MEETINGS CYCLE
"The Future War"

International Order and New Technologies

Faced with the need to create/establish spaces for reflection on the relationship between "weapons" and "humanitarian" issues, this meetings cycle invites to rethink the international context post-covid in international security terms, international affairs, humanitarian disarmament and the weapons impact on individuals and, by this way, think about how work together on this sets of topics trough this meetings cycles with experts.

María Pia Devoto

Cesar Jaramillo

By the expert's words, the technologies development for national and international security requires a massive special attention from all different specialization levels and, also, a massive consciousness from the public opinion. When we talk about started to reflection on the future war, we should analyze and identifies what we're talking about when we refer to it, the reason of their urgency and study their evolution and present dynamics. As we recognize that war's nature is changing, it's fundamental that the international community create a legal framework to englobe these conducts. Although while always

we could see permanent changes, in the Currently, we speak of a third historical revolution because, although there have always been progress, the changes are so consequentials that force us to redefine the definition of war and, therefore, this confluence of progress must be a concern for everyone who participate in theses studies. Within military systems, different types of technology are applied at a speed never seen before. As a result, technological developments are so fast that it stops the international community achieving regulation through of creating an applicable regulatory framework. This panorama has tactical, legal, normative, moral and ethical features. First, the battlefield's asymmetrical trait eliminated the classic combat between equals or comparable opponents, making it irrelevant. Today, wars are asymmetrical and the

advantages aren't sought on the same territorial or the equal use of technologies, which forced and encouraged new forms of attacks. Secondly, exists a dislike to the risk because the classic soldier's image – bloody and hurt – it's changed and increase, thought the massive media, the dislike to the generalize risk which privileged remote war and technologies use thar minimizes the risks and human's costs. Third, dual and multi-purpose use of the technologies has enhanced the views in favor of these and, difficulty, apply against them because of the Artificial Intelligence's benefits. For all of the above, I think it's a unique opportunity for the international Community to mark explicitly and effectively the limits on the uses of this type of technology within battlefields. Also, recognizes multilateral efforts against lethal weapons and sustaining this initiative from a collective interest.

Camilo Serna

Throughout his presentation, the expert emphasized the complexity of the term "what is a robot" by the number of definitions that exist. In general terms, a robot is an automatic machine with zero human intervention in their functions but it can be programmed by a human being. Robots are physical, unlike bots that are software and their functions work through a kind of human logical – as, for example, on the web platforms with atomized assistance – but haven't any kind of physical configuration. Although while, the Artificial Intelligence and robotics do not always go hand in hand, but it would be possible because de the autonomous weapons systems – as Killers Robots – go to that way. In the last few years, large advances have been made to that robots assume some tacks that, in practice, are too big for the humans. And because of that, the human being begins to be replaced by machinery and, a clear example, the autonomous cars. Automation involves handing over to a machine all the responsibility for potential human errors, for that the human being doesn't have the need or the possibility of assuming any blame for any crime or felony that occurred in war contexts.

Although the benefits, so sold and exposed by the defenders of this type of technology and who aspire to replace the deficiencies of the human being, inevitably fall into a contradiction. Robots must be for help and support to human beings, not to their detriment. Even so, there is nothing that regulates this military methodology by letting a robot make the decision to kill a target. Many times, they position themselves on the laws of robotics exposed by Isaac Asimov, but the normative regulation of conduct can't be based on science fiction. In this sense, current wars are asymmetric wars that have a strong focus on the technological development of weapons that can lead to a more humane type of weapon in terms of mental processing under more complex thinking. Currently, robotic machines respond to basic programming and don't have the capacity or intelligence to resemble a human mind, that is, they're brut machines applicated on the battlefield because they follow the instructions that the programmer develops. But they always hit against an imperfect world and this was demonstrated by the use of autonomous cars, because they were designed to be used in perfect environments. Therefore, to think about the development of an autonomous type of technology for the battlefield, it should also be planned that the perfect contexts don't exist and can lead to critical failures at the time to implementing them.

Juan Battaleme

For the exhibitor, thinking about what the possible new post-covid world order and about the future of war is problematic because predicting it is. But what is clear is that the technological element is always crucial. However, when we talk about war, we must focus on the doctrinal element at the moment of apply these technologies. Today, discussions around conflicts between major powers - symmetric or asymmetric - focus on "who" is gaining control over the use and monopoly of base technologies, this being a crucial strategy to establish global hegemony and supremacy in military terms. Similarly, we are witnessing a decentralization of the military technological field in the face of the disparity of state and non-state actors in its intervention, adding greater complexity to the phenomenon. The conflicts themselves are very varied. On the one hand, the High-In conflicts promoted the militarization of intra-terrestrial space, not in arms terms, but with the aim of ensuring communications and data flow. On the other hand, low-in conflicts are asymmetric and have an analytical view of how the State has the technological capacity to increase control over individuals and also how individuals have found in technology a means to raise resistance. In this sense, there is clear evidence that the progress and relationship between technology on cities and on citizens

is increasing and involves a utilitarian logic in how to use certain technology in society. Another important aspect to consider is to continue thinking about why robots are going to have a central role on the battlefield. Previously, decisive type battles involved a military confrontation where the end was a defeat and the opponent couldn't continue with that war effort. However, today we are witnessing the indecisive battles that are long-lasting conflicts and "desgate" that generate positions of huge inequality due to the different types of violence and application of technology in the military battlefield. In any case, at present, the great powers face each other in hybrid terms, that is, a clear combination and complementation between man and machine. From this, it is planned if the man can be removed from the machine. So, if we want to stop the advance and development of Killer Robots, we also must rethink the increasing use of Artificial Intelligence in air defense systems because they are increasingly automatic and semi-autonomous. Another criterion to analyze, in ethical terms, is the fact of shooting time because the man is in charge of defining "what it's what" the machine learns to establish and configure the parameters to shoot. Even if we add the efficiency criterion, the positive numbers rise. These types of technologies are more precise and, as they increase, they are cheaper and more accessible. We no longer think of large units of men, but of large units Man: the same man controlled the doctrinal application on the practical use of a certain technology. But, even in this context, there is still a certain degree of probation for humans over this technology. All the technologies that the Stop Killer Robots campaign addresses are CO-DEPENDENT, therefore, thinking about "how" to prohibit their use is complicated. Even more, if we consider that we are going towards a highly sensorized world. Our daily life is structured in sensors, some more visible than others. In the case of the military mentality, a world of sensors follows the logic of who will have the advantage of the first blow. Consequently, whoever have the technology will not only have greater advantages, but also the ability to handle high volumes of data as a military force, even more if the use of Artificial Intelligence is added to achieve a quick response at the moment of discriminating and eliminate potential threats. Clearly, military technological advance under this logic will have an unequal impact on the development of the wealth of nations. For this reason, it's essential to continue discussing the moral implications of going to war because it's what will allow organizations - like SKR - to continue and carry out their campaign objectives.

APP
Asociación para Políticas Públicas

PROJECT PLOUGHSHARES

CAMPAIGN TO STOP KILLER ROBOTS

SEHLAC
SEGURIDAD HUMANA
EN LATINOAMÉRICA Y EL CARIBE