Interdisciplinary Studies in Society, Law, and Politics 2025; 4(3): 325-9

ISSLP
Interdisciplinary Studies in Society, Law and Politics

Original Research

The Use of Artificial Intelligence in Military Weapons: From the Perspective of Humanitarian Law Principles and Islamic Jurisprudence

Ramin. Faghani[1*], Fatimeh Sadat. Ghoreshi Mohammadi[2]

[1] Assistant Professor, Department of Fiqh and Fundamentals of Islamic Law, Payame Noor University, Tehran, Iran
[2] Assistant Professor, Department of Law, Payame Noor University, Tehran, Iran

*** Corresponding author email address**: ramin.faghani@pnu.ac.ir

Received: 2024-12-07 **Revised:** 2025-02-06 **Accepted:** 2025-02-25 **Published:** 2025-07-01

With the imminent use of artificial intelligence (AI) in weaponry, the human element is being removed from the decision-making loop in attacks conducted by such systems. These systems will soon be capable of independently deciding whether to attack specific targets, replacing human combatants in armed conflicts. This development has raised significant concerns regarding adherence to the principles of humanitarian law in warfare. Accordingly, this study aims to examine the use of AI in military weaponry and the principles of humanitarian law from the perspective of Islamic jurisprudence and international law. The research adopts a descriptive-analytical approach and utilizes a library-based methodology to address the stated question. The findings indicate that the application of AI in military weapons has fundamentally altered the nature of warfare. Given that AI-based military weapons lack human emotions and perceptions, they will undoubtedly create significant challenges in the realm of humanitarian law. Specifically, AI-based military weapons may lead to violations of fundamental principles of humanitarian law, such as the principle of distinction between combatants and non-combatants, the prohibition of unnecessary suffering, the principle of necessity, and the principle of proportionality. The prohibition or regulation of novel means and methods of warfare through multilateral disarmament and arms control treaties could potentially address concerns related to the use of such advanced tools and techniques in warfare.

Keywords: *artificial intelligence, autonomous weapons, Convention on Conventional Weapons, humanitarian law.*

How to cite this article:

Faghani, R., & Ghoreshi Mohammadi, F. S. (2025). The Use of Artificial Intelligence in Military Weapons: From the Perspective of Humanitarian Law Principles and Islamic Jurisprudence. *Interdisciplinary Studies in Society, Law, and Politics, 4*(3), 1-9. https://doi.org/10.61838/kman.isslp.4.3.25

1. Introduction

Artificial intelligence (AI) can be utilized in developing automated military systems, including unmanned aerial vehicles (drones) and ground vehicles. These systems, leveraging AI technology, can perform intelligence, surveillance, and operational missions without the direct presence of military personnel, reducing casualties and threats to soldiers while enhancing tactical capabilities on the battlefield. AI can also improve logistics and supply chain management in military operations, significantly contributing to the success of such missions.

However, the development of autonomous weapon systems capable of independent lethal decision-making introduces complex legal issues and raises concerns about accountability for their decisions. Deploying AI-based military systems that are fully autonomous creates

a serious challenge regarding human control over these technologies' actions on the battlefield. This issue potentially results in problems such as civilian casualties and machine cognitive errors.

Integrating AI into military domains offers numerous opportunities to enhance efficiency, decision-making, and human life preservation. However, it also poses substantial risks and challenges that require meticulous scrutiny and regulatory frameworks. One of the primary challenges associated with using AI-based military weapons is the violation of humanitarian law principles by such weapons.

The central question of this article is: How do humanitarian law principles apply to the use of AI in military weapons, and what are the perspectives of Islamic jurisprudence and international law in this regard? This question is significant because principles such as the distinction between combatants and non-combatants may not be practically enforceable by AI-based weapons. To address this question, the article first examines the concept of AI-based military weapons and humanitarian law, followed by an analysis of AI-based military weapons through the lens of Islamic jurisprudence and the principles of international humanitarian law.

2. The Concept of Artificial Intelligence and AI-Based Weapons

2.1. Artificial Intelligence

Artificial intelligence is a field of computer science focused on developing advanced systems capable of performing tasks typically requiring human intelligence. These systems specialize in activities such as learning, reasoning, decision-making, and data processing. AI is employed to improve efficiency and automation across various industries, from healthcare to energy (Matti et al., 2017).

AI encompasses a broad range of techniques, models, and algorithms that enable computer systems to perform tasks seemingly requiring human intelligence. AI is an interdisciplinary field of computer science, with the primary goal of developing machines capable of simulating human thought and behavior. Such machines can execute tasks demanding human-like intelligence (Ghaemi Nia, 2006).

AI is commonly categorized into two types: strong AI and weak AI. Strong AI posits that computers can be designed to think at least at a human level and replicate human capabilities. In this framework, computers are not merely tools for studying the mind but are equivalent to minds themselves, capable of genuine understanding and cognitive states if appropriately programmed (Russell & Norvig, 2003).

2.2. AI-Based Weapons

As a dual capability of human comprehension and programming languages, AI aids analysts in processing vast amounts of information in shorter timeframes. Military units can develop AI-driven systems akin to ChatGPT, integrated into joint combat platforms, to plan missions, identify targets, and engage them (Moshbeki, 2000). AI applications range from soldier robots to amphibious vehicles, representing concerning trends in military AI usage.

AI simplifies maneuvering in battlefields and can save lives in hazardous situations. Furthermore, supplying robotic allies to combat forces enhances military performance. After gunpowder and nuclear weapons, "lethal autonomous weapon systems" (LAWS), also referred to as killer robots or robotic weapons, could signify a third revolution in military technologies (Al-Zuhaili, 1991).

What sets AI apart in warfare is its speed in analysis and its learning capability. Military industries increasingly favor the development of fully autonomous weapons capable of identifying targets, firing at them, navigating terrain, and determining optimal positioning to avoid danger (Azizi Basati & Sokouti, 2013).

Recent advancements in AI enable the creation of mobile combat systems, such as unmanned aerial vehicles designed to operate alongside piloted fighter jets, destroying air and ground targets upon command. For instance, the next-generation Russian T-14 tank's fire control system autonomously identifies and bombards targets until their complete destruction (Treder, 2014).

"Lethal autonomous weapons operate based on AI, which provides these weapons with the ability to process information for targeting and firing. AI in weaponry is divided into two areas: execution-level AI, related to data processing, widely employed in modern weapons; and decision-making AI, concerning situational assessment and target engagement. This new capability raises

critical challenges for protecting civilian populations and adhering to international human rights and humanitarian law" (Schmitt, 2013).

Autonomous weapons and robots are increasing both in number and application domains. Militarized AI has become a new reality of warfare, reducing human involvement in immediate decision-making regarding the use of force in armed conflicts. Autonomous AI-based weapons are increasingly used in contemporary conflicts, indicating the potential growth of AI integration into future weapon systems, particularly autonomous weapons that can independently identify, select, and engage targets without meaningful human oversight.

Previously, the threats posed by weapons of mass destruction had identifiable sources and outcomes, with damage and mechanisms being relatively predictable. However, the scope of destruction and diversity of AI weapons remain uncertain, including the untraceability of their country of origin. Consequently, arms control agreements, international legal regimes, and diplomatic measures fail to maintain peace. Despite this, there is currently no global standard or legal framework regulating the use of AI-equipped combat systems in warfare. The Geneva Conventions do not specify which AI systems are permissible in war, nor are there international laws for holding individuals accountable for failures of autonomous systems.

3. Humanitarian Law

Humanitarian law is a branch of human rights law that is applied exclusively during international wars and internal armed conflicts. In other words, "humanitarian law refers to principles that limit the use of force and violence during wars, thereby protecting the lives of individuals who are not directly involved in the conflict or lack any military presence, including the wounded, the sick, shipwrecked individuals, prisoners, and civilians. Additionally, humanitarian law seeks to limit the impact of force in war and prevent acts of revenge or inhumane mistreatment that are not essential to military necessity" (Movahedi, 2007).

According to the United Nations, humanitarian law addresses methods of armed conflict while emphasizing human protection for civilians, wounded combatants, and prisoners of war. This framework relies heavily on the Geneva and Hague Conventions. It also strives to provide special support for humanitarian rights, exemplified by continuous Security Council resolutions advocating civilian protection. These measures include establishing international criminal tribunals to address crimes against civilians and children, as seen in Yugoslavia, Sierra Leone, Rwanda, and Cambodia. Various conventions recognize crimes against civilians as violations of humanitarian law and classify them as crimes against humanity, subject to investigation. War crimes and crimes against humanity are adjudicated in the International Criminal Court (ICC) to uphold humanitarian law and consistently condemn acts of genocide (Eithari Kasemi, 2009).

The principles of international humanitarian law, rooted in the concept of human dignity, include the principles of humane treatment and non-discrimination, military necessity, distinction, limitation, proportionality, and good faith (Ziaei Bigdeli, 2004). Contemporary international humanitarian law emerges from the integration of Hague Law and Geneva Law, encompassing the Hague Conventions, the four Geneva Conventions, and their two additional protocols (Ziaei Bigdeli & Hosseini, 2008).

4. Challenges of AI-Based Military Weapons from the Perspective of Islamic Jurisprudence and International Humanitarian Law Principles

From an Islamic viewpoint, humanitarian law encompasses all rights that an enemy possesses despite their adversarial status. This recognition provides legitimate protection for the adversary, aiming to safeguard human life, animals, property, and assets during war. In other words, humanitarian law constitutes the rights of the enemy, which must be applied and respected during conflict. Observing these rules during war is natural and necessary, as warfare should not be accompanied by barbarism.

The principles upheld in the four Geneva Conventions align with those recognized by the International Court of Justice when adopting the Genocide Convention. These principles reflect the fundamental values universally accepted by civilized nations, binding all states regardless of their treaty status. Observing these principles under all circumstances is essential.

The emergence of artificial intelligence (AI) in conflicts has disrupted many equations, making it crucial to address the introduction of AI into warfare. While the

primary purpose of such technologies is to reduce damage in conflicts, the legal implications are complex and challenging due to the reliance of AI on extensive data and intelligent systems (Alaie Fard et al., 2025).

This section examines AI-based military weapons from the perspective of Islamic jurisprudence and international humanitarian law principles, focusing on the principles of distinction, prohibition of unnecessary suffering, proportionality, and military necessity.

4.1. Failure to Observe the Principle of Distinction Between Combatants and Non-Combatants

The primary rule in any armed conflict is that parties must always distinguish between combatants and non-combatants. "According to the principle of distinction, there must be a clear differentiation between military and civilian targets. The Fourth Geneva Convention, which addresses the protection of civilians during wartime, explicitly distinguishes between civilians and combatants. Furthermore, Article 48 of Protocol I (1977) to the Geneva Conventions expands on this protection, stipulating that to ensure respect and protection for civilian populations and civilian property, parties to the conflict must always distinguish between civilians and combatants and between civilian and military targets, directing their operations solely against military objectives" (Doebbler, 2005).

Thus, the principle of distinction protects not only individuals (civilians) but also their property. Opponents of AI-based weapons argue that the burden of proving these weapons can adhere to the principle of distinction lies with technologists, who claim that machines can effectively perform these tasks. However, opponents assert that no evidence exists demonstrating that robots can make such distinctions (Giacca, 2015).

Critics contend that for a robot to observe the principle of distinction, it must be equipped with advanced capabilities such as image analysis, sensory data processing, and information integration. Additionally, situational awareness and object recognition are necessary. Even the most optimistic proponents of AI-based weapons acknowledge the technical challenges of meeting these requirements, and AI specialists have yet to provide convincing evidence that such systems can uphold the principle of distinction. This principle becomes even more complex when considering the direct participation of civilians in hostilities, making identification difficult.

In Islam, the principle of distinction is also recognized. "The principle requires separating combatants from non-combatants. Military operations should be directed only at military individuals and objectives, avoiding attacks on civilian individuals and property" (Momtaz & Ranjbarian, 2005; Tabatabai, 1991). The distinction between combatants and non-combatants is endorsed in Islamic teachings, supported by some of the Prophet Muhammad's commands during military expeditions, such as prohibiting the killing of women, children, the elderly, and fleeing individuals (Najafi, 1989).

While AI can facilitate faster military decision-making, it is prone to errors due to its inability to distinguish between combatants and non-combatants. This limitation suggests that AI may inherently fail to comply with international humanitarian law.

4.2. Non-Adherence to the Principle of Prohibition of Unnecessary Suffering by AI-Based Military Weapons

Another fundamental principle of humanitarian law is the prohibition of unnecessary suffering and indiscriminate attacks in armed conflicts. This principle emphasizes that no party in warfare should cause unnecessary suffering to combatants. Armies aim to neutralize and disarm the opposing armed forces, and inflicting unnecessary suffering goes beyond the legitimate military objectives that any army must pursue (Doebbler, 2005).

According to humanitarian law, the prohibition of unnecessary suffering is a fundamental principle and an "imperative norm" of customary international law. Given the importance of human protection, Article 23 of the Hague Regulations prohibits the use of weapons or projectiles that cause unnecessary suffering or additional harm. Article 35 of Protocol I to the 1949 Geneva Conventions, concerning the protection of victims of international armed conflicts, reaffirms this fundamental norm of international humanitarian law. It explicitly states that the parties to an armed conflict are not unlimited in their choice of methods or means of warfare and prohibits weapons, projectiles, materials, and methods of warfare that cause unnecessary suffering or excessive injury.

In Islam, the principle of prohibition of unnecessary suffering is also acknowledged. Before Islam, warfare was often cruel and brutal, as "each side in the conflict sought to dominate the other by any means, using all possible tools and methods of warfare. The goal was victory and the destruction of the enemy. However, Islam rejected this idea and established a humanitarian framework for the battlefield. According to one scholar, Islam introduced humanistic and spiritual elements into warfare, respecting the dignity and status of both combatants and non-combatants" (Aboul-Wafa, 2000).

One of the humanitarian and spiritual elements introduced by Islam is the principle of reason governing weapons, often referred to as the "principle of necessity." This principle asserts that if the necessity of war arises, such necessity must be constrained by limitations. Islamic humanitarian thought aims to mitigate the cruelty and brutality common in armed conflicts, ensuring that reason prevails over emotions and weaponry. Consequently, Muslim combatants are not free to use any weapon they choose and are prohibited from employing weapons such as toxic and chemical arms, which cause unnecessary pain and suffering.

Islamic jurisprudence also emphasizes the principle of limitation regarding military weapons. Prominent Islamic jurists explicitly forbid the use of poison in warfare. Additionally, some scholars have prohibited or considered unfavorable practices such as setting fires, creating floods, or inundating enemy territories in ways that destroy their lands (Amid Zanjani, 2004; Jafari, 2012, 2017; Khomeini, 2008).

By design, machines eliminate the human element, placing them in an entirely distinct category. Observing the principle of limitation is a significant challenge for AI-based military weapons.

4.3. *Non-Adherence to the Principle of Limitation by AI-Based Military Weapons*

All foreseeable precautions must be taken to avoid and minimize incidental civilian casualties, harm to civilians, and damage to civilian property. This requirement was first emphasized in Article 2(3) of the 1907 Hague Convention, which states: "If, for any reason, immediate military action against maritime or military targets located in an undefended town or port becomes necessary, and no opportunity can be given to the enemy, the naval commander must take all necessary measures to minimize damage to the town. The purpose of humanitarian law is to alleviate human suffering during war" (Amir-Arjmand, 1999).

"Humanitarian law seeks to limit the effects of war and, for humanitarian reasons, restricts the parties to a conflict in their choice and use of methods and means of warfare, protects civilians, upholds the dignity of humanity, and prosecutes and punishes war criminals" (Abbasi, 2010). The principle of limitation prohibits the use of weapons that cause disproportionate injuries to the enemy unless justified by military necessity (Sharifi-Tarazkouhi, 1996).

Islam also upholds the principle of limitation. Verse 190 of Surah Al-Baqarah states: "Fight in the cause of Allah those who fight you, but do not transgress limits; for Allah does not love transgressors." Similarly, verse 8 of Surah Al-Ma'idah commands: "Let not the hatred of others make you swerve to wrong and depart from justice. Be just; that is nearer to piety. And fear Allah, for Allah is well-acquainted with all that you do."

From these verses, it is evident that Islam prohibits excess and aggression in war. The primary goal of warfare in Islam is to overcome the enemy, not to destroy them or devastate their land. Accordingly, when the aim is not to annihilate the enemy, there is even less justification for torture or undue suffering. Therefore, Islam commands restraint in warfare, ensuring that actions do not exceed ethical and humanitarian boundaries.

Islamic rules governing warfare emphasize forgiveness, compassion, and empathy, as the faith consistently encourages adherence to moral and ethical principles. Examples of prohibited transgressions mentioned in Islamic traditions and interpretations include: killing women and children, killing those unfit for combat (such as the elderly), targeting unarmed individuals or those not involved in the war, expanding the war beyond the battlefield (e.g., destroying civilian property, animals, or plants unrelated to the conflict), mutilating the dead, and killing wounded individuals (Hurr Amili, 1991; Majlisi, 1983).

The principle of prohibition of unnecessary suffering is fundamental to humanitarian law. However, it is unrealistic to expect AI-based military weapons to have a proper understanding of or adherence to this principle.

4.4. *Non-Adherence to the Principle of Proportionality by AI-Based Military Weapons*

One of the humanitarian principles in Islamic warfare is the observance of proportionality. Proportionality means that the harm and damage caused by an attack on military targets must not outweigh the direct and concrete military advantage expected from the attack. Historically, achieving victory over the enemy by any means has been an accepted strategy in warfare. However, the principle of proportionality dictates that parties to a conflict must conduct military operations in such a way that incidental harm is not excessive compared to the anticipated military advantage (Jafari, 2012, 2017).

This principle emphasizes that defensive attacks by Muslims should not cause widespread destruction, civilian casualties, or the devastation of civilian property. The aim of conflict is to break the enemy's resistance, with the enemy as the primary instrument of that resistance. Accordingly, during operations and attacks on military targets, civilians and civilian properties must be protected from harm.

In a time when indiscriminate killing without regard for combatant or non-combatant status—thus violating proportionality—was commonplace, Islam explicitly prohibited its followers from such actions. For example, whenever the Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) dispatched a group or army on a mission, he instructed: "Fight in the cause of Allah against the disbelievers, but do not kill children, the elderly, or women" (Hurr Amili, 1991). Similarly, during one battle, when a woman was found dead, the Prophet reprimanded his companions, stating: "That woman was not engaged in combat" (Al-Zuhaili, 1991).

This principle was also evident during the conquest of Mecca, when the Muslim army entered the city without harming civilian targets. No one attacked the elderly, women, children, crops, property, or livestock.

Machines struggle to reliably assess context and evaluate the broader situation, making it difficult for AI-based weapons to adhere to the principle of proportionality on the battlefield. Consequently, these weapons often fail to respect this principle.

Proportionality does not imply achieving a precise numerical balance but depends on the military significance of the target. The military advantage of a target depends on various factors such as its rank, operational function, and tactical position. For instance, military leaders and technical specialists are high-value targets while actively engaged in conflict. However, their importance diminishes once they are removed from their position. There is no universal set of objective criteria to determine the desired outcome in all situations. Each operation requires a separate assessment to evaluate proportionality.

4.5. *Non-Adherence to the Principle of Military Necessity by AI-Based Military Weapons*

Under the principle of military necessity, only actions necessary to achieve victory are permissible. Accordingly, there must be proportionality between the actions taken and the harm or damage caused. The incidental harm caused by an attack must not exceed the direct and concrete military advantage expected from it. Article 5(b) of the 1977 Additional Protocol to the Geneva Conventions prohibits the unnecessary destruction of property, even in cases of military necessity. This principle imposes restrictions on belligerent forces, stating that states may not use force in armed conflicts beyond what is necessary (Additional Protocol I, Article 5).

In Islamic humanitarian law, the principle of military necessity is fundamental in military activities. This means that every military action must be justified by sufficient evidence and reasoning. Activities lacking such justification are prohibited. The legitimacy of war and jihad cannot justify disregarding the dignity and basic rights of enemy combatants and civilians. Islamic values emphasize respect for human dignity and impose additional obligations on Islamic armies. Military necessity in all wars must conform to human and religious values and cannot be justified solely by military advantage.

For this reason, the Prophet Muhammad instructed Muslim fighters: "Do not kill the elderly, women, children, passersby, or monks living in caves and hermitages" (Majlisi, 1983). Similarly, Islamic scholars such as Sahib Jawahir have emphasized that civilians and non-combatant populations must be protected from the dangers of general hostilities and military operations.

Machines cannot independently determine what constitutes necessity because such evaluations often involve political judgments that go beyond battlefield circumstances. Consequently, AI-based military

weapons inherently lack the capacity to adhere to the principle of military necessity.

5. Discussion

AI-based autonomous weapons face significant challenges in adhering to the key principles of international humanitarian law. The use of automated weapons systems powered by AI is a topic of frequent debate and contention due to their potentially destructive capabilities. An example of potentially unlawful use of such systems could involve an attack causing unnecessary pain and suffering to combatants or civilians.

Like other emerging technologies, AI is a double-edged sword. With the broader military application of AI, new issues have emerged, intensifying global concerns. For example, in military contexts, AI's potential spans all domains—land, sea, air, space, and information—and all levels of warfare, including political, strategic, operational, and tactical. One challenge at the political and strategic levels is that AI might destabilize opponents by generating and spreading vast amounts of fake information. Since many AI-equipped systems require not only high efficiency but also transparency, safety, and user trust or understanding, they appear inherently vulnerable (Hakimzadeh Khoyee & Drougari, 2023).

Key challenges in deploying autonomous weapons include:

1. **Distinction:** Machines may not be capable of reliably distinguishing combatants from civilians in all circumstances.
2. **Proportionality:** Machines struggle to assess context with reasonable confidence to evaluate the overall situation accurately.
3. **Necessity:** Machines cannot independently determine what is necessary, as such evaluations often involve political judgments far beyond the battlefield.
4. **Precaution:** Machines must be programmed for real-life decision-making scenarios, but there is no certainty that this is achievable.

In addition to humanitarian law, international human rights law plays a critical role in the discussion of autonomous weapons. This became particularly prominent following a Human Rights Council meeting in 2013, primarily because of the centrality of the right to life among fundamental human rights. Machines, devices, computers, and robots are not moral agents and lack intrinsic human qualities such as compassion, empathy, or intuition. No algorithm alone should decide matters of life and death (Bhuta, 2016).

A pressing risk is that unless satisfactorily regulated, fully autonomous weapons will sooner or later be developed and become increasingly sophisticated. Smart weapons equipped with advanced AI, designed to follow precise programming, could become problematic due to a lack of flexibility or human judgment when facing changing conditions. For instance, if a commander needs to halt an attack for any reason, how can the operator recall the weapons? The speed of AI-based weapons could lead to unintended escalations or conflicts, while computational errors might produce unpredictable outcomes. Predicting the actions or decisions of self-learning AI programs is particularly challenging.

In the medium term, a dangerous arms race among military powers may arise, potentially leading to the unparalleled proliferation of autonomous weapons. In the worst-case scenario, non-state actors, terrorists, or extremist groups targeting minorities (ethnic, religious, or otherwise) could access these technologies and use them for malicious purposes. The most compelling long-term risk involves the potential loss of human control over the use of force in extreme situations. Even if robots could theoretically be more accurate and save civilian lives, delegating the moral burden of war to machines would lead to a profound withdrawal of human responsibility, rendering the process "fundamentally inhuman" (Scharre, 2018).

Often, the ethical issue of killing itself raises questions about the horrors of war, increases its political cost, and acts as a constraint on excesses and suffering, which international humanitarian law seeks to prevent (Eslami & Ansari, 2017).

Given these considerations, it can be concluded that AI-based military weapons face significant gaps when confronted with current humanitarian law. While proponents argue for their compatibility with existing legal frameworks, these arguments fail to address the critical and specific challenges in this domain. In other words, if states intend to use AI-based military weapons, they must either create a new framework of laws governing warfare or ensure that all existing humanitarian law principles are strictly adhered to

during the design of autonomous robots. However, fully autonomous AI-based military robots would inherently challenge these principles.

6. Conclusion

This article addressed the legal status of AI-based military weapons in light of Islamic jurisprudence and international humanitarian law. The findings indicate that such weapons are permissible only if they adhere to the principles of distinction between combatants and non-combatants, proportionality, prohibition of unnecessary suffering, military necessity, and environmental preservation. However, the main challenge lies in the lack of clear criteria for applying these principles to AI-based military weapons.

Research on the compatibility of autonomous weapons with humanitarian law suggests that proponents of these technologies claim that machines can eventually become intelligent enough to distinguish themselves from humans and adhere to humanitarian principles. In contrast, opponents argue that these weapons will never achieve the necessary capacity to make such distinctions in the chaos of warfare or demonstrate appropriate empathy when required.

While there is no doubt about the applicability of humanitarian law to new weapons technologies under Article 36 of Additional Protocol I to the Geneva Conventions, which mandates states to ensure compliance with international law, ambiguity persists regarding whether new autonomous weapons, drones (remotely piloted weapon systems), and other modern armaments comply with humanitarian principles.

When the use of new weapon systems cannot be properly prohibited or regulated in armed conflicts, it inevitably leads to violations of humanitarian law. As military AI technologies advance, with potential to breach humanitarian principles, states bear the responsibility to ensure compliance with these principles under Common Article 1 of the 1949 Geneva Conventions. At the national level, executive, legislative, and judicial authorities, along with relevant military and humanitarian organizations, must leverage appropriate mechanisms under international human rights law to ensure adherence to these obligations.

AI-based weapons, lacking emotions such as fear, revenge, or personal gain, can perform heavy and sensitive tasks that humans may struggle with. However, entrusting machines with decisions about life and death diminishes the value of human life. Furthermore, like any technology, AI-based weapons could be misused or suffer from malfunctions. While they pose minimal risks to the user, they create greater risks for enemy combatants and civilians, leading to asymmetric and unjust warfare. Delegating decisions about human life and death to machines is a profound ethical challenge. Therefore, the ethical examination of AI-based weapons could form a separate discussion, which was beyond the scope of this article.

Authors' Contributions

Authors contributed equally to this article.

Declaration

In order to correct and improve the academic writing of our paper, we have used the language model ChatGPT.

Transparency Statement

Data are available for research purposes upon reasonable request to the corresponding author.

Acknowledgments

We would like to express our gratitude to all individuals helped us to do the project.

Declaration of Interest

The authors report no conflict of interest.

Funding

According to the authors, this article has no financial support.

Ethical Considerations

In this research, ethical standards including obtaining informed consent, ensuring privacy and confidentiality were observed.

References

Abbasi, M. (2010). Humanitarian Law. *Research Security Quarterly*, *3*(29), 13-23.

Aboul-Wafa, A. (2000). *The Declaration of Rules of International Law and International Relations in Islamic Sharia* (Vol. 10). Dar Al-Nahda Al-Arabiya.

Al-Zuhaili, W. (1991). *Islamic Jurisprudence and Its Evidence* (Vol. 8). Dar Al-Fikr.

Alaie Fard, S., Ansari Mehiyari, A., & Raei Dehghi, M. (2025). The Principle of Proportionality in Light of Artificial Intelligence in Armed Conflicts. *Journal of Legal Studies on Cyberspace*(9), 35-44.

Amid Zanjani, A. (2004). *Political Jurisprudence* (Vol. 5). Amir Kabir Publishing.

Amir-Arjmand, A. (1999). Teaching Human Rights. *Legal Research Journal*, *1*(25-26), 29-35.

Azizi Basati, M., & Sokouti, M. (2013). Examining the Impact of Automated Weapons on International Peace and Security. *Foreign Policy Quarterly*, *29*(7), 35-56.

Bhuta, N. (2016). *Autonomous Weapons Systems Law Ethics Policy*. Cambridge University Press.

Doebbler, C. F. J. (2005). *Introduction To International Humanitarian Law*. CD publishing.

Eithari Kasemi, A. (2009). *The United Nations: Public Information Department (The UN in Today's World)*. Abaroun Publications.

Eslami, R., & Ansari, N. (2017). The Use of Military Robots in Warfare in Light of Humanitarian Law Principles. *International Law Journal*, *34*(56), 141-164.

Ghaemi Nia, A. (2006). Religion and Artificial Intelligence. *Journal of Mind*, *7*(25), 23-36.

Giacca, A. L. (2015). *Robot-Wars: the Regulation of Robotic Weapons*. Oxford Martin School at the University of Oxford.

Hakimzadeh Khoyee, P., & Drougari, R. (2023). The Role of Artificial Intelligence in Armed Conflicts and Its Legal Implications. Conference on the Impact of Science and New Technologies on International Peace and Security (Iranian Association for UN Studies),

Hurr Amili, M. b. H. (1991). *Wasa'il al-Shi'a ila Tahsil Masa'il al-Shari'a*. Dar Ihya al-Turath al-Arabi.

Jafari, S. A. (2012). *Analysis of Prohibited Tools and Methods in War from the Perspective of Islam and International Humanitarian Law*. Center for Political and International Studies.

Jafari, S. A. (2017). Principles of International Humanitarian Law from the Perspective of Imam Khomeini. *Journal of Public Law Studies*, *74*(2), 754-799.

Khomeini, R. (2008). *Sahifeh of Imam Khomeini*. Institute for Compilation and Publication of Imam Khomeini's Works.

Majlisi, M. B. (1983). *Bihar al-Anwar*. Al-Wafa Institute.

Matti, D., Ekenel, H. K., & Thiran, J. P. (2017). Combining LiDAR space clustering and convolutional neural networks for pedestrian detection. 14th IEEE International Conference on Advanced Video and Signal Based Surveillance (AVSS),

Momtaz, J., & Ranjbarian, A. (2005). *International Humanitarian Law (Internal Armed Conflicts)*. Mizan Publications.

Moshbeki, A. A. (2000). Introduction to Artificial Intelligence and Its Applications in Industries. *Management Development Journal*, *5*(13), 30-35.

Movahedi, H. (2007). Establishment of the Islamic Humanitarian Law Committee. *Internal Journal of the Bar Association*, *3*(5), 193-208.

Najafi, M. H. (1989). *Jawahir al-Kalam fi Sharh Shara'i al-Islam*. Dar Ihya al-Turath al-Arabi.

Russell, S., & Norvig, P. (2003). *Artificial Intelligence: A Modern Approach*. Publisher Upper Saddle River.

Scharre, P. (2018). *Army Of None Autonomous Weapons And The Future Of War*. Norton.

Schmitt, M. N. (2013). *Autonomous Weapons Systems and International Humanitarian Law: A Reply to the Critics*. Harvard University Press. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2184826

Sharifi-Tarazkouhi, H. (1996). *The Law of War*. Imam Hossein University Press.

Tabatabai, S. M. H. (1991). *Tafsir al-Mizan* (Vol. 2). Islamic Publishing Institute.

Treder, M. (2014). Robotic War Appears Inevitable. http://ieet.org/index.php/IEET/more/treder20090327

Ziaei Bigdeli, M. R. (2004). An Overview of International Responsibility for Violations of Human Rights and Humanitarian Law. *Journal of Legal and Political Research*, *3*(13), 18-23.

Ziaei Bigdeli, M. R., & Hosseini, S. A. (2008). Afghanistan's Responsibility for Actions by Jihadi Forces and the Taliban. *Journal of Law and Politics*, *10*(25), 77-85.