ISSN Online: 3006-4708
ISSN Print: 3006-4694

SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW ARCHIVES
https://policyjournalofms.com

Exploring the Role of Artificial Intelligence in Modern Warfare: Implications for Global Security and International Humanitarian Law

Mahtab Jamil Akhtar[1], Abdul Wahab Ahmad[2], Seemab Jamil Akhtar[3]

[1] Lecturer, Department of Politics and IR, Lahore Leads University, Lahore Pakistan.
Email: mahtab.pol@leads.edu.pk
[2] Advocate, High Court of Pakistan. Email: wahabwattoo18@gmail.com
[3] Clinical Psychologist by the Allied Health Professionals Council (AHPC), Pakistan.
Email: seemabjamilakhtar@gmail.com

Corresponding Author: Mahtab Jamil Akhtar

DOI: https://doi.org/10.70670/sra.v3i4.1148

Abstract
Artificial intelligence (AI) has become a revolutionary phenomenon which is transforming the character of contemporary warfare and international relations security processes. This paper considers the impact of AI technologies such as autonomous weapons to predictive surveillance systems. It explores the two-sidedness of AI as a means of improving the efficiency of defense and a problem of unprecedented risks, especially in the question of accountability, legality, and moral responsibility. With countries like the United States, China and Russia investing heavily in the fields of AI-based military advancements, the common structures of the international humanitarian law (IHL) cannot follow the developments at an identical speed. This study emphasizes the necessity to have definite regulation systems and international collaboration that would guarantee responsible application of AI in war. Through the discussion of the latest conflicts and technological changes, the paper highlights the necessity of balancing the use of AI with humanitarian values.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, warfare, global security, International Humanitarian Law

Introduction

Artificial intelligence (AI) has become one of the most revolutionary technologies of the 21st century that is changing multiple industries and transforming the essence of the war system. Similar to previous technological revolutions, including gunpowder and nuclear weapons, AI is currently redefining the ways of war, war strategy, and management of defence in the global arena (Naseeb, 2024). The artificial intelligence systems are becoming more accurate, fast, and efficient using such tools as autonomous drone, predictive analytics, and sophisticated surveillance. These developments, however, have brought along some complicated ethical, legal, and humanitarian issues, especially when it comes to accountability, transparency, and adherence to international humanitarian law (Jafarian Dehkordi, 2024).

Although AI will provide unbiased decision-making, algorithms tend to be biased and may mislead into civilian targets, which will cause the illegal killing of people (Al Kuwari, 2021). The moral and legal issues of automated systems impacted by the lack of human control, and the risks in the operation may increase due to cyber-attacks. Motivation of AI militarization by global powers like the United States, China and Russia leads to stiff competition in the field, focusing on speed and capability as

opposed to safety, which heightens geopolitical tensions and clods regulatory checks and balances (Naseeb, 2024).

The use of AI in the field of war has another impact of the nature of international relation as the boundaries between the conventional and cyber warfare are blurred. Transparency, accountability, and privacy are the values that are questioned by surveillance and data-based activities (Narayan, 2023). The existence of AI in any affiliation like NATO makes interoperability, coordination, and trust among member state complicated. In addition, the increasing use of AI in the military reveals how the current international standards of humanitarian law such as the Geneva Conventions that were not originally intended to operate with autonomous technologies (Al Kuwari, 2021). The Ethics like distinction and proportionality is becoming harder and harder to maintain as algorithms are substituting human judgment.

The study seeks to explore further the twin effects of AI in increasing the efficacy of the military and causing uncertainties in ethical and legal grounds. It defines the necessity of the international collaboration tied to the immediate need to overhaul legal frameworks and moral principles through which AI can be responsibly used in the field of the military (Challagasville, 2024).

Problem Statement

AI-driven military systems stance major challenges to global security and international law. Autonomous weapons raise accountability questions when machines make life-and-death decisions. Errors in data processing can escalate conflicts, while rapid AI and quantum computing advances aid both state militaries and terrorists. As major powers invest heavily in AI, global safety risks intensify. Since international humanitarian law was created before such technologies, it now struggles to address the ethical and legal issues emerging from modern AI warfare.

Research Objectives

1. To identify artificial intelligence and new technology are being used in today's military
2. To investigate AI in the military and greater security challenges to changing how different nations balance their power
3. To examine military technologies using AI influence IHL, mainly as they relate to responsibility, proportionality and distinguishing whom to target.

Research Questions

1. Are Artificial intelligence and new technologies are part of many military systems today?
2. Does blending AI into military efforts create tougher safety issues for the world, particularly by changing the power position of nations?
3. How does the use of AI in military technology affect the rules of war and accountability for lawful and proportional attacks?

Literature Review

Horowitz (2018) highlights that automation, accurate targeting and improved data systems are playing a big role because of AI in military. Many modern militaries are now using autonomous systems, complex algorithms and modern spy tools to improve how decisions are made and how missions are carried out. These tools should help reduce mistakes, improve how targets are chosen and analyze huge amounts of battle information, thus changing the approach to operations (Horowitz 2018).

The author emphasizes that AI can be used to coordinate transportation, share resources and direct battles on the field. These improvements do come with major dangers. A common idea across literature is that AI struggles to predict actions in changing and chaotic situations. The main focus of ongoing study and discussion remains these two features access and barriers of education for migrants (Cummings 2020).

Researchers are finding that AI is likely to add to destabilizing effects, mainly due to increasing technology competition worldwide. USA, China and Russia want to develop AI to be number one,

since they consider leadership in this area to be vital to their strategy. Experts Allen and Chan argue that the competition over AI among these nations increases regional frictions and could result in accidental or unintentional battles. Because of this situation, global security is constantly threatened by increasing distrust and unpredictability (Allen and Chan, 2017).

In their Research paper, Bradshaw and Howard (2019) underline that two main uses for AI in weapon systems, dissemination of disinformation and cyber conflict often lead to ethical dilemmas. Propaganda bots built on AI and using deepfake technology are more commonly used to attack people's trust in democracies. As a result, many people are discussing the consequences of including AI in conflicts (Bradshaw and Howard 2019).

Bradshaw and Howard (2019) by using AI and deep fake, propaganda is now being spread by bots on the internet. It points out that these methods are often abused to weaken public faith in democracy which brings up major ethical problems when added to military plans.

According to the article Time, AI is to use for disinformation has already happened. Li Bicheng, a researcher from China's military, has discussed using AI to control what the public sees online Research shows that Russia used AI-based false news and social media sites to impact popular stories about the Ukraine war (Time, 2023).

Adding AI to military systems leads to big legal challenges focused on International Humanitarian Law (IHL). IHL's major document, the Geneva Conventions, strongly insists that wars follow the rules of distinction, proportionality and civilian protection. Nevertheless, having autonomous weapons systems raises doubts about how these systems fulfill legal requirements (Time, 2023).

Wired (2024) Because of their major efforts in AI technology, the US, China and Russia are increasing geopolitical issues. Writing in 2020, Binnendijk and Kugler argue that nations are spending heavily on AI to get a competitive edge and warn that this could cause an arms race. American defense planners have put in place their "Third Offset" system, believing it will give them an advantage with the use of technology in weapons (Wired, 2024).

Besides, the Chinese government has revealed its ambition to become the number one player in AI by 2030 with the 2017 plan "New Generation Artificial Intelligence Development Plan" (Forbes, 2024).

IDST (2024) Russia is creating AI-driven aircraft, ground tanks that operate with no human input and decision systems for those in command during battles, according to (IDST,2024).

The rush to build new weapons raises the chance of fast escalation, since many systems are put into service before being fully tested. According to Gilli and Gilli (2019), creating AI rapidly for the military can result in breaking existing arms agreements, raising the chance of conflict if improperly applied by AI.

Al Khuwari (2023) because these risks are growing, global players are now looking at ways to regulate different industries. On top of that, the U.S. published a Political Declaration on Using Artificial Intelligence and Autonomy in the Military Ethically. Beyond that, the Framework Convention on Artificial Intelligence which 50+ countries have signed, makes clear that AI must not harm human rights, democratic values or the rule of law (Al Khuwari, 2023).

Historical Background

The timeline of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in warfare is a history of the role of technological ability in transforming the military. Early speculative theories of the thinking machines have turned into a major strategic asset in contemporary war. This study follows the major developments in connecting theoretical backgrounds, the Cold War automation, precision warfare, post-9/11 counterterrorism, and modern AI warfare in the context of the tension between innovation, ethics, and regulation. The duality of scientific research and strategic necessity is essential: every innovation provokes the issues of independence, responsibility, and liability (Burdette, 2025).

Concepts and Theoretical Applications of the British Empire (C. 1940s -1960s)

The beginnings of Artificial Intelligence (AI) could be traced to the work of Alan Turing on machine thinking (1936, 1950), whose proposals formed the basis of the logic of calculations in a military

setting. His work on cryptanalysis during the war proved a pioneer in the collaboration of the machines with people (Daxhelet, 2024). Fronted by McCarthy, Minsky, Rochester, and Shannon, the Dartmouth Conference of 1956 officially introduced AI as a field of study, which was associated with defense and decision-making. Contemporary researchers perceive this period as the fundamental one as it influenced the theoretical desires and military implementation of AI (Turing, 1936; Burdette, 2025).

Automation and Decision Support (1960s-1980s): Cold War Era.

At the time of the Cold war, automation and heavy investment on computing changed the strategy of the military. Real-time command and control System that used systems such as the U.S. SAGE network was a successful precursor to modern AI-enabled defense technologies. The Strategic Computing Initiative program of 1983 developed pattern recognition and expert systems and autonomous navigation. At the same time, Soviet work aimed at ensuring similar automation on the rapid response. This period formalized two strands of AI research scientific and militarized defining the basis of the modern era of military AI systems and human-machine symbiosis in warfare (Burdette, 2025).

Syria (2012) under the Arab Spring Governance (2011)

The Gulf War (1990-1991) was the first high-technology war where AI-enhanced applications, such as cruise missile direction systems and primitive UAV vehicles (classes of unarmed aerial vehicles) showed up due to high precision, navigation, and surveillance abilities (Military Review, 2024). The reconnaissance and target acquisition of UAVs along with the minimization of collateral damage by the use of cruise missiles made feasible. Sensor fusion and satellite imagery were a better situational awareness. Researchers note that this war is the place of transitions to the support of AI intelligence being turned into operational tasks, which are associated with quick processing of data and decision-making as well as conventional firepower (Daxhelet, 2024; Burdette, 2025).

Post 9/11 Age: Counterterrorism and Autonomous Systems (2000s-2010s)

The global war on terror that was initiated after the 9/11 attacks brought AI and unmanned aircrafts such as MQ-1 Predator and MQ-9 Reaper to the fronts through the application of algorithms to identify targets, track, and recognize images (Military Review, 2024). The use of AI in intelligence, surveillance, and identification grew, using analysis of biometrics and social media (Ethics as Enabler, 2023). Project Maven represented a typical example of both ethical and operational issues where precision and excessive dependence on automation were combined. The legal matters of distinction, proportionality and accountability were addressed, solidifying AI application in counterinsurgency against ethical concerns of independent use of force (My Attorney Is A Robot, 2024).

Introduction: AI as a Strategic Asset (2010s-Present) Modern Warfare

Since the 2010s, AI has evolved into more of a support resource into a strategic resource within the military and is used as an autonomous system, human-machine teaming, cyber operations, and accelerated decision making (Burdette, 2025). The AI was institutionalized in the U.S. with the assistance of the JAIC and the Project Maven and the "Loyal Wingman" reconnaissance, targeting, logistics, and cyber-defense initiatives (Military Review, 2024). Autonomous weapons development and AI two-sided rivalry, urgent norms of warfare are some of the risks. The regulation, human control, and the standard of validation are priorities in policy discussions, and AI has become the center of contemporary doctrine, Army organization, and competition at the level of strategies (Simmons-Edler et al., 2024; Military AI Needs Regulation, 2025).

Modern Warfare (2018 Onwards): USA, China, Russia

Since 2018, the major powers have tightened the competition in the military AI. The U.S. also focuses on integrating the multi-domain and accelerating decision making via human-machines teaming and artificial intelligence control systems (Burdette, 2025). Military-Civil Fusion doctrine enhances China

surveillance, UAV autonomy, and swarm tactics, but innovation might be suppressed by centralization (Finabel & Daxhelet, 2024). In Ukraine, Russia has experimented with AI-based mechanisms such as Uran-9, AI-assisted drones and uses AI to dominate the cyber, propaganda and information fronts (Burdette, 2025). AI in the military is the catalyst of talent, conventions, and even alliances.

Research Methodology

Research Methodology refers to the process of choosing and implementing of befitting research designs on a research topic. It is the qualitative research that is applied, hence our decision to adopt analytical research design. It is concerned with a critical analysis to find out issues and their remedies. Secondary sources are also employed frequently through which the reader interprets the work more conveniently. This, through the utilization of qualitative tools, examines the functionality of AI in warfare, and its influence on international safety and humanitarian standards.

The present study used the case study method and the techniques of cross-sectional model to test the impact of AI on military activities and geopolitics. With this method, we are able to use our framework on real observations in the environment.

Conceptualization of Research Methodology:

The theoretical design of the study was the exploration of the truth of the position of AI in the contemporary warfare and the implication on global security and the situational elements (variables) that influence the international humanitarian law. The study thus proceeds to point out the objective and the subjective reality. The literature review may lead to the conclusion that there are three methodologies that are founded on the dominant paradigms.

Theoretical Framework

The connection of Artificial Intelligence (AI) to the war is a disruption in the strategy of military affairs and the safety of the world by turning the battlefields into the space of the technical rivalry. Nevertheless, any current legal system especially International Humanitarian Law (IHL) is not capable of tackling the unethical and legal dilemma of autonomous systems and cyber warfare (Horowitz, 2018). The machinery is threatening fundamental humanitarian values such as distinction and proportionality, as machines are taking human judgment out to an even greater extent. This has contributed to worsening power contest and military competition and geopolitical conflicts due to its increasing involvement in international relations and diplomacy (O'Neil, 2016). The use of AI in cyber and autonomous weapon systems creates lacks of civilian and military target regulation, which requires new international conventions and mutual legal frameworks (Holk et al., 2017). To overcome these issues, it is imperative to solve the problem through an interdisciplinary approach, robust regulations, and moral responsibility so that military AI application could be driven by humanitarian principles and global security goals (O'Neil, 2016).

Use of Artificial Intelligence in military tactics

AI has revolutionized the nature of contemporary warfare by improving intelligence collection, surveillance, logistics, and commanding activities. Satellites and drones based on AI make it possible to investigate and follow dangers in real-time, thus, giving forces an opportunity to observe potential threats and analyze extensive data to reveal the possible risk and prevent its further growth in case it occurs. This predictive path allows being aware of the situation and makes quicker decisions, which makes military actions more calculated and strategic (Katensberg, 2024). Artificial intelligence has existed as a protective weapon and offensive force in the area of cyber warfare against terrorist activities, recognizing threats, and stopping them, but also has the potential of causing mass attacks, which are significant concerns on a global scale (Time, 2023).

The application of AI in cyber conflicts undermines the principles of the International Humanitarian Law (IHL) especially the ability to differentiate between civilian and military targets. With the blur of cyber and traditional warfare, it is important to establish transparent moral and legal standards that

would help be accountable and avoid misuse (Holk et al., 2017). The application in logistics enhances the supply chain management, predictive maintenance, resource allocation and minimizes downtime and enhances the operations preparedness. Its prediction of failure and the optimization of routes increases the efficiency and safety of the mission (Katensberg, 2024).

Theoretical Perspectives; Laws Governing Armed Conflicts

The purpose of the International Humanitarian Law (IHL) is to reduce the effects of the armed conflicts, including the protection of civilians and the regulation of the warfare strategies. Nonetheless, the application of Artificial Intelligence (AI) within military systems provokes concerns with the formulation of traditional IHL principles, particularly the principles of accountability, proportionality, and distinction. Responsibility gets complicated when AI runs on its own, and it is hard to designate the person responsible in the cases of violations, leading to the need to provide a so-called collective responsibility model that incorporates developers, operators, and commanders. The concept of proportionality and distinction that is crucial to the distinction between combatants and civilians is also threatened since AI has no moral evaluation and situational awareness, which might result in the targeting illegally. Furthermore, there is an ethical discussion on whether machines ought to make life and death decisions because they have no empathies and moral reasoning. Such challenges bring into prominence the sense of urgency in finding human regulation, new licensing laws, and moral protection of the responsible and legal application of AI in contemporary warfare (Roberts and Venables, 2021).

Accountability

Heating accountability is so far from a significant dilemma when looking at allowance in combat. The existing IHL that is based on human liability until now, has been the major issue regarding the identification of war crimes (Krugman, 2014). But AI does not always work as an entity; it operates independently of the user. The law of war obtains dilemmas when AI is responsible for harm or for the IHL principal violation (Roberts & Venables, 2021).

Lack of traceability in AI-operated machines, especially makes it difficult to connect tasks with specific individuals or groups using machine learning. This oblivion complicates efforts to entrust responsibility and ensure accountability. A potential solution is to adopt a "collective responsibility" structure, where all involved parties-like developers, deployment, and operator-AI- powered decisions are accountability (Roberts & Venables, 2021).

Proportionality and Distinction

Principles of genetics and distinctions serve as major pillars of International Human law (IHL). Proportional theory ensures that no anticipated military benefits come at extreme cost for civil life or property. Similarly, the distinction theory suggests that the warning parties clearly differentiate between military and civilian personnel as well as military infrastructure and civil property.

This difference becomes particularly important in the context of deadly autonomous arms systems (laws). AI may be challenging to make the right decisions of these distinctions, which can be a cause of violations of IHL (Fedchuk, 2024).

The difficulty has been the design of AI systems that can take into account the environment and the potential outcomes so they could distinguish properly. Though AI is able to process even enormous amounts of data and to find some regularities, it may miss the relevant context and not have the moral judgment that is necessary to apply the principles of proportionality and distinction properly. This fact gives a strong reason for the need for human oversight of AI-driven military operations and intervention (Fedchuk, 2024).

Ethical Dilemmas

AI in war brings up major ethical concerns such as a non-moral agent, where it is challenging to hold a party accountable. Automated targeting systems offend human dignity and the principles of

international humanitarian based on establishing the worth of life. The lack of transparency and trust with machine learning algorithms makes it harder to be responsible due to their lack of transparency. Moreover, the over-autonomy of the weapon systems increases the risks and lacks human control. To maintain humans in control and the efficiency of AI, it is necessary to make sure that there is ethical usage and moral responsibility in contemporary warfare (Dalila Say et al. 2025).

Legal Adherence and Legislation

AI rules of war are still a much nuanced category thus a fine set of laws should be created to ensure that legal regulations are adhered to. The international law needs to be altered in terms of structure to accommodate the AI systems in order to make deployment of the systems adhere to the principles of IHL. Siregar recommends that new legislation of artificial intelligence in the military field should be established and with improved surveillance and control mechanisms (Siregar et al. 2024).

Regulatory Frameworks

Successful management of AI use in war necessitates revised international conventions under which the current conventions such as the Geneva conventions are outdated due to the evolution of AI. Countries have to put specific laws into consistency with the world standards to have uniformity in the use of AI in the military. The global partnership is crucial in developing common structures and best processes. In tandem with the legal provisions, ethical policies should be implemented to support transparency, accountability, and human dignity so that the use of AI in war would comply with the principles of the international humanitarian law (Siregar et al., 2024).

Regional Perspective: USA, China and Russia

The application of AI in war depends on the geopolitical environment and strategic interests depending on the region. Countries such as China and India make hefty investments in AI in the Indo-Pacific to gain an advantage in their military and are open to an arms race that can weaken the stability of the region (Putro et al., 2024). The technological rivalry of the area makes the inclusion of AI in military strategies possible, but brings up the question of the safety of transparency, responsibility, and possible further progress in case of a miscommunication or misunderstanding (Hallaq et al., 2017). It is critical to put in place standardized guidelines, international collaboration and ethical frameworks to reduce risks and stabilize everything. The advantages of AI and its ethical and legal issue are to be put on par to this day, especially when it comes to autonomous weapons, which make the International Humanitarian Law principles of accountability, proportionality, and distinction difficult (Marsili, 2024). Elsewhere, such as in Europe and the Middle East, there are also increasing military consequences of AI. EU is in the forefront in formulating legal and ethical guidelines in the field of transparency, human dignity, and accountable supervision. In the meantime, the Middle East nations should match the application of AI in their moral and security frameworks to fit their geopolitical circumstance. Enhanced global collaboration and comparable regulatory frameworks are essential in the efforts of making sure that AI boosts security and does not defile international peace (Siregar et al., 2024).

Each of the three countries, the United States, China, and Russia, applies the concept of artificial intelligence (AI) to war in very different ways based on their strategic and ideological perspectives. The American mode of action is a blend of liberal institutionalism and technological realism, through international collaboration using international bodies but with the military dominance. The Department of Defense Joint AI Center and National Defense Acts are also its defense programs that seek to improve its edge against its competitors such as China and Russia through the introduction of AI into its deterrence and power-balancing policies (Hallaq et al., 2017). The AI policy in China is based on Marxist-Leninism and techno-nationalism, where AI is the focus of rejuvenation and military modernization of the nation according to the policy of the New Generation AI Development Plan. People Liberation Army is promoting the use of what is known as intelligentized warfare, which combines AI with cyber and space to counter the U.S. dominance in the Indo-Pacific (Marsili, 2024).

Russia, in its turn, considers AI a pillar of its hybrid warfare strategy, encompassing both the use of technologies and disinformation efforts to attain the strategic goals without an open war. AI assists Russia in struggling military autonomy, deterrence and updates as NATO broadens its origins, as in Ukraine or Syria. Regardless of economic disparity, Russia focuses on AI in expedited operations and enhanced automated systems aiming to be a global power by being technologically equal as the U.S. and China (Putro et al., 2024).

AI's military Application

This research on the use of AI in the military and its consequences to the international humanitarian law (IHL) requires a multidisciplinary research approach by incorporating the latest perspectives in technology, ethics, law, and military strategy (Roberts and Venables, 2021). AI places significant ethical dilemmas, especially the ability of an autonomous weapon to make life or death choices without morality or empathy. The responsibility of responsible use of AI in warfare is to ensure ethical governance, transparency and respect to human dignity. The advent of AI in warfare as well as the change in the world power balance heightens the competition and risks of conflict between countries. These risks must be reduced by means of powerful international law, moral principles, and collaborative global policies (Acquaviva, G. 2023). Such cooperation may make sure that AI does not reduce the efficiency of the military at the expense of the humanitarian principles. The study highlights the need to establish universal rules and even interdisciplinary approaches to ensure the balance of the benefits of AI in the military and ethical, legal, and even strategic duty and responsibility to advance world order and adherence to IHL (Dalila Say et al. 2025).

Analysis of the Research

The issue of terrorism in the 21st century has become an intricate issue that has been entangled in the psychological vulnerability as well as religious accounts by extremist factions through which they enlist and radicalize supporters. This relationship is interpreted within the context in which modern warfare is rapidly evolving due to the impact of technological progress, in particular, artificial intelligence (AI). Such states as the USA, China, and Russia lead the pack in the integration of AI into military systems. This is not only transforming the way in which war is fought but also that of the application of the International Humanitarian Law (IHL) with real or potential impacts on the human psyche.

Furthermore, AI is currently in the psychological-religious nexus along with terrorism. Autonomous weapons are thought of using AI-based tactics, as a concern, raise ethical questions of privacy, human rights as well as state responsibility. And when something is definite, the internet has become ground zero in all forms of revolutionary AI processes, be it good or evil.

Psychological-Religious Nexus of Terrorism in Technologically Advanced World

The combination of psychological weaknesses and notions introduced in the religion may promote radicalization. Most of the victims of PTSD, crises of identity or a break with society usually become drawn to the extremist ideologies. Extremists use erroneous accounts on scripture to make terrorism seem like what religion demands. Under these circumstances, the holders of power are in a better position to treat violence as normal and take away empathy to their victims. This radicalization is new, but the technology advances it have been making are significant, with Artificial Intelligence dictating how wars and counterterrorism occurs today. Artificial intelligence devices come to the rescue in the detection of radical activity and when it comes to extremists, propaganda is blocked on the internet, but it also introduces issues concerning morality, issues of privacy discomfort and risks of exploitation by various players. The dangers of AI implementation, such as deepfakes, bot and message messages, designed to manipulate emotions, increase the possibility of easily recruiting more individuals.

Implications for Global Security and Modern Warfare

The threats of terrorism in the world are fully changing because of the synthesis of psychological

strategy, distortion of the religious ideology and modern technologies. The presence of closed circles of online society is now a plus to extremists who aim at strengthening such circles with information which is inherent to the inefficiency of the participants of such circles. The AI can be imposed to cheat individuals by using the analysis of their behavior and so-called empathy that can trick the artificial leaders into speaking in the name of different beliefs.

In the meantime, one can easily cross the boundaries between counterterrorism and aggression any time an AI-enhanced decision-making is involved, and drones are offered with independence and access to real-time information on the battlefield. As a result of these new technologies, the wartime constitutionalists and the overall population, produce more productions of trauma and extremist anger. Moreover, the struggle of the U.S opposition between Russia and China renders global organizations incapable of the unification of the global issues. Exchange of opinions on technology, contradicting geopolitical objectives and diverse strategies towards human rights, ensure that countries do not choose to employ a common counterterrorism policy. The consequences of these technologies are likely to influence in even more pernicious manner unless being handled ethically, which is supposed to promote the discussion of religious beliefs and provide psychological assistance.

In fact, as the discussion reveals, contemporary-day terrorism has not just been associated with philosophies and religions, but also, mentalities or use of technologies. Radical thinking and high-technological state, particularly, the sphere of artificial intelligence may turn an average psychological problem into a regular and consistent act of violence. U.S., Russia and China differ in the use of their methods in fighting terrorism due to the difference in their home systems and direction.

Peacekeeping and safety in the world is a process that generates definite theological arguments and lets people get their minds healed in terms of the consequences of the technology and conduct principled diplomacy with the most partners possible. The terror war entails adjustment of thoughts, principles and the establishment of communities.

Conclusion

The associated artificial intelligence that happens to deal with warfare and eliminating terrorism today has both its advantages and difficulties. The use of AI may be used to detect the radical activity, determine online propaganda, and define the networks through which terrorists communicate. However, it raises significant issues about how it has to be used ethically, whether the repressive powers may use it to perpetrate atrocities and possible abuse of International Humanitarian Law (IHL). Sovereign weapons, fake news videos and unending surveillance reveal the civil rights and can place a diversity of people in an emotional state. Besides, it is harder to identify the perpetrator because of AI, and may than lead to individuals moving in a way that contradicts fundamental tenets of IHL, such as the distinction, proportions and necessity principle.

The politics of the United States, Russia and China in this world war are all variant and they all have their advantages and disadvantages. The United States has been exerting relationships with the consideration of religious freedom by the soft power approach, which guarantees the achievement of mental health and the application of AI in a thoughtful way to curb terrorism. But its activities in other nations do not necessarily convey adequate psychological support and cultural acumen. The Russian state is repressive and highly interventionist to keep the status quo that constantly reacts to any form of defiance and takes any action against religions. Although this would be successful in the short term to dissolve extremist groups, it can also lead to additional frustration and will cause people to be even more distanced to the community. The programs in Xinjiang, China have an underdeveloped level of surveillance and targeted to shift the thinking pattern of people to be consistent by artificial intelligence. Since it results in the eradication of the extremist, it can cause psychological trauma and risky confrontations between the religious rights and laws protecting human rights and the international law of humanitarian.

Recommendations

The recent intersection of psychology with religion, as well as artificial intelligence, in modern

terrorism, involves a multifaceted response to the entire world. There has been a growth in the concern about the equilibrium of technological innovation and ethical responsibility and compliance to the International humanitarian Law (IHL) with the employment of AI by the United States, China and Russia. Terrorism intervention should also not be limited to military interventions and psychological as well as theological interventions must also be incorporated to prevent radicalization. US needs to set up culturally sensitive psychological care using trust-building outreachs in an effort of ensuring counterterrorism becomes more effective. Though, however, Russia must resort to the power of coercion in order to introduce religion, it should contemplate the integration of mental health and counseling into the system and China should restructure local counterterrorism and de-radicalization systems in line with the religious preference and embracing international responsibility policies.

These powers need to work together internationally in the responsible AI governance and share information on extremist threats. Counterterrorism must address more basic societal and psychological crises, caused by distortion of ideologies and abuse of technology. Sustainable practices should be on mental health, religious education, and ethical implementation of technology. The compassion will allow the countries to decrease the levels of radicalization, please the society with the holistic approaches and strictly adhere to the IHL, which will help to increase the effectiveness of the counterterrorism practices, keeping it lawful and safer and more humane beyond the field.

References

Acquaviva, G. (2023). Crimes without humanity. *Journal of International Criminal Justice.*

Amnesty International. (2020). *Unaccountable strikes: The impact of AI misidentification on civilian casualties.*

Allen, G., & Chan, T. (2017). *Artificial intelligence and national security*. Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, Harvard Kennedy School.

Asaro, P. (2012). On banning autonomous weapon systems: Human rights, automation, and the dehumanization of lethal decision-making. *International Review of the Red Cross, 94*(886), 687–709.

Azam, A. (2021). Role of artificial intelligence in defence strategy: Implications for global and national security. *Strategic Studies.* https://doi.org/10.53532/ss.041.01.0058

Binnendijk, A., & Kugler, R. L. (2020). *The impact of artificial intelligence on strategic stability and nuclear risk: Euro-Atlantic perspectives*. RAND Corporation.

Boulanin, V., & Verbruggen, M. (2017). *Mapping the development of autonomy in weapon systems*. Stockholm International Peace Research Institute.

Bradshaw, S., & Howard, P. N. (2019). *The global disinformation order: 2019 global inventory of organised social media manipulation*. Oxford Internet Institute.

Cummings, M. L. (2020). Optimizing military logistics via predictive analytics. *Journal of Military Operations Research, 12*(3), 89–104.

Cummings, M. L. (2020). *Artificial intelligence and the future of warfare*. Chatham House.

Defense & Security Analysis. (2019). [Article title missing — please add it.] *Defense & Security Analysis, 35*, 147–169. https://doi.org/10.1080/14751798.2019.1600800

Ekelhof, M. A. C. (2019). The gaps in accountability of autonomous weapon systems under international humanitarian law. *Journal of International Humanitarian Legal Studies, 10*(1), 89–119.

Fedchuk, T. (2024). Control of compliance with norms of international humanitarian law when using weapons controlled by artificial intelligence. *Analytical and Comparative Jurisprudence.* https://doi.org/10.24144/2788-6018.2024.02.129

Forbes. (2024). *China's AI ambitions: A global tech race.* Retrieved May 2025.

Future of Life Institute. (2023). *Autonomous weapons: An open letter from AI & robotics researchers.*

Geist, E. (2016). The role of AI in deterrence enhancement. *Defense Analysis*, *22*(4), 78–95.

Geist, E. (2016). It's already too late to stop the AI arms race—We must manage it instead. *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists.*

Gilli, A., & Gilli, M. (2019). Why China has not caught up yet: Military-technological superiority and the limits of imitation, reverse engineering, and cyber espionage. *International Security, 43*(3), 141–189.

Hallaq, B., Sõmer, T., Osula, A., Ngo, K., & Mitchener-Nissen, T. (2017). *Artificial intelligence within the military domain and cyber warfare.* [Publisher info missing.]

Horowitz, M. (2018). The diffusion of military AI: Implications for global warfare. *Journal of Strategic Studies, 41*(2), 201–222.

IDST. (2024). *Russia's military AI: From autonomous tanks to AI command systems.* Institute for Defence Studies and Technologies.

Jafariandehkordi, M. (2024). AI driven surveillance: Military and domestic applications in modern China. *Security and Technology Review, 16*(2), 123–139.

Johnson, J. (2019). *Artificial intelligence & future warfare: Implications for international security.* [Publisher info missing.]

Marsili, M. (2024). Lethal autonomous weapon systems: Ethical dilemmas and legal compliance in the era of military disruptive technologies. *International Journal of Robotics and Automation Technology*. https://doi.org/10.31875/2409-9694.2024.11.05

Naseeb, S. (2024). AI enabling threat detection and mission execution: A perspective on modern warfare. *International Journal of Defense Studies, 19*(1), 34–56.

Nayak, M. (2024). Who is accountable for AI in war? The problem of attribution in autonomous combat. *Journal of Conflict & Security Law.*

O'Neil, C. (2016). *Weapons of math destruction: How big data increases inequality and threatens democracy.* Crown Publishing Group.

Putro, Y., Tarigan, M., & Asyari, H. (2024). Artificial intelligence in Indo-Pacific. *Lentera Hukum.* https://doi.org/10.19184/ejlh.v10i3.43449

Roberts, A., & Venables, A. (2021). The role of artificial intelligence in kinetic targeting from the perspective of international humanitarian law. In *2021 13th International Conference on Cyber Conflict (CyCon)* (pp. 43–57). https://doi.org/10.23919/CyCon51939.2021.9468301

Roff, H. M. (2019). The strategic implications of military AI. *The Brookings Institution.*

Scharre, P. (2018). *Army of none: Autonomous weapons and the future of war.* W. W. Norton & Company.

Say, D., Qaisar, S. M., Krichen, M., & Zidi, S. (2025). Artificial intelligence assisted non-destructive testing of welding joints: A review of techniques, X-ray image processing and applications. *Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence, 160*, 111792.

Schuller, A. (2017). At the crossroads of control: The intersection of artificial intelligence in autonomous weapon systems with international humanitarian law. [Publisher or journal info missing.]

Sharkey, N. (2019). The impact of autonomous weapons systems on international security and arms control. *IEEE Technology and Society Magazine, 38*(4), 68–74.

Siregar, N., Aini, D., Rehulina, R., Subandi, A., & Mirza, I. (2024). The use of artificial intelligence in armed conflict under international law. *Hasanuddin Law Review.* https://doi.org/10.20956/halrev.v10i2.5267

Sparrow, R. (2015). Robots and respect: Assessing the case against autonomous weapon systems. *Ethics & International Affairs, 30*(1), 93–116.

Taddeo, M., & Floridi, L. (2018). How AI can be a force for good. *Science, 361*(6404), 751–752.

Time. (2023). *How China uses AI for public opinion manipulation.* Time Magazine. Retrieved May 2025.

U.S. Department of Defense. (2023). *Annual report on AI and autonomy programs.* Retrieved from www.defense.gov

United Nations. (2023). *Autonomous weapons must be subject to international humanitarian law, say UN experts.* UN News.

Reaim 2023. (2023). *Responsible AI in the military domain.* Retrieved May 2025.

Wired. (2024). *The Pentagon's 'Third Offset' strategy and AI.* Wired Magazine. Retrieved May 2025.