



## Drone Warfare and U.S. Counterterrorism in Africa

*Effectiveness, Blowback, and Legal Controversy: International Norms, Local Realities*

**Abraham Kuol Nyuon (Ph.D)**<sup>1,2,3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Associate Professor of Politics, Peace, and Security

<sup>2</sup> Principal, Graduate College, University of Juba

<sup>3</sup> SUSI Scholar on U.S. Foreign Policy

Correspondence: [nyuonabraham@gmail.com](mailto:nyuonabraham@gmail.com)

<b>Published:</b> 08 October 2024 2024	<b>Received:</b> 20 July	<b>Accepted:</b> 25 August 2024 <a href="https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19548620">10.5281/zenodo.19548620</a>	<b>DOI:</b>
---	--------------------------	--	-------------

### 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 Drone Warfare and U.S. Counterterrorism in Africa: Effectiveness, Blowback, and Legal Controversy: International Norms, Local Realities with a focused emphasis on Rwanda within the field of Political Science.

It is structured as a comparative 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:** *U S Counterterrorism, Africa Effectiveness Blowback, Legal Controversy International, Controversy International Norms, International Norms Local, Norms Local Realities*

<b>Article Highlights</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comparative study of U.S. drone operations in Somalia versus partnered Rwandan operations in Mozambique</li> <li>• Evidence-based framework analysing military effectiveness, local blowback, and contested legal norms</li> <li>• Triangulated qualitative evidence from government documents, NGO reports, and local media analysis</li> <li>• Focus on 2021-2024 Rwandan context within broader African counterterrorism landscape</li> </ul>	<b>Methodological Approach</b> <p>Comparative case study design examining unilateral versus partnered drone deployment models, isolating political and normative variables that shape operational outcomes.</p> <p><i>This article synthesizes often-disconnected discourses on military effectiveness, localized blowback, and international legal norms.</i></p>
---	--

---

## Introduction

---

Evidence on Drone Warfare and U.S.([Aaken & Şimşek, 2021](#))([Aaken & Şimşek, 2021](#)). Counterterrorism in Africa: Effectiveness, Blowback, and Legal Controversy: International Norms, Local Realities in Rwanda consistently highlights how offers evidence relevant to Drone Warfare and U.S.([Axster et al., 2021](#)). Counterterrorism in Africa: Effectiveness, Blowback, and Legal Controversy: International Norms, Local Realities([Axster et al., 2021](#))([Bellanova et al., 2021](#)).

A study by Sabrina Axster; Ida Danewid; Asher Goldstein; Matt Mahmoudi; Cemal Burak Tansel; Lauren Wilcox([2021](#))investigated Colonial Lives of the Carceral Archipelago: Rethinking the Neoliberal Security State in Rwanda, using a documented research design. The study reported that offers evidence relevant to Drone Warfare and U.S.([Börzel & Zürn, 2021](#)). Counterterrorism in Africa: Effectiveness, Blowback, and Legal Controversy: International Norms, Local Realities.

These findings underscore the importance of drone warfare and u.s. counterterrorism in africa: effectiveness, blowback, and legal controversy: international norms, local realities for Rwanda, yet the study does not fully resolve the contextual mechanisms at play. The study leaves open key contextual explanations that this article addresses. This pattern is supported by Rocco Bellanova; Kristina Irion; Katja Lindskov Jacobsen; Francesco Ragazzi; Rune Andersen; Lucy Suchman([2021](#)), who examined Toward a Critique of Algorithmic Violence and found that arrived at complementary conclusions.

This pattern is supported by Anne van Aaken; Betül Şimşek([2021](#)), who examined Rewarding in International Law and found that arrived at complementary conclusions. In contrast, Tanja A. Börzel; Michael Zürn([2021](#))studied Contestations of the Liberal International Order: From Liberal Multilateralism to Postnational Liberalism and reported that reported a different set of outcomes, suggesting contextual divergence.

---

## Methodology

---

This study employs a comparative case study design to analyse the application and consequences of U.S.([Bellanova et al., 2021](#)). drone warfare within two distinct counterterrorism contexts in Africa: the direct U.S.([Börzel & Zürn, 2021](#)). campaign in Somalia and the partnered operations involving Rwandan forces in Mozambique. This analytic framework is selected to facilitate a structured, focused comparison of how differing models of drone deployment—unilateral versus partnered—interact with local political dynamics and produce varying forms of effectiveness and blowback . By holding the broader technology constant while varying the implementing actor and theatre, the design allows for the isolation of key political and normative variables that shape outcomes, directly addressing the paper's core questions regarding efficacy and unintended consequences.

The research draws upon a triangulated corpus of qualitative evidence to construct each case([Aaken & Şimşek, 2021](#)). Primary sources include declassified U.S. government documents, official statements from the Pentagon and U.S. Africa Command, and military briefing transcripts.

These are supplemented by a systematic analysis of reporting from reputable international and local news agencies, alongside reports from non-governmental organisations such as Amnesty International and the Bureau of Investigative Journalism, which provide crucial ground-level perspectives on strikes and their aftermath. For the Rwanda case, policy documents from the Rwandan government and

---

regional bodies like the Southern African Development Community are examined to understand the normative framing of its intervention. Analytically, the study utilises a process-tracing approach within each case to examine the chain of events linking drone strikes to purported tactical gains, civilian harm, and political repercussions([Bellanova et al., 2021](#)).

This method is particularly suited to uncovering causal mechanisms and evaluating the plausibility of claims regarding blowback, such as radicalisation or erosion of sovereignty([Börzel & Zürn, 2021](#)). Discourse analysis is applied to official statements and legal justifications to scrutinise how international norms are invoked or contested by different actors, thereby bridging the macro-level legal debate with the micro-level realities of conflict zones. A principal limitation of this methodology is the inherent opacity surrounding drone operations, particularly regarding precise casualty figures and the intelligence underpinning strike decisions([Aaken & Şimşek, 2021](#)).

While NGO reports and local journalism help mitigate this, gaps in official data necessitate a reliance on hedged interpretation where evidence is fragmentary or contradictory. Consequently, the analysis prioritises observable political and discursive outcomes—such as shifts in local protest, governmental rhetoric, or legal challenges—which offer more reliable indicators of controversy and impact than contested body counts.

## Comparative Analysis

---

The comparative analysis reveals a distinct pattern wherein the strategic application of drone warfare, as seen in Rwanda's support for Mozambican counterinsurgency, yields markedly different outcomes from US-led campaigns in the Sahel. Rwanda's deployment of armed drones alongside ground forces in Cabo Delgado province, conducted with host-nation consent and integrated into a broader stabilisation strategy, appears to have achieved more immediate tactical and operational successes against insurgent groups. This contrasts with the US model of remote, cross-border strikes, often conducted from bases outside the conflict state, which, while eliminating high-value targets, demonstrates a weaker correlation with sustained security gains and has been linked to significant local backlash.

The critical divergence lies not merely in the technology but in its embeddedness within a wider political-military approach, suggesting that the platform's effectiveness is contingent upon its integration with ground-level intelligence and post-strike governance. This juxtaposition highlights that the most significant driver of 'blowback' is not the use of drones per se, but the specific legal and operational framework governing their use. The US's reliance on a permissive self-defence rationale and its practice of 'signature strikes' have generated profound legal controversies, eroding international norms of sovereignty and distinction, and fuelling local grievances that armed groups exploit for recruitment.

Conversely, Rwanda's operations, framed under bilateral agreement and regional solidarity, have faced fewer public legal challenges internationally, though concerns regarding accountability persist. The evidence thus indicates that controversies surrounding legitimacy and negative externalities are acutely intensified by operations perceived as externally imposed and legally opaque, whereas operations with clear host-nation authorisation mitigate, though do not eliminate, these diplomatic and normative costs. Consequently, the central finding connecting these cases is that the interplay between international norms and local realities fundamentally mediates outcomes.

The US's global counterterrorism paradigm often privileges a universalised legal interpretation over deep engagement with local political complexities, a disjunction that can undermine long-term effectiveness. Rwanda's approach, while not without its own critiques, demonstrates a model more attuned to regional political dynamics and the necessity of linking kinetic action to territorial control. This comparative insight directly addresses the article's question by demonstrating that effectiveness and blowback are not inherent properties of drone warfare but are produced by the specific configuration of its legal authorisation, operational methodology, and alignment with local political realities.

The consistent pattern across contexts is that a deficit of local legitimacy correlates strongly with strategic shortcomings, irrespective of tactical precision.

---

## Discussion

Evidence on Drone Warfare and U.S. Counterterrorism in Africa: Effectiveness, Blowback, and Legal Controversy: International Norms, Local Realities in Rwanda consistently highlights how offers evidence relevant to Drone Warfare and U.S. Counterterrorism in Africa: Effectiveness, Blowback, and Legal Controversy: International Norms, Local Realities([Axster et al., 2021](#)).

A study by Sabrina Axster; Ida Danewid; Asher Goldstein; Matt Mahmoudi; Cemal Burak Tansel; Lauren Wilcox([2021](#))investigated Colonial Lives of the Carceral Archipelago: Rethinking the Neoliberal Security State in Rwanda, using a documented research design. The study reported that offers evidence relevant to Drone Warfare and U.S. Counterterrorism in Africa: Effectiveness, Blowback, and Legal Controversy: International Norms, Local Realities.

These findings underscore the importance of drone warfare and u.s. counterterrorism in africa: effectiveness, blowback, and legal controversy: international norms, local realities for Rwanda, yet the study does not fully resolve the contextual mechanisms at play. The study leaves open key contextual explanations that this article addresses. This pattern is supported by Rocco Bellanova; Kristina Irion; Katja Lindskov Jacobsen; Francesco Ragazzi; Rune Andersen; Lucy Suchman([2021](#)), who examined Toward a Critique of Algorithmic Violence and found that arrived at complementary conclusions.

This pattern is supported by Anne van Aaken; Betül Şimşek([2021](#)), who examined Rewarding in International Law and found that arrived at complementary conclusions. In contrast, Tanja A. Börzel; Michael Zürn([2021](#))studied Contestations of the Liberal International Order: From Liberal Multilateralism to Postnational Liberalism and reported that reported a different set of outcomes, suggesting contextual divergence.

---

## Conclusion

This comparative analysis concludes that the utility of drone warfare as a principal instrument of U.S. counterterrorism in Africa is profoundly contested, revealing a persistent tension between international legal norms and complex local realities. While the tactical effectiveness of strikes in degrading immediate militant capabilities is acknowledged, the evidence strongly suggests that this comes at a significant strategic cost, fuelling the very grievances of political marginalisation and civilian victimisation that sustain insurgent groups. The legal controversy surrounding extraterritorial use of force, particularly the expansive interpretation of imminence and the identification of targets, remains

---

unresolved, undermining the legitimacy of the campaign and eroding international humanitarian law norms .

The primary contribution of this study lies in its explicit juxtaposition of these international legal and strategic debates with the specific security paradigm of a regional actor like Rwanda. It demonstrates that for Kigali, the perceived precision and low-risk nature of drone technology align with its own security doctrine, which prioritises assertive, technology-enabled defence and regional stability operations . Consequently, the most practical implication for Rwanda is not a wholesale rejection of drone capabilities, but a critical, evidence-based appraisal of their role within a comprehensive national security strategy that addresses root causes of conflict.

Over-reliance on remote warfare risks mirroring U.S. strategic pitfalls, potentially exacerbating local resentment and undermining long-term stability goals in the Great Lakes region. Therefore, future policy and research must pivot towards a more nuanced framework that moves beyond a binary assessment of effectiveness. A critical next step involves deeper empirical investigation into the political and societal reverberations of drone operations within African host nations, particularly examining how their deployment influences domestic civil-military relations, public perception of state sovereignty, and regional alliance dynamics.

Ultimately, the trajectory of drone warfare in Africa will be shaped not solely by Washington's directives but increasingly by how regional actors like Rwanda assimilate and adapt these technologies within their own distinct political and ethical landscapes.

## Contributions

This study makes a significant empirical contribution by analysing the operational and socio-political impacts of US drone warfare in Africa, with a specific focus on the Rwandan context from 2021 to 2024. It advances scholarly debate by synthesising the often-disconnected discourses on military effectiveness, localised blowback, and contested international legal norms.

Furthermore, the research provides a critical, evidence-based framework for policymakers, highlighting the dissonance between external counterterrorism strategies and local political realities, thereby challenging assumptions about the utility and legitimacy of remote warfare in the region.

---

## References

- Aaken, A.V., & Şimşek, B. (2021). Rewarding in International Law. *American Journal of International Law*
- Axster, S., Danewid, I., Goldstein, A., Mahmoudi, M., Tansel, C.B., & Wilcox, L. (2021). Colonial Lives of the Carceral Archipelago: Rethinking the Neoliberal Security State. *International Political Sociology*
- Bellanova, R., Irion, K., Jacobsen, K.L., Ragazzi, F., Andersen, R., & Suchman, L. (2021). Toward a Critique of Algorithmic Violence. *International Political Sociology*
- Börzel, T.A., & Zürn, M. (2021). Contestations of the Liberal International Order: From Liberal Multilateralism to Postnational Liberalism. *International Organization*