Appendix 2. A summary table of typical responses

Q9				

	Human	Machine	N/A I do not know
Trust in decision-making	15	9	29

1. Trust in people's decisions
- A machine may have no emotions and stay calm in some situations, but I would prefer a human for tough decisions. I know a person makes mistakes and but a person takes responsibility. We're equal, and we are both human, neither is a machine.
- I wouldn't trust a robot, whether or not to turn a person off from the artificial respiration apparatus to judge a patient's life and death. Everything else can be allowed, with some concessions.
- I would not trust machines to solve any ethical issues. I don't think robots should be trusted to do social work or give psychological help. That's what a person has to do.

1. Trust in machine's decisions
- I would trust an autonomous robot within household appliances. In geological studies, I would trust robots to work in mining shafts.
- In theory, a self-driving car reacts many times faster than a person and is more capable of foreseeing and avoiding dangers.
- In computational, if something needs to be calculated, then surely a machine is trusted. A person can always make a mistake.
- Decisions made by machines, based on statistics, are better than they would have been if humans had made them. Man cannot comprehend as much statistical information as a machine can.

2. Accountability (number of associations). Who should be responsible for the consequences of the decisions made by the autonomous machine?

Commander	Chief of Defense	State Liability	Operator	Software engineer	Head of State
9	7	5	3	3	2

- The responsibility lies on the superior who gave an order, whether to machine or soldier. The soldier/machine is just the executor.
- Not a software engineer. The military leadership or the officer who gave the order.
- I think only the military can be responsible for this.

Q10	1. Preference of soldier vs. machine (number of associations)

	Soldier	Machine	Both	N/A
1. in defense	9	22	3	19
2. attacked by	17	16	-	20

1.1 Preference in defense
- If you can assign the task to a person or a machine, assign the task to the machine.
- We would choose to have machines. The fewer casualties there are, the better.
- I want to be protected by people, so I know who is responsible for my life. When a machine does something terrible, then I don't know who is responsible.
- I also want people to defend me, because human behavior is more predictable than machines.
- I trust a person more than a machine. At least based on the knowledge we have right now.

	1.2 Attacked by machines or soldiers – I think the combination, in the sense that it would be good to have machines on the border, would give more security if real persons were moving among us. – I'd rather see people on both sides. It would give an objective insight; how big the losses are and perhaps enable to end the war more quickly. – Let the same size fight each other, not in a way that soldiers against technology. There must be equality. – If the opponent has a better arsenal, a technology we can't even face, how can we prefer machines? We can prefer machines only if we know exactly what machines opponents have.

Q11

	Right, ethical	Wrong, unethical	Both	N/A
Development of AWS	7	7	13	26

1. Ethical
– The development is right, of course, because machines are used in situations and places where it is dangerous or uncomfortable for people to be.
– Most of the things produced for war are later used in the civilian field. I'm optimistic in that sense. The things that are currently being developed enthusiastically will still find use somewhere in the future.

2. Unethical
– I can't even give you a reason, but it's just that the human dimension is disappearing there, and I don't think that's right.

3. Both
– That depends on the concrete situation and whether the development of unmanned vehicles is ethical or not. If a machine is not making real decisions, then it's ethical. But if they build killing machines, I don't think it's ethical.

4. N/A
– I can't tell you, it's a complicated question. It all depends on many circumstances; it is difficult for me to take a stand on this issue.
– I would say there is no right or wrong answer here. I also can't tell if it is ethical or unethical. War is war.

Q12

	Ban	Develop	N/A
Should the development of AWS prohibited or not?	7	13	26

1. Ban
– Where people's lives may be put at risk, they should not act on their own. Such killing weapons would rather be gone.
– Why is it necessary to make weapons first and only afterward use them as household appliances? Why not directly invent civil society things and develop what people need? It doesn't have to come through war, through the development of military equipment.
– Autonomy could be in areas where lives are independent of machines.

2. Develop
– What is being developed as a military technique will later be used in the civilian field.
– You're just forced to develop these things. It is necessary to agree on what they will be used.
– This arms race is like a development spiral; if possible, make agreements. The arms race is not good, but it is not sensible to step off this ladder.

3. N/A

	– I tried to formulate my point of view somehow, but I didn't have any good ideas on this subject, no opinion. – I would recommend using experts, not people from the street. It determines very little in general. – In addition to developing this technology, we should develop a person, develop a completely different way of thinking.