

**ADDITIONAL SUBMISSION BY REPRIEVE
ALL PARTY PARLIAMENTARY GROUP ON DRONES INQUIRY
“THE USE OF ARMED DRONES: WORKING WITH PARTNERS”**

Reprieve is an international human rights organisation which seeks to uphold the rule of law and the rights of individuals around the world. We provide free legal and investigative support to some of the world’s most vulnerable people: those facing execution, and those victimised by states’ abusive counter-terrorism policies – rendition, torture, illegal detention and extrajudicial killing.

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Reprieve welcomes the opportunity to submit additional evidence to the APPG’s inquiry on the United Kingdom’s cooperation with allies in the use of armed drones. This submission is supplementary to our principal submission of 7 April 2017, which detailed the ways in which the British Government aids and assists the US drone programme.¹
2. The opportunity to make submissions is particularly timely, in light of significant developments in US policy and practice on the use of lethal force both inside and outside armed conflict. Since Reprieve made its last submission, the Trump administration has presided over a massive escalation in the US drone programme, while simultaneously rolling back the limited safeguards the President Obama imposed in 2016.
3. Shortly after President Trump took office, the incoming US Defense Secretary General James Mattis referred to the new President’s first lethal action in Yemen as a “game changer”. This phrase accurately reflects the unprecedented brutality of the raid in question, but it also speaks to a wider reality that the UK must consider in its cooperation with the US around the use of armed drones. President Trump is a “game changer” for the US drone programme, and this must influence UK/US involvement in this area.
4. Reprieve is concerned that despite these significant changes in US policy and practice, the UK’s approach to cooperation with the US drone programme remains largely the same as under the Obama administration. Given the vastly different and more dangerous approach taken by the Trump Administration, there is a real risk that in providing the same level of assistance to US drone operations, the United Kingdom will be complicit in human rights abuses which kill innocents, breach international law and undermine our foreign policy objectives.
5. Unfortunately, the UK Government has refused to clarify what safeguards it is putting in place to address these new and alarming risks, or even whether it has considered the need for a change to current systems of cooperation in light of President Trump’s new approach. Instead, it has maintained a policy of constructive ambiguity regarding its partnership with the US, and continues to obfuscate as to the legal and policy basis for its continued, potentially unlawful cooperation with the US drone programme.
6. In light of these concerns, this supplementary submission will address the following issues:
 - I. Recent developments in US policy and practice affecting US-UK cooperation in the use of armed drones
 - II. The UK’s failure to respond effectively to changes in US policy and practice
 - III. Unanswered questions for the UK Government

II. RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN US POLICY AND PRACTICE AFFECTING US-UK COOPERATION IN THE USE OF ARMED DRONES

7. Since President Trump took office in January 2017, there has been a dramatic escalation of the US drone programme in tandem with a systematic weakening of the safeguards surrounding the use of drones.
8. Reprieve has carefully documented the expansion of US action under President Trump, which has been most marked in Yemen. Since January 2017, there have been at least 119 drone strikes in Yemen, which

have resulted in at least 163 deaths; this represents a 272% increase in drone strikes in Yemen as compared with the number of strikes taken by former President Obama in 2016.ⁱⁱ

9. In addition to the dramatic increase in the number of drone strikes, President Trump has also authorised two devastating ground raids on the villages of Yakla and Al Jubah in Yemen.ⁱⁱⁱ These raids pursued the ill-defined objective of gathering intelligence from villages which, far from being home to networks of high-ranking Al Qaeda operatives, are rural and do not even have access to electricity. The hallmark of both operations was the total failure to protect innocent Yemeni citizens from harm, with over 25 individuals, 11 of whom were children, losing their lives to the raids.^{iv}
10. The terrible impact of US counter-terror operations has not been limited to Yemen. The US has dramatically increased the number of strikes in Somalia and taken several strikes in Libya—both countries where the US is not formally at war. Somalia has seen a 73% increase in strikes as compared with 2016, and 2017 has also seen the first US drone strikes in Libya launched from Sigonella airbase in Italy.^v Notwithstanding CENTCOM statements that the US is “conducting one of the most precise air campaigns in military history”,^{vi} the first seven months of the Trump administration resulted in more civilian deaths than under both terms of the Obama administration.^{vii}
11. There have been strong indications that the US intends to expand its theatre of action beyond Yemen, with President Trump intimating that the US may resume strikes in Pakistan, unless Pakistan strengthens its counter-terrorism efforts and ensures its territory is not a “safe haven” for alleged terrorists.^{viii}
12. It also has recently been reported that the Nigerien Government has given permission for the US to use armed drones within its territory, having previously resisted US pressure to do so.^{ix} The two countries are reportedly close to finalising a memorandum of understanding, with the *New York Times* suggesting the Pentagon wants to begin strikes within days.^x Reports suggest the Nigerien Government is concerned about the potential impact of US strikes on civilians.^{xi} This follows widespread reports of a US counter-terror operation in Niger, which cost four US Special Forces personnel their lives.^{xii} It appears that the devastating combination of drone strikes and ground operations deployed in Yemen will now also form the model for action in an expanding list of countries, entirely at the discretion of the US President.
13. The expansion of action in Niger has met with a great deal of concern from key figures within the national security establishment in the US who were not aware of the extent (or, in some cases existence) of action in Niger. For example, Senator John McCain noted that “the American people need to know why we have 6,000 US troops in Africa”.^{xiii} However Congress has repeatedly shown itself to be unwilling or unable to reform the domestic authority – the 2001 Authorisation for Use of Military Force - which purports to license these operations. Operations in Niger are allegedly being conducted with the support of both the French and British governments, raising concerning questions about complicity.^{xiv}
14. The radical expansion of the drone programme under Trump has been accompanied by a systematic weakening of safeguards regulating their use. In the last few years of his Presidency, President Obama went to great lengths to restrict and reduce the CIA’s role in the drone programme, curtailing their involvement in Yemen and prohibiting the CIA from even flying drones over Syria.^{xv} President Trump has rolled back these efforts. In March 2017, he authorised the CIA to once again begin conducting drone strikes.^{xvi} Such strikes are taken by a civilian spying agency under cover of Title 50 which sets out the legal authorisation for intelligence activities and covert operations. Covert lethal operations conducted by the CIA are by their nature shrouded in secrecy and beyond the purview of any transparent form of accountability.
15. Similarly, as noted in our primary submission, in March 2017, President Trump unilaterally declared parts of Yemen and Somalia “areas of active hostilities” negating the safeguards put in place on the use of force by President Obama in the form of the “Presidential Policy Guidance” (PPG).^{xvii} An anonymous US official reportedly complained that “some of the Obama administration rules were getting in the way of good strikes”, thereby prompting the new designation.^{xviii}
16. As a result of this designation, the stringent requirements the PPG puts in place to safeguard against the risk of civilian casualties no longer cover Yemen or Somalia. In addition, once an area is designated an “area of active hostilities”, decision-making is devolved from the Administration to lower level command

structures within the military and/or CIA, weakening controls on the use of lethal force and facilitating the rapid expansion of strikes. Furthermore, under the PPG, the Administration was required to notify Congressional oversight committees of each strike taken outside of a “declared theater of armed conflict”.^{xix} This new designation of areas of Yemen and Somalia as “areas of active hostilities” may mean these Congressional committees are no longer notified. What is clear is that the change in designation has allowed the Administration to dramatically accelerate the rate and frequency of drone strikes in Yemen and Somalia, as Reprieve recently documented in its report.^{xx}

17. In September of this year, it was reported that President Trump has replaced President Obama’s PPG with a “Principles, Standards and Procedures” Document (PSP). The PSP has yet to be released, making it difficult to assess its full impact. According to the limited information available, the PSP significantly dilutes the standards and procedures put in place by the PPG. While the PPG limited lethal US strikes to alleged “high-value terrorists” who posed a “continuing imminent threat” the PSP reportedly expands the list of targets to alleged “foot soldier jihadists with no special skills or leadership roles” with no requirement that they pose a “continuing and imminent threat”. The PSP also eliminates “high level vetting” of drone strikes.^{xxi}
18. The Trump administration is reported to have preserved the “near certainty” standard in the PSP. However, there are no indications that the Trump administration has revoked the designation of parts of Yemen and Somalia as “areas of active hostilities.” If, as seems likely, the PSP only applies outside “areas of active hostilities” then any protections in place to protect civilian life under the PSP are unlikely to apply to Yemen and Somalia, areas where we’ve seen the greatest expansion of the drone programme in the past nine months and the greatest loss of civilian life.
19. By eliminating the “continuing and imminent” threat requirement, President Trump has not only diluted Obama-era safeguards limiting the US’s use of lethal force, but also dramatically increased the probability that strikes violate international human rights law. This is particularly true when taken in tandem with a weakening of the approval processes for conducting drone strikes. The revisions to the PSP legitimise the use of lethal force in a far broader set of circumstances than was permitted under the PPG and expressly authorise the US to conduct strikes in violation of well-established norms of *ius ad bellum*, international human rights and international humanitarian law.

III. THE UK’S FAILURE TO RESPOND EFFECTIVELY TO CHANGES IN US POLICY AND PRACTICE

20. Reprieve’s primary submission noted the extensive, porous and largely unaccountable nature of US-UK intelligence and operational cooperation on the drone programme. There is a serious risk that in the face of an expanded US drone programme, the provision of assistance will render the UK complicit in violations of international law.
21. The UK has expressly rejected the doctrine of pre-emptive self-defence and the global war on terror paradigm as advocated by the US.^{xxii} In his January 2017 speech, the Attorney General Jeremy Wright noted that the approach of the UK:

“is a very long way from supporting any notion of a doctrine of pre-emptive strikes against threats that are more remote and even further from seeking to diminish the importance of a rules-based international order. I am not suggesting that the threshold for military force be watered down, and I am certainly not suggesting we adopt an analysis which amounts to a Global War on Terror paradigm.”
22. Despite the UK Attorney General’s suggestion that the UK is not “seeking to diminish the importance of a rules-based international order”, the US’s domestic authority for the use of military force, and President Trump’s recent policy reforms do exactly that.
23. The 2001 Authorisation for Use of Military Force authorises the US, under domestic law, to use force against any nation, organisation or person who planned, committed or aided the 11th September attacks. It imposes no geographical limit on the use of force nor any requirement that force only be used in self-defence. Over the years, its interpretation has been stretched beyond all recognition so that a link to the 11th September attacks is no longer required.

24. The newly adopted PSP removes the minimal safeguards that President Obama placed on the use of this power – and in doing so further exposes the UK to the same erosion of international law standards as a result of its close cooperation. In particular, the elimination of the “continuing, imminent threat” requirement in the newly-adopted PSP and extension of the targeting policy to low-level operatives, suggests that US drone policy goes far beyond the limits of self-defence recognised by international law.
25. Such an expansive policy is clearly in violation of the *ius ad bellum* which limits the use of force to truly anticipatory self-defence, where a threat leaves “no moment for deliberation”. Indeed, the PSP appears to authorise targeted assassinations of members of alleged terrorist groups regardless of any knowledge of even who the individuals are or what threat they might pose; this is an unequivocal violation of both international human rights law and international humanitarian law, neither of which permit killing in the absence of an imminent threat.
26. The UK has been deliberately opaque with respect to its cooperation with the US drone programme; as a result, there is no clarity around what safeguards – if any – are in place to protect the British Government from complicity in violations of international law. Earlier this year the Government confirmed it would renege on a previous promise to publish a critical document, the Joint Targeting Policy, which relates to drone operations with partners such as the US.^{xxiii} In response to a written parliamentary question, UK Defence Minister Mike Penning confirmed on 17th January that:

“While we are working to produce an updated version of JSP900 which is releasable to 5-eyes and NATO allies, it is now not the case that we are producing a version which would be releasable to all. It is judged that the necessary removal of information that would prejudice the capability, effectiveness or security of the Armed Forces would result in a version with insufficient detail to warrant publication.”^{xxiv}

27. The recently published Joint Doctrine Publication 0-30.2 on Unmanned Aircraft Systems demonstrates a studied failure to engage with the question of (i) the legal basis for the use of armed drones outside of armed conflict; (ii) the use of UK bases and intelligence in support of the US drone programme; and (iii) guidance given to UK personnel involved in drone strikes.^{xxv}
28. The total lack of guidance is troubling from a rule of law perspective, and also creates a serious risk for serving personnel. As noted by the Court of Appeal and echoed by the Joint Committee on Human Rights inquiry, UK service personnel risk criminal prosecution for murder if involved in a lethal strike outside of a war zone.^{xxvi} The JCHR concluded:

“The possibility of criminal prosecution for complicity in murder also arises for all those UK personnel who have a role in assisting or facilitating the use of lethal force by coalition allies, such as the US, which has a much wider approach to the use of lethal force outside of armed conflict. Such assistance might take the form of logistical support (for example, permitting US jets to use UK airbases), or the provision of intelligence about targets gathered by UK surveillance and reconnaissance.”

29. In a concerning example of the UK’s failure to mitigate such risks, Reprieve has learned that UK personnel embedded within US Air Force’s 432nd Unit based at Creech in Nevada, one of the main hubs for drone strikes, were not provided with any written advice concerning their legal obligations or limits of their activities. Instead, the Ministry of Defence provided guidance that is “often delivered verbally”.^{xxvii} The failure to provide written guidance is indicative of the failure to implement appropriate safeguards to protect UK service personnel from criminal liability, and perhaps more broadly, to protect the UK from liability in internationally wrongful acts.
30. In providing intelligence and other operational support for the drone programme in the manner detailed in our primary submission, the United Kingdom risks liability under international law. Article 16 of the International Law Commission’s Articles on State Responsibility provides that a State will be liable if it provides aid or assistance to another State in the commission of an internationally wrongful act.
31. Despite these risks, further evidence of UK complicity in the US drone programme continues to come to light. In September 2017, *The Intercept* profiled another UK base, RAF Digby, involved in the drone

programme.^{xxviii} Located in Lincolnshire, it allows the UK to conduct extensive surveillance and geolocational tracking in a number of countries where the US conducts drone strikes, including Libya and Syria.^{xxix}

32. In addition, it revealed the involvement of a UK military unit called the Joint Services Signals Organisation (“JSSO”) in the US drone programme. According to documents uncovered by *The Intercept*, JSSO trainees were embedded at an NSA surveillance centre in the US state of Georgia.^{xxx} This surveillance centre is responsible for surveillance of Yemen, raising questions over the involvement of UK personnel in drone strikes in the country.^{xxxi} Since this information has surfaced, Reprieve has made FOI requests to the Ministry of Defence seeking confirmation of embedded personnel in previous years and asking whether these personnel have been provided with any guidance as to their role.^{xxxii} To date, the Ministry of Defence has relied on several FOI exemptions to refuse to provide any information.
33. Although the UK’s approach to this policy area has been characterised by secrecy and obfuscation, UK Government Ministers have signalled changes in UK policy in apparently unguarded comments to journalists. In October of this year, Rory Stewart, an FCO Minister, stated that in almost every case, the only way to deal with British ISIL fighters will be to “kill them”.^{xxxiii} Mere days after his appointment, Defence Secretary Gavin Williamson seemed to confirm these statements indicating that it will be necessary to eliminate “that threat completely” to ensure that British born fighters do not return.^{xxxiv} These statements mirror comments made by US officials earlier in 2017 that foreign fighters should “never make their way out of Syria and Iraq”, and should “not survive the fight to return home” and appear to signal an express intention by the UK to move closer to US policy in relation to the use of lethal force.^{xxxv}
34. Both Rory Stewart and Gavin Williamson appear to have asserted a broad right to kill British born foreign fighters regardless of where they are, the imminence of the threat they pose or attempts by those fighters to surrender and face a trial. Such an assertion is a clear violation of international human rights law and international humanitarian law, and potentially constitutes a war crime.^{xxxvi} To the extent that this represents an express and public policy of what the UK considers to be legitimate action within situations of armed conflict, it raises serious concerns about the standards applied by the UK to the use of lethal force outside situations of armed conflict, especially given the reduced transparency and accountability that tend to accompany such actions.
35. If this is an accurate representation of UK policy on the use of lethal force, then in addition to risking complicity in internationally wrongful acts committed by the US, the British Government will itself be committing independent violations of international law.

IV. UNANSWERED QUESTIONS FOR THE UK GOVERNMENT

36. In light of the concerning developments in US policy since President Trump took office, and continued ambiguity around the UK’s policy in this area, there is an urgent need for the British Government to provide clarity on a number of points.
37. As is clear from Reprieve’s primary submission, the UK has a complicated and multi-layered relationship with the US in the support it provides the drone programme. Notwithstanding the “special” nature of the relationship between the US and the UK, in the wake of the dramatic changes to the drone programme under President Trump, it is essential that the UK Government respond to a number of questions regarding the UK’s diplomatic engagement with the US on these issues; on the UK’s legal and policy basis for its actions in this area; and on the nature and extent of its intelligence and operational support to the US drone programme.
38. Of paramount importance, and given the US’s changing definition of just which areas it considers to be “areas of active hostilities”, the UK must clearly set out answers to the following two key questions:
 - I. Does the UK Government believe it is necessary to inform Parliament and to seek Parliament’s approval before engaging the UK, whether directly or indirectly through cooperation with partners, in an armed conflict?

- II. In light of President Trump's dramatic changes to the both the scope and the rules governing the US's use of armed drones, does the UK government believe it needs to review the safeguards it has in place to ensure the UK is not inadvertently aiding and assisting in these potentially unlawful acts? If it does believe a review is needed, has that review taken place and what was the outcome?
39. In addition to the above overarching questions, there are a series of additional questions that require urgent responses. We have broken these down into three thematic areas: 1) Questions on the UK's diplomatic engagement with the US;; 2) Questions on the UK's legal and policy basis for its actions in this area; and 3) Questions on the nature and extent of the UK's intelligence and operational support to the US drone programme.

Questions on the UK's diplomatic engagement with the US:

40. To date, the UK government has failed to clarify its position in relation to President Trump's dramatic escalation of the US drone programme and his reported removal of essential safeguards. In order to avoid finding itself liable for complicity in these actions, the UK government urgently clarify:
- I. To what extent has the UK, if at all, considered the impact of the expanded drone programme upon the degree of assistance which the UK is able to provide the US?
 - II. What measures, if any, has the UK taken to safeguard itself against violations of international law in continuing to provide intelligence and operational support to the drone programme?
 - III. What representations, if any, has the UK made to its US counterparts to gather information on (i) the expansion of the drone programme to areas such as Niger; (ii) the weakening of safeguards regulating the use of drones?
 - IV. What representations, if any, has the UK made to its US counterparts about the concerning number of lives lost under the expanded drone programme?
 - V. What representations, if any, has the UK made to its US counterparts about its duty under international law to acknowledge and investigate all potential breaches of the right to life?
 - VI. What support, if any, has or will the UK provide to expanded ground operations in countries such as Yemen and Niger, where such ground operations are conducted in tandem with drone strikes?
 - VII. To what extent, if at all, has the UK considered the withdrawing support from the US drone programme in light of the recent developments outlined above?

Questions on the UK's legal and policy basis for its actions in this area:

41. The UK has resolutely refused to disclose the legal and policy bases upon which it provides support to the US drone programme or conducts its own drone strikes outside of armed conflict. In light of the serious risks that the UK may be violating its own obligations under international law as well as placing service personnel at risk of criminal prosecution for their actions, the UK must respond to the following questions:
- I. Where does the UK consider itself to be involved in an armed conflict – both international and non-international?
 - II. How does the UK determine whether it is involved in an armed conflict?
 - III. Does the UK limit the cooperation it provides to the US drone programme to situations of armed conflict?
 - IV. What is the UK's policy on using lethal force against terrorism suspects outside situations of armed conflict?
 - V. What is the UK's policy of providing support to the US to use lethal force against terrorism suspects outside situations of armed conflict?
 - VI. What law applies to the use of lethal force outside of armed conflict?
 - VII. Does the UK have a policy of targeted assassination?
 - VIII. Does the UK carry out investigations in situations where it has supported the use of lethal force outside Iraq, Syria and Afghanistan, and there are credible allegations of breaches of the right to life?
 - IX. How many times has the UK responded to an "imminent" threat with the use of lethal force in the last five years in areas outside of Iraq, Syria and Afghanistan?

Questions on the nature and extent of the UK's intelligence and operational support to the US drone programme:

42. Finally, as set out in detail in our primary submission, the UK provides both intelligence and operational support to the US through, *inter alia*, the direct provision of intelligence and embedded personnel. In light of the close nature of this cooperation, the UK must respond to the following questions:
- I. How many lethal strikes outside of Iraq, Syria and Afghanistan has the UK provided intelligence for?
 - II. How many targets has the UK 'tasked' to the US in Yemen? Over what period?
 - III. How many targets has the UK 'tasked' to the US in Somalia? Over what period?
 - IV. How many targets had the UK 'tasked' to the US in countries other than Afghanistan, Syria, and Iraq? Over what period?
 - V. How many targets, which have been assigned as targets by the UK, have subsequently been killed by a US drone strike?
 - VI. How many individuals who are the subject of "actionable requests" for intelligence by the US, have subsequently been targeted by drones?

ⁱ Reprieve, Submission to APPG on Drones Inquiry: 'The Use of Armed Drones: Working with Partners', 7 April 2017, available at: <http://appgdrones.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/Submission-from-Reprieve.pdf>.

ⁱⁱ Bureau of Investigative Journalism, Drone Warfare, available at: <https://www.thebureauinvestigates.com/projects/drone-war>.

ⁱⁱⁱ Reprieve, Game Changer: An investigation by Reprieve into President Donald Trump's secret assassination programme and the massacre of Yemeni civilians in the villages of Yakla and Al Jubah, July 2017, available at: https://www.reprieve.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/2017_08_15_PRIV-Yemen-Report-UK-Version-FINAL-FOR-USE.pdf.

^{iv} Reprieve, Game Changer: An investigation by Reprieve into President Donald Trump's secret assassination programme and the massacre of Yemeni civilians in the villages of Yakla and Al Jubah, July 2017, available at: https://www.reprieve.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/2017_08_15_PRIV-Yemen-Report-UK-Version-FINAL-FOR-USE.pdf.

^v La Repubblica, *Libia, attacco Usa all'Isis I droni partiti da Sigonella*, 26 September 2017.

^{vi} New York Times, *The Uncounted*, 16 November 2017, available at:

https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2017/11/16/magazine/uncounted-civilian-casualties-iraq-airstrikes.html?smid=tw-nytmag&smtyp=cur&_r=0

^{vii} Salon, Under Trump, US airstrikes are killing more civilians, 20 October 2017, available at:

https://www.salon.com/2017/10/20/under-trump-presidency-us-airstrikes-kill-more-civilians_partner-2/.

^{viii} Reuters, *Exclusive: Trump administration eyes hardening line toward Pakistan*, 20 June 2017, available at: <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-pakistan-exclusive/exclusive-trump-administration-eyes-hardening-line-toward-pakistan-idUSKBN19B0C8>; Politico, *Pakistan terrorism crackdown 'necessary' to Trump's Afghanistan strategy*, 22 August 2017, available at: <https://www.politico.eu/article/pakistan-terrorism-crackdown-necessary-to-trumps-afghanistan-strategy/>

^{ix} Reuters, *Niger defense minister asks U.S. to deploy armed drones against militants*, 1 November 2017, available at: <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-niger-security-usa/niger-defense-minister-asks-u-s-to-deploy-armed-drones-against-militants-idUSKBN1D14VA>.

^x New York Times, *Niger Approves Armed U.S. Drone Flights, Expanding Pentagon's Role in Africa*, 30 November 2017, available at <https://mobile.nytimes.com/2017/11/30/us/politics/pentagon-niger-drones.html>.

^{xi} <http://www.africanews.com/2017/11/05/niger-allows-us-forces-to-arm-drones-in-counter-terrorism-fight/>

^{xiii} Newsweek, *How many troops does the U.S. have in Africa? Top Senators didn't know Military was in Niger*, 23 October 2017, available at: <http://www.newsweek.com/how-many-troops-does-us-have-africa-top-senators-didnt-know-military-was-niger-690937>

^{xiv} Former CIA Director James Woolsey (JM) talked to Wolf Blitzer (WB) about US presence in Niger and abroad on CNN 20 October 2017, available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-qT3U84mLeA>.

^{xv} Washington Post, *Why CIA drone strikes have plummeted*, 16 June 2016, available at:

https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/cia-drone-strikes-plummet-as-white-house-shifts-authority-to-pentagon/2016/06/16/e0b28e90-335f-11e6-8ff7-7b6c1998b7a0_story.html?utm_term=.777600397687

-
- ^{xvi} Wall Street Journal, *Trump Broadens CIA Powers, Allows Deadly Drone Strikes*, 13 March 2017, available at: <https://www.wsj.com/articles/trump-gave-cia-power-to-launch-drone-strikes-1489444374>.
- ^{xvii} Washington Post, *Accelerating Yemen campaign, U.S. conducts flurry of strikes targeting al-Qaeda*, 2 March 2017, available at: https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/accelerating-yemen-campaign-us-conducts-flurry-of-strikes-targeting-al-qaeda/2017/03/02/8a9af8cc-ff91-11e6-99b4-9e613afeb09f_story.html?utm_term=.6a99e1423b87; Reuters, *Trump grants U.S. military more authority to attack militants in Somalia*, 30 March 2017, available at: <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-defense-somalia/trump-grants-u-s-military-more-authority-to-attack-militants-in-somalia-idUSKBN1712OD>.
- ^{xviii} *Id.*
- ^{xix} 10 U.S. Code § 130f.
- ^{xx} Reprieve, *Game Changer: An investigation by Reprieve into President Donald Trump's secret assassination programme and the massacre of Yemeni civilians in the villages of Yakla and Al Jubah*, July 2017, available at: https://www.reprieve.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/2017_08_15_PRIV-Yemen-Report-UK-Version-FINAL-FOR-USE.pdf.
- ^{xxi} New York Times, *Trump Poised to Drop Some Limits on Drone Strikes and Commando Raids*, 21 September 2017, available at: <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/09/21/us/politics/trump-drone-strikes-commando-raids-rules.html>.
- ^{xxii} See 2001 Authorization to Use Military Force, Section 2.
- ^{xxiii} Written Question, 10 January 2017, available at: <http://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Commons/2017-01-10/59422/>
- ^{xxiv} <http://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-question/Commons/2017-01-10/59422/>
- ^{xxv} Ministry of Defence, *Joint Doctrine Publication 0-30.2 on Unmanned Aircraft Systems*, 12 September 2017, https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/640299/20170706_JDP_0-30.2_final_CM_web.pdf.
- ^{xxvi} Joint Committee on Human Rights, *The Government's policy on the use of drones for targeted killing*, 27 April 2016, pp. 24-25, available at: <https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/jt201516/jtselect/jtrights/574/574.pdf>; *R (Noor Khan) v Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs*, [2014] EWCA Civ 24.
- ^{xxvii} Request under the Freedom of Information Act 2000, FOI 2017/05758, 16 June 2017.
- ^{xxviii} <https://theintercept.com/2017/09/13/digby-uk-nsa-gchq-surveillance/>
- ^{xxix} *Ibid.*
- ^{xxx} <https://theintercept.com/document/2017/09/12/uk-airhandler-trainees/>
- ^{xxxi} <https://theintercept.com/document/2017/09/12/cryptologic-shore-support/>
- ^{xxxii} Reprieve FOIs available upon request.
- ^{xxxiii} Telegraph, *'The only way' of dealing with British Islamic State fighters is to kill them in almost every case, minister says*, 22 October 2017, <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2017/10/22/way-dealing-british-islamic-state-fighters-kill-almost-every/>.
- ^{xxxiv} The Sun, *New Defence Secretary Gavin Williamson wages war on British IS fighters, promises to be tough on North Korea and to support our forces heroes*, 13 November 2017, available at: <https://www.thesun.co.uk/news/4907445/new-defence-secretary-gavin-williamson-interview/>.
- ^{xxxv} Guardian, *Defense secretary Mattis says US policy against Isis is now 'annihilation'*, 28 May 2017, available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2017/may/28/james-mattis-defense-secretary-us-isis-annihilation>; US Department of State, *Special Briefing from Brett McGurk, Special Presidential Envoy for the Global Coalition to Counter ISIS*, 4 August 2017, available at: <https://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/ps/2017/08/273198.htm>.
- ^{xxxvi} Rome Statute, Article 8(2)(b)(x).