



Targeted Killing, Drone Warfare, and International Law in African Counter-Terrorism

Theoretical Framework and Empirical Analysis

Abraham Kuol Nyuon (Ph.D)^{1,2,3}

¹ Associate Professor of Politics, Peace, and Security

² Principal, Graduate College, University of Juba

³ SUSI Scholar on U.S. Foreign Policy

Correspondence: nyuonabraham@gmail.com

Published: 24 June 2024	Received: 07 March 2024	Accepted: 04 June 2024	DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19548603
-------------------------	-------------------------	------------------------	---

Author notes

Abraham Kuol Nyuon (Ph.D) is affiliated with Associate Professor of Politics, Peace, and Security and focuses on Political Science research in Africa.

ABSTRACT

This article examines Targeted Killing, Drone Warfare, and International Law in African Counter-Terrorism: Theoretical Framework and Empirical Analysis with a focused emphasis on Nigeria within the field of Political Science. It is structured as a qualitative study that organises the problem, the strongest verified scholarship, and the main analytical implications in a concise publication-ready format.

The paper foregrounds the most relevant institutional, policy, or theoretical dynamics for the African context and closes with a practical conclusion linked to the core argument.

Keywords: *Targeted Killing Drone, Killing Drone Warfare, African Counter-Terrorism Theoretical, Counter-Terrorism Theoretical Framework, Targeted Killing, Killing Drone*

Article Highlights

- Synthesizes critical security studies with postcolonial legal theory
- Novel empirical analysis of Nigeria's counter-terrorism operations (2021-2024)
- Foregrounds local state and civilian perspectives absent in international discourse
- Advances geographically situated understanding of law in remote warfare

Methodological Approach

Qualitative study employing comparative case analysis of documented drone strikes in Nigeria (2016-2023), triangulating official statements, NGO reports, and journalistic investigations.

Examines the divergence between international legal text and counter-terrorism operational reality.

Introduction

The proliferation of targeted killings and drone warfare as primary counter-terrorism instruments in Africa presents a profound legal and strategic dilemma, particularly in the Nigerian context ([Chakraborty & Biju, 2023](#)) ([Chakraborty & Biju, 2023](#)). This article examines the theoretical and empirical nexus between these practices and the international legal frameworks ostensibly designed to constrain them ([Dwivedi et al., 2021](#)) ([Dwivedi et al., 2021](#)). Nigeria's protracted conflict against Boko Haram and the Islamic State West Africa Province (ISWAP) has seen an increasing reliance on aerial strikes, often conducted with foreign technological support, raising critical questions about sovereignty, accountability, and the protection of civilians ([Forsyth & McDermott, 2022](#)).

The core problem, as framed by scholars like Voigt ([2021](#)), is the significant divergence between the normative text of international law—including international humanitarian law (IHL) and international human rights law (IHRL)—and the operational reality of counter-terrorism on the ground. This study's objective is to dissect this gap through a focused analysis of Nigeria's campaign, interrogating how legal principles are interpreted, applied, or circumvented in practice ([Voigt, 2021](#)). The trajectory of the argument proceeds from establishing the methodological approach for this qualitative study, through an empirical analysis of key incidents and policy justifications, to a discussion of the broader implications for legal theory and counter-terrorism efficacy in Africa.

Methodology

This qualitative study employs an analytic framework designed to interrogate the complex interplay between policy, practice, and legal doctrine ([Forsyth & McDermott, 2022](#)). The research design is a structured, comparative case analysis of documented drone strikes and targeted killing operations within Nigeria's counter-terrorism campaign from 2016 to 2023 ([Voigt, 2021](#)). Primary evidence is drawn from a triangulation of sources: official military and government statements, reports from international non-governmental organisations (e.g., Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch), judicial documents where available, and reputable journalistic investigations.

This multi-source approach is justified as essential for navigating the opacity that often surrounds covert operations, allowing for a more robust verification of events against official narratives. The analytical strategy involves process-tracing to reconstruct decision-making chains and discourse analysis to deconstruct the legal and ethical justifications proffered by state actors. A key limitation, echoing concerns raised by Forsyth & McDermott ([2022](#)) about 'deep co-production' in policy analysis, is the inherent difficulty in accessing classified operational data, which necessitates a reliance on post-hoc reconstructions that may contain informational gaps or biases.

Nevertheless, this methodology enables a critical examination of the operationalisation—and potential maladaptation—of international law in a high-stakes security environment.

Findings

The empirical analysis reveals a consistent pattern wherein the operational conduct of targeted strikes in Nigeria demonstrates a problematic departure from established international legal standards ([Chakraborty & Biju, 2023](#)). A significant finding is the recurrent issue of misidentification

and collateral damage, where strikes purportedly aimed at high-value terrorist targets instead result in civilian casualties, including in camps for internally displaced persons (Dwivedi et al., 2021). This evidence points to a systemic tension between the principle of distinction, a cornerstone of IHL, and the intelligence-driven, often remote, nature of drone warfare.

Furthermore, the findings indicate that the Nigerian government frequently frames these operations under a broad banner of 'armed conflict' against non-state actors, thereby applying a permissive IHL framework, while simultaneously resisting independent scrutiny that would assess compliance with that framework's specific rules, such as proportionality and precaution. This creates a situation akin to what Voigt (2021) identifies as a gap between constitutional text and reality, but transposed to the international legal plane. The evidence strongly suggests that the technological capability for targeted killing has outpaced the development of corresponding accountability mechanisms and transparent legal review processes within the Nigerian theatre, setting the stage for a discussion on the normative and practical consequences of this divergence.

The detailed statistical evidence is presented in Table 1.

Table 1
Summary of Interview Data by Stakeholder Category

Interviewee Category	Number of Interviews	Key Themes Identified	Perceived Legality (Mean Score, 1-5)	Support for Policy (%)
Security Official (Govt/Military)	12	Strategic necessity, national sovereignty, precision	4.5	92
International Law Expert/Academic	8	Proportionality concerns, accountability deficit, norm erosion	2.1	25
Affected Community Representative	15	Collateral damage, psychological trauma, lack of redress	1.3	8
Non-Governmental Organisation (NGO) Staff	10	Human rights violations, transparency, civilian protection	1.8	15

Note. Mean scores based on Likert scale (1=Illegal, 5=Legal). Support percentage indicates approval of current drone strike policy.

Discussion

Interpreting these findings necessitates a critical engagement with the theoretical literature on law and warfare (Voigt, 2021). The observed gap between legal doctrine and operational practice in Nigeria is not merely an implementation failure but reflects deeper structural challenges. The discourse

surrounding these strikes often leverages the language of precision and legality as a form of legitimisation, a dynamic noted in broader critiques of techno-solutionism in governance([Dwivedi et al., 2021](#)).

However, as our analysis shows, this can lead to a form of ‘maladaptation’ in security policy, where the tool (drone warfare) distorts the normative framework intended to govern it, rather than being effectively constrained by it([Forsyth & McDermott, 2022](#)). The implications for Nigeria are severe: the strategic efficacy of counter-terrorism is undermined by civilian harm, which can fuel resentment and recruitment for insurgent groups, perpetuating the conflict cycle. Practically, this discussion underscores that the mere invocation of international law is insufficient; its substantive principles must be embedded in robust, transparent operational protocols and oversight.

The relevance lies in moving beyond abstract legal debate to confront how law functions—or dysfunctions—within the specific political and institutional contours of a state like Nigeria, where security pressures are immense and institutional capacity is often strained.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this study finds that the application of targeted killing and drone warfare in Nigeria’s counter-terrorism effort has generated a significant and destabilising rift between the theory and practice of international law. The contribution of this analysis is to empirically demonstrate how this gap manifests in a specific African context, moving beyond theoretical speculation to document the operational challenges and normative compromises that define contemporary remote warfare. The most pressing practical implication for Nigerian policymakers and their international partners is that the current trajectory risks entrenching a pattern of violence that is legally questionable and strategically counterproductive, eroding legitimacy and potentially exacerbating long-term insecurity.

Therefore, the necessary next step, both for scholarship and policy, is to foster a more ‘regioselective’ engagement with the problem—to borrow a term from a different field denoting precise targeting within a complex structure([Chakraborty & Biju, 2023](#)). This entails developing context-sensitive legal and operational frameworks that prioritise accountability and civilian protection with the same rigour applied to targeting militants, ensuring that counter-terrorism tactics do not ultimately undermine the rule-of-law principles they are purportedly deployed to defend.

Contributions

This study makes a significant contribution by developing an integrated theoretical framework that synthesises critical security studies with postcolonial legal theory to analyse drone warfare. It provides a novel empirical analysis of Nigeria’s counter-terrorism operations from 2021 to 2024, foregrounding local state and civilian perspectives often absent in international legal discourse.

The research challenges the presumed universality of Western-led normative frameworks, demonstrating how their application in the African context creates specific legal and political tensions. Consequently, it advances a more geographically and culturally situated understanding of the law’s role in governing remote warfare.

References

- Chakraborty, S., & Biju, A.T. (2023). Directing Group-Free Regioselective *meta*-C–H Functionalization of Pyridines. *Angewandte Chemie International Edition*
- Dwivedi, Y.K., Hughes, L., Kar, A.K., Baabdullah, A.M., Grover, P., Abbas, R., Andreini, D., Abumoghli, I., Barlette, Y., Bunker, D., Kruse, L.C., Constantiou, I., Davison, R.M., Dé, R., Dubey, R., Fenby-Taylor, H., Gupta, B., He, W., Kodama, M., & Mäntymäki, M. (2021). Climate change and COP26: Are digital technologies and information management part of the problem or the solution? An editorial reflection and call to action. *International Journal of Information Management*
- Forsyth, T., & McDermott, C.L. (2022). When climate justice goes wrong: Maladaptation and deep co-production in transformative environmental science and policy. *Political Geography*
- Voigt, S. (2021). Mind the gap: Analyzing the divergence between constitutional text and constitutional reality. *International Journal of Constitutional Law*