**Forum:** Human Rights Council  
**Issue:** Human Rights Implications of Lethal Autonomous Robotics  
**Student Officer:** Trisha Thacker  
**Position:** Deputy President

### Introduction

‘Lethal Autonomous Weapon have been described as the third revolution in warfare, after gunpowder and nuclear arms.’–Stuart Russell, (renowned computer scientist).¹

Although Lethal Autonomous Robotics have not yet been deployed, technology is growing exponentially in the path of creating these autonomous weapon systems. These weapon systems act on the basis of artificial intelligence-the ability to perform tasks that predominantly require human intelligence, produced by the use of complex algorithms involved in programming the robotic system. The rapid technological developments of the 21st century make it highly doubtful to predict how long it is before the creation of fully autonomous weapons that are ready to be used. This re-enforces the urgent need for a comprehensive and unanimous agreement to be reached on this question.

These advancements in the field of robotics have sparked heated debate on an international stage concerning the ethics, desirability and legality of fully autonomous robotics. Majority of the questions raised are in regard to the infringement of human rights because, unlike technological limitations, the philosophical question of violating human rights is very difficult to overcome with the betterment of engineering or science. The advancement into using fully autonomous weapon systems marks a shift in the paradigm of military affairs as not only is it an improvement in the weapons used but it will also alter who will be using the weapons and whether these weapons will have somebody controlling them at all.

The chief question however, remains about the violation of the fundamental human right to life. There have been several controversies surrounding the creation of these powerful weapons that can pose a threat to the right to life. There is a collective discomfort at the prospect of a robot making decisions that determine the life or death of a human. In addition, there are several doubts regarding the entrustment of the decision of life and death by LARs as they lack any conscience and humanity, which makes it difficult for these robots to meet the respect for human life.

The human rights implications of lethal autonomous robotics in combat have to be looked at from two perspectives: in regard to International Human Rights Law as well as International Humanitarian Law (the former applicable in both war and peace while the latter only applicable in combat). It is imperative to note that the bedrock of both these laws is the regulation of the use of lethal force to protect human life and safety and the issue of lethal autonomous weapons should be considered with regard to these laws.

Another complicated matter is the un-predictability of the situation, as lethal autonomous robotics have never been deployed in distinctive and complicated conflict situations, it is impossible to foresee the consequences of the use of LARs on the battlefield. This hence makes it difficult to come up with a comprehensive strategy to prevent unlawful killing and the infringement of human rights in armed conflicts involving autonomous weapon systems. The complexity of these technological systems makes it near impossible to predict their actions in unplanned situations and complex operational environments.

The advantages that LARs may pose to human rights should also be considered in regard to this issue. For example, there have been recent international concerns regarding a leaked report that contains the details of sexual assaults by French Peacekeeping Troops in December 2013, at a centre for displaced persons in Central African Republic. LARs would hence make better peacekeeping forces for the United Nations and several countries, as they would not indulge in the sexual exploitation as the UN Peacekeeping Forces have been alleged to do. Moreover, there have been several issues raised about the misappropriation of resources under the United Nation’s Watch such as food rations, illegal

exploitation of natural resources and aviation units as well. As autonomous robotic systems would not act in self-preservation and only complete the task they are instructed to, there would be no exploitation and states could ensure that the peacekeeping forces sent out have completed and carried out the required tasks. Furthermore, LARs would not act with any anger and prejudice and thus would reduce the conflicts between the locals and the peacekeeping forces. States as well as the United Nations could be confident that once sent in to areas of conflict the LARs would not torture or assault any locals as a result of any bias, racism etc.

There has been increasing pressure on the United Nations to put a preemptive ban on autonomous weapon systems before the come into existence. The greatest influence is from the movement of the ‘Campaign to Stop Killer Robots’ coordinated by the Human Rights Watch that is rallying for the decision of a pre-empive ban on LARs. Other highly active organizations also involve the International Committee of the Red Cross, Amnesty International and Article 36. However, the criticism of this ban has mostly been indicated from several states such as the USA, Israel and South Korea who are supposedly in the process of developing similar prototypes. Nevertheless, this situation is highly ambiguous as all the operations dealing with LARs are highly protected and inaccessible. The inability to access this information makes it hard to determine the stance of these states, as voicing against the ban on LARs, will cause scrutiny of the state from the international community. As these prototypes have not been deployed, it is difficult to be certain about the states perspective on the violation of human rights in balance to the imminent military advantage these weapon systems pose.

**Definition of Key Terms**

**Lethal Autonomous Robotics (LARs)**

Any weapon systems that, once activated, can select and engage targets without further human intervention. The chief element is that the robot has an autonomous ‘choice’ in regard to target selection and usage of lethal force. Hence, they would have the power to decide when to take a human life.

**Supervised Autonomy**

---

This in terms of technology refers to any system in which there is human involvement as well as participation of a human who monitors and can override the robot’s decisions. The system can select targets and deliver force with the oversight of a human operator with the power to supersede any actions.

**Semi Autonomous Weapon System (Also known as human ‘in the loop’)**

It is a weapon system wherein once activated it can only engage specific targets that have been selected by a human operator. The system can select targets and deliver force only when there is a human in command.

**Artificial Intelligence**

Artificial Intelligence (AI) refers to the development as well as the theory of technological systems with the ability to execute tasks that predominantly require human intelligence, such as speech recognition, visual perception and decision-making.

**Right to Life**

The Human Rights Council describes the right to life to be the Supreme Right. The Article 6 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights states that ‘every human being has the inherent right to life that shall be protected by the law. Nobody shall arbitrarily be deprived of his life’. In addition, in the question of any armed conflicts the right to life refers to not being killed unaccountably, arbitrarily or otherwise inhumanely. It is more colloquially regarded as the right to human dignity.

**Arbitrary Killings in Armed Conflict**

---


7 From: [http://www.claiminghumanrights.org/right_to_life_definition.html](http://www.claiminghumanrights.org/right_to_life_definition.html)

Manfred Nowak the former UN special rapporteur on torture has defined arbitrary killings in any armed conflict as those, which contradict the humanitarian laws of war.  

### Accountability

The basis for accountability is when an individual, group or organization is entrusted with human, financial or other resources that the individual, group, organization is obliged to give an account of for the use or non-use of that resource.

### Background Information

**A brief history of the use of semi-automated and supervised automated weapons**

Although fully autonomous legal systems haven’t yet been deployed, the usage of unmanned combat aerial vehicles (UCAV) or combat drones in armed conflicts has been prevalent. These combat drones have varying levels of autonomy and there is a high possibility that in the near future these drones will replace manned aircrafts. Currently, USA, UK, Israel and China are few of the states that own drones competent in launching missiles. The first time an armed UCAV was used during a time of combat was in the Iran-Iraq War, successfully deployed by Iran in 1980. The numerous advantages of UCAVs including their lower expenditure, sturdiness and expendability with room for advancements in technology prove that overtime these drones may not only replace manned aerial vehicles but also be improved to be fully autonomous. Another important advantage for the pervasiveness of UCAVs in warfare is their ability to fly high above civilian populations and carry out an attack without posing the high risk of putting soldiers in the line of fire.

Another example of advancements in this field includes the creation of sentry robots. South Korea has installed a team of these sentry robots in the demilitarized zone along its border. These robots are equipped with heat sensing capabilities and have the ability to detect and fire the built-in machine gun on any human targets. These semi-autonomous weapons alert humans of a target and the operator makes the final decision to pull the trigger. However, the international community has not responded positively to this

---
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extensive security measure. Peter Asaro (co-founder of the International Committee for Robot Arms Control) stated that South Korea has got a lot of bad press for dispatching these sentinels on their border.\textsuperscript{11} The United Kingdom has also developed a prototype of a jet propelled UCAV, which has the ability to autonomously recognize and locate enemies. However, it requires a human operator to engage with a target.

A major issue to consider when deploying any UCAVs is the violation of human rights. By deploying these weapons that endanger civilians on the other sides is infringing upon the principle of equality. The idea of valuing the lives of soldiers of a developed country in comparison to that of civilians: women, children and elderly from LEDCs rely on an unspoken racism. Furthermore, the use of drones in warfare should be focused on in regard to it’s contradictions to the laws of warfare as well as the possibility of technical problems and the hacking of drones by criminals.

Issues of lethal autonomous robotics

\textit{The gap of accountability}

The use of fully autonomous weapon systems means that the lack of meaningful control will lead to a gap in accountability, as it will be ambiguous whom or what can be held responsible for any errors and wrongful firing. Both international humanitarian and international human rights law require accountability for any legal violations. The major flaw is the inability to identify responsible parties, which means that there is nobody to deliver and ask compensation from for any unjust injury or death. In addition, the military contractors and military personnel would be immune from civil suits and would completely escape liability for the use of LARs in combat.

Another question is if a fully autonomous weapon system-with the ability of decision-making using artificial intelligence-would be held to an equal standard of obeying International Humanitarian Law as humans or if there would be a need for a comprehensive and unanimous amendment on how LARs will be judged in terms of complying with IHL. On a psychological level, the killing by a LAR would mean that it will not be condemned and may lead to a sense of injustice amongst victims’

\textsuperscript{11} Statement from: http://www.nbcnews.com/tech/security/future-tech-autonomous-killer-robots-are-already-here-n105656
families. This also violates the ‘Right to Remedy’ that falls under International Human Rights Law, which calls for states to ensure individual accountability in the case of the violations of any human right. It ensures that any victims receive some form of remedy which may be the provision of reparations, criminal prosecution etc.\(^\text{12}\)

UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon stated that imperative questions on the ability of LARs to operate in accordance to international humanitarian and human rights law have been raised. He went on to ask, ‘If responsibility cannot be determined as required by international law, is it legal or ethical to deploy such systems?’\(^\text{13}\)

**The right to life**

The Right to Life, as defined previously, prevents the arbitrary killings of human life. Arbitrary killings are ones that fail to meet the requirements of the lawful use of force. Opponents of LARs state that no matter how much advancement there will be in Artificial Intelligence, it cannot surpass human judgment and reason, for example an autonomous weapon system would lack the ability to understand subtle differences between a combatant and a civilian using interpretations of body language, tone of voice and reasoning of motive. This lapse in judgment may be the deciding factor between whether the killing was arbitrary or not and it many find it hard to leave the decision of human life or death in the hands of a machine which is not 100% capable.

Furthermore, in highly unpredictable combat situations, it is questionable if these autonomous systems would have the ability to make critical decisions that may often deem if civilian harm overshadows military advantage.

**The dilemma of opposition**

When evaluating the human rights implications and the issues regarding any combat weapons, it is highly important to see the consequences for both sides of the armed conflict. The deployment of LARs may alter the actions of an individual, for example, an injured soldier may be unsure how to react when confronted by a

---

\(^{12}\) Right to Remedy: [http://www.hrw.org/sites/default/files/reports/arms0514_ForUpload_0.pdf](http://www.hrw.org/sites/default/files/reports/arms0514_ForUpload_0.pdf)

robot and his different response may make the autonomous weapon system misinterpret him as a threat.

It is imperative to note that the deployment of LARs that supersedes human physical ability would give an invaluable military advantage against the opposing state. It could possibly lead to an imbalance in power between technologically advanced MEDCs and LEDCs that lack the resources and funds to develop these lethal robots. This has been previously seen in the advancements of nuclear warfare that has made certain countries much more powerful than others. Previous claims that state that the use of LARs reduces the loss of lives of military personnel are inconsiderate of the fact that it results in more deaths of the soldiers on the opposing side of combat.

Even though the use of autonomous weapon systems does not inevitably result in the victory of combat, they increase the chances of it, which may lead to disastrous consequences such as proliferation or an arms race.

**Benefits of Lethal Autonomous Robotics**

An important advantage of using LARs (Lethal Autonomous Robotics) in combat in terms of protecting human life is the lack of bias. As a result of highly advanced artificial intelligence and lack of human emotion and bias the LARs will not be victim to making decisions out of revenge, preconception, fear, hatred and anger. Another benefit is that the robots will only carry out actions they are programmed to do so hence they will not intentionally torture, harm, assault or mock civilian populations. The LARs guarantees the states complete transparency and loyalty, as they will act for the government before any personal self-interest. However, it is imperative to note, that this same lack of bias may serve as a disadvantage in complex combat situations as the LARs may indiscriminately kill civilians too as they lack the high behavioral perception humans posses.

Dispatching LARs further reduces casualties, as not only will they result in fewer soldiers on the battlefield but also LARs have the greater ability to protect the lives of the soldiers on their same side. Moreover, autonomous robotics don’t act in self-preservation and can be used in battle for self-sacrificing tasks without any reservations or doubt. They may also improve the quality of life of their own military personnel’s as they can be programmed to carry out lowly and life-threatening tasks that soldiers are presently required to perform. In addition, these weapons may be costly to create at first, but they reduce military expenditure in the long run as they cut down the costs of salaries, food and shelter required to be provided to military personnel.
Major Countries and Organizations Involved

The United States of America

The United States of America has developed an overtly accessible national policy on autonomous weapon systems stating “autonomous and semi-autonomous weapon systems shall be designed to allow commanders and operators to exercise appropriate levels of human judgment over the use of force.” The American government is pioneering these technological developments and is eager to move into the direction creating autonomous weapons for the purpose of reducing casualties by taking soldiers off the battlefield. The United States of America is also one of the pioneers in the use of supervised autonomous robotics with over 7000 UCAVs currently in use by the US Military. The US Navy has also worked in conjunction with Northrop Grumman (the main contractor) to develop the X-47B UCAS for the unmanned combat air system carrier demonstration programme.

Israel and South Korea

Israel and South Korea have both allotted resources into developing automated lethal robotics, although none have confirmed whether they are developing any fully autonomous weapon systems. Both these states have dispatched automated sentry guns; these sentinels are semi-autonomous and can search and detect targets, but require a human officer to make the decision to fire.

Pakistan

Pakistan, being a victim of drone attacks, has fervently asked the United Nations for a pre-emptive ban on killer robots at the summit on lethal autonomous weapons as it would lead to unjust and one-sided killing. Pakistan heavily opposes LARs by making several statements including how the lower military expenditure allowed by LARs would make going to warfare more accessible than the last-resort it is now. The state has also

made several statements regarding the ethical issues of fully autonomous weapons and stated the lack of human judgment and morality would make combat more inhumane.

Ambassador Zamir Akram, the permanent representative of Pakistan to the UN stated in the 68th session of the UNGA that, ‘States that possess LARs can't afford to be complacent that such capabilities will not proliferate and hence they too shall become vulnerable unless the production of LARs is curtailed under an international regime’.  

Human Rights Watch

“Action is needed now, before killer robots cross the line from science fiction to feasibility” – Steve Goose, Arms Division director at Human Rights Watch. Human Rights Watch is one of the leading organizations against LARs. Human Rights Watch has worked in conjunction with the International Human Rights Clinic and asked for an international agreement that would forbid any development, production and use of LARs. Human Rights Watch has also published many reports regarding the human rights implications of fully autonomous systems such as “Shaking the Foundations” and “Mind the Gap”. The organization has also called upon individual states to develop policies prohibiting the manufacture and use of LARs on a domestic platform. Human Rights Watch is also the coordinator of the ‘Campaign to Stop Killer Robots’.

International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC)

The ICRC is an international committee consisting of experts in fields such as robotic ethics and technology as well international humanitarian and human rights law. The ICRC has been very critical of the human rights implications of LARs and is highly concerned about the dangers that military robots pose on both international security and civilians in war. The ICRC has published the report ‘International Humanitarian Law and the challenges of contemporary armed conflicts’ in 2011 that sparked apprehension about LARs.

16 Quote From: http://www.hrw.org/sites/default/files/reports/arms0514_ForUpload_0.pdf
and called on states to consider all the ethical, humanitarian and legal issues raised before developing them.

Dr. Matthew Bolton (a member of ICRC) addressed the UNGA First Committee on 30th October 2013, and called for an urgent need for a disarmament approach primarily driven by the rights of the people affected, as opposed to the discretion of states responsible for the arms and technology.\textsuperscript{17}

**United Kingdom**

At the debate on fully autonomous weapons at the UNHRC in Geneva, that took place on 9th April 2013 the United Kingdom stated its stance of not supporting an international preemptive ban on LARs and deemed that the existing rules on fully autonomous weapon systems were sufficient. However, on 17th June 2013, the UK Minister for Counter Proliferation emphasized that UK is not in possession of LARs and has no intentions of developing them. The Minister further clarified previous statements by claiming that the understanding of the existing international law in regard to weapons by the UK Government prohibits the development of fully autonomous weapon systems.

**Sri Lanka**

Sri Lanka has pointed out its concerns and the threat of international security that may arise by the possession of LARs as drawing upon from the experience of nuclear weapons.\textsuperscript{18}

**Timeline of Events**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description of event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13\textsuperscript{th} October, 1995</td>
<td>Protocol IV was adopted that called for a pre-emptive ban that prohibited the use and transfer of blinding laser weapons at the International Red Cross</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{17} Statements from: http://icrac.net/2013/10/icrac-member-and-campaign-to-stop-killer-robots-deliver-statements-at-the-un-general-assembly-first-committee/

\textsuperscript{18} Statements from: http://www.asiantribune.com/node/86777
Conference

18th June, 2004
First armed drone strike by USA under President George W. Bush, it killed approximately 5-8 people in South Waziristan, a province in northwest Pakistan.

2006
Samsung announces that its defense subsidiary Samsung Techwin has developed a military robot sentry named SGR-A1 for South Korea.

September, 2009
Formation of the International Committee for Robot Arms Control (ICRAC)

4th February, 2011
First flight of Northrop Grumman X-47B, the unmanned combat air vehicle of the United States of America

April, 2013
This date marked the launch of the ‘Campaign to Stop Killer Robots’ aimed at preemptively banning lethal autonomous robotics

Chirstof Heyns (the special rapporteur to the United Nations on extrajudicial killing) presents a report to the UNHRC that portrays numerous objections towards this rising technology.

30th May, 2013
At the UNHRC in Geneva, the first international debate on the use of fully autonomous weapon systems takes place

One of the most fatal drone strikes by USA in Pakistan that consisted of two missiles fired at a house near a popular markaz in Miranshah, Pakistan killing approximately 16-18 and injuring 5 people.

May, 2014
The Convention on Conventional Weapons holds an expert meeting on lethal autonomous weapon systems.

The meeting of Experts on Lethal Autonomous Weapon Systems (LAWS) was held in Geneva within the structure of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW)

Relevant UN Treaties and Events

- Report of Christof Heyns the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions (A/HRC/23/47)
• 2013 session of the United Nations CCW meeting of the High Contracting Parties to the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons (CC1/MS/2013/CRP.1)

**Previous Attempts to Resolve the Issue**

The regulation of technological and robotic development is a very controversial and difficult issue, primarily due to the fact that most of the ongoing scientific development in this field is not open knowledge shared between states and instead is a part of classified and under-the-wraps operations. In addition, there is a blurring line between the management of such robotics. Autonomous robotics can be employed in armed conflict even for non-lethal intentions such as diffusing explosive devices.

April 2013 saw the launch of the ‘Campaign to Stop Killer Robots’, which highlights the ethical, and human rights implications of using lethal autonomous robotics. The campaign is coordinated by the International Organization ‘Human Rights Watch’, and includes 55 international, regional and non-governmental organizations including Amnesty International and the International Committee for Robot Arms Control. This movement endorses the call for a preemptive ban on lethal autonomous robotics. This preemptive ban would serve as both a protective and preventive measure because it would eradicate the necessity of solving any foreseeable problems that may occur in the future as a result of using these autonomous weapon systems. On the contrary, several proponents of autonomous robotics contend that the preemptive ban on any production and development of LARs is premature as it eradicates scope for positive technological improvements and war technologies that may reduce loss of lives by making targeting and firing decisions more precise and better controlled. This campaign is ongoing and is working towards a preemptive ban, however, this is seeming to be extremely difficult as it's not easy for the campaign to reach the common public, who have been already debating the use of artificial intelligence in military. The problem stems from false and glamorized notions of the public that stem from the fiction and ideas of menacing looking robots. Another conflict faced by the campaign is the challenge of the new laws and regulations that should apply. It is important to determine which type of humanitarian laws will be required and under whose oversight will they be implemented.

Several technological and robotics experts including Stephen Hawking and Elon Musk were signatories of a letter presented to the International Joint Conference on AI in Buenos Aires on 27th July, 2015. The content of the letter warned the potential of extensive
destruction and an impending international arms race that will threaten peace and security. The letter called for a pre-emptive ban on autonomous weapon systems. Moreover, Stephen Hawking suggested that Artificial Intelligence ‘could spell the end of the human race’.19

Furthermore, a chief issue faced by most campaigns, organizations and conferences dealing with autonomy, is the determination of a threshold of autonomy. There is considerable debate on the minimal level that needs to be set for a system to be deemed as fully autonomous and hence banned. It should prove important that there are no loopholes around which complex artificial intelligence systems that are autonomous may fall under the other category and be deployed. An important task for the international community will be to come up with a comprehensive consensus on this question that will be accepted by states as well as non-governmental organizations.

Possible Solutions

It is imperative to consider that the issue of the human rights implications of lethal autonomous robotics is a global one and any decision for or against the pre-emptive ban on these autonomous weapon systems has to be a unanimous one to prevent an arms race and threats to international security.

The International Committee for Robot Arms Control (ICRAC) has called up the international community to discuss issues on LARs including the preemptive ban on any autonomous nuclear weapon delivery system as well as questions regarding the restrictions, regulation and transparency of LARs that should be tackled.

Regulation of lethal autonomous robotics

A solution proposed by several proponents of LARs is the established of strict regulations of LARs instead of a prohibition on this technology. Some possible regulations could include a strict and concise determination of which situation LARs could be deployed in, as well as the number in which they could be deployed. There could be several other rules that require human military personnel to be in armed combat alongside LARs to prevent any technical problems and issues of hacking etc. Proponents further contend that it is highly unlikely that all the supreme powers may unanimously agree on the preemptive

ban and if some countries do not comply and continue to develop these weapons it may threaten international security.

Moreover, if the regulatory scheme is deemed unsuccessful and the last resort- a ban is considered indispensable then it will be simpler to develop the ban on the existing regulatory scheme as opposed to creating one from nothing. There would be a dire need to create a regulatory protocol that would consist of rules overriding the use of LARs as well as eradicating the chances of proliferation of these weapons. Another requirement would be the development of concise criteria that will determine if the deployment of LARs should be permitted. However, there are questions raised as to once these weapon systems are allowed to develop states may not agree to comply to regulations as seeing the tremendous military advantage they provide.

**No-Fault compensation system**

A No-Fault Compensation system is a legal system that provides no-fault insurance to victims, regardless of liability. This system allows the insured to be given compensation not considering which party would be held liable under the ordinary common law rules.

The question of compensation and ‘The Right to Remedy’ could possibly be resolved by the creation of a No-Fault Compensation System that applies to complex fully autonomous weapon systems and artificial intelligence. The victims would have the ability to file a suit against the countries government, which used an LAR that caused any civilian harm, and compulsory compensation would be due. The violation of the ‘right to remedy’ as well as appropriate repatriation would be an obligation that falls under both international humanitarian law as well as international criminal law. Hence, any case (for example a war crime or a crime against humanity by LARs) under this category would be granted jurisdiction by a national or international criminal tribunal. Although, the decision of any individual accountability would be under a mandate of international humanitarian law, the final decision would be executed through international criminal law. However, it is arguable that this measure does not provide any meaningful accountability or moral blame. The victims may not get satisfaction or closure as the fully autonomous weapon system would not be ostracized by society or deemed as something that wronged. Furthermore, it is highly unlikely that many governments would be willing enforce this legal regime.

**Involvement of International Judicial Bodies**

The International Court of Justice (ICJ) could investigate cases that involve the use of lethal autonomous robots that are controversial and litigious between states, if the states
accept submitting to the court’s jurisdiction. This could be both for only a specific case or optionally accepting the court’s jurisdiction for future cases on the same issue as well. Furthermore, on appeal by the UNGA and the Security Council the ICJ could put forward an advisory opinion on contentious legal issues surfacing due to the use of lethal autonomous weapon systems in conflict. However, as mentioned before the states cannot be compelled to submit these cases and accept any jurisdiction, hence without compulsory legal enforcement, other measures need to be implemented to make this idea effective and foolproof.
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