The fear of some African leaders who led the decolonisation struggles that colonial powers were awake and would return if not completely tamed, has materialised through Artificial Intelligence which they are using to dominate, emasculate, manipulate and subjugate Africa and her citizens. Their current strategy is subtle like the divide and rule policy deployed in the continent during the days of colonialism. Through divide and rule, the Western powers created divisions among African native communities, kingdoms, tribes and nationalities that before then existed as brothers thereby making them enemies. As the brothers fought, the coloniser was busy looting African resources. Today, they are hiding under technology to extract African resources in the form of data without commensurate and consequential benefits to Africans and African nations.

Resistance and Decolonisation of Artificial Intelligence in Africa

Africa and the Global South must vehemently resist this new brand of colonialism in order to ensure their human freedom. Just as they decolonised their countries politically, they should free themselves from digital colonialism. One way to do that is by embracing Free Software Movement founded in 1983 by Richard Stallman. The Free Software Movement is defined by four fundamental freedoms namely freedom to run the programme the way you like, freedom to know how a programme works and change it if need be, freedom to redistribute verbatim copies of the programme and freedom to distribute the modified versions of the programme to others (Kwet, 2019). Mohamed, Png and Isaac (2020) argue that decolonisation could either be territorial or structural. According to them, territorial decolonisation is concerned with the dissolution of colonial relations whereas structural decolonisation revolves around dissolving the colonial mechanisms of power, economics, language, culture, and thinking that shape modern life: questioning the provenance and legitimacy of the prevailing forms of knowledge, values, norms and assumptions.

Mohamed, Png and Isaac (2020) situate the decolonisation role under three views namely the decentralising view, an additive-inclusive view and an engagement view. The decentralising view rejects in entirety the imitation of the West in all areas of life and called for the assertion of the unique identities by the colonised while the additive-inclusive view welcomes the continuation of existing knowledge which accommodates the flourishing of new and alternative ways of knowledge creation. In addition, the engagement view calls for a critical view of science by examining scientific practice from the periphery in order to place the needs of the marginalised populations at the centre of design and research process and interrogates the source of knowledge, those included and excluded and in whose interest science is applied, who is silenced and what unacknowledged hypotheses might be playing out. Besides, making digital sovereignty policies, strengthening data protection and privacy laws, investing in digital infrastructures, supporting

Vol. 2, No. 1, 2026 - Kwararafa University Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation
Pub. Link: https://aa.unij.co.uk/index.php/kujmri/issue/view/6 - E- ISSN: 3156-5492 | P- ISSN: 3156-5514

local digital contents, promoting open-source technologies and entering into balanced trade agreements are necessary steps to reducing digital colonialism in Africa (Salami, 2024).

Should Decolonising Artificial Intelligence in Africa be a Priority?

There is an argument as to whether AI is already decolonised in Africa or not. There are two strands to the argument. One side of the argument holds that AI is already decolonised whereas the other side holds that AI is not yet decolonised. Although the proponents of decolonised AI school of thought may argue that some AI tools could perform some tasks using indigenous African languages, it is important to note that decolonising AI goes beyond using indigenous African languages to train AI. Decolonising AI consists in the structural dissolution of the colonial mechanics of power, culture, thinking, etc. that change modern life. The question therefore is whether African countries can compete favourably as an equal partner with the advanced countries of the world in the AI industry. If African countries are still being eclipsed by the major players in the AI industry, we argue that AI needs to be decolonised. If African countries are still struggling to catch up with the advanced nations who control the AI industry, we argue that AI in Africa needs to be decolonised.

An example to buttress the position above will suffice. According to Pricewaterhousecoopers (PWC) (2017), by 2030 the global Gross Domestic Product (GDP) could be $15.7 trillion (14%) higher as a result of Artificial Intelligence thereby presenting the highest commercial opportunity in the fast dynamic global economy. Of the total sum, PWC notes that $6.6 trillion and $9.1 trillion respectively would come from improved productivity and consumption-side effects. The body projects that China will be the greatest beneficiary with a likely improvement of 26% followed by North America with a likely boost of up to 14%. Lamentably, Africa, Oceania and other Asian markets will have their GDP improved by 5 6% amounting to $1.2 trillion only. The data show that Africa is dominated in the global AI power relations hence the need to have AI decolonised in Africa.

Ayana et al. (2024) observe that there are disparities in the adoption and influence of AI which favour the Global North against the Global South which Africa is part and needs to be confronted head-on to correct it to ensure equal distribution of the benefits accruing from it. Ayana et al. assessed 10 Sub-Saharan African countries using the following indicators: (1) Does the country have an institution to guide AI governance? (2) Does the country have a national AI governance strategy? (3) Is 'sovereignty' a priority in the country's AI governance strategy? (4) Does the country have data protection regulations? (5) Does the country necessitate or oblige the use of local data for AI tools used in the country? Based on the above indicators, the scholars rated countries as follows: (I) Decolonisation-Resistant: Accepts AI governance colonization and does not do anything. (II) Decolonisation-Blind: Ignore AI decolonisation governance and do not do anything. (III) Decolonisation-Aware: Acknowledge AI governance decolonisation but do not work toward decolonisation. (IV) Decolonisation-Responsive: Acknowledge and consider decolonisation's specific needs. (V) Decolonisation-Transformative: Address the causes of decolonisation and work to transform AI governance decolonisation. According to the results of the study, 80% of the selected Sub-Saharan African countries examined were decolonisation-aware whereas 10% each were decolonisation-responsive and decolonisation-blind respectively. The only country that was decolonisation-responsive was Rwanda while the only country that

Vol. 2, No. 1, 2026 - Kwararafa University Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation
Pub. Link: https://aa.unij.co.uk/index.php/kujmri/issue/view/6 - E- ISSN: 3156-5492 | P- ISSN: 3156-5514

was decolonisation-blind was Cameroon but other countries such as Nigeria, South Africa, Kenya, Seychelles, Mauritius, Senegal, Ghana and Ethiopia are all decolonisation-aware. If these above named countries that should be considered as major players in the AI industry in Africa were merely decolonisation-aware not even decolonisation-responsive some two years ago in AI governance, we argue that AI in Africa is far from being decolonised. Looking at the foregoing, we argue that decolonising Artificial Intelligence should be prioritised by all African nations.

Conclusion and recommendations

This study examined how Western technology companies deploy Artificial Intelligence to dominate the third world nations particularly in Africa. It basically examined the power relations between the technologically advanced nations of the world who dominate the technology and AI industry and the less technologically developed African societies who are playing the catching up game in the AI industry. The study indicates that in the face of domination, the dominated usually revolt in order to reclaim their God-given freedom. The study shows that the third world countries especially African nations are technologically disadvantaged as against their western counterparts. Therefore, there is the need for Africa to adopt a combined approach which accommodates the decentralising, additive-inclusive and engagement views to AI decolonisation process. Also, Africa should embrace the Free Software Movement initiated by Richard Stallman in 1983 in order to free herself from the stranglehold of the global technology corporations. Similarly, African nations should embrace alternative technologies, models and ideologies which promote democracy, human rights and socio-economic justice while possessing decentralised ownership and control of the three main pillars of digital ecosystem such as hardware, software and network connectivity. African countries therefore, should prioritise decolonising AI in order to dismantle the western-centric ideas, biases, prejudices and structures that undermine Africa's efforts to operate as equal partners with the advanced nations in the global AI industry. This can done through stakeholder involvement like national governments and indigenous AI experts among others.

References

Acemoglu, D. & Robinson, J.A. (2013). *Why nations fail: The origins of power, prosperity and poverty*. London: Profile Books.

Ayana, G., Dese, K., Nemomssa, H. D., Habtamu, B., Mellado, B., Badu, K., Yamba, E., Faye, S. L., Ondua, M., Nsagha, D., Nkweteyim, D. & Kong, U. D. (2024). Decolonizing global AI governance: Assessment of the state of decolonized AI governance in Sub Saharan Africa. *Royal Society Open Science*, (11): 231994. https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.231994

Berger, B. K. (2005). Power over, power with, and power to relations: Critical reflections on Public Relations, the dominant coalition, and activism. *Journal of Public Relations research*, *17*(1), 5–28.

Césaire, A. (1972). *Discourse on colonialism*. Monthly Review Press.

Vol. 2, No. 1, 2026 - Kwararafa University Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation
Pub. Link: https://aa.unij.co.uk/index.php/kujmri/issue/view/6 - E- ISSN: 3156-5492 | P- ISSN: 3156-5514

Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the European Council, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on Artificial Intelligence for Europe, Brussels, 25.4.2018 COM(2018) 237 final.

Couldry, N. & Mejias, U. A. (2019). *The costs of connection: How data is colonizing human life and appropriating it for capitalism*. Stanford University Press.

De Melo, J. C. (2025). Decolonial AI: A perspective on the imperialist states' colonizing quest for labor applied in the development of Artificial Intelligence. *Brazilian Journal of Political Economy*, 1-20.

General Assembly Resolution 1514 (xv) (December 10, 1960). Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/declaration-granting-independence-colonial-countries-and-peoples

Hao, K. (2022). Artificial intelligence is creating a new colonial world order. Available at: https://www.technologyreview.com/2022/04/19/1049592/artificial-intelligence-colonialism/

Hauer, T. (2017). Technological determinism and new media. *International Journal of English, Literature and Social Science (IJELS)*, 2 (2), 1-4.

Héder, M. (2021). AI and the resurrection of Technological Determinism. *Információs Társadalom* XXI (2) 119–130. https://dx.doi.org/10.22503/inftars.XXI.2021.2.8

Jaldi, A. (2023). *Artificial intelligence revolution in Africa: Economic opportunities and legal challenges*. Policy Center for the New South.

Koniakou, V. (2019). Revista Publicum Rio de Janeiro, v. 5, n. 2, p. 36-72, 2019 http://www.epublicacoes.uerj.br/index.php/publicum DOI: 10.12957/publicum.2019.47200

Kwet, M. (2019). Digital colonialism: US Empire and the new imperialism in the Global South. *Race & Class*, 60(4) 3–26.

Leslie, D., Burr, C., Aitken, M., Cowls, J., Katell, M. & Briggs, M. (2021). *Artificial intelligence, human rights, democracy, and the rule of law: A primer*. The Council of Europe.

Mbembe, A. (2022). The *earthly community*: *Reflections on the last utopia*. V2_Lab for the Unstable Media. https://store.v2.nl/products/the-earthly-community-reflections-on-the-last-utopia

Mbembe, A. (2021). *Out of the dark night*: *Essays on decolonization.* Columbia University Press.

Mohamed, S., Png, M. T. & Isaac, W. (2020). Decolonial AI: Decolonial theory as sociotechnical foresight in Artificial Intelligence. *Philosophy and Technology* (405), 1-28. DOI: 10.1007/s13347-020-00405-8

Vol. 2, No. 1, 2026 - Kwararafa University Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation
Pub. Link: https://aa.unij.co.uk/index.php/kujmri/issue/view/6 - E- ISSN: 3156-5492 | P- ISSN: 3156-5514

Mollema, W. J. T. (2024). Decolonial AI as Disenclosure. Open Journal of Social Sciences, 12, 574-603. https://doi.org/10.4236/jss.2024.122032

Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S. J. (2013). *Coloniality of power in postcolonial Africa: Myths of decolonization*. Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa.

Nwodu, G. E. & Emechebe, C. N. (2023). Dominant coalitions, Public Relations and power relations dynamics in ministries, departments and agencies in Nigeria. In A. A. Idachaba, O. E. Ogunyombo, C. Onumah & L. U. Abdulsalam (Eds), *Communication, Media and Power Relations in a Multicultural Society: Context, Issues and Perspectives for Development*. Association of Communication Scholars and Professionals of Nigeria.

Nye, J. S. (2004). *Soft power: The means to success in World politics*. PublicAffairs.

Price Water House Coopers (2017). *Sizing the prize: What's the real value of AI for your business and how can you capitalize?* A Report of the Price Water House Coopers. www.pwc.com/AI.

Scott, J. C. (1995). *Weapons of the weak: Everyday forms of peasant resistance*. Yale University Press.

Salami, A. O. (2024). Artificial intelligence, digital colonialism, and the implications for Africa's future development. *Data & Policy*, (6), 1-12. doi:10.1017/dap.2024.75

Samoili, S., López-Cobo, M., Gómez, E., De Prato, G., Martínez-Plumed, F. & Delipetrev, B. (2020). *AI Watch. Defining Artificial Intelligence. Towards an operational definition and taxonomy of artificial intelligence*. European Union.

Quijano, A. (2000). Coloniality of power, Eurocentrism, and Latin America. *Nepantla: Views from South 1.3*. Duke University Press.

Udeze, S. E. (2005). *After the whirlwind: A discourse on International communication*. Rhyce Kerex Publishers.

Wee, L. (2025). *Automation in communication: The ideological implications of language machines*. Routledge.

Willems, W. & Obadare, E. (2014). African resistance in an age of fractured sovereignty. In W. Willems & E. Obadare (Eds), *Civic Agency in Africa Arts of Resistance in the 21st Century*. James Currey.

Wrong, D. H. (2017). *Power its forms, bases, and uses*. Routledge.