Technological Advancement and Unregulated Production of New Weapons: The Bane of International Humanitarian Law

[1]James E. Archibong., [2]Dr. John Egbe Inyang

[1]Department of Jurisprudence and International Law, University of Calabar, Nigeria

[2]Department of Commercial and Industrial Law, University of Calabar, Nigeria

DOI: https://doi.org/10.51244/IJRSI.2025.120600167

Received: 13 June 2025; Accepted: 18 June 2025; Published: 23 July 2025

ABSTRACT

States are charting new fields daily and developing new weapons to impose their will on others, as witnessed in recent conflicts. From bow and arrow, weapons of war have evolved to the invention of the atomic bomb, ballistic missiles, unmanned combat vehicles, autonomous weapons, military robotics, and cyber technologies. These inventions are driven by advancements in science and technology and the wartime needs of states. These new developments undoubtedly influence tactics and highlight the necessity for the law to keep up with the advancement and use of weaponry. A new era in military strategy is being ushered in by modern armed conflicts, as technological advancements and innovations in weapon systems continue to pick up speed. The cardinal principle of international humanitarian law (IHL) is that parties to a conflict do not have an unrestricted right to choose their weapons and techniques of warfare. This work analyzes the introduction of some technologically advanced weapon systems into the modern battlefield and the necessity for IHL to adjust to and govern the new weapons in armed conflict. It has been established that advanced weapons are endangering global peace and security, and double the likelihood of civilian casualties. Serious concerns have been raised concerning the lack of regulation surrounding their development and use. Therefore, it is necessary to create new rules within the framework of international law to keep combatants in check. It is recommended that advanced weaponry be developed by IHL standards and accepted legal and moral precepts. A convention should be adopted to formulate global policies, methods, and collaboration to regulate the manufacturing and use of such weaponry.

Keywords: Technology, weapons, regulation, international humanitarian law, legal review

INTRODUCTION

It appears that in every generation, people invent new technologies that change the character of war and present new difficulties for those who want to lessen the frequency, devastation, and general suffering of armed conflict (Klare, 2018). The topic of new technologically advanced weapons and their conformity with international humanitarian law (IHL) has once again gained attention due to the conflict in the Middle East that began on October 7, 2023. A non-state armed force was the target of hundreds of pagers and walkie-talkies that exploded simultaneously throughout Syria and Lebanon on September 17 and 18, 2024 (Shamim, 2024; Murphy, 2024). Over 3,000 people were injured, and approximately 42 people, including civilians and children, were killed by explosives that were placed in the communication devices (Bassam & Gebeily, 2024). This development has sparked new worries regarding communication devices as a weapon of war and whether new technological weapons comply with IHL (Bachega, 2024).

New weaponry and fighting techniques tend to assist some governments in imposing their will on others as new areas are being charted. Additionally, non-state actors increasingly have a big say in how armed conflicts are carried out, with proxy wars and terrorism taking precedence (Observer Research Foundation, 2024). These new developments undoubtedly influence tactics and highlight the necessity for the law to keep up with the advancement and use of weaponry (McLaughlin & Nasu, 2014). Therefore, it is necessary to create new rules of participation within the framework of international law. Without a doubt, a new framework for the development of new legal principles for the regulation of modern weapon systems must be provided by

international law (Schmitt, 2006). These rules are essential to keeping combatants in check and lowering their zeal for using their newfound authority to harm people and property. Therefore, the development of weapons technology presents a significant threat to IHL and creates issues with regulation and management (Klare, 2018).

This work aims to analyze the introduction of some technologically advanced weapon systems into the modern battlefield, a phenomenon limited to science fiction a few decades ago. It also investigates how IHL can be modified to address the legal and regulatory issues brought about by advanced weapon systems in combat. In light of this, the development of weapons technology and the necessity for IHL to adjust to and govern the new weapons in armed conflict scenarios are explored and critically examined in this study. Since advanced weapons are endangering global peace and security, and pose more than double the likelihood of civilian casualties, it addresses how IHL may effectively address this concerning trend.

The concept of international humanitarian law

The standards of international humanitarian law (IHL), sometimes referred to as the law of armed conflict, are binding on all nations as well as, to a lesser extent, on organizations and persons. This area of law controls how war is fought and aims to lessen the suffering caused by the start of hostilities. It protects those who do not or no longer participate in military activities while simultaneously placing limitations and constraints on the selection of weapons and tactics used in military operations. Although nations have long asserted the right to use force to resolve international conflicts (*jus ad bellum*), international humanitarian law (IHL) establishes the legal framework for regulating war and its conduct (*jus in bello*) (Kalshoven & Zegveld, 2001). IHL regulates the use of weapons of war and controls belligerent behaviour. Additionally, it prohibits weapons with indiscriminate effects, that cause needless harm or suffering, and that seriously or permanently harm the environment (Frei, 1974). The cardinal principle of IHL is that parties to a conflict do not have an unrestricted right to choose their weapons and techniques of warfare, in addition to protecting those impacted by war (Blank & Noone, 2014:20).

Regulation of weapons of war

Historical attempt to regulate weapons of war

There have been attempts to control the use of weapons of war since the Middle Ages and before by imposing legal restrictions on their usage. The Decree of the Emperor Henry IV Concerning a Truce of God, which was published in 1085, was designed to restrict fighting and violence on specific holy days (McLaughlin and Nasu, 2014). In 1139, the Second Lateran Council disapproved of the use of crossbows and forbade the carrying of weapons like lances, swords, and shields (Shereshevsky, 2022). The St. Petersburg Declaration of 1868, which prohibited explosive projectiles weighing less than 400 grammes in time of war, is the source of the current attempt to regulate weapons of war (Schmitt, 2006). This effectively outlawed the Dum-Dum explosives and bullets, which resulted in needless pain and harm. Since then, restrictions have been placed on war weapons, including the Oxford Manual (1880), the Declaration of Brussels (1874), and the Hague Regulations (1899), which forbade the use of poison in combat.

A fundamental principle relating to means of warfare was embodied in Article 22 of the Hague Regulations, which stated that the right of belligerents to adopt means of injuring the enemy is not unlimited. Also, Article 23(e) of the Hague Regulations prohibited arms, projectiles, or materials calculated to cause unnecessary suffering. The Hague Convention VIII of 1907 forbade belligerents from laying automatic contact mines off the coast and ports of the enemy, with the sole object of intercepting commercial shipping (Article 2, Hague Convention VIII Relating to the Laying of Automatic Submarine Contact Mines 1907). The Protocol on the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and Bacteriological Methods of Warfare (1925) imposed an additional restriction (Scott, 1999).

Contemporary approach to regulation

The modern approach to regulation basically concerns the restriction or prohibition of certain types of weapons. Treaties embody the current IHL rules that govern specific weapons used in conflict and restrict the

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XII Issue VI June 2025

manufacture and use of certain weapons (Schmitt, 2006). These include the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling, and Destruction of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons in 1972 and the En-Mod Convention (Convention on the Prohibition of the Military or Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques) in 1977. Under the 1980 Convention and its five Protocols, certain weapons, including anti-personnel mines, fragmentation, undetectable booby traps, blinding laser weapons, fire-producing devices, and others, are prohibited or restricted (Ann, 1996). The Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling, and Use of Chemical Weapons and Their Destruction (1993), the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (1996), the Land Mine Convention (1997), and the Convention on Cluster Munitions (2008) are further treaties. Furthermore, certain weapons that are already in use and those that are to be developed are restricted by customary international law. For instance, customary law forbids weapons that strike indiscriminately, weapons that cause needless harm or suffering, and weapons that make death unavoidable (Boothby, 2009).

Weapons of mass destruction

This category of weapons, which is devised to inflict large-scale deaths and destruction, consists of chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons. Chemical weapons were used in World War I (1914-1918). The Geneva Protocol of 1925 banned the use of chemical weapons in warfare. They are also banned by the 1997 Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC). Biological weapons infused with disease-causing agents, micro-organisms, and toxins are also prohibited under the Biological Weapons Convention of 1972. Nuclear weapons, the most dangerous and destructive, with the capacity to destroy a whole city, occupy a special status. Originally used in Japan during World War II, nuclear weapons are now regarded as weapons of mass devastation.

No treaty forbids the manufacturing and use of nuclear weapons, in contrast to chemical and biological weapons, which are likewise considered weapons of mass destruction and prohibited by international law. However, states are urged by the United Nations (UN), the International Court of Justice (ICJ), and the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) not to employ them. According to the ICJ's 1996 Advisory Opinion in the *Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons*, states do not have an unrestricted choice of weapons and fighting strategies (Schmitt, 2006). Nonetheless, there are a few accords designed to prevent nuclear weapons testing and proliferation. Nuclear weapons were exempted from the list of forbidden weapons of war during the Cold War because they were considered a "special case" (Mickeviciute, 2016)

Article 36 procedure: Evaluation of new weaponry

A growing reliance on advanced military technology undoubtedly has the potential to dehumanize combat, even though the prospect of nuclear war appears to have diminished (Boulanin & Verbruggen, 2017). Article 36 of the API of 1977 contains the present regulatory framework that addresses the creation of new weapons (Jacobsson, 2006). According to that clause, “In the study, development, acquisition or adoption of a new weapon, means or method of warfare, a High Contracting Party is under an obligation to determine whether its employment would, in some or all circumstances, be prohibited by this Protocol or by any other rule of international law applicable to the High Contracting Party.” States must conduct a legal assessment or evaluation to guarantee that a new weapon complies with IHL before producing or purchasing it (Daoust et al., 2002: 347). Article 36 was introduced to ensure that existing legal norms are applied to modern technological developments and that the applicable law remains relevant as technology advances (Boulanin & Verbruggen, 2017). Certain advanced weapon types, both current and future, must be subject to legal review to ensure compliance with IHL. Three new technological areas—robotics, artificial intelligence, and cyberwarfare technology—are the foundation of Article 36 evaluations (Boulanin & Verbruggen, 2017).

Evolution of weapons of war

From bow and arrow to the atomic bomb and ballistic missiles

A weapon is an equipment or gadget used to harm or injure people or damage property. The use of weapons in combat has its roots in prehistoric periods, when the primary weaponry was spears, bows, clubs, swords, and

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XII Issue VI June 2025

arrows (Marshall, 2009; Anand, 1999). Over time, these weapons underwent modifications and advancements, particularly during Europe's Renaissance, when firearms were first used on the battlefield. The invention of fire cannons and their application in warfare throughout the Middle Ages marked a significant advancement facilitated by the discovery of copper, bronze, and other metals (George, 2023).

The Industrial Revolution provided a boost and marked a substantial contribution to the creation of new technologies that led to improvements in already-existing weapons (Anand, 1999). Military technology also evolved significantly during and after World War I, as several cutting-edge weapons were created to support the war effort out of necessity (Klare, 2018). Already-in-use weapons like machine guns were significantly enhanced to increase their firepower. During this time, artillery, poison gas, combat aircraft, tanks, and submarines were developed to improve land, air, and naval warfare (Marshall, 2009). In terms of advanced weaponry and battle techniques, the late 20th century and beyond saw significant shifts in warfare made possible by advancements in industry, science, and technology. The era of ballistic missiles and the atomic bomb was brought about by this change (Anand, 1999). World War II witnessed the first use of nuclear weapons as a result of the application of nuclear technology to warfare (Klare, 2018).

Modern technology and new weapons of concern

Technology is being used in modern warfare in a way never seen before (Backstrom & Henderson, 2006). Modern weapon systems are beyond science fiction due to scientific advancements and military technologies (Guilmartin, 2024; Lukpata & Andeshi, 2014). Modern warfare is increasingly being fought by machines without humans, as demonstrated by the deployment of automated and autonomous weapons, remotely operated robots, powered exoskeletons, unmanned underwater vehicles, and unmanned aerial vehicles (Singer, 2009). To assist modern combat, there has also been a notable advancement in the creation of sensors, radar, satellites, computers, sophisticated communications, missile guidance systems, data linkages, and information collecting tools. By decreasing the role of humans, these cutting-edge devices also alter battle tactics, shifting the emphasis from large standing armies to tiny, elite, and mobile troops.

Additionally, research in other fields, like genetics, nanotechnology, completely autonomous weapons, and artificial intelligence, is advanced, and some of its components are currently available (Klare, 2018). In terms of distance, accuracy, destructive power, and detection capabilities, technological advancements have greatly enhanced conventional weaponry and battle tactics. Adapting computer and software applications for military use has significantly improved intelligence collection, surveillance, and reconnaissance (Lukpata & Andeshi, 2014:74-79,). The use of precision guided weaponry and remote control of unmanned devices has significantly increased thanks to satellite guidance equipment and global positioning systems (GPS). Significant progress has been made in the areas of accuracy in target determination, precision, intelligence gathering, and weapon range (Ratiu & Rosu, 2021). As McLaughlin and Nasu (2014) aptly point out, the ever-expanding capacity to employ evolving technology in warfare renders existing means and methods more destructive and/or more precise and also leverages or creates new means and methods.

Military robots and unmanned vehicles

The use of remotely piloted unmanned vehicles, as observed in the particular setting of modern combat, is arguably the most complicated factor (Button, 2009). The usage of military robots or unmanned vehicles has increased over the past three decades, particularly for tasks like logistics, base security, explosives disposal, and reconnaissance (Button, 2009). The application of robots has the advantage of reducing soldier casualties, which leads to tactical and operational gains, and they do not grow fatigued or require counseling. These machines perform duties intended for many human soldiers while being shielded from sleep deprivation, fatigue, a lack of team spirit, communication difficulties, and other performance-impairing factors (Singer, 2009). Major military powers are increasingly using unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs), also known as drones, in battle (McDonnell, 2017). In addition to various payload devices, these remotely operated vehicles are equipped with cameras, sensors, and communication devices (Laghari et al., 2023). Like robots, their use in combat reduces the emotional and traumatic stress usually associated with humans. Several nations are engaged in the development and application of unmanned vehicles.

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XII Issue VI June 2025

Autonomous weapons

Autonomous weapons have also made their ways into modern battlefield. A machine is said to be autonomous if it can function without direction or control and carry out specific tasks by itself (Klare, 2018). Without humans, autonomous weapon systems can select and initiate assaults (Davidson, 2018). The main question is whether autonomous weapons can fulfill their military objectives while still abiding by human rights norms, IHL, and protection of civilians (Ratiu & Rosu, 2021; Sharkey, 2008). The United States is a major investor in the autonomous weapons industry (Hiebert, 2024). Other major powers currently employ a variety of armament systems with varying degrees of autonomy. The creation of completely autonomous weapon systems has brought up some basic concerns, such as the fact that the artificial intelligence incorporated into these weapons is devoid of all the characteristics of human intelligence and judgment that subject and hold people to standards and laws (Davidson, 2018). The deployment of robots and autonomous weapons in combat also raise some ethical and legal concerns (Krishnan, 2008).

Information and Cyber warfare

One of the more lethal aspects of contemporary warfare is information warfare in armed conflicts (Observer Research Foundation, 2024; Thomas, 1996). A person without a gun becomes a combatant in information warfare, "armed" only with a laptop that he can use to damage or destroy an enemy's military target or make an army more vulnerable by breaking into their computer system and spreading information that leads the army into an ambush, resulting in both military and civilian casualties (Schwartau, 1994).

The use of cyber technology in warfare presents another serious cause for concern. Cyberwarfare refers to procedures that involve the use of cyberspace during times of armed conflict (Droege, 2012). The international community is concerned about this mode of warfare since cyber networks are delicate and cyber-attacks can have costly and humanitarian repercussions (Schmitt, 2002:365). A state's computer networks could be attacked or blocked, impacting residents by interfering with necessities like water supply, healthcare, and energy, among other facilities (Li & Liu, 2021). A cyberattack could ground the global positioning system (GPS) and impact flights, dam control facilities, nuclear plants, and other crucial computer-dependent operations (Droege, 2012). Due to the interconnectedness of networks, the damage from such an attack would be enormous. Because cyber activities during armed conflict can cause a major humanitarian disaster, belligerents must uphold their duties to protect civilians and limit cyberwarfare to the guidelines and parameters of IHL (Hollis, 2014).

Nanotechnology and military applications

The management of materials at the molecular, atomic, or subatomic scale is known as nanotechnology, and it is increasingly used in military applications (Souther, 2012). In terms of guaranteeing the legality of weapons, distinction, proportionality, and safeguard, the application of nanotechnology in combat presents challenges to IHL (Nasu, 2012:654). There is currently no treaty clause governing the use of nanotechnology in the military, and its effects are yet unknown because of the weapons industry's secrecy.

Article 36 issues with the evaluation of new weapons

There are many challenges with the review procedure outlined in Article 36 of AP I. The first issue, and possibly the most basic one, is noncompliance. There are reportedly very few states with an official Article 36 review process in place. Furthermore, it offers no specific recommendations on how governments ought to codify this procedure (Boulanin & Verbruggen, 2017). It has no guidelines for the precise conduct of legal reviews and does not require states to disclose their findings or give information on the topic to anyone.

Regarding the application of Article 36 and their weapons programme, the major states with sizable military arsenals follow distinct procedures. Since 1999, Article 36 of the UK has required a formal legal weapons review of all new weapons and equipment entering service. DoD Instruction 5500.15, which lays out general rules to guarantee that newly produced weapons comply with international law, governs Article 36 review in the US. The Instruction establishes a formal procedure for evaluating whether weapons are lawful under international law. Nonetheless, certain elements of the review can be categorized as confidential.

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XII Issue VI June 2025

China has legal evaluation processes for new weapons as a State Party to Additional Protocol I. It is difficult to determine the scope and efficacy of its execution, nevertheless, because information regarding China's unique internal processes and how they handle the review process is not generally accessible. Although this cannot be confirmed, the Russian Federation complies fully with its duties under Article 36 of AP I by its guiding concept. The absence of international regulations to establish a consistent approach for the review of new weapons is the most urgent technical concern with Article 36 (Cochrane, 2020).

Resistance to weapons regulation

Wartime needs of states

Most of today's weaponry was created to satisfy wartime demands and needs (Anand, 1999). During World War I, among other weapons, armed aircraft and tanks were produced, completing the industrialization of warfare. Chemical and biological weapons were also created to satisfy wartime demands, even though they are now prohibited as weapons of mass destruction. During World War II, new, extremely advanced weaponry was invented, and already-existing weapons were continuously upgraded and updated. The creation and application of the atomic bomb was the most significant invention of that era (Klare, 2018).

Arms race

A new weapons race has been triggered by tensions and problems in global security (Chin, 2019; Inyang & Ofem, 2019). The conflicts in the Middle East and Russia-Ukraine represent a rapid increase and intensification in the quantity and quality of weaponry obtained by rival nations. As a result of the rhetoric between Russia and the West and the resurgence of the Cold War, various dangerous war machines are being manufactured, acquired, and accumulated. Russia has announced its suspension of the New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (New START), citing the conflict in Ukraine and the backing it receives from the West (Bugos, 2023).

Reduction in costs of war

Additionally, states invest in cutting-edge weaponry to, at the very least, reduce the costs of going to war (Anand, 1999). Major military countries are now using new military strategies and weaponry that significantly reduce the number of casualties in conflict by utilizing coordinated systems that are remotely managed. One of the most significant of these weapon systems is the unmanned vehicle. The purpose of these weapons, in essence, is to enable their operators to perform combat tasks without facing significant risks. Any approach that promotes technology that can lower the cost of war, even politically, would be welcomed because war, in any form or method, is typically a destructive endeavour (Lin et al., 2008).

Strategic advantage

For strategic reasons, states typically oppose any restriction relating to advanced weapons technology they have produced, which places them on the brink of another arms race (Mickeviciute, 2016). There is a connection between the strategic impact of a certain weapon or ammunition and the degree to which it can be governed by a particular weapon regulation that governs its use (Klare, 2018). Therefore, the more strategic and warning effects a weapon has, the less likely a state is to tolerate banning or even restricting it.

It has long been understood that states actively want to establish a military edge over those they perceive to be their adversaries. As such, they will not tolerate any regulation of weapons that provides them with a military edge. The ability to effectively regulate the use of tactical weapons has been significantly diminished since the nations that acquire them keep their ownership and potential secrets. Another obstacle to regulating modern weaponry is the difference in technological prowess between warring sides (Shereshevsky, 2022). Some states aim to avoid treaty obligations that limit specific types of weaponry to preserve their capabilities and superiority (Paust, 1974). The United States requested an exemption from the Ottawa Convention, which forbade anti-personnel landmines having self-destructive and self-deactivating capabilities. Other states not willing to exempt the United States from the prohibition rejected the request.

ISSN No. 2321-2705 | DOI: 10.51244/IJRSI |Volume XII Issue VI June 2025

Dangers of unregulated and unrestrained weaponry development

The spread of sophisticated weaponry is a serious cause for concern and risk since it could spark another arms race between nations (Chin, 2019). Without stringent regulation, the weapons or the technology to manufacture them might be sold illegally on the black market. Around the world, totalitarian governments would be keen to have the technology necessary to create advanced weaponry so they could threaten their neighbours and cause instability in their regions. The primary concern is that unauthorized organizations and non-state armed groups may obtain these weapon systems for nefarious purposes. Certain weapon systems could be used as an oppressive tool by a repressive government if they are not regulated. Government forces in Syria's civil conflict had been charged with using chlorine gas, barrel bombs, and chemical weapons against civilians and militants in areas under opposition control (Brooks et al., 2018).

The true test is the ability of newly developed weapon systems to adhere to the principles of proportionality, precaution, and differentiation between civilians and combatants, as well as if such qualities exemplified by people can be transferred to machines (Klare, 2018). Systems for unmanned weapons function by their programming. In this sense, it is debatable how a robot can be successfully programmed to prevent civilian casualties when humans cannot distinguish between different groups in conflict situations and struggle to resolve these issues. The software that powers the sophisticated armament systems is likewise questionable in dependability. Such software may be vulnerable to virus infestation, hacking, and gadget malfunctions. Deprogramming and hacking the robots could adversely affect both combatants and civilians. By initiating a cyberattack to aid in a war effort, hackers can take a direct part in hostile acts.

Making the world a safer place

This study has demonstrated that the development of advanced weapons technology and the potential for these weapons to find their way into the illicit market are making the world dangerous. IHL might be dealing with a new challenge in this respect (Mickeviciute, 2016). Advanced weaponry and battle tactics must be developed in compliance with IHL standards and accepted legal and moral precepts. Regulation will restrict their accessibility and availability to terrorist organizations, armed groups, and non-state actors. The conduct of weapons reviews is now hampered by the absence of clear treaty regulation about modern weapons.

States are unlikely to give up weapons that give them a strategic advantage over others, thus making regulation or prohibition difficult. Therefore, adopting a clear law that prohibits the development and use of nuclear weapons is necessary, and states that currently possess nuclear weapons ought to pledge to destroy them. Effective national and international frameworks and measures should be created to stop, control, and end cyberwarfare, particularly when non-state actors are responsible for the attacks. A convention should be adopted to develop global policies, methods, and collaboration to regulate the manufacturing and use of autonomous weapons.

The role of the UN in weapons control

The UN is in charge of preserving world peace and security. Through a number of treaties and other measures, it tackles the problems related to sophisticated weaponry. Conventional weapons regulation and the prevention of the spread of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) are covered by treaties. Through the United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs (UNODA), the UN also collaborates with member nations on disarmament initiatives. Reducing and finally eradicating WMD, which directly threaten humanity, has been the UN's top objective. The International Atomic Energy Agency was founded by the UN to guarantee that states use atomic energy responsibly and peacefully. The UN is also concentrating on new weapons that are the result of developing technology and their effects on global security, including cyber weapons, autonomous weapons, and unmanned combat vehicles. With worries about the moral ramifications and responsibility, the UN is actively participating in talks and negotiations about the creation and application of such weapons. Some states' noncompliance with existing accords makes it difficult for the UN to implement and enforce them. When it complies with international law, the UN Charter does not forbid its members from possessing and utilizing conventional weapons. New military systems and emerging technology provide new difficulties that require international regulation and collaboration. To further slow-moving negotiations on a treaty or

agreement that would regulate autonomous weapons, the UN General Assembly has ordered further international consultations (Klare, 2024). The UN must keep up its efforts to confront emerging risks posed by sophisticated weapons and to fortify current disarmament regimes. It must provide systems and processes that offer deadlines for completing important goals, arms control, and armaments constraints.

The need for accountability

The international legal order ought to be firmly rooted in an accountability framework. IHL lacks the tools and procedures to hold people accountable for grave transgressions of its tenets, including the abuse of weapons of war. This falls within the province of international criminal law (ICL). The International Criminal Court (ICC) can prosecute persons who commit serious violations of IHL. The Court has already issued arrest warrants for certain individuals, including political and military officials, for offences bordering on war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide (Archibong & Lloyd, 2021).

CONCLUSION

IHL requires governments to ensure that new weapons and battle strategies comply with international law, even as they assert their right to go to war. Under the law, states must conduct weapons reviews and make sure that some of the core principles of international humanitarian law—particularly those relating to distinction, proportionality, and precaution—are followed. Russia's recent military intervention in Ukraine has reenacted the Cold War tensions, the East-West divide and the instability and fragility of the global order. As a result, the main world powers are always investing in new weaponry and improving their existing ones.

States are ignoring the UN Security Council and its notorious veto power by depending increasingly on their military force to settle conflicts rather than using the processes designed for peaceful resolution. Some states have been forced to invest in new weaponry and greatly raise their military budgets at the expense of social welfare, health care, and education due to the competition for global domination and the risks posed by non-state actors. Without international regulation, this could have unanticipated repercussions.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

REFERENCES

1. Anand, V. (1999) “Strategic Analysis: Impact of technology on Conduct of Warfare” A Monthly Journal of the IDSA Aril (Vol. XXIII No.1)
2. Ann, P. (1996) “Blinding Laser Weapons: New Limits On The Technology of Warfare” Contemporary Law Journal 733
3. Archibong, J. E. and Lloyd, C. J. (2021). Long road to justice: Omar al-bashir and the issue of heinous crimes in Darfur Journal of Organizational Culture, Communications and Conflict, 25(2), 1-11
4. Bachega, H. (2024) “‘We don’t know if our phones are safe’: Lebanon on edge after exploding device attacks” BBC 18 September https://ww.bbc.com accessed 12/03/2025
5. Backstrom, A. and Henderson, I. (2006) “New Capabilities in Warfare: An Overview of Contemporary Technological Developments and the Associated Legal Engineering Issues in Article 36” Weapons Review, 06, 23-43
6. Bassam, L. and Gebeily, M. (2024) “Israel planted explosives in Hezbollah’s Taiwan-made pagers, say sources” Reuters September 20 https://www.reuters.com
7. Blank, L. R. and G.P. Noone, G. P. (2014) International Law and Armed Conflict (New York: Wolters Kluwer Law & Business, 2014) pp 16-19
8. Boothby, W.H. (2009) Weapons and the law of armed conflict Oxford: Oxford University Press
9. Button, C. (2009) “Unmanned Aerial Vehicles on Operations: Overcoming the Challenges” Rusidefence Systems, June
10. Boulanin, V. and Verbruggen, M. (2017) “Article 36 Reviews – Dealing with the challenges posed by emerging technologies” Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, December

11. Brooks, J., Erickson, T.B. and Burkle Jr, F.M. (2018) "Responding to chemical weapons violations in Syria: legal, health, and humanitarian recommendations" Conflict and Health 12, Article number: 12
12. Bugos, S. (2023) "Russia suspends New START" Arms Control Association, March
13. Chin, W. (2019) "Technology, war and the State; past, present and future" International Affairs Vol. 95, Issue 4, 765-783
14. Cochrane, J.M. (2020) Conducting Article 36 Legal Reviews for Lethal Autonomous Weapons" Journal of Science Policy and Governance 16(01)
15. Daoust, I., Coupland, R. and Ishoey, R. (2002) "New wars, new weapons? The obligation of States to assess the legality of means and methods of warfare" RICR Jun IRRC June Vol.84 No 846
16. Davidson, N. (2017) A legal perspective: Autonomous weapon systems under international humanitarian law, UNODA Occasional Papers No. 30, November, 5-18
17. Droege, C. (2012) "Get off my cloud: Cyber warfare, international humanitarian law, and the protection of civilians" International Review of the Red Cross Vol. 94, No. 886
18. Frei, D. "The Regulation of Warfare: A Paradigm for the Legal Approach to the Control of International Conflict" The Journal of Conflict Resolution Vol. 18, No. 4, 620-633
19. George, S.C. (2023) "From Stone Tools to Guns: A Timeline of Ancient Weapons" Discover Magazine Dec 7 https://www.discovermagazine.com accessed 13/12/2024
20. Hiebert, K. {2024) "The United States Quietly Kick-Starts the Autonomous Weapons Era" Centre for International Governance, January 15
21. Hollis, D.B. (2014) "Re-Thinking the Boundaries of Law in Cyberspace: A Duty to Hack?" in Cyber War: Law & Ethics for Virtual Conflicts J. Ohlin et al., eds., Oxford University Press, 129-174
22. Inyang, G.E.B. and Ofem, N.I. (2019) "The carrier strict liability in the carriage of goods by sea: Instituting the carrier liability regime under Hague and Hague-Visby rules" International Journal of Law 5(5); September 73-79
23. Jacobsson, M. (2006) "Modern Weaponry and Warfare: The Application of Article 36 of Additional Protocol I by Governments" in Anthony M. Helm ed. The Law Of War In The 21st Century: Weaponry And The Use Of Force 184 US Naval War College International Law Studies Vol. 82
24. Kalshoven, F. and L. Zegveld, L. (2001) Constraints on the waging of war 3rd ed. Geneva: International Committee of the Red Cross
25. Klare, M.T. (2018) "The Challenges of Emerging Technologies" Arms Control Association, December www.armscontrol.org accessed 13/12/2024
26. Klare, M.T. (2024) "UN Moves to Expand Autonomous Weapons Discussions" Arms Control Association, December www.armscontrol.org accessed 10/6/2025
27. Krishnan, A. (2009) Killer Robots, Legality and Ethicality of Autonomous Weapons, Ashgate, Farnham, 2009, 43-45.
28. Laghari, A.A., Jumani, A.K., Laghari, R.A. and Nawaz, H. (2023) "Unmanned aerial vehicles: A review" Cognitive Robotics Volume 3, 8-22
29. Li, Y. and Liu, Q. (2021) "A comprehensive review study of cyber-attacks and cyber security; Emerging trends and recent developments" Energy Reports Volume 7, November, 8176-8186
30. Lin, P., Bekey, G. and Abney, K. (2008) Autonomous Military Robotics: Risk, Ethics, and Design, CALPOY, 20 December
31. Lukpata, V.I., Andeshi, C.A. "Impact of Technology on Modern Life: A Colossus in Defence and Security" Journal of Good Governance and Sustainable Development in Africa Vol.2, No., May, 2014, 74-79
32. Marshall, M. (2009) "Timeline: Weapons technology" New Scientist 7 July https://newscientist.com accessed 10/12/2024
33. McDonnell, T.M. (2017) "Rule of Law in the Age of the Drone: Requiring Transparency and Disqualifying Clandestine Actors – the CIA and the Joint Special Operations Command" University of Miami Law Review Vol 72: 34, 34-111
34. McLaughlin, R. and Nasu, H. (2014) "Introduction: Conundrum of New Technologies in the Law of Armed Conflict" in H. Nasu and R. McLaughlin (eds.) New Technologies and the Law of Armed Conflict, The Hague: T. M. C. ASSER PRESS, 2014
35. Mickeviciute, N. (2016) "Lessons from the past for weapons of the future" International Comparative Jurisprudence Volume 2, Issue 2, 99-106

36. Murphy, M. (2024) “What we know about the Hezbollah device explosions” BBC 20 September https://www.bbc.com accessed 10/12/2024
37. Nasu, H. (2012) “Nanotechnology and challenges to international humanitarian law; a preliminary legal assessment” International Review of the Red Cross Vol. 94 No. 886
38. Observer Research Foundation (2024) “Future Warfare and Critical Technologies: Evolving Tactics and Strategies” Feb 12 www.orfonline.org accessed 13/01/2025
39. Paust, J.J. (1974) “Weapons Regulation, Military Necessity and Legal Standards: Are Contemporary Department of Defense Practices Inconsistent with Legal Norms,” Denver Journal of International Law & Policy Volume 4, Number 2, 229-235
40. Ratiu, A. & Rosu, O. (2021) “The Impact of Some Emerging Technologies in Modern Military Actions” Scientific Bulletin Vol. XXVI, No. 2(52)
41. Schmitt, M. N. (2002) “Wired Warfare: Computer Network Attack and Jus in Bello” in: Int’l Rev. Red Cross, Vol. 84
42. Schmitt, M. N. (2006) “War, Technology and the Law of Armed Conflict” in A.M. Helm (ed.) The Law of War in the 21st Century: Weaponry and the Use of Force, International Law Studies Volume 82, 138-182
43. Schwartau, W. (1994) Information warfare in armed conflicts: Chaos on the Electronic Superhighway New York: Thunder’s Mouth Press
44. Scott, K. (1999) “International Control of Biological Weapons” ILSA Journal of International & Comparative Law Vol. 6: Iss. 1, Article 4
45. Sharkey, N. (2008) “Grounds for discrimination: autonomous robot systems” RUS Defence Systems Vol. 11
46. Shamin, S. (2024) “How did Hezbollah get pagers that exploded in Lebanon?” Aljazeera 18 Sep www.aljazeera.com accessed 13/12/2024
47. Shereshevsky, Y. (2022) “International humanitarian law-making and new military technologies” International Review of the Red Cross No. 920-921, November
48. Singer, P.W. (2009) “Military Robots and the Laws of War” A Journal of Technology and Society, Winter, 27-47
49. Souther, W. (2012) “Nanotechnology in the Military” Azo Nano June 20 https://www.azonano,com accessed 11/01/25
50. Thomas, T. L. (1996) “Deterring Information Warfare: A New Strategic Challenge” Parameters Winter 26(4), 81-91