

Multi-Domain Analysis of Autonomous and Lethal Autonomous Weapon Systems: Strategic Implications for Modern Warfare

Gideon – ZeroLine Intelligence - November, 2025

I. Executive Summary and Strategic Context

The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into military systems, culminating in Autonomous Weapon Systems (AWS) and Lethal Autonomous Weapon Systems (LAWS), represents the most profound paradigm shift in modern conflict since the nuclear revolution. This technological transformation is driving the evolution from informationized warfare to "intelligentized warfare," a concept embraced explicitly by near-peer competitors.¹ The strategic appeal of these systems—leveraging algorithmic speed, precision, and the prospect of reduced risk to military personnel—is driving an undeniable technological arms race aimed at achieving strategic parity and dominance.¹

The development and potential deployment of LAWS present a dual strategic challenge to the international system and U.S. military posture. First, the geopolitical reality is characterized by an emerging arms race where major powers are investing heavily in HOUTL (Human-Out-of-the-Loop) capabilities, viewing them as essential force multipliers in contested environments.¹ Second, this technological advance coincides with a profound erosion of moral and legal accountability. The fundamental incompatibility of autonomous lethal decision-making with established Just War Theory (JWT) and International Humanitarian Law (IHL) creates a normative vacuum that challenges the very moral architecture of armed conflict.¹

Key report findings underscore this tension: The U.S. commitment to maintaining human oversight (Human-in/on-the-Loop) imposes legal and doctrinal restraints not adopted by key adversaries, creating a significant speed and mass disadvantage in future high-intensity conflicts. Furthermore, the operational proliferation of low-cost, attritable autonomous

systems, validated by conflicts such as the war in Ukraine, necessitates immediate shifts in U.S. force structure and defense concepts, such as the Replicator initiative, while requiring robust C-UAS (Counter-Uncrewed Aerial Systems) and Electronic Warfare (EW) investment to mitigate asymmetric risks.

II. The Normative and Legal Architecture of Autonomous Warfare

A. The Central Ethical and Strategic Dilemma: Accountability and Legitimacy

The debate surrounding AWS and LAWS is fundamentally rooted in the question of moral legitimacy in deploying force, which is traditionally contingent on the presence of human agents capable of bearing responsibility for resulting harms.¹

1. Arguments for and Against AWS Development

Proponents articulate three primary justifications for pursuing autonomous capabilities: First, AWS promise enhanced military efficiency and reduced casualties by operating in dangerous, contested, or inhospitable environments, thereby reducing risk to human soldiers.¹ A single operator could command swarms, acting as a potent force multiplier.³ Second, some proponents argue for improved compliance with IHL through algorithmic precision. It is theorized that machines, unlike humans, would not attack out of fear, anger, or retaliation, potentially leading to more consistent and precise targeting.⁵ Third, there is the undeniable element of operational necessity, particularly in high-threat or communications-degraded environments where timely human intervention is impossible.¹ Conversely, critics raise fundamental ethical and legal objections, centered on the profound implications of delegating life-and-death decisions to machines.⁷ These concerns include:

- **Accountability Gaps:** If an autonomous system commits a war crime or causes unintended civilian harm, traditional accountability structures—which assign moral and

legal responsibility to commanders, programmers, or operators—collapse, creating a "responsibility gap".¹

- **Loss of Human Judgment:** Machines lack the moral reasoning, empathy, and contextual understanding necessary to interpret complex and ambiguous battlefield situations.¹ The critical component of human moral restraint, facilitated by emotions and compassion, would be absent, potentially safeguarding against disproportionate force use.⁸
- **Digital Dehumanization:** Utilizing AI to profile, pattern match, and process human beings as mere data points for targeting constitutes the "ultimate form of digital dehumanization," challenging human dignity and reducing individuals to quantifiable variables.⁹

2. IHL Compliance and the Demand for Meaningful Human Control

AWS present specific challenges for ensuring compliance with IHL, particularly the rules governing the conduct of hostilities, namely the principles of distinction and proportionality.⁷

The proportionality test is particularly demanding. It requires human weapon users to form reasonable "expectations" about potential incidental loss of civilian life and to reasonably "anticipate" the concrete and direct military advantage from an attack.¹⁰ The core legal conflict regarding AWS resides not in their technical precision but in their capacity for *attribution* and *cognitive expectation*. Although a machine might achieve IHL compliance statistically through algorithmic precision⁶, IHL necessitates a human agent capable of anticipation and contextual judgment.¹⁰ The current analytic consensus maintains that machines cannot fulfill this requirement because they lack the moral agency required to bear accountability for harms.¹ This results in a legal vacuum where even compliant actions remain morally and legally unattributable to a culpable human agent.¹¹

Consequently, the consensus among many states and bodies, including the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons' Group of Governmental Experts (CCW GGE), is that **meaningful human control** (MHC) must underpin the system to uphold compliance with IHL, including the principles of distinction, proportionality, and precautions in attack.¹⁰ The challenge remains defining what level of control constitutes "meaningful," particularly when autonomous systems self-initiate strikes based on generalized target profiles after initial activation.⁷

3. Just War Theory and the Proportionality of Conflict Initiation

The ethical and legal debate extends beyond *jus in bello* (conduct in war) principles to *jus ad bellum* (justification for war), particularly the principle of proportionality.¹³ The use of LAWS has the potential to fundamentally undermine moral accountability, leading to the conclusion that AWS inherently lack ethical legitimacy within the traditional framework of just warfare.¹

A significant concern involves the impact of AWS/LAWS on the decision to enter conflict. The low risk and low cost afforded to the deploying power by autonomous systems—which substitute machine risk for human soldier risk³—may substantially lower the political and moral threshold for initiating military action. This increased feasibility of force employment, divorced from the human toll of deploying large troop numbers, risks challenging the *jus ad bellum* requirement of last resort and proportionality, potentially leading states to engage in conflict more readily.¹⁴

B. Global Regulatory Efforts and Strategic Division

The international community's response to LAWS has been characterized by urgency from humanitarian organizations and slow, politically charged deliberation within diplomatic bodies.

1. The UN and ICRC Positions

The International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) views the risks posed by AWS—including harm to civilians, conflict escalation, and ethical concerns over delegating lethal decisions—as severe.⁷ The ICRC is convinced that **new, legally binding rules** are urgently required to clarify and specify how IHL applies to AWS, including specific prohibitions and restrictions, ensuring that the protections afforded by IHL are not undermined.⁷

The UN CCW GGE has served as the central multilateral forum since 2017 to examine the technological, military, ethical, and legal dimensions of LAWS.⁴ However, the CCW's consensus model has been criticized for slow progress.¹⁵ While the GGE confirmed that human control is essential for IHL compliance, it continues to focus on formulating a rolling

text aimed at systematizing a normative and operational framework.¹⁶

2. U.S. and Adversary Stances

The normative debate is structurally insufficient to constrain the ongoing technological arms race, as evidenced by divergent national positions. The United States and its allies have opted for a softer, non-binding approach, exemplified by the 2023 Political Declaration on Responsible Military Use of AI and Autonomy.¹⁷ This framework seeks to build international consensus around responsible behavior and guide states in development and deployment.¹⁷

In contrast, Russia, Belarus, and North Korea have clearly signaled their rejection of mandatory constraints. In 2024, these three nations voted against a UN General Assembly resolution on LAWS, underscoring their military commitment to maintaining unrestricted development of autonomous capabilities.¹⁵ This divergence highlights a significant geopolitical reality: adversaries view the ability to operate LAWS in communications-degraded or denied environments—where human control is operationally impossible—as a non-negotiable strategic necessity.⁴

Table 1: International Positions on LAWS Regulation

Actor/Body	Core Position on LAWS	Primary Concern	Regulatory Instrument/Status
ICRC	Urges new legally binding prohibitions/restrictions ⁷	Loss of meaningful human control, accountability, ethical vacuum, digital dehumanization ⁷	Actively advocating for new legal instrument complementary to IHL ⁷
UN GGE (CCW)	Seeking consensus on normative and operational framework; upholding IHL ¹⁶	Ensuring human control upholds compliance with Distinction and Proportionality ¹⁰	Ongoing discussions; criticized for slow progress due to consensus model ¹⁵

United States	Responsible military use; Human-in/on-the-loop mandated for lethal use ⁴	Mitigation of unintended engagements; maintaining strategic advantage ¹⁷	Endorsing non-binding Political Declaration; DODD 3000.09 governance ¹⁷
Russia/NK/Belarus	Opposes UN GA resolution on LAWS ¹⁵	Military necessity; preserving strategic options for AI integration into strategic forces ¹⁸	Opposes international restrictions; focuses on internal doctrine modernization [19]

III. Comparative Global Development and Doctrinal Integration

The global development of AWS/LAWS reveals stark differences in strategic priorities, particularly between the U.S. focus on control and the adversaries' emphasis on speed and mass.

A. U.S. Military Approach: Strategic Agility and Responsible AI

The U.S. military’s policy on AWS is defined by adherence to strict governance protocols, prioritizing human oversight, even while acknowledging the strategic imperative for autonomous capabilities.

1. Policy and Governance (DODD 3000.09)

Department of Defense Directive (DODD) 3000.09 (most recently updated in 2023) establishes the U.S. policy for the development and use of autonomous and semi-

autonomous functions in weapon systems.⁴ Critically, this directive does not prohibit the development or employment of LAWS, but it mandates a comprehensive senior-level review process involving the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (VCJCS), the Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering (USD), and the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy (USD[P]) before development and fielding.⁴ This structure ensures compliance and accountability, reflecting a commitment to Human-in-the-Loop or Human-on-the-Loop controls for lethal actions.

2. AI in Targeting and Force Structure

The U.S. integrates AI primarily through sophisticated decision support systems (AI DSS), such as **Project Maven**. Launched in 2017, Project Maven accelerates the adoption of machine learning to enhance military intelligence workflows, fusing data from various sensors to flag potential targets for human analysts.²¹ This approach prioritizes algorithmic speed for *situational awareness* and *targeting guidance* (a Human-in-the-Loop architecture) rather than autonomous lethality.²²

A significant doctrinal shift is embodied by the **Replicator initiative**, launched in 2023, which aims to field thousands of All-Domain Attributable Autonomous (ADA2) systems by 2025.²³ This initiative, directly drawing lessons from the massed use of low-cost drones in the Ukraine conflict²³, signals a strategic acceptance that technological quality must be countered by quantitative mass. The goal is to overcome China's advantage in conventional "mass" (ships, missiles).²³ These systems are foundational to the Joint All-Domain Command and Control (JADC2) framework, utilizing cloud and edge computing capabilities to network sensors and shooters across all warfighting domains.²⁴

B. China's Intelligentized Warfare and Strategic Dominance

China's approach to military AI is holistic and doctrinally aggressive, framed around a national strategy of Military-Civil Fusion (MCF) and a concept known as "intelligentized warfare".²⁶

1. Doctrinal Foundation: Intelligentized Warfare

The People's Liberation Army (PLA) recognizes intelligentized warfare—driven by AI, quantum computing, and big data—as the future trajectory of conflict, evolving beyond the previous emphasis on informatization.² The strategic goal is to move toward **Systems Destruction Warfare**, targeting the integrated operational systems of the enemy rather than merely annihilating opposing mechanized forces.²

The doctrinal divergence between the U.S. and China is stark. While the U.S. applies AI for accelerated targeting support within legal and ethical restraints, China views AI as the core driver for comprehensive disruption and psychological paralysis. The PLA explicitly seeks to integrate AI into non-physical domains, aiming for control in the **cognitive domain**—disrupting the enemy's will to fight and operational capabilities.²⁸ This focus connects psychological warfare, which is viewed as fundamentally information warfare, with advanced computing and data processing capabilities for large-scale information manipulation.²⁹

2. Platform Focus: Swarms and Maritime A2/AD

The PLA is heavily investing in autonomous swarming drone technology. Chinese military writings confirm that this capability is being developed specifically to address critical strategic challenges, such as potential amphibious assault or blockade scenarios involving Taiwan, where massed, low-cost swarms can overwhelm sophisticated defenses.³¹ The strategic utility of LAWS is maximized in this framework by combining kinetic effect with AI-driven psychological operations designed to break the adversary's cognitive processing capacity.

C. Russia's Pursuit of Robotic Complexes and Strategic Automation

Russia prioritizes the modernization of its armed forces through the rapid integration of AI and robotics to offset conventional technological disadvantages, a priority famously articulated by President Putin in 2017.¹⁹

In the context of the Ukraine conflict, while Russian forces utilize systems like the Lancet-3 loitering munition³⁴, the practical operational fielding of high-profile Unmanned Ground Vehicles (UGVs) like the Uran-9 has been limited, showing a gap between state-promoted

programs and verified combat use.³⁵

A critical area of strategic concern is Russia's move to automate its strategic forces. The Strategic Rocket Forces have indicated that automated security systems for stationary and mobile strategic missile complexes will incorporate AI and robotic systems by 2030.¹⁸ The convergence of AI, battlefield autonomy, and strategic nuclear command authority creates an unprecedented risk of accidental escalation. This automation shortens the decision-making cycle, reducing the time available for human validation and termination of an attack, making the system highly susceptible to cyberattack vulnerabilities or machine error at the highest level of conflict.¹⁸

D. Disruptive Proliferators: Iran and North Korea

Iran and North Korea pose unique threats through their multifaceted proliferation activities, often leveraging low-cost autonomous technologies. Iran is a leading state sponsor of asymmetric drone warfare, supplying weaponized drone programs to non-state proxies such as the Houthi rebels, Hezbollah, and Hamas.³⁷ Houthi forces have repeatedly employed explosive-laden UAVs, such as the Sammad-3, to conduct high-impact asymmetric strikes against critical civilian infrastructure and military targets in the Gulf region.³⁹

North Korea, designated alongside Russia and China in the CRINK context, focuses primarily on WMD and ballistic missile cooperation.⁴⁰ Its mutual defense pact with Russia is highly likely to result in the transfer of advanced military technology, bolstering Pyongyang's ability to threaten regional stability.⁴¹

Table 2: Comparative Adversary AWS/LAWS Doctrines

Nation	Primary Doctrine/Concept	Strategic Goal	Key Autonomy Focus	Noted Platforms/Systems
U.S.	JADC2, Replicator, Responsible AI [23, 25]	Maintain technological and information	Human-in/on-the-loop for lethality; AI for data fusion (AI	Project Maven, Replicator systems, Phalanx CIWS

		superiority; defeat enemy mass with attritable autonomous mass ²³	DSS) [21, 22]	(HOTL) ⁴²
China	Intelligentized Warfare (Systems Destruction) ²	Disrupt enemy will and C2 via cognitive domain control; prepare for Taiwan scenario [28, 31]	Swarming autonomy; integrated cyber/EW/lethal capabilities	Swarming UAVs, unmanned intelligent combat systems [32]
Russia	Military Modernization via Robotics/AI [19]	Offset conventional weakness; automate strategic force protection and security [18, 33]	Integration into strategic assets (e.g., Strategic Rocket Forces); loitering munitions	Lancet loitering munition, Uran-9 UGV (limited operational success) [34, 35]
Iran/Proxies	Asymmetric Force Projection	Bypass conventional defenses; conduct high-impact strikes on critical infrastructure ³⁹	State-sponsored, weaponized drone proliferation	Sammad-3 drones, explosive-laden UAVs [39, 43]

IV. Operational Reality, Typology, and Battlefield Effects

A. The Proving Ground of Ukraine-Russia: Massed Attrition

The Ukraine-Russia conflict has served as the definitive proving ground for current-generation autonomous systems, fundamentally shifting military planning towards massed, low-cost assets. Both Ukrainian and Russian forces have extensively utilized drones and loitering munitions with autonomous functions, often based on cheap, commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) components adapted for kamikaze or Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (ISR) missions.³⁴

The widespread adoption of AI-enabled targeting technology, often provided by commercial companies, is key to the unprecedented tactical effectiveness observed. This technology analyzes and fuses battlefield data, dramatically compressing the sensor-to-shooter cycle. Reports indicate that the time from target detection to destruction has been reduced to approximately 30 seconds.³⁴ The operational success of these cheap, massed drone attacks by Ukraine demonstrated that high-end technological quality (expensive manned systems) can be negated by low-cost, disposable, autonomous quantitative mass, compelling the U.S. military to adopt the Replicator force structure doctrine to maintain peer competition.²³

B. Asymmetric and Hybrid Warfare Case Studies

Autonomous technologies have profoundly empowered non-state actors, granting them capabilities previously restricted to advanced state militaries. Organizations like the Houthis rebels, Hezbollah, and Hamas have successfully developed and run weaponized drone programs, often leveraging Iranian state sponsorship.³⁷ The tactical innovation among these groups is characterized by the use of commercial drones for armed incursions, resulting in significant events such as the 2024 attack on a U.S. outpost in Jordan, which caused the first U.S. soldier fatalities from an enemy drone attack.⁴³ These operations demonstrate that, despite countermeasures, the low cost and ease of deployment mean that the threat is persistent, with defense experts noting that "the drone will always get through".⁴³

C. Adversary Countermeasures and Adaptation (The EW/C-UAS Race)

The intense deployment of autonomous systems has simultaneously driven rapid innovation in countermeasures, particularly Electronic Warfare (EW). The Ukraine conflict is characterized by the largest use of EW resources in modern military history.⁴⁵ Russian forces employ sophisticated systems (e.g., Krasukha-4) to jam GPS and communications, specifically aiming to degrade Ukrainian drone operations.⁴⁵ This EW intensity validates the operational necessity of developing HOUTL systems: if command and control (C2) links are guaranteed to be degraded or denied by peer adversaries, military effectiveness will rely on systems capable of independent operation.⁴ EW effectively mandates autonomy, forcing states to accept the associated ethical and legal risks for the sake of operational necessity.

In response to massed incursions, allied nations are developing the "drone wall" concept—a layered C-UAS network combining advanced radar, jammers, directed energy, and kinetic interception systems to defeat both individual threats and swarms.⁴⁶ The challenge here is the strategic cost: this competition requires disproportionately expensive defensive measures against low-cost, disposable offensive assets, creating a substantial new drain on defense budgets.

D. AWS Typology and the Autonomy Spectrum

AWS are generally defined as weapon systems with autonomy in their critical functions—the capacity to select (search, detect, identify, track) and attack (use force against) targets without further human intervention after initial activation.⁷

1. Categorization of Systems

- **Loitering Munitions:** Often called "suicide drones," these carry built-in warheads and loiter around a predefined area until a target is located by an operator or automated sensors, and then attack.⁴⁷ Examples like the Israeli Harpy drone, which autonomously targets radar systems, illustrate that highly sophisticated variants are already capable of HOUTL-level operations in specific, narrow mission profiles.³
- **AI-Enabled Targeting Systems (AI DSS):** These systems are distinct from LAWS because they provide operational planning, strategic support, and actionable recommendations to human operators, enhancing C2 and logistics, but they do not

possess the authority to engage targets independently.²² Project Maven serves as a prime example of AI DSS.

- **Swarming Drone Platforms:** Designed for force multiplication, these are deployed to overwhelm enemy defenses through quantitative mass.¹²

2. Levels of Autonomy

The degree of human involvement in the lethal decision cycle is categorized along a spectrum⁴²:

Table 3: Levels of Autonomy in Weapon Systems

Autonomy Level	Designation	Definition of Human Role	Function in Targeting	Example System
Human-in-the-Loop	HITL / Semi-autonomous ⁴²	Human selects the target and directs the attack execution.	System detects and tracks; human retains manual control of engagement.	Predator/Reaper UAVs ⁴²
Human-on-the-Loop	HOTL / Supervised Autonomous ⁴²	System selects and engages target; human provides oversight and retains veto/abort capability.	System operates rapidly within pre-defined operational parameters with human supervision.	Iron Dome, Phalanx CIWS ⁴²
Human-Out-of-the-Loop	HOUTL / Fully Autonomous (LAWS) ⁴²	System autonomously selects and	AI makes the lethal decision based on	Advanced Loitering Munitions or

		engages targets without intervention after initial deployment.	generalized target profile.[12]	future LAWS ³
--	--	--	---------------------------------	--------------------------

The operational reality demonstrates a blurring of the typological lines. While U.S. and allied doctrine insists on HITL or HOTL systems, the functional deployment of advanced loitering munitions in specific targeting roles—such as automatically destroying a radar emitter—moves them from Human-on-the-Loop to *de facto* Human-Out-of-the-Loop in that moment.⁴⁷ This critical blurring validates the need for urgent regulation, as functionally autonomous lethal systems are already operational, regardless of state doctrine classifications.

V. Strategic and Psychological Implications for U.S. Military Posture

A. Implications for Large-Scale Combat Operations (LSCO)

The shift in U.S. doctrinal focus towards large-scale combat operations (LSCO) against peer competitors like China and Russia necessitates a reassessment of AWS integration, particularly regarding escalation control and rules of engagement (ROE).⁵⁰

1. Escalation Risk and Algorithmic Speed

AWS/LAWS introduce significant risks of algorithmic escalation. In a high-intensity, geographically expansive conflict, reliance on AI DSS within the JADC2 framework could accelerate the decision loop far beyond human cognitive capacity.¹ This rapid decision-making increases the risk of misidentification in complex, congested environments. If

autonomous systems accelerate conflict, human commanders may lose the critical time needed to execute restrictive ROE or diplomatic off-ramps, potentially leading to crisis management failure driven by algorithmic speed, rendering traditional escalation control mechanisms obsolete.

2. Rules of Engagement and the Autonomy Paradox

Future LSCO against great powers will likely be defined as "limited war," requiring extensive, restrictive ROE to manage escalation, particularly in domains involving space or nuclear assets.⁵⁰ Integrating highly autonomous systems into an environment constrained by such restrictive, human-defined ROE creates a profound operational paradox. AWS must operate at machine speed, but the algorithmic interpretation of context-dependent ROE (such as distinguishing between legitimate targets and protected civilian objects, or assessing hostile intent) may be flawed or too narrow.⁵¹ If AWS systems are programmed to operate under the restrictive, law-enforcement paradigm often applied in counterinsurgency, this contradiction may obstruct mission accomplishment in times of armed conflict.⁵¹

B. Implications for Irregular Warfare (IW) and Counterinsurgency (COIN)

While AWS offer undeniable advantages in high-risk environments, their integration into low-intensity or irregular warfare environments raises specific ethical and legal friction points.

1. Accountability and Misidentification

In IW/COIN environments, where targeting ambiguity is high and actions are often governed by a law enforcement paradigm, accountability for AWS use becomes technically complex. Autonomous systems afford increased temporal and spatial separation from the attack, making attribution difficult for military investigators or states fulfilling their duty to investigate IHL violations.¹¹ Furthermore, if AWS are deployed in COIN, targeting techniques based on pattern-of-life or biometric data are highly susceptible to dataset bias and misidentification.¹¹

Erroneous targeting in these contexts risks violating fundamental human rights, including the right to life, privacy, and freedom from discrimination.¹¹

This doctrinal friction implies a strategic limitation on AWS use. If highly autonomous systems are prone to bias and misidentification, their utility may be ironically constrained to large, less-ambiguous conventional conflicts, despite the historical use of uncrewed systems in counterterrorism. Their deployment in COIN undermines the critical goal of gaining local legitimacy and minimizing civilian harm, exacerbating legal flaws and subsequent accountability failures.⁵¹

C. Psychological Warfare and AI Integration (Cognitive Domain)

The convergence of AI with kinetic systems is profoundly influencing the non-physical domains of warfare, particularly psychological operations (PSYOP) and cognitive warfare.

1. AI in Cognitive Warfare

Adversaries are actively leveraging AI, specifically generative AI tools, to scale disinformation campaigns and conduct adversarial activities designed to destabilize online information ecosystems, constituting modern "cognitive warfare".²⁹ The People's Liberation Army (PLA) explicitly integrates AI into its doctrinal concepts for psychological warfare, viewing it as fundamentally information warfare driven by advanced data processing.²⁹ The PLA seeks to gain victory by establishing control in the **cognitive domain**, disrupting the enemy's will to fight.²⁸

The speed and ubiquity of autonomous systems provide the raw data necessary for large-scale information manipulation and influence campaigns. China's focus on the cognitive domain reveals that AWS/LAWS are being developed not just as shooters but as *components of an integrated information war system* designed to shape adversary decision-making.³⁰

2. The Psychological Impact of Dehumanization

Beyond information campaigns, the deployment of LAWS carries intrinsic psychological effects. The concept of **digital dehumanization** suggests that being targeted by a machine that inherently lacks moral reasoning, emotion, compassion, or restraint ⁵ is in itself a powerful psychological weapon.⁹ This machine objectivity, which reduces the adversary to a data point, can be used to erode the enemy's morale and will to fight, accelerating operational paralysis.

VI. Conclusions and Strategic Recommendations

The analysis confirms that AWS and LAWS represent an immediate and multifaceted challenge characterized by accelerating technological capability against stagnating international legal and ethical consensus.

A. Emerging Trends and Gaps

The primary trends indicate that operational proliferation—manifested chiefly through AI-enabled targeting support and massed, attritable loitering munitions—is outpacing global regulatory deliberation. The slow, consensus-driven process of the UN CCW is functionally inadequate to address the urgency of this technological shift.¹⁵ This regulatory gap forces leading military powers to rely on internal policy (DODD 3000.09) to manage ethical risk, while adversaries retain the freedom to pursue Human-Out-of-the-Loop lethality as a necessity for operating in EW-contested environments.⁴

The critical strategic dilemma is the inherent conflict between the tactical necessity of autonomy (mandated by EW effectiveness) and the ethical and legal requirement for meaningful human oversight.

B. Strategic Dilemmas and Policy Recommendations

1. Strategic Dilemma: Mass vs. Morality

The U.S. commitment to the ethical high ground (DODD 3000.09) imposes self-restraint that adversaries, prioritizing speed and mass, do not accept. This creates a critical vulnerability in the race for technological parity.

Recommendation: Invest significantly in robust verification and Explainable AI (XAI) systems for AI Decision Support (AI DSS). By focusing resources on ensuring transparent accountability and minimizing algorithmic bias within the Human-in-the-Loop applications (like Project Maven), the U.S. can simultaneously accelerate the kill chain and demonstrate a responsible governance model, setting a high standard for responsible military AI use while competing effectively in speed and data processing.¹¹

2. Strategic Dilemma: Crisis Stability

The risk of accidental escalation, particularly concerning strategic assets, increases drastically when algorithmic speed drives tactical decisions in LSCO, as evidenced by Russian doctrinal planning.¹⁸

Recommendation: Develop, test, and formally propose bilateral or multilateral AI-enabled crisis management protocols for potential LSCO environments. These protocols must focus on instantaneous transparency, verification standards, and algorithmic safety mechanisms designed to preserve the human commander's ability to execute restrictive ROE and diplomatic off-ramps, thereby mitigating algorithmic crisis management failure.

3. Strategic Dilemma: Asymmetric Defense

Low-cost, massed drone threats from state proxies (Houthi, Hezbollah) impose disproportionate defense costs and require continuous adaptation.⁴³

Recommendation: Shift defense investment priorities to prioritize offensive and defensive Electronic Warfare (EW) and integrated C-UAS systems (the "drone wall" concept) as the primary mechanism for countering autonomous proliferation.⁴⁵ This tactical adaptation, drawing heavily from the lessons of the Ukraine conflict, must focus on dominating the electromagnetic and C2 domains to neutralize massed threats before they become kinetic.

4. Strategic Dilemma: Cognitive Competition

Adversaries, notably China, are integrating autonomous capabilities not just for kinetic destruction but as tools for cognitive disruption and information warfare.²⁸

Recommendation: Fully integrate counter-cognitive warfare and AI ethics into joint operational doctrine. Treat AI-enabled influence campaigns and the psychological effects of autonomous systems (digital dehumanization) as a critical domain of conflict, requiring synchronized defensive and offensive capabilities across information, cyber, and cognitive domains to protect the adversary's decision-making integrity and prevent psychological paralysis.²⁸

Works cited

1. Full article: The ethical legitimacy of autonomous Weapons systems: reconfiguring war accountability in the age of artificial Intelligence - Taylor & Francis Online, accessed November 4, 2025, <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/16544951.2025.2540131>
2. Military and Security Developments Involving the People's Republic of China 2024 - DoD, accessed November 4, 2025, <https://media.defense.gov/2024/Dec/18/2003615520/-1/-1/0/MILITARY-AND-SECURITY-DEVELOPMENTS-INVOLVING-THE-PEOPLES-REPUBLIC-OF-CHINA-2024.PDF>
3. AI Ethics in Autonomous Weapons: Balancing Innovation and Global Security | by Gary A. Fowler | Sep, 2025, accessed November 4, 2025, <https://medium.com/@gafowler/ai-ethics-in-autonomous-weapons-balancing-innovation-and-global-security-40a640e38a3d>
4. Defense Primer: U.S. Policy on Lethal Autonomous Weapon Systems | Congress.gov, accessed November 4, 2025, <https://www.congress.gov/crs-product/IF11150>
5. Chapter 3: AWS and the Battlefield of the Future - House of Lords - Proceed with Caution: Artificial Intelligence in Weapon Systems - AI in Weapon Systems Committee, accessed November 4, 2025, <https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/ld5804/ldselect/ldaiwe/16/1607.htm>
6. The ethical legitimacy of autonomous Weapons systems: reconfiguring war accountability in the age of artificial Intelligence - Taylor & Francis Online, accessed November 4, 2025, <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/16544951.2025.2540131>
7. Autonomous Weapon Systems and International Humanitarian Law: Selected

- Issues - ICRC, accessed November 4, 2025, <https://www.icrc.org/en/article/autonomous-weapon-systems-and-international-humanitarian-law-selected-issues>
8. A Hazard to Human Rights: Autonomous Weapons Systems and Digital Decision-Making, accessed November 4, 2025, <https://www.hrw.org/report/2025/04/28/hazard-human-rights/autonomous-weapon-systems-and-digital-decision-making>
 9. Problems with autonomous weapons - Stop Killer Robots, accessed November 4, 2025, <https://www.stopkillerrobots.org/stop-killer-robots/facts-about-autonomous-weapons/>
 10. SUBMISSION ON AUTONOMOUS WEAPON SYSTEMS TO THE UNITED NATIONS SECRETARY-GENERAL, accessed November 4, 2025, [https://docs-library.unoda.org/General Assembly First Committee -Seventy-Ninth session \(2024\)/78-241-ICRC-EN.pdf](https://docs-library.unoda.org/General Assembly First Committee -Seventy-Ninth session (2024)/78-241-ICRC-EN.pdf)
 11. RESEARCH BRIEF SENDING UP A FLARE: AUTONOMOUS WEAPONS SYSTEMS PROLIFERATION RISKS TO HUMAN RIGHTS AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY, accessed November 4, 2025, <https://www.geneva-academy.ch/joomlatools-files/docman-files/Sending%20Up%20a%20Flare%20Autonomous%20Weapons%20Systems%20Proliferation%20Risks.pdf>
 12. Autonomous Weapon Systems and Their Compliance with International Humanitarian Law, accessed November 4, 2025, <https://isil-aca.org/download/papers/ISIL-Occasional-Paper-12-2025.pdf>
 13. AUTONOMOUS WEAPON SYSTEMS AND THE JUST WAR THEORY: CHALLENGES AND IMPLICATIONS - DergiPark, accessed November 4, 2025, <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/inuhfd/issue/78859/1253060>
 14. Lethal Autonomous Weapons and Jus Ad Bellum Proportionality - Case Western Reserve University School of Law Scholarly Commons, accessed November 4, 2025, <https://scholarlycommons.law.case.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=&httpsredir=1&article=1006&context=jil>
 15. Lethal Autonomous Weapons Systems & International Law: Growing Momentum Towards a New International Treaty | ASIL, accessed November 4, 2025, <https://www.asil.org/insights/volume/29/issue/1>
 16. Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Inj, accessed November 4, 2025, <https://docs.un.org/en/CCW/GGE.1/2024/WP.11>
 17. Political Declaration on Responsible Military Use of Artificial Intelligence and Autonomy, accessed November 4, 2025, <https://www.state.gov/bureau-of-arms-control-deterrence-and-stability/political-declaration-on-responsible-military-use-of-artificial-intelligence-and-autonomy>
 18. 532. Russia and the Convergence of AI, Battlefield Autonomy, and Tactical Nuclear Weapons - Mad Scientist Laboratory, accessed November 4, 2025,

- <https://madsclublog.tradoc.army.mil/532-russia-and-the-convergence-of-ai-battlefield-autonomy-and-tactical-nuclear-weapons/>
19. RUSSIAN PERCEPTIONS OF MILITARY AI, AUTOMATION, AND AUTONOMY - Foreign Policy Research Institute, accessed November 4, 2025, <https://www.fpri.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/012622-russia-ai-.pdf>
 20. DoD Directive 3000.09, "Autonomy in Weapon Systems," January 25, 2023 - Executive Services Directorate, accessed November 4, 2025, <https://www.esd.whs.mil/portals/54/documents/dd/issuances/dodd/300009p.pdf>
 21. Project Maven - Wikipedia, accessed November 4, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Project_Maven
 22. The risks and inefficacies of AI systems in military targeting support, accessed November 4, 2025, <https://blogs.icrc.org/law-and-policy/2024/09/04/the-risks-and-inefficacies-of-ai-systems-in-military-targeting-support/>
 23. DOD Replicator Initiative: Background and Issues for Congress, accessed November 4, 2025, <https://www.congress.gov/crs-product/IF12611>
 24. Cloud Computing for US Defense - Amazon AWS, accessed November 4, 2025, <https://aws.amazon.com/federal/defense/>
 25. THE DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE ROLE IN JOINT ALL-DOMAIN OPERATIONS, accessed November 4, 2025, https://www.doctrine.af.mil/Portals/61/documents/AFDP_3-99/AFDP%203-99%20DAF%20role%20in%20JADO.pdf
 26. The Tech Revolution and Irregular Warfare: Leveraging Commercial Innovation for Great Power Competition - CSIS, accessed November 4, 2025, <https://www.csis.org/analysis/tech-revolution-and-irregular-warfare-leveraging-commercial-innovation-great-power>
 27. PLA's Intelligentized Warfare: The Politics on China's Military Strategy*, accessed November 4, 2025, <https://www.nids.mod.go.jp/english/publication/security/pdf/2022/01/05.pdf>
 28. PLA's Perception about the Impact of AI on Military Affairs* - IIDA Masafumi, accessed November 4, 2025, <https://www.nids.mod.go.jp/english/publication/security/pdf/2022/01/04.pdf>
 29. Chinese Next-Generation Psychological Warfare: The Military Applications of Emerging Technologies and Implications for the United States - RAND, accessed November 4, 2025, https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/research_reports/RRA800/RRA853-1/RAND_RRA853-1.pdf
 30. Chinese Next-Generation Psychological Warfare - RAND, accessed November 4, 2025, https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RRA853-1.html
 31. PRC Concepts for UAV Swarms in Future Warfare - CNA.org., accessed November 4, 2025, <https://www.cna.org/analyses/2025/07/prc-concepts-for-uav-swarms-in-future-warfare>
 32. China's Military Employment of Artificial Intelligence and Its Security Implications, accessed November 4, 2025, <https://www.iar-gwu.org/print-archive/blog-post->

- [title-four-xgtap](#)
33. Russian Concepts of Future Warfare Based on Lessons from the Ukraine War - CNA.org., accessed November 4, 2025, <https://www.cna.org/reports/2025/08/Russian-Concepts-of-Future-Warfare-Based-on-Lessons-from-the-Ukraine-War.pdf>
 34. The Use of AI and Autonomous Technologies in the War in Ukraine and Implications for Strategic Stability - CNA.org., accessed November 4, 2025, <https://www.cna.org/reports/2023/10/Use-of-AI-and-Autonomous-Technologies-in-the-War-in-Ukraine.pdf>
 35. From Hype to Humiliation: Putin's Uran-9 "Robot Tank" Breaks Down Before Seeing Combat, accessed November 4, 2025, <https://united24media.com/latest-news/from-hype-to-humiliation-putins-uran-9-robot-tank-breaks-down-before-seeing-combat-12453>
 36. Bureaucrat's Gambit: Why is Dmitry Rogozin Sending Russian Uncrewed Ground Vehicles to Ukraine—and Does it Matter? - Modern War Institute, accessed November 4, 2025, <https://mwi.westpoint.edu/bureaucrats-gambit-why-is-dmitry-rogozin-sending-russian-uncrewed-ground-vehicles-to-ukraine-and-does-it-matter/>
 37. Drones in the Hands of Terrorists: What Happens Then? - Modern Diplomacy, accessed November 4, 2025, <https://moderndiplomacy.eu/2021/08/04/drones-in-the-hands-of-terrorists-what-happens-then/>
 38. Off the Shelf: The Violent Nonstate Actor Drone Threat - Air University, accessed November 4, 2025, https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Portals/10/ASPJ/journals/Volume-34_Issue-3/F-Chavez_Swed.pdf
 39. Full article: The impact of precision strike technology on the warfare of non-state armed groups: case studies on Daesh and the Houthis, accessed November 4, 2025, <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/09592318.2024.2319216>
 40. Iran & North Korea: Proliferation Partners | UANI, accessed November 4, 2025, <https://www.unitedagainstnucleariran.com/north-korea-iran>
 41. Countering the China, Russia, Iran, North Korea Challenge | George W. Bush Presidential Center, accessed November 4, 2025, <https://www.bushcenter.org/publications/countering-crink>
 42. Offensive Autonomous Weapons: Should We Be Worried? - Michigan Journal of International Law, accessed November 4, 2025, <https://www.mjilonline.org/offensive-autonomous-weapons-should-we-be-worried/>
 43. Tower 22: Innovations in Drone Attacks by Non-State Actors, accessed November 4, 2025, <https://icct.nl/publication/tower-22-innovations-drone-attacks-non-state-actors>
 44. Publication | Ten Lessons from the Russia-Ukraine War, accessed November 4, 2025, <https://www.gcsp.ch/publications/ten-lessons-russia-ukraine-war>
 45. Russia-Ukraine War: Lessons from an Electronic Warfare (EW) Perspective -

- CLAWS, accessed November 4, 2025, <https://claws.co.in/russia-ukraine-war-lessons-from-an-electronic-warfare-ew-perspective/>
46. Talk of 'Drone Walls' and More Counter-UAS Updates from September - Defense Security Monitor, accessed November 4, 2025, <https://dsm.forecastinternational.com/2025/10/09/talk-of-drone-walls-and-more-counter-uas-updates-from-september/>
 47. Lethal Autonomous Weapon Systems - United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs, accessed November 4, 2025, <https://disarmament.unoda.org/en/our-work/emerging-challenges/lethal-autonomous-weapon-systems>
 48. Cheap Drones, Expensive Lessons: Ethics, Innovation, and Regulation of Autonomous Weapon Systems - The Henry M. Jackson School of International Studies, accessed November 4, 2025, <https://jsis.washington.edu/news/cheap-drones-expensive-lessons-ethics-innovation-and-regulation-of-autonomous-weapon-systems/>
 49. Recent Advances in Artificial Intelligence and Tactical Autonomy: Current Status, Challenges, and Perspectives - PMC - PubMed Central, accessed November 4, 2025, <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9782095/>
 50. Rules of Engagement in Large Scale Combat Operations - Lieber Institute, accessed November 4, 2025, <https://lieber.westpoint.edu/rules-of-engagement-large-scale-combat-operations/>
 51. Rules of Engagement in Large-Scale Combat Operations: Force Enabler or Much Ado About Nothing? - Lieber Institute, accessed November 4, 2025, <https://lieber.westpoint.edu/rules-engagement-large-scale-combat-operations-force-enabler-much-ado-nothing/>
 52. The fundamental rights risks of countering cognitive warfare with artificial intelligence - NIH, accessed November 4, 2025, <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12500826/>