

AI MILITARIZATION IN THE SEAS: BEYOND THE STOPPING POWER OF THE SEA

Shahtaj¹
Dr. Shireen Mushtaq²

ABSTRACT

In an era dominated by technological advancements, the use of artificial intelligence (AI) emerges as a pivotal element for nations seeking to assert influence on the global stage. Mearsheimer's idea of the stopping power of water asserts that oceans are pivotal enablers of wealth and power. The study explores how nations strategically cultivate AI technology to enhance global influence. This research examines oceans as the next frontier of competition, with particular emphasis on the high seas as valuable arenas for power projection. AI-based unmanned vehicles and advanced technologies are identified as key facilitators for easy access to these high seas, contributing to an escalating power struggle between the US and China. The study scrutinises extravagant claims and freedom of navigation operations as manifestations of this competition. This research employs a qualitative research method to provide analysis using Mearsheimer's analysis directed at the limitations of international laws in effectively addressing the challenges posed by AI-based vehicles in open waters. Lastly, the research underscores a prevailing power vacuum in the high seas, highlighting how major powers employ AI technology to assert dominance, reshaping the landscape of global maritime geopolitics.

KEY WORDS: AI-Militarization, High Seas, US-China, Offensive Realism, Power Competition.

INTRODUCTION

The 21st century is marked by incessant technological revolution. Artificial intelligence (AI) is used extensively from the narrow to the general range with various levels of sophistication. Artificial intelligence pertains to the replication of human intelligence in machines that are designed to simulate human brainpower. It refers to the traits of perception, learning, reasoning, adapting and problem-solving in machines without human assistance. In terms of AI-based high-tech competition between the US and China, both aimed at AI supremacy and aspired to be the innovation centres of the world. The ambition of both adversaries is not only to equate but also to overtake AI-based capabilities, signalling the return of great power competition. Supremacy in the maritime environment is the landmark of dominance, and the quest to dominate global commons (especially high

¹ Assistant Professor, International Relations Department, Kinnaird College for Women, Lahore. She can be reached at shireen.mushtaq@kinnaird.edu.pk.

² Lecturer, Beaconhouse Main Campus Canal, Faisalabad Pakistan. She can be reached at shahtaj.101583@bh.edu.pk.

seas) through AI-based systems has become a matter of great importance. In this scenario, militarised AI will play a critical role in the drive for hegemony. Offensive realists provide a better understanding of the complexity of technological interplay to fill the power vacuum in the high seas. Security, power maximisation, and the quest for dominance serve as a weaving thread in this research work. In the anarchic structure, states are endeavouring to gain control of the high seas to attain maritime supremacy. This study analyses the role of artificial intelligence-based autonomous/unmanned vehicles in gaining access to far waters efficiently. The use of AI-based naval vessels, especially on the high seas, and the legal frameworks in this regard have been critically analysed through the lens of offensive realism. The core proposition of this research is that the integration of AI technology has transformed oceans and high seas into contested domains, as the growing competition among great powers – the US and China – to harness offensive capabilities through AI technology represents a pivotal shift in the quest for dominance in high seas. This quest in AI-based advancements enables power projection in the realm of maritime relations.

This research study is structured into the following sections: the first section provides a comprehensive description of Mearsheimer's theory of offensive realism and highlights the critique on the stopping power of water in light of modern technological advancements. The second section delves into the militarisation of artificial intelligence and its pivotal role in the competition among great powers. It underscores the emerging significance of oceans as the next arena of competition among these powers. The subsequent section explores the particular importance of the high seas, viewed as a resource-rich domain and a strategic temptation for major players, such as the United States and China, aiming to establish dominance through integrated AI offensive capabilities. Lastly, the study offers a critical assessment of the use of AI on the high seas, taking into account both its advantages and risks. It also highlights the limitations of international law in effectively addressing the multifaceted challenges arising in this context. These sections collectively lay the foundation for a comprehensive analysis of the evolving dynamics, ethical considerations, and the transformative role of AI in shaping maritime geopolitics.

MEARSHEIMER'S THEORY OF GREAT POWER POLITICS

John Mearsheimer, under the banner of Offensive Realism, made significant contributions to the neorealist approach with his book-length, seminal writings on great power politics. John Mearsheimer's cornerstone work, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, was hailed as a classic in the realist tradition. The view of great powers' rivalry with a haunting fear of security competition is built up in the offensive realist theory of international relations. He explains his theory of offensive realism with five basic assumptions that include:

- Anarchy, absence of central authority.
- Possession of offensive military capabilities by great powers.
- Uncertainty about other states' intentions of using offensive capability.
- Survival is the prime goal and a means to all ends.
- States are rational actors that behave strategically to pursue their highest goal (survival).

The tragic self-help system generated deep insecurity that compelled states to pursue aggressive aims at the risk of war. Even if a great power attains an upper hand in military might over its adversaries, the quest for power never stops until it becomes a hegemon. It strives to eliminate any future challenger that disrupts its power. He asserted that maximum power generates a favourable strategic insight. And if the circumstances are feasible, more power can aid in pursuing hegemony (Mearsheimer, 2001).

PRIMACY OF LAND POWER

The main arguments address the importance of land power and the unremitting power of water. The paramount power of a state is primarily based on the army accompanied by air and naval forces. Mearsheimer argued that in the modern era land force is the main source of a state's power. Some might argue that nuclear weapons nullify the primacy of land power. Mearsheimer claims that nuclear weapons either make war obsolete or form a nuclear balance among great powers. Continental powers remain the king in war conquest. While insular powers are less likely to initiate war or project power. There is an exception: an insular state, Japan, attacked Pearl Harbour in 1941. However, it did not conquer any part of the US and just invaded some islands to establish its rule. So, water has stopping power to limit the power projection (Mearsheimer, 2001).

He argues that land power is crucial because land armies are necessary to control territory—the most important asset in a world of territorial states (Brzezinski & Mearsheimer, 2009). Furthermore, the focus on land power leads Mearsheimer to focus narrowly on territorial expansion. This implies a risk that his analyses miss a host of other ways of gaining and exercising influence. Moreover, Mearsheimer himself recognises that territorial conquest is unlikely to be the prevalent way of power maximisation in the decades to come, as he expects China—the most likely challenger to the US—to attempt to dominate Asia in more subtle ways (Toft, 2005). The power projection abilities are naturally limited by water and prevent any state from becoming a hegemon by dividing the power across the globe.

STOPPING POWER OF WATER: A CRITIQUE OF SEAS

According to Mearsheimer, the presence of water stops the continental powers from exercising enough power to establish global hegemony. This geographical barrier forces states to focus on immediate geographical regions, as the cost and challenges of projecting power over long distances are significant (Mearsheimer, 2001, p. 114). The best way of being powerful is to become a regional hegemon in its part of the world. It can have an influence on other accessible regions on nearby land. He depicts insular powers as less vulnerable and more secure than land powers. The land powers, like Germany, the USSR, and France, aspire to be regional hegemons and are involved in fierce power competition. While the UK and US were less prone to such conquests, because both were insular powers. Due to such geographical constraints, he believes that regional hegemony is the ultimate goal (Mearsheimer, 2023). There is a difference of opinion among offensive realists about the pursuit of hegemony. Gilpin asserts that the absolute goal of states is to be a global hegemon, and he speculates that global hegemony, which establishes their rules and exercises influence, has been naval powers. To give an example, the UK and the US were

prominent naval powers to exercise absolute power, as the UK was a major sea power and the US had fleets around the world.

Apart from hegemonic theorists like Gilpin, many influential sea theorists, such as Alfred Thayer Mahan, Julian Corbett, and Nicholas Spykman, articulated the immense significance of oceans as an enabler of power. Spykman expressed the importance of rimland along the heartland (Islam, 2023). Mahan enunciated sea control (Defence Technical Information Center, 2003). Corbett put forward securing sea command to accumulate maximum power and wealth (Shevin-Coetzee & Hendrix, 2016). In another paper, the author delves into the pivotal role of oceans in global geopolitics, underscoring the unparalleled strategic advantage derived from AI-based naval supremacy and sea power. Instead of adhering to the concept of water's stopping power, this research highlights the role of oceans as an enabler of power projection and underscores their critical importance in achieving maritime dominance. The analysis reveals that states vie for control not only over territorial waters but also the high seas, with a notable influence from artificial intelligence-based systems (Mushtaq & Shahtaj, 2023). The attribute of water as a stopping power is more pertinent to the state's incapability to attain sea power and secure power projection. So, oceans are not barriers but enablers of wealth, power projection, and generators of influence in world politics (de Almeida Silva, 2017).

AI REVOLUTION: MITIGATING THE STOPPING POWER OF WATER

In the age of artificial intelligence, technological advancements, such as aircraft carriers, unmanned/autonomous surface or underwater vehicles, unmanned aerial vehicles, and long-range aircraft, have significantly reduced the stopping power of water. These advancements have enabled states to project power and influence across oceans and waterways more effectively. As a result, the traditional constraints of geographic barriers like oceans have been reduced. For instance, aircraft carriers serve as mobile airbases/force multipliers that can project airpower over long distances. Unmanned ships and submarines with cutting-edge technology can move through and under the water to carry out a variety of tasks. Additionally, long-range aircraft and missiles can target distant locations with precision. These advancements have changed the strategic landscape and the way states interact globally. They have allowed states to overcome the stopping power of water to a considerable extent. As a result, states can extend their influence, conduct military operations, and protect their interests far beyond their immediate coastal regions (Tinnirello, 2018).

OFFENSIVE REALIST APPROACH VIEWS AI AS A STRATEGIC TECHNOLOGY

AI is deemed a strategic technology that heightens international competition, as more than fifty states are involved in drafting strategies to become pioneers in this field. While the two competing high-tech giants, the US and China, are altering the balance of power. As John Mearsheimer is of the view that states go for strategies to improve their power by strengthening economic and military capabilities. In this regard, states are likely to pursue technological development to enhance their military power. He has not specifically addressed the use of artificial intelligence, but underlined the significance of technological advancement. AI has remarkable potential to augment the state's national,

economic, and military capabilities (Krasadakis, 2023). AI has successfully overcome both spatial and temporal obstacles, as well as the power of water. The use of AI technology in various fields could be seen as aggressive, but it appears to be the only means for smaller states to ensure their survival and for great powers to maintain their dominant status. States are inherently desperate to gain power and survive in the international system. Artificial intelligence gives a way for states (leading-edge or smaller actors) to compete more efficiently and ensure survival under anarchy (Wu, 2020).

RATIONALE OF AI MILITARISATION

The enthralling attributes of artificial intelligence with the element of surprise, accuracy, and efficiency, are swiftly augmenting the military capabilities. Considering the potential of artificial intelligence and its influence in multiple domains, states have started to incorporate AI in the defence sector to gain a competitive advantage over adversaries. Major powers view it as a tool to shift the balance of power in their favour (Anupama, 2022). From 2009 to 2017, China significantly altered the course of scientific and technological advancement. It emerged as a potential competitor and led in many areas of AI. Eric Schmidt mentioned explicitly that China has gained the status of a full-spectrum peer competitor. China is playing smartly by enhancing the level of sophistication of PLAN with AI integration for credible deterrence, rather than stockpiling the traditional weaponry. The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) recorded a 9.4% rise in military expenditures all over the world in 2024. Both the US and China are the largest military spenders in the world, accounting for half of world military spending. However, there is a colossal gap in military spending; the US topped the chart with the highest military spending of \$997 billion, while China fell to second with \$314 billion in the 2024 ranking (Tian et al., 2024).

GREAT POWERS COMPETITION IN THE ERA OF TECHNOLOGICAL ADVANCEMENTS

The 21st Century has witnessed radical change in world affairs, geopolitics, high-tech development and the modern ways of warfare. Global Trends: Paradox of Progress (2017) assessed these dramatic changes and increased the chances of conflict more than ever before. The Worldwide Threat Assessment mentioned that as the competition among nations is increasing, the higher the chances of conflict among major powers and regional aggressors since the end of the Cold War (National Intelligence Council, 2017). The initial glimpse can be seen as the tensions have increased between the US and its high-end peer competitors. Mearsheimer predicted that in the early decades of the 21st century, the US might confront China as a potential challenger in Northeast Asia. The prospects for China to emerge as a hegemon depend on its economic modernisation, and if it continues to grow at a good pace and gains economic leverage, it will be the leader in spearheading the technology. Offensive realists anticipated that China might formulate its own account of the Monroe Doctrine. Just as the US did not allow any power to interfere in the Western Hemisphere, China would also not allow meddling in Asian affairs. The wealthiest power would not be a status quo entity but an aggressor seeking domination (Kurki, Smith & Dunne, 2013, p. 89).

The National Security Strategy (2017) of the US outlined the strategic vision for the US in the context of great power competition based on high-tech with China and Russia. These opponent states try to gain by a minimal pushback to their adversaries. It mentioned China and Russia as "revisionist powers" and "rivals", discarding the words "friends" and "partners", hardening the US stance in the theatre of politics. A Report to Congress on Great Powers Competition and National Defence (2020) marked China's rise as a fierce competitor, which is paving its path to become a high-tech giant. The Defence Primer: Geography, Strategy and Force Design (2022), describes that the US is exercising power to prevent the rise of any regional hegemon and to preserve its power preponderance (Congressional Research Service, 2024). The Annual Report to Congress 2024 includes in-depth details about China's military, security and technological development (U.S. Department of Defence, 2024). Therefore, Artificial Intelligence (AI) is at the core of the intensifying competition between the United States and China (Glaser & Allen, 2023). Here, we have highlighted a specific focus on the growing importance of technology.

The deployment of the Third Offset Strategy (2014-2016) by the Department of Defence US is to enhance the integration of artificial intelligence in all the domains of defence. The US is aiming to retain technological ascendancy and sustain military leverage in the face of potential threats. While China is quickly closing the gaps in levelling the US, especially in the naval sphere (The National Interest, 2023). The US military issued a futuristic-looking publication in 2016 named Joint Operating Environment 2035. It has a section entitled 'Technology' that describes a future technological landscape characterised by rapid technological advancement. The National Defence Strategy prioritises technological advancement, as the security environment is influenced by high-tech development (Joint Chiefs of Staff, 2016). China also unveiled its Generation Artificial Intelligence Development Plan (2017), aiming to establish China as the global leader in AI by 2030 (Carter & Crumpler, 2019). The use of AI technology to support military weapons, arsenals, and vessels has become a matter of concern. The cultivation of AI-based technology and automation of the systems indicates the winners and losers of future battles based on it. The US and China are expanding their influence through AI-powered naval vessels to achieve maritime superiority. Both states are building offensive and defensive AI capabilities, strategies and plans to acquire naval might.

BEYOND BORDERS: STRATEGIC SIGNIFICANCE OF OCEANS

Historically, oceans have remained a source of exercising power and have become a theatre of conflict. It is the space where traditional navies are struggling to extend their sovereign claims and exploit others' interests. As Bruce Jones mentioned in his book, 'To Rule the Waves: How Control of the World's Oceans Shapes the Fate of the Superpowers,' he characterises oceans as a chessboard on which states have been battling to dominate for centuries. The nuclear age, missile arsenals, and AI-based autonomous systems are generating the security concerns among nations. States are opting for maximum power on land and at sea as well. He enunciated that naval power is crucial to maintain the US's supreme standing in any region. Ruling the waves in every domain to gain power preponderance has become a prime interest of big powers (Pietrusiński, 2022). The research event at Chatham House, titled "Controlling the world's oceans: The next domain of great

power competition?", focused on the increasing strategic importance of the world's oceans and the potential for great power competition in this domain. It examined the role of new technologies, such as artificial intelligence and autonomous systems, in shaping the future of maritime security and the potential risks and opportunities that these technologies present (Chatham House, 2021).

AI ON THE HELM: MARITIME COMPETITION ON THE HIGH SEAS

The high seas are the part of the ocean outside the jurisdiction of any country. The United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) defined the apparent boundary of the high seas as starting 200 nautical miles from the coastline. The Geneva Convention on the High Seas (1958) declared that all parts of the sea, excluding the territorial waters of a state, are characterised as the high seas under Article 13(1)(a). Part VII of UNCLOS retains the permissible and impermissible on the high seas. It declared that the high seas or any part of it is not subject to the national sovereignty of any state (Cornell Law School, 2022). The international law defines four areas as global commons, including the high seas, atmosphere, Antarctica and outer space (Haskin, 2024). Two-thirds of Earth's surface is covered by the oceans that hold 96.5% of all Earth's water. 64% of the ocean is deemed the high seas. The high seas are the home of ocean giants and are considered the most biologically productive area in the world. Therefore, the high seas serve as a crucial space for nations vying to secure valuable resources (Rey, 2023).

The high seas are considered a global common where all the nations have equal rights and are allowed the peaceful exploration and entitled to scientific research. However, the exploration of deep-sea beds is halted, as this area has ceased to be free. This action has been taken under the advocacy of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) and the International Seabed Authority (ISA) to protect the fragile marine ecosystem (International Seabed Authority, 2023). The exploitation of resources and sea mining is posing an unprecedented threat to the ocean environment. This situation also fosters hostility among nations as they compete to maximise their benefits from the resources of the global commons (Liu et al., 2023). The advent of advanced technology and autonomous systems makes the high seas easily accessible for exploration, surveillance, and countering any formidable threat.

The high seas are pivotal in the flow of global trade and commerce. They are home to Sea Lanes of Communications (SLOCs), deemed as maritime highways for sea transportation between countries and continents. With the passage of time and the changing geopolitical landscape of the world, the marine routes and shared space have become a disputed matter. The unlawful claims, forceful deployment of military vessels and personnel, and aggressive behaviour towards other states have imperiled the freedom. For centuries, states had been challenging the free navigation and sovereignty in the high seas. In the current paradigm, the South China Sea has been a subject of dispute over sovereign claims extending beyond the territorial waters. The South China Sea is of utmost importance, as it is a semi-enclosed sea space comprising the sea lanes of communication connecting Europe, the Middle East, Northeast Asia, Southeast Asia, the Pacific Ocean, and North America. This sea is home to several islands, natural resources, and strategic choke points (Altaf, 2022).

The South China Sea has gained currency in geopolitics due to its abundant resources; it is called the 'second Persian Gulf' (Miranda & Maljak, 2022). China is making a sovereignty claim over the whole South China Sea to maintain its upper hand. The US declared the Freedom of Navigation Operations intended to uphold the freedom of navigation, overflight, and free trade. The US Navy is setting the AI-based unmanned and autonomous naval vessels on patrol missions in consonance with FONOPs. These cost-effective and intelligent machines with higher accuracy and flexibility gave an asymmetric advantage over adversaries, especially in open waters. This not only poses a security dilemma but also a decision dilemma to the adversary's scarce manned assets in countering such a threat. The Defence Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) is integrating the AI capabilities to maintain the superiority of autonomous patrolling and harnessing the intelligent autonomous capability for high-seas navigation (Artificial Intelligence Initiatives within the Department of Defence, 2021). In 2016, China seized an unmanned underwater vehicle in the international waters of the South China Sea. Pentagon officials declared that the underwater drone was entitled to collect oceanographic data autonomously. The seizure of the glider in international waters is a violation of freedom of navigation norms in compliance with international law (Buckley, 2016). This scenario demonstrated the escalating competition between the US Navy and the PLAN to gain dominance in the international waters.

EXPLOITATION OF GLOBAL COMMONS

The global commons are crucial for worldwide connectivity through trade and telecommunication. The use of maritime routes, the high seas, and outer space has been a critical source for enhancing military power. These vital zones have become fragile due to exploitation by human activities. Particularly, the high sea is a free space without any sufficient legislative framework, effective governance, and monitoring to stop the rogue behaviour of states to exercise their influence. The principle of open access is being misused by the states to hunt the limitless resources and deter their enemies in the open oceans. The geopolitical upheaval and changing strategic dynamics have heightened the importance of the global commons for strategic and military purposes. The most powerful players in the world have demonstrated their power with shows of highly capable naval vessels in the high seas. As Garret Hardin expressed his views in his book 'The Tragedy of the Commons,' about the inexorable tendency of destruction towards common property resources. This illustration can be employed in terms of the high seas. The open access and the freedom to act independently caused the states to function according to their national interest. Consequently, the common good for all users will be neglected on a mass scale and resulting in the depletion of resources and violation of prescribed laws (Freund, 2022).

CHALLENGES TO THE APPLICABILITY OF LAW

The maritime laws essentially cover the extent of the state's actions in the designated territorial waters. However, in terms of the high seas, international law has an indefinite relation to the state's actions over any perceived geostrategic threat or malign intentions of an adversary. These maritime laws are subject to the conditions of peace or cases of war and do not address the in-between possibilities. Hence, states are left with developing their

naval capabilities and augmenting their naval might in the self-help arena. International maritime law has several treaties, conventions and customary laws to regulate the maritime activities of the states. The key assumption is about the vessels or ships noted to be commanded by a master and managed by a crew. The AI-based autonomy at sea is a challenge to such assumptions. There are more than 1000 autonomous ships successfully operating in the seas (Nadig, 2023).

Even though these are small platforms with remote operation, fully autonomous vessels are also on the doorstep. It raised the question of how UNCLOS accommodated and dealt with maritime autonomous vessels. The anchor point is that UNCLOS presented the body of laws in the 1970s and 1980s with no anticipation of AI-based autonomy (Parker, 2022). Furthermore, these laws address the flagship state to ensure compliance with international law. If any autonomous ship is involved in a violation or seized by an adversary state, then the laws to deal with it have not been drafted yet. For instance, the seizing of an American glider by China in the high seas. The development of a code of regulations for the maritime autonomous vehicles according to their varying capabilities should be drafted to overcome the arduous challenges (Chang, Zhang, & Wang, 2020).

MEARSHEIMER'S TAKE ON INTERNATIONAL LAW

Mearsheimer's debate over the relevance of international law for international politics and its impact on states' behaviour enunciated the realist school of thought. He negated the erroneous view that realists believe that international institutions or international law do not matter at all. The international institutions and their rules are as effective as the international law and are considered these entities the same. Therefore, he used the terms 'law' and 'rule' interchangeably. In a highly globalised world, states are interdependent in terms of politics, economy, and security; hence, they required international laws and institutions to run the world. Even the great powers like the US require rules and regulations for things like trade, so these are essential. Mearsheimer asserted that these laws are helpful in coercing the minor powers and are suitable for great powers like the US in achieving their goals. For instance, the Non-Proliferation Treaty was introduced after the US acquired the nuclear weapons. So, the law prevents others from getting the nuclear weapon under the blanket of safety and stability (Notre Dame, 2021). In a self-help world, international law is usually at odds with a state's vital interests. States disobey the rules or break the laws for vital interest and survival (Abouchdid, 2020). Mearsheimer asserted that great powers write the rules that best suit their interests. He referred to Lowes Dickinson's book, named 'The European Anarchy,' which states that in an anarchic world, states are going to behave as they like. Under the anarchic structure, the great powers are never going to obey those laws or rules that conflict with their national interests. These entities are the powerful players that decide the rules of the game and can break them whenever they want. So, in making, taking, or breaking the law, the great powers are the principal architects. Powerful states may use their influence to shape the development and interpretation of international law in ways that serve their interests, hence undermining its legitimacy and effectiveness (Patrick, 2023).

CONCLUSION

Over the span of years, artificial intelligence (AI) has garnered the attention of many powerful states around the world. States have indulged in a perpetual cycle of competition to cultivate artificial intelligence to gain strategic advantages and compete effectively in the global arena. The growing influence of China in the South China Sea and extravagant claims in international waters are endangering US interests. While the US commitment to sail, fly, and navigate freely in the open waters is an attempt to sustain its long-standing powerful stature in the world's oceans. The potential brought about by high-tech and AI to shape security, national interest, and the accumulation of power has triggered competition between various powers regarding who will be leading in AI-based technology. The development and deployment of AI-based autonomous systems aim to outpace each other's influence. This strategic behaviour of both states is driven by their grand strategy ambitions, security, and power maximisation in the anarchic structure.

In the great power competition, the maritime realm is of immense significance. A powerful navy with high-tech capabilities ensures unfettered access to the oceans. AI-based autonomous/unmanned surface, aerial and underwater vehicles add up to a great deal of power. In the maritime domains, the high seas are outside the jurisdiction of national sovereignty, hence open to all. The area with minimal gatekeeping in the anarchic system invites the temptations of aggressors and competing states. The vastness and natural resource richness made the high sea an area of intersecting interests of nation-states. The risk of contestation increases manifold with AI-based autonomous vehicles, as they are just acting according to the programmed instructions and have no knowledge of international law. It raises the questions about the reliability of machines in the decision-making process in the complex marine environment. The use of autonomous vehicles in the far seas is still unaddressed and needs the development of a code of conduct to regulate them. The neorealist thought highlighted the limitations of international law due to an anarchic international system. It justified the states' behaviour as up to the mark in cultivating the AI defensive capabilities to ensure their security and survival. The limitation of international law and institutions is outlined as structural realists claim that great powers are the lawmakers and breakers. Such anarchic states led the rational actors to engage their capabilities to gain maximum power that enables them to exert influence and meet the national interests on point.

DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

REFERENCES

- Abouchedid, N. (2020). Realism vs legalism. Retrieved from *The Irish Rover*: <https://irishrover.net/2020/02/realism-vs-legalism>
- Altaf, I. (2022). Geo-strategic significance and importance of South China Sea for China, Vietnam and Philippines – Analysis. Retrieved from *Eurasia Review*: <https://www.eurasiareview.com/17012022-geo-strategic-significance-and-importance-of-south-china-sea-for-china-vietnam-and-philippines-analysis/>

- Anupama, V. (2022). Potential impact of artificial intelligence on the emerging world order. Retrieved from *F1000Research*, 11: <https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.124906.2>
- Artificial Intelligence Initiatives Within The Department Of Defense. (2021). Retrieved from: <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/CHRG-116shrg46003/html/CHRG-116shrg46003.htm>
- Brzezinski, Z., & Mearsheimer, J. J. (2009, October 22). Clash of the titans. Retrieved from *Foreign Policy*: <https://foreignpolicy.com/2009/10/22/clash-of-the-titans/>
- Buckley, C. (2016, December 20). Chinese navy returns seized underwater drone to U.S. Retrieved from *The New York Times*: <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/12/20/world/asia/china-returns-us-drone.html>
- Carter, W., & Crumpler, W. (2019). China's national strategy for AI. In *Smart Money on Chinese Advances in AI* (pp. 4–6). *Center for Strategic and International Studies*. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/resrep22599.7>
- Chang, Y.-C., Zhang, C., & Wang, N. (2020). The international legal status of the unmanned maritime vehicles. Retrieved from *Marine Policy*, 113: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2020.103830>
- Chatham House. (2021). Controlling the world's oceans: The next domain of great power competition? Retrieved from <https://www.chathamhouse.org/events/all/research-event/controlling-worlds-oceans-next-domain-great-power-competition>
- Congressional Research Service. (2024). *Report to Congress on great power competition and national defense*. Retrieved from <https://news.usni.org/2024/01/19/report-to-congress-on-great-power-competition-8>
- Cornell Law School. (2022). High seas. Retrieved from *Legal Information Institute*: https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/high_seas
- de Almeida Silva, R. (2017). The enabling power of the oceans Antonio. *Contexto Internacional*, 39(2). doi.org/10.1590/S0102-8529.2017390200002
- Defense Technical Information Center. (2003, January). *Mahan for the twenty first century: His principles still apply to national power*. Retrieved from <https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/citations/ADA526258#:~:text=Mahan%20was%20not%20able%20to,space%20power%2C%20and%20information%20dominance.>
- Doherty, K. (2022). The cyber sea: Conflict and security. *Journal of Advanced Military Studies*, 13, 154–166. <https://muse.jhu.edu/article/866870>
- Freund, J. (2022). Exploiting the resource and the tragedy of the commons. Retrieved from *The Scientific Fly Angler*: <https://www.thescientificflyangler.com/post/exploiting-the-resource-and-the-tragedy-of-the-commons>
- Glaser, B., & Allen, G. (2023). Centrality of artificial intelligence in US-China competition. Retrieved from *German Marshall Fund of the United States*: <https://www.gmfus.org/news/centrality-artificial-intelligence-us-china-competition>
- Gupta, S. (2022). Indo-Pacific between economic growth, technological competition and security. Retrieved from *Institute for China-America Studies*: <https://chinaus-icas.org/research/indo-pacific-between-economic-growth-technological-competition-and-security-our-interview-with-sourabh-gupta/>
- Haskins. (2024). What are global commons? Retrieved from *My Law Questions*: <https://www.mylawquestions.com/what-are-global-commons.htm>
- International Seabed Authority. (2023). Retrieved from Protection of the marine environment: <https://www.isa.org.jm/protection-of-the-marine-environment/>
- Islam, M. (2023). The shifting sands of power: Understanding geopolitics in the 21st century. Retrieved from *The Geopolitics*: https://thegeopolitics.com/the-shifting-sands-of-power-understanding-geopolitics-in-the-21st-century/#google_vignette
- Joint Chiefs of Staff Washington DC Washington United States. (2016). Joint Operating Environment 2035 (JOE 2035). The Joint Force in a Contested and Disordered World. Retrieved from DeFense Technical Information (No. AD1012885): <https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/pdfs/AD1012885.pdf>
- Krasadakis, G. (2023). How is AI changing the global, geopolitical system? Retrieved from *Medium*: <https://medium.com/60-leaders/how-is-ai-changing-the-global-geopolitical-system-528e8ac29c1f>
- Kurki, M., Smith, S., & Dunne, T. (2013). *International relations theories: Discipline and diversity* (3rd ed., p. 89). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Liu, Z., Liu, K., Chen, X., Ma, Z., Lv, R., Wei, C., & Ma, K. (2023). Deep-sea rock mechanics and mining technology: State of the art and perspectives. *International Journal of Mining Science and Technology*, 33(9), 1083–1115. doi.org/10.1016/j.ijmst.2023.07.007
- Mearsheimer, J. J. (2001). *The tragedy of great power politics* (pp. 83–137). New York: W.W. Norton.
- Mearsheimer, J. J. (2001). *The tragedy of great power politics* (p. 114). New York: W.W. Norton.
- Mearsheimer, J. J. (2023, August 2). Great power rivalries: The case for realism. Retrieved from *Le Monde Diplomatique*: <https://mondediplo.com/2023/08/02great-powers>
- Miranda, G., & Maljak, V. (2022). The role of United Nations Convention on the Laws of the Sea in the South China Sea disputes. Retrieved from *E-International Relations*: <https://www.e-ir.info/2022/06/23/the-role-of-united-nations-convention-on-the-laws-of-the-sea-in-the-south-china-sea-disputes/>
- Mushtaq, S., & Shahtaj. (2023). Sea power in the age of artificial intelligence (AI): China's naval modernization as a pacing threat for the United States. *The Beacon Journal*, 3(1), 87–107. https://pnwc.paknavy.gov.pk/thebeaconjournal/crs/Vol3No1_2023/5.pdf
- Nadig, S. (2023, January 26). The future of autonomous vessels in oil and gas companies. Retrieved from *Offshore Technology*: <https://www.offshore-technology.com/features/the-future-of-autonomous-vessels-in-oil-and-gas-companies/?cf-view>
- National Defense Magazine. (2022). China matching Pentagon spending on AI. Retrieved from *Center for Security and Emerging Technology*: <https://cset.georgetown.edu/article/china-matching-pentagon-spending-on-ai/>
- National Intelligence Council. (2017). *NIC releases Global Trends – Paradox of progress*. Retrieved from <https://www.dni.gov/index.php/features/1685-nic-releases-global-trends-paradox-of-progress>
- Notre Dame Journal of International & Comparative Law. (2021). Symposium debate transcript: The promise of international law: Realism versus legalism. *NDJICL*, 11(1), 91–105. <https://scholarship.law.nd.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1132&context=ndjicl>
- Parker, J. (2022). Autonomous vessels and international law. Retrieved from *Australian Naval Institute*: <https://navalinstitute.com.au/20335-2/>
- Patrick, S. (2023, September 12). Rules of order: Assessing the state of global governance. Retrieved from *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace*: <https://carnegieendowment.org/2023/09/12/rules-of-order-assessing-state-of-global-governance-pub-90517>
- Pietrusiński, M. (2022). To rule the waves: How control of the world's oceans shapes the fate of the superpowers. *ATHENAEUM*, 75(3), 309–311. doi.org/10.15804/athena.2022.75.18
- Rey, N. (2023). New global ocean treaty: Historic action for the high seas. Retrieved from *High Seas Alliance*: <https://highseasalliance.org/treatytracker/news/new-global-ocean-treaty-historic-action-for-the-high-seas/>
- Rizvi, S., & Abbas, S. (2021). U.S. freedom of navigation operations and Pakistan – Legality under international law and geopolitical implications. *RSIL Law Review*, 1, 83–117. <https://rsilpak.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/U.S.-FREEDOM-OF-NAVIGATION-OPERATIONS-AND-PAKISTAN-LEGALITY-UNDER-INTERNATIONAL-LAW-AND-GEOPOLITICAL-IMPLICATIONS.pdf>
- Shevin-Coetzee, M., & Hendrix, J. (2016). From blue to black: Applying the concepts of sea power to the ocean of space. Retrieved from *Center for a New American Security*: <https://www.cnas.org/publications/reports/from-blue-to-black>
- The National Interest. (2023). U.S. Navy vs. China's navy (PLAN): Which is the best on Earth? Retrieved from <https://nationalinterest.org/blog/buzz/us-navy-vs-chinas-navy-plan-which-best-earth-207810>
- Tian, N., Lopes da Silva, D., Liang, X., Scarazzato, L., Karim, Z. A., & Ricard, J. G. (2024). Trends in world military expenditure, 2024. Retrieved from *Stockholm International Peace Research Institute*: <https://doi.org/10.55163/AVEC8366>
- Tinnirello, M. (2018). *Artificial intelligence safety and security: Offensive realism and the insecure structure of the international system* (1st ed., p.18). Chapman and Hall/CRC.
- Toft, P. (2005). John J. Mearsheimer: An offensive realist between geopolitics and power. *Journal of International Relations and Development*, 8, 381–408. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.jird.1800065>

- U.S. Department of Defense. (2024). *Military and security developments involving the People's Republic of China 2024: Annual report to Congress*. <https://media.defense.gov/2024/Dec/18/2003615520/-1/-1/0/MILITARY-AND-SECURITY-DEVELOPMENTS-INVOLVING-THE-PEOPLES-REPUBLIC-OF-CHINA-2024.PDF>
- Wu, X. (2020). Technology, power, and uncontrolled great power strategic competition between China and the United States. *China International Strategy Review*, 2(1), 99–119. doi.org/10.1007/s42533-020-00040-0
- Xu, M., Ma, X., Zhao, Y., & Qiao, W. (2023). A systematic literature review of maritime transportation safety management. *Journal of Marine Science and Engineering*, 11(12). doi.org/10.3390/jmse11122311