



Artificial Intelligence in Modern Warfare: Navigating the Complexities of Ethical Decision-Making in the Face of Uncertainty

**Godddy Uwa Osimen,¹ Ayankoya Abimbola Rachel,² Edokpa Fadal Mary³
Aderemi Opeyemi Ade-Ibijola⁴**

1,2 Department of Political Science and International Relations, Covenant University, Nigeria.

³Department of Political Science, Ambrose Alli University, Ekpoma, Nigeria

⁴Department of International Relations & Diplomacy, Afe Babalola University, Nigeria.

^{1}Email: godddy.osimen@covenantuniversity.edu.ng, ²abimbola.ayankoyapgs@stu.cu.edu.ng,
³marydokpa@gmail.com, ⁴Email: adeibjope@gmail.com*

Abstract:- The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into military operations significantly impacts international peace, necessitating a comprehensive understanding of its implications by the international community, scholars, and policymakers. This study examines the ethical issues surrounding AI in modern warfare, with a focus on accountability, particularly in autonomous system failures. Anchored on technological determinism theory, this qualitative study analyzes secondary data from credible sources, including online resources, textbooks, journal articles, conference proceedings, and newspapers. Thematic analysis reveals that the increasing use of AI in warfare raises profound ethical questions about accountability, human dignity, and the future of conflict. The study recommends the establishment of a global framework to regulate the military use of artificial intelligence in their operations.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Modern Warfare, Security, International, Ethical

1. Introduction

The advent of artificial intelligence (AI) in military operations has sparked intense debate about its ethical implications. As AI technologies become increasingly sophisticated, their potential to transform modern warfare grows, raising critical questions about accountability, human dignity, and the future of conflict. There are enormous potential advantages to the rapid advancements in artificial intelligence (AI) (Rowe, 2022). To avoid unforeseen, detrimental effects and hazards brought on by the application of AI in society, it is imperative that we investigate all ethical, facets of AI systems. One widespread fallacy that is frequently connected to science fiction is the notion that artificial intelligence consists of humanoid robots with full



awareness of their surroundings (Osimen, Fulani, Chidozie & Dada, 2024). However, it goes beyond this, from the perspective of Copeland (2024), artificial intelligence (AI) is the ability of computer-controlled machines or robots to do jobs requiring intelligence on par with humans; they are thought to be able to think, comprehend, and learn from prior experiences (Osimen, Fulani, Chidozie & Dada, 2024).

Regardless of how scholars view it, artificial intelligence has developed at an ever-increasing rate during the past 20 years. Consequently, AI-powered technology has already impacted numerous facets of the lives of people in the US and other industrialized nations. AI is permeating many aspects of daily life, including smartphones, mobile mapping and navigation systems, computers that can communicate with natural language, targeted online marketing, and customized social media information campaigns (Morgan, Boudreaux, Curriden & Klima, 2020). As autonomous robotic technologies, such as self-driving cars, gain societal acceptance and integration, this trend will only intensify (Morgan, Boudreaux, Curriden & Klima, 2020). Artificial intelligence has quickly become a vital part of our daily lives, influencing a variety of industries such as healthcare, education, finance, and entertainment (Marwala, 2023; Adom, Kportufe, Asare-Aboagye, & Kquofi, 2024).

Alan Turing's 1950 essay "Computing Machinery and Intelligence" is widely regarded as the foundational work of artificial intelligence. In it, renowned mathematician and computer science pioneer Alan Turing asked whether machines might ever be able to reason (Anyoha, 2017). Throughout history, the pursuit of technological progress has been rationalized as a means of achieving military superiority. The focus of fighting changed from direct physical combat to the field of digital warfare once trench warfare was abandoned (Chukwudi, Osimen, Dele-Dada, Ahmed, 2024). Technology was initially employed to produce more powerful weaponry, but it soon spread to mechanized combat, ushering in a new era (Military Africa, 2023). It was observed by Parkin (2015) that the idea of using artificial intelligence (AI) software in place of people in military technology and planning involving potentially deadly force is becoming more and more popular. Given the dangers of military conflict, there is strong motivation to automate its participants (Osimen, et al, 2024). An automated gun turret from South Korea, for example, that employs basic AI, is widely used (Parkin, 2015).

However, Alderman, Daniel, and Ray (2018), expressed their concerns about ethical issues that arise when militaries use AI during conflict or even to bolster security during times of relative calm. The most vehement complaints have focused on the possibility that robots could murder individuals without the direct consent of human administrators and possibly even without their supervision or capacity to step in if the wrong targets are chosen by the weapons. However, there have also been worries expressed regarding other uses of AI, such as decision support systems that could recommend more drastic measures or even pre-emptive strikes without commanders being able to review the intricate calculations that go into them, or citizens being imprisoned or even killed after being mistakenly identified as terrorists or criminals by a facial recognition system or another sophisticated AI calculation (Alderman, Daniel, & Ray, 2018).



Modern warfare's use of artificial intelligence (AI) has presented serious ethical issues and difficulties. The use of AI in military operations is having a growing impact on operational efficiency, targeting precision, and decision-making processes as these technologies advance. Nevertheless, there are concerns associated with this advancement as well, such as possible human rights abuses, AI-driven judgments that are not aligned, diminished human accountability, and dangers to international humanitarian law (IHL). These issues are made worse by the lack of strong moral standards and legal frameworks for the application of AI in combat, which raises concerns about the tension between innovation and accountability, its effect on civilian populations, and the role of autonomy in killing decisions. To make sure AI's use in warfare complies with moral standards and global norms, it is imperative that these problems be rigorously examined.

This study aims to explore these ethical issues, focusing on the challenges posed by autonomous systems and the need for a global regulatory framework and to address ethical issues raised by the creation and application of artificial intelligence in modern warfare. This qualitative study employs a secondary data analysis approach, drawing on credible sources such as online resources, textbooks, journal articles, conference proceedings, and newspapers. Thematic analysis is used to identify and analyze patterns in the data.

2. Conceptual Clarification

Ethical Philosophy

This study is grounded in technological determinism theory, which posits that technological advancements shape societal structures and cultural values. In the context of AI in warfare, technological determinism highlights the need to consider the broader societal implications of AI adoption. Given the close connection between ethics and people, we believe that any examination of its specifics in the context of AI should begin with a look at how humans conceptualize ethics, how they establish morality, and how they determine what is right and wrong. Ethics has always been a key topic in sociology, philosophy, and religion. According to the Access Partnership and the University of Pretoria (2018), Moral principles that direct a person's behavior or the manner in which an activity is conducted are known as ethics. One moral principle that is applicable in real life involves handling people with dignity.

In a study carried out by Trausan-Matu, (2021), on Ethics in AI, he emphasized on an experiment carried out by a sociologist, Raymond Baumhart where he asked some businesspeople "What does ethics mean to you?" and included several of their answers:

1. "Ethics is about what my emotions tell me is right or wrong."
2. "Following the law is the definition of ethics."
3. "The norms of conduct that our society accepts comprise ethics."
4. "My religion has to do with ethics."
5. "I am unsure of the meaning of the word" (Velasquez et al., 2017).



The experiment described by Velasquez and colleagues shows that there are significant differences in the ethical responses. They refer to both social and subjective elements, such as sentiments and beliefs, rules of conduct and legislation

European Commission's High-Level Expert Group on Artificial Intelligence (AI HLEG), (2019), has pointed out 4 ethical principles:

- i. respect for human autonomy,
- ii. (b) prevention of harm,
- iii. (c) fairness,
- iv. (d) explicability

Furthermore, in 2020, this same group also proposed seven criteria that ought to be followed for the creation of AI applications, which are described in the "Assessment List for Trustworthy Artificial Intelligence (ALTAI)" and are likely to be enforced in addition to these ethical principles (particularly the second one) (AI HLEG, 2020):

- participation and observation
- safety and technological stability
- adherence to privacy and data governance.
- openness
- responsibility
- the well-being of society and the environment.
- diversity, non-discrimination, and equity.

The Concept of Artificial Intelligence

For many years, the term "artificial intelligence" has been disparaged. One of the field's pioneers, Herbert Simon, acknowledged that he was unhappy with the lofty connotations the phrase conjures up but also said, "In any case, 'artificial intelligence' is here to stay (Gigova, 2017). Although it has somewhat become the case in common speech, it does not appear to be the case in technical circles where more exact definitions are required (Daudu, Osimen, & Shuaibu, 2023). In a study carried out by Morgan, Boudreaux, Curriden & Klima, (2020), Observed that the term's grandiosity, which creates irrational expectations and suggests greater competence than has historically existed, is not the only issue. It also has to do with how the technologies and capabilities it depicts change over time. Tax software and chess-playing computers, which were formerly considered the apex of artificial intelligence, were really stepping stones to a more universal form of the technology. The term "artificial intelligence" is no longer frequently used to describe such systems. One of the most widely used definitions taken into consideration in the Defence Science Board's 2016 Summer Study on Autonomy encapsulates this seeming contradiction: "the ability of computer systems to carry out tasks that typically require human intelligence." According to this definition, a technology stops being artificial intelligence (AI) once it becomes widely used enough that the task it accomplishes no



longer calls for human intelligence. This appears to be in line with popular speech and explains why what was formerly referred to as artificial intelligence is now simply computing (Daudu, et al. 2025). Artificial intelligence (AI) can be incorporated into hardware platforms like advanced robots, driverless cars, drones, or Internet of Things apps, or it can be purely software-based and function in virtual environments like search engines, image analysis software, voice assistants, and speech and facial recognition systems. A common definition of artificial intelligence is a tool that enables machines to mimic a variety of complex human skills. The European Commission's High-Level Expert Group on Artificial Intelligence (AI HLEG) provides a definition of AI as "Systems that display intelligent behavior by analyzing their environment and taking actions with some degree of autonomy to achieve specific goals" (The European Commission, 2018). Bode & Huelss, (2022) defines AI as the endeavour to enable computers to perform tasks that are typically done by people.

Marwala (2023), argued that the use of AI in military operations has profound effects on both international security and the conduct of war. They made the case that AI may enhance military capabilities by facilitating more rapid decision-making, precise targeting, and effective resource allocation. Additionally, by doing away with the need for direct human intervention, the deployment of AI-powered autonomous weapons may lower the hazards for human soldiers. This study concluded that, as opposed to a static regulatory approach, a flexible and changing regulatory framework is required (Osimen, Etoroma, Pokubo & Adi, 2025)

A well-known ISIS fan declared on the Rocket. Chat server on December 6, 2022, that he was utilizing ChatGPT to get advice on how to back the Islamic Caliphate. Two weeks later, further supporters showed interest in promoting jihadi actions through "Perplexity Ask." This demonstrates how AI platforms could help extreme groups attract new members and disseminate their beliefs (Lahav, 2024). When AI algorithms are used to customize messages to the interests of potential recruits, chat applications can be extremely effective tools for terrorists to excite and recruit people.

Reports of terrorists utilizing armed drones and other remote-controlled devices have surfaced; ISIS is notorious for its use of drones fitted with explosives during assaults. An Indian Air Force installation in Jammu had drone-assisted explosions in 2021, which were connected to the Pakistani terrorist organization Lashkar-e-Taiba. Terrorists utilized small drones to target specific sites with explosives and avoid discovery at night, according to the study. With Iran's help, Hezbollah has a well-established drone program and a notable history of using drones to establish itself as a non-state actor. The "Ababil" and "Mirsad-1," two Iranian-made drones, are among its current fleet (Lahav, 2024).

The Concept of Modern Warfare

The idea of war has changed significantly throughout time, as have the weapons used in it, but the human element has always been present. The paradox of contemporary conflicts is that, in addition to being a means, they have evolved into an end in themselves. Historically, war served



as a means for one of the opposing parties to accomplish goals that it was unable to accomplish through political means (Salih, 2020).

The term "modern warfare" emerged because of all of this, as a distinct idea from the conventional one that predominated until the start of the final decade of the twentieth century, when it was feasible to discuss several generations of wars that could be separated from the two generations that came before this period, beginning with the third generation's conflicts. Alternatively, the third wave of warfare, which essentially started with the Second Gulf War (1990–1991), gave rise to the conflicts of the fourth, fifth, and sixth generations as well as more advanced generations whose characteristics are still unclear (Osimen, Dele-Dada, & Osere, 2025). Shakhtrah & Bashar, (2017), believes that the idea of war has changed because it is now possible to use and employ the anthropological traits and features of peoples and societies to shift the causes of conflict and transform them into crucial factors and instruments for what is now referred to as "modern warfare." Conventional literature often portrays war as a normal and frequent occurrence in the global framework, imagining its occurrence to give a new reality to relations between states, which are defined by the use of physical violence on the battlefield by the armed forces of one state against those of another. As a result, in a chaotic international order, politicians frequently view conflict as a tool to further their own national interests (Barkan & Ikram, 2010).

However, since the early 1990s, when the post-Cold War era began, this traditional notion—along with other notions based on the nineteenth-century definition of war created by "Clausewitz" as "a deliberate use of aggression and force intended for compulsion and coercing an adversary to carry out our will"—no longer corresponds with what modern and contemporary wars have evolved into. Due to the significant changes in the patterns and structure of connections and the sharp rise in conflict intensity worldwide, the traditional understanding of war is completely at odds with the forms and models of contemporary warfare (Clausewitz & Carl Von, 1988). Scholars like Van Creveld, Holsti, and "Kaldor" tried to define post-Cold War precisely because of the possible repercussions, especially under terms like "moderately intense conflicts," "third-generation wars," "a novel war," or "contemporary wars." creative conventions for new ideas of war itself, as well as new techniques of war operations brought about by technical advancements (Barkan & Ikram, 2010).

The modernist notion of war has evolved to one that is built on chaos; the more confusion that exists between the conflict's many parties, the more the war is consistent with its modernist nature and departs from the classical war. Thus, once these elements are met, the intended outcomes of it are automatically attained. This alludes to the idea that civil wars are the inevitable outcome of a policy adopted by a group of people when regular politics fails to enable it to accomplish the objective it has set for itself (Shakhtrah & Bashar, 2017).

Shakhtrah & Bashar, (2017), affirms that the term "civil wars" is no longer appropriate for modern conflicts because, among other things, one of the key characteristics of the shift in the war is that the latter use local forces and parties as tools for a proxy conflict between regional



and international powers vying for interests in the warring nation. The lack of boundaries between the internal, regional, and global scales is what defines the current context of modern warfare. However, the result of these wars causes countries' levels of internal exposure to increase, which puts unprecedented pressure on the interior (Chidozie, et al, 2025). This is because regional crises trigger a series of international pressures that affect the internal situation, such as uprisings, revolutions, the emergence of terrorist groups, the escalation of internal conflicts, and indirect warfare fought by certain regional and global powers. These include the fight against terrorism worldwide, the war that followed the United States' involvement in Iraq and Afghanistan, and, lately, the term hybrid warfare, which is characterized by unconventional militias that are not considered specialized armies and decentralized battle (Voels & Glenn J, 2018).

The Thesis of Technological Determinism

Mass media technologies guarantee the spread of culture within a social fabric, which then modifies people's social behaviour, according to Marshall McLuhan's 1964 theory. He said, "We build our arsenal of devices, and they make us." A distinct approach was taken by McLuhan, who added money, games, and numbers as mediated tools. Most communication researchers discuss radio and television as mediated tools (Jan, Khan, Naz, Khan & Khan, 2021).

Marshall McLuhan developed the technical determinism or media ecology theory in 1964. According to this theory, mass media technology alters how a social system operates in addition to influencing people's views and behaviours. According to the hypothesis, the way a social fabric functions changes along with new technologies. Human survival on Earth is shaped by shifts in the human communication system, according to the core premise of media ecology theory. According to McLuhan, advancement of mass communication devices ensures that a custom spread throughout a group, which in turn affects behaviour (Martin, & Erickson, 2013). To match the discussion, let's use McLuhan's well-known statement. "We shape our tools and they in turn shape us." According to McLuhan, "we have a symbolic relationship with mediated technology, we create technology, and technology in turn re-creates who we are," as cited by West and Turner. According to the theory's historical perspective, civilizations have occasionally undergone equivalent transformations because of technological revolutions (West & Turner, 2010).

Technological determinism suggests that technological advancements can lead to significant social change, transforming the way societies function and interact. It implies that technology can shape cultural values, influencing the way individuals and societies think, behave, and interact. Technological determinism raises questions about human agency, suggesting that technology can limit or expand individual choices and actions (Heidegger, 1977).

According to the theory of technological determinism, social structures, values, and behaviours are all influenced by technology. According to this perspective, developments in AI and



autonomous systems will determine military tactics, moral standards, and decision-making procedures in the context of contemporary conflict, possibly marginalizing human agency. Essentially, ethical issues in AI warfare, such as accountability, giving machines the potential to make deadly decisions, and the deterioration of international conventions, could be presented as unavoidable outcomes of technical advancement if technology is viewed as the main force behind change. This point of view may undermine attempts to enforce human-centred governance on the application of AI in warfare.

Technological determinism can be applied to understand the impact of artificial intelligence on society, including its potential to transform industries, change workforce dynamics, and raise ethical concerns. This theory can also be used to analyze the role of technology in social movements, including its potential to facilitate mobilization, dissemination of information, and collective action. Some critics argue that technological determinism overemphasizes the role of technology in shaping society, neglecting the impact of other factors, such as economics, politics, and culture. This theory has been criticized for implying that humans have limited agency in shaping their own destiny, with technology driving social change (Marx, 1997).

However, technological determinism provides a framework for understanding the significant impact of technology on society. While this theory has its limitations, it highlights the importance of considering the role of technology in shaping societal structures, cultural values, and human behavior.

3. Ethical Issues in Modern Warfare and the Complexity of Decisions Making

The usage of AI technology in the military is expanding quickly. Numerous new kinetic and non-kinetic systems and platforms—such as autonomous drones carrying explosive payloads or cyberattacks—are already supported by AI technology. Even though humans still play a crucial part in the employment of these weapons, the growing usage of AI has allowed weapons to weaken human decision-making strength (Daudu, Osimen & Anaiye, 2025). Weapon systems that are semiautonomous are completely under human control. They have some control over supervised autonomous systems, but they can eventually overrule them. Lastly, they have no control over unsupervised autonomous systems (Parkin, 2015).

In military technology and military strategy involving potentially lethal force, artificial intelligence (AI) software is increasingly being offered as a replacement for humans. There is strong motivation to automate the actors in military conflicts because they are dangerous. For example, a South Korean automated gun turret that employs basic AI is well-liked worldwide (Parkin, 2015). Targeting presents the most obvious ethical issues with military AI, but there are also problems with operations planning and logistics support. However, it is challenging to create AI systems that can make potentially fatal decisions, and for many activities, present AI techniques are still less accurate than humans (Emery, 2021). It can be unethical to use them to apply lethal force, much like it is to use an inaccurate weapon like a shotgun in a modern military combat (Rowe, 2022; Braimah, et al, 2024).



Given that people have higher-level goals than machines and are therefore generally more ethical, major concern with AI software is whether it can be trusted to think and behave substantially like humans. The ability of AI systems to understand every decision-making process used by people and their ability to reason similarly to humans given the same facts are sub issues (Rowe, 2022). Sub issues include whether AI systems can understand every decision-making process used by humans and whether, given the identical information, they will behave similarly to humans. people should be involved ("in the loop" when it comes to military decisions, especially those involving fatal force); for example, people may be aware of extra factors that the AI is unaware of, such as why civilians are more likely to show up in a conflict zone.

Additionally, groups of well-chosen people could offer a wider range of viewpoints than AI. After that, AI might operate as a consultant, suggesting actions that human superiors could reject. These days, a lot of AI-based battle management systems are similar (Cummings, 2021).

Ross (2021), examines several examples involving autonomous or remote-controlled weapon systems, considering factors pertaining to accountability for military AI system failures. He contends that having the ability to make judgments accompanies responsibility (Ross, 2021). The reasoning behind this is that the human pilot or chain of command will be held accountable for any unethical behaviour involving a weapon that is operated remotely. An autonomous weapon system's AI would be held accountable if it committed an ethical transgression, but as AI is not a legal person, the developers or the people who choose to use the system for that mission should bear the blame. Although developers may contend that they wrote the code long before the failure occurred and without the knowledge that was accessible at the time, the human chain of command may also contend that they are powerless to direct decisions and give commands to prevent the failure (Nalin & Tripodi, 2023). Furthermore, Nalin & Tripodi, (2023), concluded that there is a chance that people will overlook the ethical implications of AI system decisions because they feel exempt from any accountability.

4. AI-driven warfare and International Humanitarian Law

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) in modern warfare raises significant concerns about human rights violations. AI has emerged as the most recent "weapon" used by governments and other players, raising both existing and emerging threats to national and international security. Based on accessible data, AI provides the ability to understand human behaviours, emotions, and beliefs. When AI is used maliciously, risk increases and its detrimental effects, such as its ability to uphold or upset democratic balances, increase. AI poses a threat to universal values and principles, freedom, privacy, and the right to life. The development of autonomous weapons systems poses significant ethical concerns, including the potential for machines to make life-or-death decisions without human oversight. According to Sparrow (2023), autonomous weapons systems may lead operators to make decisions to kill too lightly due to geographical and emotional distance (Humble,2024).



The development and deployment of autonomous weapon systems (AWS) that can select and engage targets without human intervention pose significant risks to human rights. These systems may not be able to distinguish between combatants and civilians, potentially leading to unintended harm.

In recent time, LAWS have sparked intense debate, with concerns about their potential to operate without meaningful human control. The United Nations has emphasized the need for human responsibility in deploying weapon systems and using force. AI-driven cyberattacks can exploit vulnerabilities and cause significant harm to civilians. For instance, AI-assisted hackers can identify and exploit weaknesses in software within 22 minutes of a proof of concept being published. AI disinformation and misinformation as it can generate convincing fake content, influencing public opinion and decision-making. This can lead to wrongful arrests, ill-treatment, discrimination, and even attacks on civilians. For instance, in Ukraine's AI-enabled drones. Humble (2024), claim that Ukraine has equipped its long-range drones with AI to autonomously identify terrain and military targets launching successful attacks against Russian refineries. Israel's "Lavender" AI system: According to Uzer (2024), Israel has used the "Lavender" AI system in the conflict in Gaza to identify 37,000 Hamas targets. The use of AI in warfare raises significant ethical and legal concerns, including:

- **Distinction and Proportionality:** AI systems may not be able to distinguish between military targets and civilians, potentially leading to disproportionate harm.
- **Accountability:** The use of AI in warfare, raises questions about accountability for human rights violations.
- **Human Control:** The lack of human control over AI systems can lead to unintended consequences and violations of international humanitarian law.

As stated in Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, "Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression, which includes the freedom to hold opinions without hindrance and to seek, receive, and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers" (UNDR, n.d). The crucial question is: How can we protect free speech when AI shape's public opinion? Freedom is being put at further peril by this new instrument, and this poses as one of the dangers of AI in the protection of one's right.

The US Armed Forces categorize autonomous weapons as either offensive or defensive, combining AI with military hardware in general. These weapons can be used in space, on land, in the air, and at sea. Weapons that operate autonomously choose and strike targets without human input. They are being produced using robots and computation, and they could end up fighting humanity. Humanity will become irreversibly dependent on the computer to make moral decisions if this is not taken into consideration normatively. Thus, autonomous weapons have the potential to undermine human agency, but they also have the potential to prevent the loss of human life in military operations. For this reason, some people support their use,



provided that the IHL is adhered to, which is built into their algorithms (value sensible design) (Roumate, 2021).

The development and application of autonomous weapons are currently not specifically governed by international law. Expecting a complete prohibition on the employment of AI in combat is unproductive. Prohibiting its use against human life (which is already permitted by IHL) and promoting its use in auxiliary domains, such medical and logistical support, bomb disassembly, the evacuation of wounded and people from combat zones, etc., would be intriguing. Therefore, the IHL agreements' distinction, proportionality, and precautionary principles can serve as a starting point for regulating the military's employment of AI.

AI provides new tools for content creation (audio and visual analyses), and although it has the potential to promote free speech, which is essential to democracy and the antidote to corruption, in practice it gives the government more control over social media platforms and the right to free speech. Considering workflow optimization, automated content creation, content creation from legacy archives, content selection for targeting audience demographics, asset selection optimization, metadata creation, and content personalization, AI systems found in social media are also utilized to shape social movements and sway public opinion (ITU). After publishing a text on her Facebook page called "Surah Corona" (The New Arab), Amna Al-Sharqi was arrested in Tunisia. Freedom House claims that the extension of national sovereignty to internet has allowed authorities to freely repress human rights violations rather than safeguarding users.

While predicting the dangers of artificial intelligence (AI) and asserting that "anyone who emerges the supreme figure in this area will eventually become the ruler of the world," Russian President Vladimir Putin in 2017 referred to AI as the "foreseeable future," not only for Russia, but for all humankind" (Khalaileh, 2023). The inability of public international law to appropriately address this issue was caused by the plurality of state interests. Regulation AI does not appear to have kept up with the slow pace of international law, given its sluggish decision-making and norm-creation processes. Therefore, international laws pertaining to defence and the use of force must be updated, particularly to outlaw AWS, or state actors will decide humanity's fate. Assuring that the commander (human or not) using military systems can and will uphold fundamental legal duties is one of the difficulties and threats to international law, particularly international humanitarian law.

The updating of certain core principles of international law is not the only significant obstacle posed by the malicious use of artificial intelligence (MUAI). "How this law will be interpreted by non-humans" is the crucial question. Therefore, the UN Charter needs to be changed immediately. All facets of AI and its ramifications, such as automation, personhood, weapons systems, control, and standards, must be considered in the updating of international law. In a study conducted by Roumate (2021), maintained that as AI entities have legal personality, international law needs to be examined.



Globally, effective regulation of the development and use of autonomous lethal weapons must consider both potential uses in repressing social movements and war scenarios. This is made more difficult by the fact that the degree of democratization in each state varies, which influences the use of these weapons. Because of its history in IHL and human rights, the UN is arguably the best body to oversee the use of AI in warfare on a global scale. However, there is a very relevant complication to be evaluated because of the disagreement over the basis of meaningful human control, which is arguably the most significant for the discussion of the normative parameters of autonomous weapons (Khalailah, 2023).

5. Conclusion

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) in modern warfare raises significant ethical concerns that challenge traditional understandings of the morality of war, particularly regarding accountability in autonomous system failures. The lack of clear accountability frameworks complicates the ethical and legal landscape, necessitating a reassessment of responsibility paradigms in military AI. The increasing use of AI in warfare necessitates a comprehensive and coordinated response to address the ethical challenges it poses. The ethical issues in modern warfare are multifaceted and complex, requiring careful consideration of various perspectives. To address these challenges, it is essential to develop a nuanced understanding of the moral implications of modern warfare and to establish clear guidelines and regulations for military personnel such as the establishment of a global framework to regulate the military use of AI, ensuring that its development and deployment align with human values and international law.

Funding

This study received funding from Covenant University Center for Research, Innovation, and Discovery (CUCRID).

Authors Acknowledgement

The authors acknowledge the valuable contribution of Covenant University Center for Research, Innovation, and Discovery (CUCRID) for offering the framework for this study and for their support with publication expenses. They also appreciate the reviewers for their valuable feedback.

Conflict of Interest

None

Disclosure Notice

This is not a component of a thesis submitted to obtain a degree.



References

1. Adom, D., Kportufe, G. E., Asare-Aboagye, I., & Kquofi, S. (2024). Artificial Reproductive Technology: Cultural considerations through an African lens. *Research Journal in Advanced Humanities*, 5(3). <https://doi.org/10.58256/4hsp3z34>
2. Alderman, Daniel, & Ray. (2018). Best Frenemies Forever: Artificial Intelligence, Emerging Technologies, and China-US Strategic Competition. *SITC Research Briefs*, 9. <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2pq268gz>
3. Anyoha, R. (2017, August 28). The History of Artificial Intelligence. Retrieved June 27, 2024, from sitn. hms.harvard.edu: <https://sitn.hms.harvard.edu/flash/2017/history-artificial-intelligence/>
4. Barkan, Ikram (2010). Analysis of Contemporary Conflicts in Light of the Components of the Cultural Dimension in International Relations, MA Thesis, El Hadj Lakhdar University, Batna, Algeria. P. 16.
5. Bode, I., & Huelss, H. (2022). Autonomous Weapons Systems and International Norms.
6. Braimah, E S, Gberevbie, D E, Chidozie F, Osimen, G U. (2024). Drivers and outcomes of international migration on infrastructural development of Edo State, Nigeria, *Journal of Infrastructure, Policy and Development* 2024, 8(8), 5974. <https://doi.org/10.24294/jipd.v8i8.5974>
7. Chukwudi, E, C, Osimen, G,U, Dele-Dada, M., Ahmed, T.M.O. (2024) Conflict and Security Challenges in the Semi-Arid Region of Sahel: Implications for Sahel Women's empowerment and Demographic Dividend (SWEDD); *Journal of Somali Studies*: Vol.11 (1), 81-107-Uk. 10.31920/2056-5682/2024/v11n1a4
8. Chidozie, F. C., Osimen, G. U., Bhadmus, J. & Newo, O. A. (2025). Sustainable development goals implementation in a post-colonial African State: Any future for the African Continental Free Trade Area? *Journal of Sustainable Development*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.3183>.
9. Clausewitz, Carl Von (1988). *The Brief on War*, Op. Cit., P. 74.
10. Daudu, B.O., Osimen, G.U & Kennedy Shuaibu (2023). Cyberbullying and Social Media: Implications for African Digital Space; in Mohamed Lahby, et al (Eds) Book "Combating Cyberbullying in Digital Media with Artificial Intelligence" Routledge.
11. Daudu, B.O, Osimen, G.U & Anaiye E.B (2025). Sustainable Smart Cities in African Digital Space in Pawan W. et al. (Eds) Book "Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning for Sustainable Development" CRC Press. Routledge.



12. 32) Daudu, B. O., Osimen, G. U., & Abubakar, A. T. (2025) Artificial Intelligence, Fintech, and Financial Inclusion in African Digital Space. In FinTech and Financial Inclusion (pp. 268-282). Routledge.
13. Gigova, R. (2017). Who Vladimir Putin Thinks Will Rule the World. CNN, September 2, 2017. As of June 25, 2018: <https://www.cnn.com/2017/09/01/world/putin-artificial-intelligence-will-rule-world/index.html>
14. Heidegger, M. (1977). The question concerning technology and other essays. Harper Torchbooks.
15. Humble, K. (2024). War, Artificial Intelligence, and the Future of Conflict.
16. Jan, A., Khan, Naz, Khan & khan, Q. (2021). Marshal McLuhan's Technological Determinism Theory in the Arena of Social Media. Pakistan Journal of Social Science.18(2), 30-34.
17. Khalaileh, Y. (2023). Accommodating Artificial Intelligence in International Law: An Overview and New Frontier. Journal of Human Security, 19(1), 22-31.
18. Lahav, E. (2024, February 23). Will AI Be Used by Terrorists? The New Threat: The Dangers Arising from the Use of Advanced Technologies by Radical Islamic Organizations. Retrieved May 18, 2024, from <https://idsf.org.il:https://idsf.org.il/en/interviews-en/ai-used-by-terrorists/>
19. Martin, P. & Erickson., T. (2013). Social Media: Usage and Impact. Global Vision Publishing, New Delhi, India, 238.
20. Marx, L. (1997). The idea of technological determinism. In M. R. Smith & L. Marx (Eds.), Does technology drive history? The dilemma of technological determinism. MIT Press.
21. Marwala, T. (2023, July 7). Militarization of AI Has Severe Implications for Global Security and Warfare. Retrieved from <https://unu.edu:https://unu.edu/article/militarization-ai-has-severe-implicationsglobal-security-and-warfare>
22. Nalin & Tripodi, (2023), Future Warfare and Responsibility Management in the AI-based Military Decision-making Process. Journal of Advanced Military Studies (14)1, 83-97.
23. Osimen, G., Newo, O., & Fulani, O. (2024). Artificial Intelligence and Arms Control In Modern Warfare. Cogent Social Sciences, 1-39.
24. Osimen, G. U., Dele-Dada, M., & Osere, N. J. (2025). The misconception of enemy images in war reporting: The insight narratives on Israel-Hamas conflict. Global Change, Peace & Security, 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14781158.2025.2458878>



25. Osimen, G. U., Fulani, O. M., Chidozie, F., & Dada, D. O. (2024). The weaponization of artificial intelligence in modern warfare: Implications for global peace and security. *Research Journal in Advanced Humanities*, 5(3). [https:// doi.org/10.58256/g2p9tf63](https://doi.org/10.58256/g2p9tf63)
26. Osimen, G.U, Etoroma, O.M, Pokubo, I & Adi, I. (2025) N-Power program and youth empowerment in Nigeria, *Cogent Social Sciences*, 11(1), 2466786, <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2025.2466786>
27. Parkin, S. (2015). Killer Robots: The Soldiers that Never Sleep. In: *AI: the Ultimate Guide | Weapon*. Available online at: <https://www.bbc.com/future/article/20150715-killer-robots-the-soldiers-that-never-sleep> (accessed June 20, 2022).
28. Ross W. (2021). Can AI Weapons Make Ethical Decisions? *Criminal Justice Ethics* (40),2 86–107, <https://doi.org/10.1080/0731129X.2021.1951459>.
29. Roumate. (2021). Artificial Intelligence, Ethics and International Human Rights Law. *International Review of Information Ethics*, 29, 1-10.
30. Rowe, N. (2022). Algorithms for artificial intelligence. *IEEE Computer* 55(7), 87–102. doi: 10.1109/MC.2022.3169360
31. Salih, M. (2020). Modern warfare: From an anthropological perspective. *International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation*, (24)3, 5036-5051.
32. Shakhtrah, Bashar (2017). Postmodern Wars. *Talaat Tanweer Magazine - The Cultural Review of the Arab National List*, Issue (32), January. Pp. 1-3.
33. Sparrow, R. (2023). *A military-philosophical complex: Steven Umbrello: Designed for death: controlling killer robots*. Budapest: Trivent Publications, 2022, 221 pp, €44 PB. *Metascience*, 32(3), 421–424.
34. Trausan-Matu, s. (2021). Ethics in Artificial Intelligence. *International Journal of User-System Interaction* 13(3), 136-148.
35. Velasquez, M., Andre, C., Shanks, T., & Meyer, M.J. (2017) What is Ethics? <https://www.scu.edu/ethics/ethics-resources/ethical-decision-making/what-is-ethics/> (Last accessed: 3 March, 2021).
36. Voels, Glenn J. (2018). *The Rise of Electronic Warfare: Identity, Information, and Characteristics of Modern Warfare*, translated by Hazem Center for Strategic Studies Translation. Institute for Strategic Studies, United States of America. 25.
37. Uzer, M. A. (2024). *The Integration of AI in Modern Warfare: Ethical, Legal, and Practical Implications*.