

KASDI MARBAH UNIVERSITY-OUARGLA

Faculty of Letters and Languages

Department of English Language and literature



Academic Master

Domain: Letters and Foreign Languages

Field: English Language, Literature and Civilization

Major: Literature and Civilization

Submitted by: Benzaid Loubna Wissal

Title:

The Failure of the USA's Responsibility to Protect in Libya

Dissertation submitted in partial Fulfillment for the Requirement of the master degree in English

Literature and Civilization

Before the Jury

Examiner **Mr. Kantaoui Mohamed**

Supervisor **Mr. Djelloul Bouahla**

Examiner **Mrs. Dalila Mesloub**

Academic year: 2019 / 2020

Dedication

I would like to dedicated this work to my small family: my parents who provided me with all the needed, materialistic and moral support, my dearest sisters and my only brother

Special dedication goes to the ones who always tried to help me while finishing my work and never refuse to be by my side

I also dedicate this work to my beloved and my best friends who I share with the happiest moments during the years of my study

To everyone whom I love.

Acknowledgement

My heartfelt appreciation goes to my Supervisor, Mr.Bourahla Djelloul, to whom I am thankful for his observation, his feed backs while I was mostly mistaking, and his remarkable efforts.

An another brunch of thanks are delivered to all of the ones who cared the most about finishing this work , supported me to the end , and always been there for me. To all who helped me to find references and buy books, thank you.

I would like to extant my thanks to the jury members for their priceless time while proofreading my paper and evaluating it.

Abstract

The RtoP policy is divided to three stages: To Prevent, To React, and To Rebuild. In Libya, in the wake of humanitarian intervention, the USA and NATO took many procedures and actions to stop the massacres. Overall, the intervention in Libya was a test for RtoP. Success or failure would have confirmed its relevance or called it into question. At least the first objective of protecting Libyan civilians in Benghazi against the grave human rights abuses at the hand of their own government was achieved. Strong condemnation was also expressed toward the shift from civilian protection to regime change. A confusion of goals can lead to a failure of well structured intervention. The Responsibility to Prevent and the Responsibility to React are generally by the international community, but the Rebuilding is the special responsibility of bringing new beginning to the country. In other words, it is all about helping to build a long durable and sustainable development.

Key Words: Responsibility to Protect, Prevent, React, Rebuild, intervention, Libya, USA, NATO

ملخص

مبدأ سياسة التدخل و الحماية التي تنتهجها الدول الكبرى عند انتهاك حقوق المواطنين تنقسم إلى ثلاثة عناصر وهي المنع و التهديد ثم التدخل العسكري ثم إعادة البناء. في خضم التحول الطارئ في ليبيا، قام كل من حلف الشمال الأطلسي و الولايات المتحدة بالعديد من العمليات العسكرية و التدخلات الأجنبية من اجل توفير الحماية للمتضررين. اعتبرت حالة ليبيا كتجريب للسياسة و بحث عن النتائج هته السياسة التي كانت عبارة عن حبر على ورق. في بادئ الأمر كان التدخل عبارة حماية و لكن تحول إلى تغيير و تحية حكم. وهذا ما قوبل بموجة من السخط في المحيط العالمي. المنع و التدخل يعتبران من أهم العناصر و لكن البناء هو الأساس فإذا غاب هذا العنصر يمكن الجزم أن التدخل فاشل و لا يوازي المعايير العالمية للتدخل. في هاته المرحلة تأمل الدول أن تصل إلى صناعة السلام و بناء الحكومة الجديدة و تحقيق التنمية المستدامة.

الكلمات المفتاحية: سياسة التدخل و الحماية ، حلف الشمال الأطلسي، الولايات المتحدة، المنع و التهديد، التدخل العسكري، إعادة البناء.

List of Abbreviation

RtoP:	Responsibility to Protect
UN:	United Nations
USA:	United States of America
ISIS/IS:	Islamic State in Iraq and Syria
CNN:	Cable News Network
GNA:	Government of National Accords
LNA:	Libyan National Army
OHCHR:	Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights
GNC:	General National Congress
HoR:	House of Representatives
LPA:	Libyan Parliament Agreements
UNSMIL:	United Nations Support Mission in Libya
HRD:	Human Resource Development
BBC:	British Broadcasting Corporation
TB:	Tuberculosis
ICRC:	the International Committee

Table of Content:

Dedication	1
Acknowledgement	III
Abstract	IV
List of Abbreviation	V
Table of Content	VI
General Introduction:	Error! Bookmark not defined.
1. Purpose of the Study:.....	10
2. Research Problem:	11
.3 Hypothesis:	11
4. Research Questions:.....	12
.5 Objectives of the Study:.....	12
6. Methodology:.....	12
7. Dissertation Structure:	12
Chapter 1: The Notions of Responsibility to Protect	14
1. Introduction:	15
2. Responsibility to protect:	15
2.1. History of Responsibility to protect:.....	16
2.2 Norms of the Responsibility to protect:	18
3. US Foreign Policy in Relation to Humanitarian Intervention:	19
4. Conclusion:	20
Chapter two: in the Road of Successful Intervention in Libya	22
1. Introduction:	23

2. The Prevention in the US Intervention: 23

2.1 PublicThreats: 24

2.2 Condemnation..... 24

3. Reaction in the US Intervention: 25

3.1. Operation Odyssey Dawn: 25

3.2 The Shift from Operation Odyssey Down to the Operation Unified Protector: 26

3.3 The US Relation with the Libyan Opposition: 27

4. The Fall of Quaddafi:..... 27

5. Conclusion: 27

Chapter Three: Descent to Chaos 29

1. Introduction: 30

2. Libya’s Internal Challenges: 31

2.1. Two Rival Governments:..... 33

3. Rebuilding in Libya: 35

3.1. Militias and Weapons: 36

3.2. A Fractured Country: 36

3.3. Election Hopes Gone Away: 37

3.4. Disappearance and Kidnapping: 38

3.5. Political Prisoners: 38

3.6. Arbitrary Attacks, War Crimes, and Torture: 39

3.7. The Emergence of Terror Groups and Slavery:..... 41

4. Conclusion: 43

General Conclusion: 44

Bibliography 47

General Introduction

The early beginning of the reformulation of the idea of the interventions was in form of using force from the perspective of taking lands or taking wealth but the new definition of intervention is to use force under the reason of protecting the innocent. While no solution is found, the Responsibility to Protect (RtoP) can stand against unfair, instability, and crimes. In general, the war crimes were not stopped or faced in most of the cases. In other words, the leaders of each country had the right to abuse their own people no matter what is happening inside their country but the decision of the intervention turned the things upside down. Responsibility to protect policy came as reaction to human suffering and innocent people asking for help. In fact, it aims to focus on this issue to stop it even before it begins, so that establishing facilities is highly important to face the situation and prevent the words to become to action then to tragedies. RtoP is formulated to stand against crimes, inhumanity, and suffering .in the same time, it is not considered with economy or politics in way in which each country can decide its systems while it is not causing real danger to its own people.

The movement of the Arab Spring went quickly from country to another, so that the protestors began to ask for their rights and to work so hard to achieve that. Libya's descent into violence provoked quick responses from the UN reporting the situation of instability and inhumanity, and Human rights abuses. They publicly stand against, condemned the crimes, and excessive use of force, and weapons against peaceful protestors. UN, NATO, and the USA were the main parts of the intervention in Libya. Starting from the early beginning to the last station of this intervention many events came to happen. If we look at development during the Libyan crisis, we can understand that the United States and NATO reacted differently to Libya than the other countries such as Tunisia, where nothing was done to stop the war situation.

No one can deny that Libya was facing dangerous problems and there were many calls for foreign intervention, especially the Westerns. In fact, Arab countries such as Emirates asked for the same. The whole Arab Spring matter was the turning point in Libyan history without forgetting the government discriminations on the innocents whom they refused to continue living in such conditions. This loud demands for democracy raised awareness of the need of free life among Libyans and intervention among foreign countries, aiming to bring better conditions. This process went through different stages and operations inside the country itself and International debates outside the country about the way and the duration of the intervention.

1. Purpose of the Study:

The RtoP policy is divided to three main stages: prevention, reaction and rebuilding. Each one of the previous stages has its tools and its results. In Libya, we can say that the needed results immediately appeared in period of less than year. However, later on, many surprising events came to happen as new result of this doctrine. Therefore my purpose of the study is to explore the short term results and long term results of the USA's Responsibility to Protect in Libya in relation to the three stages as the main parts of the whole intervention.

2. Research Problem:

The topic of RtoP has been debatable for a long time. When 1973 resolution was passed by the United Nations Security Council a strange contradiction quickly emerged regarding the justification for the RtoP approval. On one side the pro-interventions, who had doubt about the mission was absolutely essential for humanitarian reasons, and that this mission could be only a test of the RtoP efficiency, and it has not a clear results that we can rely on when doing an intervention . On the other side, there were who supported the intervention and the policy, and saw that the mission is a necessary way to create a state of stability to a country that is suffering from instability. Throughout 2011,in the wake of the Libyan intervention exposed by the UN and then by NATO, observers and public viewers left between why international forces chose to intervene in Libya, what is the future of the intervention, and what are going to be the exact results of the RtoP. While investigating about the strategy of the USA's Responsibility to protect in Libya's case, the research problem is to arrive to the extent to which the USA strategy has been decreasing and causing a failure in Libya, and the real role of the NATO in this intervention.

3. Hypothesis:

If considering the RtoP as urgent solution to Libya's case, the international community that is shaped into the UN, NATO and USA decided to intervene in Libya to stop crimes. Meanwhile this strategy was transferred into real acts in the state; the country was entering to a new era of civil war and crimes. The gap between the Libyan government and the international community caused a serious problem to Libya. All of that led to many horrifying results. To facilitate the meaning, this conflict ended up by being international mistake. Libya now is a failure state of civil war and divided governments that remain danger inside and outside. Furthermore, the US intervention via the NATO operations went through words than actions but when it comes to rebuilding nothing

was actually done. In fact, another problem appeared while intervention and caused the failure, which is that the goals of the NATO operation changed in the middle of the event from helping innocents and stopping war crimes, to a regime change. This is what we see in Libya today.

4. Research Questions:

- 1) How did a well-structured intervention end in failure in Libya?
- 2) In which way was the intervention, and what was the role of NATO?
- 3) To what extent is this intervention failure, and was it successful at some stages?
- 4) How was RtoP applied in Libya?

5. Objectives of the Study:

- 1) To investigate about USA's Responsibility to protect in Libya.
- 2) To identify the results of RtoP in Libya.
- 3) To clarify why RtoP is a failure in Libya.

6. Methodology:

This study goes through interpreting and selecting the events of how the US policy worked and ended in Libya. This research is a descriptive and analytical work based on narrating the main events in chronological coherent of this intervention. At the same time, it is based on interpreting those events by focusing on facts and real deals that happened inside and outside the country. It will focus on talks of politicians, such as the President and other members of governments. I will use the descriptive-analytical approach to determine the succession or the failure of the RtoP in relation to Libya's case by highlighting the way in which the intervention will be conducted by exposing the nature of the support of NATO to the US intervention. I will provide an over view of the US strategy, I will analyze the situation in way in which I will divide the duration of the intervention to three parts: Prevention when it is all about the threat and word against the crimes, Reaction which is the part where real actions are made against the dictator, and then to Rebuild which is the most important step of developing the country and refreshing whole situation for new different beginning. Furthermore, the study will use the process of narrating some important events that will play the biggest role in the change of Libya's history. In the end, I will highlight how a well structure intervention will end in failure.

7. Dissertation Structure:

This dissertation is divided into three chapters. Each chapter deals with different aspects of the study. The first chapter tackles the Arab Spring in relation to Libya with the historical background, and notion of RtoP. It contains the general composing of the RtoP policy. It focused on the general idea of its history to the more specific when dealing with three stages of the policy. To Prevent, to React and then to Rebuild are the 3 main components of the RtoP that this chapter discusses. Furthermore, the principles of the RtoP are included in this chapter to clarify the composing building of this policy.

The second chapter is where the short term results of RtoP in Libya appear as successful outcomes. The chapter tackles the analysis of the first two stages of RtoP in Libya's case: The responsibility to prevent and the responsibility to react. They will be shown as interrelated and completing each other. Each of them has its conditions to be considered as completed one. The chapter is about how each stage is a reaction of the lacuna of the previous one and none of the stages can stand as whole itself. I deposit details of the both stages as first step to arrive to a complete RtoP policy. Furthermore, it will raise the question of what could be the best response to prevent or to react.

The third chapter concerns with another part of this strategy as long term results, in which I will highlight how it ended as an international failure. As it is titled with Descent to chaos, it tells more about the consequences of not looking abroad while deciding to intervene. It draws the path of the intervention while the rebuilding as a stage of RtoP is absent in the whole strategy. This chapters goes in details about the civil war in Libya and the inside conflict that remains a danger for the whole community.

Chapter I: The Notions of Responsibility to Protect

1. Introduction:

World countries faced many wars, dangerous conditions, and political problems. People were suffering in their countries. Therefore, the international law and community developed a new term that will solve the problem of not controlling the situation of injustice. This chapter will investigate in the RtoP policy and its developments through time. The main idea is about intervention of country in other country based on the right intention of stopping human suffering. In many old cases, to not to intervene ended in catastrophic way. In other words, RtoP become the only solution to face such problems of instability and inequality. Many countries exposed to be supporters of this policy. UN agreed that RtoP is what could stand against the facing problem.

Furthermore, the interest is about the three norms of RtoP that are going to be summarized in the following: prevention, reaction, and then rebuilding. Those norms are necessary to defined whether an intervention is well structured and effected or not. To give more details, Libya's case is one the most significant cases where RtoP has been highly recommended to fix the current situation of the country. After the Arab spring, Libya opened a page of crimes, genocides, and massacres.

According to Steven Groves in his 2008's article titled with The U.S. Should Reject the U.N. "Responsibility to Protect" Doctrine for The Heritage Foundation, UN embraced this policy and worked with in way in which it included the strongest countries in its line of intervention. During many chances, US declared its support of this policy and later on worked with. The right of intervention was made in favor of human protection and preventing mess strategy. In addition to that, the intervention went through ups and downs but yet still under observation.

2. Responsibility to protect:

According to the Heritage Foundation, at the United Nations world summit in 2005, a historical agreement was shared about this policy. RtoP came as a framework of how to use force under the name of human rights protection during war beside the legalization of the humanitarian intervention. Many debates have been proceeded about the Responsibility to protect but ending to be a matter of fact. Ban Ki-moon said in the interactive dialogue of the General Assembly on principle agreed at a summit of world leaders in 2005: "The Responsibility to Protect is a concept whose time has come. For too many millions of victims, it should come earlier" (NEWS). For Paul Tang Abomo and Carter, RtoP is that, "when preventing fails, or if the state is

unable or unwilling to act, or if the state is even complicit in the damage inflicted, it becomes the responsibility of the international community to take appropriate action to protect victims” (25). Since safety and security are fundamental needs, the RtoP is a human right norm that aims to sovereignty that is based on many principles, which world leaders approved. It is mainly about the intervention of a country in another country to enhance its ability to protect its civilians from crimes against humanity. Whenever innocent civilians are suffering, and rules are broken in wars and fights, the RtoP must take place.

2.1. History of Responsibility to protect:

Charles Homans highlighted in his article for The Foreign Policy website that RtoP had a large history in which this policy had enlarged and took the shape of many developments when it comes to the international law. We can say that the current principles of RtoP went through many changes to arrive to their latest form. While the UN policies do not refer to any right of humanitarian intervention for either individual states or UN Security council, fear of international crisis appeared between strong communities. The history is full of neglecting and denying the problems of other countries. It is all started in the 1990's when the international community failed to respond to international tragedies such as Rwandan genocides in 1994. The gap between these international legal responsibilities and realities on the ground became obvious and no one could deny this fact. It was logical that the RtoP will be an urgent demand of many associations and governments when no other solution was suggested to stop the system of violence that is imposed on people and countries.

By the year of 2000, the African Union proposed the right to intervene under the name of Constitutive Act that contains many other rights with the right to intervene when state is transferred to a genocides and crimes against humanity. In other words, from the early beginning, the African Union always adopted and welcomed the RtoP policy. In September of the same year, a new committee was established a named as the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty by the Canadian government. Between the right to intervene and the obligation to intervene, the term of RtoP took its place. The idea of responsibilities and taking action arrived to its peak when ICCSS spoke loudly by its reports about sovereignty and how it should be released and conducted in the entire world. In February 2000, as a solution to how the world should respond to the genocides of Rwanda and Srebrenica, the term of the Responsibility to Protect has been proposed in the ICISS meeting in London. Furthermore, the committee supported RtoP in many occasions and argued that this policy must be

released when some cases meet certain criteria such as the right intention and the last solution for case. The ICISS declared its first objective to establish clearer rules, and procedures to how, whether, and when to intervene. We can derive that the term of RtoP before to arrive to its final shape went through chronological stages and events. First, the ability to talk about other countries, than to expose public threats to leaders of the countries, after that the right to have a military intervention came to take place as one of the principles. To conclude that, the rebuilding is yet an added must to the list of reformulating the whole policy.

The present concepts of RtoP originate with ICISS report but find their most coherent, and legally relevant, expression in the 2005 world summit. Yet, the debate about it was still historically enforcement by the cases of non-intervention, such as Afghanistan, and what happened to their countries and citizens. Many of the powerful countries asked how the international response should be automatic and quick but not guided. Therefore, rather than to suggest an international law with the Security Council's guidance and authorization of intervention, a world approval was made about the concern to start adopting the policy. In fact, the RtoP to this moment still just written law.

The UN resolution about the RtoP did not come at once but it was in series of voting and summits. The United Nations 2005 world summit brought together representatives from more than 170 countries, including the USA. The summit assigned clear responsibilities for the international community when a country failed to protect its own citizens. The UN official website included that on January 12, 2009, more details were provided by the UN about the RtoP. In February 2008, the UN announced the appointment of Edward Luck as the Secretary-General's Special Adviser on the RtoP with responsibility for the further conceptual, political and institutional development of the concept. Luck adopted the way that RtoP will work and act in many situations. He was addressed and asked to deal with the issue of how RtoP will operate as the first official responsible of this policy. In addition to the previous decision, the General Assembly discussed RtoP in informal dialogue in August 2010.

The ambiguity related to RtoP is the first reason why it an obligation to establish clearer rules, and procedures of how will this policy work .RtoP has been evolved and involved in many UN summits to the point where it became part of the dictionary of world's norms and policies. From pure humanitarian intervention to RtoP intervention, the world decision makers took many remarkable decisions about the policy itself to achieve

its nowadays principles and norms. RtoP's advocates, NGOs, and political figures focused on its powerful points to strength their position.

2.2 Norms of the Responsibility to protect:

The development of RtoP within the UN summits has arrived to the final from a long way in a short period of time, but in the same time many significant challenges of how to shape this policy appeared. Thus, the three pillars RtoP were set in 2009, to clarify all the ambiguities, which were related to. The three pillars of RtoP are so intertwined and chained to make logical sequencing when they will be transmitted to real actions. Danial Fiott and Koops added, "There exists the temptation to think that the decision to use force can be as clear-cut as the moral principals guiding the RtoP" (Fiott and Koops 130). RtoP had given new understanding protection and peacemaking by its three long-standing characteristics of sovereign and democratic state. That to say, RtoP is given its shape by its three norms: the Responsibility to Prevent, the Responsibility to React, and the Responsibility to Rebuild.

As first step, it is necessary to prevent conflicts from the early beginning before they achieve the climax. The Responsibility to Prevent focuses on peaceful measures of prevention and stopping crimes in the country before going deeper. It is based on words and only words such as warnings. There are no better conflict prevention tools than public threats and condemnations. "The bloody conflict that wracked Sri Lanka for more than quarter century originated in constitutional arrangements that could satisfy both sides" (international Crisis Group Asia Report 141). The management of the situation through negotiations and looking for the direct reasons and causes of the problem with the promotion of the solutions between the components is one of the remarkable parts of this stage. To hold dialogues between the two sides to find solutions is yet another step to achieve the prevention. There are no weapons that are legal in this stage but the warnings and threats as it is mentioned in Africa report of international crisis: "threats of arms embargoes or withdrawal of military cooperation can also be effective preventive tools" (International Crisis Group, Africa Report 71)

Whenever the prevention fails, action must take place. Responsibility to React or to act is highly recommended when further damages start to be noticeable in the country. It is divided into two procedures: first, to try to help the country itself by providing means to achieve the stability by its own systems, second, to take direct actions without going back to the country but by the foreign countries that aim to intervene. It is

based on peaceful operations ,“Examples of peace enforcement include UN intervention in the Korean war in 1950, or the Security Council mandated multinational forces that were deployed against Iraq after its invasion of Kuwait in 1991” (Abomo and Carter Ham 27). That is to say that acts can be in peaceful way or by military intervention using force. All of that can be shaped in different operations by different sides to act upon crimes and abuses.

As last step, the Responsibility to Rebuild is to achieve long lasting stable situation .This stage offers fundamental needs such as social development. At this stage you can discover the long lasting results of the military success while the first two stages can only show the instant and unreliable results. For example, we have Iraq case that show exactly how some long results of the military intervention can be catastrophic. It is also called as post-conflict period when the real results of the intervention will appear. In addition to that, sustainable development is the most asked aftermath of the conflict. It can define whether it was successful or not. Going back to the same example, Iraq suffered from lacuna of this stage when it needed a following observation of the situation and further help, the interveners did not offer this facility. The first task in rebuilding is to establish an immediate judicial system that is strong and reliable to take fair decisions. Furthermore, more challenges will take place such as developing more government structures such as economical and educational systems that can work hand to hand with people in the post-conflict period to overcome the mess. This step is to look beyond the intervention itself and to fulfill all the necessary parts of system that can facilitate the rebuilding process later on.

The three stages are interlinked and highly important when deciding to intervene in a country. Being a side of the conflict, under the name of RtoP is to take into consideration all the possible results when preventing, and reacting to achieve the rebuilding of the country in well structured intervention. We can conclude that the post-conflict period is important more than conflict itself.

3. US Foreign Policy in Relation to Humanitarian Intervention:

US foreign policy has developed many changes and many views. Its strategy differs from one country to another .you can never consider its case with country as another. On April 6, 1994, Rwandan president Juvénal Habyarimana’s was shot down because of conflict between parts inside the country, which known as most terrifying and long war inside a country in the whole history. It was full of massacres and war crimes. In fact,

US did not take any serious reaction against. Human right activists strongly condemn US policy toward Rwanda, its ignorance of covering the situation back then, and it took no actions to stop the crimes. American news media paid no attention to these cases and keep observing only,

In the aftermath of the conflict, several reporters denounced editors' resistance to broadcast the Rwandan story. For example, Scott Petersen, a British journalist said that he was unable to convince his editors to print his story about Oxfam's grim report on the genocide of the Tutsi minority. In April, Aiden Hartley was sent to Rwanda by Reuters Nairobi to cover evacuation of foreigners from Kigali . But the reality that he saw there was that of massive acts of horror and inhumanity. (Hartley 396)

KOSOVO is yet another kind of US policy of dealing with situations that need to intervene. "We stand united with our allies for peace. By acting now, we are upholding our values, protecting our interests, and advancing the cause of peace" (Ewans 45). The USA took too long time to intervene while it was highly urgent to do so. When the economic system started to be in danger, actions were made. It was purely economic and humanitarian values rank was the second. The case of Afghanistan is one of the recent examples of the US policy toward other countries. It was a reaction or revenge after the murder of its ambassador. US considered protecting its people and allies as duty. After 11 September attacks, the USA launched war on terror and adopted a new policy of taking urgent acts when innocent people and countries are suffering of inner problems. The US intervention in Iraq faced a conflict between humanitarian objectives and security matters but security is always the winner. So that, the decision of intervention in Libya came as surprise and changed to the beliefs of this country.

4. Conclusion:

Responsibility to protect was historically debatable topic. "Among the states of the Arab Spring, Libya has been probably seen the most profound transformation" (Lacher). It was highly, significant, and urgent to be worked with while wars and crimes took place in several countries. The decision makers' countries besides many other countries approved the RtoP as effective policy. USA adopted the RtoP policy as a new foreign policy to act against crimes and inhumanity, and chose to apply this policy into Libya's case. Under the findings of the RtoP, the global security would look far different from that of traditional international security. While RtoP reached the UN agenda, it offered hope to those in areas experiencing human rights problems,

specifically in further stages. The case of Libya truly highlighted much of this argument. In the same time, a question is raised of how the USA did intervene in Libya and what were their operations, and actions that were taken during RtoP.

**Chapter II: On the Road to
Successful Intervention in Libya**

1. Introduction:

The RtoP policy started with a sequence of events that show how the situation is changing to the worst conditioning. Libya entered a situation of instability and unsafety. The civilians started to rebel against the authority and all the decisions that are made. The observers of the situation were many but the suggested solution was only; the foreign intervention. The evaluation of any intervention as successful RtoP must contain its three pillars. In addition to that, it must reach the sovereignty and the protection as internationally shared responsibilities by going through the three aspects of this RtoP policy: Prevent, React, and Rebuild. The following chapter will study the existence of two out of the three aspects in the US intervention and the results of each by going into detailed coherent events.

Abomo said about the US foreign policy of intervention that, “The USA has always been ready to act” (Abomo and Carter Ham 4). While no solution is suggested for Libya's case, The USA strongly embraced the Responsibility to protect. In 2011 U.N. summit, Susan Rice, USA National Security Advisor to be President Barack Obama and USA ambassador to the U.N. from 2009 to 2013, insisted that, “the USA had the R2P civilians and prevented another massacre” (Blomdahl 5). In other words, the USA chose to intervene for the aim of developing plans to safeguard civilians and countries. This whole intervention came against the wave of violence unleashed against civilians by Quaddafi but in the same time it aimed to end the whole matter in peaceful and successful way.

2. The Prevention in the US Intervention:

As any other intervention, I can declare that the prospect of military intervention divided into two opposite sides. The most known proponents of military intervention are John McCain of Arizona, and McConnell of Kurdistan. They all welcomed this idea of intervention and strongly condemned the crimes. In on hand, The most significant voice against the intervention was Secretary of Defense Robert Gates who argued that the US is not ready to be part of a third war, and interpreted the situation as a war against the stability of the country. In the other hand, inside the US many of its politicians asked for UN resolution before to carry the intervention.

While many condemnations arrived out of the Libyan's authority, the general idea of starting the official intervention became clear to the international community. The prevention stage contains many strategies to judge whether we can say if it is complete prevention or not. These strategies are interrelated in way in which

they follow each other to formulate a chain. In other word if the first step had not prevent, we can directly move to the next step. The position of the US inside all of this is that it condemned the bloody conflict between the protesters and the security forces loyal to the Libyan leader in many occasions and ways.

2.1 Public threats:

Warning before intervention is the suitable title for this section. “On numerous occasions, President Obama had called on Quaddafi to stop killing peaceful protesters and even threatened to use force against. This was a clear signal that the USA would not stand idle while Quaddafi was slaughtering innocent civilians” (Abomo and Carter Ham 2). Obama first addressed the Libyans to strongly stand and handle the situation. On 28th March 2011, Obama delivered a public speech to his people about what is going to do in favor of protecting civilians. The White House press secretary Jay Corney stated in his article for the official President talks that, “it is clear that Quaddafi lost confidence of his people... His legitimacy has been reduced to Zero” (the white house). As first analysis, it was highly important to slow down while dealing with the whole situation which means that neither Obama nor Clinton had direct contact with Quaddafi in the early beginning of this stage. The specialists said that it was just delay before to make sure that all the Americans inside Libya are took off because the safety of their people is the important. This view was clearly strengthened when the white house toughened its language and actions against the Libyan regime, the moment that the US ended its operation of bringing back its citizens. At the same time, meetings and connections with foreign leaders were held to stop the bloody battle. All the world voices were raised together to impose international pressure against on the Libyan authority but not yet for the resignation of Quaddafi.

Benefit freezing is one the permit of prevention stage. In other words, all the old deals made with Quaddafi or his family, were forbidden. “This move came after Switzerland announced that it was freezing any assets owned by Quaddafi and his family in the country” (Covin and Bull). To close all the doors in front of Libyan authority is the idea of this step also minimizing all the deals such as financial Transactions with Libya.

2.2 Condemnation:

Public condemnation and warnings are yet other forms of prevention. All the speeches, interviews, and meetings were delivered in front of Americans and international journalist to gain popularity in order to have the support of the international community. Quaddafi become the important part in the international news. The

number of supports increased because of showing the Libyan situation to the public. Furthermore, the demand of Western countries and Arab countries to intervene arrived to its higher point. This popularity led to a new option of possible military action to stop massacres. Obama called Quaddafi to leave the power and warned him directly to use the force if he refused to stop the violence. In addition to that, the white house tried to convince Quaddafi and his loyalists to leave Libya. Unlike the other leaders, he would not give up as easily. He continued in his path, which is appeared in his famous interview with international journalists. “He offered no hints of surrender, and he accused the west of trying to reoccupy his country” (Amanpour) . As we can see, many actions were made to stop the war but none of them showed its efficacy in reducing the amount of danger and could prevent the leader from killing more innocents. This denial led the international community to adopt another kind of actions and US responded with new reactions.

3. Reaction in the US Intervention:

The reaction is translated to a decision of military intervention. Going into step by step analysis of this case, we can arrive to the fact that the closest people to Obama were supporters of the military intervention in Libya. Samantha power was part of this community that asks for military intervention in Libya. The Daily Best called her in one the article: “the femme fatale of the humanitarian assistance world” (Cony). After many debates, the US intervention in Libya officially went further to portray an image of military intervention by using force.

3.1. Operation Odyssey Dawn:

In order to stop the Quaddafi’s forces from having more power inside the country, Obama signed order to allow American pilots to join the military strikes. In same time, he described this operation as very limited action toward the authority. In fact, whether it is limited or not, it is a use of force. This operation aims to strength the no-fly zone operation. In campaign with the use of force on the ground, the air controlling matter began with bombing many targets. Furthermore, Arms Embargo and No-drive Zone are yet other ways to target the Libyans forces. But the US did not have the absolute management and full control of the situation without going back to the international and the UN decisions. It was hard to come back each time to international view before to take any actions.

3.2 The Shift from Operation Odyssey Down to the Operation Unified Protector:

That means that the American intervention became international grouped intervention. Many countries are going to intervene in Libya under the name of NATO. In simple words, Instead of going back each time to discuss the actions, the actions are going to be unified. According to Aidan Hehir and Robert Murray, “In Masrata, he [the prime minister] reported that at least 2000 rebels and civilians had been killed, in addition to government forces, a toll roughly ten times higher than if NATO had not prevented” (206). We can understand that this step was urgent and highly recommended in that time.

A few days into the operation, obstacles appeared to face the NATO. Confusion came into view, when each of the US and the Britain wanted to be the leader of the operation while they were considered to be only as supporters of the operation. But as quickly as more events come to happen, the operation turned back to be under the control of NATO. During this mission, many decisions were made via voting. All countries participated in the mission, either directly or indirectly. NATO integrated by nearly 5,070 airs, sea, and ground movements. “NATO also depended on the U.S. for nearly all its suppression of enemy air defenses missions and combat search and rescue” (Abomo et Carter Ham 172).

NATO took command of all ground, sea, and air operations over Libya under the Operation Unified Protector. The Arms embargo is one of the elements of this operation against the Libyan government in the sea. Ships and sea power are integrated to stop Quaddafi by enforcing an arms embargo in the Mediterranean Sea allowing allies to take all necessary means. No-drive zone and No-fly zone are yet another means that are made to reinforce the operation and strength the control over the whole country.

At the outset goal of the military intervention was to help innocence. The goal of this mission was not for the resignation of Quaddafi but later on the political view changed and become unclear. French Foreign Minister Alain Juppe answered: “the plan is help Libyans choose their future” (Cartez) . As the events extended, we can understand that there was shift in known goals of the mission, from protecting civilians into a regime change, so that the Libyan people are going to take the charge and the responsibility of their country and decide their destiny. Furthermore, a new question is raised: is it an RtoP or Regime change.

3.3 The US Relation with the Libyan Opposition:

After handing over the control of operations to NATO, the US role remained very limited. US participation was only to support the NATO operation. The US did not stand against the rebels during the conflict. In fact, there were rumors that the US shored the Libyan rebellion with the needed weapons and money. As General Carter Ham said, “it is not only after the conflicts was over that we gave some small arms... During the conflict, to my knowledge, US African command had no role in arming rebels” (Ham). The US recognized the Libyan National Transitional Council as the country official government on July 15, 2011, four months after the beginnings of military intervention. It immediately started working on unfreeze the transactions with Libyan new government in preparation for post- Quaddafi Libya. However, none of the public money was given to rebels, but instead was given to international agencies, to make sure that it would directly goes to humanitarian needs. The TNC was also recognized by the UN when the general voted to consider the TNC as the one and only official representative of the Libyan people.

4. The Fall of Quaddafi:

After the sharp conflict and the USA and NATO intervention, the Libya rebels decided to end the war against Quaddafi the moment that he was found. He was killed on 20 October 2011 during the Battle of Sirte. He was turreted after his death by his people, who declared great hate toward him. “The video was about rebel fighters beating him after his death. Cell phone video shows the jubilant rebels dragging him from the tunnel, taunting him and sodomizing him with a stick” (Wehrey 63). He was the first President to be killed by his people. Due to all the events, his death was the end of the NATO intervention but the beginning of different interventions and regime. Libya was divided into different groups and different militias. At the end, all the foreign forces stopped the intervention while NATO is ending his operations.

5. Conclusion:

As it can be seen, RtoP in Libya went through two first steps that are successful outcomes of this policy. In other words, many of the criteria of successful Prevention and Reaction are founded in the US intervention and translated from words to actions. Many preventive strategies involved in the responsibility to prevent in Libya were applied including public condemnation, benefit freezing and targeting the financial transaction. At the same time, Quaddafi denied all these measures and advanced in his plan, neglecting all the warnings. So that,

the intervention became a must, to stop the crimes and to help civilians. The US and the international community decided to appraise the pressure and allow military intervention against the forces of Quaddafi, which were powerful. The responsibility to react was applied through No-fly zones, and Arms Embargoes. The nature of this stage is operative. Prevention was a series of speech and warnings while reaction was in shape of operations and actions, than rebuilding, which is the last stage offered a new question of: whether the US is concerned about nation building in the post- Quaddafi Libya or not.

Chapter III: Descent to Chaos

1. Introduction:

After the fall of Quaddafi, the situation in Libya has been changed. On 31 October 2011, the NATO intervention has come to put an end in Libya. Divisions between political and security authorities appeared in the country. East and West were in a real endless battle. After operation odyssey dawn and operation unified protector, the government entered a situation of insecurity, murders, unlawful killing, and many other dangerous and severe problems.

The country was divided between two rival governments in the East and West, and among dozen of the armed groups competing over the country and its oil wealth. Alison Pargeter stated that the situation in Libya:

Ever since the uprisings that erupted in Libya in 2011, the country has been locked in crisis. The collapse of what was a highly centralized and personalized regime, even by regional standards, opened an enormous power vacuum that was filled by an array of armed groups and militias which sprang up during, and in some instances after, the revolution. The ongoing competition between these armed groups, coupled with the failure of Libyans to build a new state, left power fragmented and the country steeped in ever-worsening chaos and conflict. (6)

The whole country turned to be unstable. More civilians were killed, and Libya remains a battleground. Libya has been scarred by violence ever since the fall of the previous leader. Paolo and Carter highlighted that,

The situation in late 2011 and early 2012 was one of relative calm, but the change was in the air. A bomb was thrown at convey accompanying the head of the U.N. mission to Libya (April 2012). The Red Cross was hit with rocket (May 2012). A diplomatic convoy was attacked as a result of which the British abandoned their Benghazi consulate (June 2012). A program to train Libyan police in Jordan met with considerable difficulty when the recruits decided to fight it out among themselves, as a result of which many of the trainees were sent back home(July 2012). A bomb exploded in front of the U.S. consulate (August 2012). (110-111)

With the end of foreign intervention, the Libyan rebellions faced a real test; to build a government of unity or to stay divided, while destroying the country. Here is came the role of the third stage of RtoP that called the Rebuilding. We cannot deny that the two first stages are Important but the most needed in this case are the after

math results that can show to which extent an intervention can be successful or failure. One of the most significant criticisms of the situation of the after NATO's intervention was by Kirkpatrick that,

Although NATO's intervention was explicitly predicated on the short-term goal of protecting civilians and backfired in this regard, it is worth exploring whether the intervention produced any longer-term net benefit for Libyans. The most positive development in post-war Libya undoubtedly was democratic election July 2012, which brought to power a moderate, secular coalition government – a stark change from Quaddafi's four-decade dictatorship. (Kirkpatrick 8)

2. Libya's Internal Challenges:

Many tasks were challenging the transitional government with the presence of different threats from all sides. According to Dirk, Dartmouth University professor, "Building a state and a nation takes time, ideas, compromise, and leadership -- particularly difficult if, as, in Libya, the social and political landscape after the civil war was essentially a tabula rasa, and none of those qualities now needed to construct a modern state were in demand during the Quaddafi period" (Vandewalle). While Christopher Chivvis, Special to CNN, said that history repeatedly shows that maintaining security is critical for a country to make a successful transition from war to peace. Absent security, no underlying structure for all the systems, organizations, institutions are challenging facts that need to carefully deal with. Violence targets government forces and could also empower militias to find their way inside the big mess while the government is unable to effectively respond.

From the beginning, the US should reject to intervene in Libya. The USA should been dealing with the Responsibility to Protect with extreme caution in way in which a detailed plan should be prepared before to intervene. The case of Libya could not been compared to any old similar case. It was unique and none of the previous results of any intervention can be considered as shared results. In fact, Libya was a test of RtoP policy in reality. For certain, this policy appeared to be the only solution but not the effective one. Adopting a doctrine and taking international collective actions without being sure of the results may end in big mess. Indeed, Libya's case remained a failure. We can derive to the fact that this failure is made due to many causes.

In the first beginning, the US intervention was just a series of public threats and speech to prevent the things for being more dangerous. Than the real intervention took place when a real actions and operations under the NATO recommendation and control started and the international community exposed their real position toward

this intervention. The nature of NATO intervention was for a clear humanitarian intervention, which is to help innocents and to prevent war crime. According to Steven Groves in his article of what is the real intention of the intervention, the NATO intervention appeared to be a help provided operation to stop massacres. In fact, this was clearly declared by many leaders of the countries that are included in the operation. The NATO operation in the end changed its intention to be a regime change and resignation of the president. The French ambassador mentioned in many occasion such as interview with the CNN's journalist John Mineral that they are willing to achieve the regime change by letting the Libyans to have the right to decide their future and that was clear when the Libyan leader died the whole NATO operation came to its end. This objectives change in the operation is one of the direct reasons of this failure.

Second, the timeline of the intervention was considered as one of shortest duration. How a well structured intervention can be done in period of less than a year. Big countries took too long time to rebuild itself so how a country such as Libya can reach its high developments and needs in this short time. In other cases, US intervention in other countries such as Iraq considered as the longest intervention in its history of intervention. The decision to pull out its military forces was very quick beside that the military intervention of US became limited due the fact that NATO took the control of the operation.

Third, the after conflict period is the most important period in any RtoP intervention. In my opinion, this is the main gap in the US intervention. US did not carry its mission by supervising the after conflict. The judicial system was suffering. The Education system is missing. The economic system is divided between two rival governments. Libyans missed the peace situation of their old country. But the US took few steps to help that are translated in promises, public condemnation and visits. No real action such as holding trials, supervising the police system ,and sending back up and military forces to stop west and east civil war. The Rebuilding step was missed in the process of US RtoP policy.

Furthermore, how can the US protect Libyans while it could not protect its own people. The murder of the US ambassador in Benghazi remains an unforgettable failure in the US policy of foreign intervention. Christopher Stevens and three other embassy staff were killed in an attack in Benghazi. The aftermath was covered by the media under the civil war situation. It was irresponsible step of not protecting the ambassador while all the other countries closed their consulate in Benghazi. After this mishap, the US should

give on its disillusion that it is the strongest country that fights against terror while it did nothing but watching Libya being destroyed.

US could reach the irreproachability of the mistakes by the accompaniment of Libya's radical change. This mismanagement, misconduct, and misplacement cost Libya its stability. The Rebuilding process is where the results will appear as definitive and long lasting results. The US skipped this step when the Libyan leader was killed and consider it as the main results while other kind of results finally appeared to judge the intervention as a failed one.

2.1. Two Rival Governments:

Libya has become a country of two governments, two parliaments, and civil conflict. The Libyan conflict is between the Government of National Accord (GNA) as the transitional government that is created after political agreement in 2015, headed by Prime Minister Fayez al-Sarraj, and another eastern institution called Libyan National Army (LNA) led by General Khalifa Haftar. This conflict divided the country to the control and the struggle of two eastern and western governments.

This conflict means that Libya now had two rival governments, two parliaments, and two constellations of loosely loyal militias. Even Libyan embassies abroad split. A foreign journalist had to get two different visas, and two separate media passes. Traveling between Tripoli and the east was akin to crossing the borders of two countries at war. It was not uncommon to be interrogated as a spy for the other side upon the arrival. (Wehrey 192)

The conflict of Tripoli and Tobruk heightened between the two sides, especially after the LNA exercised a high level of control over the majority of Libyan territory where the oil is mostly founded. The conflict between LNA and GNA derived the country to a civil war. All the states have become dangerous for all the people, Libyan or migrants. As the real fight began, all the foreign countries closed their consulates in Benghazi and Tripoli. The UN had pulled out its staff as soon as the clashes started. Militias destroyed Tripoli International Airport. Besides that, Libya split into two. The whole country was divided into armed groups and militias that fight each other.

During the division between the West and East, the official and legal government took very limited procedures against the challenging circumstances that Libyan people were facing. This struggle reduced the

ability to control the inside battle of Libya. The Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor described the situation of the country during the conflict when doing the country reports on Human right practices for 2019 of USA:

Significant human rights issues included arbitrary and unlawful killings, including of politicians and members of civil society, by armed groups including some aligned with the GNA and the LNA, criminal gangs, and ISIS-Libya; forced disappearances; torture perpetrated by armed groups on all sides; arbitrary arrest and detention; harsh and life-threatening conditions in prison and detention facilities, some of which were outside government control; political prisoners held by nonstate actors; unlawful interference with privacy, often by nonstate actors; undue restrictions on free expression and the press, including violence against journalists and criminalization of political expression; widespread corruption; trafficking in persons; threats of violence against ethnic minorities and foreigners; criminalization of same-sex sexual orientation; and use of forced labor. (BUREAU OF DEMOCRACY 1-2)

In the absence of judicial and security bodies, most of the criminal cases were not investigated, like the murder of the USA ambassador that it ambiguous and no one knows who is the real attackers that are behind this international crime.

We can see that the conflict was focusing more on who is going to have the power upon the other, but looking for better options for Libya. Going after taking more territory was the concern of both, while the civilians required real help because of the variety of the armed groups in the country. In the same above reports, it is mention that,

Between January and October, the U.N. Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) documented the deaths of 218 civilians and the injury of 289 others. In July, the World Health Organization estimated the number of deaths in broader Tripoli since April was 1,093, including 106 civilians, and 5,752 wounded, including 294 civilians.

On July 2-3, an airstrike on the Tajoura migrant detention center in Tripoli killed 53 persons and injured more than 80 others. Press reports attributed the attack to LNA-aligned forces.

On August 5, LNA-aligned forces conducted airstrikes on Murzuq, killing more than 40 civilians, according to the U.N. Panel of Experts for Libya. (BUREAU OF DEMOCRACY 3)

The violence and lawlessness flourished to its high level as it was supposed to be in insecurity case. “These are some of the impressive achievements of Libya's post-coup elite! This elite is no doubt also proud of the fact that, by 2015, anywhere between one and two million Libyans have fled out of a population of six million” (Sensini 220). The whole battle was tragic for civilians and innocent people who were the only ones to pay the price.

General Khalifa Hiftar was very confident about ruling the country; his party was shown to be the strongest by controlling the central oil states and fighting terror. Before his official start in June 2014, he decided to appear in the scene after not being for a long time. LNA led by him had great suspension about the General National Congress and its free and fair election as they claim to. “On February 14, 2014, he surfaced. Dressed in his army uniform, he appeared on television announcing the suspension of the elected parliament, the General National Congress” (Wehrey 173). The parliament or the GNC was a target of his dignity operation.

Many negotiations to held dialogue between the two sides were suggested but ended with no sign of a bright future and peace. False hopes were made many times. Libyans now do not doubt that Libya is no not safe. After six years of the fall of Quaddafi, Benghazi, or what is left of, is the only place of fights, militias, and armed camp. Migrants and refugees, including men, women, and children, were subjected to extensive sexual violence, kidnapping, and awful killing. GNA-aligned groups, LNA-aligned groups, and other armed groups were responsible for uncounted crimes against ordinary people, activists, journalists, migrants, and the security forces.

3. Rebuilding in Libya:

The last stage in RtoP policy is Rebuilding. Here we can make the final judgment about the whole intervention. In Libya, this station is the most important one due to many reasons: first, the fact that Libya has entered in case of multiple interventions, second, we cannot decide the exact results without detecting the rebuilding process, and finally, the scenario of Libya was not familiar to any of the ancient interventions. Neither the words nor the pervious actions are needed in this stage, all what we are looking for is to settle a situation of stability and to stop the civil war.

3.1. Militias and Weapons:

The fall of Tripoli came after rebel groups had empowered itself by having more supporters. The movement of rivalries began emerging again between the two governments and militias. The TNC unsuccessfully tried to organize these militias into a national army. But these efforts soon failed as the leaders of these militias insisted on forming their own independent movement. Militia's fighters had different loyalists and did not see themselves as one coherent army. Each of the militias groups has their own beliefs and plan. It was impossible to unite different ideas to only one.

This situation made it difficult to unite the country and gain control over heavily armed militias. Here at this point, neither of NATO nor the USA made any effort to stop this problem. The only actions that were made are international speech but no serious actions were made. Both of them took very quick movement of taking their own people out but the Libyans. It was impossible to take control over the thousands of men organized in independent militias. Furthermore, the international organizations started to reporting documents that denounced a wave of terror and wide spread abuses by militias groups but still no real actions were made.

3.2. A Fractured Country:

The government was widely criticized over the arrest and the murder of the old leader. In other words, how can it call for justice system while it did not even offer a rightful trial. Many crimes were reported but there was no sign that anyone had been arrested and charged because of any crime. In the same time, an effort was made to draft a Transitional Justice Law and an Amnesty Law. But there still were unjust laws. Freedom of speech and association was still limited and controlled rights by the name of religion, and politics. The main goal of NATO and US intervention in Libya is to change the unstable situation and support Libyans. But at the end, we can say that no serious actions were made.

Libya's transitional government and rebel fighters shared the same enemy and goal of removing him from power but the way of fighting the enemy was different. Libya's transitional government, mainly recognized by Western, and Arab powers, had no established power among the Libyans as the voice of the Libyan people had been challenged by rebel fighters. The most common criticism was that this government was dominated by the old leader loyalists, and the fact that it derives its authority from west rather than from the local people.

Heavily armed groups controlled strategic points including airports. The TNC asked the militias to join the national army but it failed in changing the situation. A new trend was detected in Libya, which is the trend of killing. After the wake of victory, Libya transformed to be square of rebels. As anti-Quaddafi rebellions chose to act, all the suspected to be Quaddafi supporters were torture, beaten, and killed while Human Rights Watch did nothing but reporting the scene. The Washington Post reported by Hendrix in April 2012 that, “rival tribes inflicted 147 deaths in March 2012”. “Some months had gone by, and the campaign to save civilian’s lives had turned into a bloodbath. Human right? In this war, fought in the name of human rights, there was not a right that had not been violated” (Sensini 165)

3.3. Election Hopes Gone Away:

Mahmoud Jibril led the NFA. He was a prime minister after October 2011. In an interview with CNN's Christiane Amanpour, Jibril said that, “I think the biggest challenge right now is to convince our potential partners, especially the Islamist forces that now it is time that we sit around one table and talk about one destiny that is in the interest of the Libyan people”. Sitting around one table is what Libya needed back then. It was the time when all the groups were supposed to group to form new Libya. Civilians were released from a long reign to a newly elected century. The prospect of general elections came in the midst of the chaos. After having been postponed from June, elections to select a new transitional body, the GNC, would appoint a prime minister and his cabinet.

Although, it was danger to say that, most of Libyans took place in the Election Day to ask for their rights. It was a historic vote. “As the voting day approached, Selwa Bugaighis called her son Wail in the states, reminding him to vote. It is historical, she said, do not miss out” (Wehrey 81). Libyans set their hopes on this election to fulfill its responsibilities, but challenges were tough to be overcome. The progress of building new Libya was blocked down and stopped while Libya held a successful national election. However, the elections were refused by movement of violence. “I think a lot of these militias will try to take advantage of this, to exert their authority,” he added. “I think the ramifications will be quite bad” (Kirkpatrick). People kept protesting and caused the shutdown of three major oil facilities, causing a new problem that faces the innocents. “Less encouraging, the country’s first democratically elected prime minister failed to last even one month in office, being removed by a vote of no confidence, attributed to regional rivalries” (Kirkpatrick). In the end there were

no institutions, no national systems, such as education or even a health care. The international community was too slow to recognize this fact and was ineffective in helping the Libyan people to quickly establish themselves as new nation. We can conclude that it was a lost opportunity for the US to made huge step in rebuilding the country.

US direct involvement of rebuilding did not go beyond diplomatic visits, meetings, or promises. It was necessary for Libya to quickly work to rebuild its society and economy after forty year of dictatorship. But at the same time, it was impossible to achieve that while no one is helping in real. The situation in Libya after the prevention can be summarized in the failure creating of new government. Other foreign countries involved in the conflict also failed Libya and did not perform satisfactorily in the aftermath of the military operation. When the previous regime fell, there was sense of relief among the Libyan people. In fact, the situation turned to be a real chaos. None of the rebuilding promises were achieved. Disappearance, abductions, killings, and many other abused became daily life issues.

3.4. Disappearance and Kidnapping:

Journalists, migrants, and HoR members were the main target of kidnappers. Many of the journalists, who were mainly active and acted against one of the Libyans groups, were kidnapped for a long time and sometimes killed or released. According to country Report on Human Rights Practices 2019, on May 2, two Libyan journalists for television broadcaster Libya al-Ahrar, Mohamed al-Qurj, and Mohamed al-Shibani, were abducted. They were released three weeks later. In the same report, it is mention that, “On July 17, HoR member Siham Sergiwa was abducted from her home after criticizing the LNA’s offensive on Tripoli in a television interview” (BUREAU OF DEMOCRACY). Her husband was shot in the leg, and her son was beaten. Many of the hostages were released after a long time or delivered as bodies.

3.5. Political Prisoners:

There is no stable number of political prisoners in Libya because there are no official government reports about the political affairs in Libya. Most of this category of prisoners is often held without any charge. Abu Salim is a prison located in Tripoli that is for those prisoners. According to the 2019 Libya report done by the USA for Human Rights practice, “GNA's armed groups had the authority to hold persons on political grounds such as Quaddafi’s

supporters and the ones who were having a specific position against 2011 revolution” (BUREAU OF DEMOCRACY 9). The international community did not react against this discrimination because the statistics of this operation are still ambiguous. Here we can ask where the role of NATO is inside this unfair situation of inequality. The US did not take any further steps after the death of ancient leader. In addition to that, the murder of the US ambassador in Benghazi did not motivate the US as in Afghanistan case while US condemned the murder.

3.6. Arbitrary Attacks, War Crimes, and Torture:

The Libyan parliament agreement (LPA) signed in 2015 to stop the conflict, but little progress had been made to prevent the massacre of this conflict where many people remained arbitrarily detained without protection. The armed groups across Libya that are under GNA or LPA control were having the extreme authority to start any attacks against any front even if they were only poor civilians. In April 2018, the report that is published by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), in cooperation with the United Nations Support Mission in Libya (UNSMIL) mentioned that,

The rise of lawlessness, coupled with the proliferation of weapons, also provides fertile ground for unlawful deprivation of liberty in the form of criminal kidnappings. Armed groups and criminal gangs abduct and hold victims, including children, to extort money from their relatives. In some cases, alleged victims are killed before payments are made. For instance, on 20 October 2016, the body of a four-year-old girl was found. Some two weeks after her abduction from her home in the area of Warshafana. According to a forensic report reviewed by HRD, she died from asphyxia and had sustained bruises to the head. (BUREAU OF DEMOCRACY 18)

The two sides made many horrible crimes. Hospitals, airports, homes, schools, and many other structures were the targets of arbitrary attacks of GNA or LNA. According to 2019 Country Reports on Human Rights Practices about Libya, that tackles examples of real attacks,

As of November, UNSMIL reported there had been 60 registered attacks on health facilities and workers, including attacks on hospitals, field clinics, and ambulances. The attacks led to 11 confirmed health-care worker deaths and 33 injuries, although the actual number could be higher. An estimated 20 percent of

health-care infrastructure in the country was inoperable due to damages from conflict, disrepair, or other factors.

For example, in late July, airstrikes by LNA-affiliated groups targeted two field hospitals and two ambulances, killing four health-care workers and injuring eight others. (BUREAU OF DEMOCRACY 13)

We can obtain from the above the reality that the more the conflict grows, the more damages are recorded. In addition to that, abuses, including punishment and children obligated soldiers were also a side of the civil war.

Like any other war, many people were tortured, and killed with cold blood. Libyans were arrested and humiliated by their people. The ones who should protect their people were bombing innocents in their houses. The Cruel crimes against human rights heightened more than it was in the time of the old regime but yet USA kept its help in form of promises. In Libya, no one can know who is the real responsible for any attack or arrest. In this context, 2019 report that is published by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), in cooperation with the United Nations Support Mission in Libya (UNSMIL) included that,

Most commonly documented torture methods include beatings on the head and the body with various objects, including metal bars, water-pipes, and rifle butts; whipping on the soles of the feet (a method known as *falaqa*); kicking and punching; suspension in stress positions for prolonged periods; electrocution; burning with cigarettes or hot rods; and the pulling of beards. (BUREAU OF DEMOCRACY 30)

People were arrested without charge or trial, were beaten with hoses and metal bars, punched, and kicked. In the same report, a story has been told,

Another man from western Libya, taken from a street in Tripoli in June 2016, described his treatment by armed men he later identified as belonging to the Ministry of Interior: “I was forced into a small dark room, and not given any food or water for the first 24 hours. The next day, I was just given some milk. The room was completely bare, and there was no toilet. I had to urinate in an empty bottle. In the three months, I was held there, I was taken out blindfolded for beatings with PPR (a term commonly used in Libya for a type of water pipe).” HRD examined a medical report indicating the visibility of scars on the

man's back. Although he filed a complaint to the Office of the Prosecutor General (seen by HRD), no investigations into his case have been carried out to HRD's knowledge. (BUREAU OF DEMOCRACY)

Most victims of torture carry physical and psychological scars. They did not have any mental health or physical treatment. Human rights were abused and that was the main goal of intervention. The rebuilding is totally missing for this stage and the US failed Libya.

3.7. The Emergence of Terror Groups and Slavery:

In Libya, there is no single government that had the authority upon all the country, but several groups that are located in different zones. The emergence of terror groups is yet another problem that is facing the national and the international community. In the first beginning, the USA, in its way to release the world from terrorists, created a considerable state of terrorist. The Libyans were divided into many groups who fight each other to control as much as Libyan territory.

The first groups are non-jihadist and pro-Islamist. Libya Dawn is one of GNA supporters. They attacked Tripoli airport. They have control from Misrata to the border with Tunisia. Libya Shield is yet another GNA supporter that claims to be part of the Ministry of Defense. Many other groups are derived from those groups.

On the other hand, there are jihadist groups. The main group is ISIS, the Islamic state. They had divided Libya geographically into three: Barqah in the east, Tripoli in the West, and Fezzan in the center and south. Born in Iraq and Syria and arrived in 2014 in Libya. They appeared in Derna. "Libya had become the branch of the terrorist group with the most threatening capabilities outside Levant. And the Islamic state's leadership in Raqqa had given this branch significant operational autonomy" (Wehrey 239). ISIS-Libya claimed responsibility for various attacks on civilian and military-held areas during the year. Like any other group, I.S. had its rival groups with whom they were running after power. The white house was mostly worried about this group and its intense situation in Libya. But did nothing with efforts for remarkable aid. While I.S. is in Libya, other groups like Ansar al-Sharia are against it. Pro-government groups and government groups are yet other Libyan militias. LNA and GNA are the much-known fighters who mainly control the big part of the country. They are divided into many armed militias who are sent to the battlefield. The rival government in the east and the West had supporters of the case of each.

On one hand, Refugees and illegal immigrants are what transformed to be because of the civil war. On the other hand, other illegal immigrants inside of Libya from African nationalities were suffering from abuses and cruel treatment. According to a BBC article, wrote in July 2019 by Rana Jawad, “I was locked in a small room with 50 other women and just a bucket for a toilet. We barely ate, and there was not enough water. So many people were sick with T.B., some died in my arms. I was beaten up, and we were tortured - with electricity”. They were treated like animals by Libyan militias. Smuggling people has become a new trend in Libya .the migrants were bought from their countries by job opportunity or kidnapped to be handed to others whom they need them in hard service. This progress had become a trade in Libya.

Slavery is yet another big problem that faced the migrants. They were treated the same as they were one of Quaddafi's supporters. In 2018, a famous story of Nigerians being used as slavery, which was told by BBC NEWS, "they gave us to their friends." They have been held two months in the center of detention called Gharian. “Again and again they tell the same story, of detainees horrifically abused by prison guards, starved, beaten, raped - and traded as slaves” (BBC). Libya has been gradually malformed to the slave market of who can pay more.

“Migrants, refugees, and other foreign nationals were especially vulnerable to kidnapping. UNSMIL received reports that an unknown number of migrants intercepted at sea by the Libyan Coast Guard went missing after disembarking at Libyan ports, and they might have been seized by armed groups engaged in human trafficking or smuggling”. (BUREAU OF DEMOCRACY 4)

Migrants were leaving in severe conditions inside the battle of Libya while waiting for the international organization and community to rescue and set them free.

It all begins with a series of attacks against the international community. As the summer comes, the serious attacks had been heightened. “A judge died after being shot in the abdomen on his way to afternoon prayers, and a colonel perished in a car bomb” (Wehrey 110). Several attacks started: a car of the envoy of the U.N. had been attacked with a grenade; the jihadist group attacked the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC); the representative of the British ambassador faced two serious attacks, and explosive tool blew the USA compound's wall.

4. Conclusion:

The last stage of RtoP strategy in Libya is rebuilding which remained in failure and the long lasting results appeared .The results show that the situation in Libya turned to be worst than ever before. The USA committed to helping Libyans while it could not help Americans while being in the Libyan territory. The aftermath of the conflict in Libya shows how an intervention to prevent and stop large massacres and crimes against humanity can evolve into much more complex, and perhaps open ended situation of chaos. Only few criteria of the Responsibility to Rebuild were met in this case, namely the promises. There is no evidence of US involvement in military strategies to disarm and facilitate the transition of militias into national army or civil life. Very little was done to support the security sector reform.

General Conclusion

Using the descriptive-analytical method this work is about the US intervention in Libya, and its results including the short term results and the long results via analysis of the three RtoP stages. We can arrive to the fact that RtoP can have two different kinds of results in one country. The American respond to such genocides remain the same for long period of time. It was much the same for Libya's case, the US decided to intervene in Libya under the name of RtoP. The RtoP strategy as it is known for its major three parts: to Prevent, to React, and to Rebuild, was highlighted in Libya.

We have seen all the possible information about RtoP when it comes to its history, pillars, and stages. The first chapter tackles the history of RtoP from its early beginning as humanitarian intervention to translated actions in countries. It also deals with the different norms of RtoP and how can we distinguish if the intervention can be evaluated and named as RtoP or not, by going into its three norms: words, actions, and results.

We have covered the sequence of events when it comes to the US different policies with the international intervention. We have seen that the US acted differently in each case according to many criteria and degrees of chaos. Libya's case was totally different when it comes to how it was influenced by the Arab Spring and how the uprising movement encouraged it to speak loudly against its leader.

The second chapter focuses more on the two early stages of the policy. Words than action, or to prevent than to rebuild, are part of decision. We have analyzed the chronicle that highlights how the decision to intervene was made and how major of the preventative strategies dictated by the Responsibility to rebuild were applied such as: condemnation, and public threat. At this point we can consider the beginning of the intervention as a succeeded one due to the fact that it matches most of the criteria of prevention. Furthermore, we have studies the US response to stop the old leader while he keeps neglecting all the threats. Actions must take place. It describes the actual use of force and the conduct of the operations in the battlefield. It started to be US operation but ended to be controlled by the NATO forces. The nature of this intervention is a purely military intervention that's transmitted to Arms Embargo, No-fly zone, and many other operations to heighten the pressure against the old regime. As the analysis goes on, we have seen that according to evaluation of those two stages we can ensure that the intervention was going in the right road. To this point, this intervention ruled by NATO shows a well structured intervention. During the conduct of military operations much of the

measures used in the Responsibility to React are applied including no-fly zones, arms embargos, and other operations. Which make it possible that the Responsibility to React was operative at this level. This chapter highlights the intervention powerful one when we have finished the chapter with most significant result which is the fall of the old regime.

In this chapter, we have analyzed the third stage in the RtoP policy, which is the Responsibility to Rebuild. It is whole different aspect of this policy where actual results are shown. It stands for the fact that it is the missing gap inside the intervention. We have seen how further steps should be taken when it comes to rebuild a state. It directly answers the question of how well structured intervention remains to be a failure. In this chapter the hypothesis that we have set is confirmed by the fact that US direct involvement did not go beyond diplomatic visits and promises. At the political and legal level, next to nothing is done to support any fundamental system. In the immediate aftermath of the resignation of the old regime, the signs were actually encouraging. It appeared, that Libya was on a positive and right way of sustainable development. But unfortunately the US kept on neglecting the underlying issues that caused fracture causing the Libyan the huge gap in the society as we see it today.

We conclude that prevention and reaction components of the RtoP were approved and worked with but the third component, which is essential part of successful Rtop. The analysis of US intervention in Libya shows the critical importance of the responsibility to Rebuild. Under the US RtoP, the Responsibility to Prevent and to React are generally shared by international community, but rebuilding is the needed responsibility of the states undertaking military intervention. Furthermore, we can say that the military intervention in Libya was born out of desire to protect civilians, with NATO taking over the control of operations, but changed to be a regime change. This confusion of goals is yet a reason of the failure. The RtoP policy in Libya went through many events and changed many times due to many reasons, yet the results of this intervention keep appearing each time. We can consider Libya as an example where a miss planning of future took place in the intervention.

Bibliography

Works Cited:

- Abomo, Paul Tang and Gen Carter Ham. *R2P and the U.S. Intervention in Libya*. Nairobi, Kenya: Palgrave Macmillan Springer, 2019.
- Alec, Russell. "Mediation and Libya." *Financial Times Weekend* ".(2011): 5.
- Armatsu, Louise and Micheal N Schmitt. *Year Book of International Law*. Vol. 14. the Netherlands: T.M.S Asser Press, 2011.
- BBC, NEWS. "Migrant slavery in Libya: Nigerians tell of being used as slaves". 2 January 2018. 1 May 2020 <bbc.com>.
- Bergmann, Christina. Deutsche Welle DW_ 29 March 2011. 4 May 2020 <dw.com>.
- Blomdahl, Mikael. "*Interacting Interests: Explaining President Obama's Libyan Decision*".European Journal of American Studies (2018): 5.
- Brown, Heather, Emily Guskin and Amy Mitchell. "*The role of Social Media in the Arab Up raising*." Pew Research Centre. Washington D.C., 28 November 2012.
- BUREAU OF DEMOCRACY, HUMAN RIGHTS, AND LABOR. "2019 Country Reports on Human Rights Practices: Libya Country Report". 2019.
- Chivvis, Christopher. *A year after the fall of Tripoli, Libya still fragile*. 30 August 2012. 1 May 2020 <globalpublicsquare.blogs.cnn.com>.
- Dirk, Vandewalle. "Preliminary results trickle in for Libya's historic election". CNN. Jomana Karadsheh et Michael Pearson. 10 July 2012.
- Fiott, Danial et Joachim Koops. *The Use of Force and the third pillar*.. Spinger, 2015. 130.
- Hehir, Aidan, and Robert Murray. *Libya: the Responsibility to Protect and the Future of Humanitarian Intervention*. UK England: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.
- Hendrix. «Free From Gaddafi's from Uniting Grip, Libya confronts its Diversity.» The Washington Post (2012).
- Hosenball, Mark. *Exclusive: Obama authorizes secret help for Libya rebels*. 30 March 2011. 27 April 2020 <reuters.com>.

- Jawad, Rana. "Migrant crisis: Self-immolation exposes U.N. failures in Libya". 31 July 2019. 19 April 2020 <bbc.com>.
- Jay, Solmon. «interview with Jordan's King Abdullah the second.» Wall Street Journal (2011): 2.
- Jibril, Mahmoud. "Liberal coalition makes strides in historic Libyan election; Christiane Amanpour". Éd. Jomana Karadsheh. Cable News Network, 18 July 2012.
- Kirkpatrick, David D. "Libya's Prime Minister Is Dismissed". The New York Times (2012): 8.
- Kramer, Sarah Kate. Beinart Analysis: Obama's Libya Speech. 29 March 2011. 1 May 2020 <wnyc.org>.
- Lacher. *Collapse and New beginning from 2011*. Schnelzer, Nadine.91.
- Largeter, Alison. *After the fall: Views from the ground of international military intervention in post-Gadhafi Libya*. London: Remote Control, 2017.
- Obama, Barack. "Remarks by the President in Address to the Nation on Libya". 28 March 2011. 20 April 2020 <obamawhitehouse.archives.gov>.
- Secretary-General's remarks to General Assembly Informal Interactive Dialogue on "The Responsibility to Protect: Timely and Decisive Response." 5 September 2012. <UN.org>.
- Sensini, Paolo. *Sowing Chaos: Libya in the wake of humanitarian intervention*. Trad. Alexander M SYNGE. Atlanta USA: Clarity Press Inc, 2016.
- Wehrey, Frederic. *The Burning Shores: INSIDE the BATTLE of the NEW LIBYA*. New York: Library of Congress, 2018.
- Zuckoff, Mitchell. *13 Hours: The Inside Account Of What Really Happened In BENGHAZI*. New York: Twelve, 2014.