

**MAY 2017**

---

**AUTONOMOUS  
VEHICLES**

---

**JUSTINE BRIAN**



DEBATING MATTERS  
**TOPIC  
GUIDES**

[www.debatingmatters.com](http://www.debatingmatters.com)

**MOTION:**

**“AUTONOMOUS  
VEHICLES WILL  
MAKE DRIVING  
SAFER”**

**IN PARTNERSHIP WITH:**

**Institute of Ideas**

**CATAPULT**  
Transport Systems

## ABOUT DEBATING MATTERS

Debating Matters because ideas matter. This is the premise of the Institute of Ideas Debating Matters Competition for sixth form students which emphasises substance, not just style, and the importance of taking ideas seriously. Debating Matters presents schools with an innovative and engaging approach to debating, where the real-world debates and a challenging format, including panel judges who engage with the students, appeal to students from a wide range of backgrounds, including schools with a long tradition of debating and those with none.

# SUPPORTED BY

### PRIMARY FUNDER



### HEADLINE PRIZE SPONSOR



### REGIONAL SPONSORS



### CHAMPIONS



### QUALIFYING ROUND SPONSOR



### TOPIC GUIDE SPONSOR



### ALUMNI CHAMPION



### VENUE PARTNERS



# CONTENTS

**Introduction**

**Key terms**

**The Autonomous Vehicles debate in context**

**Essential reading**

**Organisations**

**Backgrounders**

**Audio/Visual**

**In the news**

## KEY TERMS

[Artificial intelligence \(AI\)](#)

[Autonomous car](#)

[Google self-driving car](#)

[LUTZ Pathfinder](#)

# INTRODUCTION

**1 of 6**

# NOTES

1  
1  
2  
4  
4  
5  
6  
6

In 2015 the UK's first self-driving pod - the LUTZ Pathfinder – was made public by the government-funded Transport Systems Catapult [Ref: [Transport Systems Catapult](#)]. This follows in the wake of the launch in 2010 of technology giant Google's Self-Driving Car project to “make driving safer, more enjoyable and more efficient.” [Ref: [Google](#)] Google asked us to imagine a point where: “Deaths from traffic accidents—over 1.2 million worldwide every year—could be reduced dramatically, especially since 94% of accidents in the U.S. involve human error” [Ref: [Google](#)], and Transport Systems Catapult additionally suggest that we could see, “a marked reduction in congestion as well as... benefits to the environment” from autonomous vehicles [Ref: [Transport Systems Catapult](#)]. The idea of ‘autonomous vehicles’ isn't a new one [Ref: [Computer History Museum](#)], but the advent of these projects has caused both excitement and concern. Supporters of the new technology argue that: “The strongest case for self-driving cars is safety” [Ref: [Guardian](#)], whilst others are concerned that self-driving cars, “introduce a whole new category of road user...that entirely lacks an understanding that all those road users share” [Ref: [Slate](#)], and question how this new automated technology will integrate into a human-controlled and human-centred environment. The recent fatal crash of a Tesla car [Ref: [Wired](#)] in the USA [Ref: [ABC News](#)] has brought into focus the possible limitations of the technology, with some arguing that talk of automation and ‘autopilots’ “encourage people to think that the systems are more capable than they really are, and that is a serious problem.” [Ref: [Scientific American](#)] So is the future of driving a safer, autonomous one, or is that still a futuristic dream? What are the pros and cons of this new technology?



### Safety first

One of the key motivations given for a move to autonomous cars is improving road safety. Cars that are able to anticipate risky situations and avoid them will, it is argued, reduce road-traffic accidents, “helping to make the roads safer for everyone.” [Ref: [Telegraph](#)] The small fleet of Google automated cars (both commercial makes and Google’s own prototype) have driven over a million miles within California since 2009 [Ref: [Telegraph](#)], but in February this year one of their vehicles had an accident and collided with a public transport bus [Ref: [Financial Times](#)], with Google admitting the computer made an “incorrect assumption about where [the bus] would go”, and that the crash would not be the last [Ref: [Daily Mail](#)]. That incident is considered an important moment, not only because it’s the first one where the technology has been deemed to bear ‘some responsibility’ for the incident [Ref: [Daily Mail](#)], but because it highlights the concerns of some about the safety of driverless cars more broadly. Whilst future autonomous vehicles might be able to safely “navigate roads, they don’t think like humans”, and some question whether autonomous cars can really be safe in an environment where they need to interact with humans, and as such, it will be difficult for them to “cope with the uncertainty and complexity of human behaviour.” [Ref: [Popular Mechanics](#)] But others call for perspective on the Google car crash, and ask us to consider “the number of crashes that occurred on the same day that were the result of human behaviour.” [Ref: [BBC News](#)]

### Man vs Machine

For writer Carl Franzen, “the biggest issue with self-driving cars lies in their inability to make moral and ethical decisions for which human drivers have so far been almost entirely responsible. Would-be autonomous carmakers might be uncomfortable programming such choices into their systems, but human drivers make such momentous split-second decisions with regularity.” [Ref: [Popular Mechanics](#)] The development of artificial intelligence (AI), including in transport, has led some to consider ethical and moral questions about introducing this new technology into our lives. Human drivers make constant judgements – practical and moral – especially about the safety of ourselves and those around us, but will computers be programmed to do the same, and if so what decisions will their algorithms make? “Here is the nature of the dilemma. Imagine that in the not-too-distant future, you own a self-driving car. One day, while you are driving along, an unfortunate set of events causes the car to head toward a crowd of 10 people crossing the road. It cannot stop in time but it can avoid killing 10 people by steering into a wall. However, this collision would kill you, the owner and occupant. What should it do?” [Ref: [MIT Technology Review](#)] Others contest that: “When machines take over, the work required of the human is typically not removed”, but rather our interaction with cars changes, and instead we will be a “monitor—one who constantly watches to detect and correct technology failures” and that we should welcome “a cooperative effort between humans and technology—one where the human plays a vital, active role in systems that optimize the interaction between the driver and the technology” [Ref: [Newsweek](#)].



## Who takes responsibility?

One of the key questions in the debate about autonomous vehicles is who will be responsible in the event of an accident, and if we can hold a machine to account as we do people. The UK government has already begun to put in place legislation to allow automated vehicles onto UK roads and to be insured under existing policies by 2020 [Ref: [Auto Express](#)]. But some argue that even if the law and ethics of autonomous vehicles are resolved: “Insurers still need to make confident judgments about risk, and this will be very difficult.” [Ref: [Atlantic](#)] To be able to make such judgements about risks, and responsibilities, the law currently requires someone, or something, to be ultimately accountable for decisions made. That raises the interesting idea of extending to robots ‘legal personhood’ which, argues one commentator, is “less about what is or is not a flesh-and-blood person and who/ what is or is not able to be hauled into court.” [Ref: [Atlantic](#)] But British transport writer Christian Wolmar argues that our current focus on automation is misplaced and that even if the “legal, social, economic, political and practical” issues are resolved, an automated “takeover of the mainstream transport system is about as likely as the long-awaited arrival of the futuristic jet packs of 1960s comic books.” [Ref: [New Statesman](#)] Yet Google and other developers point to the prospect of the new technology opening up driving and mobility to many more of us, meaning, “everyone could get around easily and safely, regardless of their ability to drive. Ageing or visually impaired loved ones wouldn’t have to give up their independence. Time spent commuting could be time spent doing what you want to do.” [Ref: [Google](#)] So is a move to automation an unquestionable good for society, a threat to life, or a pipe dream?



## ESSENTIAL READING

[Where to? A history of autonomous vehicles](#)

Computer History Museum 2016

### FOR

[Safety first: the future of driving](#)

Tim Gibson *Telegraph* 15 January 2016

[Self-driving cars: safe, reliable – but a challenging sell for Google](#)

Jemima Kiss *Guardian* 6 October 2015

[Driving should be illegal](#)

Kevon Roose *Fusion* 5 October 2015

[Google's self-driving cars are ridiculously safe](#)

Robert Montenegro *Big Think* June 2015

### AGAINST

[Transport's favourite myth: why we will never own driverless cars](#)

Christian Wolmar *New Statesman* 10 April 2016

[The big question about driverless cars no one seems able to answer](#)

Brian Fung *Washington Post* 17 February 2016

[Sorry to disappoint, but driverless cars will still need drivers](#)

Michael Nees *Newsweek* 10 May 2015

[Why self-driving cars aren't ready to share the road with humans](#)

Carl Franzen *Popular Mechanics* 5 February 2015

## IN DEPTH

[Why self-driving cars must be programmed to kill](#)

*MIT Technology Review* 22 October 2015

[The driverless car debate: how safe are autonomous vehicles?](#)

Lauren Keating *Tech Times* 28 July 2015

[The moral challenges of driverless cars](#)

Keith Kirkpatrick *Communications* 2015

## ORGANISATIONS

[Google](#)

[Transport Systems Catapult](#)

4 of 6

NOTES



## BACKGROUNDERS

[Deadly Tesla crash exposes confusion over automated driving](#)

Larry Greenemeier *Scientific American* 8 July 2016

[Tesla 'Autopilot' crash raises concerns about self-driving cars](#)

NPR 1 July 2016

[Can self-driving cars cope with illogical humans?](#)

Mark Prig *Daily Mail* 14 March 2016

[Driverless cars pose worrying questions of life and death](#)

Andy Sharman *Financial Times* 20 January 2016

[Google's self-driving cars aren't as good as humans—yet](#)

Alex Davies *Wired* 12 January 2016

[How can we make sure that driverless cars are safe?](#)

Matt McFarland *Los Angeles Times* 22 December 2015

[Humans are slamming into driverless cars and exposing a key flaw](#)

Keith Naughton *Bloomberg* 8 December 2015

[Uber and out: is there a future for driving?](#)

*Battle of Ideas* 17 October 2015

[Tesla's cars now drive themselves, kinda](#)

Molly McHugh *Wired* 14 October 2015

[When humans and robots share the roads](#)

Adrienne Lafrance *Atlantic* 9 October 2015

[Future proofing: Mobility](#)

*BBC Radio 4* 26 September 2015

[If a self-driving car gets in an accident, who—or what—is liable?](#)

Alexis C. Madrigal *Atlantic* 13 August 2014

[Driverless cars: increased road safety and efficiency or 'lethal weapons'?](#)

Oliver Balch *Guardian* 1 August 2014

[The cars we'll be driving in the world of 2050](#)

*BBC* 8 November 2013

[No one understands the scariest, most dangerous part of a self-driving car: Us](#)

Bianca Bosca *Huffington Post* 25 October 2013

[The ethics of autonomous cars](#)

Patrick Lin *Atlantic* 8 October 2013

[The trollable self-driving car](#)

Samuel English Anthony *Slate* 2012

[Self-driving car project](#)

*Google*

[Self-driving pods](#)

*Transport Systems Catapult*

5 of 6

NOTES



## IN THE NEWS

[Tesla's autopilot under investigation after fatal crash](#)

*ABC News* 1 July 2016

[Queen's Speech sets out new driverless car legislation](#)

*Auto Express* 18 May 2016

['Someone is going to die': experts warn lawmakers over self-driving cars](#)

*Guardian* 15 March 2016

[Google car crash 'not a surprise' - US transport secretary](#)

*BBC News* 14 March 2016

[Google self-driving car caught on video colliding with bus](#)

*Guardian* 9 March 2016

[BMW sees its future shift to ultimate self-driving machine](#)

*Bloomberg* 7 March 2016

[Ford boss claims the technology will become standard in just four years](#)

*Daily Mail* 23 February 2016

[Driverless cars: London wants Google vehicle trials](#)

*BBC News* 6 February 2016

[Autonomous vehicles will be safer, not perfect](#)

*Automotive News* 10 January 2016

[Self-driving vehicles expected on roads in next few years](#)

*China.org* 13 April 2015

[Driverless cars set to roll out for trials on UK roads](#)

*Guardian* 11 February 2015

[FBI warns driverless cars could be used as 'lethal weapons'](#)

*Guardian* 16 July 2014

[Google's driverless cars are 'safer' than human drivers](#)

*Telegraph* 29 October 2013

6 of 6

NOTES

## AUDIO/VISUAL

[Tesla 'Autopilot' crash raises concerns about self-driving cars](#)

*NPR* 1 July 2016

[Uber and out: is there a future for driving?](#)

*Battle of Ideas* 17 October 2015

[Future proofing: Mobility](#)

*BBC Radio 4* 26 September 2015



## ADVICE FOR DEBATING MATTERS



### FOR STUDENTS

#### READ EVERYTHING .....

In the Topic Guide and in the news - not just your side of the argument either.

#### STATISTICS ARE GOOD BUT.....

Your opponents will have their own too. They'll support your points but they aren't a substitute for them.

#### BE BOLD

Get straight to the point but don't rush into things: make sure you aren't falling back on earlier assertions because interpreting a debate too narrowly might show a lack of understanding or confidence.

#### DON'T BACK DOWN

Try to take your case to its logical conclusion before trying to seem 'balanced' - your ability to challenge fundamental principles will be rewarded - even if you personally disagree with your arguments.

#### DON'T PANIC

Never assume you've lost because every question is an opportunity to explain what you know. Don't try to answer every question but don't avoid the tough ones either.

### FOR TEACHERS

Hoping to start a debating club? Looking for ways to give your debaters more experience? Debating Matters have a wide range of resources to help develop a culture of debate in your school and many more Topic Guides like this one to bring out the best in your students. For these and details of how to enter a team for the Debating Matters Competition visit our website, [www.debatingmatters.com](http://www.debatingmatters.com)

### FOR JUDGES

Judges are asked to consider whether students have been brave enough to address the difficult questions asked of them. Clever semantics might demonstrate an acrobatic mind but are also likely to hinder a serious discussion by changing the terms and parameters of the debate itself.

Whilst a team might demonstrate considerable knowledge and familiarity with the topic, evading difficult issues and failing to address the main substance of the debate misses the point of the competition. Judges are therefore encouraged to consider how far students have gone in defending their side of the motion, to what extent students have taken up the more challenging parts of the debate and how far the teams were able to respond to and challenge their opponents.

As one judge remarked *'These are not debates won simply by the rather technical rules of schools competitive debating. The challenge is to dig in to the real issues.'* This assessment seems to grasp the point and is worth bearing in mind when sitting on a judging panel.



**“A COMPLEX  
WORLD REQUIRES  
THE CAPACITY  
TO MARSHALL  
CHALLENGING IDEAS  
AND ARGUMENTS”**

**LORD BOATENG, FORMER BRITISH HIGH  
COMMISSIONER TO SOUTH AFRICA**