



2nd  
International  
Model United Nations  
Conference  
Leirion

The Question of applying Artificial Intelligence to Stockpiles  
of Lethal Autonomous Weapons

*Security Council (SC)*

**Nikitas Papadopoulos**, American College of Thessaloniki,

**Piotr Verejan**, MGIMO-University

Secretariat Guidance: **George Laios**, Leibniz University Hannover, Computer Engineering

May 20 – 22, 2022

Athens, Greece

*Leirion Alternative Library – Art Place*

## Contents

Introduction.....	2
General Information.....	3
Definition of Key Terms.....	5
Why is this issue important? .....	6
Risks of lethal autonomous weapons.....	7
Unpredictability.....	7
Escalation.....	7
Proliferation.....	7
Selective Targeting of Groups.....	7
Nuclear autonomous weapons & existing regulating documents.....	8
What is the problem? .....	8
What is happening regarding the issue? .....	9
Questions to guide you in the right direction.....	9
Other types of autonomous weapons.....	10
What are they?.....	10
Questions to guide you in the right direction.....	12
Ethical and legal issues.....	13
Ongoing discussions .....	13
Divergent opinions .....	14
What is being done to address this part of the issue .....	15
List of States that have given their consent to the aforementioned eleven Principles (as of 20 September 2019).....	16
Questions to guide you in the right direction.....	16
Helpful links .....	17
Bibliography.....	18

## Introduction

Lethal autonomous weapons (LAWs) are autonomous military systems that can automatically and independently search and eliminate targets at its own discretion through the help of certain algorithm. With the use of LAWs, there is no human intervention. Some examples of LAWs are drones, military robots, artificially intelligent missiles and unmanned vehicles. This was the first concept of LAWs when they were used as reported by the United Nations in the Second Libyan Civil War. The use of artificial intelligence (AI) has been labelled as the creation of killer robots. This is the most important aspect of this topic. What kind of ethical and political decision needs to be made concerning Lethal Autonomous Weapons?

## General Information

The first idea of automation in warfare came in 1495 actually, as Leonardo da Vinci created the “mechanical knight” as armour could move like a human being and perform tasks like one. The motives for this were unclear though. The first time that robots had a clear motive was 1914 as the US created a bomb that was guided by a gyroscope whereas the Germans had wire-guided motorboats. This is the first time that robotic technology was used for warfare. Many similar examples appeared during World War 2, the Vietnam War, the Iran-Iraq War and the Bosnian War. The war in Bosnia was the first time that drones were used in a militarized area but they were used for gathering intelligence not as a weapon. In 2001 though, these drones were carrying Hellfire missiles, which marked the start of killer drones. Thus, our benchmark for LAWs is 2001. Since then, every major power in the world has developed LAWs. In 2013, 117 governments in the UN decided to start discussions on LAWs. Big protests were held against these weapons as people pushed for their ban by 2016 but it is obvious that something like this did not happen.

Lethal autonomous weapons have been labelled as offensive weapons and that is why many people oppose them. Some automated weapons, meaning that they do not require human intervention have been used in the past and have gained a lot of popularity. Many people do not realize that land mines are actually LAWs. Land mines have been used ever since the 14th century in China and played a big role in every war until the 21st century. For example, in the Gulf War the United States deployed 117,634 mines. Because mines that are not detonated pose a serious threat to civilian population after the war is over the Ottawa Treaty was signed in the 1997 Convention on the Prohibition on the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti- Personnel Mines and on their Destruction. Interestingly enough, China, the Russian Federation and the United States have not signed the treaty opposite to 164 nations. Moreover, a weapon that has been highly praised in a recent conflict is the Iron Dome. Israel’s anti-missile defensive system has been said that has saved thousands of lives in the most recent Israel- Palestine conflict. The Iron Dome is an anti-missile system that neutralizes missiles mid-air and it acts automatically without human intervention because of its instant response to missiles in the case of a sudden attack that Israel may face. There is only one such weapon in the world which only makes it more noteworthy. The Iron Dome is so celebrated around the world that even the Ukrainian government asked if they could have it in order to counter Russian missiles. This shows that the problem is not automated weapons whereas offensive automated weapons.

Killer robots and drones that work through an algorithm without any human control can increase efficiency but they do not take into account human emotion or even the case of a miscalculation. Artificial intelligence only adds insult to injury as it could very possibly make these systems uncontrollable by people. In times, that AI is heavily doubted as the correct step for military purposes and even for humanity how effective would it be if we developed weapons that are automated and use AI as well. This means that these would be weapons with zero human control acting and thinking for

themselves. Many points can be made in favour and against this topic. The delegates are expected to articulate arguments on this issue that tackle the concerns created by the use of AI in Lethal Autonomous Weapons as well as reach a conclusion on a clear definition of LAWs that is accepted internationally.

## Definition of Key Terms

*Please note that the key terms in this section have been sorted based on relevance and importance and not alphabetically.*

- **Lethal Autonomous Weapons** <sup>1</sup>(in journalistic discourse — "killer robots") are weapons systems capable, after being activated, of selecting and hitting targets without subsequent operator intervention.



Autonomy is a key and fundamental distinguishing feature of the LAWs; therefore, a clear distinction should be made between them and other modern high-tech weapons that also use elements of automation and computerization.

In particular, unmanned aerial vehicles widely used in modern armed conflicts, missile weapons equipped with missile guidance and other similar

types of weapons are not autonomous, since in their case the decision on the choice and defeat of the target always remains within the person. In this sense, some experts consider the possible transition to the use of LAWs to be a "third revolution" in the means of warfare, comparable to the invention of gunpowder and nuclear weapons



- **Artificial intelligence (AI)** is the type and ability of intelligent systems to perform creative functions that are traditionally considered the prerogative of man; the science and technology of creating intelligent machines, especially intelligent computer programs.



---

<sup>1</sup> <https://autonomousweapons.org/>

## Why is this issue important?

The issue of LAWs has been in the international negotiating field since 2013 after the UN Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions submitted a report on this issue to the UN Human Rights Council. The document expressed concerns about the extent to which the use of LAWs may be compatible with the need to comply with international humanitarian and human rights law. It recommended that States establish national moratoriums on the development of lethal autonomous systems and proposed the establishment of a high-level group on this issue to develop a policy for the international community regarding LAWs.

After reviewing the report of K. Haines in the Human Rights Council, it was decided that further discussion of the problem of lethal autonomous systems will continue within the framework of the negotiation mechanism of the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects.

## Risks of lethal autonomous weapons

In order to understand why this is such a grave issue, it would be useful to first examine the potential dangers that stem from it. Lethal autonomous weapons (LAWs) pose a significant number of risks, so let us review some of them:

### Unpredictability

Lethal autonomous weapons are quite unpredictable in how they behave. Since they use artificial intelligence and machine learning (a process through which an AI system improves itself based on its own previous decisions, similar to how a human learns from their mistakes), one can hardly tell what action the AI might decide to make next, at least in the real world and not in a simulated environment. Coupled with the fact that the behavior of such systems is often deliberately obfuscated (so as for them to remain one step ahead of the enemies), one can understand why the - by design - unpredictability of such systems is a force to be reckoned with.

### Escalation

Lethal autonomous weapons can operate very efficiently, very quickly, and at a large scale. This introduces the risk of rapid conflict escalation, causing crises and general instability in a warfare situation. This, in turn, might lead to such weapons being used even more, which then creates a vicious cycle of violence.

### Proliferation

The majority of lethal autonomous weapons can be mass-produced with little cost. This means that their numbers will grow rapidly, and it will be difficult to even keep track of them. This might, among other issues, pose the risk of some of these weapons falling into the wrong hands, such as the black market.

### Selective Targeting of Groups

As has been already established, lethal autonomous weapons can be used to track and attack people based on specific characteristics they might possess. Naturally, this means that such weapons can easily be used to target and perform acts of violence against specific groups of people, possibly even assisting with the act of genocide.

## Nuclear autonomous weapons & existing regulating documents

### What is the problem?

As already proven, the dangers that LAWs pose could be detrimental for humanity. The same has been said for nuclear weapons, of course. Therefore, it is evident what a grave issue could occur if these two things were combined.

It has been reported by US officials<sup>2</sup> that Russia is in possession of nuclear weapons that utilize the capabilities of AI, albeit in an unspecified manner. So far, any nuclear action such as the bombing of Nagasaki and Hiroshima was performed by a human. The same applies for the tests that these nuclear weapons go through. LAWs or killer robots may be fooled by even a tiny mistake in the algorithm and perform erroneous decisions that a human would often have not made due to his or her superior cognitive ability.

Naturally, incidents like these aren't reported as often as they happen but in the case of nuclear autonomous weapons the damage done could change the shape of humanity. Artificial intelligence isn't precise every time and it is logical for one to think that such power shouldn't be handed to machines. Tech mogul, Elon Musk, has said that AI can be far more dangerous than nuclear weapons. This means that AI has unlimited potential where it can even make its own decisions without any human intervention.

It all comes down to the argument of having a computer with zero emotions control such great powers. Essentially, the future of humanity would be in the hands of an algorithm.

On the other hand, there are the people with the belief that this could be something beneficial for humanity. The main arguing points are that machines can go to war instead of humans and as a result this could save lives despite the war taking place. Moreover, calculated and methodical attacks can be performed with incredible precision that can be achieved only by a computer. Thus, one could minimize human mistakes in warfare, potentially even causing significantly less collateral damage. By using killer robots and machines we eliminate the possibility of emotional weakness that is not endorsed in war and maximize the precision that attacks have in order not to cause civilian casualties and unnecessary carnage.

---

<sup>2</sup> <https://thebulletin.org/2022/02/giving-an-ai-control-of-nuclear-weapons-what-could-possibly-go-wrong/>

## What is happening regarding the issue?

This issue is undoubtedly still in its infancy – not much has been done as of yet to address it. All in all, the nuclear arms race and the AI arms race are quite comparable. As is to be expected, the global powers are trying to get ahead in these fields, but not in secret this time as the private industry is starting to get involved too. This could pose another problem in the development of AI. The terrifying results of killer robots if they are misused need not be described and discussed - but one thing that has to be discussed is what is being done for this.

## Questions to guide you in the right direction

- How can the international community cooperate so that nuclear weapons can be connected with AI safely? What kind of treaty would you propose?
- What can be done for the control of AI weapons for the future? If any regulations appear, what should they be like?
- How can the Security Council establish a legal and ethical framework for AI and nuclear weapons and through which means?
- Should the United Nations be involved in a country's LAWs development? In what way can this take place without infringing on the state's sovereignty?
- Should there be a limit for the quantity and the development of LAWs owned by countries?

## Other types of autonomous weapons

### What are they?

As was mentioned previously, the majority of LAWs, especially the ones that heavily use AI, are still in their infancy. Meanwhile, prototypes and operating models of autonomous combat robots have long been used in the armies of many countries of the world. Experts point to at least several existing and promising weapon systems that fully meet the characteristics of the autonomy of the LAWs:

- The SGR-A1 ground—based stationary sentry robot developed (in part) by the South Korean company Samsung;<sup>3</sup>



- The Israeli development of the Harpy, an unmanned aerial vehicle designed to detect and destroy enemy air defences;<sup>4</sup>

- Developed in the US, the "Sea Hunter" is an unmanned surface ship designed to autonomously patrol the sea, track, and engage in combat with enemy submarines;<sup>5</sup>



<sup>3</sup> <https://www.globalsecurity.org/military/world/rok/sgr-a1.htm>

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.iai.co.il/p/harpy>

<sup>5</sup> <https://www.naval-technology.com/analysis/sea-hunter-inside-us-navys-autonomous-submarine-tracking-vessel/>

- An unmanned stealth aircraft "Neuron" ("nEUROn") developed by the French company Dassault Aviation.<sup>6</sup>



As a matter of fact, there are probably significantly more existing LAWs samples, since developers do not always publish complete information about the tactical, technical and combat characteristics of their systems, as is to be expected given the nature of these products.

Furthermore, in the spring of 2021, the world media reported an incident in Libya, which may very well be the first documented case of the use of lethal force against a person by an autonomous combat drone. We are referring to the case of the combat use of the Turkish-made STM Kargu-2, which occurred back in March 2020, but became widely known only after the incident was described in the report of the UN Security Council Expert Group on Libya.<sup>7</sup>



In one of his speeches in May 2021, the Minister of Defence of the Russian Federation Sergey Shoigu mentioned the beginning of production of combat robots (in Russia) capable of "fighting independently on the battlefield."<sup>8</sup>

### What is being to address this part of the issue?

The existing rules and norms of international humanitarian law (IHL) do not contain specific provisions concerning autonomous weapons systems. At the same time, the norms of IHL require that States developing, acquiring or adopting new types of weapons must first make sure that the use of such weapons is not prohibited by international law. In practice, this means that the LAWs must be able to distinguish combatants from civilians, distinguish between active participants in hostilities (from among both combatants and civilians, law enforcement officers, etc.) and the wounded, surrendering, etc. Autonomous weapon systems developed and adopted must comply with the principles of proportionality of the use of force, a clear distinction between

<sup>6</sup> <https://www.dassault-aviation.com/en/defense/neuron/introduction/>

<sup>7</sup> <https://lieber.westpoint.edu/kargu-2-autonomous-attack-drone-legal-ethical/>

<sup>8</sup> <https://www.aa.com.tr/en/europe/russia-launches-mass-production-of-combat-robots/2250467> & [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lethal\\_autonomous\\_weapon#Automatic\\_defensive\\_systems](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lethal_autonomous_weapon#Automatic_defensive_systems)

military and non-military objects, minimization of civilian casualties when striking military targets and other rules of IHL.

At the Fifth Review Conference of the CCW Member Countries (Geneva, December 12-16, 2016), it was decided to establish an Open-ended Group of Governmental Experts (GGE) of the States Parties to the Convention on "Inhumane" Weapons on the issue of LAWs. The agenda includes such issues as the parameters of lethal autonomous systems, the LAWs and the human factor, the potential military use of the LAWs, options for countering international security challenges in the context of the possible use of the LAWs and others.<sup>9</sup>

During the first meetings of the Group of Governmental Experts on LAWs in 2017-2018, these issues were considered, including their military-technical, legal, moral-ethical and political aspects. Because of the discussions, a consensus report was adopted, which sets out the main common understandings and guidelines in the field of LAWs. In March and August 2019, regular meetings of the Group were held, during which 11 guidelines on LAWs were approved by consensus.

### Questions to guide you in the right direction

- Are non-nuclear lethal autonomous weapons less dangerous than the nuclear ones and does their use need to be regulated? If yes, to a lesser extent or not?
- To kill or not to kill: who does or does not pull the trigger? Shall UN ban any type of autonomous weapons, or may the military groups use them in some cases? Make sure to research and come up with arguments and examples!
- Is it possible to keep AI out of warfare? Provide some technological, ethical and legal grounds or elaborate them, so that they could be established and recognized by the Security Council.

---

<sup>9</sup> [https://docs-library.unoda.org/Convention\\_on\\_Certain\\_Conventional\\_Weapons\\_-\\_Fifth\\_Review\\_Conference\\_\(2016\)/FinalDocument\\_FifthCCWRevCon.pdf](https://docs-library.unoda.org/Convention_on_Certain_Conventional_Weapons_-_Fifth_Review_Conference_(2016)/FinalDocument_FifthCCWRevCon.pdf)

## Ethical and legal issues

### Ongoing discussions

The increased use of artificial intelligence (AI) and autonomous systems by military throughout the world might have an impact on deterrence techniques and escalation dynamics in crises and wars. Until recently, deterrence has been individuals attempting to persuade other humans not to do certain actions. What happens when the thought and decision-making processes are no longer just human?

Stuart Russell, a computer science professor at the University of California, Berkeley, indicated that he is concerned about LAWs because he believes it is immoral and cruel. The fundamental flaw with this approach is that it is difficult to tell the difference between fighters and non-combatants.

Some economists and legal scholars are concerned that LAWs would violate International Humanitarian Law, particularly the principles of distinction, which requires the ability to distinguish combatants from non-combatants, and proportionality, which requires that civilian casualties be proportional to the military goal. This worry is frequently raised as a cause to outright ban "killer robots," however it is unlikely that this fear can be used to justify laws that do not violate International Humanitarian Law.

"There are no local or international legal constraints on the creation of LAWs," according to a 2021 study from the American Congressional Research Service, despite continuing talks at the UN Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW).

Autonomous weapons, like child soldiers, are causally but not ethically accountable, according to philosopher Robert Sparrow. He claims that in each scenario, there is a potential of atrocities occurring without a proper subject to hold accountable, which is a violation of *jus in bello*.

## Divergent opinions

### “Use of LAWs is ethical”

- No emotion: prevent bloodlust and sexual violence
- Better compliance with IHL, fewer civilian casualties
- Protection of soldiers from harm

### “Use of LAWs is unethical”

- Loss of human dignity in death
- Removal of human agency
- Loss of moral responsibility
- Loss of martial virtue
- War crimes are often tactical/strategic

### Risks

- Distance and depersonalization
- Asymmetry
- Lower threshold of going to war
- Conflict escalation
- New arms race



## What is being done to address this part of the issue

Since 2012: Stop Killer Robots Campaign<sup>10</sup>

Since 2014: Negotiations under the UN's 1980 Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW) were initiated at France's suggestion to address the issues posed by the possible development of deadly autonomous weapons systems (LAWS). LAWS are weapons that can detect, engage, and neutralize a target without the need for human interaction. While no such systems exist, the entire autonomy of these weapons might raise a slew of moral, legal, and operational concerns.

This is why, despite the fact that these weapons are not yet a strategic reality, a debate on how to deal with them is important. This procedure must be built on a universal framework that brings together all major military forces in order to be effective. The CCW is an important tool of international humanitarian law and a platform that brings together specialists with complementary understanding of humanitarian and security challenges, making it an excellent match.

The guiding principles were agreed upon by this conference, demonstrating the progress accomplished in this process as well as its significance.

The declaration on LAWS, drafted by France and Germany and opened for signature on September 26 during the Alliance for Multilateralism event, is a snapshot of the CCW's ongoing work, which uses the 11 guiding principles to provide a framework for the development and use of autonomous weapons systems.

These principles affirm inter alia that:

- international humanitarian law applies to these systems;
- a human must always be responsible for the decision to use these systems;
- States must examine the legality of these new weapons that they are developing or requiring at the design stage.

The eleven Guiding Principles affirmed by the Group of Governmental Experts on Emerging Technologies in the Area of Lethal Autonomous Weapons System were established.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> <https://www.stopkillerrobots.org/>

<sup>11</sup> [https://ccdcoe.org/uploads/2020/02/UN-191213\\_CCW-MSP-Final-report-Annex-III\\_Guiding-Principles-affirmed-by-GGE.pdf](https://ccdcoe.org/uploads/2020/02/UN-191213_CCW-MSP-Final-report-Annex-III_Guiding-Principles-affirmed-by-GGE.pdf)

## List of States that have given their consent to the aforementioned eleven Principles (as of 20 September 2019)<sup>12</sup>

“The Principles have now been agreed by consensus within the framework of the Group of International LAWS Experts which includes:

*Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Cuba, Czech Republic, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Holy See, Honduras, Hungary, India, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mexico, Montenegro, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, State of Palestine, United States of America, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Sweden, Switzerland, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Venezuela (Bolivar Republic of), Zambia, as well as Egypt (which has signed but not ratified the CCW).”*

## Questions to guide you in the right direction

- Can LAWS ever comply with International Law?
- Is their legality dependent on context of use?
- Pushing for a more substantive debate at the Security Council: How can this be achieved?
- How can we promote discussion on the matter (finding consensus, increase understanding)?
- How can we apply the “Lead by example” here? (unpack “LAWS”, transparency)

---

<sup>12</sup> <https://www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/en/french-foreign-policy/united-nations/multilateralism-a-principle-of-action-for-france/alliance-for-multilateralism/article/11-principles-on-lethal-autonomous-weapons-systems-laws>

## Helpful links

We highly encourage you to continue your pre-MUN reading and research of the topic. There are many official documents that we could not place here in full, but that we would like you to at least look through. Remember: the more you read prior to the conference - the more realistic and interesting your debates will be!

These links point to material that might assist you with your preparations for the debate. *They are not necessarily included in the bibliography.*

1. UN CCW in Geneva - Development of A New Legally Binding Protocol  
<https://www.un.org/disarmament/the-convention-on-certain-conventional-weapons/background-on-laws-in-the-ccw/>
2. Deterrence in the Age of Thinking Machines  
[https://www.rand.org/pubs/research\\_reports/RR2797.html](https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR2797.html)
3. Our Common Agenda - The Future of the United Nations  
<https://www.un.org/en/content/common-agenda-report/>
4. The Role of the United Nations in Addressing Emerging Technologies in the Area of Lethal Autonomous Weapons Systems  
<https://www.un.org/en/un-chronicle/role-united-nations-addressing-emerging-technologies-area-lethal-autonomous-weapons>
5. Laying Down the LAWS: Strategizing Autonomous Weapons Governance  
<https://www.cfr.org/blog/laying-down-laws-strategizing-autonomous-weapons-governance>
6. The Presence of Lethal U.S. Drones in Niger is Expanding  
<https://www.cfr.org/blog/presence-lethal-us-drones-niger-expanding>
7. AUTONOMOUS WEAPONS SYSTEMS AND INTERNATIONAL HUMANITARIAN LAW: 'OUT OF THE LOOP'?  
[https://um.fi/documents/35732/48132/autonomous\\_weapon\\_systems\\_and\\_international\\_humanitarian\\_law\\_out\\_of\\_the/c0fca818-3141-b690-0337-7cfcbed3013?t=1525645981157](https://um.fi/documents/35732/48132/autonomous_weapon_systems_and_international_humanitarian_law_out_of_the/c0fca818-3141-b690-0337-7cfcbed3013?t=1525645981157)
8. On banning autonomous weapon systems: human rights, automation, and the dehumanization of lethal decision-making  
<https://international-review.icrc.org/sites/default/files/irrc-886-asaro.pdf>
9. <https://futureoflife.org/lethal-autonomous-weapons-systems/>
10. See How Much You Know About Weapons of Mass Destruction  
<https://www.cfr.org/quiz/see-how-much-you-know-about-weapons-mass-destruction>

11. Flipping through the pages of history on the topic of lethal autonomy – This is quite an interesting read, but due to its length we could not include all of it in the Study Guide, so we highly recommend you give it a look:

“Lethal Autonomy: A Short History”  
<https://foreignpolicy.com/2014/01/24/lethal-autonomy-a-short-history/>

## Bibliography

*Please note that several links to certain sources have been included as footnote or in the “Helpful Links” section instead.*

- Frankenfield, J. (2022, March 16). How artificial intelligence works. Investopedia. Retrieved May 8, 2022, from [https://www.investopedia.com/terms/a/artificial-intelligence-ai.asp#:~:text=Artificial%20intelligence%20\(AI\)%20refers%20to,as%20I%20earning%20and%20problem%20solving.](https://www.investopedia.com/terms/a/artificial-intelligence-ai.asp#:~:text=Artificial%20intelligence%20(AI)%20refers%20to,as%20I%20earning%20and%20problem%20solving.)
- Giving an AI control of nuclear weapons: What could possibly go wrong? Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists. (2022, February 15). Retrieved May 8, 2022, from <https://thebulletin.org/2022/02/giving-an-ai-control-of-nuclear-weapons-what-could-possibly-go-wrong/>
- Knight, W. (2021, December 19). Autonomous weapons are here, but the world isn't ready for them. Wired. Retrieved May 8, 2022, from <https://www.wired.com/story/autonomous-weapons-here-world-isnt-ready/>
- McCormick, T. (2014, January 25). Lethal autonomy: A short history. Foreign Policy. Retrieved May 8, 2022, from <https://foreignpolicy.com/2014/01/24/lethal-autonomy-a-short-history/>
- Toby Walsh, Professor of AI at UNSW. (2022, April 21). Lethal Autonomous Weapons and World War III: It's not too late to stop the rise of 'Killer Robots'. The Conversation. Retrieved May 8, 2022, from <https://theconversation.com/lethal-autonomous-weapons-and-world-war-iii-its-not-too-late-to-stop-the-rise-of-killer-robots-165822>
- Wikimedia Foundation. (2022, April 27). Land mine. Wikipedia. Retrieved May 8, 2022, from [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Land\\_mine](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Land_mine)
- Wikimedia Foundation. (2022, February 25). Lethal Autonomous Weapon. Wikipedia. Retrieved May 8, 2022, from [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lethal\\_autonomous\\_weapon](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lethal_autonomous_weapon)