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# TASK 4 – *Ethics and the user of Data Science/ML/AI*

## Task 4-1 : Stop The Killer Robots – Autonomous Drone Warfare

1. **Overview of problem**

This title may sound like a bad ‘B-Movie’ but the *Campaign to Stop Killer Robots* (https://www.stopkillerrobots.org/) is an umbrella framework for 180+ organisations that is concerned about the growing potential threat of autonomous weapons systems.

In this section of the assignment, I am considering the ethical and legal issues raised by groups like *Stop The Killer Robots* (STKR) that are associated with this extreme end of the spectrum when it comes to autonomy in technology.

What can, and should, be done to ensure that the artificial intelligence development and processes underpinning ‘killer robots’ is accountable and free from abuse?

The question becomes less and less academic each day. We already have present day examples of quasi-autonomous weapons in the field, such as Israel’s *Harpy* anti-radar ‘fire-and-forget’ drone. These, and ongoing military AI development across the globe, raise an ongoing moral dilemma around such technology**[1]**.

1. **Ethical and Legal Challenges**

Paul Scharre, a former US-Army Ranger, and a director at the New American Security ‘think-tank’, wrote in 2019 in his book: *Army of None: Autonomous Weapons and the Future of War* that the Pentagon needed to shift its thinking on artificial intelligence**[2]**.

Scharre distilled his concerns down to two kinds of legal and ethical questions;

1. Machine permissibility. What is the system allowed to do on its own?
2. Machine accountability? Who takes initial (and ultimate) responsibility for what the system does on its own?

In February 2020, as a response to these types of concerns, the US DoD rolled out a list of five AI ethical principles to govern its work in this area**[3]**:

1. Responsibility and good judgement applied by military personnel in the use of AI capabilities.
2. Equitable. Bias is minimized.
3. Traceable. Reasons for AI decisions can be understood.
4. Reliable. Systems tested, secured, and robust.
5. Governable. The ability exists to easily disengage in the case of unintended behaviour.

However, the concern from the *Campaign to Stop Killer Robots* is that these effectively remain guidelines and could ultimately be used by human actors to avoid taking legal (or moral) responsibility for the actions of autonomous weapons systems**[4]**.

The campaign highlights that a new proposed international treaty to prohibit and restrict ‘killer robots’ has been endorsed by dozens of countries**[5]**. Despite this, the major powers remain resistant to new treaties, preferring to look at existing legislation and regulation **[6][7]**. This fuels scepticism in many that the desire to be first in the ‘AI Arms Race’ will lead to compromises in ethical standards.

1. **Challenges for Data Scientist**

The US DoD have declared that they want to integrate ethics into all aspects of their AI test and evaluation processes**[8]**, and thus have outlined policies for their data engineers.

In the need to be equitable and traceable, the AI test harnesses must be able to identify algorithmic bias. It must be clear what data elements are contributing to a systems decision. If a system is literally going to be targeting an individual, or group of individuals, it must be clear what criteria the machine learning model is using to make that decision.

Even for the DoD a major challenge is that AI testing is still heavily dependent on manual assessment. There is widespread engagement with the private sector and academia, but this is still seen as an area of concern. There is a lack of sophisticated toolkits to test AI-driven systems, in the view of the US DoD.

The disengagement mechanism appears to be more of a general engineering challenge in terms of capability, rather than one unique to data engineers. ‘Pulling the plug’ quickly and effectively, if needed, in the event of a suspicious decision requires a generally well-built system architecture.

Other US government departments are impressed with the AI techniques being deployed by the DoD and seek to emulate them in their own ethical artificial intelligence strategies**[9]**.

1. **Reflections**

Many voices in the *Campaign to Stop The Killer Robots* advocate an outright ban on AI technologies being used to create autonomous weapons systems. Professor Noel Sharkey has passionately argued that computers should never be in the business of killing people**[4]**.

However, Is an outright ban even remotely practical? Many in the military today believe that such a ban is impossible **[10]**.

Crucially, there are other voices in the STKR organisation, with both academic and military backgrounds, that push for governments to, at the very least, adopt the US DoD ethical principles and then enshrine this process in multi-lateral treaty agreements. Critically, it should be paramount that ‘permanent significant human control’ always remains in place **[11]**.

To me, it seems that, just like with Nuclear and Chemical weapons before them, AI-based weapons need to be comprehensively covered under dedicated international arms treaties. Such weapons will proliferate and be a great deal harder to count and verify, but pressure needs to be brought to bear on the major powers to recognise the genuine concerns of humanity in the face of ‘killer robots’.
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