**(CNN)** -- Over the last few months there has been an increasing debate about the use armed robots that once launched can select their own targets and kill them without any human guidance.

Some have argued that robots could be more accurate on the battlefield than human soldiers and save more civilian lives. But this is a guess based on how we think computers will advance in the future. But in fact, since the 1950s, Artificial Intelligence has moved at a snail's pace compared to what people had predicted.

Others argue that we shouldn't give machines the decision about who lives or dies.

At this point, we cannot rely on machines to follow the rules of war. Current sensing systems are not up to the task of determining who should be killed (soldiers) and who shouldn’t (innocent civilians). And even if machines had adequate sensors, they would still be missing the common sense to make decisions about who and when it is appropriate to kill.

Yet a recent U.S. Department of Defense decision is asking scientists to research and develop independent weapons systems. This move sends the wrong message to other nations.

Is anyone considering how unknown computer programs will interact when groups of enemy robots meet each other? Is anyone considering how independent weapons could trigger accidental wars?

In April this year in London, a nongovernmental group will launch a large campaign to ["Stop Killer Robots."](https://twitter.com/BanKillerRobots" \t "_blank) They are seeking an international treaty to stop the development and deployment of independent robot weapons.

We must stop these weapons while there is still an opportunity. Once there has been large investment in the technology, it may be too late.
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