ACADEMIA International Journal for Social Sciences
Volume 4, Issue 4, 2025 ISSN-L (Online): 3006-6638

The Role of Artificial Intelligence in Shaping International Law and Foreign Policy: A Qualitative Study on State Behavior and Global Norms

Shahbaz Ahmed Shahzad
shahbazahmed614@yahoo.com
PhD, NUST Institute of Peace and Conflict Studies (NIPCONS), National University of Sciences &Technology (NUST), Islamabad, Pakistan

Basit Aziz
basit396@yahoo.com
PhD scholar, Department of management sciences; Comsats university Lahore

Tabinda Mehdi
Tabindamehdiadv7@gmail.com
LLM department of school of law university of Gujrat
Lawyer at District Bar Association Gujrat
Corresponding Author: Shahbaz Ahmed Shahzad shahbazahmed614@yahoo.com

Received: 16-10-2025 **Revised:** 12-11-2025 **Accepted:** 18-11-2025 **Published:** 03-12-2025

ABSTRACT

Artificial intelligence (AI) has taken the center stage of political attention across the world, and is becoming more and more influential on how states practice power, or policy formulate, as well as negotiate international rules. The paper will discuss the future of international law and foreign policy through the impact of AI, especially its connection to the state behavior and the development of international standards. The paper is based on the application of a qualitative research design as it is a synthesis of the doctrinal analysis of international legal tools and a thematic study of existing theoretical literature and the comparative analysis of approaches of the United States, China, and the European Union in developing AI. The results indicate AI has turned into a strategic resource, which has increased geopolitical competition, is driving military innovation, and changing diplomatic and information practice, such as surveillance and disinformation. Simultaneously, AI has provoked the creation of new soft-law and regional policies, including the OECD AI Principles, the Recommendation on the Ethics of AI by UNESCO, or the proposed Artificial Intelligence Act to the European Union. Nonetheless, major loopholes still exist with the implementation of current international law in AI, specifically attribution and accountability, autonomous weapons, governance of data, and human rights safeguards. The article claims that the present international governance delineation of AI is divided, and very much infected by rival political and regulatory frameworks. It finds that there is the necessity of more concerted, integrative, and binding international action to make sure that AI promotes rather than subverts international peace, the rule of law, and the core human rights.

Keywords: *Artificial Intelligence (AI); International Legal Frameworks; Foreign Policy Decision-Making; Geopolitical Competition; Algorithmic Governance; Autonomous Weapon Systems (LAWS); Data Governance; Digital Sovereignty; Soft-Law Norms; Human Rights and AI*

INTRODUCTION

Artificial Intelligence (AI) has become one of the most dominant powers that impact world politics, security, and law. The use of AI technologies in decision making, diplomacy, military operations, economic planning, cyber defence, digital surveillance and public administration are some common uses of AI technologies by governments around the world. Since states have come to pay more and more attention to AI to advice or

offer assistance to their foreign policy, AI is already a significant contributor to state interdependence with each other, bargaining of international regulations, and shaping of global standards. This change offers significant challenges to the international law traditionally based on taking human choices, predicting behavior with easy-to-understand responsibility. AI disrupts these propositions by making global governance more automated, quicker, opaque, and unpredictable.

The driving force behind this paper is to discuss the application of AI in defining international law, the foreign policy and the state conduct in the changing international system. It analyzes the impact of AI technologies on national interests, national diplomatic options, rule-making, military affairs, and diplomatic relations. It further justifies how the current international law is finding it hard to cope with the pace of these changes in technology. Some of the central questions that are covered in the paper include:

(a) What is the effect of AI on foreign policy behavior of states?

(b) What are some new international norms that are being created due to AI?

(c) Where are the gaps in the international legal systems?

(d) What is the impact of big powers, like the United States, China and the European Union, on the AI regulation in the world?

It is well-founded that AI has turned into a strategic resource on the international level. According to the U.S National Security Commission on Artificial Intelligence (2021), AI is outlined as one of the determinants of future global power. The National AI Development Plan in China established aims to make the country the world leader in artificial intelligence by 2030 (State Council of China, 2017). In the same manner, the Artificial Intelligence Act of the European Union is dedicated to the establishment of the international standards of ethical and human-oriented AI (European Commission, 2021). The strategies demonstrate that AI has become more than only an innovation in the country as it is now fully integrated into the competition, cooperation, and norm-formation at the international level.

The current paper will employ the qualitative method to examine academic literature, international policy documents, and official government strategies of 20182025. It offers an objective and simple analysis, which can be used by a reader desiring a simple interpretation of how AI impacts global politics. The paper posits that AI is a political and legal actor, as well as a technological tool, which establishes the norms in the entire world. Consequently, AI will make further impacts on international law and foreign policy, which require states to collaborate to achieve responsible and ethical governance.

The paper is separated into a number of sections. Once the introduction had been implemented, the literature review details the significant scholarly debates regarding AI and global governance. The qualitative approach which was adopted is described in the methodology section. The results and analysis cover the impact of AI on the state behaviour, norm development, and international law. Lastly, the conclusion will be a summation of critical insights and suggestions on how the international law and global decision-making can embrace AI in a more responsible, inclusive and stable manner.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The academic field of Artificial Intelligence and global governance has developed an increasing pace in the last 10 years. Researchers reviewed the effects of AI in the international law and military conflict, diplomacy, human rights, and privacy in cyberspace security and global economic competition. The section is a review of the key themes in the current research as well as illuminating the gaps that this paper will seek to fill.

AI as a Governance Challenge

According to several researchers, AI is changing the rules of governance in ways that had not been established on the legal system of the past to fill. As Bryson (2020) emphasizes, AI systems have reflections of political choices, values, institutional structures and therefore are never neutral. The systems based on AI affect decisions by means of prediction, automation, and pattern analysis, which may affect political and legal consequences on a very large scale. On the same note, Allen and Chan (2018) report that AI can hasten the shift of power across the world and force states to embrace new forms of governance that can mitigate ethical, political, and security risks.

Kello (2017) states that AI will be the centre of cyber warfare, some of the key challenges in this matter are automated cyberattacks, algorithms in warfare, and even accelerated military decision-making. This begs the question how international humanitarian law (IHL) is relevant to AI-enabled warfare.

2.2 Digital Sovereignty and Competing AI Models

The other significant one in the literature is the emergence of digital sovereignty that is defined as the ability of the state to exercise control over its digital infrastructures, data streams, and algorithms. Researchers name three major governance models that determine international arguments:

1. **European Union (rights-based and human-centered)**
   The EU's approach prioritizes ethics, transparency, non-discrimination, and fundamental rights (European Commission, 2021). Its AI Act aims to become a global regulatory model.
2. **United States (market-driven and innovation-focused)**
   The U.S. approach supports technological leadership and private innovation, with less emphasis on strict regulation (NSCAI, 2021).
3. **China (state-centric and control-oriented)**
   China uses AI to support national security, social stability, and large-scale surveillance (Creemers, 2018).
   Scholars such as Gorwa (2019) argue that these competing models contribute to global fragmentation, making it harder to build unified international norms.

Autonomous Weapons and International Humanitarian Law

Much of the literature is regarding Lethal Autonomous Weapon Systems (LAWS). The weapons are capable of detecting, choosing, and hitting the targets without human involvement with AI algorithms. Human rights organizations and most mini states have advocated a worldwide ban whereas major powers stand against such a ban.

According to scholars like Scharre (2018), autonomous weapons raise some core legal issues regarding accountability, proportionality, and substantial human control. The implementation of LAWS has been

debated in the UN Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW) over the years with no consensus, which indicates the challenge in the regulation of AI in wars.

AI, Human Rights, and Ethical Concerns

AI also creates new challenges for international human rights law. For example:

- Article 17 of the ICCPR shows a threat to the privacy rights by automated surveillance (Kaye, 2021).
- Discrimination may be a result of algorithmic bias, which goes against the notions of equality and fairness.
- Predictive policing can jeopardize due process and civil liberties.

Researchers point out that the international human rights organizations find it difficult to revise these norms fast enough to overcome the challenges.

METHODOLOGY

The given study makes use of a qualitative research design that is founded on three complementary sources of data:

Doctrinal Legal Analysis

The paper examines official legal instruments, including:

- Treaties
- UN resolutions
- Regional regulations
- Soft-law frameworks (e.g., OECD AI Principles, UNESCO AI Ethics Recommendation)
- National AI strategies from the U.S., China, and EU

This method helps identify legal gaps and interpret how existing frameworks apply to AI.

Thematic Review of Literature

Thematic coding was used to review academic articles, books, and policy reports (20172025). Themes include:

- State behavior in AI competition
- Digital sovereignty
- Autonomous weapons
- Ethical AI
- Human rights impacts
- Norm development

This approach identifies patterns and insights that explain how AI influences international norms and foreign policy.

Comparative Case Analysis

The study compares the AI governance approaches of:

- **United States**
- **China**
- **European Union**

The three actors have been chosen due to the fact that they represent the most influential and opposing paradigms of the AI regulation and the foreign policy course.

Limitations

The main limitations include:

- AI technology is fast moving which means that the policies can change.
- The international law is not adapted quickly and therefore normative conclusions can change when states negotiate new structures.
- Certain government policies (in particular of China) are not fully transparent, restricting access of the scholarly community.

Nevertheless, in spite of such limitations, the qualitative methodology brings a powerful basis of knowledge about the impacts of AI on the global norms and state behavior.

FINDINGS

The results of this qualitative research demonstrate that the concept of Artificial Intelligence (AI) is transforming the international law and foreign policy in three primary ways. At the outset, AI is transforming the functioning of states as well as their strategic decision-making in such aspects as security, diplomacy, and information operations. Second, it is fueling the rise of new transnational standards and regulators, many being soft-law instead of binding treaties. Third, AI is revealing severe loopholes and strains in the current international legal order, particularly, concerning accountability, data regulating and the regulations of warfare.

AI as a Driver of Strategic Competition and New State Behavior

Among the most vivid conclusions is the fact that AI has become one of the critical sources of international geopolitical rivalry. AI potential is now considered by states as essential to economic development, military superiority, and international political power. In particular, the United States and China consider AI to be a strategic technology which will allow determining the status of a great power in the 21 st century (National Security Commission on Artificial Intelligence [NSCAI], 2021; State Council of China, 2017). This directly affects foreign policy. The governments are integrating AI across military policies, diplomacy and foreign policy principles with resulting impact on their interaction levels with other nations.

In the military sector, most states are incorporating AI into arms and ammunition, intelligence collection and logistics, and combat control. The U.S. Department of Defense has already specified its mission to stay ahead of the military competition, which entails the autonomous systems and decision-support systems (U.S. Department of Defense, 2020). The strategy of military-civil fusion of China is also aimed at using AI both

as a tool of national defense and as the tool of domestic security, spending a lot of money on autonomous platforms, cyber-surveillance systems, and AI-powered cyberpower (Kania, 2019). All these developments amount to what some scholars refer to as algorithmic warfare whereby machines become more and more helpful or even replace the human element in making quick tactical and operational decisions.

The change in conduct of foreign policy at the diplomatic level by AI is also occurring. Foreign ministry and international organizations are also trying AI tools in order to follow global trends, anticipate political crises and guide negotiation strategies. To illustrate, news sources, posts on social media, indicators of the economy, and conflict reports are read by AI models to create early warning signs and risk evaluation (Hanson, 2022). This transition both increases the data-centeredness of diplomacy and the danger that policymakers will adhere excessively to data-free, or semi-data-driven probabilistic models with underlying assumptions or errors, particularly in complex social and political situations.

Information warfare and disinformation is one more aspect of the influence of AI on the state behavior. Deepfakes and fake news content can be generated on AIs, as well as an organized social media effort, through bot-created videos. They have been used to manipulate elections in other countries, craft the perception of conflicts, and undermine the credibility of institutions (Bradshaw and Howard, 2019). These types of practices confound the boundary between an acceptable public diplomacy and the lawlessness of invading the internal affairs of another state and pose a grave concern to the international law pertaining to the sovereignty and non-interventions.

In the domestic and foreign policy, AI-driven surveillance is also taking a toll. It is also possible to monitor citizens and suppress dissent because some states are applying AI-enhanced facial recognition, biometric surveillance, and predictive policing. They have become increasingly exported to other nations, particularly the Global South, where controls by the government can be tempted into considering turnkey surveillance solutions (Feldstein, 2021). This produces new dependency relationships and disseminates governance patterns that prioritize control and stability over individual rights with their direct implications on the behaviour of these states in the international forums in respect to human rights and digital governance.

On the whole, the results demonstrate that AI is not a peripheral instrument but a distinctive aspect of the state competition, cooperation, and power projection in the international arena. It influences the foreign policy decisions, alliances, and strategies in a manner that disputes the conventional presumption of international relations.

Emerging Global Norms and Regulatory Frameworks

The second key conclusion is that AI has produced a normative and regulatory activity wave across the international, regional, and national levels. Rather than primarily utilizing the classical category of hard-law treaties, states and international agencies have produced an increasingly large number of soft-law tools, principles, and model regulations on which AI development and use should be aligned.

On the international scale, there have also been various soft-law frameworks that have risen as points of reference. Various values embraced in the OECD AI Principles, which was adopted in 2019, include transparency, robustness, safety, and accountability of AI systems, and have been influential in several national policies (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD], 2019). UNESCO's Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence (adopted in 2021 by 193 member states) is an overall ethical framework which emphasizes human rights, sustainability, and inclusive governance (UNESCO, 2021). The G20 statements and principles have also emphasized credible and human-friendly AI as a common

goal among the leading economies. These tools are not an enforceable law, but an addition to the creation of international norms of responsible AI conduct.

At the regional level, the European Union has been on the forefront to come up with a more comprehensive and binding regulatory model. The EU proposed Artificial Intelligence Act presents a risk-based system banning some AI practices, including social scoring by the state apparatus, and placing stern duty on those offering high-risk AI-mechanisms, including such areas as health, transport, and police (European Commission, 2021). Researchers state that like in the case of the GDPR, the AI Act may have an extraterritorial impact as it will affect the way in which companies and foreign authorities develop AI systems to enter the EU market (Veale and Zuiderveen Borgesius, 2021). This is also confounded as the Brussels effect where a global standard is influenced by EU regulations.

Within the security sector, the discoveries reveal that the process of developing norms on Lethal Autonomous Weapon Systems (LAWS) has been a tedious and controversial one. Under the UN Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW), discussions have not yielded any specific treaty, but only general principles. A preemptive ban or strenuous control of autonomous weapons is encouraged by many states, human rights and disarmament NGOs. Nevertheless, prominent military powers do not want to face rigid limitations that could impose restrictions on their strategy (Scharre, 2018). This impasse is a demonstration and identification of how security interests can override the development of norms when it is known that ethical and legal issues prevail.

Regarding the sphere of economic regulation and digital trade, the AIs related standards could be found in the trade agreements and negotiations in the World Trade Organization (WTO). In digital trade, cross-border data mobility, algorithmic transparency, and source code protection are escalating more into digital trade chapters and regional trade-deals. Some of the provisions in the agreements such as the EU Japan Economic Partnership Agreement and the United States Mexico Canada agreement (USMCA) frame the questions about AI and data processing, although these concepts are not always explicitly referred to as AI rules. Meanwhile, discussions within the WTO Joint Initiative on E-commerce reflect the opinions between the state requirements that it is permissible to demand disclosure of algorithms or demand that data become localized due to the necessity of the security or privacy issue.

There is also a developing trend in human rights norms in relation to AI. Reporting by UN Special Rapporteurs regarding the privacy, freedom of expression, and racism have reflected on the current human rights treaties against the background of AI technologies. The reports highlight the necessity of transparency, accountability, non-discrimination, and protection against mass surveillance and a programmed decision-making process without a proper solution (Kaye, 2021; Human Rights Council, 2022). Though these interpretations are not binding, they assist in creating a consensus on the way AIs should be regulated based on human rights approach.

Overall, the results can be summarized as indicating that AI has already inspired an active stage of norm making but this has largely been done via soft-law, regional laws and interpretive guidance instead of full-fledged international treaties.

Gaps and Tensions in International Law

Regardless of this normative action, there is still a high degree of absence of international law on AI. The issue of accountability and attribution is one of the fundamental issues. The traditional understanding of the international law is that the harmful actions may be ascribed to human decision-makers or state organs.

Nevertheless, the nature of AI systems is complicated and opaque, which makes it hard to find out who has done what when some error has occurred. There are several actors and these are designers, programmers, deployers and operators. As a machine learning system shifts how it acts overtime in accordance with the information, attributing liability becomes even harder (Crootof, 2019). It makes it uncertain how to implement the principles of state responsibility and individual liability in the cases of AI-related incidents.

Another source of friction is governance of data. AI is based on big data, and cross-border data has become a critical component of most of these AI-driven services. However, states are becoming more assertive with regard to data sovereignty and are also tightening their data exports. European Union puts more focus on data protection and privacy, which makes the transfer of any data dependent on the sufficient safeguarding, whereas China strengthens the concept of national security and demands localisation of data in a specific set of industries (European Commission, 2021; Creemers, 2018). These contrasting styles generate fragmented legal landscapes and possible hostilities between trade law and home regulatory priorities requirements.

Another grave issue of international humanitarian law (IHL) in the context of autonomous weapons and algorithmic war seems to be the challenge of these two aspects. The principles of core IHL like distinction between the combatants and civilians, proportionality of the attacks, and precaution during attack, were previsioned by human judgment. Completely autonomous or heavily automated systems might be poorly able to implement the principles in dynamic and complex settings in real-time and specifically where the information is incomplete or ambiguous (Scharre, 2018). In case machines are not able to fully adhere to IHL, the states that use them can face various risks of breaking the law and fail to protect civilians.

Another loophole is that there is no global convention that is specifically linked to AI. Most of the most frequent ones including the OECD Principles or UNESCO Recommendation are soft-law and non-binding. Although they give direction, they are unable to guarantee the same implementation and adherence. This creates a lot of leeway among the states and enables influential actors to influence AI governance to bend in their interests, which reflect their interests first.

Lastly, the states have profound ethical and cultural disparities on how AI can be used. Individual privacy and autonomy is emphasized in some societies whereas collective security and social order is given more importance in other societies. With such distinctions, it is hard to come up with universal consensus on some of the major questions like acceptable levels of surveillance, legitimacy of predictive policing and the place of the state in the management of digital identities.

DISCUSSION

The results presented in this paper indicate that AI is revolutionizing international relations as well as international law, much deeper than technical breakthrough. AI acts as a strategic asset, a governance issue and a normative change driver. Meanwhile, it demonstrates the structural divisions within the current international legal system.

To begin with, AI as a strategic resource strengthens and deepens geopolitical rivalry. Large powers view AI this as part of national security and prosperity, which causes the arms race logic in autonomous weapons, cyber capabilities, and surveillance infrastructure (NSCAI, 2021; Kania, 2019). This rivalry may destabilize the world by reducing the cost of war, accelerating the rate of military interactions and crisis containment becoming more difficult. When AI systems are used to partially make decisions and react times are lower than the speed of reaction of the human mind, there is a high likelihood of miscalculation or an overblown

situation. This fact defies the conventional deterrence reasoning upon which the international security has been premised since the era of nuclearity.

Second, the division of AI governance even indicates further lines of political ideals and the philosophy of control. The human-rights-based paradigm of the EU approach, the U.S. paradigm of innovation leadership, and the Chinese paradigm of state-centric approaches are the competing approaches to the regulation of AI. Instead of converging, these models are being more utilized as templates upon which other nations can following relations in economic aspects, ideological congruence, or technology export relations. This results in so-called AI spheres of influence having countries being integrated into various technological and regulatory ecosystems. Legally, this division makes it more difficult to work on the creation of common international standards and create the threat of conflicts between regulations on both sides of the borders.

Third, the use of soft-law mechanisms of AI governance is a benefit and a drawback. This is one of the strengths, as the instruments of soft-law may be negotiated in smaller timeframe, revised easier and accepted by more individuals compared to formal treaties. They enable transnational bodies such as OECD, UNESCO, and G20 to develop common values, which may be used to inform national guidelines and corporate cultures (OECD, 2019; UNESCO, 2021). It is however also a weakness since soft-law is not enforceable. States are at liberty to disregard or selectively enforce these norms and even the influential actors may manipulate them to suit their interests, but are not based on the overall good.

Fourth, there is a huge and increasing challenge of AI to human rights. The use of the AI-enabled surveillance systems, predictive policing, and social scoring systems may dramatically infringe upon the right to privacy, freedom of speech, non-discrimination, and due process (Kaye, 2021; Barocas and Selbst, 2016). The international human rights system does provide a means of responding to such threats but such response is usually relying on the desire of the state. In autocratic or hybrid societies, AI can alternatively serve as an instrument of embedding power and restricting civic space, which subsequently influences the behavioral way these states present itself on the global level via negotiations on AI standards as well as human rights control.

Fifth, the international institutions still play an important but lesser role. Organizations like UNESCO, OECD, NATO, the UN Human Rights Council and to a large extent the WTO are working on guidance, principles and sectoral regulations of AI. Such initiatives aid in organizing debates all around the world and offer forums of discussion. But they can never provide comprehensive solutions due to institutional constraints in terms of slow decision-making, weak enforcement capacity, and geopolitical rivalries. In such fields as autonomous weapons, such as the CCW process demonstrates the hardness of the process of reaching consensus when the crucial military forces do not want to experience the strong legal restrictions.

Altogether, the discussion shows that AI is a revolutionary phenomenon which works on various levels. It influences the way states conceptualize power and security, the way they construct laws and establishments and the way they participate in the rights and freedoms of individuals. It is an international law that is starting to react, though in response largely in the more diffuse and disjointed ways. The real possibility of AI worsening inequalities, contributing to instability and making normal the practices that are inconsistent with the values of the international legal order is a risk, unless more concerted and inclusive action is undertaken.

CONCLUSION

In this paper, it has been demonstrated that Artificial Intelligence (AI) has been transforming international law, foreign policy, and global governance in significant and vast terms. AI is not merely a piece of

technology anymore, but a form of structural power affecting state behaviour, how they see threats and opportunities, and how they bargain international conventions. As the results showed, AI has a significant impact on strategic rivalry, diplomatic relationships, modernization of armies, surveillance, and information warfare. The developments render AI an essential element of national power that is involved in a new form of geopolitical rivalry among such great players as the United States, China, and the European Union.

Another aspect brought forward by the research was that AI is triggering the creation of new international norms. The majority are soft-law tools such as OECD Principles on AI, Recommendation on the Ethics of AI by UNESCO and guidelines adopted by the G20, NATO, and other bodies of the UN. On a regional level, some attempts, like the Artificial Intelligence Act of the European Union indicate that regulation can be done on a binding level, yet universally enforceable treaties are nonexistent. This leaves regulative fragmentation of AI globally and unduly influenced by countering political values, ethics, and philosophies.

The paper has also found that the current international law can hardly adapt to the reality of AI. The traditional constructs of the law such as the accountability, attribution, proportionality, distinction, and due process were created to have human decision-makers in mind. When opaque machine-learning systems influence and other decisions are made or performed, it is hard to hold anyone responsible or even hold them accountable. The autonomous weapons, cyber conflict, digital surveillance, and algorithmic discrimination areas are particularly challenging in these areas.

Moreover, AI also creates novel threats to the international human rights law. It can also compromise privacy, equality, freedom of expression and democratic participation because of automated surveillance, predictive policing, biometric tracking and algorithmic decision-making. Even though the human rights institutions have started to interpret the existing treaties through the prism of AI technologies, there is still a very big gap between the normative principles and the real practice of a state.

Lastly, the role of international organizations in the creation of global AI standards becomes more significant, especially UNESCO, OECD, the UN Human Rights Council, NATO, and WTO. Nevertheless, all these attempts are institutionalized and restrained by geopolitical tensions. In the absence of more intensive collaboration on the international level, the world can even enter a phase when AI will exacerbate inequalities, undermine the international security system, and undermine the fundamental protection of basic rights that are enshrined in the law.

Overall, this paper reveals that AI is radically changing the principles of world governance. Though there has been breakthrough in the development of normative frameworks, there are still gaps that have not been filled in. To resolve such existing loopholes, law and policy interventions must be coordinated, inclusive and future-oriented. Whether states and institutions can adjust to the pace, complexity, and transformative power of AI is the future of the international law.

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the conclusions, this paper presents a couple of policy recommendations that will contribute to a rise in the global AI regulations and make the international law workable in the digital economy.

To begin with, states need to put efforts in the creation of binding international tools on the use of AI with a high risk, especially in military and security situations. The peaceful environment presents the need to maximally address the requirements of autonomous weapons systems (LAWS) through established, enforceable regulations that ensure significant, viable human control, adherence to international humanitarian

law, and liabilities against illegal inflictions. Principles of the soft-law are no longer sufficient to meet the threat of an algorithmic war and a legally enforceable convention or protocol under the CCW is an immediate need.

Second, international bodies need to increase their processes of aligning AI standards in various regions. The existing division, which is in the rights-based orientation of the EU, the innovation-driven model of the U.S., or the state-driven model of China, brings legal ambiguity and geopolitical struggle. It is the role of international organizations like UNESCO, OECD and the UN to coordinate more and develop a means of interoperability between the regulatory systems without compromising on values like human right and privacy.

Third, AI-related harms should be improved in states. This incorporates the revising of the doctrines of responsibility of the state, the revising of the laws of responsibility and making the procurement and deployment of AI more transparent. States are to demand explainability of AI in the areas of public administration, law enforcement and border control and national security. Transparent accountability models will assist in solving the attribution issue and make sure that the introduction of AI does not undermine the rule of law.

Forth, all AI governance should incorporate human rights safeguards. The international human rights organizations must keep providing advice, do surveillance, and keep the states to accountability of the AI-based violations. The states should embrace strong privacy notions, avoid outcomes based on discrimination in AI, and make sure people can enjoy redress of their wrongs by the automated systems.

Fifth, international collaboration is to be increased in such areas as digital trade, data governance, and cyber stability. AI relies on the regular flows of data, and digital infrastructure which can work together. All international trade agreements and WTO negotiations must have a direct statement on the use of algorithms regarding transparency, protection of data, and immigration of data across national borders. Multilateral cooperation is to avoid inaptitude of conflicting regulatory frameworks where the global economy is jumbled.

Sixth, developing countries need to be given priority in capacity building. Lots of low- and middle-income countries are at risk of becoming tied to the AI technologies promoted by the powerful states, which can remove certain impact on their political system and foreign policy orientations. The transfer of knowledge, training of technologies and infrastructures should be encouraged by international institutions that would make all states enjoy the benefits of AI in a manner that does not compromise sovereignty and human rights.

Lastly, the policymakers would need to promote ethical innovation by involving multi stakeholders. More than governments, experts, civil society organizations, and private companies and affected communities should also be included In the AI governance. Inclusive governance makes AI systems inclusive of different opinions and, consequently, limits possible damages.

Collectively, these ideas demonstrate that AI governance on the international level should be based on a balanced, collaborative, and principled stance. The international community can use collective efforts in order to make AI a tool that would bring global stability, human dignity, and sustainable development.

REFERENCES (APA 7TH EDITION)

Abeba, B. (2021). Algorithmic injustice: A relational perspective. *Patterns, 2*(2), 1–15. Allen, G. C., & Chan, T. (2018). Artificial intelligence and national security. *Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs.*

Barocas, S., & Selbst, A. (2016). Big data's disparate impact. *California Law Review, 104*, 671–732. Bradshaw, S., & Howard, P. (2019). The global organization of social media disinformation campaigns. *Journal of International Affairs, 71*(1), 23–32.

Bryson, J. (2020). The political economy of artificial intelligence. *AI & Society, 35*(2), 1–12. Crootof, R. (2019). A meaningful floor for autonomous weapon systems. *Yale Law Journal Forum*, 131, 1–18.
Creemers, R. (2018). China's social credit system: An evolving practice of control. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 1–19.

European Commission. (2021). *Proposal for a Regulation laying down harmonised rules on Artificial Intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act)*. Brussels.

Feldstein, S. (2021). The rise of digital repression: How technology is reshaping power, politics, and resistance. *Oxford University Press*.

Gorwa, R. (2019). The politics of platform governance: A framework. *Internet Policy Review, 8*(2), 1–22. Hanson, F. (2022). AI and diplomacy: The new frontier of foreign policy. *Lowy Institute Report*. Human Rights Council. (2022). *The right to privacy in the digital age*. United Nations. Kania, E. (2019). In military-civil fusion, China is learning lessons from the United States and starting to innovate. *The Strategy Bridge*.

Kaye, D. (2021). Artificial intelligence and human rights. *United Nations Special Rapporteur Report*. Kello, L. (2017). *The virtual weapon and international order*. Yale University Press. National Security Commission on Artificial Intelligence. (2021). *Final report*. Washington, DC. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2019). *OECD principles on artificial intelligence*. Paris.

Scharre, P. (2018). *Army of none: Autonomous weapons and the future of war*. W. W. Norton. State Council of China. (2017). *Next Generation Artificial Intelligence Development Plan*. Beijing. UNESCO. (2021). *Recommendation on the ethics of artificial intelligence*. Paris.

U.S. Department of Defense. (2020). *DoD AI strategy*. Washington, DC. Veale, M., & Zuiderveen Borgesius, F. (2021). Demystifying the Draft EU AI Act. *Computer Law Review International, 22*(4), 97–112.

Wagner, B. (2020). Ethics as escape: Governance, ethics, and the crisis of AI regulation. *Philosophy & Technology, 33*(4), 587–607.

Zeng, J., Dai, X., & Guo, S. (2021). Artificial intelligence governance in China. *Journal of Contemporary China, 30*(129), 1–17.