

PART-I

NOTE FROM THE EXECUTIVE BOARD:

Dear delegates, Firstly its our honor to be serving as your executive board members at JECRC MUN'15. Please note the the following guide is merely for the purpose of giving you an insight about the agenda and should not be used as the sole resource for research. Considering that this agenda is both vast and complex, we would appreciate you effort to come up with innovative ideas in order to enable an intellectually stimulating discussion in committee. Realizing that for some of you, it might be your first MUN endeavor , its our duty to inform you that we shall be following the UNA USA rules of procedure and expect a basic understanding about the same from each of you. Having said that ,we are always open to any queries that you have with regard to the procedure or mode of research and can be contacted even before the conference via mail. Regarding the nature of proof in committee ,the following sources shall be regarded as credible by the executive board:

1)UN reports

2)Governmental reports

3)Reuters

The acceptance of other reports shall be subjective to each country's foreign policy and relations. We request you to not feel hesitant in bringing to us any dilemmas which you face during your course of research and we shall try and resolve those issues to the best of our abilities. Looking forward to seeing you all.

OVERVIEW OF THE DISEC –

Nature of proof and evidence - Documents from the following sources will be considered as credible proof for any allegations made in committee or statements that require verification. Reuters: Appropriate Documents and articles from the Reuters News agency will be used to corroborate or refute controversial statements made in committee. UN Document: Documents by all UN agencies will be considered as sufficient proof. Reports from all UN bodies including treaty based bodies will also be accepted. Government Reports: Government Reports of a given country used to corroborate an allegation on the same aforementioned country will be accepted as proof.

- United Nations General Assembly – DISEC –

The General Assembly is the main deliberative organ of the United Nations. Chapter IV, Articles 9-22, of the UN Charter concern the General Assembly. All Member States participate in the General Assembly and each state has one vote. The First Committee, one of the six Main Committees of the General Assembly, is allocated agenda items related to disarmament and international security. The First Committee submits a separate report to the plenary on every agenda item allocated to it. Each report:

- indicates the meetings at which the item was considered
- reports the vote, if any, of Member States on draft texts
- transmits the final version of draft resolutions and/or decisions recommended to the plenary for adoption
- symbol pattern

The plenary considers each report and votes on the draft resolutions or decisions it contains. For example, the General Assembly adopted resolutions 66/53, 66/54, 66/55, 66/56, 66/57 and 66/58 based on the report of the First

Committee (A/66/413). committee's consideration of the item • identifies the sponsors of draft resolutions DISEC covers a variety of different topics ranging from the illegal trade in weapons to conflicts dealing with non-proliferation of biological and chemical weapons. Like the other committees of the United Nations General Assembly, DISEC is unable to impose sanctions, authorize armed intervention or pass binding resolutions. That being said, DISEC has submitted recommendations to the United Nations Security Council and to the UN Secretariat on several occasions. DISEC has assisted in the production of several important treaties and conventions, including the Chemical Weapons Convention (1992), which outlaws the production, stockpiling and use of chemical weapons, and the Non-Proliferation Treaty (1968), which aims to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons and to promote peaceful cooperation in the field of nuclear energy amongst other things. Although DISEC was not directly responsible for the creation of these two documents, it certainly played an important role in laying the foundations thereof.

BRIEF OF THE AGENDA

Robotics is the branch of technology that deals with the design, construction, operation, and application of robots. This field, like many others in computing related hardware, dates back centuries, but did not truly expand rapidly as a field of study until the 1900s. With the advent of the transistor, new kinds of actuators, and better battery technologies, robots have become more versatile and more prevalent in many applications and many fields, including industry, home use, and military. Today's robots are comprised of many components and vary in complexity, but share

some fundamental similarities: some form of locomotion, instruction, and power. Most commonly, this means that a robot will have electrical circuits controlling its mechanics, and computer code giving direction to those circuits. There are some exceptions, such as soft robotics, but they tend to be less developed than the traditional robotics model. Like similar engineering centric fields, robotics enjoys research and funding from militaries in developed nations. As such, it is inevitable that a government or military will attempt to use robots in warfare, against real human beings. Perhaps most concerning is the fact that highly developed nations with large economies capable of funding research are at an obvious advantage over less developed nations. For example, in a war between a country with access to robot soldiers and one without, there is a country sustaining only economic losses and another losing human lives. Such a disparity is inherently unfair, unethical, and a matter that needs to be brought forth for debate and consideration.

TECHNICAL STATUS

From a technical viewpoint, the systems surrounding robotics are primitive, but rapidly approaching functionality in traditional roles, such as a military foot soldier. Nations with the necessary resources are likely able to develop robot standings such is already the case with the usage of drones by the United States. The technology is rapidly advancing, often more quickly than legal systems can establish proper regulations.

LEGAL STATUS

The usage of robots as soldiers presents a legal conundrum: who is held liable if a robot violates human rights? The primary issue is a matter of who is responsible – is it the engineer, the designer, the corporation, or the operator? If a nation deploys the robots in a military scenario, is it responsible, or are the aforementioned entities? Since the responsibility cannot currently be determined, it is necessary to develop legal frameworks allocating liability before this technology reaches a critical point.

ETHICAL CONCERNS

Developing a morality for robots remains questionable. Google's experimental driverless cars were rumored to have a "morality setting" that would determine whether, in the event of a crash, the car would attempt to save the life of the passenger, or a pedestrian. These questions have led to the emergence of a field known as "machine ethics" – ethics for robots. ⁴ In response to these concerns, some activists groups have been formed, and have begun campaigned against the usage of autonomous robots in daily life. One such group is known as the International Committee for Robot Arms Control, another the Campaign to Stop Killer Robots. ⁵ The mission statement of the ICRAC is as follows; "Given the rapid pace of development of military robotics and the pressing dangers that these pose to peace and international security and to civilians in conflict, we call upon the international community for a legally binding treaty to prohibit the development, testing, production and use of autonomous weapon systems in all circumstances." This approach is ⁷ undoubtedly idealistic – calling for the complete cessation of all projects relating to autonomous robotics is realistically unenforceable –

but it is a vocal position that bears significant consideration. When robots become the main method of destruction, it can be easy to ignore the death and destruction caused by war. There are considerable concerns about the effect of the use of autonomous robots on the responsibility felt for war. If a country has the capability to fight another country with the use of only autonomous robots, will the people still feel a responsibility and an accountability for the war? Some fear that as robots replace humans, people will become less affected by the death of their fellow man and less willing to wage war in the future.

The International Humanitarian Law

According to the International Committee of the Red Cross, the production and use of autonomous robots is "governed by the International Humanitarian law (IHL), including the obligation to undertake legal reviews in the study, development, acquisition or adoption of new weapons." The IHL 8 also calls for the protection of those not currently involved in the conflict and restrictions on particular weapons and methods of warfare during international armed conflict. As the level of autonomy of these robots grows, it becomes increasingly harder to imagine how humans will ensure that innocent and nonparticipation parties are not harmed. With this push for an increase of the autonomy of these robots comes concerns about how autonomous robots will be able to comply with the IHL. As technology develops quickly, it is difficult to assess these weapons and determine their ethical and legal status. It has been suggested that the IHL is not comprehensive enough to govern the use of autonomous weapons. However, if

rules and regulations are not in place, the use of autonomous robotics could quickly become out of hand.

DISCUSSION OF THE PROBLEM

The robotics revolution is heralded as being the next greatest revolution in military, as significant as the creation of gunpowder and of the nuclear bomb. However, the idea of a future in which fully autonomous robots could have the power of life and death over human beings creates additional concerns. Some parties argue that robots will never meet the requirements of international human rights law (IHRL) or international humanitarian law (IHL), and even if they ever would, they should not be given the authority to decide over the matter of life and death. This group asks for a ban on their development, production and use. Other parties argue that such technological advances are legitimate military breakthroughs, and if properly controlled, they could lead to a reduction in war casualties. Thus, they argue for some form of control on the use of this kind of technology, over the standards imposed by international law (HRW, 2012).

reduction in war casualties. Thus, they argue for some form of control on the use of this kind of technology, over the standards imposed by international law. However, there are certain advantages that could be brought about by the use of LARs. They are capable of enlarging the battlefield, penetrating more easily behind enemy lines, and thus, saving human and financial resources. Moreover, unmanned systems offer higher force projection (preserving the lives of one's own soldiers) and force multiplication (allowing fewer personnel to do more). Also, unmanned systems can stay on station much longer than individuals and withstand other impediments such as G-forces. We should also take into consideration that robots may in some respects serve humanitarian purposes. While the current emergence of unmanned systems may be related to the desire on the part of states not to become entangled in the complexities of capture, future generations of robots may be able to employ less lethal force, and thus cause fewer unnecessary deaths. Technology can offer creative alternatives to lethality, for instance by immobilizing or disarming the target. Furthermore, robots can be programmed to leave a digital trail, which potentially allows better scrutiny of their actions than is often the case with soldiers and could therefore in that sense enhance accountability.

Compared to regular soldiers, LARs will not be susceptible to

some of the human shortcoming that undermines the protection of life. Typically they would not act of revenge, panic, anger, spite, prejudice or fear. Moreover, unless specifically programmed to do so, robots would not cause intentional suffering on civilian populations, for example through torture. Robots also do not rape (HRW 2013).

The UN Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons

The UN Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons Born out of interests in disarmament and fair warfare, the UN Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW) was adopted on 10 October 1980, and entered into force 2 December 1983. The convention holds five protocols: governing non detectable fragments, landmines, incendiary weapons, blinding laser weapons, and the clearance of explosive remnants of war. The Convention has been reformed numerous times over the past three and a half decades, most recently 28 November 2003. The most important reform was adopted 21 December 2001, determining that the Convention apply not only to international conflict, but also to conflicts within states. There are 117 states party to the Convention On 14 May 2014 and the four days following, the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons Meeting of Experts on Lethal Autonomous Weapons Systems met in Geneva to discuss the legality of Lethal Autonomous Weapons.

The Issue of Autonomy

The International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) also provided a statement at the Convention in Geneva, raising concerns as to the amount of autonomy that is granted to Lethal Autonomous Weapons Systems (LAWS). The ICRC points out that "highly sophisticated autonomous weapon systems programmed to independently determine their actions, make complex decisions and adapt to their environment. . . do not yet exist." However, as technology advances and LAWS¹¹ acquire an increasing amount of artificial intelligence, it is unclear if humans should or will remain in control of the 'critical functions' of these weapon systems. The ICRC stressed that "human beings must retain some degree of control over the 'critical functions' of weapon systems and the use of force."¹² However, these 'critical functions' have not yet been defined. There is still a debate over what decisions LAWS can make without direct human control and what humans must decide for these autonomous robots. Here is where the legality and the morality of the issue meet. Autonomy is partly a legal issue as it calls for the examination of who is responsible for the robot while it is acting on artificial intelligence. On the other hand, autonomy is a moral issue. Currently, artificial intelligence is very limited. LAWS are not well equipped to adapt to changes in the environment therefore it is hard to predict how the LAWS will respond when

they encounter an unknown obstacle or situation. There are concerns that LAWS could be responsible for the killings of innocent citizens or the use of brutal force. Is it morally acceptable for LAWS to make decisions that affect the life of other human beings without first receiving the instruction of other humans?

Drones in Warfare

Rather than continue looking forward, we shall look within the realm of what is happening today. Unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs), also known as drones, are commonly used in military applications. These aircraft may be controlled autonomously or by remote operator. The issue thus lies in the fact that these warcraft may sometimes be autonomous — and, as before, there is a concern of liability. Who would be accountable, if a UAV were to accidentally kill a civilian? As before, the United States is a major player in this issue, with a massive defense budget, and a propensity to use it. A whopping 41% of the US Department of Defense's aircraft are unmanned, funded by an accordingly massive \$26.16 billion USD. With such a large assortment of drones, the US is undoubtedly inclined to use them, as it does with frequency. Pakistan, in particular, is subject to a high level of drone strikes carried out by the US. Pakistani Chief Justice Dost Muhammad Khan has condemned the strikes as "war crimes", claiming they violate the UN charter on human rights. The Obama

administration has responded by increasing the volume of strikes. Japan is similarly equipped with drones — in recent years, its unmanned air force has been growing faster than any other in the world, with plans for further growth. The implications for both local and global politics are immense, as a Japan with a large body of UAVs could easily become a peacemaker or an aggressor over the Senkaku/Diaoyu islands and North Korea. Fundamentally, the 14 nation with the most advanced technology is at a considerable advantage over those lesserequipped, which has ramifications for stability in the region. The issue is similarly nuanced to that of autonomous robots, and potential solutions are likely similar as well. The only difference is the medium — the matter of autonomous robots is not yet apparent today, whereas the matter of drones is already present. All of you, as a body, would do well to consider how best we might solve the issue, and what precedents we might set on the matter that could have very real, extended repercussions for the future of warfare.

There are three main positions regarding our topic.

1. Outright ban on any such technologies.

This would prohibit the development, production, and use of fully autonomous weapons through an international legally

binding instrument. Therefore, the countries that have already built such weapons will have to dispose of them and become as transparent as possible regarding the internal weapons review process. Moreover, the committee could agree to discuss the matter in the future when the conditions of the international system would allow such technologies to operate (Stop 2013).

2. Partial ban

This would entail a ban on certain types of fully autonomous weapons and regulations regarding the others. It is the midway solution, but it necessitates a clear distinction between the different types of LARs.

3. Regulations on LARs

Establish a professional code of conduct governing the research and development of autonomous robotic weapons, especially those capable of becoming fully autonomous, in order to ensure that legal and ethical concerns about their use in armed conflict are adequately considered at all stages of technological development (HRW 2012).

Questions to Consider

1. Can a nation be held liable if its robots or UAVs break international law?
2. Who is held liable for the actions of a robot, the designer,

engineer, company, or operator?

3. Should robots be banned entirely, in part, or not at all?
4. What would the repercussions of banning robots be? Of not banning them?
5. What level of autonomy should robots and UAVs have?