The Infinite
An International Peer Reviewed / Refereed Journal of Multidisciplinary Research

An Online Peer Reviewed / Refereed Journal
Volume 3 | Issue 1 | January 2026
ISSN: 3048-9539 (Online)
Website: www.theinfinite.co.in

Autonomous Weapons Systems and International Humanitarian Law: Legal Accountability Challenges from an Asia-Pacific Perspective

Dr. Santosh Kumar

B.Sc. (Maths), LL.M., NET, JRF, SRF, Ph.D. (Law)

ARTICLE DETAILS

Research Paper

Keywords :

International Humanitarian Law, Autonomous Weapons, Accountability, Asia-Pacific, Armed Conflict

ABSTRACT

The increasing deployment of Autonomous Weapons Systems (AWS) has raised complex legal and ethical concerns under International Humanitarian Law (IHL). This article examines whether existing IHL principles—particularly distinction, proportionality, and accountability— are adequate to regulate AWS, with specific reference to the Asia-Pacific security context. It analyses regional military practices, emerging state positions, and accountability gaps arising from algorithmic decision-making in armed conflict. The study argues that while existing IHL norms remain relevant, their effective application requires contextual reinterpretation and region-specific regulatory cooperation.

DOI- https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18185928

1. Introduction

The rapid advancement of military technology has fundamentally altered the nature of armed conflict in the twenty-first century. Among the most controversial developments is the emergence of Autonomous Weapons Systems (AWS)—weapons capable of selecting and engaging targets without direct human intervention. While technological innovation has historically influenced warfare, the deployment of autonomous decision-making in lethal force introduces unprecedented legal, ethical, and humanitarian challenges. These challenges strike at the very foundations of International Humanitarian Law (IHL), which is designed to regulate conduct during armed conflict and ensure protection for civilians and combatants hors de combat.

International Humanitarian Law rests on the assumption that human judgment governs the use of force. Concepts such as intent, responsibility, and proportionality presuppose a human decision-maker capable of moral reasoning and legal accountability. Autonomous weapons disrupt this assumption by delegating critical life-and-death decisions to algorithms. This shift raises a central question: Can existing IHL frameworks adequately regulate weapons systems that operate without meaningful human control?

The Asia-Pacific region provides a particularly significant context for examining this question. The region is marked by strategic rivalries, territorial disputes, rapid military modernisation, and increasing investment in artificial intelligence-driven defence technologies. States in the region are simultaneously parties to key IHL treaties and active participants in developing emerging military technologies. This duality makes the Asia-Pacific an essential laboratory for assessing how IHL principles function—or falter—when applied to autonomous warfare.

This article critically examines the compatibility of Autonomous Weapons Systems with International Humanitarian Law, focusing on the issue of legal accountability from an Asia-Pacific perspective. It argues that while existing IHL principles remain normatively valid, their practical enforcement faces serious challenges due to the diffusion of responsibility across programmers, commanders, manufacturers, and states.

2. Research Problem and Rationale

The central research problem addressed in this article is the accountability deficit created by the use of Autonomous Weapons Systems in armed conflict. Traditional IHL frameworks allocate responsibility based on identifiable human actors—military commanders, combatants, and state authorities. Autonomous systems, however, operate through complex layers of software, machine learning, and operational autonomy, making it difficult to trace responsibility for unlawful harm.

This accountability gap is not merely theoretical. It has direct implications for civilian protection, compliance with the laws of war, and the enforcement of international legal obligations. Without clear accountability mechanisms, violations of IHL risk going unpunished, thereby weakening the deterrent effect of humanitarian norms.

The Asia-Pacific region intensifies these concerns. Several states in the region are investing heavily in AI-enabled military systems while simultaneously facing unresolved armed conflicts, internal security operations, and maritime tensions. The absence of a unified regional regulatory approach further

complicates the application of IHL norms. Consequently, examining AWS through an Asia-Pacific lens is both timely and necessary.

3. Objectives of the Study

This study pursues the following objectives:

To analyse the concept and operational features of Autonomous Weapons Systems in contemporary armed conflict.

To examine the applicability of core principles of International Humanitarian Law—particularly distinction, proportionality, and accountability—to AWS.

To identify legal and structural gaps in attributing responsibility for IHL violations involving autonomous weapons.

To assess Asia-Pacific state practices and regional security dynamics relevant to the deployment of AWS.

To propose normative and policy-oriented recommendations for strengthening accountability mechanisms under IHL.

4. Research Questions

The article is guided by the following research questions:

Do existing IHL principles adequately regulate the use of Autonomous Weapons Systems?

How does the delegation of decision-making to autonomous systems affect legal accountability in armed conflict?

What unique challenges does the Asia-Pacific region present in regulating AWS under IHL?

Can regional cooperation supplement global efforts to address accountability gaps in autonomous warfare?

5. Methodology

The study adopts a doctrinal and analytical methodology, relying on primary sources such as international treaties, customary international law, judicial decisions, and official state positions. Secondary sources include scholarly literature, policy reports, and expert commentaries on IHL and autonomous weapons.

In addition, the article incorporates a comparative regional analysis, examining Asia-Pacific state practices in relation to global debates on autonomous weapons. This approach enables a nuanced understanding of how regional security concerns intersect with international legal obligations.

6. Scope and Limitations

The article focuses exclusively on lethal autonomous weapons systems used in situations of armed conflict governed by International Humanitarian Law. It does not address autonomous systems used solely for defensive, logistical, or non-lethal purposes, except where relevant for contextual understanding.

While the study engages with ethical debates, its primary emphasis remains legal and doctrinal. Technical aspects of artificial intelligence are discussed only to the extent necessary to understand their implications for legal accountability.

7. Significance of the Study

This research contributes to the evolving discourse on autonomous weapons and International Humanitarian Law by foregrounding accountability as a central concern. By situating the analysis within the Asia-Pacific context, the article addresses a gap in existing scholarship, which often focuses predominantly on Euro-Atlantic perspectives.

The findings of this study are intended to assist scholars, policymakers, and humanitarian actors in developing legally sound and regionally sensitive approaches to regulating autonomous weapons under IHL.

8. Conceptual Foundations of Autonomous Weapons Systems

International Humanitarian Law analysis of Autonomous Weapons Systems (AWS) necessarily begins with conceptual clarity. Despite extensive international debate, there remains no universally accepted legal definition of AWS. This definitional uncertainty poses a significant obstacle to regulation, accountability, and treaty development. States, scholars, and international organisations often employ overlapping or inconsistent terminology, resulting in fragmented legal discourse.

At a general level, Autonomous Weapons Systems are understood as weapons that, once activated, are capable of selecting and engaging targets without further human intervention. The defining feature is not autonomy in movement or navigation, but autonomy in critical functions, particularly target selection and the application of lethal force. It is this delegation of decision-making authority that raises profound concerns under International Humanitarian Law.

9. Definitional Approaches under International Law

International discussions, especially within the framework of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW), have sought to articulate working definitions of AWS. These discussions commonly

describe AWS as systems that can independently identify, track, and attack targets based on pre-programmed algorithms or adaptive machine-learning processes.

From a legal standpoint, the absence of a binding definition does not imply regulatory vacuum. Existing IHL norms apply to all weapons, irrespective of their technological sophistication. However, definitional ambiguity complicates the assessment of compliance with principles such as distinction and proportionality, particularly where algorithmic decision-making replaces human judgment.

The legal relevance of AWS thus lies less in their nomenclature and more in their operational capabilities and the degree of autonomy exercised during hostilities.

10. Automation versus Autonomy: A Legal Distinction

A critical conceptual distinction must be drawn between automation and autonomy, as the two are often incorrectly treated as synonymous. Automated weapons operate according to pre-defined rules and predictable responses to specific inputs. Their behaviour remains foreseeable and traceable to human programmers and operators.

Autonomous systems, by contrast, possess the capacity to adapt their behaviour based on environmental inputs, probabilistic assessments, or learned patterns. Many contemporary AWS rely on artificial intelligence techniques such as machine learning, sensor fusion, and real-time data processing. These features introduce an element of unpredictability that challenges traditional legal assumptions regarding foreseeability and control.

From an IHL perspective, the transition from automation to autonomy marks a qualitative shift. The more a system is capable of independent decision-making, the weaker the causal link between human intent and the resulting harm.

11. Artificial Intelligence and Decision-Making in Warfare

Artificial intelligence plays a central role in enabling autonomy in modern weapons systems. AI-driven targeting systems can process vast quantities of data at speeds far exceeding human cognitive capacity. While this may enhance military efficiency, it also raises serious concerns regarding legal compliance.

IHL presupposes that decisions concerning the use of force are made by actors capable of contextual judgment, moral reasoning, and legal accountability. AI systems, however sophisticated, lack consciousness, moral agency, and legal personality. Their decision-making is shaped by training data, algorithmic design, and operational parameters, none of which guarantee compliance with humanitarian norms in complex and dynamic combat environments.

This disconnect between technological capability and legal responsibility lies at the heart of the AWS accountability debate.

12. Models of Human Control over Autonomous Weapons

To address varying degrees of autonomy, scholarly and policy discourse commonly categorises weapons systems according to the extent of human involvement in their operation.

12.1 Human-in-the-Loop Systems

In human-in-the-loop systems, a human operator must authorise each target engagement. Although AI may assist in target identification, the final decision to use lethal force remains with a human actor. This model aligns most closely with existing IHL frameworks, as responsibility can be clearly attributed to identifiable individuals.

12.2 Human-on-the-Loop Systems

Human-on-the-loop systems permit autonomous target engagement but retain human supervisory control. Operators may intervene or override the system if necessary. However, the speed and complexity of autonomous operations may render meaningful human intervention impractical, particularly in high-intensity conflict situations.

12.3 Human-out-of-the-Loop Systems

Fully autonomous or human-out-of-the-loop systems operate without any human involvement once activated. These systems independently select and engage targets throughout their operational cycle. From an IHL standpoint, this model poses the most severe challenges, as it effectively eliminates human judgment at the moment lethal force is applied.

13. The Concept of Meaningful Human Control

In response to these challenges, the notion of meaningful human control has emerged as a normative standard in international debates. The concept seeks to ensure that humans retain sufficient involvement in weapons operations to guarantee compliance with IHL principles.

However, meaningful human control remains legally undefined and operationally contested. States differ significantly in their interpretations, with some emphasising technical supervision and others insisting on direct human decision-making. This lack of consensus undermines the effectiveness of meaningful human control as a regulatory safeguard.

14. Relevance for International Humanitarian Law

The conceptual features of AWS examined above have direct implications for the application of International Humanitarian Law. As autonomy increases, traditional mechanisms of legal attribution become increasingly strained. Understanding the nature and degree of autonomy is therefore essential for evaluating compliance with IHL principles, particularly distinction, proportionality, and accountability.

This conceptual foundation sets the stage for a deeper doctrinal analysis of how core IHL principles interact with autonomous warfare, which is addressed in the next section.

15. Core Principles of International Humanitarian Law

International Humanitarian Law (IHL) regulates the conduct of hostilities through a set of fundamental principles aimed at limiting the effects of armed conflict. Among these, the principles of distinction, proportionality, military necessity, and precautions in attack constitute the normative backbone of humanitarian protection. These principles were developed on the assumption that humans exercise judgment in the use of force. The deployment of Autonomous Weapons Systems (AWS) places this assumption under strain, necessitating a reassessment of how these principles operate in technologically mediated warfare.

16. Principle of Distinction and Autonomous Targeting

The principle of distinction requires parties to an armed conflict to distinguish at all times between civilians and combatants, and between civilian objects and military objectives. Attacks may only be directed against legitimate military targets. This principle is universally recognised as a cornerstone of IHL and is binding in both international and non-international armed conflicts.

Autonomous Weapons Systems challenge the practical application of distinction. While AI-enabled systems may be trained to recognise certain patterns associated with military targets, real-world conflict environments are fluid, context-dependent, and often ambiguous. Civilians may intermittently participate in hostilities, combatants may surrender or become hors de combat, and civilian objects may be used temporarily for military purposes. These nuanced determinations require contextual judgment that goes beyond pattern recognition.

The inability of AWS to comprehend intent, surrender, or changing civilian status raises serious doubts about their capacity to comply with the principle of distinction. Errors in classification may result in unlawful attacks, with limited avenues for legal redress due to the diffusion of responsibility inherent in autonomous operations.

17. Principle of Proportionality and Algorithmic Decision-Making

The principle of proportionality prohibits attacks that may be expected to cause incidental civilian harm excessive in relation to the concrete and direct military advantage anticipated. This assessment is inherently qualitative and context-specific, requiring a balancing exercise based on information available at the time of attack.

In the context of AWS, proportionality assessments may be encoded into algorithms through predefined thresholds or probabilistic models. However, translating human value judgments into computational logic presents fundamental difficulties. Civilian harm cannot be reduced to purely quantitative variables, as its evaluation involves moral, legal, and situational considerations.

Moreover, machine-learning systems operate based on training data and statistical correlations, which may not reflect the realities of specific combat scenarios. The risk of biased or incomplete data further undermines the reliability of algorithmic proportionality assessments. As a result, reliance on AWS may increase the likelihood of disproportionate harm, particularly in densely populated or irregular warfare environments common in the Asia-Pacific region.

18. Military Necessity and Operational Autonomy

Military necessity permits the use of force required to achieve a legitimate military objective, provided such force is not otherwise prohibited by IHL. It does not justify violations of humanitarian principles, but rather operates within their constraints.

Autonomous Weapons Systems are often justified on grounds of military efficiency, speed, and precision. Proponents argue that AWS can enhance compliance with IHL by reducing human error and emotional decision-making. However, military necessity under IHL is not synonymous with technological superiority or operational convenience.

The delegation of lethal decision-making to autonomous systems risks expanding the scope of permissible force beyond what is strictly necessary. Automated threat assessments may prioritise mission success over humanitarian considerations, particularly where operational parameters are narrowly defined. Without meaningful human oversight, the principle of military necessity may be distorted into a purely instrumental logic, detached from humanitarian restraint.

19. Precautions in Attack and the Role of Human Judgment

IHL requires parties to take all feasible precautions in the choice of means and methods of warfare to avoid or minimise incidental civilian harm. This obligation applies before and during an attack and entails continuous assessment of changing circumstances.

Autonomous systems may lack the capacity to reassess targets dynamically in response to new information, such as the sudden presence of civilians or changes in the tactical environment. While sensors and real-time data processing can enhance situational awareness, they cannot replicate the holistic judgment exercised by human operators.

Furthermore, the obligation to cancel or suspend an attack if it becomes apparent that the target is unlawful or the harm excessive presupposes the presence of a decision-maker capable of legal evaluation. In fully autonomous systems, this obligation becomes difficult to operationalise, raising questions about compliance with precautionary duties under IHL.

20. The Martens Clause and Emerging Technologies

The Martens Clause, embedded in IHL treaties, provides that in cases not covered by existing law, civilians and combatants remain under the protection of principles derived from humanity and the dictates of public conscience. This clause assumes renewed relevance in the context of AWS, where positive law has yet to develop specific regulatory standards.

The deployment of weapons capable of independently deciding to kill raises profound concerns regarding human dignity and moral responsibility. Even if AWS were technically capable of complying with certain IHL rules, their use may still conflict with the humanitarian values underlying the law of armed conflict.

The Martens Clause thus serves as a normative safeguard, reinforcing the argument that technological innovation must not erode the ethical foundations of IHL.

21. Implications for Civilian Protection

The cumulative effect of these challenges is a heightened risk to civilians in armed conflict. The difficulty of ensuring distinction, proportionality, and precaution in autonomous operations undermines the protective purpose of IHL. In regions characterised by asymmetric warfare, urban combat, and civilian proximity to hostilities, these risks are particularly acute.

From an Asia-Pacific perspective, where diverse conflict typologies coexist with rapid military modernisation, the deployment of AWS may exacerbate humanitarian vulnerabilities unless robust legal and policy safeguards are established.

22. Transitional Observations

The application of core IHL principles to Autonomous Weapons Systems reveals significant normative tension. While IHL remains technologically neutral in principle, its effective implementation depends on human judgment, accountability, and ethical restraint. AWS strain these foundations by introducing decision-making processes that are opaque, probabilistic, and detached from moral agency.

This doctrinal analysis underscores the centrality of accountability, which forms the focus of the next section.

23. Accountability as a Cornerstone of International Humanitarian Law

Accountability lies at the heart of International Humanitarian Law (IHL). The effectiveness of humanitarian norms depends not only on their articulation but also on their enforcement through individual criminal responsibility, state responsibility, and command accountability. Traditional accountability frameworks presuppose the existence of human actors capable of intent, judgment, and legal responsibility. Autonomous Weapons Systems (AWS) challenge these assumptions by introducing algorithmic decision-making into the use of lethal force, thereby complicating the attribution of responsibility for violations of IHL.

The deployment of AWS risks creating an accountability vacuum in which unlawful harm occurs without a clearly identifiable perpetrator. This erosion of accountability undermines both the deterrent function of IHL and the right of victims to justice and reparations.

24. Individual Criminal Responsibility and Autonomous Weapons

International criminal law imposes liability on individuals who commit, order, or otherwise participate in war crimes. Core elements such as intent, knowledge, and foreseeability are central to establishing individual criminal responsibility. In the context of AWS, however, linking specific harmful outcomes to the mental state of a particular individual becomes increasingly difficult.

Operators may lack direct control over autonomous targeting decisions, programmers may not foresee specific battlefield applications, and commanders may rely on the presumed reliability of complex systems. This diffusion of responsibility complicates the establishment of mens rea, potentially shielding individuals from criminal liability even where serious violations occur.

The absence of a human decision-maker at the moment of attack further challenges traditional models of criminal attribution. Without clear doctrinal adaptation, existing frameworks of individual responsibility may prove inadequate to address harms caused by autonomous systems.

25. Command Responsibility and Supervisory Failures

The doctrine of command responsibility holds military commanders criminally liable for crimes committed by subordinates where they knew or should have known of the violations and failed to prevent or punish them. This doctrine assumes a hierarchical structure of control and communication within armed forces.

Autonomous Weapons Systems disrupt this structure by operating through layers of technical autonomy rather than direct human command. Commanders may authorise the deployment of AWS without possessing full technical understanding of their operational behaviour. Moreover, the speed and complexity of autonomous operations may preclude effective supervision or timely intervention.

While commanders remain responsible for the decision to deploy a particular weapon system, the extent to which this responsibility extends to unforeseeable autonomous actions remains contested. This ambiguity weakens the practical enforceability of command responsibility in autonomous warfare.

26. State Responsibility for Internationally Wrongful Acts

Under the law of state responsibility, states are liable for internationally wrongful acts attributable to them, including violations of IHL committed by their armed forces. In principle, the conduct of Autonomous Weapons Systems deployed by state militaries is attributable to the state, regardless of the level of autonomy involved.

However, practical challenges arise in establishing breach and causation. States may argue that harm caused by AWS resulted from technical malfunction, data limitations, or unforeseen interactions with the environment rather than deliberate policy choices. Such arguments risk diluting accountability and obscuring the link between state conduct and humanitarian harm.

Moreover, the lack of transparency surrounding military AI systems hampers fact-finding and attribution, particularly in the absence of independent investigative mechanisms. These obstacles weaken the effectiveness of state responsibility as a tool for ensuring compliance with IHL.

27. Corporate and Manufacturer Responsibility

The development and deployment of AWS often involve private actors, including defence contractors, software developers, and technology firms. While these entities play a significant role in designing autonomous capabilities, international law currently imposes limited direct obligations on corporations for violations of IHL.

Domestic legal systems may provide avenues for civil liability, but such mechanisms are often inadequate to address transnational harms arising from armed conflict. The gap between corporate involvement and legal accountability raises concerns about the privatisation of warfare and the outsourcing of ethical responsibility.

From an IHL perspective, the involvement of private actors further complicates the attribution of responsibility and reinforces the need for clearer regulatory frameworks governing the development and use of AWS.

28. The Problem of Foreseeability and Causation

Foreseeability and causation are central to legal accountability. Autonomous systems, particularly those employing machine learning, may behave in ways that are not fully predictable at the time of deployment. This unpredictability challenges traditional notions of causation, which rely on a clear chain of events linking human decisions to harmful outcomes.

Where harm arises from emergent system behaviour, determining whether it was foreseeable to commanders or developers becomes contentious. Excessive reliance on the unpredictability of AWS risks creating a legal loophole through which responsibility is evaded.

IHL, however, is premised on precaution and risk assessment. The deployment of weapons whose effects cannot be reliably predicted may itself constitute a failure to comply with humanitarian obligations.

29. Accountability Gaps and Victim Redress

The accountability deficits associated with AWS have direct consequences for victims of armed conflict. Without clear attribution of responsibility, access to justice, reparations, and acknowledgment of harm may be denied. This undermines the humanitarian purpose of IHL and erodes trust in international legal institutions.

The risk of impunity is particularly acute in regions with limited investigative capacity or weak enforcement mechanisms. In the Asia-Pacific context, where conflicts often involve non-state actors and complex geopolitical dynamics, these challenges are amplified.

30. Interim Reflections

The analysis above demonstrates that existing accountability frameworks under IHL and international criminal law are ill-equipped to address the complexities introduced by Autonomous Weapons Systems. While legal responsibility in principle remains with human actors and states, practical enforcement is fraught with uncertainty and ambiguity.

These accountability gaps highlight the need for regulatory innovation at both global and regional levels. Addressing these deficiencies is essential to preserving the integrity of International Humanitarian Law in the face of autonomous warfare.

31. The Asia-Pacific as a Distinct Security Environment

The Asia-Pacific region constitutes one of the most strategically complex and militarily dynamic regions in the contemporary international system. It is characterised by unresolved territorial disputes, maritime tensions, internal armed conflicts, and rapidly evolving security alliances. Simultaneously, the region has emerged as a major hub for military modernisation and technological innovation, including the integration of artificial intelligence into defence systems. This combination renders the Asia-Pacific a critical context for assessing the implications of Autonomous Weapons Systems (AWS) under International Humanitarian Law (IHL).

Unlike regions dominated by formal interstate wars, conflicts in the Asia-Pacific often involve hybrid warfare, counter-insurgency operations, and grey-zone activities. These conflict typologies present heightened risks for civilian harm, thereby intensifying the legal challenges posed by autonomous targeting technologies.

32. Military Modernisation and AI-Enabled Capabilities

Several Asia-Pacific states have prioritised the development and acquisition of AI-enabled military technologies as part of broader defence modernisation strategies. Investments in autonomous surveillance systems, unmanned aerial vehicles, and algorithmic decision-support tools reflect a growing reliance on automation and autonomy in military operations.

While not all such systems qualify as fully autonomous weapons, the trajectory towards increasing autonomy is evident. States often justify these developments on grounds of deterrence, operational

efficiency, and force protection. However, the rapid pace of technological adoption frequently outstrips the development of corresponding legal and ethical safeguards.

From an IHL perspective, this imbalance raises concerns regarding preparedness to ensure compliance with humanitarian norms in future conflicts involving AWS.

33. State Positions on Autonomous Weapons Systems

Asia-Pacific states exhibit diverse and sometimes divergent positions on the regulation of Autonomous Weapons Systems. Some states have expressed support for continued discussions within existing international forums, emphasising the sufficiency of current IHL frameworks. Others have called for the development of new legal instruments to address the unique risks posed by autonomous weapons.

Notably, there is limited consensus within the region on the desirability or feasibility of a legally binding prohibition on fully autonomous weapons. Strategic considerations, including regional rivalries and perceived security threats, often shape state positions more decisively than humanitarian concerns. This fragmentation complicates efforts to develop a unified regional approach to AWS regulation.

34. Participation in Multilateral Regulatory Processes

Asia-Pacific states actively participate in multilateral discussions on autonomous weapons, particularly within the framework of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW). These discussions have focused on concepts such as meaningful human control, legal review of new weapons, and the applicability of existing IHL principles.

However, participation does not necessarily translate into regulatory commitment. Many states adopt cautious or ambiguous positions, preferring non-binding guidelines over formal legal obligations. This preference reflects concerns about constraining military innovation and strategic flexibility.

The absence of binding commitments weakens the normative force of international discussions and limits their impact on state practice.

35. Regional Conflicts and Civilian Vulnerability

The Asia-Pacific region hosts a range of active and latent conflicts, including maritime disputes, internal armed conflicts, and cross-border tensions. These conflicts often occur in densely populated areas or involve civilian infrastructure, heightening the risk of incidental harm.

In such environments, the deployment of Autonomous Weapons Systems may exacerbate civilian vulnerability. The inability of autonomous systems to adequately account for complex social and cultural

contexts increases the likelihood of misidentification and unlawful attacks. These risks underscore the need for heightened caution in deploying AWS within the region.

36. Legal Reviews of New Weapons under Article 36

Article 36 of Additional Protocol I to the Geneva Conventions obliges states to determine whether the employment of new weapons would be prohibited under international law. This obligation is particularly relevant to AWS, given their novel operational characteristics.

While some Asia-Pacific states have established weapons review mechanisms, their scope, transparency, and effectiveness vary considerably. The technical complexity of autonomous systems further complicates meaningful legal review, especially in states with limited institutional capacity.

Strengthening Article 36 review processes at the regional level could play a critical role in mitigating the humanitarian risks associated with AWS.

37. Regional Cooperation and Norm Development

Despite these challenges, the Asia-Pacific region possesses significant potential for regional cooperation on humanitarian norms. Regional organisations, confidence-building measures, and dialogue platforms could facilitate the exchange of best practices and promote shared standards for the use of autonomous weapons.

Such cooperation need not result in a formal treaty but could contribute to the gradual development of customary norms and regional expectations regarding meaningful human control and accountability.

38. Interim Assessment

The Asia-Pacific security landscape reflects a complex interplay between technological ambition and humanitarian vulnerability. While states in the region are increasingly engaged in the development of autonomous military capabilities, regulatory frameworks remain fragmented and underdeveloped.

This gap between technological progress and legal governance reinforces the urgency of addressing the humanitarian implications of AWS. The regional context thus provides both a challenge and an opportunity for advancing IHL-compliant approaches to autonomous warfare.

39. Centrality of Civilian Protection in International Humanitarian Law

The protection of civilians constitutes the foundational objective of International Humanitarian Law (IHL). All rules governing the conduct of hostilities ultimately aim to minimise human suffering and preserve human dignity during armed conflict. The emergence of Autonomous Weapons Systems (AWS)

places this objective under significant strain by altering how decisions affecting civilian life are made. When lethal force is exercised through algorithmic processes rather than human judgment, the humanitarian rationale of IHL risks being weakened.

Civilian protection under IHL is not merely a technical obligation but a moral commitment rooted in the recognition of shared humanity. Any weapon system that diminishes this recognition raises fundamental concerns for the legitimacy of warfare regulation.

40. Ethical Concerns in Delegating Lethal Decisions to Machines

A central ethical objection to AWS lies in the delegation of life-and-death decisions to machines. Ethical reasoning presupposes moral agency—the capacity to understand the value of human life, to feel responsibility, and to exercise compassion. Autonomous systems, regardless of their sophistication, lack consciousness and moral awareness.

The removal of humans from direct decision-making dilutes moral responsibility and risks normalising violence through technological abstraction. Killing becomes a computational outcome rather than a conscious act, potentially eroding the moral restraint that has historically limited the use of force.

This ethical concern reinforces the legal argument that meaningful human involvement is indispensable to the lawful and legitimate conduct of hostilities.

41. Human Dignity and the Martens Clause Revisited

Human dignity is an implicit yet pervasive value within IHL. The Martens Clause affirms that in cases not explicitly regulated by treaty law, civilians and combatants remain protected by principles of humanity and the dictates of public conscience. Autonomous weapons, which operate without human empathy or moral judgment, test the limits of this clause.

From a dignity-based perspective, being targeted and killed by a machine may be perceived as dehumanising, reducing individuals to data points within an algorithmic process. Even if such systems were capable of technical compliance with IHL rules, their use may still conflict with the humanitarian ethos underlying the law of armed conflict.

The Martens Clause thus provides a normative basis for questioning not only how AWS are used, but whether certain forms of autonomy are compatible with humanity itself.

42. Civilian Harm, Bias, and Algorithmic Discrimination

Autonomous systems rely on data-driven models that may reflect existing biases in training data or design assumptions. In conflict environments marked by ethnic, religious, or cultural diversity, such biases can have devastating consequences. Misclassification of civilians as combatants may disproportionately affect vulnerable populations, exacerbating existing inequalities.

Unlike human decision-makers, autonomous systems lack the capacity to contextualise behaviour within social or cultural frameworks. This limitation increases the risk of discriminatory outcomes, undermining the principle of non-discrimination inherent in humanitarian protection.

Ensuring civilian protection therefore requires scrutiny not only of operational deployment but also of the ethical implications of algorithmic bias in warfare.

43. Psychological Distance and the Normalisation of Violence

One of the less visible but significant effects of autonomous warfare is the creation of psychological distance between decision-makers and the consequences of violence. As human involvement diminishes, so too does the emotional and moral weight associated with lethal action.

This distancing effect may lower political and military thresholds for the use of force, increasing the frequency or intensity of armed conflict. From an IHL perspective, such normalisation of violence runs counter to the objective of limiting the suffering caused by war.

Civilian protection depends not only on legal rules but also on the moral restraint exercised by those who wage war. Autonomous systems risk eroding this restraint by insulating humans from the human cost of their decisions.

44. Ethical Limits of Technological Solutions to Humanitarian Problems

Proponents of AWS often argue that technological precision can enhance civilian protection by reducing human error. While technology can assist in compliance with IHL, it cannot replace ethical judgment or legal accountability. Humanitarian protection is not solely a matter of accuracy, but of values, intent, and responsibility.

Overreliance on technological solutions risks framing humanitarian law as a technical optimisation problem rather than a moral-legal framework grounded in respect for human life. Such an approach may obscure the normative foundations of IHL and weaken its protective function.

45. Asia-Pacific Context and Ethical Sensitivities

In the Asia-Pacific region, conflicts frequently intersect with complex social identities, historical grievances, and civilian-military intermingling. The ethical shortcomings of AWS are particularly pronounced in such environments, where contextual understanding is essential to protecting civilians.

The deployment of autonomous weapons in these settings risks aggravating humanitarian harm and undermining trust between civilian populations and state authorities. Ethical considerations must therefore be integrated into regional discussions on security and military modernisation.

46. Interim Ethical Assessment

The ethical dimensions of Autonomous Weapons Systems reinforce the legal concerns identified in earlier sections. Civilian protection, human dignity, and moral responsibility cannot be fully safeguarded through autonomous decision-making. The delegation of lethal authority to machines represents a profound shift in the ethics of warfare, with far-reaching implications for humanitarian norms.

These ethical challenges underscore the necessity of robust regulatory frameworks that prioritise human control, accountability, and dignity.

47. Need for Regulatory Responses to Autonomous Weapons

The legal and ethical challenges posed by Autonomous Weapons Systems (AWS) have prompted growing international concern regarding their regulation. While International Humanitarian Law (IHL) is technologically neutral in principle, the unprecedented autonomy involved in AWS has exposed gaps in existing regulatory frameworks. Addressing these gaps is essential to ensure that humanitarian protections remain effective in contemporary and future conflicts.

Regulatory responses must reconcile competing objectives: preserving humanitarian norms, maintaining international security, and accommodating technological innovation. Achieving this balance has proven difficult at the global level, resulting in incremental and often fragmented regulatory efforts.

48. Global Discussions under the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons

The primary international forum for addressing autonomous weapons has been the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW). Since 2014, states have engaged in discussions through informal meetings, expert groups, and the Group of Governmental Experts (GGE) on Lethal Autonomous Weapons Systems.

These discussions have focused on several key themes, including the applicability of existing IHL, the concept of meaningful human control, ethical considerations, and weapons review obligations. While there is broad agreement that IHL applies to AWS, states remain divided on whether new legally binding rules are necessary.

The CCW process has contributed to norm-building and awareness but has not produced a binding instrument regulating or prohibiting autonomous weapons. The consensus-based nature of the CCW has limited its capacity to deliver decisive regulatory outcomes.

49. Calls for Prohibition versus Incremental Regulation

Within international debates, two broad regulatory approaches have emerged. The first advocates for a pre-emptive prohibition on fully autonomous weapons, arguing that such systems are inherently incompatible with IHL and human dignity. Proponents of this view emphasise the risks of accountability gaps, civilian harm, and ethical erosion.

The second approach supports incremental regulation through the clarification and strengthening of existing legal obligations. States favouring this model argue that meaningful human control, robust weapons reviews, and adherence to IHL principles are sufficient to address humanitarian concerns without stifling technological development.

The absence of consensus between these approaches has stalled progress toward a unified global regulatory framework.

50. Role of Article 36 Weapons Reviews

Article 36 of Additional Protocol I to the Geneva Conventions requires states to assess the legality of new weapons before their deployment. This obligation has gained renewed prominence in discussions on AWS, as weapons reviews offer a mechanism for evaluating compliance with IHL principles at an early stage.

However, the effectiveness of Article 36 reviews depends on their scope, transparency, and technical expertise. Autonomous systems pose particular challenges due to their complexity, adaptability, and potential for emergent behaviour. Without robust review processes, Article 36 risks becoming a formalistic exercise rather than a substantive safeguard.

Strengthening weapons review mechanisms is therefore a critical component of any regulatory response to AWS.

51. Soft Law, Ethical Guidelines, and Norm Development

In the absence of binding treaties, soft law instruments and ethical guidelines have assumed growing importance. Declarations, principles, and best-practice standards adopted by states, international organisations, and expert groups contribute to shaping expectations regarding responsible behaviour.

While soft law lacks formal enforceability, it can influence state practice and contribute to the gradual development of customary norms. In the context of AWS, such instruments may serve as interim measures to promote restraint, transparency, and accountability.

Nevertheless, reliance on soft law alone may be insufficient to address the profound humanitarian risks posed by autonomous warfare.

52. Prospects for Regional Cooperation in the Asia-Pacific

Given the limitations of global regulation, regional cooperation offers a complementary pathway for addressing AWS-related challenges. The Asia-Pacific region, despite its strategic diversity, possesses multiple platforms for dialogue and confidence-building.

Regional cooperation could focus on sharing best practices for weapons reviews, promoting transparency in military AI development, and establishing common understandings of meaningful human control. Such initiatives need not result in binding agreements but could foster normative convergence and reduce humanitarian risks.

Regional approaches may also be more responsive to the specific conflict dynamics and security concerns prevalent in the Asia-Pacific context.

53. Confidence-Building Measures and Transparency

Confidence-building measures, including information exchange, joint training, and dialogue on military doctrine, can mitigate mistrust and reduce the risk of arms races involving autonomous weapons. Transparency regarding the role of autonomy in weapons systems may also facilitate accountability and public scrutiny.

In the Asia-Pacific region, where strategic competition is intense, confidence-building measures could play a crucial role in preventing destabilising escalation and promoting compliance with humanitarian norms.

54. Regional Norm Entrepreneurship

Regional actors, including middle powers and humanitarian organisations, can act as norm entrepreneurs by advocating for responsible approaches to autonomous weapons. Through diplomatic engagement, research initiatives, and capacity-building, these actors can influence regional discourse and contribute to global norm development.

Norm entrepreneurship is particularly valuable in contexts where binding legal solutions remain elusive. By shaping expectations and practices, regional initiatives can strengthen the humanitarian governance of emerging technologies.

55. Interim Regulatory Assessment

International regulatory efforts concerning Autonomous Weapons Systems remain incomplete and contested. While global discussions have clarified key issues, they have not resolved fundamental disagreements regarding prohibition, regulation, and accountability.

Regional cooperation, particularly in the Asia-Pacific, offers a pragmatic avenue for advancing humanitarian objectives in the absence of comprehensive global agreement. Such cooperation can complement international processes and contribute to the preservation of IHL in the age of autonomous warfare.

56. Summary of Key Findings

This study has examined the compatibility of Autonomous Weapons Systems (AWS) with International Humanitarian Law (IHL), with particular emphasis on accountability and the Asia-Pacific regional context. The analysis demonstrates that while IHL is formally technology-neutral, its effective application presupposes human judgment, moral agency, and legal responsibility—assumptions that are fundamentally challenged by autonomous decision-making.

The study finds that AWS pose significant difficulties for the application of core IHL principles, including distinction, proportionality, military necessity, and precautions in attack. Autonomous systems lack the contextual awareness and ethical reasoning required to apply these principles reliably in complex combat environments. As a result, the risk of civilian harm is heightened, particularly in conflicts characterised by civilian-combatant intermingling.

A central finding is the existence of a persistent accountability gap. The diffusion of responsibility among commanders, operators, programmers, manufacturers, and states undermines traditional frameworks of

individual criminal responsibility, command responsibility, and state accountability. This gap threatens the deterrent function of IHL and weakens access to justice for victims of armed conflict.

57. Asia-Pacific–Specific Observations

The Asia-Pacific region presents a distinctive context in which the challenges posed by AWS are particularly acute. Rapid military modernisation, strategic rivalries, unresolved territorial disputes, and diverse conflict typologies create conditions in which autonomous weapons may be deployed with limited regulatory oversight.

State practice in the region reveals growing engagement with AI-enabled military technologies but limited consensus on regulatory approaches. While Asia-Pacific states participate in global discussions on autonomous weapons, regional cooperation remains underdeveloped. The absence of harmonised weapons review mechanisms and shared standards for meaningful human control increases the risk of inconsistent compliance with IHL.

The study highlights that regional diversity should not be viewed solely as an obstacle. Instead, it offers opportunities for norm development tailored to the specific humanitarian and security realities of the Asia-Pacific.

58. Normative Implications for International Humanitarian Law

The findings of this study carry important normative implications for IHL. Autonomous weapons expose the limits of existing legal frameworks that rely on human agency as the foundation of responsibility and restraint. Without doctrinal adaptation or supplementary regulation, the humanitarian objectives of IHL risk being diluted.

The research underscores that accountability is not a peripheral concern but a structural requirement for the legitimacy of the law of armed conflict. Any weapon system that undermines accountability challenges the normative integrity of IHL itself. In this sense, AWS are not merely a technological issue but a test of the resilience of humanitarian law in the face of profound change.

59. Policy and Legal Recommendations

In light of the foregoing analysis, the study advances the following recommendations:

Reaffirmation of Meaningful Human Control

States should explicitly commit to ensuring meaningful human control over all critical functions of weapons systems, particularly target selection and engagement. This commitment should be reflected in military doctrine, procurement policies, and operational rules of engagement.

Strengthening Article 36 Weapons Reviews

Weapons review mechanisms should be enhanced to address the specific challenges posed by autonomous systems, including adaptability, learning capacity, and unpredictability. Reviews should be multidisciplinary, transparent, and ongoing throughout the lifecycle of the weapon system.

Clarification of Accountability Frameworks

International and domestic legal frameworks should be adapted to clarify responsibility for harms caused by AWS. This includes reaffirming command responsibility for deployment decisions and exploring avenues for corporate accountability where appropriate.

Regional Cooperation in the Asia-Pacific

Asia-Pacific states should pursue regional dialogue and confidence-building measures focused on humanitarian risks, weapons reviews, and best practices. Regional norm development can complement global efforts and foster shared expectations regarding responsible conduct.

Ethical Integration in Military Decision-Making

Ethical considerations, including human dignity and civilian protection, should be integrated into military AI development and deployment processes. Legal compliance alone is insufficient without ethical restraint.

60. Future Directions for Research and Regulation

The rapid evolution of autonomous technologies necessitates continuous research and regulatory adaptation. Future scholarship should examine empirical evidence from emerging deployments, the interaction between AWS and non-state armed groups, and the long-term humanitarian consequences of algorithmic warfare.

At the regulatory level, the possibility of new international instruments—whether binding or non-binding—should remain under consideration. Even in the absence of consensus on prohibition, incremental norm-building remains essential to preserving humanitarian protections.

61. Concluding Reflections

Autonomous Weapons Systems represent a transformative development in the conduct of warfare, with far-reaching legal, ethical, and humanitarian implications. This study has argued that while existing International Humanitarian Law principles remain normatively sound, their effective application is severely strained by autonomous decision-making.

From an Asia-Pacific perspective, the challenges posed by AWS are intensified by regional security dynamics and regulatory fragmentation. Addressing these challenges requires renewed commitment to accountability, meaningful human control, and regional cooperation.

Ultimately, the legitimacy of warfare regulation depends on preserving the human element in decisions that affect human life. The future of International Humanitarian Law in the age of autonomous warfare will be determined by whether law and policy can adapt without sacrificing the humanitarian values at their core.

References

- International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC),
- Autonomous Weapon Systems: Implications of Increasing Autonomy in the Critical Functions of Weapons, ICRC, Geneva (2016).
- International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC),
- Position on Autonomous Weapon Systems, ICRC Official Statement (2021).
- United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs (UNODA),
- Group of Governmental Experts on Lethal Autonomous Weapons Systems (CCW), UN Documents, New York.
- Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW),
- Report of the Group of Governmental Experts on Emerging Technologies in the Area of Lethal Autonomous Weapons Systems, UN Doc. CCW/GGE.1/2021/3.
- Additional Protocol I to the Geneva Conventions (1977),
- Article 36 – Legal Review of New Weapons.
- Geneva Conventions of 1949,
- Common Article 3.
- Michael N. Schmitt,
- Autonomous Weapon Systems and International Humanitarian Law: A Reply to the Critics,

- Harvard National Security Journal, Vol. 4 (2013).
- Michael N. Schmitt & Jeffrey S. Thurnher,
- Out of the Loop: Autonomous Weapon Systems and the Law of Armed Conflict,
- Harvard National Security Journal, Vol. 4 (2013).
- Noel Sharkey,
- The Evitability of Autonomous Robot Warfare,
- International Review of the Red Cross, Vol. 94, No. 886 (2012).
- Heather M. Roff,
- Meaningful Human Control or Appropriate Human Judgment?,
- IEEE Technology and Society Magazine, Vol. 37(4), 2018.
- David Turns,
- Weapons in International Law,
- Cambridge University Press, 2018.
- William H. Boothby,
- Weapons and the Law of Armed Conflict,
- Oxford University Press, 2016.
- UN Secretary-General,
- Current Developments in Science and Technology and Their Potential Impact on International Security and Disarmament, UN Doc. A/73/177 (2018).
- Rebecca Crootof,
- The Killer Robots Are Here: Legal and Policy Implications,
- Cardozo Law Review, Vol. 36 (2015).
- Human Rights Watch & International Human Rights Clinic (Harvard Law School),
- Losing Humanity: The Case Against Killer Robots, 2012.
- Gary E. Marchant et al.,
- International Governance of Autonomous Military Robots,
- Columbia Science and Technology Law Review, Vol. 12 (2011).
- Antonio Cassese,
- International Law,
- Oxford University Press, 2nd ed., 2005.
- Yoram Dinstein,

- The Conduct of Hostilities under the Law of International Armed Conflict,
- Cambridge University Press, 3rd ed., 2016.
- UN Human Rights Council,
- Report of the Special Rapporteur on Extrajudicial, Summary or Arbitrary Executions,
- UN Doc. A/HRC/23/47 (2013).
- Margaret Urban Walker,
- Moral Repair: Reconstructing Moral Relations after Wrongdoing,
- Cambridge University Press, 2006.