



offered assurances that such operations are a more precise alternative to boots on the ground and are authorized only when an “imminent” threat is present and there is “near certainty” that the intended target will be eliminated. How do you see such a “policy”, that of substituting boots on the grounds by drones?

**Peter Tatchell:** Drones serve the same purpose as boots on the ground. They are merely a different way of achieving the same military objective.

The drone strategy of the US armed forces is intended to improve target-hit accuracy and enhance the elimination of enemy combatants, while reducing civilian and US military deaths.

But the reality is that flawed intelligence has led to civilian casualties, including the killing of wedding parties and others.

**Edu Montesanti: Professor Doctor Azadeh Shahshahani**, a respected lawyer at the American Civil Liberties Union, recently observed to me that:

a) In the domestic (US) context, they be used for artistic or investigative purposes. For example, they can be used to investigate agribusinesses to see if they are engaging in animal abuse or not. In that sense, they can play an important and legitimate role. However, their use needs to be regulated to ensure that they are used for surveillance by law enforcement agencies.;

b) Per international humanitarian law, drones can only be used as bombs in an active armed conflict and even then with certain restrictions including military necessity, humanity, distinction, and [proportionality](#). Only combatants or civilians who are directly participating in hostilities may be targeted. Targeting of other civilians is prohibited and may constitute a war crime

How much the US government is respecting these principles, Peter, using drones both as surveillance and bombs?

**Peter Tatchell:** Drones can be used for benign purposes, such as monitoring bushfires and floods, delivering aid to remote earthquake victims and finding sailors lost at sea.

The US use of drones for military purposes is purportedly restricted and within the confines of the international laws of war.

However, civilians are being killed. In some cases, it looks like these deaths may have been the result of the reckless use of unreliable intelligence sources or broad-brush indiscriminate targeting.

These instances may amount to war crimes.

**Edu Montesanti:** What do you think of the UK government historically supporting US attacks with drones and surveillance, including using it in the Great Britain to spy?

**Peter Tatchell:** The UK complicity with US drone attacks and surveillance is too open ended. London seems to not ask questions or assess consequences.

Britain’s ‘special relationship’ with Washington often involves giving the Pentagon a free

hand. What the US wants, the US gets.

**Edu Montesanti:** Contrary to Barack Obama, President Donald Trump has given the Central Intelligence Agency new authority to conduct drone attacks against suspected militants. Your view, please, Peter.

**Peter Tatchell:** The problem is mostly not drones *per se*, but the military strategy and decisions that direct their use. It is the military and targeting policy that needs to change.

Drones are sometimes used as a way of circumventing congressional and public opposition to troop deployment. They become tools for the subversion of the democratic process.

*Featured image is from PravdaReport*

*This article was first published by [Pravda Report](#).*

The original source of this article is Global Research  
Copyright © [Peter Tatchell](#) and [Edu Montesanti](#), Global Research, 2017

---

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Peter Tatchell](#)  
and [Edu Montesanti](#)

**Disclaimer:** The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: [publications@globalresearch.ca](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)

[www.globalresearch.ca](http://www.globalresearch.ca) contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: [publications@globalresearch.ca](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)