Initial Post

The *Case Study: Automated Active Response Weaponry* presents Q Industries as "an international defence contractor that specialises in autonomous vehicles" which initially deployed "bomb-defusing robots and crowd-monitoring drones" before moving to "automated non-lethal responses, such as tear gas, pepper spray, or acoustic weapons" and then exploring "lethal responses of varying scales" at the behest of governments. Under the ACM Code of Ethics, Principle 1.2 mandates that any system "designed with the intention of causing harm must be ethically justified and must minimise unintended harm" (ACM, 2020). By advancing from passive to active weaponry without robust safeguards, Q fails to satisfy this requirement. Moreover, Principle 1.1 requires respect for "basic human rights such as privacy, freedom of speech, and access to information"; the use of facial recognition to identify and target protesters directly contravenes these rights (Corfield, 2022).
The engineers' resignation is consistent with Principle 1.7 (honesty) and Principle 2.7 (responsibility to report code violations). Their intention to "speak out publicly" is justified when systems pose significant public risk (Gotterbarn, Miller and Rogerson, 2020). Conversely, Q's lawsuit under confidentiality agreements aligns with Principle 2.3 (respect for property), yet conflicts with the Code's Preamble, which places "public good" above corporate interests.

The BCS Code of Conduct similarly emphasises "honesty and integrity" and obliges members to "consider the wider impact of their work" (BCS, 2023). Unlike the ACM Code, the BCS Code explicitly requires compliance with jurisdictional legal frameworks, strengthening the argument against Q's secret lethal-weapon developments for governments with poor human-rights records. Both codes would condemn deploying weaponised AI without due process, but the BCS Code adds clarity on legal accountability. Q's leadership, by prioritising profit and political favour over public welfare, undermines professional integrity and the core tenets of both ACM and BCS ethical standards.

In conclusion, both the ACM and BCS codes converge on the principle that computing professionals must prioritise the public good and legal accountability over commercial or political expediency, and Q Industries' actions fall demonstrably short of these obligations.

References

ACM (2020) *ACM Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct*. Available at: https://www.acm.org/code-of-ethics (Accessed: 6 August 2025).

BCS (2023) *BCS Code of Conduct and Code of Ethics*. Available at: https://www.bcs.org/membership/becoming-a-member/codes-of-conduct/ (Accessed: 6 August 2025).

Corfield, A. (2022) 'Autonomous weapons and the ethics of accountability', *Journal of Military Ethics*, 21(3), pp. 177–192.

Gotterbarn, D., Miller, K. and Rogerson, S. (2020) 'Responsible computing: A revised ethical code for the digital age', *Communications of the ACM*, 63(12), pp. 28–31.

Summary Post

The Q Industries case exemplifies the ethical challenges posed by autonomous weapons, particularly as systems transition from defensive to offensive applications. My initial analysis argued that Q's deployment of facial recognition against protesters contravenes ACM Principle 1.1 on human rights (ACM, 2018, sec. 1.1), while escalation to lethal systems without safeguards breaches Principle 1.2 (ACM, 2018, sec. 1.2). The engineers' resignations and whistleblowing aligned with their duty under Principles 1.7 and 2.7 to prioritise public welfare, even when confidentiality obligations were at stake.

Peers extended this discussion in valuable ways. Abdulhakim (2025) highlighted the tension between intellectual property rights (ACM, 2018, sec. 2.3) and the protection of the public good, raising the question of whether more explicit professional guidance is needed on mandatory whistleblowing. Opeyemi (2025) introduced evidence of algorithmic bias in facial recognition, with error rates disproportionately affecting marginalised groups (ACLU-MN, 2024), and stressed the importance of meaningful human oversight (Human Rights Watch & Harvard Law School, 2025). He also linked these concerns to international safeguards such as the UN Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs, 2001). Guilherme (2025) broadened the scope, drawing on historical precedents such as the Pugwash Conferences (Rotblat, 1999, p. 1475) and pointing to governance initiatives, including IEEE standards (IEEE, 2021, p. 3), and advocacy movements, like the Campaign to Stop Killer Robots (Wareham, 2020).

Together, the discussion emphasised the dual-use dilemma (MacKenzie, 1993, p. 15) and the limitations of existing professional codes. The Q Industries case highlights the urgent need for more explicit whistleblower protections, stronger accountability mechanisms, and collective ethical frameworks to ensure that computing professionals uphold the public good and human rights in contexts with global security implications.

References

ACLU-MN (2024) 'Biased technology: The automated discrimination of facial recognition', *ACLU of Minnesota*, 29 February. Available at: https://www.aclu-mn.org/en/news/biased-technology-automated-discrimination-facial-recognition (Accessed: 10 August 2025).

ACM (2018) *Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct*. Association for Computing Machinery. Available at: https://www.acm.org/code-of-ethics (Accessed: 31 August 2025).

Abdulhakim Bashir (2025) *Response to Unit 1 Discussion Forum on Q Industries*. Forum post submitted to the University of Essex Online, 7 August.

BCS (2022) *BCS Code of Conduct for Members – Ethics for IT Professionals*. Swindon: The Chartered Institute for IT. Available at: https://www.bcs.org/membership/becoming-a-member/codes-of-conduct/ (Accessed: 31 August 2025).

Guilherme Pessoa-Amorim (2025) *Response to Unit 1 Discussion Forum on Q Industries*. Forum post submitted to the University of Essex Online, 31 August.

Human Rights Watch & Harvard Law School's International Human Rights Clinic (2025) 'Killer robots threaten human rights during war, peace', *Human Rights Watch*, 28 April.

Available at: https://text.hrw.org/news/2025/04/28/killer-robots-threaten-human-rights-during-war-peace (Accessed: 10 August 2025).

IEEE (2021) *IEEE Standard for Transparency of Autonomous Systems (IEEE 2857-2021)*. Piscataway, NJ: IEEE Standards Association, p. 3. Available at: https://standards.ieee.org/ieee/7001/6929/ (Accessed: 31 August 2025).

MacKenzie, D. (1993) *Inventing Accuracy: A Historical Sociology of Nuclear Missile Guidance*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, p. 15.

Opeyemi Adeniran (2025) *Response to Unit 1 Discussion Forum on Q Industries*. Forum post submitted to the University of Essex Online, 11 August.

Rotblat, J. (1999) 'A Hippocratic Oath for Scientists', *Science*, 286(5444), p. 1475. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1126/science.286.5444.1475 (Accessed: 31 August 2025).

United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs (2001) *The Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons*. Available at: https://disarmament.unoda.org/the-convention-on-certain-conventional-weapons/ (Accessed: 31 August 2025).

Wareham, M. (2020) 'Stopping Killer Robots', *Human Rights Watch* [Preprint]. Available at: https://www.hrw.org/report/2020/08/10/stopping-killer-robots/country-positions-banning-fully-autonomous-weapons-and(Accessed: 31 August 2025).