

Remote Drones Between International Human Rights Law and International Humanitarian Law

Dr. Baqer Musa Saeed AL_khafagy

Department of Law, College of Law, The Islamic University, Najaf, Iraq

ABSTRACT

Wars and military operations in our present time have ended up more digital, using modern-day generation, and the tendency of most of the world's powers to lessen using the human detail. It's far taken into consideration one of the most lethal guns of all kinds and sizes and its supernatural potential to carry out large duties, which simplest need a small amount of human manage, and it can be something negligible in a few instances, and these aircraft are used as advanced guns in various varieties of worldwide armed conflicts, together with global, specially counter-terrorism operations, due to its high-quality capability to reduce distances, terrain, tracking operations and targeting accuracy at the desired time, further to its potential to carry various and different guns, which created issues about the overlap in the regulation regulating targeting operations, among international humanitarian regulation One aspect and among international human rights regulation then again, and the capability of these weapons and people in rate of directing them to abide by the rules of these two legal guidelines and what's branching out From them there are multiple and intertwined guidelines, which made the states' positions in struggle with these debatable plane, some of them went inside the direction of supporting the safety of the drone operator in the first region, and a number of them oppose and notice in it a weapon that possesses the extremely good lethality that makes it inconsistent with international legal policies and every route its arguments on this difference.

Keywords: Drones, International Human Rights Law and International Humanitarian Law.

INTRODUCTION

Remote drones are defined as any vehicle capable of flying remotely guided, no matter how large or small its size, and there are many types and classifications of these aircraft, some classify them according to their size and some classify them according to the degree of control over them, and with the multiplicity of their types and sizes, their uses are numerous at both the civil and military levels. In recent times, their use has increased in combat fields, especially in military operations against terrorist groups, targeting leaders and individuals of these groups because of their ease of use and their low cost if compared to the rest of the conventional weapons and warplanes, and most importantly, the safety aspect that you give to the operator who operates and administers them, which is a thousand kilometers away.

Kilometres away from the target sites, but this increase in use has met with great objection from many countries as well as international jurisprudence, where doubts about the ability of these weapons to adhere to international standards of human rights and international humanitarian law,¹ in terms of preserving the right to life, proportionality and distinction, and even going into consideration. Blind weapons that do not distinguish between civilians and soldiers, despite the advanced technology adopted to administer them, as well as the difficulty of slavery In response to the strikes carried out as a result of the remoteness of these strikes from places of gathering, which led to the existence of two opposing positions from a legal point of view regarding these highly sophisticated weapons.

RESEARCH PROBLEM

Remote drones are a qualitative weapon with a great technological development that can be used outside the territorial borders of the state, and it is also the weapon that occupies the top ranks in the fight against terrorist gangs spread in several countries, which raises the issue of determining the law regulating their strikes and the most appropriate application, given the number. There is nothing wrong with these strikes that fall outside the scope of classic armed conflicts, as this issue conflicts with both international human rights law and international humanitarian law, in addition to doubts surrounding the validity of adherence to the rules of these two laws by those who run these aircraft, given their independent mechanisms of control and selection. These advanced weapons have also aroused the ire of some jurists regarding their suitability for just war as a philosophical and moral basis for the war in general. All these matters have made remote drones a subject of controversy and debate regarding their legality and the legality of their use.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In the study of our research, we will use this descriptive and analytical approach by analyzing the rules stipulated in international legislation on human rights and international humanitarian law as well as relevant international documents, and knowing the extent to which states adhere to these rules and their observance of them, how to apply them on the practical level and the consequences thereof about aircraft Distance march.

THE FIRST REQUIREMENT

APPLICATION OF INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS LAW

There are several definitions of remote drones or so-called drone aircraft. As some went on to say that it is any vehicle capable of flying and guided remotely, regardless of its size, less or more, and even the radio-guided aircraft, which weighed a ton and a half and had a price of (one hundred and four) million dollars, which is called the (Global Hawk) combat aircraft, the FI vehicle. Two things are achieved: the ability to fly and control it from

a distance called remote drones. Most of the combat operations of these aircraft take place within the theatre of traditional operations in the context of armed conflicts, but several countries are insisting on their right to use these aircraft in counter-terrorism operations outside the actual combat zones, which raises controversy and disagreement about the law applicable to the operations of these aircraft, where The matter contested both international human rights law and international humanitarian law.²

In principle, international human rights law is designed to be applied at all times, including situations of armed conflict. Defining the protection of the most important and supreme right in the legitimacy of human rights, which is the right to life, is subject to international humanitarian law that is applied during international and non-international armed conflicts. Not all strikes take place in places of conflict as previously mentioned, and as the International Court of Justice noted about the relationship between international humanitarian law and international human rights law, there are three potential human rights cases, some rights may be limited to international humanitarian law and others to international human rights law. A set of rights exist in an intermediate area between the legal and the subject of the law governing remote drones falls within these rights. The international community has emphasized the need to adhere to the rules of international human rights law during counter-terrorism operations, including the use of remote drones, and also stressed the need to find a consensus formula for the application of both international human rights law and international humanitarian law as a strategy for the United Nations.³ To know the application of international human rights law and its relationship to the combat operations of remote drones, we will divide this requirement into three branches :

FIRST BRANCH

JURISDICTION

The first step is to determine whether the country that conducts military operations using remote drones complies with international human rights law by

determining whether the targeted persons fall under its jurisdiction or not, so the use of the aircraft in targeting operations outside the territory of the country that is targeting, especially if we know Most of the strikes carried out by remote drones are of this type. Jurists take two approaches regarding the application of the jurisdiction of the state that is targeting outside its territory and then the application of international human rights law. The first approach is whether the state has geographical control outside its territory, that is, outside its territory as if it were occupying a state, which makes its military operations, and specifically the strikes. Its remote drones are carried out and subject to international human rights law. The second approach is relying on personal control, such as being a person fleeing the state's prisons, and the standard followed here is exercising power over the individual in a way that puts the rights of the individual in the hands of the target state.⁴

Here, a problem has surfaced in the form of the state's human rights obligations through the use of military forces that do not include regional control and that take place in places not subject to the law of armed conflict. And we found that there are two cases involving the use of remote drones that were used outside the regional authority of the first country: The Alejandra case in 1996, which is summarized by the Cuban remote drone targeting two unarmed civilian aircraft belonging to the Rescue Brothers Organization in international airspace. As a result, four people were killed, and the case was presented by the families of the dead to the American Human Rights Commission, and the committee concluded that Cuba is responsible for violating the right to life that was stipulated in the American Charter of Human Rights, and in the Universal Charter of Human Rights in addition to other international conventions related to Human rights although the targeting took place outside the geographical and personal jurisdiction of the Cuban state.⁵

The second case: It is the (Pankovitch) case, which is summarized by NATO's targeting of the radio and television building in Belgrade, and this targeting led to the killing of six people, and the victims' families subsequently filed a lawsuit before the European Court of Human Rights against seventeen European countries,

including Belgium, This was due to the violation of the right to life and the right to freedom of expression, but the court rejected the case and considered it outside its jurisdiction. She explained this by the fact that the control is ineffective over the Yugoslav territories, as the limited monitoring by NATO on the regional borders is of utmost importance as it determines whether the international bodies and organizations concerned with human rights are competent to consider individual cases related to human rights, and it is possible to concede on the other hand that the killing Including the process of targeting by remote drones does not depend on treaties only, including human rights treaties, but rather is part of the international custom that forms a source of general international law based on the text of Article (38) of the Basic Law of the International Court of Justice, and therefore the application of international law Human rights is a binding principle at a time and time, whether in peace or war, and it must be applied to strikes by remote drones, especially those whose operations are carried out in safe areas outside the areas of armed conflict.⁶

THE SECOND BRANCH

THE RIGHT TO LIFE

The right to life is one of the basic rights within the international law of human rights recognized in international treaties and as a rule of customary international law that is binding and indisputably binding. Hence, Article (6) of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. All states, including those that use remote drones, are obligated, and no country can arbitrarily deprive an individual of his life.

As for the European Convention on Human Rights, it stipulated in Article Two specific reasons for depriving the right to life. And then it violated the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, on the one hand, leaving the matter to the standard of arbitrariness in depriving the right to life without mentioning specific reasons, and on the other hand, the European Court of Human Rights has interpreted the application of Paragraph (1) of Article (5) of the European Convention on Human Rights. Concerning the right to freedom in times of armed

conflict by the requirements of international humanitarian law and not by general requirements and international human rights law, although Paragraph (1) of Article (5) contains specific reasons for the deprivation of the right to liberty and in the sense of analogy with the right to life and the causes Deprivation of it in times of armed conflict is to allow the application of the rules of international humanitarian law to the enjoyment of this right, but inevitably it can be asserted that the applicable law is the rules of international humanitarian law, as stipulated in Article (2) of the European Convention on Human Rights.⁷

However, the unspecified factor of abuse remains present, whether in the application of the Covenant or the European Convention on Human Rights in the case of unlawful violence and the extent of its determination and here we can say that the criminal history of any person, whether by participating in terrorist or criminal acts, is no justification for targeting him except in the case of evidence. The occurrence of an attack or a specific and immediate criminal act related to it, and it is indisputable that the application of the right to life and the rights that derive from the legitimacy of human rights includes the target countries and the countries whose territories are targeted in case they agree. The country that allows targeting cannot give from The rights are more than it has to allow the targeted state to violate the right to life through its strikes by remote drones, and it is recognized in all international conventions on human rights and the International Court of Justice that international human rights law is binding on all states even if they practice their activities outside their territories.⁸

Here comes another topic, which is the extent to which remote drones allow fighters to surrender, as it is well established in all international and national legislation that the combatant has the right to surrender and has special treatment guaranteed in international legislation and specifying the Geneva Conventions, and the essential and basic goal of military operations is to achieve victory and defeat The adversary and not necessarily kill him, however, legal jurisprudence allowed for the existence of weapons that target fighters without giving them a chance to surrender, including remote drones, despite their inability to take prisoners

and prisoners or even their inability to provide evacuation or aid the injured in the field, But the problem lies in the nature of the technology used by remote drones, as these drones are determined to use lethal force in war and destroy the opponent and kill him without the ability to take prisoners or rescue the wounded, which results in them carrying out a number of successive strikes until the target is killed, and this would It expands to include killing, not only the target, but the paramedics and rescuers who are by nature illegal targets, but the nature of technology dictates the targeting that A war crime, and from the legal point of view, the order to kill without the ability to suspend this matter when the target is unable to fight is illegal under the rules of international law.⁹

We believe that the right to surrender is one of the important rights to preserve the right to life, especially in the area of targeting terrorist gangs, where most of the fighters or members of terrorist organizations are those with young work or young people whose status and the reasons for their affiliation with these groups must be taken into account. Nevertheless, it is indispensable. About remote drone strikes, but they can be reduced, or methods and means that allow surrendering, either through leaflets received on them or calls directed to them through media or wireless communications.

THE THIRD BRANCH

THE RIGHT NOT TO BE SUBJECTED TO CRUEL, INHUMAN OR DEGRADING TREATMENT

Upon reviewing the text of Article 7 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, we find that it prohibits exposure to or transgression of humane treatment or cruel or degrading punishment and does not permit anyone to be subjected to torture. In addition to the fact that regional charters and agreements related to human rights went to this direction as well, and indicated what is included in torture and cruel treatment what happens as a result of remote drone attacks, due to the psychological impact that these attacks have on those who suffer from their strikes and the people who live near them to the point of reaching it. Some described it as terrifying, even by workers in the military media who are

more able to withstand the psychological effects of weapons, and the most prominent example of this is the war journalist.¹⁰

In interviews conducted with individuals who live in the targeted areas, most of them suffered from psychological effects and nervous breakdowns as a result of these operations, but they seemed to run or hide when hearing the sound of any aircraft and excessive reactions in case they were exposed to any noise and most of them started talking about feeling helpless so that the human workers resemble The situation among civilians in the targeted areas and their horror at the extent of the terror in the United States of America as a result of the attacks of 9/11/2001, but these feelings represent a long-term impression, which constitutes psychological and health impairments for most of the population. Concerning the definition of torture mentioned in Article 1 of the Convention against Torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, we find that it includes physical or mental suffering.

This means that, depending on the circumstances, the impact of the drone strikes may fall within the category of torture, or in the best cases it may fall under Article 16 of the Convention itself, which provides for other acts of cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment that do not amount to the level of torture. When making a comparison between the two articles, we find that the intention and intent of the requirements of Article 1 of the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, either in Article Sixteen of the Convention itself, we do not find intentionality among its requirements, and then the treatment for which it is prohibited can occur. The negligence of the countries that are targeting, which makes it more likely that it will be applied in most cases instead of applying Article.¹¹

In our opinion, the application of Article 16 is mostly due to what has been mentioned above, in addition to that it is closer to what states claim of cases of negligence and intentionality, although we believe that negligence in these cases is the closest to intentional due to the great danger and destruction contained like these weapons. The duty with him is to calculate the psychological factors of

people near the areas of targeting and wrong strikes in the nearby areas, and then the first article must be based on most cases, contrary to what is common today, and therefore we note that the work of international human rights law is intertwined with the application of international humanitarian law that is applied to strikes Which takes place in conflict areas even if the intensity of the conflict varies, and we also see the possibility of applying both laws in close targeting areas, and it could be in one country such as Pakistan, but is not a few cases, international humanitarian law may be applied to it, which we will discuss in the following requirement.¹²

THE SECOND REQUIREMENT

APPLICATION OF INTERNATIONAL HUMANITARIAN LAW

International humanitarian law governs the relations between the disputing parties in the event of an international or internal armed conflict, regardless of the geographical location of this conflict, or the location of the military operations, and then the application of this law takes place in the air, land and sea region, and even within electronic warfare, even if that is in the territories of A third country, whether it is hostile, belligerent, occupier or neutral, and therefore the use of remote drones in any international or internal conflict is subject to international humanitarian law.¹³

After the above, we will try to address this requirement in several matters, the most prominent of which is the applicable principles of international humanitarian law, and then turn to just war theory and its application to the topic of our research.

FIRST BRANCH

THE PROPORTIONALITY BETWEEN FORCE AND MILITARY NECESSITY

The principle of proportionality is intended to take into account the damage caused to the adversary and the military advantages that can be achieved as a result of the use of force in military operations, and then the application of this principle and I mean the principle of proportionality determines the level of military

intervention to achieve a balance between military and humanitarian necessity. Many international agreements have stipulated the principle of proportionality as one of the basic principles of international humanitarian law. These agreements emphasized the protection of civilians during armed conflicts and the minimization of unnecessary force as well as attempted to reduce the chances of disproportionate attacks and then Commanders, and those in charge of the military decision, must refrain from attacks that result in the expected loss of civilian life or damage to property or cultural objects as a result of excessive attacks about the expected military advantage of the attack, this matter also applies to remote drones.¹⁴

The importance of proportionality becomes clear and increases when targeting is carried out outside the scope of conflict actions, as happens when terrorist elements are targeted in places that do not constitute conflict zones in the actual sense. The effect of the rule of proportionality is not limited to accidental damage to the uninvolved persons only, but extends to paralyze the targeted individuals themselves, as the rule states that Use of force designed to kill proportionately only in an unavoidable situation to protect another human being.¹⁵

The rule of proportionality requires the existence of an amount of information and the study of the target that is chosen for targeting to obtain a sufficient amount of results about the extent of the risk resulting from the targeting process and the desired military benefit from this targeting, and perhaps the remote drones are the most capable of carrying out this intelligence operations and gathering information because they can Observe the target for several days, reaching it wherever it is, and studying the targeting area and surveying it geographically, which provides great opportunities for the existence of proportionality in the strikes of remote drones. The clearest example of this is what happened when one of the leaders of Al-Qaeda organization in Pakistan who was related to the assassination of the Prime Minister of Pakistan (Benazir Bhutto) and assisted in carrying out several suicide operations, as he was monitored for a long time by remote drones until he headed to areas It was not inhabited, and he was targeted there, and only his wife was injured. Many officials,

especially the Americans, emphasized the commitment of remote drones to the principle of proportionality. There is no doubt that in the issue of proportionality, each case must be studied separately each time the targeting is carried out, and the operator must respond positively, provided that the operation he is carrying out provides a military advantage to achieve a military objective, as remote drones are not different from any other weapon in the application Power on this.¹⁶

By reviewing the above, we find that the remote drones can study the target and the targeting area elaborately, but the issue of the military advantage remains dependent on whoever moves this plane or the command of the Supreme Commander because the desired military advantage is related to events outside the conflict and targeting areas.

THE SECOND BRANCH

DISTINGUISH BETWEEN CIVILIAN AND MILITARY TARGETS

One of the most prominent principles of international humanitarian law is the principle of distinction between civilian targets and military objectives, as this principle states that the parties to the conflict must distinguish between combatants and non-combatants, given that combatants, from a legal standpoint, are members of an organization that has an internal disciplinary system and implements the laws of war. The violation is that civilians are non-combatants and they are immune from targeting, but with their direct participation in hostilities, they are deprived of this immunity, and this principle applies to the distinction between civilian and military objects, this is what was indicated by the First Additional Protocol to the Geneva Conventions in the text of Article forty-eight.¹⁷

The principle of distinction is evident in two parts: the first is not to target civilians and to distinguish between combatants and non-combatants, and to distinguish between civilian objects and military targets, and the second part is not to invoke civilians to protect combatants and military objectives and to use civilians as shields to protect fighters and military objectives. This matter does not raise any doubt about international armed

conflicts, but the matter differs about non-international conflicts, as there is doubt about the extent to which the principle of distinction is applied about non-international armed conflicts in light of the first additional protocol and the extent to which the concept of civilians and combatants applies to irregular armed groups in informal conflicts International.¹⁸

Or even the militants of al-Qaeda or similar organizations because the members of these organizations do not fall within the scope of the concept of irregular armed groups based on the Second Additional Protocol to the Geneva Conventions.

In this regard, general rules can be applied, as civilians can be stripped of the immunity granted to them under international humanitarian law in two ways: The first is through their temporary participation in hostilities, and this method can be considered temporary, such as carrying a weapon or planting a bomb as part of hostilities, and the civilian's deprivation continues. Immunity until the termination of this participation. As for the second method, which requires the permanent deprivation of civilian protection, it is through engaging in continuous combat missions within non-governmental organized armed groups. Individuals whose continuous mission involves preparing, carrying out, or participating in hostilities are considered combatants, even if the combat activity is What they practice takes part of the time, not all, and falls into this category the farmer who continues his work during the day and turns to fight at night.¹⁹

This classification is criticized for its negative impact on the principle of distinction, especially as it creates parties to non-international armed conflicts whose entire armed forces remain part of the civilian population. The matter becomes more difficult as irregular armed groups conceal their personnel and equipment among civilians, especially since international humanitarian law did not define the obligations of irregular armed forces strictly and clearly as it did with regular armies. Determining the legality of the mixing of irregular armed groups with civilians is due to the intention of these groups. By taking civilians as human shields without violating the law by mixing with civilians, but although mixing with civilians by armed

groups is illegal, this has a legal effect on the armies fighting them in the context of the distinction between civilians and soldiers, and this has affected the weapons they use as they have become more Distinguished and intelligent, and became smaller in size to attack the unconventional enemy and unconventional armies, and drones are one of the most important of these methods.²⁰

Although remote drones can carry out indiscriminate strikes like any other weapon, they can comply with the principle of distinction, whether in international or non-international armed conflicts. Drones can distinguish military clothing in international armed conflicts as well as have the ability. To monitor and analyze to target combatants in non-international armed conflicts, even if the fighters wear civilian clothes or are in civilian neighbourhoods, but more than that as these aircraft can conduct what is called a life analysis by tracking and analyzing the suspect's daily life activities. It makes discrimination error unlikely.²¹

Some jurists express a different opinion, based on figures and statistics issued mostly by non-governmental organizations, and among these numbers is what was reported by the Center for Investigative Journalism. On the number of people killed in the drone attacks, where the numbers range from (three thousand) to (four thousand) people, including more than (200) children, between 2003 and 2013.²²

Other statistics indicate that the percentage of civilian casualties in the places of targeting by US drones between 2004 and 2007 amounted to 50% of the total casualties, which decreased significantly in 2011 despite the increase in the number of strikes, as the percentage of civilian casualties reached only 1% of the total casualties, according to the reports submitted, and the reduction in the percentage to this small extent is due to the United States 'adoption of vague standards in identifying civilians and military personnel, and most of the strikes take place in areas far from the presence of persons documenting civilian victims, which leaves the door open to the United States. The US government can issue as many numbers as it wants about the casualties of the strikes, and the Islamic nature of the areas in which they are targeted contributes to the difficulty of knowing

the victims due to the prohibition on keeping the bodies for a long time, which increases the difficulty of documenting the attack, and the US aims to reduce the numbers by various means to defend the use of drones Remotely, due to the low cost of use and almost complete safety in targeting operations .²³

The principles of proportionality and distinction take us to the necessity of having the precautionary principle in targeting and taking all necessary to avoid false injuries and by applying the principles of proportionality and distinction to remote drones and their operation, we find that targeting is under the control of the operator, and this does not raise any ambiguity about the legality of remote drones. The violation or error is attributed to the military operator or commander, but the matter is different when talking about technological development and the possibility of fully autonomous and targeting aircraft, without any human intervention that contributes to the estimates and judgments required by the principles of proportionality and distinction, as this makes them indiscriminate weapons. Which cannot be controlled and thus prohibiting its use by international conventions and international humanitarian law.²⁴ This same matter and the extent of the legal acceptance of remote drones takes us to what is known as the just war philosophy and its availability in remote drone strikes, especially when targeting terrorist groups.

THE THIRD BRANCH

JUST WAR

The concept of just war theory knows that both parties involved in a conflict have something at stake, and then they both have some kind of risk, and this does not mean that the battle needs to be balanced and equal in the interests of both parties, but the threat must continue to affect both parties regardless of the equality of this threat. As long as both parties can threaten, regardless of its size and extent, and about remote drones, the authors mention (Henry Shaw). And (Matthew Evangelista) in their book (The American Method for Bombing, Changing the Ethical and Legal Rules from Flying Saucers to Drones), "remote drones violate just war theory, where instead of a heroic encounter between equal combatants we have an

asymmetric situation, where the plane's path takes a stand. The gods who decide who will live and who will die and watch the remaining individuals on the earth act of death and killing without any means of confrontation. "Remote drones violate the basic principle of the just war theory of the possibility of danger and threat, no matter how weak it is, so the operator sits thousands of kilometres away and operates the plane and targets what he deems appropriate, The jurists who support the theory of just war assert that remote drones cannot be compared to any other weapon in terms of the possibility of exposure to danger, so that the pilot in a regular warplane risks himself from some strikes from ground combat when entering the airspace of hostile countries or target areas and in their absence, The risk of mechanical failure in the plane suffices, while none of this is available in remote drones, and another section goes tighter. To me that the use of remote drones against terrorist organizations is arbitrary in their use, given that these fighters cannot respond immediately to strikes, which violates the theory of just war so that the terrorist attacks that they carry out are not before an immediate response because they need planning and preparation. It lasts longer .²⁵

We see that the application of the concept of just war is not without validity, so a person sees the battle and the objectives as a video game on a screen in front of him while he is in a distant country, his vision and psychological state differ from that of a person within the battle or next to it who hears its voice and sees the fire with his own eyes, and here we find the essence of the difference about drones from After the application of this concept to launching it with regard to terrorist organizations, it is useless stress, and the use of remote drones can be abolished and the same result can be achieved by adopting other methods that are better, more efficient and closer to logic, such as applying the principles of proportionality, distinction and precaution in applying these two principles in order to preserve rights The humanity of these killers and their innocent relatives, without prejudice to the feeling of being subjected to terrorist attacks or influenced by it, considering the fighter as an illegal target for remote drones simply because he is unable to immediately

respond to them is excluded his acceptance, especially from the families of victims of terrorist attacks.

Some jurists are relying on a matter of legal and moral significance about remote drones, relying on the fact that use at present has long-term effects in terms of forming acceptable legal precedents and practices for the use of remote drones, and in this regard, they specialize in the United States of America. It is the largest user of these aircraft and they rely on most, if not all, of the countries trying to develop this type of aircraft to support their military arsenal, and that these countries will follow the impact of the United States of America in using these aircraft.²⁶

CONCLUSIONS

1. Remote drones are used in all armed conflicts, whether international or non-international and even outside the scope of the conflict.
2. International human rights law can be applied to unmanned strikes in some targeting areas, where targeting is done outside the battles in safe civilian areas.
3. The right to life and the right not to be subjected to humiliating or cruel treatment are among the rights covered by the protection of international humanitarian law.
4. The most prominent remarks on remote drones are the repeated strikes until the target's annihilation, which threatens the paramedics and the wounded, and generates psychological pain to people in the vicinity or near the targeted areas.
5. International humanitarian law can be applied to strikes during conflicts, as it contains the principles of distinction, proportionality and precaution in applying these two principles.
6. The lack of confidence of some jurists in the ability of remote drones to fully apply the principles of proportionality and distinction as a result of automatic autonomy from the aircraft itself with the presence of defenders of this type of weapon and its ability to adhere to these two principles.

7. With the absence of rules for remote drones, current practices constitute precedents and rules that can be relied upon in the future.
8. As long as there is human control over this type of weapon, it remains a legitimate weapon, and the more the automatic aspect of control and selection increases, the more illegitimate it becomes, even if it becomes fully automatic, it turns into an illegal weapon, being closer to an indiscriminate weapon.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. We see the need to review the application of international human rights law to remote drone strikes and to find a legal compromise formula in an agreement so that there is an agreement that integrates the application of international human rights law and international humanitarian law that preserves the privacy of these devices and the privacy of the places in which they are targeted.
2. The necessity to conclude an international agreement that regulates the legal status of this type of aircraft in line with its technological development and danger, and to be independent of other international agreements, similar to nuclear and chemical weapons. Experts and specialists in these weapons are referred to in addition to scholars in international and criminal law.
3. We suggest asking for advice from the International Court of Justice by the United Nations General Assembly to determine the legality of these weapons and adopting a binding resolution by the UN Security Council regulating their status in light of the advisory opinions of the International Court of Justice.
4. Forming independent committees in international governmental and non-governmental organizations to look into individual complaints submitted by victims of airstrikes by a remote control that follow speed in their work and employ independents to assess appropriate compensation and penalties.

5. To oblige the countries that are targeting to provide correct information about their strikes and to include the location of these aircraft for the countries used within the annual reviews of the Human Rights Council, and we also recommend that a special rapporteur for victims of these aircraft be found in the Human Rights Council to hear complaints and make appropriate suggestions for each case.

REFERENCES

1. Ahmed Al-Ibrahim, Unmanned Aircraft System, Aviation for All Magazine, 2015, First Year, Issue 6.
2. Haider Abd Ali and Zainab Jabbour, The Principle of Proportionality in International Humanitarian Law, Al Mohaqiq Al Hilli Journal for Legal and Political Sciences, 2016, Year Eight, Issue 2.
3. Report of Ben Emerson, Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism, United Nations, General Assembly, Sixty-eighth Session, 9/18/2013, Document A / 68/389.
4. The United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy, United Nations, General Assembly, Sixtieth Resolution, 9/8/2006, Sixtieth Session A / RES / 60/158.
5. Resolution for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms in the Context of Combating Terrorism, United Nations, General Assembly, Resolution No. 60/158, Sixtieth Session / 16/12/2005, A / RES / 60/158.
6. The Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court 1998.
7. The Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, 1984.
8. The First Additional Protocol to the Geneva Conventions, 1977.
9. International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, 1966.
10. European Convention on Human Rights, 1950.
11. Nils Melzer, Human Rights Implications Of The Usage Of Drones And Unmanned Robots In Warfare, European Parliament, Directorate-General For External Policies Of The Union, 2013, ISBN:978-823-4390-6.
12. Erik Roxstrom and others, The NATO Bombing Case And the limits of western human Rights Protection, Boston University International Law Journal, 2005,
13. Grant H. Frazier, Armed Drones: An Age-Old Problem Exacerbated by New Technology, Claremont Colleges, Pomona College 2016.
14. Interpretive Guidance On the Notion Of Direct Participation in Hostilities under International Humanitarian Law, Adopted by The Assembly Of The International Committee Of The Red Cross, 2009.
15. Laurie R. Blank, After "Top Gun" How Drone Strikes The Law Impact The Law Of War, the University Of Pennsylvania Journal Of International Law, 2012.
16. Brookman-Byrne, M. (2017). Drone Use 'Outside Areas of Active Hostilities': An Examination of the Legal Paradigms Governing US Covert Remote Strikes. *Netherlands International Law Review*, 64(1), 3-41.
17. Casey-Maslen, S. (2012). Pandora's box? Drone strikes under jus ad Bellum, Jus in Bello, and international human rights law. *International Review of the Red Cross*, 94(886), 597-625.
18. Anderson, K. (2009). Targeted killing in US counterterrorism strategy and law.
19. Brunstetter, D. R., & Jimenez-Bacardi, A. (2015). Clashing over drones: The legal and normative gap between the United States and the human rights community. *The International Journal of Human Rights*, 19(2), 176-198.
20. Wagner, M. (2011). Taking humans out of the loop: implications for international humanitarian law. *JL Inf. & Sci.*, 21, 155.
21. Otto, R. (2011). Targeted killings and international law: with special regard to human rights and international humanitarian law (Vol. 230). Springer Science & Business Media.
22. Wuschka, S. (2011). The Use of Combat Drones in Current Conflicts-A Legal Issues or a Political Problem. *Goettingen J. Int'l L.*, 3, 891.

23. Sterio, M. (2012). The United States' use of drones in the War on Terror: the (il) legality of targeted killings under international law. *Case W. Res. J. Int'l L.*, 45, 197.
24. Drake, A. M. (2010). Current US Air Force Drone Operations and Their Conduct in Compliance with International Humanitarian Law-An Overview. *Dev. J. Int'l L. & Poly*, 39, 629.
25. Wagner, M. (2014). The dehumanization of international humanitarian law: legal, ethical, and political implications of autonomous weapon systems. *Vand. J. Transnat'l L.*, 47, 1371.
26. Takemura, H. (2014). Unmanned Aerial Vehicles: Humanization from International Humanitarian Law. *Wis. Int'l LJ*, 32, 521.