

PHILOSOPHY OF WAR IN THE AGE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE: ETHICS, TECHNOLOGY, AND THE TRANSFORMATION OF MILITARY POWER

Aleksandar M. Pavić¹, Hatidža A. Beriša²

¹Military Academy, University of Defense, Republic of Serbia, e-mail: aleksandar.pavic@mod.gov.rs

²National Defense School "Vojvoda Radomir Putnik", University of Defense, Republic of Serbia,
e-mail: hatidza.berisa@mod.gov.rs

Abstract: War has always been a complex phenomenon that is simultaneously the subject of philosophical, moral, legal and technological re-examination. With the emergence of artificial intelligence and autonomous systems, war as a phenomenon is experiencing a fundamental transformation, not only in operational and tactical terms, but also in conceptual and normative terms. New technologies are changing the way wars are fought, but also the way wars are understood. Instead of war as human decisions and conflicts, contemporary studies of war imply a war in which algorithms, machines and autonomous systems make decisions with potentially deadly consequences, often without direct human oversight. This paper aims to take an interdisciplinary look at the impact of artificial intelligence on the nature of modern warfare, through the intersection of ethics, technology and the transformation of military power.

Starting from a historical overview of philosophical ideas about war, to contemporary approaches, the article explores how artificial intelligence challenges traditional paradigms and questions categories such as courage, responsibility, subjectivity and ethical choice. In particular, the focus is on the transformation of just war theory, both in terms of the justification for entering into war (*jus ad bellum*) and in terms of the principles within war (*jus in bello*). The use of autonomous weapons systems opens up a number of moral dilemmas: who is responsible for the decisions made by a machine? Can an algorithm be the subject of moral assessment? What is the role of man in the context of delegated lethal power?

The theoretical framework of the work combines philosophy, ethics, technological development and military theory, which is the basis of contemporary security studies. On the other hand, the triad of ethics, technology and transformation of power implies that the work considers normative and empirical aspects. While the use of the phrase "philosophy of war" points to a deeper, more fundamental reflection, not only on the application but also on the meaning of warfare in the age of artificial intelligence. The previously presented facts indicate how artificial intelligence fits into the strategic matrices of great powers and how new technologies are changing geopolitics, becoming a new source of global hegemony. Dominance in the field of artificial intelligence today has almost the same meaning as nuclear superiority once did.

The aim of the paper is not only to describe technological changes, but also to critically review the need for new ethical, philosophical and legal frameworks that will enable the understanding and regulation of war in the digital age. The research concludes that it is necessary to reexamine the fundamental categories that determine war, from subjectivity and responsibility, to the concept of the enemy and the ethics of violence, in order to adequately respond to the challenges brought by the age of artificial intelligence.

Keywords: *artificial intelligence, war, philosophy of war, autonomous systems, ethics of war, responsibility, geopolitics.*

Field: Social Sciences

1. INTRODUCTION

Artificial intelligence in the modern concept of war is causing a fundamental change in the domain of responsibility, justice and human control. If autonomous systems take over decisions that have so far been the domain of human reasoning, the question arises whether war can remain morally justified when it goes beyond the framework of human agency. Just war theories and traditional ethical categories are called into question, because artificial intelligence operates on the basis of algorithms that cannot sense human suffering, which leads to new philosophical dilemmas about where responsibility for the use of force lies and whether it is possible to maintain justice in war in the era of digital decisions.

The philosophy of war has always been a key framework for understanding the essence of armed conflicts, as well as their moral and political implications. It connected human nature with the concept of force, responsibility and necessity, serving as a corrective mechanism in times of crisis and conflict. Today, however, modern man is increasingly moving away from this tradition. Accelerated technological development and the digitalization of all spheres of society make it increasingly difficult for even the actors

¹Corresponding author: aleksandar.pavic@mod.gov.rs



of war themselves, scientists, military leaders, and philosophers, to recognize the essence of the conflict. As Starčević and Kajtez emphasize, modern society turns its back on the wisdom that has been created over centuries, denying the importance of philosophical reflection, although it is precisely this that is just as necessary today as in the past (Starčević & Kajtez, 2024, p. 7). The lack of philosophy only increases the “fog of war”, questioning ethical norms and moral awareness in conditions of increasing machine domination.

The modern era, marked by the emergence of artificial intelligence, poses new challenges to the concept of war. Artificial intelligence is not just a tool in the hands of the military, it is becoming an autonomous decision-maker, with the potential to delegate or even take over functions that have so far been exclusively human. This opens up topics that reach to the very core of moral responsibility, justice and control. Can a system devoid of subjectivity and ethical reasoning decide about life and death? Is it possible to apply the classical theory of just war in the age of algorithmic rationality?

From the standpoint of philosophy, ethics and military power, it analyzes the impact of artificial intelligence on the understanding of modern war, the concept of responsibility in armed conflicts and on the transformation of military power in the contemporary international system. The thesis of the work implies that technological innovations in warfare are not only a question of technique, but also a deep philosophical transformation that questions subjectivity, the dominance of human control and the legitimacy of the use of force. Although today's operations increasingly involve autonomous systems and algorithms, most states still rely on traditional methods of warfare, which indicates the existence of parallel paradigms, classical and digital (Pavić, Jelić, & Đokić, 2024, pp. 46-47).

The emphasis is placed on the concept of just war, not only in the context of human subjectivity, but also in light of the question of whether an algorithm can wage a “just” war. Numerous contemporary authors question the relevance of just war theory, pointing to its historical context and the transformation of the nature of armed conflicts. In conditions of delegated decision-making and algorithmic violence, the issue of proportional use of force in the protection of the common good becomes increasingly problematic, and the ideal of peace becomes increasingly unattainable (Nicolaidis, 2024, p. 15).

Contemporary conflicts, such as the war in Ukraine, the internationalized conflict in Syria, and the events in Gaza after 2023, point to the problematic nature of applying classical criteria of justice in the era of hybrid and technologically mediated violence. In this context, philosophy is no longer a luxury reflection; it becomes a necessary instrument of analysis and ethical navigation in the conditions of the new paradigm of war.

The main research question of this paper is: How does the use of artificial intelligence change the philosophical and ethical dimension of war? The answer to this question is built through the hypothetical-deductive method and interdisciplinary analysis at the intersection of philosophy, ethics, and technology. The paper is structured in three parts: the first chapter analyzes the philosophical foundations of war, the second deals with the new paradigm of war in the age of artificial intelligence, and the third explores the relationship between ethics, power, and the transformation of military strategy in the modern era.

2. PHILOSOPHY OF A “JUST” WAR

War is a sociological phenomenon that has accompanied human society since the beginning of its development. The philosophy of war and peace has been an integral part of the thoughts of the greatest philosophers the world has ever created. Human society develops and exists in periods of war and peace. The achievement of the goals of man, people, nations, states and alliances has usually required war sacrifice and engagement. Whether it is a necessary process and whether there is another way to achieve interests is a question that no one has been able to fully answer even today. Is war just and is it moral to take someone else's life for the sake of one's own interest, even if it is above the individual. However, human thought can interpret and understand human war, but the perception that a machine independently decides to neutralize a person opens up new ethical questions. The question of the ethical use of artificial intelligence in modern war is perhaps the most important question facing man in the 21st century. The central philosophical stance in the conflict between the two sides remains the issue of a “just war”, regardless of the transformation and evolution of the conflict.

Plato's (Greek: Πλάτων) thought experiment with the Ring of the Ring explores the question of whether people act justly out of inherent moral conviction or because of social consequences such as punishments and rewards. Plato questions the natural nature of morality, noting that it is often maintained by social norms. Just war theory in international law explores the moral foundations of warfare, determining when war is justified (*jus ad bellum*) and how it should be waged (*jus in bello*). Modern just war theory includes principles such as proportionality and distinction, which limit the use of force and protect civilians

(Molendijka, 2025). The 2003 Iraq War is an example of a violation of these principles. Questionable justifications and the absence of United Nations approval call into question the legitimacy of the war, and violations such as the abuse of detainees at Abu Ghraib prison undermine ethical legitimacy (Jagodzinski, 2024).

In the 21st century, just war theory faces new challenges such as humanitarian interventions, asymmetric warfare, and non-state actors, which complicate the application of traditional principles. Legal positivism and moral absolutism are two approaches used to assess the ethics of war. Positivism is based on codified laws but fails to cope with new forms of warfare, while absolutism advocates universal moral principles but can be subjective. Just war theory must adapt to new security challenges and technological advances (Syed, 2025). Ultimately, a revised just war theory should take into account new forms of warfare and the role of non-state actors, ensuring that it remains relevant in contemporary conflicts. To understand how new technologies affect the understanding of war, it is necessary to first return to the classical philosophical concepts that have shaped understandings of war throughout the centuries.

The philosophy of war has always been intertwined with questions of human nature, politics, morality, and technology. In Heraclitus' (Greek: 'ρόκλειτος' 'φέσιος) thought, war is the "father of all things", the initiator of change and creation. For Plato, war is the result of disharmony in the soul and society, while for Thomas Hobbes it arises as a product of fear and the desire for security in a state of natural chaos (*status naturalis*). These early ideas reveal that war is more than a physical conflict; it is a mirror of the human condition. Hobbes in his work *Leviathan* presents war as a state in which "man is wolf to man", but at the same time points to the necessity of creating a sovereign, who will prevent a return to anarchy with authoritarian force. In the context of artificial intelligence, the question arises who is the "sovereign" when an algorithm takes control, man or machine.

Immanuel Kant, unlike Hobbes, in his work "On Perpetual Peace" develops the idea of the possibility of a lasting peace based on reason, a republican orientation and international institutions. He introduces a moral framework that later becomes the basis for the concept of a just war, where war must be a last resort, proportionate and limited (Kant, 2024). This raises the dilemma: can artificial intelligence, devoid of moral sense, distinguish between "just" and "unjust"?

The fact is that the war waged by algorithms threatens to become invisible, but all encompassing. These philosophical perspectives indicate that war is more than a physical conflict. It is a space where technology, morality and politics intersect. With the advent of artificial intelligence, this space takes on a new dimension, one in which humans are no longer the sole bearers of decision, responsibility and power.

3. A NEW PARADIGM OF WAR

The philosophy of war, analyzed through classical philosophical theories of war, including Plato, Heraclitus, Hobbes, and Kant, points to the concepts of necessity, justice, and the relationship between power and morality in the context of armed conflict. To understand how new technologies affect the understanding of war, it is first necessary to return to the classical philosophical concepts that have shaped the understanding of war through the centuries. Two completely different approaches to the theory of warfare, direct and indirect, and both completely variable in practice, were given to us through their theoretical approaches by Carl Philipp Gottfried von Clausewitz and Sir Basil Henry Liddell Hart. Although they lived in different times, both made an immeasurable contribution to the science of war with their theoretical approach. On his path to mediocrity, Liddell Hart had to encounter the ideologist of the opposite theory, Clausewitz, who wrote that the sole aim of war was the destruction of the bulk of the enemy's forces on the battlefield and that this was most successfully achieved by a decisive battle (Hart, 1952, p. 9). Defining the position and analyzing the impact of artificial intelligence in the domain of national security, and therefore war, cannot be considered without theoretical assumptions. Among the large number of significant strategists in the history of war, a significant number of theorists stand out. However, for the purposes of this research, the authors are of the opinion that it is Clausewitz and Hart who deserve to be considered through their theoretical postulates in the context of the application of completely new technologies and dimensions of warfare.

Clausewitz is recognized as someone who laid the foundations of the modern system of the use of military force in the modern state. His work "On War" is without equal in the basis of all subsequent strategic considerations in the field of the use of armed force. In his theory of war, Clausewitz insists on war as "the continuation of policy by other means". For him, war is a rational activity in the service of state interests, but always unpredictable due to the "fog of war" and the human factor (Clausewitz, 1951). With the introduction of artificial intelligence, the question is whether algorithms can reduce this fog, or do they create a new fog of digital irresponsibility? On the other hand, Liddell Hart, with his relatively modest

military experience and his own brilliance, has presented a new indirect approach to the use of military force, newer, more modern than Clausewitz, and therefore closer to today's military thinkers.

Various authors have analyzed the position of artificial intelligence at the level of strategy, doctrine, the operational planning process, and ultimately the use of military forces. Among others, Cameron Hunter and Bleddyn E. Bowen have argued that proponents of the application of artificial intelligence predict a major impact on the decision-making process in the use of military forces, which is fundamentally wrong. The nature of war requires decisions based on abductive logic, while machine learning relies on inductive logic. The abductive approach to theory development rejects the concept of deductive and inductive approaches as separate, since it is not a choice of one or the other, but an attempt to reconcile these approaches so that research can begin with the deductive and continue with the inductive approach. These two forms of logic are not interchangeable and therefore limit the useful use of artificial intelligence in command at all levels. This logical approach suggests that more data or more computing power does not necessarily lead to better decisions. (Hunter & Bowen, 2023). Indeterminacy, friction, chaos are just some of the characteristics of war that characterize the complete inconsistency and unrepeatability of war. This view of war is entirely consistent with the algorithmic form of decision-making of artificial intelligence. There is no future war that could be fought according to exactly the same criteria as any previous one. In the same way, Clausewitz defined that war in the "real world" of people and chaos cannot be reduced to "some kind of algebra of action". If all variables and outcomes could be known and if war were a purely rational matter, there would be no need for the physical existence of armies, but only for theoretical relations between them. (Klauzevic, 1951).

Some authors, such as Rodrick Wallace, have used cutting-edge tools from the fields of information and management theory to examine the canonical and idiosyncratic ways in which real-time cognitive systems fail when confronted with the fog of war and the constraints of friction. He has concluded that no one can navigate war without being changed by the effects of Clausewitz's friction. (Wallace, 2018).

In the 20th century, Liddell Hart developed the theory of the "indirect approach", emphasizing the importance of technological developments in warfare. After his experiences in trench warfare, he advocated the integration of land and air forces through radio communications. Although he met with resistance in Britain, Germany adopted his ideas through the "Blitzkrieg", relying on the "Junkers - Ju 87" aircraft and encrypted communication using the "Enigma". The Allies later recognized the value of this strategy, as confirmed by a letter from General Dorman Smith (Hart, 1952, p. 19). Alan Turing's work at Bletchley Park to break the Enigma code not only shortened the war, but also laid the foundations for the digital era (Hoover, 2006).

Today we are well into the fifth generation of warfare, where one of the stated goals is to conquer the human mind and influence its thought (Krishnan, 2022). The very foundation of this modern warfare is represented by technologies such as artificial intelligence. Automation and the pursuit of autonomous military platforms are a direct consequence of the development of the digital sphere of technology and are developing completely unstoppably together with artificial intelligence.

Clausewitz's fundamental philosophical approach indicates that artificial intelligence, without understanding the context and human cognitive abilities cannot be a relevant factor in making decisions in war. Its application is justified in analytical processes that rely on a limited number of variables and logical operations. If artificial intelligence were to lead a decisive battle, it would most likely absolutize the achievement of the goal, neglecting resources and strategic expediency. Today's hybrid wars, often based on indirect methods, confirm the relevance of the indirect approach strategy advocated by Liddell Hart. The development of artificial intelligence in war must be based on a theoretical understanding of war. Philosophical and technocratic approaches must be equally represented in the academic community, because only such a framework can lead to an ethically grounded and scientifically justified use of artificial intelligence. At that stage, man will truly understand the place and role of general artificial intelligence.

4. ETHICS, POWER AND THE TRANSFORMATION OF WAR

The question of just war, which this paper places at the center of the discussion of the relationship between power, ethics, and technology, implies that there is a truth in the art of war that many overlook, which is that success without ethics is empty. Graham Wallington argues that true victory is that which brings harmony, not disillusionment, and that morality has always been the foundation of that harmony. Artificial intelligence, a marvel of human ingenuity, must be guided by the same principles that guide the warrior and the sage. Any victory that is not in harmony with the principles of International Humanitarian Law is a Pyrrhic victory (Wallington, 2024). The ethical norms of using artificial intelligence in war are discussed by Mariarosaria Taddeo, a professor at the University of Oxford, who emphasizes the postulate

of just war, while considering artificial intelligence as a means of defense. She emphasizes the key advantage of artificial intelligence in defense against enemies, but also argues that we need to find a new way to attribute responsibility for the actions performed by artificial intelligence systems in defense and to ensure that this way is justified and fair. To do this, we need new ethical thinking (Taddeo, 2024).

With the integration of artificial intelligence into military operations, the ethics of warfare are taking on a new, more complex dimension. Deciding on the use of force, distinguishing between soldiers, or those who use force, and civilians, and assessing the risk and justification of combat actions are all decisions that have traditionally belonged to humans, or military decision-makers. However, as autonomous systems become more precise and capable of making these decisions, profound ethical questions arise that consider the responsibility, subjectivity, and legality of using these systems. The pace at which future conflicts supported by artificial intelligence will be fought will confirm the complex and chaotic nature of modern warfare (Johnson, 2022).

One of the key ethical issues in the use of artificial intelligence in warfare is the question of liability, that is, who is to blame if an autonomous system makes a mistake? This requires a new rethinking of ethical and legal norms, whereby traditional principles of the law of war must be adapted to the reality in which machines make decisions without human intervention. With the transformation of war, the moral code is also changing, and theories such as the principle of double effect, which justifies action if the benefit is greater than the harm, provided that there is a clear distinction between intention and effect, are becoming increasingly difficult to apply in the context of algorithmic decisions. The greatest challenge is the absence of subjectivity. Although algorithms are capable of quickly processing data and identifying threats, they do not possess the ability to empathize, moral reasoning, or cultural sensitivity. Therefore, the question is whether the philosophy of “cold rationality” of artificial intelligence can be justified in modern combat operations at all (Namestiuk, 2023). War devoid of morality, subjectivity and legal norms represents a regression, i.e. a return to a pre-civilizational level, where humanity risks losing its essential humanity.

Power is a central factor in international relations from the point of view of realist theory. Likewise, the potential of global power and the security dilemma of artificial intelligence is one of the central factors in assessing the impact of artificial intelligence on the development of future national security strategies (Pavić & Beriša, 2024, pp. 20-21). Michel Foucault considers power through knowledge and control of information, while Jean Baudrillard, through the concept of simulation in the era of mass culture, analyzes the “simulacrum of war” and implies the fact that we no longer distinguish between reality and war as a media event (Slović, 2019). It can be concluded that whoever controls artificial intelligence will very quickly control the global order. In this way, artificial intelligence gains a geopolitical context and it is certain that its development will also condition new global implications. The fact is that the upcoming multipolarity, as well as stagnant globalization, is precisely the opportunity for artificial intelligence to be the factor that will ensure that certain global actors such as the PRC become the new global leader.

Artificial intelligence as a technological entity questions human sovereignty in decision-making, posing new moral dilemmas in the 21st century. Considering the relationship between subjectivity, responsibility and power in the age of digitalized warfare is perhaps the central question of the transformation of war in the age of artificial intelligence.

The world of cyberspace and artificial intelligence opens up space for a new “Cold War 2.0”, in which the threat is often invisible, decentralized and algorithmically managed (Vacarelu, 2021). Instead of classic armed conflict, cyberattacks, information manipulation, and cognitive operations dominate. In such an environment, the threat of autonomous systems operating without human intervention becomes a serious security and ethical challenge. The fact is that three key processes mark modern warfare:

- Automation and autonomy, where combat systems increasingly operate independently;
- Cyberspace as a new battlefield, where attacks are being conducted on infrastructure and consciousness;
- Information dominance, where power is defined by the ability to manage data and perception.

Information is becoming the most powerful weapon. Artificial intelligence in this context is no longer just a tool, but a new subject of war, that is, a factor that affects not only the technological factor, but also the very concept of power. It can be concluded that the contemporary philosophy of power is increasingly shaped by “algorithmic dominance”, where technology and artificial intelligence expand the concept of power from physical domination to digital control and information management. War is no longer fought only with weapons, but also with algorithms, which opens up new philosophical and ethical challenges. On the one hand, artificial intelligence promises a more efficient use of force and a reduction in human casualties, but on the other hand, it carries the risks of dehumanization, loss of moral responsibility and disruption of geopolitical balance. In a war waged by machines, the key question is: what is the role of

man in such a conflict? Without constant philosophical re-examination, we risk losing the central place of man in understanding war and power.

5. CONCLUSION

Modern warfare has transcended the boundaries of the classical understanding of armed conflict and is increasingly moving into the realm of digitalized, automated, and algorithmically driven conflict. This transformation also requires a new understanding of categories such as subjectivity, moral responsibility, justice, and power. This paper has shown that the use of artificial intelligence in warfare is not just a technological novelty, but also a profound philosophical and ethical turning point. Starting from classical philosophers such as Heraclitus, Plato, Hobbes, Kant, and Clausewitz, the paper argues that war is more than physical violence; it is a mirror of human nature, politics, and technological development. Modern military practice, through the development of autonomous systems and algorithmic decisions, undermines precisely these foundations, questioning man as the central subject of ethics and strategy.

The work immanently shows that artificial intelligence, although capable of precise data analysis and operational decision-making, remains ethically limited, devoid of instinct, empathy and the ability to make moral judgments. Without human intervention, war risks becoming a process without accountability, in which the distinction between ends and means is lost.

The modern theory of just war, as well as international legal frameworks, must adapt to new challenges. It is necessary to develop a hybrid ethical-legal framework that combines universal moral norms with technological reality, ensuring that military operations remain in the domain of man, not machine. The role of ethics in the era of algorithmic dominance becomes more important than ever, not as an abstract concept, but as a necessary condition for preserving man at the center of decision-making. Ultimately, the fact is that war in the age of artificial intelligence is not only a technological challenge, but also a challenge of humanity. If we as a society do not respond to this challenge with new ethical, philosophical and normative paradigms, we risk not only changing war, but also dehumanizing humanity itself. Therefore, it is crucial that technological progress is accompanied by moral maturity and philosophical insight, so that instead of post-human chaos, we step into an ethically sustainable future.

REFERENCES

- Hart, L. (1952). *Strategija posrednog prilaženja*. Beograd: Vojna biblioteka.
- Hoover, S. M. (2006). *Religion in the Media Age. Media, Religion and Culture* (1st ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Hunter, C., & Bowen, B. (2023). We'll never have a model of an AI major-general: Artificial Intelligence, command decisions, and kitsch visions of war. *Journal of Strategic Studies*, 47(1), 116–146. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/01402390.2023.2241648>
- Jagodzinski, J. (2024). The Trauma of the Image: Prisoner 'Abuse' in Abu Ghraib Prison. *Studies In Media & Information Literacy Education*, 6(1), 1-15. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.3138/sim.6.1.004>
- Johnson, J. (2022). The AI Commander Problem: Ethical, Political, and Psychological Dilemmas of Human-Machine Interactions in AI-enabled Warfare. *Journal of Military Ethics*, 21(3-4), 246–271. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/15027570.2023.2175887>
- Kant, I. (2024). *O večnom miru*. Beograd: Dosije.
- Klauzevic, K. f. (1951). *O ratu*. Beograd: Vojno delo.
- Krishnan, A. (2022). Fifth Generation Warfare, Hybrid Warfare, and Gray Zone Conflict: A Comparison. *Journal of Strategic Security*, 15(4), 14-31. doi:<https://doi.org/10.5038/1944-0472.15.4.2013>
- Molendijka, T. (2025). Just War Theory for Morale and Moral Injury: Beyond Individual Resilience. *Journal of Military Ethics*, 23(3-4), 201–218. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1080/15027570.2024.2442802>
- Namestiuk, S. (2023). Challenging the Boundary between Self-Awareness and Self-Consciousness in AI from the Perspectives of Philosophy. *Futurity Philosophy*, 2(4), 43-60. doi:<https://doi.org/10.57125/FP.2023.12.30.03>
- Nicolaides, A. (2024). Waging a Just and Ethical War – Contemplating Saint Augustine, 'Just War' theory, Gaza, and other Philosophical Notions. *Pharos Journal of Theology*, 105(3), 1-18. doi:<https://doi.org/10.46222/pharosjot.105.321>
- Pavić, A., & Beriša, H. (2024). Artificial intelligence impact assessment on national security strategy development. *Science International Journal*, 3(4), 19-27. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.35120/sciencej0304019p>
- Pavić, A., Jelić, D., & Đokić, M. (2024). Artificial intelligence as an asset for the improvement of decision-making cycle in military operations. *Vojno delo*, 76(3), 45-58. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.5937/vojdolo2403045P>
- Slović, S. (2019). Bodijerov koncept simulacije u eri masovne komunikacije. *Baština*, 49, 167-175. doi:<https://doi.org/10.5937/bastina1949167S>
- Starčević, S., & Kajtez, I. (2024). Potreba za filozofijom u savremenom svetu. *Nacionalni interes*, 47(1), 7-28. doi:<https://doi.org/10.5937/nint47-48381>
- Syed, A. (2025, February 24). *The Ethics of War and Peace*. *Essydo Politics*. Retrieved April 30, 2025 ca <http://essydo.com/2025/02/24/the-ethics-of-war-and-peace/>
- Taddeo, M. (2024). *The Ethics of Artificial Intelligence in Defence*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Vacarelu, M. (2021). *Artificial Intelligence: To Strengthen or to Replace Traditional Diplomacy*. Y F. Roumate, Artificial Intelligence and Digital Diplomacy. Cham: Springer. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-68647-5_1

Pavić, A., & Beriša, H. (2025). Philosophy of war in the age of artificial intelligence: Ethics, technology, and the transformation of military power, *SCIENCE International journal*, 4(2), 109-115.
doi: 10.35120/sciencej0402109p UDK: 355.01:004.8

Wallace, R. (2018). Carl von Clausewitz, the Fog-of-War, and the AI Revolution: The Real World Is Not a Game of Go. New York, NY, USA: Springer.

Wallington, G. (2024, Octobre 18). The Hollow Victory: A Reflection on Ethics and the Use of AI in War. Medium. Retreved May 1, 2025 ca <https://medium.com/@graham.wallington/the-hollow-victory-a-reflection-on-ethics-and-the-use-of-ai-in-war-65b08b3b2e32>

