### 1NC – Killer Robot PIC

#### CP – States ought to ban killer robots.

#### Names matter – “LAWs” is less effective for public pressure.
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Yes, the organized campaign against killer robots has gained momentum as the technology and militarization of robotics has advanced, and the smartest thing the movement has done is pick its name. “Killer robots” still isn’t a well-defined term, but it's clearly a winning one.

Autonomous robotic systems have indeed come a long way since Asimov. Far enough that, in 2012, Human Rights Watch issued a report making the case against lethal autonomous weapons systems—weapons that can make lethal decisions without human involvement. Except they didn’t call them “lethal autonomous weapons systems.” The title of the report was “Losing Humanity: The Case Against Killer Robots.”

Mary Wareham, coordinator of the Campaign to Stop Killer Robots, admits it was a bit much. “We put killer robots in the title of our report to be provocative and get attention,” she says. “It’s shameless campaigning and advocacy, but we’re trying to be really focused on what the real life problems are, and killer robots seemed to be a good way to begin the dialogue.”

Ryan Gariepy, the chief technology officer at Clearpath Robotics, echoed Wareham: “It is a little bit sensationalist, and the engineer side of me thinks it’s a little bit not specific. But if that’s what society needs to address this issue, then that’s the way we’ll talk about it.”

Naming weapons and missions like this isn’t new. The LGM-118A “Peacekeeper” was a missile that could carry up to 3,000 kilotons of warheads. Israel Aerospace Industries makes a missile named Gabriel, named for the angel. A 2006 Israeli mission to bomb South Lebanon was named Mivtza Sachar Holem, “Operation Just Reward.” When the United States invaded Iraq they called the program Operation Iraqi Freedom. Researcher Charles Kauffman argues that as our weapons get more and more powerful, our names for them get more and more demure, to soften the idea of the damage they could do. But if you’re in the market of making a weapon seem evil, “killer robot” is effective.

But not everybody defines “killer robot” the same way. For Clearpath, a killer robot is a robot that can make a decision to use lethal force without human intervention. At Human Rights Watch, the definition is broadened to include any robot that can choose to use force against a human, even if that force isn’t lethal.

Really, there's reluctance to pin down a single definition, Wareham says. “In fact there was a push away from that.” That's at least in part because different organizations and agencies have distinct—and sometimes conflicting—goals about what discussion of killer robots might yield.

So while Human Rights Watch is seeking potential rules against “killer robots” that could regulate specific weapons, classes of weapons, weapons systems, or entire attack strategies, groups like Clearpath have to consider their clients—including both the Canadian and U.S. militaries. Once Clearpath hands over robotics technology to those governments, Gariepy acknowledges, the company has no control over how that technology is used.

For now, this nebulous mass of robotic entities that could kill or harm humans has a name without a solid definition—but it’s a really smart name. After all, Wareham says, “no government wants to be seen as pro-killer-robot.”

#### Net benefit is extinction.
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We have to ban all LAWS.

LAWS should never be developed or used. LAWS should never be used in anger.

Those are just a few of the responses researchers at the University of British Columbia got when they asked the Internet-using public about the military use of lethal, autonomous weapons systems — Terminator-style killer robots, in layman's terms.

The survey itself sheds some interesting light on people's attitudes — 11 percent of respondents say they'd rather be under attack from robots that could control themselves rather than robots that were being operated by humans — but it's impossible to read the study without getting the nagging feeling that LAWS is just, well, not the acronym you want to be using if you're trying to warn people about the dangers of deadly artificial intelligence.

Laws, which are of course distinct from LAWS, are necessary. Any well-functioning society requires them. So to say that LAWS pose "a matter of democratic and humanitarian concern" is not wrong per se, but it could be misleading. For one thing, the military already uses the LAW acronym — to refer to the light anti-tank weapon. So, in the minor interest of our species' survival, I'm launching an effort to rebrand killer robots to better reflect their true nature. How about instead of LAWS, we call them:

KILLAS — Kinetic Independent Lethal Locomotive Autonomous Soldiers

BOOMERs — Big Obnoxious Outwardly Mobile Eradication Recruits

THWACKs — Tough as Heck While Actively Computing Killzones

VADERs — Vain but Able Death-Emitter Robots

MUSKs — Machines Using Software to Kill

TURINGs — Totally Unrelenting Resource for Infiltration, Neutralization and Getaways

KBOTs — Killer Bloodthirsty Operational Toadies

TERMINATORs — Trained Electronic Representative for Military-Industrial Networks and Autonomous Tactical Operations Resource

For the sake of humanity, I'm open to other suggestions.

#### No solvency deficit – a technical definition isn’t needed, desired, or viable.
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This article shows that having a common vernacular to describe autonomous weapons may seem a notable achievement, but upon further examination this common vocabulary appears to be fluid and pluralistic. This complicates the discourse on autonomous weapons, in particular when one is in search of concrete answers to sensitive issues or even pursuing the development of an additional Protocol to the CCW. In the current situation, any definition that is introduced to this debate, no matter how adequate or well-defined, will be interpreted differently among its participants. Striving for a definition can be understandable, but the result of introducing one in this current discourse renders any definition practically meaningless. Hence, clarification of these terms to describe autonomous weapons seems important in order to be able to engage in a constructive debate on the issue. But although the fluidity and pluralistic nature of the vocabulary itself may be troubling, it may also be the subtle secret of its success.76 Keeping a definition vague in an international political body that is to take decisions by consensus can turn out to be a brilliant strategy. Hence, the question arises whether, at this point in time, a precisely defined and mutually understood definition is needed, desired and viable.