

Lethal autonomous weapon

14 languages

Article Talk Read Edit View history Tools

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

"Killer robot" redirects here. For the concept of robots and/or artificial intelligence killing or eradicating humans and/or other living beings, see Existential risk from artificial general intelligence, Al takeover, and grey goo.

Lethal autonomous weapons (LAWs) are a type of autonomous military system that can independently search for and engage targets based on programmed constraints and descriptions. LAWs are also known as lethal autonomous weapon systems (LAWS), autonomous weapon systems (AWS), robotic weapons or killer robots. LAWs may operate in the air, on land, on water, underwater, or in space. The autonomy of current systems as of 2018 was restricted in the sense that a human gives the final command to attack—though there are exceptions with certain "defensive" systems.



combat robot

Being autonomous as a weapon [edit]

Being "autonomous" has different meanings in different fields of study. In terms of military weapon development, the identification of a weapon as autonomous is not as clear as in other areas. [1] The specific standard entailed in the concept of being autonomous can vary hugely between different scholars, nations and organizations.

Various people have many definitions of what constitutes a lethal autonomous weapon. The official United States Department of Defense Policy on Autonomy in Weapon Systems, defines an Autonomous Weapons Systems as, "A weapon system that, once activated, can select and engage targets without further intervention by a human operator."[2] Heather Roff, a writer for Case Western Reserve University School of Law, describes autonomous weapon systems as "armed weapons systems, capable of learning and adapting their 'functioning in response to changing circumstances in the environment in which [they are] deployed,' as well as capable of making firing decisions on their own."[3] This definition of autonomous weapon systems is a fairly high threshold compared to the definitions of scholars such as Peter Asaro and Mark Gubrud's definitions seen below.

Scholars such as Peter Asaro and Mark Gubrud are trying to set the threshold lower and judge more weapon systems as autonomous. They believe that any weapon system that is capable of releasing a lethal force without the operation, decision, or confirmation of a human supervisor can be deemed autonomous. According to Gubrud, a weapon system operating partially or wholly without human intervention is considered autonomous. He argues that a weapon system does not need to be able to make decisions completely by itself in order to be called autonomous. Instead, it should be treated as autonomous as long

as it actively involves in one or multiple parts of the "preparation process", from finding the target to finally firing.^{[4][5]}

Other organizations, however, are setting the standard of autonomous weapon system in a higher position. The British Ministry of Defence defines autonomous weapon systems as "systems that are capable of understanding higher level intent and direction. From this understanding and its perception of its environment, such a system is able to take appropriate action to bring about a desired state. It is capable of deciding a course of action, from a number of alternatives, without depending on human oversight and control - such human engagement with the system may still be present, though. While the overall activity of an autonomous unmanned aircraft will be predictable, individual actions may not be." [6]

As a result, the composition of a treaty between states requires a commonly accepted labeling of what exactly constitutes an autonomous weapon. [7]

Automatic defensive systems [edit]

The oldest automatically triggered lethal weapon is the land mine, used since at least the 1600s, and naval mines, used since at least the 1700s. Anti-personnel mines are banned in many countries by the 1997 Ottawa Treaty, not including the United States, Russia, and much of Asia and the Middle East.

Some current examples of LAWs are automated "hardkill" active protection systems, such as a radar-guided CIWS systems used to defend ships that have been in use since the 1970s (e.g., the US Phalanx CIWS). Such systems can autonomously identify *and attack* oncoming missiles, rockets, artillery fire, aircraft and surface vessels according to criteria set by the human operator. Similar systems exist for tanks, such as the Russian Arena, the Israeli Trophy, and the German AMAP-ADS. Several types of stationary sentry guns, which can fire at humans and vehicles, are used in South Korea and Israel. Many missile defence systems, such as Iron Dome, also have autonomous targeting capabilities.

The main reason for not having a "human in the loop" in these systems is the need for rapid response. They have generally been used to protect personnel and installations against incoming projectiles.

Autonomous offensive systems [edit]

According to *The Economist*, as technology advances, future applications of unmanned undersea vehicles might include mine clearance, mine-laying, anti-submarine sensor networking in contested waters, patrolling with active sonar, resupplying manned submarines, and becoming low-cost missile platforms.^[8] In 2018, the U.S. Nuclear Posture Review alleged that Russia was developing a "new intercontinental, nuclear-armed, nuclear-powered, undersea autonomous torpedo" named "Status 6".^[9]

The Russian Federation is actively developing artificially intelligent missiles, [10] drones, [11] unmanned vehicles, military robots and medic robots. [12][13][14][15]

Israeli Minister Ayoob Kara stated in 2017 that Israel is developing military robots, including ones as small as flies.^[16]

In October 2018, Zeng Yi, a senior executive at the Chinese defense firm Norinco, gave a speech in which he said that "In future battlegrounds, there will be no people fighting", and that the use of lethal autonomous weapons in warfare is "inevitable". [17] In 2019, US Defense Secretary Mark Esper lashed out at China for selling drones capable of taking life with no human oversight. [18]

The British Army deployed new unmanned vehicles and military robots in 2019.^[19]

The US Navy is developing "ghost" fleets of unmanned ships. [20]

In 2020 a Kargu 2 drone hunted down and attacked a human target in Libya, according to a report from the UN Security Council's Panel of Experts on Libya, published in March 2021. This may have been the first time an autonomous killer robot armed with lethal weaponry attacked human beings. [21][22]

In May 2021 Israel conducted an Al guided combat drone swarm attack in Gaza. [23]

Since then there have been numerous reports of swarms and other autonomous weapons systems being used on battlefields around the world.^[24]

In addition, DARPA is working on making swarms of 250 autonomous lethal drones available to the American Military.^[25]

Ethical and legal issues [edit]

Degree of human control [edit]

Three classifications of the degree of human control of autonomous weapon systems were laid out by Bonnie Docherty in a 2012 Human Rights Watch report.^[26]

- human-in-the-loop: a human must instigate the action of the weapon (in other words not fully autonomous).
- human-on-the-loop: a human may abort an action.
- human-out-of-the-loop: no human action is involved.

Standard used in US policy [edit]

Current US policy states: "Autonomous ... weapons systems shall be designed to allow commanders and operators to exercise appropriate levels of human judgment over the use of force."[27] However, the policy requires that autonomous weapon systems that kill people or use kinetic force, selecting and engaging targets without further human intervention, be certified as compliant with "appropriate levels" and other standards, not that such weapon systems cannot meet these standards and are therefore forbidden. [28] "Semi-autonomous" hunter-killers that autonomously identify and attack targets do not even require certification.^[28] Deputy Defense Secretary Robert O. Work said in 2016 that the Defense Department would "not delegate lethal authority to a machine to make a decision", but might need to reconsider this since "authoritarian regimes" may do so. [29] In October 2016 President Barack Obama stated that early in his career he was wary of a future in which a US president making use of drone warfare could "carry on perpetual wars all over the world, and a lot of them covert, without any accountability or democratic debate". [30][31] In the US, security-related Al has fallen under the purview of the National Security Commission on Artificial Intelligence since 2018. [32][33] On October 31, 2019, the United States Department of Defense's Defense Innovation Board published the draft of a report outlining five principles for weaponized AI and making 12 recommendations for the ethical use of artificial intelligence by the Department of Defense that would ensure a human operator would always be able to look into the 'black box' and understand the kill-chain process. A major concern is how the report will be implemented. [34]

Stuart Russell, professor of computer science from University of California, Berkeley stated the concern he has with LAWs is that his view is that it is unethical and inhumane. The main issue with this system is it is hard to distinguish between combatants and non-combatants.^[35]

There is concern by some economists^[36] and legal scholars about whether LAWs would violate International Humanitarian Law, especially the principle of distinction, which requires the ability to discriminate combatants from non-combatants, and the principle of proportionality, which requires that damage to civilians be proportional to the military aim.^[37] This concern is often invoked as a reason to ban "killer robots" altogether - but it is doubtful that this concern can be an argument against LAWs that do not violate International Humanitarian Law.^{[38][39][40]}

A 2021 report by the American Congressional Research Service states that "there are no domestic or international legal prohibitions on the development of use of LAWs," although it acknowledges ongoing talks at the UN Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW).^[41]

LAWs are said by some to blur the boundaries of who is responsible for a particular killing. [42][36] Philosopher Robert Sparrow argues that autonomous weapons are causally but not morally responsible, similar to child soldiers. In each case, he argues there is a risk of atrocities occurring without an appropriate subject to hold responsible, which violates *jus in bello*. [43] Thomas Simpson and Vincent Müller argue that they may make it easier to record who gave which command. [44] Potential IHL violations by LAWs are – by definition – only applicable in conflict settings that involve the need to distinguish between combatants and civilians. As such, any conflict scenario devoid of civilians' presence – i.e. in space or the deep seas – would not run into the obstacles posed by IHL. [45]

Campaigns to ban LAWs [edit]

The possibility of LAWs has generated significant debate, especially about the risk of "killer robots" roaming the earth - in the near or far future. The group Campaign to Stop Killer Robots formed in 2013. In July 2015, over 1,000 experts in artificial intelligence signed a letter warning of the threat of an artificial intelligence arms race and calling for a ban on autonomous weapons. The letter was presented in Buenos Aires at the 24th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI-15) and was co-signed by Stephen Hawking, Elon Musk, Steve Wozniak, Noam Chomsky, Skype cofounder Jaan Tallinn and Google DeepMind co-founder Demis Hassabis, among others. [46][47]



Rally on the steps of San Francisco City Hall, protesting against a vote to authorize police use of deadly force robots

According to PAX For Peace (one of the founding organisations of the Campaign to Stop Killer Robots), fully automated weapons (FAWs) will lower the threshold of going to war as soldiers are removed from the battlefield and the public is distanced from experiencing war, giving politicians and other decision-makers more space in deciding when and how to go to war. They warn that once deployed, FAWs will make democratic control of war more difficult - something that author of *Kill Decision* - a novel on the topic - and IT specialist Daniel Suarez also warned about: according to him it might recentralize power into very few hands by requiring very few people to go to war. [48]

There are websites [clarification needed] protesting the development of LAWs by presenting undesirable ramifications if research into the appliance of artificial intelligence to designation of weapons continues. On

these websites, news about ethical and legal issues are constantly updated for visitors to recap with recent news about international meetings and research articles concerning LAWs.^[49]

The Holy See has called for the international community to ban the use of LAWs on several occasions. In November 2018, Archbishop Ivan Jurkovic, the permanent observer of the Holy See to the United Nations, stated that "In order to prevent an arms race and the increase of inequalities and instability, it is an imperative duty to act promptly: now is the time to prevent LAWs from becoming the reality of tomorrow's warfare." The Church worries that these weapons systems have the capability to irreversibly alter the nature of warfare, create detachment from human agency and put in question the humanity of societies. [50]

As of 29 March 2019, the majority of governments represented at a UN meeting to discuss the matter favoured a ban on LAWs.^[51] A minority of governments, including those of Australia, Israel, Russia, the UK, and the US, opposed a ban.^[51] The United States has stated that autonomous weapons have helped prevent the killing of civilians.^[52]

In December 2022, a vote of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors to authorize San Francisco Police Department use of LAWs drew national attention and protests.^{[53][54]} The Board reversed this vote in a subsequent meeting.^[55]

No ban, but regulation [edit]

A third approach focuses on regulating the use of autonomous weapon systems in lieu of a ban.^[56] Military AI arms control will likely require the institutionalization of new international norms embodied in effective technical specifications combined with active monitoring and informal ('Track II') diplomacy by communities of experts, together with a legal and political verification process.^{[57][58][59][60]} In 2021, the United States Department of Defense requested a dialogue with the Chinese People's Liberation Army on AI-enabled autonomous weapons but was refused.^[61]

A summit of 60 countries was held in 2023 on the responsible use of AI in the military. [62]

On 22 December 2023, a United Nations General Assembly resolution was adopted to support international discussion regarding concerns about LAWs. The vote was 152 in favor, four against, and 11 abstentions.^[63]

See also [edit]

- · Artificial intelligence arms race
- · List of fictional military robots
- Slaughterbots

References [edit]

- 1. ^ Crootof, Rebecca (2015). "The Killer Robots Are Here: Legal and Policy Implications" ☑. Cardozo L. Rev. 36: 1837 via heinonline.org.
- 2. ^ Allen, Gregory (6 June 2022). "DOD Is Updating Its Decade-Old Autonomous Weapons Policy, but Confusion Remains Widespread"

 . **Center for Strategic and International Studies.** Retrieved 24 July 2022.
- 3. A Roff, Heather (2015). "Lethal Autonomous Weapons and Jus Ad Bellum Proportionality" 2.
- 4. ^ Asaro, Peter (2012). "On Banning Autonomous Weapon Systems: Human Rights, Automation, and the Dehumanization of Lethal Decision-Making" ∠. *Red Cross.* 687: 94.
- 5. ^ "Autonomy without Mystery: Where do you draw the line?" ☑. 1.0 Human. 2014-05-09. Archived from the original ☑ on 2018-11-16. Retrieved 2018-06-08.

- 6. A "Unmanned aircraft systems (JDP 0-30.2)" Z. GOV.UK. Retrieved 2018-06-08.
- 7. ^ Krishnan, Armin (2016). *Killer Robots: Legality and Ethicality of Autonomous Weapons* ☑. Taylor & Francis. doi:10.4324/9781315591070 ☑. ISBN 9781317109129. Retrieved 2018-06-08.
- 8. * "Getting to grips with military robotics" . The Economist. 25 January 2018. Retrieved 7 February 2018.
- 9. ^ "US says Russia 'developing' undersea nuclear-armed torpedo" ☑. CNN. 3 February 2018. Retrieved 7 February 2018.
- 10. ^ "Russia is building a missile that can makes its own decisions" ☑. Newsweek. 20 July 2017.
- 11. ^ Litovkin, Nikolai (2017-05-31). "Russia's digital doomsday weapons: Robots prepare for war Russia Beyond" ∠. Russia Beyond.
- 12. ^ "'Comrade in Arms': Russia is developing a freethinking war machine" . 2017-08-09.
- 13. ^ "Rise of the Machines: A look at Russia's latest combat robots" №. 2017-06-06.
- 14. ^ "Is Terminator back? Russians make major advances in artificial intelligence" ∠. Russia Beyond. 10 February 2016
- 15. ^ "Virtual trainer for robots and drones developed in Russia" ☑. 15 May 2017. Archived from the original ☑ on 11 October 2017. Retrieved 3 September 2017.
- 16. A "Kara: I wasn't revealing state secrets about the robots" ... The Jerusalem Post.
- 17. ^ Allen, Gregory. "Understanding China's Al Strategy" ☑. Center for a New American Security. Retrieved 11 March 2019.
- 18. A "Is China exporting killer robots to Mideast?" Z. Asia Times. 28 November 2019. Retrieved 21 December 2019.
- 19. ^ "British Army to operationally deploy new robots in 2019 | March 2019 Global Defense Security army news industry | Defense Security global news industry army 2019 | Archive News year" ♂.
- 20. A "US Navy plans to build an unmanned Ghost Fleet" 2.
- 21. ^ Hambling, David. "Drones may have attacked humans fully autonomously for the first time" ☑. New Scientist. Retrieved 2021-05-30.
- 22. ^ "Killer drone 'hunted down a human target' without being told to" ∠. Fox News. 2021-05-29. Retrieved 2021-05-30.
- 23. ^ Hambling, David. "Israel used world's first Al-guided combat drone swarm in Gaza attacks" №. New Scientist. Retrieved 2023-01-15.
- 24. ^ "SLAUGHTERBOTS ARE HERE" 2.
- 25. ^ "DARPA'S DREAM OF A TINY ROBOT ARMY IS CLOSE TO BECOMING A REALITY" 2. December 2020.
- 26. Amitai Etzioni; Oren Etzioni (June 2017). "Pros and Cons of Autonomous Weapons Systems" ... army.mil.
- 27. A US Department of Defense (2012). "Directive 3000.09, Autonomy in weapon systems" (PDF). p. 2. Archived from the original (PDF) on December 1, 2012.
- 28. ^ a b Gubrud, Mark (April 2015). "Semi-autonomous and on their own: Killer robots in Plato's Cave" . Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists. Archived from the original . on 2017-05-09. Retrieved 2017-10-30.
- 29. * Lamothe, Dan (30 March 2016). "Pentagon examining the 'killer robot' threat" ... Boston Globe.
- 30. ^ Chait, Jonathan (2016-10-03). "Barack Obama on 5 Days That Shaped His Presidency" ☑. Daily Intelligencer. Retrieved 3 January 2017.
- 31. ^ Devereaux, Ryan; Emmons, Alex (2016-10-03). "Obama Worries Future Presidents Will Wage Perpetual, Covert Drone War" . The Intercept. Retrieved 3 January 2017.
- 32. ^ Stefanik, Elise M. (2018-05-22). "H.R.5356 115th Congress (2017–2018): National Security Commission Artificial Intelligence Act of 2018" ☑. www.congress.gov. Retrieved 2020-03-13.
- 33. ^ Baum, Seth (2018-09-30). "Countering Superintelligence Misinformation" ☑. *Information*. **9** (10): 244. doi:10.3390/info9100244 ♂. ISSN 2078-2489 ☑.
- 34. ^ United States. Defense Innovation Board. *Al principles : recommendations on the ethical use of artificial intelligence by the Department of Defense*. OCLC 1126650738 ₺.
- 35. A Russell, Stuart (27 May 2015). "Take a stand on Al weapons" ... International Weekly Journal of Science. 521.
- 36. ^ a b Coyne, Christopher; Alshamy, Yahya A. (2021-04-03). "Perverse Consequences of Lethal Autonomous Weapons Systems"

 . Peace Review. 33 (2): 190–198. doi:10.1080/10402659.2021.1998747 . ISSN 1040-

- 2659 Z. S2CID 233764057 Z.
- 37. ^ Sharkey, Noel E. (June 2012). "The evitability of autonomous robot warfare*" ☑. International Review of the Red Cross. 94 (886): 787–799. doi:10.1017/S1816383112000732 ☑. ISSN 1816-3831 ☑. S2CID 145682587 ☑.
- 38. ^ Müller, Vincent C. (2016). Autonomous killer robots are probably good news ☑. Ashgate. pp. 67–81.
- 39. ^ Umbrello, Steven; Torres, Phil; De Bellis, Angelo F. (2020-03-01). "The future of war: could lethal autonomous weapons make conflict more ethical?" ∠. AI & Society. 35 (1): 273–282. doi:10.1007/s00146-019-00879-x ∠. hdl:2318/1699364 ⊘. ISSN 1435-5655 ∠. S2CID 59606353 ∠.
- 40. ^ Umbrello, Steven; Wood, Nathan Gabriel (2021-04-20). "Autonomous Weapons Systems and the Contextual Nature of Hors de Combat Status" ☑. *Information*. **12** (5): 216. doi:10.3390/info12050216 ②. hdl:1854/LU-8709449 ③.
- 41. * Kelley M. Sayler (June 8, 2021). Defense Primer: Emerging Technologies (PDF) (Report). Congressional Research Service. Retrieved July 22, 2021.
- 42. ^ Nyagudi, Nyagudi Musandu (2016-12-09). "Doctor of Philosophy Thesis in Military Informatics (OpenPhD #openphd): Lethal Autonomy of Weapons is Designed and/or Recessive" . Archived from the original . on 2017-01-07. Retrieved 2017-01-06.
- 43. * SPARROW, ROBERT (2007). "Killer Robots" . Journal of Applied Philosophy. 24 (1): 62–77. doi:10.1111/j.1468-5930.2007.00346.x . ISSN 0264-3758 . JSTOR 24355087 . S2CID 239364893 .
- 44. ^ Simpson, Thomas W; Müller, Vincent C. (2016). "Just war and robots' killings" ∠. Philosophical Quarterly. 66 (263): 302–22. doi:10.1093/pq/pqv075 ∂.
- 45. A Boulanin et al., "Limits on Autonomy in Weapon Systems", SIPRI & ICRC (2020): 37.
- 46. ^ Zakrzewski, Cat (2015-07-27). "Musk, Hawking Warn of Artificial Intelligence Weapons" ☑. WSJ Blogs Digits. Retrieved 2015-07-28.
- 47. [^] Gibbs, Samuel (27 July 2015). "Musk, Wozniak and Hawking urge ban on warfare AI and autonomous weapons" ∠. *The Guardian*. Retrieved 28 July 2015.
- 48. ^{A a b} "Deadly Decisions 8 objections to killer robots" (PDF). p. 10. Retrieved 2 December 2016.
- 49. A "Front page" . Ban Lethal Autonomous Weapons. 2017-11-10. Retrieved 2018-06-09.
- 50. A "Holy See renews appeal to ban killer robots" . Catholic News Agency. November 28, 2018. Retrieved 30 November 2018.
- 51. ^ a b Gayle, Damien (29 March 2019). "UK, US and Russia among those opposing killer robot ban" ∠. The Guardian. Retrieved 30 March 2019.
- 52. ^ Werkhäuser, Nina (27 August 2018). "Should 'killer robots' be banned?" ☑. Deutsche Welle (DW). Retrieved 31 December 2021.
- 53. ^ Silva, Daniella (2 December 2022). "San Francisco vote to allow police use of deadly robots spurs concern and outrage" ∠. NBC News. Retrieved 5 December 2022.
- 55. ^ Morris, J.D. (6 December 2022). "S.F. halts 'killer robots' police policy after huge backlash for now" ☑. San Francisco Chronicle. Retrieved 6 December 2022.
- 56. A Bento, Lucas (2017). "No Mere Deodands: Human Responsibilities in the Use of Violent Intelligent Systems Under Public International Law" . Harvard Scholarship Depository. Retrieved 2019-09-14.
- 57. ^ Geist, Edward Moore (2016-08-15). "It's already too late to stop the AI arms race—We must manage it instead". *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*. **72** (5): 318–321. Bibcode:2016BuAtS..72e.318G ₺. doi:10.1080/00963402.2016.1216672₺. ISSN 0096-3402₺. S2CID 151967826₺.
- 58. * Maas, Matthijs M. (2019-02-06). "How viable is international arms control for military artificial intelligence? Three lessons from nuclear weapons". *Contemporary Security Policy*. **40** (3): 285–311. doi:10.1080/13523260.2019.1576464 [2]. ISSN 1352-3260 [2]. S2CID 159310223 [2].
- 59. ^ Ekelhof, Merel (2019). "Moving Beyond Semantics on Autonomous Weapons: Meaningful Human Control in Operation" ∠. Global Policy. 10 (3): 343–348. doi:10.1111/1758-5899.12665 ். ISSN 1758-5899 ∠.
- 60. A Umbrello, Steven (2021-04-05). "Coupling levels of abstraction in understanding meaningful human control of autonomous weapons: a two-tiered approach" . Ethics and Information Technology. 23 (3): 455–464.

- doi:10.1007/s10676-021-09588-w a. hdl:2318/1784315 a. ISSN 1572-8439 2.
- 61. Allen, Gregory C. (May 20, 2022). "One Key Challenge for Diplomacy on AI: China's Military Does Not Want to Talk" ... Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS). Retrieved 2022-05-20.
- 62. ^ Brandon Vigliarolo. "International military AI summit ends with 60-state pledge" ☑. www.theregister.com. Retrieved 2023-02-17.
- 63. ^ Pandey, Shashank (4 January 2024). "HRW calls for international treaty to ban 'killer robots' ". Jurist. Retrieved 8 January 2024.

Further reading [edit]

- The Guardian (2023) Video "How killer robots are changing modern warfare^[1]". 24.2.2023, Josh Toussaint-Strauss Ali Assaf Joseph Pierce Ryan Baxter.
- Heyns, Christof (2013), 'Report of the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions', UN General Assembly, Human Rights Council, 23 (3), A/HRC/23/47.
- Krishnan, Armin (2009), Killer robots: Legality and ethicality of autonomous weapons ☑ (Aldershot: Ashgate)
- Müller, Vincent C. (2016), 'Autonomous killer robots are probably good news' ∠, in Ezio Di Nucci and Filippo Santoni de Sio (eds.), Drones and responsibility: Legal, philosophical and socio-technical perspectives on the use of remotely controlled weapons, 67-81 (London: Ashgate).
- Saxon, Dan (2022). *Fighting Machines: Autonomous Weapons and Human Dignity*. University of Pennsylvania Press. ISBN 978-0-8122-9818-5.
- Sharkey, Noel E (2012), 'Automating Warfare: lessons learned from the drones ∠", *Journal of Law, Information & Science*, 21 (2).
- Simpson, Thomas W and Müller, Vincent C. (2016), 'Just war and robots' killings' ∠, The Philosophical Quarterly 66 (263), 302–22.
- Singer, Peter (2009), Wired for war: The robotics revolution and conflict in the 21st Century (New York: Penguin)
- US Department of Defense (2012), 'Directive 3000.09, Autonomy in weapon systems ∠''. <2014 Killer Robots Policy Paper Final.docx>.
- US Department of Defense (2013), 'Unmanned Systems Integrated Road Map FY2013-2038'. <[1] .
- The Ethics of Autonomous Weapons Systems (2014) Seminar at UPenn

 Archived

 2020-10-25 at the Wayback Machine

Categories: Uncrewed vehicles | Military robots

This page was last edited on 22 April 2024, at 18:33 (UTC).

Text is available under the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike License 4.0; additional terms may apply. By using this site, you agree to the Terms of Use and Privacy Policy. Wikipedia® is a registered trademark of the Wikimedia Foundation, Inc., a non-profit organization.

Privacy policy About Wikipedia Disclaimers Contact Wikipedia Code of Conduct Developers Statistics



