

---

Subject: Slightly less ridiculous than the "gay-bomb"..  
Posted by [IRON FART](#) on Sun, 23 Jan 2005 23:45:04 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/click/rss/0.91/public/-/2/hi/americas/4199935.stm>

They are supposed to be deployed soon.  
Talk about "robot-wars."

---

---

Subject: Slightly less ridiculous than the "gay-bomb"..  
Posted by [warranto](#) on Sun, 23 Jan 2005 23:48:19 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Meh, one innocent killed because there was no human there to verify, and the project will be scrapped (unfortunatly). Visual verification can only work so well when you're half a mile away.

---

---

Subject: Slightly less ridiculous than the "gay-bomb"..  
Posted by [msgtpain](#) on Sun, 23 Jan 2005 23:54:19 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

yea., and exactly how effective are they against RPG's and road-side bombs? There are 18 of them on their way, how many "days" will those last.

---

---

Subject: Slightly less ridiculous than the "gay-bomb"..  
Posted by [Sir Phoenixx](#) on Mon, 24 Jan 2005 01:02:07 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I don't really think it would be practical for use with machine guns patrolling/assaulting/etc., a soldier can easily move around obstacles, climb walls, ladders, etc., while the little robot can't. Until they can come up with Terminator like robots, actual soldiers will be the better choice.

Now, for something like assassination where the robot would just need to sit on the side of a mountain with a heavy sniper rifle and wait for the target to come out, it would be much better then actual people.

---

---

Subject: Slightly less ridiculous than the "gay-bomb"..  
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Mon, 24 Jan 2005 01:50:55 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I think theyre cool. Have you guys ever seen teh RC type All terrain vehicles with enough firepower to bring down a tank? I saw em on Future Fighting Machines. They are pretty sweet.

---

---

Subject: Slightly less ridiculous than the "gay-bomb"...

Posted by [PointlessAmbler](#) on Wed, 02 Feb 2005 03:22:26 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Sir Phoenixxl don't really think it would be practical for use with machine guns patrolling/assaulting/etc., a soldier can easily move around obstacles, climb walls, ladders, etc., while the little robot can't. Until they can come up with Terminator like robots, actual soldiers will be the better choice.

Now, for something like assassination where the robot would just need to sit on the side of a mountain with a heavy sniper rifle and wait for the target to come out, it would be much better than actual people.

Sure, a soldier is more useful, but I think they wanted to use this as a simple armed patrol device that could potentially save the lives of some US soldiers. One destroyed robot is a lot less of a loss than one dead soldier.

---

---

Subject: Slightly less ridiculous than the "gay-bomb"...

Posted by [Vitaminous](#) on Wed, 02 Feb 2005 03:25:52 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

PointlessAmblerSure, a soldier is more useful, but I think they wanted to use this as a simple armed patrol device that could potentially save the lives of some US soldiers. One destroyed robot is a lot less of a loss than one dead soldier.

Uhh, financially no, but towards the eyes of the American society, yes.

---

---

Subject: Slightly less ridiculous than the "gay-bomb"...

Posted by [Nodbugger](#) on Wed, 02 Feb 2005 03:27:36 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Just like they said on Battle Bots

"I wonder what these other countries think when we build things that can take over their entire country in our spare time"

---

---

Subject: Slightly less ridiculous than the "gay-bomb"...

Posted by [PointlessAmbler](#) on Wed, 02 Feb 2005 03:27:48 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Lives are irreplaceable. Money can be reraised, and the US Military has it coming out of their ears anyway.

EDIT: Nodbugger wins.

---

---

Subject: Slightly less ridiculous than the "gay-bomb"...

Posted by [SuperMidget](#) on Wed, 02 Feb 2005 13:30:22 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Wow, this is a dawn of a new era...mech wars.

Seriously! Look:

Quote:Unlike its human counterparts, the armed robot does not require food, clothing, training, motivation or a pension

When I read this, I thought, "Why would they keep hiring GI's then in the future?" It's cheaper and more efficient. Maybe this IS the dawn of the future. Scary...

---

---

Subject: Slightly less ridiculous than the "gay-bomb"...

Posted by [icedog90](#) on Wed, 02 Feb 2005 20:39:06 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I think this is awesome technology, but I also agree with a lot of other people here.

---

---

Subject: Slightly less ridiculous than the "gay-bomb"...

Posted by [IRON FART](#) on Thu, 03 Feb 2005 01:19:20 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I don't think they can match anything a human can do.

---

---

Subject: Slightly less ridiculous than the "gay-bomb"...

Posted by [YSLMuffins](#) on Thu, 03 Feb 2005 03:49:47 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Perhaps this will set a nice precedent. In the future, we won't even need people to fight wars!

---

---

Subject: Slightly less ridiculous than the "gay-bomb"...

Posted by [icedog90](#) on Thu, 03 Feb 2005 04:24:00 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

IRON-FARTI don't think they can match anything a human can do.

|  
v

PointlessAmblerSure, a soldier is more useful, but I think they wanted to use this as a simple armed patrol device that could potentially save the lives of some US soldiers. One destroyed

robot is a lot less of a loss than one dead soldier.

---

---

Subject: Slightly less ridiculous than the "gay-bomb"..  
Posted by [Vitaminous](#) on Thu, 03 Feb 2005 05:05:22 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

YSLMuffinsPerhaps this will set a nice precedent. In the future, we won't even need people to fight wars!

And then they'll get smarter and refuse to fight our wars.

---

---

Subject: Slightly less ridiculous than the "gay-bomb"..  
Posted by [IRON FART](#) on Thu, 03 Feb 2005 06:19:35 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

LOL

They will take over the world.

---

---

Subject: Slightly less ridiculous than the "gay-bomb"..  
Posted by [icedog90](#) on Thu, 03 Feb 2005 06:47:14 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Then it'll be like Terminator.

---

---

Subject: Slightly less ridiculous than the "gay-bomb"..  
Posted by [Sir Phoenixx](#) on Thu, 03 Feb 2005 15:38:32 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

First you'd have to give them AI, as long as you don't do that, they won't be able to think for themselves...

All they have to do is make realistic robots that don't have any intelligence apart from how to control their body in reaction to the environment and the person controlling them.

---

---

Subject: Slightly less ridiculous than the "gay-bomb"..  
Posted by [Weirdo](#) on Thu, 03 Feb 2005 17:10:48 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Quote:Eighteen of the 1m-high robots, equipped with cameras and operated by remote control,

are going to Iraq this spring, the Associated Press reports.

I doubt they actually have their own real AI. So there is no danger in them attacking the wrong side. Unless of course, the enemy actually finds a way to hack the remote signals and creates its own remote controls. Although the military of course has a way better encryption than normal computers.

---