

JOURNAL ARTICLE

Human Rights and the use of Autonomous Weapons Systems (AWS) During Domestic Law Enforcement

Christof Heyns

Human Rights Quarterly

Vol. 38, No. 2 (May 2016), pp. 350-378 (29 pages)

Published By: The Johns Hopkins University Press



https://www.jstor.org/stable/24738054

<u>Cite</u>

Read and download

Alternate access options

cookies

X

ITHAKA websites, which ITHAKA manages from its location in the United States, use cookies for different purposes, such as to ensure web site function, display non-targeted ads, provide social media features, and track usage, engaging with third party service providers such as Google Analytics. You may manage non-essential cookies in "Cookie Settings". For more information, please see our **Cookie Policy**.

Cookie Settings

OK, proceed



Abstract

Much attention has been paid during the last couple of years to the emergence of autonomous weapons systems (AWS), weapon systems that allow computers, as opposed to human beings, to have increased control over decisions to use force. These discussions have largely centered on the use of such systems in armed conflict. However, it is increasingly clear that AWS are also becoming available for use in domestic law enforcement. This article explores the implications of international human rights law for this development. There are even stronger reasons to be concerned about the use of fully autonomous weapons systems—AWS without meaningful human control—in law enforcement than in armed conflict. Police officers—unlike their military counterparts—have a duty to protect the public. Moreover the judgments that are involved in the use of force under human rights standards require more personal involvement that those in the conduct of hostilities. Particularly problematic is the potential impact of fully autonomous weapons on the rights to bodily integrity (such as the right to life) and the right to dignity. Where meaningful human control is retained, machine autonomy can enhance human autonomy, but at the same time this means, higher standards of responsibility about the use of force should be applied because there is a higher level of human control. However, fully autonomous weapons entail no meaningful human control and, as a result, such weapons should have no role to play in law enforcement.

Journal Information

After more than a quarter century, Human Rights Quarterly is widely recognized as the leader in the field of human rights. The Quarterly provides information on important developments within the United Nations, and governmental and non-governmental regional human rights organizations. The journal highlights current work in human rights research and policy analysis, reviews of related books, and philosophical essays probing the fundamental nature of human rights as defined by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. By providing decision makers with insight into complex human rights issues, the Quarterly helps to define national and international human rights policy.

Publisher Information

One of the largest publishers in the United States, the Johns Hopkins University Press combines traditional books and journals publishing units with cutting-edge service divisions that sustain diversity and independence among nonprofit, scholarly publishers, societies, and associations. Journals The Press is home to the largest journal publication program of any U.S.-based university press. The Journals Division publishes 110 journals in the arts and humanities, technology and medicine, higher education, history, political science, and library science. The division also manages membership services for more than 20 scholarly and professional associations and societies. Books With critically acclaimed titles in history, science, higher education, consumer health, humanities, classics, and public health, the Books Division publishes 150 new books each year and maintains a backlist in excess of 3,000 titles. With warehouses on three continents, worldwide sales representation, and a robust digital publishing program, the Books Division connects Hopkins authors to scholars, experts, and educational and research institutions around the world. Project MUSE® Project MUSE is a leading provider of digital humanities and social sciences content, providing access to journal and book content from nearly 400 publishers. MUSE delivers outstanding results to the scholarly community by maximizing revenues for publishers, providing value to libraries, and enabling access for scholars worldwide. Hopkins Fulfillment Services (HFS) HFS provides print and digital distribution for a distinguished list of university presses and nonprofit institutions. HFS clients enjoy state-of-theart warehousing, real-time access to critical business data, accounts receivable management and collection, and unparalleled customer service.

Rights & Usage

This item is part of a JSTOR Collection.

For terms and use, please refer to our <u>Terms and Conditions</u>
Human Rights Quarterly © 2016 <u>The Johns Hopkins University Press</u>

Request Permissions

Explore JSTOR

- > ABOUT US
- > EXPLORE CONTENT

> RESEARCH TOOLS

> HELP CENTER

For Librarians

For Publishers











t

JSTOR is part of <u>ITHAKA</u>, a not-for-profit organization helping the academic community use digital technologies to preserve the scholarly record and to advance research and teaching in sustainable ways.

©2000–2024 ITHAKA. All Rights Reserved.

JSTOR®, the JSTOR logo, JPASS®, Artstor®,
Reveal Digital™ and ITHAKA® are registered trademarks of ITHAKA.

Terms & Conditions of Use

Privacy Policy Accessibility

Cookie Policy Cookie Settings