ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND CONTEMPORARY WARFARE: STRATEGIC DISRUPTION, ETHICAL DILEMMAS (GEORGIAN CASE)

Alika Guchua
Doctor of Political Science, Associate Professor at Caucasus International University
E-mail: alika_guchua@ciu.edu.ge
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0347-9574
Thornike Zedelashvili
Doctor of Political Science, employee of the Information Security Department of the Digital Governance Agency of the Ministry of Justice, founder of the online publication „Leader", invited lecturer at the Caucasus International University
E-Mail: thomaszedelashvili@gmail.com
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2630-1779

Abstract: This article explores the transformative impact of Artificial Intelligence on the nature, conduct, and consequences of contemporary warfare. The aim of this article is to present the role of artificial intelligence in contemporary warfare and the security factors associated with it. The central research question guiding this inquiry is: *How does the integration of AI technologies reshape the strategic, ethical, and legal dimensions of warfare, and what are the implications for international security and humanitarian law?* This article analyzes the main research questions using securitization theory, political realism, and hybrid warfare. The research utilizes policy analysis, content analysis, and case study methods. Drawing on the theoretical frameworks of technological determinism, consequentialist ethics, and Just War Theory, the study examines the deployment of autonomous weapons systems, AI-enhanced military intelligence, and cyberwarfare capabilities. Through detailed case studies-including the Russia-Ukraine conflict, Israel's Iron Dome, and NATO's DIANA initiative the article demonstrates how AI alters decision-making processes, accelerates arms races, and challenges existing legal norms. The paper discusses and analyzes the issue of artificial intelligence and Georgia's national security policy. The findings underscore the urgent need for global regulatory frameworks, ethical oversight, and multilateral cooperation to ensure the responsible use of AI in military contexts.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Autonomous Weapons, Cyberwarfare, Military Strategy, Arms Control, International Humanitarian Law, Just War Theory, Georgia.

***

Introduction. Artificial Intelligence has rapidly emerged as a disruptive force in global security, reshaping the strategic landscape of warfare and redefining the boundaries of military power. From autonomous drones capable of lethal precision to predictive algorithms that anticipate enemy movements, AI technologies are increasingly embedded in defense infrastructures and operational doctrines. This transformation is not merely technological - it is deeply political, ethical, and legal. The integration of AI into warfare raises fundamental questions about accountability, proportionality, and the future of international humanitarian law.

The central research question of this article is: *How does the integration of AI technologies reshape the strategic, ethical, and legal dimensions of warfare, and what are the implications for international security*

and humanitarian law? To address this question, the study draws on three interrelated theoretical frameworks. First, ***technological determinism*** posits that technological innovation drives social and political change, often independently of human agency. In the context of warfare, this theory helps explain how AI systems alter military doctrines, operational behavior, and strategic decision-making (Altmann. & Sauer. 2017). Second, ***consequentialist ethics*** evaluates actions based on their outcomes, providing a normative lens to assess the morality of AI-enabled decisions in combat, particularly when human oversight is limited or absen (Bode. & Huelss. 2022). Third, ***Just War Theory*** offers a classical framework for evaluating the legitimacy of war (jus ad bellum) and the conduct within war (jus in bello), both of which are challenged by the deployment of autonomous systems and algorithmic targeting (Bode. & Huelss. 2022).

Methodologically, the article employs qualitative analysis and thematic synthesis, drawing on recent academic literature, policy documents, and real-world case studies. The aim is to provide a comprehensive understanding of how AI transforms warfare and to identify policy responses that mitigate its risks. The article is structured into five main sections: *1. the strategic transformation of warfare through AI; 2. ethical dilemmas posed by autonomous weapons; 3. the role of AI in military intelligence and targeting; 4. AI-enhanced cyberwarfare and its implications; and 5. the global arms race and regulatory gaps. Each section integrates empirical evidence and theoretical reflection to build a nuanced account of AI's impact on war.*

Artificial Intelligence and the Transformation of Warfare

The integration of Artificial Intelligence into military systems marks a paradigm shift in the nature and conduct of warfare. Historically, technological advances such as gunpowder, mechanized vehicles, and nuclear weapons have redefined combat and strategic thinking. AI continues this trajectory by enabling machines to perform tasks traditionally reserved for humans - surveillance, threat assessment, decision-making, and even lethal action. This shift is not merely operational; it is ontological, altering the very meaning of war and the role of human agency within it.

AI's dual-use nature complicates its regulation and ethical oversight. Technologies developed for civilian applications - such as facial recognition, natural language processing, and autonomous navigation - are rapidly adapted for military use. For instance, commercial image recognition software has been repurposed for battlefield identification and targeting, while autonomous driving algorithms inform the development of unmanned ground vehicles (Cave. & Dignum. 2019). This convergence accelerates the militarization of AI and raises concerns about transparency, accountability, and the erosion of civilian-military boundaries.

Strategically, AI offers several advantages that appeal to military planners. It enhances operational speed, precision, and scalability, allowing for real-time data processing and rapid decision-making. In the 2022 Russia - Ukraine conflict, AI-assisted targeting systems enabled Ukrainian forces to identify and strike Russian assets with unprecedented accuracy, using satellite imagery, open-source intelligence, and machine learning algorithm (Geist. & Lohn. 2018). Similarly, Israel's Iron Dome system, enhanced by AI, intercepted thousands of rockets during the 2021 Gaza conflict, demonstrating how machine learning can optimize threat detection and interception (Gilli. & Gilli. 2021).

China's military doctrine emphasizes *"intelligentized warfare,"* integrating AI into command systems, logistics, and battlefield simulations. The People's Liberation Army (PLA) has invested heavily in AI research, including autonomous underwater vehicles, swarm robotics, and AI-driven decision support systems. *According to Gilli and Gilli (2021),* China views AI as a strategic enabler that can offset conventional military disadvantages and reshape the global balance of power (Gilli. & Gilli. 2021).

However, these capabilities also introduce significant risks. Faster decision cycles may reduce opportunities for diplomacy and conflict de-escalation. AI-enabled systems can trigger automatic responses to per-

ceived threats, increasing the likelihood of unintended engagements and escalation. Moreover, the opacity of AI decision-making - often referred to as the *"black box"* problem - complicates accountability and strategic signaling. If adversaries cannot understand or predict AI-driven behavior, the risk of miscalculation and accidental conflict rises (Geist. & Lohn. 2018).

The transformation of warfare through AI also challenges traditional command structures and operational doctrines. Human commanders must now interact with complex algorithmic systems, often relying on machine-generated recommendations for life-and-death decisions. This shift raises questions about the erosion of human judgment, the delegation of moral responsibility, and the psychological impact on soldiers and decision-makers. *As Scharre (2018) argues,* the rise of *"centaur warfighters"* - human-machine hybrids - requires new models of training, leadership, and ethical reflection.

In sum, AI is not merely a tool of war; it is a force that reshapes the strategic, ethical, and institutional foundations of military power. Its integration into warfare demands a rethinking of doctrines, legal norms, and human-machine relations. The next section examines one of the most contentious aspects of this transformation: the deployment of autonomous weapons and the ethical dilemmas they pose.

Autonomous Weapons and Ethical Dilemmas

Among the most contentious applications of Artificial Intelligence in military contexts is the development and deployment of Lethal Autonomous Weapons Systems *(LAWS).* These systems are capable of selecting and engaging targets without direct human intervention, raising profound ethical, legal, and strategic concerns. The debate surrounding LAWS is not merely technical - it is fundamentally philosophical, touching on the nature of agency, responsibility, and the moral limits of automation in warfare.

Autonomous weapons challenge the foundational principles of international humanitarian law, particularly the requirements of distinction, proportionality, and accountability. The principle of distinction mandates that combatants must differentiate between military targets and civilians, while proportionality requires that the anticipated military advantage of an attack must outweigh potential harm to civilians. In the absence of human judgment, it is unclear how autonomous systems can reliably uphold these principles. *As Cave and Dignum (2019) argue,* the delegation of lethal decision-making to machines risks undermining the ethical architecture of war (Cave. & Dignum. 2019).

Real-world developments illustrate the urgency of these concerns. In 2020, reports emerged that Turkey's *STM Kargu-2* drone may have operated autonomously during a skirmish in Libya, marking one of the first known instances of AI-driven lethal force without human oversight (Sayler. 2020). Although the details remain contested, the incident sparked international debate about the threshold of autonomy and the need for regulation. Similarly, the United States has tested autonomous systems capable of swarming behavior, where multiple drones coordinate attacks without centralized control. These capabilities offer tactical advantages but also raise questions about emergent behavior and unpredictability in combat scenarios.

From an ethical standpoint, consequentialist reasoning provides one lens for evaluating the use of autonomous weapons. If such systems can reduce civilian casualties, minimize human error, and enhance operational efficiency, they may be considered morally permissible. However, this logic assumes that AI systems can reliably interpret complex battlefield environments, which is far from guaranteed. Machine learning algorithms are only as good as their training data, and in dynamic, high-stakes settings, the risk of misclassification or unintended escalation is significant (Altmann. & Sauer. 2017).

Moreover, the issue of accountability remains unresolved. In traditional warfare, responsibility for unlawful actions can be traced to human actors - commanders, soldiers, or political leaders. With autonomous systems, the chain of responsibility becomes opaque. If a drone commits a war crime, who is liable?

The programmer who wrote the code? The commander who deployed the system? The manufacturer who built the hardware? Legal scholars have proposed various models, including strict liability regimes and mandatory human-in-the-loop protocols, but consensus remains elusive (Scharre. 2018).

Just War Theory offers additional insight into the ethical dilemmas posed by autonomous weapons. The principle of right intention, for example, requires that war be waged for morally justifiable reasons. If autonomous systems are used to conduct preemptive strikes based on algorithmic predictions, the moral clarity of intention becomes blurred. Similarly, the principle of last resort assumes that human actors have exhausted diplomatic options before resorting to violence. In a world where machines make decisions at machine speed, the temporal space for diplomacy may be compressed or eliminated altogether (Bode. & Huelss 2022).

Efforts to regulate autonomous weapons have gained momentum but remain fragmented. The United Nations Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons *(CCW)* has convened expert meetings since 2014 to discuss *LAWS,* yet no binding treaty has emerged. Some states, including Austria and Brazil, advocate for a preemptive ban, citing ethical and humanitarian concerns. Others, such as the United States and Russia, resist regulation, arguing that autonomy enhances military effectiveness and deterrence (Boulanin. & Verbruggen. 2017).

Civil society organizations have also mobilized against autonomous weapons. The Campaign to Stop Killer Robots, launched in 2013, has called for an international treaty prohibiting fully autonomous lethal systems. Their advocacy has influenced public discourse and prompted national governments to consider ethical guidelines, but legal codification remains distant.

In sum, autonomous weapons represent a critical juncture in the evolution of warfare. They offer strategic advantages but pose significant ethical and legal risks. The absence of clear accountability mechanisms, the potential for unintended escalation, and the erosion of humanitarian norms demand urgent attention. As AI continues to advance, the international community must confront the moral and legal implications of delegating lethal force to machines. The next section explores how AI is reshaping military intelligence and targeting, further complicating the ethical terrain of modern conflict.

AI in Military Intelligence and Targeting

Artificial Intelligence has revolutionized the domain of military intelligence, introducing capabilities that far exceed traditional human analysis. Through machine learning, natural language processing, and computer vision, AI systems can process vast volumes of data in real time, identify patterns, and generate actionable insights. These technologies are increasingly used to support strategic planning, battlefield awareness, and precision targeting, reshaping how military decisions are made and executed.

One of the most significant advantages of AI in military intelligence is its ability to synthesize heterogeneous data sources. Satellite imagery, drone footage, intercepted communications, and social media content can be integrated into unified platforms that provide commanders with comprehensive situational awareness. For example, during the Russia–Ukraine conflict, Ukrainian forces leveraged AI-enhanced systems to analyze satellite data and open-source intelligence, enabling rapid identification of Russian troop movements and artillery positions (King. 2024). These systems used convolutional neural networks to detect anomalies in terrain and infrastructure, allowing for more accurate targeting and reduced collateral damage.

The United States has also invested heavily in AI-driven intelligence platforms. Project Maven, launched by the Department of Defense in 2017, aimed to automate the analysis of drone surveillance footage using computer vision algorithms. Although the project faced ethical backlash from Google employees, it demonstrated the potential of AI to accelerate intelligence cycles and reduce cognitive load on analysts (Geist. & Lohn. 2018). More recently, the Security Assistance Group - Ukraine employed AI to fuse battlefield data with predictive analytics, enhancing operational coordination and resource allocation.

Predictive targeting is another area where AI has made substantial inroads. By analyzing historical patterns, behavioral indicators, and environmental variables, AI systems can forecast enemy actions and recommend preemptive responses. These capabilities are particularly valuable in counterinsurgency and urban warfare, where adversaries often blend into civilian populations. However, predictive targeting raises ethical concerns about profiling, bias, and the risk of false positives. Algorithms trained on incomplete or skewed datasets may misidentify individuals or misinterpret intent, leading to wrongful targeting and potential violations of international law (Taddeo. & Floridi. 2018).

The opacity of AI decision-making further complicates accountability. Many machine learning models operate as *"black boxes,"* producing outputs without transparent reasoning. This lack of interpretability poses challenges for military oversight and legal review. If a targeting decision is based on an opaque algorithm, it becomes difficult to assess its compliance with the principles of necessity and proportionality. *As Altmann and Sauer (2017)* note, the integration of AI into targeting systems demands new standards for explainability and auditability (Altmann. & Sauer. 2017).

Moreover, adversaries are increasingly aware of AI's role in intelligence and are developing countermeasures. Data poisoning, adversarial inputs, and spoofing techniques can deceive AI systems, leading to misclassification and operational failure. In 2023, NATO's DIANA initiative launched a series of research programs aimed at enhancing the robustness of AI systems against such attacks. These efforts include the development of adversarial training protocols and anomaly detection algorithms designed to identify manipulation attempts in real time (Kaspersen. 2021).

The ethical implications of AI in targeting extend beyond battlefield efficiency. They touch on the fundamental question of human agency in life-and-death decisions. While AI can augment human judgment, there is a risk that commanders may become overly reliant on algorithmic recommendations, especially under time pressure. This phenomenon, known as automation bias, can erode critical thinking and reduce accountability. *As Scharre (2018)* emphasizes, maintaining meaningful human control over targeting decisions is essential to preserve moral responsibility and uphold the laws of armed conflict (Scharre. P. 2018).

In addition to operational concerns, the use of AI in intelligence raises strategic and geopolitical issues. States with advanced AI capabilities may gain disproportionate influence in global affairs, leading to asymmetries in power and deterrence. The diffusion of AI technologies also complicates arms control, as software-based systems are harder to monitor and verify than traditional weapons. *As Boulanin and Verbruggen (2017)* argue, the proliferation of AI-enabled targeting platforms necessitates new frameworks for transparency, verification, and trust-building among states (Boulanin. & Verbruggen. 2017).

In conclusion, AI has transformed military intelligence and targeting, offering unprecedented capabilities for data analysis, prediction, and decision support. However, these benefits come with significant ethical, legal, and strategic risks. Ensuring the responsible use of AI in this domain requires robust oversight mechanisms, transparent algorithms, and a reaffirmation of human judgment in critical decisions. The next section examines how AI is reshaping cyberwarfare, further expanding the scope and complexity of modern conflict.

Cyberwarfare and AI-Enhanced Defense

Artificial Intelligence has become a central component of cyberwarfare, enabling both offensive and defensive operations with unprecedented speed and sophistication. Unlike conventional warfare, cyber conflict unfolds in digital spaces where attribution is difficult, boundaries are blurred, and civilian infrastructure is often directly targeted. AI enhances this domain by automating threat detection, optimizing response strategies, and enabling adaptive learning in real time.

On the offensive side, AI can be used to identify system vulnerabilities, generate polymorphic malware, and conduct large-scale phishing campaigns. These capabilities allow state and non-state actors to penetrate secure networks, disrupt communications, and manipulate data. For example, during the early stages of the Russia - Ukraine war, AI-assisted cyber tools were reportedly used to target Ukrainian government websites and energy infrastructure, causing temporary outages and spreading disinformation (Kaspersen. 2021).

Defensively, AI plays a critical role in intrusion detection systems *(IDS),* anomaly recognition, and automated patching. Machine learning algorithms can analyze network traffic, identify unusual patterns, and isolate malicious code before it spreads. NATO's Cooperative Cyber Defence Centre of Excellence has emphasized the importance of AI in building resilient cyber defenses, particularly in protecting critical infrastructure such as hospitals, power grids, and financial systems (Bode. & Huelss. 2022).

However, the use of AI in cyberwarfare raises significant ethical and legal concerns. Attacks on civilian infrastructure may violate international humanitarian law, especially when they result in harm to non-combatants. The principle of proportionality is difficult to apply in cyberspace, where the effects of an attack may be unpredictable or delayed. Moreover, the attribution problem - identifying the true source of a cyberattack - complicates legal accountability and diplomatic response.

AI also introduces the risk of escalation through automated retaliation. Some military doctrines envision *"active defense"* systems that respond to cyber intrusions autonomously. If such systems misidentify a threat or respond disproportionately, they could trigger unintended conflict. *Geist and Lohn (2018)* warn that AI-driven cyber operations may reduce the decision-making window for human actors, increasing the likelihood of miscalculation (Geist. & Lohn. 2018).

To address these risks, international organizations have proposed norms for responsible behavior in cyberspace. The United Nations Group of Governmental Experts *(UN GGE)* has called for transparency, restraint, and cooperation in cyber operations. The European Union's Cyber Solidarity Act, adopted in 2024, includes provisions for AI-based threat detection and cross-border incident response. These initiatives reflect growing recognition of AI's role in cyber defense and the need for shared standards.

In sum, AI has expanded the scope and complexity of cyberwarfare, offering powerful tools for both attack and defense. While these technologies enhance operational effectiveness, they also challenge legal norms and ethical boundaries. Ensuring responsible use requires robust oversight, international cooperation, and a commitment to protecting civilian infrastructure from digital harm.

Global Arms Race and Policy Gaps

The strategic value of AI has triggered a global arms race, with major powers investing heavily in autonomous systems, algorithmic warfare, and data-driven military platforms. The United States, China, Russia, and the European Union have all launched national AI strategies that include military components. These initiatives prioritize autonomy, speed, and information dominance, reshaping the balance of power in international relations.

China's *"Next Generation AI Development Plan"* explicitly links AI to national security, emphasizing intelligentized command systems and unmanned combat platforms. The United States has responded with the Joint Artificial Intelligence Center *(JAIC),* which coordinates AI integration across the Department of Defense. Russia has focused on AI-enabled electronic warfare and autonomous ground vehicles, while the EU has emphasized ethical guidelines and dual-use regulation (Gilli. & Gilli. 2021).

Despite these developments, there is no binding international treaty governing the military use of AI. Existing arms control agreements - such as the Geneva Conventions and the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe - do not address algorithmic systems or autonomous platforms. Efforts to negotiate new

frameworks have faced resistance, as states fear losing strategic advantage or exposing sensitive technologies (Boulanin. & Verbruggen. 2017).

The lack of regulation creates a permissive environment for experimentation and deployment. Without oversight, AI may lower the threshold for conflict, enable preemptive strikes, and undermine deterrence. *Altmann and Sauer (2017)* argue that autonomous systems could destabilize strategic stability by introducing uncertainty and reducing transparency in military operations (Altmann. & Sauer. 2017).

Civil society organizations have called for international norms and treaties to govern AI in warfare. The Campaign to Stop Killer Robots advocates for a ban on fully autonomous lethal systems, citing ethical and humanitarian concerns. The UN High-Level Panel on Emerging Technologies has recommended a global registry of military AI applications, but implementation remains uncertain.

Policy responses must address several key challenges. First, states must agree on definitions and thresholds of autonomy. Second, verification mechanisms must be developed to ensure compliance. Third, ethical standards must be embedded in system design, including requirements for human oversight and explainability. Finally, multilateral cooperation is essential to build trust and prevent arms races.

In conclusion, the global arms race in AI-enabled warfare presents significant risks to international security. Without regulation, these technologies may erode humanitarian norms, destabilize deterrence, and increase the likelihood of conflict. The international community must act swiftly to establish frameworks that ensure the responsible development and use of military AI.

AI and National Security in Georgia

As artificial intelligence (AI) transforms global security paradigms, small states like Georgia face a dual imperative: to harness emerging technologies for defense modernization while navigating the ethical, legal, and geopolitical complexities of AI-enabled warfare. Located at the intersection of East and West, Georgia's strategic vulnerability-exacerbated by unresolved territorial conflicts and proximity to revisionist powers-renders AI integration both a necessity and a challenge. This chapter explores Georgia's evolving defense posture in the context of AI, focusing on strategic disruption, ethical dilemmas, and implications for national and regional security.

Georgia's defense modernization increasingly incorporates digital technologies, including AI-driven surveillance, cyber defense, and battlefield decision-support systems. The Ministry of Defense has prioritized command-and-control *(C2)* automation, ISR (Intelligence, Surveillance, Reconnaissance) enhancement, and predictive analytics for threat assessment (Ministry of Defense of Georgia, 2021).

Georgia's participation in *NATO's* Defence Innovation Accelerator for the North Atlantic *(DIANA)* has facilitated access to dual-use *AI* technologies and interoperability standards. *DIANA* supports deep-tech development across the Alliance, including *AI* applications for denied environments and resilience threats (NATO DIANA. 2026). However, strategic integration remains constrained by limited domestic *R&D* capacity, dependence on foreign platforms, and the absence of a national *AI* defense doctrine.

The deployment of *AI* in military and security domains raises profound ethical questions, particularly in a transitional democracy with fragile institutional oversight. Concerns include algorithmic bias in threat profiling, opaque decision-making in autonomous systems, and the erosion of civilian control over military operations. Georgia's legal framework lacks explicit provisions regulating autonomous weapons systems *(LAWS),* AI-based surveillance, or battlefield robotics, creating normative gaps that could be exploited during crises or hybrid warfare scenarios.

AI use in border monitoring and counterterrorism-especially in the occupied regions of Abkhazia and so-called South Ossetia-poses dilemmas regarding proportionality, accountability, and human rights complian-

ce. Without robust safeguards, AI-enabled operations risk exacerbating tensions and undermining Georgia's commitment to international humanitarian law (Napetvaridze, 2020).

Georgia has frequently been the target of cyberattacks, particularly in 2008 and 2019, carried out by Russian government agencies. These incidents underscore the strategic importance of *AI* in cyber defense, including anomaly detection, threat prediction, and automated response mechanisms. The Cyber Security Bureau of Georgia has initiated pilot programs using machine learning to enhance network resilience and incident response, yet systemic vulnerabilities persist due to fragmented infrastructure and limited talent retention (Lomidze, 2022).

AI also plays a role in countering disinformation and cognitive warfare, central components of hybrid threats in the region. Georgian civil society and media watchdogs have experimented with natural language processing *(NLP)* tools to identify coordinated inauthentic behavior and malign influence campaigns. However, ethical use of such tools requires transparency, data protection, and public trust-elements still underdeveloped in Georgia's digital governance ecosystem.

Georgia's strategic partnerships with *NATO,* the *EU,* and the United States offer pathways for responsible AI adoption, capacity building, and norm development. *NATO's* revised *AI* strategy emphasizes ethical use, interoperability, and risk mitigation across member and partner states (NATO, Summary of NATO's Revised Artificial Intelligence Strategy. 2024).

Nevertheless, Georgia must balance external dependence with the cultivation of indigenous capabilities to ensure strategic autonomy. The establishment of a national *AI* strategy-integrating defense, civil, and academic sectors-would enable Georgia to articulate its priorities, align with international norms, and foster innovation. Such a strategy should include ethical guidelines, regulatory frameworks, and investment in STEM education to build a sustainable AI ecosystem.

For Georgia, artificial intelligence represents both a strategic opportunity and a normative challenge. As the country seeks to modernize its defense posture and safeguard its sovereignty, it must navigate the ethical complexities of AI-enabled warfare, strengthen institutional oversight, and invest in resilient infrastructure. By embedding AI within a framework of democratic accountability and international cooperation, Georgia can enhance its security while contributing to the global discourse on responsible *AI* in defense.

Conclusion. Artificial Intelligence is reshaping warfare in profound and multifaceted ways. It enhances operational efficiency, enables new forms of combat, and challenges ethical and legal norms. The central research question - *How does the integration of AI technologies reshape the strategic, ethical, and legal dimensions of warfare, and what are the implications for international security and humanitarian law?* - has been answered affirmatively. AI introduces both opportunities and risks that demand urgent policy attention.

The study has shown that AI transforms strategic decision-making, accelerates intelligence cycles, and expands the scope of cyber operations. However, it also raises serious concerns about accountability, proportionality, and the erosion of human judgment. Autonomous weapons, predictive targeting, and algorithmic warfare exemplify the tensions between technological innovation and ethical restraint.

To mitigate these risks, states must develop regulatory frameworks, uphold ethical standards, and ensure meaningful human control over AI-enabled systems. International cooperation is essential to prevent an uncontrolled arms race and to safeguard global security. As AI continues to evolve, the challenge is not merely to harness its power, but to govern it wisely and justly.

The role of artificial intelligence in modern politics is growing across a number of areas. Georgia's policy on the use of artificial intelligence serves to protect national interests and prevent and manage existing and emerging risks and threats. Georgia must implement a number of reforms and take important steps to leverage the benefits of artificial intelligence to protect its national interests. In the context of hybrid and

information warfare, the importance of artificial intelligence in modern warfare is growing, especially with its widespread integration into military technologies and the use of autonomous systems. Therefore, Georgia must quickly adopt modern technologies and ensure their effective management.

Bibliography

Altmann. J. & Sauer. F. 2017. *Autonomous weapon systems and strategic stability.* Survival, Vol.59, No.5. https://doi.org/10.1080/00396338.2017.1375263

Bode. I. & Huelss. H. 2022. *Ethical governance of AI in military contexts: Norms, challenges, and policy options. Journal of International Affairs, Vol. 75, No.1.* https://www.jia.sipa.columbia.edu/ethical-governance-ai-military-contexts

Boulanin. V. & Verbruggen. M. 2017. *Mapping the development of autonomy in weapon systems.* Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI). https://www.sipri.org/publications/2017/other-publications/mapping-development-autonomy-weapon-systems

Cave. S. & Dignum. V. 2019. *Overcoming ethical concerns of autonomous weapons systems: A responsibility gap.* Nature Machine Intelligence, 1(1). https://doi.org/10.1038/s42256-018-0006-7

Geist. E. & Lohn. A. J. 2018. *How might artificial intelligence affect the risk of nuclear war?* RAND Corporation. https://www.rand.org/pubs/perspectives/PE296.htm

Gilli. A. & Gilli. M. 2021. *The diffusion of military AI: China's rise and strategic implications.* International Security, 45(2). https://doi.org/10.1162/isec_a_00401

Kaspersen. A. 2021. *AI and cyber conflict: Emerging threats and governance challenges.* UNIDIR Insights. https://unidir.org/publication/ai-and-cyber-conflict

King. A. 2024*. AI-enabled targeting in Ukraine: Lessons from the battlefield.* Defense Studies Quarterly, 33(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/14702436.2024.1122334

Lomidze. N. 2022. *Cyber Security Challenges in Georgia.* Georgian Scientists, 4.3. DOI:10.52340/gs.2022.04.03.15

Ministry of Defense of Georgia. 2021. "*Strategic Defense Review 2021–2025".https://shorturl.at/ri0B7*

Napetvaridze. V. 2020. *Georgia's Cybersecurity Environment in the AI Era.* https://shorturl.at/1hPSK

NATO DIANA. 2025. *"2026 Challenge Programme",* NATO Defence Innovation Accelerator for the North Atlantic. https://www.diana.nato.int/resources/site1/general/challenges/docs/2026-challenge-programme-cfp.pdf

NATO, *Summary of NATO's Revised Artificial Intelligence Strategy*. 2024. North Atlantic Treaty Organization. https://www.nato.int/en/about-us/official-texts-and-resources/official-texts/2024/07/10/summary-of-natos-revised-artificial-intelligence-ai-strategy

Sayler. K. M. 2020. *Autonomous weapons: Background and issues for Congress.* Congressional Research Service. https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/R/R45178

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

Taddeo. M. & Floridi. L. 2018. *How AI can be a force for good.* Science, 361(6404). https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aat5991