

# What Killer Robots Mean for the Future of War

By [Jonathan Erskine](#) and [Miranda Mowbray](#)

Global Research, January 11, 2023

[The Conversation](#) 10 January 2023

Theme: [Intelligence](#), [Militarization and WMD](#)

All Global Research articles can be read in 51 languages by activating the Translate Website button below the author's name.

To receive Global Research's Daily Newsletter (selected articles), [click here](#).

Follow us on [Instagram](#) and [Twitter](#) and subscribe to our [Telegram Channel](#). Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

\*\*\*

*You might have heard of killer robots, slaughterbots or terminators – officially called lethal autonomous weapons (LAWs) – from films and books. And the idea of super-intelligent weapons running rampant is still science fiction. But as AI weapons become increasingly sophisticated, [public concern is growing](#) over fears about lack of accountability and the risk of technical failure.*

Already we have seen how so-called neutral AI have made [sexist algorithms](#) and [inept content moderation systems](#), largely because their creators did not understand the technology. But in war, these kinds of misunderstandings could kill civilians or wreck negotiations.

For example, a target recognition algorithm could be trained to identify tanks from satellite imagery. But what if all of the images used to train the system featured soldiers in formation around the tank? It might mistake a civilian vehicle passing through a military blockade for a target.

## Why do we need autonomous weapons?

Civilians in many countries (such as [Vietnam](#), [Afghanistan](#) and [Yemen](#)) have suffered because of the way global superpowers build and use increasingly advanced weapons. Many people would argue they have done more harm than good, most recently pointing to the [Russian invasion of Ukraine](#) early in 2022.

In the other camp are people who say a country must be able to defend itself, which means keeping up with other nations' military technology. AI can already outsmart humans at [chess and poker](#). It outperforms humans in the real world too. For example Microsoft claims its speech recognition software has an error rate of 1% compared to the human error rate of around 6%. So it is hardly surprising that armies are slowly handing algorithms the reins.

But how do we avoid adding killer robots to the long list of things we wish we had never invented? First of all: know thy enemy.

## What are Lethal Autonomous Weapons (LAWs)?

The US [Department of Defence](#) defines an autonomous weapon system as: “A weapon system that, once activated, can select and engage targets without further intervention by a human operator.”

Many combat systems already fit this criteria. The computers on drones and modern missiles have algorithms that can [detect targets](#) and fire at them with far more precision than a human operator. Israel’s Iron Dome is one of several active defence systems that can engage targets without human supervision.

While designed for missile defence, the Iron Dome [could kill people by accident](#). But the risk is seen as acceptable in international politics because the Iron Dome generally has a reliable history of protecting civilian lives.



An Israeli missile defence system [ChameleonsEye/Shutterstock](#)

There are AI enabled weapons designed to attack people too, from [robot sentries](#) to [loitering kamikaze drones](#) used in the Ukraine war. LAWs are already here. So, if we want to influence the use of LAWs, we need to understand the history of modern weapons.

## The rules of war

International agreements, such as the [Geneva conventions](#) establish conduct for the treatment of prisoners of war and civilians during conflict. They are one of the few tools we have to control how wars are fought. Unfortunately, the use of chemical weapons by the US in Vietnam, and by Russia in Afghanistan, are proof these measures aren’t always successful.

Worse is when key players refuse to sign up. The [International Campaign to Ban Landmines](#)

[\(ICBL\)](#) has been lobbying politicians since 1992 to ban mines and cluster munitions (which randomly scatter small bombs over a wide area). In 1997 the [Ottawa treaty](#) included a ban of these weapons, which 122 countries signed. But the US, China and Russia didn't buy in.

Landmines have injured and killed at least 5,000 soldiers and civilians per year since 2015 and as many as 9,440 people in 2017. The [Landmine and Cluster Munition Monitor 2022 report said](#):

Casualties...have been disturbingly high for the past seven years, following more than a decade of historic reductions. The year 2021 was no exception. This trend is largely the result of increased conflict and contamination by improvised mines observed since 2015. Civilians represented most of the victims recorded, half of whom were children.

Despite the best efforts of the ICBL, there is evidence both [Russia](#) and [Ukraine](#) (a member of the Ottawa treaty) are using landmines during the Russian invasion of Ukraine. Ukraine has also relied on drones to guide artillery strikes, or more recently for ["kamikaze attacks" on Russian infrastructure](#).

## Our future

But what about more advanced AI enabled weapons? The [Campaign to Stop Killer Robots](#) lists nine key problems with LAWs, focusing on the lack of accountability, and the inherent dehumanisation of killing that comes with it.

While this criticism is valid, a full ban of LAWs is unrealistic for two reasons. First, much like mines, Pandora's box has already been opened. Also the lines between autonomous weapons, LAWs and killer robots are so blurred it's difficult to distinguish between them. Military leaders would always be able to find a loophole in the wording of a ban and sneak killer robots into service as defensive autonomous weapons. They might even do so unknowingly.



San Francisco, CA – December 5, 2022: Activists opposed to the implementation of armed police robots rallied at City Hall. [Phil Pasquini](#)

We will almost certainly see more AI enabled weapons in the future. But this doesn't mean we have to look the other way. More specific and nuanced prohibitions would help keep our politicians, data scientists and engineers accountable.

For example, by banning:

- black box AI: systems where the user has no information about the algorithm beyond inputs and outputs
- unreliable AI: systems that have been poorly tested (such as in the military blockade example mentioned previously).

And you don't have to be an expert in AI to have a view on LAWs. Stay aware of new military AI developments. When you read or hear about AI being used in combat, ask yourself: is it justified? Is it preserving civilian life? If not, engage with the communities that are working to control these systems. Together, we stand a chance at preventing AI from doing more harm than good.

\*

Note to readers: Please click the share buttons above. Follow us on Instagram and Twitter and subscribe to our Telegram Channel. Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

[Jonathan Erskine](#), PhD Student, Interactive AI, University of Bristol

[Miranda Mowbray](#), Lecturer in Interactive AI, University of Bristol

Featured image: Killer robots don't look like this, for now. [Denis Starostin/Shutterstock](#)

The original source of this article is [The Conversation](#)

Copyright © [Jonathan Erskine](#) and [Miranda Mowbray](#), [The Conversation](#), 2023

---

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Jonathan Erskine](#)  
and [Miranda Mowbray](#)

**Disclaimer:** The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: [publications@globalresearch.ca](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)

[www.globalresearch.ca](http://www.globalresearch.ca) contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the

copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: [publications@globalresearch.ca](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)