Chapter 10

Algorithmic Speed and The Future of Lethality

Virginia Bacay Watson

"The history of command can thus be understood in terms of a race between the demand for information and the ability of command systems to meet it."[2]

— Martin van Creveld
Command in War (1985)

Lethality has long served as a core organizing principle in military thought, doctrine, and capability development. Traditionally understood as the capacity to inflict physical destruction on an adversary, lethality has been measured in range, payload, accuracy, survivability, and firepower. Its logic has been platform-centered

doi.org/10.71236/npfss9qe

and materially grounded: the destructive effect resides in weapons, while human actors determine when and how that effect is applied.

The diffusion of artificial intelligence across military systems complicates this settled understanding. Policymakers and strategists increasingly invoke "AI lethality," yet the term is often left undefined, sometimes implying greater destructive yield, other times suggesting something more structural. This ambiguity risks obscuring a deeper transformation already underway.

AI lethality does not simply amplify firepower. It reorganizes the informational and temporal conditions under which force becomes possible, timely, and decisive. Whereas conventional lethality resides in platforms and munitions, AI lethality resides in data architectures, decision systems, and networked integration that shape how, when, and whether force is employed at all. The locus of advantage shifts from explosive output to decision tempo.

In an era of competitive multipolarity—especially in the Indo-Pacific—this shift carries profound implications for deterrence credibility, crisis stability, and force design. This chapter argues that AI lethality represents a structural shift from weapon-centered destruction to system-level decision advantage, redefining how military power is generated, governed, and contested.

Classical Lethality: Weapon-Centered Destruction and Human Control

In its classical formulation, lethality refers to the capacity of a weapon system or military force to inflict physical harm or material destruction. It is assessed through measurable attributes—accuracy, range, rate of fire, payload, penetration capability, and survivability—typically evaluated at the platform, munition, or force package level. Destructive capacity resides in the hardware itself.

Classical lethality is therefore weapon centered. The warhead, projectile, or kinetic mechanism generates the physical effect, while human actors determine when and how that effect is applied. In joint doctrine, the employment of force is mediated through formal targeting processes that translate the commander's intent into prioritized targets, approved engagements, and sequenced operations.[3] Hierarchical command-and-control structures this process, embedding layers of review, coordination, and authorization between destructive capacity and its execution.

These institutional mechanisms impose natural limits. Time delays, cognitive bandwidth constraints, bureaucratic friction, and political oversight shape the conversion of potential violence into actual force. The existence of destructive capability does not automatically produce its use; human judgment intervenes at multiple stages.

Legal review further reinforces these constraints. Commanders must apply principles of distinction, proportionality, and feasible precautions in planning and conducting attacks,[4] making decisions in good faith and on the basis of the information available at the time, even under uncertainty and time pressure.[5] Law does not eliminate violence, but it structures its authorization and scope.

Even the most advanced precision-strike systems remain bounded by these mediating processes. Long-range cruise missiles, hypersonic systems, or stealth aircraft may possess extraordinary destructive reach, yet their employment depends on deliberate targeting cycles, established command authorities, and defined rules of engagement.[6] Traditional lethality is thus best understood as contained, episodic, and human-directed: contained in discrete weapons, episodic in activation, and mediated by institutional judgment at critical decision points.

AI Lethality: From Destruction to Decision Advantage

AI lethality represents a shift not in how much force can be generated, but in where combat effectiveness resides within military systems. Rather than increasing the explosive yield or kinetic reach of individual weapons, AI reshapes the informational and temporal conditions under which destruction becomes possible, timely, and decisive. The locus of advantage moves from the platform to the process.

In this sense, AI lethality is not primarily an enhancement of firepower; it is an enhancement of what the Department has described as *enduring decision advantage*.[7] AI-enabled systems filter and prioritize targets, fuse sensor data across domains, compress decision timelines, and coordinate distributed forces under contested conditions. They sustain persistent situational awareness across maritime, air, cyber, and space domains, reducing uncertainty and constraining adversary maneuver space before a weapon is ever released.

The cumulative effect is structural. Lethality migrates from discrete platforms to integrated networks of sensing, processing, and action, enterprise-wide systems designed to generate coherent decisions at the speed of relevance.[8] What becomes decisive is not merely the missile or drone, but the algorithmic capacity to integrate information, reduce ambiguity, and synchronize effects faster than an adversary can adapt.

The destructive instrument may remain unchanged; the architecture governing its employment is transformed. In this model, advantage derives less from the magnitude of force than from the tempo, reliability, and coherence with which force can be generated. AI does not replace destruction; it organizes the pathway through which destruction is authorized and applied.

Decision Centric Lethality: Algorithms as Force Multipliers

Traditional lethality assumes a clear division of labor: humans decide, machines execute. Authority resides with commanders; weapons implement their intent. AI-enabled systems complicate this arrangement by structuring the decision environment before human judgment is exercised. Even where formal authority remains intact, algorithms increasingly determine which information is visible, which signals are amplified, which targets are prioritized, and which courses of action appear feasible within compressed timelines. Human agency is not displaced, but it is conditioned. The cognitive terrain upon which decisions are made is increasingly pre-shaped by machine processing.

This shift is not unique to the United States. In the People's Liberation Army's (PLA) modernization drive, AI-enabled decision support systems are central to what Chinese strategists describe as *intelligentized warfare*, a doctrinal evolution that integrates AI into command systems, information processing, and operational planning rather than focusing narrowly on autonomous weapons.[9] PLA analyses emphasize data fusion, command automation, and enhanced battlefield cognition as pathways to decision superiority. The objective is not merely faster weapons, but faster coherence: the ability to orient and act before an adversary can assemble an effective response.[10]

In this context, lethality emerges indirectly through decision compression. When targeting cycles contract from hours to minutes—or from minutes to seconds—the probability of successful strike execution rises, while the adversary's reaction time diminishes. Sanctuary erodes not because destructive power has increased, but because the opportunity to adapt has narrowed. Algorithms function as force multipliers not by increasing explosive yield but by accelerating cognition, reducing uncertainty, and stabilizing coordination under contested conditions. The multiplier effect resides in tempo and integration, not in additional firepower.

Scale and Persistence: From Episodic to Ambient Lethality

Human-directed lethality is episodic by necessity. Analysts fatigue, operators rotate, and commanders confront cognitive saturation. Even the most capable forces must sequence attention, prioritize limited targets, and operate within bounded decision cycles. Destructive power may be immense, but its activation is intermittent and mediated.

AI-enabled systems alter this rhythm. Operating continuously, they ingest vast data streams, update probabilistic assessments, recalibrate targeting recommendations, and adjust logistics priorities without interruption. What was once periodic becomes persistent; what was once reactive becomes anticipatory.

In the Indo-Pacific maritime domain, AI-enabled maritime domain awareness architectures track vessel movements across expansive theaters in near real time.[11] When integrated with strike assets, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) networks, and sustainment systems, these architectures generate a condition of persistent exposure[12]—what may be termed *ambient lethality*. In such an environment, adversary forces are continuously detectable, behaviorally modeled, and conditionally targetable.

Lethality in this context does not manifest as constant violence. It manifests as constant vulnerability embedded in the operational environment itself. The strategic effect is coercive even in the absence of kinetic action. Persistent detection narrows maneuver space, increases defensive costs, and compresses the adversary's planning cycle. The battlespace becomes structurally conditioned—less a neutral arena and more a continuously surveilled and selectively hostile domain.

Non-Kinetic and Indirect Forms of AI Lethality

Classical lethality presumes physical destruction as the primary mechanism of military effect.[13] AI lethality expands this logic by incorporating non-kinetic actions that degrade an adversary's capacity to perceive, decide, and coordinate, targeting the data flows and cognitive infrastructure upon which modern operations depend. The objective is not necessarily to destroy platforms, but to degrade the coherence of the systems that govern them.[14]

AI-enabled cyber and electronic warfare capabilities can disrupt command-and-control networks, corrupt data integrity, spoof sensor inputs, or subtly distort the informational environment within which decisions are made. Rather than eliminating assets, such operations undermine confidence in the reliability of information itself. In an Indo-Pacific contingency, cyber operations could degrade early warning networks, disrupt logistic coordination, or compromise the systems that enable mobilization and power projection before kinetic engagement occurs. As the *2023 Cyber Strategy* notes, China's theory of victory emphasizes degrading Joint Force combat capability by targeting networks that support mobilization and operational coordination.[15] The immediate effects may be neither visible nor kinetic, yet the consequences—operational paralysis, mistimed responses, or strategic miscalculation—may be profound.

In this form, AI lethality operates by eroding agency rather than destroying matériel. It constrains perception, distorts feedback loops, and compresses the space for coherent response. When decision integrity collapses, material destruction often follows, but the decisive shift occurs earlier, within the cognitive and informational domain where control is first compromised. As Robert Jervis observed, wars frequently arise not solely from material imbalances but from distorted perceptions and misinterpretations that shape leaders' choices under pressure.[16] In AI-enabled conflict, the manipulation of perception may precede and precipitate the application of force.

Speed, Escalation, and Strategic Stability

Consider a crisis in the Western Pacific. An AI-enabled maritime domain awareness system detects anomalous fleet movements near a contested strait. Satellite imagery, radar returns, and electronic emissions are fused in real time, generating an automated alert that suggests preparations for missile deployment. Defensive algorithms reposition missile defense assets and generate preemptive counter-targeting options based on predictive modeling. Within minutes, political leadership receives a decision brief complete with confidence scores and recommended responses, while attribution remains probabilistic rather than certain. In such an environment, hesitation risks forfeiting advantage; action risks miscalculation. The decisive variable is no longer force size by decision tempo.

AI lethality reshapes escalation dynamics by compressing the interval between warning, attribution, and response. As algorithmic systems fuse data, prioritize targets, and recommend courses of action at machine speed, the temporal buffer that historically separated detection from retaliation narrows. Warning windows contract even as uncertainty persists. Automated or semi-automated systems, interacting across the domains of cyber, space, air, and maritime, may generate feedback that no single actor can fully anticipate or control.

In the Indo-Pacific, where multiple nuclear-armed states operate within dense and contested sensor environments, these dynamics assume heightened significance. AI-enabled early warning, missile defense, and counterstrike systems may improve survivability at the tactical level while simultaneously intensifying preemptive pressure at the strategic level. When leaders believe delay may prove fatal, restraint can appear strategically irrational. As Thomas Schelling warned, when each side fears that waiting increases vulnerability, reciprocal incentives for preemption can emerge, even in the absence of aggressive intent.[17]

AI lethality thus introduces a stability paradox. At the tactical level, accelerated decision systems enhance precision, coordination, and operational efficiency. At the strategic level, compressed timelines and opaque algorithmic processes reduce opportunities for deliberation, signaling, and correction. Traditional lethality scales roughly with inventory and force posture. AI lethality scales nonlinearly with speed, connectivity, and feedback loops, where small data errors, model biases, or misinterpreted signals can cascade rapidly across integrated networks.

Escalation in such an environment need not originate in deliberate political intent. It may unfold through machine-accelerated interaction, as the narrowing of decision space outpaces the human capacity to reassess assumptions or restore control. The decisive danger lies not in autonomous rebellion but in tempo asymmetry: the possibility that strategic outcomes are determined by the velocity of systems rather than the judgment of leaders.

Conceptual Distinction

The distinction between traditional lethality and AI lethality is structural rather than semantic. It reflects a shift in where military advantage resides and how force translates into political effect.

In its classical formulation, lethality refers to the capacity to inflict physical destruction through force. Its effects are measurable in damage assessments, destroyed platforms, neutralized infrastructure, and degraded capabilities. Destructive power resides in munitions, platforms, and kinetic mechanisms. The decisive question is whether one can eliminate more of the adversary's material capacity than the adversary can eliminate of one's own.

Advantage scales with inventory, survivability, range, and precision.

AI lethality alters this logic. It does not primarily increase destructive yield; it restructures the system that determines how and when destruction occurs. Its locus is not the warhead but the decision architecture that governs sensing, prioritization, targeting, and coordination. Advantage scales not linearly with inventory but nonlinearly with speed, integration, and feedback.

Traditional lethality eliminates assets. AI lethality reshapes the decision environment in which assets are employed.

The former is episodic, activated at discrete moments of engagement. The latter compresses time and narrows deliberative space.

The distinction has strategic consequences. In a force-centered model, deterrence rests on visible capability and credible destructive capacity. In a tempo-centered model, deterrence increasingly rests on decision advantage; the ability to generate coherent action faster than an adversary can adapt. Stability is therefore influenced not only by inventory balances but by asymmetries in informational speed and systemic integration.

The shift is not from destruction to non-destruction. It is from material advantage to tempo advantage; from who can destroy more to who can decide faster without losing control.

In this sense, AI lethality is less a new category of weapon than a transformation in the architecture of war.

Force Design Imperatives

For the United States, AI lethality is not a question of adopting new tools; it is a question of redesigning the architecture of force. In an era where advantage increasingly derives from tempo and decision coherence rather than inventory alone, competitive success will depend on resilient, adaptive decision systems capable of integrating human judgment with machine acceleration under contested and degraded conditions. The issue is not whether AI enters force structure; it already has, but whether it is integrated as a coherent operational system rather than as a collection of disconnected applications.

First, data resilience must be treated as combat power.[18] Secure networks, trusted data pipelines, model validation, latency reduction, and redundancy in sensor integration are not technical support functions; they are preconditions for generating force at speed. In a tempo-centered model of warfare, corrupted data, delayed transmission, or brittle architectures can paralyze decision cycles as effectively as destroyed platforms. The protection, authentication, and survivability of data ecosystems must therefore be prioritized alongside munitions production and platform procurement.

Second, human-machine integration must preserve command responsibility while enhancing decision quality.[19] AI systems should expand, clarify, and accelerate human judgment, not obscure accountability or displace it. The delegation of analytical and targeting functions must remain anchored in clear doctrinal boundaries. Deterrence credibility depends not only on capability but on intelligibility: adversaries must understand who decides, how decisions are governed, and where escalation authority resides. Without such clarity, acceleration risks undermining strategic signaling.

Third, alliance interoperability must extend beyond hardware compatibility to shared decision ecosystems.[20] Distributed operations across the Indo-Pacific require common data standards, secure cross-domain architectures, interoperable cloud environments, and confidence in the integrity of algorithmic outputs. In coalition warfare, fractured data flows can degrade tempo as surely as incompatible weapons systems. If AI lethality is systemic, interoperability must be systemic as well.

Fourth, organizational adaptation is as critical as technological adoption.[21] Forces structured around platform dominance must adapt to operating as nodes within resilient, distributed networks. This requires investment not only in software and sensors, but in training, doctrine, procurement reform, and professional military education that prepares leaders to command in algorithmically accelerated environments. Without institutional adaptation, technological speed will outpace organizational capacity.

Finally, speed must be governed. The ability to operate at machine tempo offers operational advantage, but unbound acceleration can erode crisis stability. In competitive multipolarity, tempo asymmetries may prove more decisive than inventory asymmetries; yet unmanaged tempo compresses deliberation and amplifies miscalculations. Effective force design must therefore pair acceleration with control, ensuring that systems enhance responsiveness without surrendering strategic restraint.

In an era of algorithmic competition, the decisive edge will belong not simply to the fastest force, but to the force that can generate speed, sustain resilience, and deliberately regulate its own tempo under pressure.

Conclusion

AI lethality does not replace traditional lethality; it reorganizes it. Weapons still destroy, but AI increasingly determines when destruction occurs, how it propagates, and whether it remains bounded within intended political limits. The locus of advantage is shifting from platforms to processes, from explosive yield to decision architecture.

In the Indo-Pacific, where nuclear-armed states operate in dense, contested sensor environments and escalation pathways are compressed, this transformation demands sustained doctrinal and strategic scrutiny. Understanding AI lethality as a decision-centric, system-level phenomenon is not a theoretical refinement; it is a prerequisite for responsible force design, credible deterrence, and crisis stability.

Inventory still matters. Range still matters. But advantage will increasingly accrue to those who can generate, integrate, and regulate tempo under pressure. In contemporary conflict, the decisive margin lies less in who can destroy more than in who can decide faster without losing control.

The future of lethality is not defined by greater violence, but by the governance of speed. In an era of intelligentized competition, the strategic edge will belong to those who master acceleration without surrendering judgment.

Endnotes

[1] The author is solely responsible for the views expressed in this publication, which do not necessarily represent the official policy or position of the Daniel K. Inouye Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies, the U.S. Department of War, or the U.S. government.

[2] Martin van Creveld, *Command in War* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1985), 285.

[3] Joint Chiefs of Staff, *Joint Publication (JP) 3-60, Joint Targeting*, September 28, 2018; II-1–II-4, https://www.esd.whs.mil/Portals/54/Documents/FOID/Reading%20Room/Joint_Staff/21-F-0520_JP_3-60_9-28-2018.pdf.

[4] U.S. Department of Defense, *DoD Law of War Manual* (updated July 2023), §§ 2.5, 5.10, 5.11, https://ogc.osd.mil/Portals/99/Law%20of%20War%202023/DOD-LAW-OF-WAR-MANUAL-JUNE-2015-UPDATED-JULY%202023.pdf.

[5] U.S. Department of Defense, *DoD Law of War Manual*, § 5.4.3.

[6] Joint Staff J7, *Authorities: Insights and Best Practices Focus Paper*, 2d ed. (October 2016), 2, 9, https://www.jcs.mil/Portals/36/Documents/Doctrine/fp/authorities_fp.pdf.

[7] U.S. Department of Defense, *Data, Analytics, and Artificial Intelligence Adoption Strategy: Accelerating Decision Advantage*, June 27, 2023, 3–5, https://media.defense.gov/2023/nov/02/2003333300/-1/-1/1/dod_data_analytics_ai_adoption_strategy.pdf.

[8] U.S. Department of Defense, *Summary of the Joint All-Domain Command and Control (JADC2)*, March 2022, 3–5, https://media.defense.gov/2022/Mar/17/2002958406/-1/-1/1/SUMMARY-OF-THE-JOINT-ALL-DOMAIN-COMMAND-AND-CONTROL-STRATEGY.PDF.

[9] Kevin Pollpeter and Amanda Kerrigan, *The PLA and Intelligent Warfare: A Primer Analysis*, CNA, October 2021, 7, https://www.cna.org/reports/2021/10/The-PLA-and-Intelligent-Warfare-A-Preliminary-Analysis.pdf.

[10] Joshua D. Baughman, "The Path to China's Intelligentized Warfare: Converging on the Metaverse Battlefield, *Cyber Defense Review*, Fall 2024, 29–36, https://cyberdefensereview.army.mil/Portals/6/Documents/2024-Fall/Baughman_CDRV9N3-Fall-2024.pdf.

[11] U.S. Department of State, "The United States' Commitment to Maritime Security in the Indo-Pacific," Fact Sheet, September 23, 2025, https://www.state.gov/the-united-states-commitment-to-maritime-security-in-the-indo-pacific.

[12] U.S. Department of Defense, *Summary of JADC2 Strategy*, 4–6; Darian Wilson, "NIWC Pacific Enhances India's Maritime Security Capabilities," NIW Pacific, May 22, 2025, https://www.niwcpacific.navy.mil/Media/Press-Releases/Article/4195283/niwc-pacific-enhances-indias-maritime-security-capabilities/.

[13] Joint Chiefs of Staff, *Joint Publication 3-60, Joint Targeting*, II-22; Joint Chiefs of Staff, *Joint Publication 3-0, Joint Operations*, January 17, 2017, A-1–A-2.

[14] U.S. Department of Defense, Data, Analytics, and Artificial Intelligence Adoption Strategy, 4–5.

[15] U.S. Department of Defense, *2023 Cyber Strategy Summary* (2023), 10, 16, https://media.defense.gov/2023/Sep/12/2003299076/-1/-1/1/2023_DOD_Cyber_Strategy_Summary.pdf.

[16] Robert Jervis, *Perception and Misperception in International Politics* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976) 187–202.

[17] Thomas C. Schelling, *Arms and Influence* (New Haven, CT: Yale University, 2020), 224–25.

[18] U.S. Department of Defense, Data, Analytics, and Artificial Intelligence Adoption Strategy, 6–7.

[19] James Johnson, "The AI Commander Problem: Ethical, Political, and Psychological Dilemmas of Human-Machine Interactions in AI-enabled Warfare," *Journal of Military Ethics 21*, no. 3-4 (2022), https://doi.org/10.1080/15027570.2023.2175887.

[20] U.S. Department of Defense, Data, Analytics, and Artificial Intelligence Adoption Strategy, 9–11.

[21] U.S. Department of Defense, Data, Analytics, and Artificial Intelligence Adoption Strategy, 4–5, 12–13.