INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LEGAL STUDIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES [IJLSSS]

ISSN: 2584-1513 (Online)

Volume 4 | Issue 3 [June, 2026]| Page 239 – 252

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN ARMED CONFLICT: RETHINKING RESPONSIBILITY AND REGULATION

- Nandita Saha[1]

- Nur Nahar Amin[2]

ABSTRACT

This research paper discusses the role of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in reshaping warfare today and raising important legal and ethical issues. Nowadays, AI is becoming more popular in the field of military surveillance, target recognition, data analysis, and strategic planning. Although these technologies can lead to greater speed and precision in military operations, they can also pose very dangerous risks, particularly when systems become autonomous or uncontrollable. One of the main problems is the sufficiency of the current legal provisions, including the Geneva Conventions, that were formulated at a time when only a human being could decide on war. Such laws are silent on cases where AI-enabled systems arbitrarily choose and strike targets. This brings confusion over accountability, especially in cases when civilian damage has taken place. This paper discusses three issues. First, the legal issue: the existing legislation focuses on civilian protection and accountability, yet it might not be applicable in situations that involve AI in the decision-making process. Second, the ethical issue: letting machines decide who lives and who dies will lead to a diminishing of human judgment, dignity, and the worth of life. Third, the policy problem: there is no international agreement on the regulation of autonomous weapons, and such a situation complicates the control of the creation and use of these weapons. Finally, on the one hand, AI can streamline the work of the army, but on the other hand, it jeopardises the basic human rights in the absence of control. It is urgently necessary to engage in more robust legal regulations and enhanced international collaboration to make sure that the application of AI in warfare is ethical, responsible, and consistent with humanitarian values.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Modern Warfare, Autonomous Weapons, International Humanitarian Law, Geneva Convention.

[1] Symbiosis Law School Hyderabad (SLSH), Hyderabad, India.

[2] Symbiosis Law School, Hyderabad (SLSH), Hyderabad, India.

INTRODUCTION

Whenever new technologies were developed, wars have always transformed throughout history. The development of gunpowder transformed the mode of fighting battles. The tanks, aeroplanes, and nuclear weapons came in later and altered [3]the plans and strategies of armies also made the governments reconsider the rules of war. With every invention, there was more devastation, but at the same time, there was a demonstration to the world as to the significance of limits in war. Artificial Intelligence (AI) is changing everything nowadays, and perhaps the most crucial change to date[4].

AI is no longer employed in hospitals, schools or online services; it has become a component of war as well[5]. The current armies take advantage of AI in numerous ways that can be utilised, such as in drones that can detect and attack targets with minimal human assistance, defence systems that can shoot down missiles within seconds and smart programs that can analyse large amounts of data within seconds and can provide superior war plans than a human. These new-fangled devices provide countries with increased velocity, precision, and strength and make wars more programmed than ever. Nevertheless, it is not only a positive development with certain issues. The responsibility is a big question. Should an AI-equipped drone kill any civilians, who is to blame: the author of the program, the operator of the drone, or the government that initiated the war? The other issue is that of morals. Is it the right of machines to determine who lives and who dies[6]? In contrast to humans, AI does not have feelings, no kindness, no right or wrong. It is not able to comprehend pain or the worth of a human life.

This poses a direct challenge to the International Humanitarian Law (IHL) that is primarily founded on the Geneva Conventions. These principles were formulated at a time when human decisions in war were made alone[7]. Concepts such as distinguishing between soldiers and civilians or civilian safety versus military gain are concepts that rely on human judgments. However, AI only processes codes and data, and it is not aware of morals, feelings, and human suffering.

This is why this paper considers how AI can be implemented into the current war laws, the novel legal and ethical issues it introduces, and whether the world should change or develop new regulations. The key question is whether existing regulations are sufficient to regulate AI in war or whether new

[3] GEOFFREY BEST, WAR AND LAW SINCE 1945 13 (Oxford Univ. Press 1994).
[4] MICHAEL N. SCHMITT, WAR, TECHNOLOGY, AND THE LAW OF ARMED CONFLICT, 82 INT'L L. STUD. 137, 140 (2006).
[5] *Id.* at. 142."
[6] PAUL SCHARRE, ARMY OF NONE: AUTONOMOUS WEAPONS AND THE FUTURE OF WAR 25 (W.W. Norton & Co. 2018).
[7] *Id.* at. 54.

provisions are necessary to ensure the safety of civilians and to safeguard human values in the era of independent weapons.

HISTORICAL CONTEXT AND EVOLUTION OF AI IN WARFARE

A SHORT HISTORY OF TECHNOLOGY IN WAR

War has always been a matter of technology. Since the dawn of human history, man has been fighting with new means to win better[8]. Chariots, bows, and swords were employed in ancient times by soldiers. Then, in the Middle Ages, everything changed thanks to the invention of gunpowder; now guns and cannons could be invented, and battles became more lethal[9]. In the 20th century, wars had become even more modern as new technologies started to exist. Machines, tanks and poisonous gas were first used in World War I. And throughout the time during World War II[10], the change in the new weapons, such as aeroplanes, tanks, and radar, was drastic and made the war quicker and more destructive[11]. Finally, towards the very end of World War II, the creation of the nuclear bombs made war very dangerous and altered the balance of power in the world.

THE BEGINNING OF COMPUTERS AND EARLY ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

The history of computers began in World War II. Two pioneer computers (the British Colossus and American ENIAC) were designed to solve military problems, and assisted the military in breaking the enemy code secret and calculating the direction of missiles, which came in handy during the planning of attacks. Following the war in the Cold War, both the United States and the Soviet Union were interested in creating superior computers, and since then, the concept of computers to utilize it in missile defence, communication and military planning began. It was then that scientists started to question: Will a machine be able to think like a human being? Artificial Intelligence (AI) began with this question. Scientists desired to create thinking, making decisions and problem-solving machines.

[8] GEOFFREY BEST, WAR AND LAW SINCE 1945 3 (Oxford Univ. Press 1994).
[9] *Id.* at. 7
[10] MICHAEL HOWARD, WAR IN EUROPEAN HISTORY 123 (Oxford Univ. Press 2009).
[11] JOHN KEEGAN, THE SECOND WORLD WAR 58 (Penguin Books 1989).

KEY MILESTONES IN THE EVOLUTION OF MILITARY AI

1950S–1960S: EARLY IDEAS

The age of AI really started in the 1950s. It is a famous paper that was written by a British mathematician by the name Alan Turing titled: Computing Machinery and Intelligence. His question was, Can a machine think? He also introduced the Turing Test, one of the methods to determine whether a machine can behave as a human being. This is about the same time when the U.S. military began utilising computers in training and simulations to allow the soldiers to prepare to go into the actual battle.

1970S–1980S: EXPERT SYSTEMS

During these years, scientists developed computer programs known as expert systems, which were able to make intelligent decisions just like human experts. These systems were used by the military to repair equipment, supply management and strategy planning. These programs assisted soldiers and commanders in making quicker and smarter decisions.

1990S: RISE OF AUTONOMOUS SYSTEMS

The Gulf War (1991) demonstrated the extent to which technology was powerful. Precision-guided missiles were employed by the U.S. and could strike the target with high accuracy. It is also during this period that scientists developed unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) or drones. Drones would be flown without a pilot and perform tasks such as spying or attacking the enemy. It marked the beginning of self-functioning (autonomous) systems in war.

2000S: DRONES AND MACHINE LEARNING

The 2000s saw the development of smarter drones due to AI and machine learning. Now, drones are able to autonomously fly, search, and even make certain decisions independently. These AI-controlled drones were deployed by the U.S. in Afghanistan and Iraq to carry out surveillance and air attacks. This demonstrated that AI may, in fact, be in charge of actual weapons in actual wars.

2010S–PRESENT: DEEP LEARNING AND FULLY AUTONOMOUS WEAPONS

Over the past few years, AI has become even more powerful than we believe. Using deep learning and neural networks, AI is now able to learn and predict, as well as make complex decisions with little

assistance from human beings. The modern AI weapons are able to locate enemies, strategies, and even strike without necessarily being ordered by humans. This renders them highly quick and efficient yet dangerous, as they may commit errors or go out of control. The timeline of AI in warfare indicates how technology has evolved over time into the complex systems that are able to think and act independently, with simple machines merely computing numbers. Every new step complicated and increased the risk of war, yet made it more advanced. Through this history, we can discern why AI in warfare is such a serious and significant problem in the present day. It demonstrates how machines are no longer assisting people but may even be substituting human decisions on the battlefield. This context makes us comprehend the present applications, issues, and ethical concerns related to Artificial Intelligence in contemporary warfare.

AI IN MODERN WARFARE

Artificial Intelligence is one of the most powerful weapons of war today[12]. Previously, AI was not the case, as new inventions typically brought the soldiers superior guns or machines. Not only does it make weapons stronger, but it also assists in making the real decisions in a battle. This is the reason why we observe various nations investing a lot of money in it so that it can be hastened, less expensive, and also more efficient than the past methods of war.

The most obvious one is the application of drones, also known as Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs). Using AI, these drones are able to follow individuals or vehicles and even attack with minimal human assistance[13]. The system monitors the movement of a person, compares it to stored information and then determines whether a person is a threat or not. This not only makes armies faster and more efficient, but poses significant risks as well. In this case, one may consider a farmer with tools that are similar to a soldier with weapons that can, unfortunately, result in the murder of innocent individuals.

There are also automatic defence systems that use AI. These machines are able to easily identify incoming missiles, rockets or planes and destroy them within seconds. Because humans might be too slow to respond at such times, which AI is entrusted with. This can be used to defend cities and also army bases, yet there is a high risk as well and should the AI make an error and misjudge what is happening, it might attack the wrong target, ruin innocent lives or even initiate a war on its own.

[12] PAUL SCHARRE, ARMY OF NONE: AUTONOMOUS WEAPONS AND THE FUTURE OF WAR 15 (W.W. Norton & Co. 2018).

[13] RONALD C. ARKIN, GOVERNING LETHAL BEHAVIOR IN AUTONOMOUS ROBOTS 62 (CRC Press 2009).

Yet another large application of AI is in information gathering and research. Contemporary conflicts generate vast volumes of information, such as satellite images, radio communications, and sensor reports in the field. This is all something humans cannot study fast, but AI can. It may propose battle formations, speculate on the possible further actions of the enemy, and indicate weak points[14]. This assists the commanders in making decisions more quickly, but there is also a chance that they would begin to rely on machines excessively and overlook their judgment in cases where it is actually needed. There are also some of the armies who are testing robots as well as vehicles that have the capacity to work in hazardous areas like minefields, areas having radiation or even in the cities that is full of battlefields and this is where the actual problem begins when they give robots weapon and behave like human and act on their own which is the cause of creating a possibility of making life and death decisions without even asking human beings at all when they should be asking human To the point, AI is now engaged in almost all aspects of war, starting with the planning, spying, defending and fighting aspects, which explains why the emergence of AI in war is such an acute concern[15], as it not only alters the nature of waging war, but also poses difficult legal and ethical challenges concerning the containment of such a technology.

LEGAL CHALLENGES UNDER INTERNATIONAL HUMANITARIAN LAW

International Humanitarian Law, or the law of war, that was designed to alleviate suffering and to safeguard individuals who are not engaged in fighting or taking part in any of the war[16]. These are Geneva Convention-based rules, and at the time of writing these rules, no one ever imagined that machines would one day go to war as opposed to people. This is why AI weapons present new issues that cannot be properly addressed by the old rules, because there is no adherence[17].

One of the fundamental principles of war law is that of distinction, that is, they should only attack the fighters or military targets, but not ordinary individuals who are not even involved in the war. Judgment and training are applied to this rule by human soldiers, whereas in AI, it is applied only by

[14] LUCIANO FLORIDI, THE ETHICS OF INFORMATION WARFARE 73 (Springer 2015).
[15] PETER ASARO, On Banning Autonomous Weapon Systems: Human Rights, Automation, and the Dehumanisation of Lethal Decision-Making, 94 Int'l Rev. Red Cross 687, 692 (2012).
[16] JEAN PICTET, The Principles of International Humanitarian Law 12 ICRC (1996).
[17] MICHAEL N. SCHMITT, *Autonomous Weapon Systems and International Humanitarian Law: A Reply to the Critics,* 45 HNSJF, (2013).

data and programs, which is very important. As an illustration, an AI-controlled drone may kill civilians, assuming that they were the enemy, and it would violate this fundamental principle.

Proportionality is another rule that is important. This implies that the civilian casualties should not exceed the military benefit achieved. This is difficult to determine even in humans, but it is much more difficult in the case of AI. Numbers can be done by AI, but it does not experience pain, feelings, or long-term impacts. In the absence of this knowledge, AI might easily violate this rule.

The other major issue is responsibility. In normal wars, when a war crime occurs, it is the fault of the soldier, commander or the state. However, with AI weapons, it is not evident who is in the wrong. When an AI weapon kills civilians, does it make the programmer, the commander, or the government responsible? The victims do not always receive justice, as machines cannot be punished.

The other weakness of current IHL is that it presupposes that people are always in charge of the weapons. Nonetheless, most AI systems are considerably quicker than human beings. As an illustration, missile-defence systems are programmed to shoot within a few seconds after receiving an alert, while in many cases, a human operator is still verifying the target. It forms a grey area in which the traditional laws cannot be easily utilised.

Also exists the possibility that AI weapons will end up in the wrong hands, such as non-state actors, such as terrorist organisations or insurgents. Such groups are much less likely to be adherent to international law. When such actors have access to AI-controlled weapons, the threats are multiplied, and it will be even more difficult to regulate.

To summarise, although IHL forms the basis of what is known as the rules of war, the time it was authored was when human beings made all decisions regarding the battlefield. The emerging autonomy systems pose a threat to such principles as distinction, proportionality, and accountability. The further development of AI warfare will likely cause more civilian deaths and less justice to victims unless new legal reforms are implemented.

ETHICAL CONCERNS

Besides legal issues, AI in war raises large moral issues. Law informs us on what is permissible, whereas ethics enquires into what is good or bad. Although AI weapons might behave within the law, as many pundits assert, it is still unjust to entrust machines to make decisions regarding life and death[18]. The

[18] PETER ASARO, *On Banning Autonomous Weapon Systems: Human Rights, Automation, and the Dehumanization of Lethal Decision-Making,* 94 IRRC, 2012.

concerns are the loss of human judgment, damage to human dignity, the danger of bias and mistakes, facilitation of easy war initiation, and that nobody is really to blame.[19]

Loss of human judgment during the battle is one of the most profound ethical issues. Mercy and compassion in war are possible among humankind. As an example, a soldier will not attack when he or she sees children or civilians, even though the law permits the latter. However, a machine does not think or feel about what is right or wrong; it only acts according to its code. By eliminating human beings in making war decisions, war can become a cold and automatic process whereby lives are lost without any concern.

The other issue is human dignity. Life is precious, and it is up to man to determine who should live or die. When machines make the decisions, humans are simply reduced to mere values, not human beings with rights. Critics believe that this reduces the meaning of humanity, and no speed or accuracy is justified to treat humans as numbers in a program.

Another big problem is bias. AI learns based on data, and if the data is inaccurate or unjust, the AI will replicate these errors. This may translate to some groups being perceived as threats and being attacked more frequently in a case of war. This violates humanitarian law and poses severe ethical issues, since civilians may perish as a result of the errors in the technology itself[20].

AI systems are also unpredictable. They cannot be trained and controlled like human soldiers. During the war, an AI weapon may do anything that no one would have anticipated. This is hazardous since a single error may lead to colossal and irreparable loss of lives. The other concern is that AI weapons could cause wars to occur more frequently. Governments are likely to be faster to initiate wars when they are certain their soldiers are secure. When machines fight the war, the cost might appear to be smaller, but civilians will bear the brunt, which will leave the world less stable and more wars rather than fewer.

The other issue is moral responsibility. In a conventional war, human beings can be reprimanded in case of violation of the law. However, AI systems are not guilty and cannot be held accountable. When any civilians are killed by an AI weapon, it cannot go to trial and repent. This implies that chances are high that the victims might not receive justice, which is also a breach of the human rights approach, and no fear of punishment to deter such acts.

---

[19] PETER ASARO, AUTONOMOUS WEAPONS AND THE ETHICS OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE, IN THE ETHICS OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE 212 (2020).

[20] Int'l Comm. of the Red Cross, *Autonomy, Artificial Intelligence and Robotics: Technical Aspects of Human Control* (2019).

On the whole, these ethical issues demonstrate that, despite the fact that AI adheres to the rules of war, it nevertheless creates significant ethical questions, which would only damage the world. It questions human dignity, human compassion, and responsibility, and threatens to turn war colder and less human. This is why, according to many experts, not only the law, but also ethics should inform the decision to use AI in war, but it is also a very important factor.

GLOBAL DEBATE ON AUTONOMOUS WEAPONS

The application of AI in war has sparked a large debate on the planet. [21]The primary question that arises is that of Lethal Autonomous Weapon Systems (LAWS), which are weapons that are capable of locating and attacking targets without human control. This topic is not agreed upon by different countries and human rights groups. There are those countries where such weapons are permitted, those who require that require stricter regulations and those that want them outright because they can be a threat in the period of war that would be killing civilians.

The weapons are backed by big countries such as the United States, Russia and China. AI, they say, assists in quicker decision-making, safeguards soldiers, and makes attacks more precise. They also consider that AI will help minimise human errors. AI does not represent a threat to them, but a national defence facility. But many other nations, particularly those of Europe, Latin America, and Africa, do not concur. Even such countries as Austria, Brazil, or Chile claim that machines such as AI should never determine who is going to survive and who will die. They think that the current war laws are not tough enough to regulate such lethal weapons, and they are afraid that unless there are strict limits or prohibitions, people might get injured, human rights might be trampled down, and the peace of the world might be endangered, and that will be anarchic.

This issue is mainly discussed in the United Nations (UN). Since 2014, the professionals of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW) have been discussing the risks, advantages, and regulations of such weapons. However, after numerous meetings, nations are still unable to reach a consensus. The big powers are interested in continuing to develop AI weapons, whereas the small nations insist on stringent regulations or prohibitions. This conflict has prevented the world from coming up with a single decision.

The Red Cross International Committee (ICRC) is also involved in this debate. It indicates that such weapons are extremely dangerous to civilians, and it becomes difficult to know who is to be held

[21] United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs, The Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW) and Lethal Autonomous Weapons Systems."

accountable when all goes wrong. The ICRC is convinced that human beings need to always make life and death decisions, particularly when there is an attack. When this is replaced by machines, it would contravene the fundamentals of war and leave innocent individuals at high risk.

CURRENT INTERNATIONAL LEGAL FRAMEWORK

EXISTING TREATIES RELATED TO AI IN WARFARE

Currently, a world law designed specifically to deal with Artificial Intelligence or robotic war weapons does not exist. Nevertheless, some of the key existing international laws do exist that apply to such technologies since they encompass all the types of weapons, both old and new.

The Geneva Conventions and their Additional Protocols are one of the most significant groups of regulations that constitute the foundation of the International Humanitarian Law (IHL). These regulations are applicable to any weapon system, even those that are AI within it. There are a couple of major ideas on which they are constructed. The first principle is that of distinction, that is, in war, the soldiers fighting must never confuse between civilians and soldiers, and between civilian property and military objectives. Next is proportionality, stating that the harm caused to civilians should not be too much in comparison to the military benefit. Next is the principle of precaution, which states that everything possible must be done to prevent or limit harm to civilians. Lastly, unnecessary suffering is prohibited, and this implies that unnecessary weaponry should not inflict more harm and pain than necessary to accomplish a military objective.

The other significant rule is Article 36 of Additional Protocol I (1977). It stipulates that a country has to ensure that the weapon that it is going to use will not violate any international laws before it begins to use the new weapon. This principle applies particularly to AI and autonomous weapons, since it implies that a government would need to test and to examine such systems in accordance with the law prior to their deployment in a war.

The Martens Clause, in turn, written in the 1899 Hague Convention, is also a significant factor. It states that although there is no particular law regarding a certain weapon or situation, civilians and soldiers are subject to the principles of humanity and the conscience of the people, that is, what is right and fair. A number of professionals believe that one can apply this rule to the debate against entirely autonomous weapons, the ones that make life and death-related decisions without human intervention, as this type of technology might run counter to the core human morals and values.

The Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW), which was established in 1980, should also be mentioned. This treaty attempts to restrict or outlaw arms that inflict excessive damage or are incapable of discriminating between military and civilian targets. The CCW does not specifically address AI or robot weapons, but it has become the primary international forum where nations discuss Lethal Autonomous Weapon Systems (LAWS). Since the year 2016, analysts in the CCW structure have been sitting around a table frequently to discuss the ways in which these arms need to be regulated.

UN CONVENTION ON CERTAIN CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS (CCW) PROCESS

In the framework of the CCW, a new special body called a Group of Governmental Experts (GGE) was established in 2017 to deliberate on the matter of autonomous weapons. Eleven guiding principles were agreed upon by the group in 2019. According to these principles, any employment of weapons, including AI systems, should be in accordance with international humanitarian law. Another point that they emphasise is that humans should retain the responsibility of making decisions regarding the use of weapons, that human control should be incorporated into weapon systems and that there should be accountability to whoever develops or uses such technologies. The principles also stipulate that nations must undertake risk evaluation and mitigation measures prior to coming up with such weapons.

Nevertheless, there has been little progress. This is attributed to the fact that the CCW operates on a consensus basis, implying that all countries have to agree before any rule is made official. This rule has been used by a small number of very powerful countries that are heavily investing in military AI, such as the United States, Russia, and China, to prevent the new binding laws. Consequently, despite the intention of many nations to impose severe restrictions or prohibitions on autonomous weapons, no international legally binding decision has been reached yet.

REGIONAL AGREEMENTS AND EFFORTS

Since no global treaty is in place yet, there are regional initiatives that some groups have undertaken. The European Parliament has issued several resolutions in the European Union (EU) requesting a ban on lethal autonomous weapons that do not have real human control. The EU also suggested in 2021 the Artificial Intelligence Act, which categorises certain autonomous weapons as high-risk AI systems. This implies that they would require good human oversight, transparency and safety checks

before they can be used. The Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) has also initiated talks on how to instil trust among nations in the employment of AI in the military. They primarily focus on transparency and minimising risks in order to make sure AI weapons do not contribute to accidental conflicts in Europe. The African Union (AU) has been concerned as well. In 2022, the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights issued a resolution that autonomous weapons would be a threat to fundamental human rights. It urged the African nations to participate in international negotiations and demand stronger international regulations.

SOFT LAW AND VOLUNTARY RULES

With a lack of binding international laws, some non-binding (soft law) actions have emerged. These are not binding treaties but assist in steering the nations and corporations. The UN Secretary-General Agenda for Disarmament (2018) titled Securing Our Common Future is one of them. It suggests that states should either limit or totally prohibit weapons that are not controlled by human beings, and that machines should never be entrusted with the authority to make the decision to kill. Another one is the IEEE Global Initiative on Ethics of Autonomous and Intelligent Systems. It is an initiative of a huge global entity of engineers that establishes ethical guidelines on how AI is to be employed. These principles emphasise openness, responsibility, and ensuring that AI systems behave in accordance with human values, even when these are applied to military applications.

And lastly, technology firms have begun to establish their own ethical guidelines as well. An example is when Google released its AI Principles in 2018, following a backlash by its workers over its involvement in a U.S. military AI initiative named Project Maven. These principles ensure that Google will never create or develop AI systems that are intended to be used as weapons or in any other manner that infringes upon human rights or international law. In general, the existing legal system of AI in military conflicts is a combination of archaic treaties, local initiatives, soft legislation, and corporate regulations. This patchwork practice demonstrates how challenging the process of developing a single international treaty is in this rapidly developing area. The primary threats are the pace of AI evolution, the possibility of application of AI to civilian and military purposes (dual-use technology), and the absence of consensus among different countries with various interests and priorities.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION

FINDINGS

The researchers discovered that Artificial Intelligence has started radically transforming the manner in which wars are fought. The AI is used to spy, plan attacks and even decide on the battlefield. But the old war laws were composed as if only human beings made such decisions, and they do not easily go well with AI systems. The largest legal issues are concerning distinction, proportionality, and responsibility. AIs are not able to experience any feelings or moral judgment, and therefore, they may easily commit a mistake that can endanger civilians. Morally, the ability to control life and death through machines robs human beings of control and dignity. No single international law has been created specifically to be applied to AI in war. Some of the few areas that are making efforts are the EU and some human rights organisations, yet influential nations desire to keep developing such weapons. Due to these variations, the world is yet to develop a single rule. The study also discovered that in the absence of clear laws, AI in war may result in an increased number of civilians and the escalation of conflicts.

RECOMMENDATIONS

To address these issues, this study recommends that new and explicit international law needs to be developed concerning AI and autonomous weapons and that human control should always be present regarding any weapon that can kill or cause harm to people or result in war. In the event of an error by an AI weapon, there should be accountability. The United Nations should ensure that all countries collaborate and work together to develop powerful international regulations. The use of AI should be informed by the human values of kindness, compassion, and respect for life. The use of AI weapons in battle should be tested and reviewed, and the nations should be transparent about their AI programs so as to avoid confusion and unintentional wars. Ethical provisions must also be fortified in such a way that technology does not take over people.

CONCLUSION

Summing up, Artificial Intelligence is quickly transforming contemporary warfare by accelerating, enhancing precision, and automating military operations. Nonetheless, there are grave legal, ethical, and policy implications to this technology. The current systems of International Humanitarian Law, especially the ones relying on the Geneva Conventions, do not sufficiently tackle the case when

independent systems take independent decisions on the battlefield. This brings in confusion in issues like accountability, civilian protection and proportionality.

In addition, the concept of ethical issues in war involving AI, namely, the proposal of machines making life-and-death choices, is a threat to human dignity, moral responsibility, and the value of life. The absence of international agreement makes regulation even more difficult, exposing the threat of abuse and unregulated spread of autonomous weapons.

Thus, AI can be effective in increasing the efficiency of the military, but its use should be strictly controlled. There must be strong international legislation, meaningful human control and international collaboration to ensure that technological advancement is not at the expense of humanity. Unless timely actions are taken, the introduction of AI in warfare can cause more damage, compromising legal standards and the very essence of human values.