

BINDURA UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE EDUCATION



FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

DEPARTMENT OF PEACE AND GOVERNANCE

TOPIC: THE IMPACT OF THE INTERVENTIONIST POLICIES OF THE WESTERN COUNTRIES (FRANCE, BRITAIN AND THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA) IN THE LIBYAN CRISIS OF 2011.

SUBMITTED BY: GLADMORE CHINEMBIRI (B1747665)

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science in International Relations (MSc. I.R) of the Bindura University of Science Education, Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities.

BINDURA, ZIMBABWE

2019

SUPERVISOR: MRS ZEMBERE

APPROVAL FORM

The undersigned certify that they have read and recommended to Bindura University of Science Education (BUSE) for acceptance the dissertation with the title; **“The Impact Of The Interventionist Policies Of The Western countries (Britain, France and USA) In The Libyan Crisis Of 2011”** by Gladmore Chinembiri in partial fulfilment of the requirements for Master of Science Degree in International Relations.

Gladmore Chinembiri

Student’s name

Signature

Date

M. Zembere

Supervisor’s name

Signature

Date

Faculty Chairperson

Signature

Date

RELEASE FORM

Name of author: Gladmore Chinembiri: B1747665

Title of dissertation: The Impact of the Interventionist Policies of the Western Countries (Britain, France and the United States of America) in the Libyan crisis of 2011.

Degree to which dissertation was presented: Master of Science in International Relations.

Year Granted: 2018

Permission is hereby granted to the Bindura University of Science Education (BUSE) library to produce single copies of this dissertation and to lend or sell such a copy for private, scholarly or scientific research only. This author reserves the publication rights and neither the dissertation nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise without the author's written permission.

Date: _____

Signature: _____

Permanent Address: 1772 Ushewekunze, Harare South.

DECLARATION FORM

I the undersigned, Gladmore Chinembiri (B1747665) hereby declare that the research study is my own original work and that it has not been submitted, and will not be presented at any other University for a similar or any other award.

.....

Signature

.....

Date

DEDICATION

To my husband and sons without your unwavering support I would not have made it. Also to my parents for the wisdom.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my heartfelt appreciation to the Almighty God for His protection and gratitude without which I would have come this far. Thus far the Lord has taken me. My profound gratitude goes to my supervisor (Mrs Zembere), for the expert advice, unwavering support, guidance and inspiration.

I would like to acknowledge Bindura University of Science Education and staff of the Department of Peace and Governance at the Bindura University for their frantic efforts in availing administrative support and commitment towards the success of this research.

My sincere gratitude goes to my respondents who enabled me to complete my research through their cooperation and hard work for this piece of work to materialise. Finally my husband and MIR colleagues your patience, support and encouragement are greatly appreciated.

Abstract

The research study examines the implications of the interventionist policies of Britain, France and USA through NATO in the Libyan crisis of 2011. The occurrence of the revolutionary movements of the 'Arab Spring' in early 2011 had a domino effect in Libya which led to peaceful protests and demonstrations against Gaddafi who was regarded as a dictator during his tenure in office. The US led military intervention which led to the ruthless murder of Gadhafi turned Libya into an anarchy, hence the study used the realism theoretical perspective to scrutinise the NATO intervention in the Libyan crisis of 2011. Hence, this also had an impact in Mali, Nigeria and Somalia where there was instability and insecurity as armed conflicts worsened in the aforementioned countries through illicit arms trafficking. This study used the descriptive research design in exploring the causes of instability and conflict in Libya after the intervention by NATO and the implications to that effect. Questionnaires, interviews and documentary reviews were used as data collection instruments in this research. Questionnaires were administered, interviews conducted to the targeted population in order to obtain relevant information pertaining to the military intervention in Libya and its implications in Libya and outside its borders. More so, the target population of the study were Libyan refugees and asylum seekers in Zimbabwe, UNHCR staff, academics and Western diplomatic staff members. The research gathered that the major intention of the Western countries and NATO intervention in Libya was premised on pursuing their national interest under the banner of the responsibility to protect. Hence, in future there is need for African countries to unite together in finding African solutions for African problems.

Table of Contents

APPROVAL FORM.....	i
RELEASE FORM.....	ii
DECLARATION FORM.....	iii
DEDICATION	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
Abstract.....	vi
LIST OF TABLES	x
ABBREVIATIONS.....	xi
CHAPTER ONE	1
INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Background of the study	1
1.2 Statement of the problem	2
1.3 Aim of the study	3
1.4 Significance of the study	3
1.5 Objectives.....	3
1.6 Research questions.....	4
1.7 Assumptions	4
1.8 Limitations	4
1.9 Delimitations	5
1.10 Definition of terms	5
1.11 Chapter Outline.....	6
CHAPTER TWO	7
LITERATURE REVIEW	7
2.0 Introduction	7
2.1 Theoretical framework.....	7
2.2 The legitimacy of military intervention in Libya.....	8
2.2.1 Just War theory	8
2.2.2 Jus ad bellum.....	8
2.2.3. Jus in Bello	10
2.2.4 Jus post bellum.....	11
2.3 Interest of the Western Countries in Libya.....	13
2.4 Responsibility to Protect	15

2.5 The effectiveness of regional and international bodies in solving political instability in Libya	18
2.5.1 The roles of African Union in solving political instability in Libya	18
2.5.2 NATO's role in solving political instability in Libya	21
2.5.3 United Nations	23
2.6 The implications of the Western countries' military intervention in Libya	24
2.7 Chapter summary	27
3.0 Introduction	28
3.1 Research Design	28
3.2 Research Methodology	29
3.3 Population of the study	29
3.3.1 The Sample and Sampling Procedure	30
3.3.2 Snowballing sampling	30
3.4 Data Collection Methods	31
3.4.1 Documentary review	31
3.4.2 Interviews	31
3.4.3 Questionnaires	32
3.5 Data validity and reliability	32
3.6 Data Presentation and Analysis	33
3.7 Ethical Consideration	33
3.8 Chapter Summary	34
CHAPTER FOUR	35
DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION	35
4.0 Introduction	35
4.1 Demographic information of participants	35
4.2 Emerging themes	36
4.2.1 The legitimacy of military intervention in Libya in 2011	36
4.2 National interests	41
4.3 Efforts by regional and international bodies in solving political instability in Libya.	44
4.3.1 NATO	44
4.3.2 African Union	45
4.3.3 United Nations	47
4.4 The implications of the Western countries' intervention in Libya.	48
4.5 Conclusion	49
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	50
5.1 Introduction	50

5.2 Summary of the Research.....	50
5.3 Conclusions	51
5.4 Recommendations	53
5.5 Areas for further study	54
References.....	55
APPENDIX B: QUESTIONNAIRE GUIDE.....	64

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Interview responses.....	35
Table 2 Response to questionnaires.....	36
Table 3 Responses on the relevance of R2P doctrine in the Libyan crisis.....	40
Table 4: Responses on national interests and the invasion of Libya by the Western countries.....	43

ABBREVIATIONS

APSA	Africa Peace and Security Architecture
AQIM	Al Qaeda in the Islamist Maghreb
AU	African Union
AUPF	African Union Peace Fund
EU	European Union
ICSS	International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty
ISIL	Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NTC	National Transition Council
PSC	Peace and Security Council (of the AU)
RASCOM	Regional African Satellite Communication Organisation
RTP	Responsibility to Protect
UN	United Nations
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNSC	United Nations Security Council
US	United States
USA	United States of Africa

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the study

Libya is a country which is found in the Northern part of Africa and was under the leadership of Muammar Gadhafi for 42 years. According to Thakur (2012), Gaddafi became a Libyan leader through a military coup against King Idris I in September 1969. The Libyan Revolutionary Command Council which was under the command of Gaddafi, phased out the use of the old constitution and abolished the monarchy system apart from proclaiming the new leader following the escape of the king from Libya and all was done under the motto "freedom, socialism, and unity" (Thakur, 2012). In addition, Gadhafi had associated himself with the Soviet Union whereby he buttressed the idea of a USA (United States of Africa) a Pan African movement in nature (Thakur, 2012).

According to Weiss (2011), although Gadhafi appeared as if he was against imperialism, he was contented exercising various forms of repression, brutality and control over the Libyan people. According to Duffield (2007), France harboured post imperial ambitions in her former colonies hence could not cut ties with them apart from France historically claiming itself to be an essential power the world over. However, some scholars have questioned the legality, legitimacy, necessity, and morality of the military involvement in the 2011 Libyan crisis. In mid-January 2011, civil uprising that occurred earlier in Tunisia had a domino effect in Libya whereby protests perceived as trivial were instigated due to corruption, deteriorating social environment and the propensity to have larger civil liberties as well as political freedoms (Weiss, 2011). Consequently, mass demonstrations against Gadhafi regime were instigated in Libya in 2011 and protests had started spreading to the rest of the country in a bid to force Gaddafi to step down. According to Weiss (2011), in response, the Gadhafi led government violently cracked down the protestors through violent suppression operations against demonstrators to the extent that the subjugation considerably escalated into mass killings which occurred between the 17th and 19th of February 2011.

Building on the above insights, the conflicts which occurred in Libya resulted from multifaceted and contentious sequence of developments, where exogenous factors heavily influenced local political events. According to Thakur (2012), a twofold set clash of interests originated from the dimensions of inter-Arab and Euro-Mediterranean, whereby Turkey and Italy teamed up versus Britain and France, and on the other side Qatar was conflicting with

Saudi Arabia and the UAE. Accordingly, Thakur (2012) further brings into light that, the regime of Gadhafi was an autocratic government which abused human rights and as a result of that, it led to an uprising which involved both Libyans and non-Libyan actors. Subsequently, this led to the demise of the fundamental, central and civil institutions in Libya which resulted into the creation of various mercenaries and militias locally (Thakur, 2012). The demise of Gadhafi as the president of Libya was characterised with a dysfunctional central government which led to porous borders and this led activities like transnational trafficking of weapons and migration flows in the Mediterranean. To this end, the inability of both endogenous and exogenous ambitions generated into disaster which escalated into a civil war in Libya, hence creating a complex and tremendous challenging situation which was difficult to solve. Subsequently, Libya became ungovernable due to leadership crisis and political polarisation.

Furthermore, Yusuf (2012) opines that, the peaceful demonstrations against the government of Gaddafi ensued in a vicious clampdown because the situation had worsened whereby the ordinary people took up arms in a bid to end the brutality of Gadhafi's government. In addition, Regardless of a sizeable number of defections from the military, the opposition was in disarray hence rebel force was out-gunned. The forces of Gadhafi gradually aimed at the civilian population, therefore, the opposition appealed for a no-fly zone from the international community so as to minimise or avoid the atrocity threatened by Gadhafi (Weiss, 2011).

In response to the 2011 peaceful protests, Gadhafi reasonably threatened countless lives of the civilian population and crackdown of protestors. The revolt ended up being an armed revolt and the country witnessed several military personnel and diplomats vacating from Libya fearing for their lives due to the vicious reaction of Gadhafi's regime and forces. Relatedly, the UNSC conceded for an earlier Resolution 1970 meant for the restriction and advising the ICC any human rights violations apart from authorising the Resolution 1973 declaring a no-fly zone to safeguard the civilian populations (Chipaike, 2012).

1.2 Statement of the problem

The Responsibility to protect concept comes from the view of an increasing humanism in the international world rise where human security takes the centre stage (Duffield, 2007). Hence, the R2P doctrine calls forth action to avert "mass attacks, crimes against humanity, ethnic cleansing and war crimes" (UN, 2011). However, it seems like there are anomalies by the western powers and the UN when it comes to the application of the R2P principle by some western countries, hence, the inconsistency in the application of the R2P through NATO

military intervention in the Libyan crisis of 2011 gave rise to many questions regarding the efficacy and objectives of the R2P. The Resolution 1973 was approved by the UNSC which declared a no-fly zone to safeguard Libyan population. The intervention of the Western countries under the principle of Responsibility to Protect is now the cause for concern in Libya because since 2011 when Colonel Muammar Gaddafi was dethroned, Libya became ungovernable and various problems emanated such as terrorism, migration and Libyans being sold as slaves. The political and economic instability prevailing in Libya is now a threat to global security and peace.

1.3 Aim of the study

This research was aimed at assessing the impact of the interventionist policies of the Western countries in the Libyan crisis of 2011. The interventionist policies are explained through the influence of Western countries in various regional and international bodies like African Union, NATO and United Nations. Accordingly, the goal was to provide recommendations for strengthening the efficacy of these regional and international bodies to have the ability to effectively respond to crisis timeously and in a decisive manner to maintain global peace and security.

1.4 Significance of the study

The research under study unravelled the implications of the Western countries' intervention in Libya. This then helped to assess the effectiveness of regional and international bodies in ensuring peace and security in fragile states. The study unpacked various interests of Western countries had in the Libyan crisis. Again, the research will add more literature in the international relations field especially in the module of UN, whereby the research analysed the role of the UNSC as the principal arm of the UN organization responsible for maintaining global peace and security the world over. The research is also important because it provides recommendations to regional and international bodies like African Union on how to strengthen the APSA so as to timeously intervene to avoid a replication of the AU's ostensible indecisiveness same as in the scenario of the 2011 Libyan crisis.

1.5 Objectives

The objective(s) of this research project were to:

- To assess the legitimacy of NATO military interventions in Libya.

- To analyse the effectiveness of regional and international bodies in solving political instability in Libya
- To examine the implications of the Western countries' intervention in Libya.
- To establish the national interests of the Western countries in Libya.

1.6 Research questions

- How legitimate was military intervention in the Libyan crisis of 2011?
- How effective were the regional and international bodies in solving political instability in Libya?
- What are the implications of Western countries in Libya?
- What were the national interests of the Western countries when they intervened in the Libyan crisis of 2011?

1.7 Assumptions

This research was based on the following research assumptions;

- Western countries intervened in Libya for self- interests than to solve the crisis in Libya.
- The terrorist attacks currently taking place in some of the Western countries like France and Britain are as a result of the intervention by NATO in Libya which created a breeding ground for terrorism in North African countries.
- Regional and international bodies are not capable of employing the principle of collective security in solving intra-state conflicts and civil wars.

1.8 Limitations

Most researches carried out are affected by certain impediments and this one was not exceptional. In this regard, the limitations that the researcher encountered include, the prevailing political crisis in Libya which emanated from the Libyan crisis of 2011, hence bringing up some limitations to the researcher. However, due to use of various research instruments the above problem were addressed quite satisfactorily. Again, the applicability of data was compromised by the fact that as a case study only one NATO intervention contribution constituted the respondents of the study, as such, results were generalized to the whole of NATO contributions. However, the use of documentary evidence among other data collection instruments helped in resolving this pertinent problem. The researcher limited the travelling stress by communicating with some respondents via online interviews, WhatsApp, e-mail and cell-phone.

1.9 Delimitations

The research focused on the Libyan crisis of 2011. This means that other countries where military interventions occurred were not given special attention to. The research focused on the legitimacy of the intervention and the implications of the Western countries in Libya. Accordingly, the study also factored in the roles of regional and international bodies like NATO, AU and UNSC.

1.10 Definition of terms

Responsibility to Protect.

Bellamy (2006), defined the R2P as a norm espoused by the UNGA at the World summit outcome document in 2005 which instructs that the main responsibility to protect the populace of a nation is on the state itself. More so, R2P contains a developing norm built on the idea of embracing sovereignty as a responsibility and not a right. R2P emphasis on the prevention and halting of heinous killing of people, war crimes, massacre, crimes against humanity as well as ethnic cleansing (Bellamy, 2006).

Intervention

Intervention is defined as coercive action encompassing the military or forces which are armed in a member state regardless of the agreement of the government of the same country as preserved in Article 4(h) and (j) of the African Union Constitutive Act (Yusuf, 2012). ICISS report noted that, there are three (3) forms intervention which are economic, political, sanctions, international criminal trials and military intervention to uphold human security (Yusuf, 2012).

Humanitarian intervention.

Murphy (1996), expresses it to the situation where states, group of states or international organizations resort to the threat or use of force to mainly for the determination of protecting the civilians of state targeted from extensive denials of human rights which are recognised internationally.

National interests

National interests are the core values, national objectives, goals and aspirations which a nation state seeks to fulfil and protect (Pham, 2008:257). Morgenthau (1978) defines national interests as identical with power and, as such, both the proper object of a state's foreign policy and the

best measure of its ability to attain its purposes. According to Morgenthau (1978) national interests are renowned as vital and secondary interests, temporary and permanent interests, specific and general interests and lastly complementary and conflicting interests.

Foreign policy

According to Hill (2003:285), Foreign policy is a purposive action with the perception of upholding the interests of a single political state or community. Baldwin (2000:171) points out that Foreign Policy is viewed as a nation-state's purposive behaviour. In a way, national interests are reflected in a nation's foreign policy and occupy the centre of gravity of a nation's foreign policy-hence the relationship between the two political phenomena.

Collective security

Collective security is a concept of assuring the security of a member state of an alliance thus, in collective security, an aggressor against one is an aggressor against all <http://www.nato.int/nato-welcome>. According to Schwarzenberger (1951), collective security is a "machinery for joint action in order to prevent or counter any attack against an established international order". The term implies joint actions to avert any threats to peace from the aggressor.

1.11 Chapter Outline

The research is structured into five chapters. Chapter one focused at the introduction, background to the study, statement of the problem, research questions, and significance of the study, definition of terms, limitations and delimitations of the study. Chapter two related literature review in line with the problem being researched on. The methodology and data collection methods used to collect data for the study was presented in chapter three. Chapter four presents the results and finding emerged from the study which include data analysis, presentation of data and discussion of findings. Lastly, chapter five looked at the research summary, conclusion drawn from the findings, recommendations and areas for further study.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Introduction

A presentation of the reviewed literature related to the study was outlined in this chapter the main thrust being to review the literature that has been written by scholars on the Libyan crisis of 2011. Accordingly, the literature enabled the researcher to build a sound knowledge base and gain a deeper insight into the issues dealing with military intervention in Libya. The researcher acquired information on what other scholars and authorities have written in relation to the studies under consideration. Thus, it is literature review that informs the research, identifying study gaps in the studies that were done related to the topic in question.

2.1 Theoretical framework

This research is guided by the theory of realism which was propounded by some main proponents of realism such as Machiavelli, Thucydides Thomas Hobbes, Morgenthau and Kenneth Waltz. The most important assumptions realists are that the utmost vital players in the international system are states which behave in such a way as to maximize and pursue their national interest and that the international system is characterized by a state of anarchy (Goldstein and Pevehouse 2006, p. 57). As put forward by Thucydides (1985), the position that morality in and of itself is not sufficient against power. In other words, powerful states will always prey on weak states despite there being international legal statutes that forbid such unwarranted military interventions. This means that, the behavior of the state in the international arena is driven by the desire to secure national interests. Therefore, considering multilevel governance, realists argue that to exclude international and regional bodies like AU out of the equation or power matrix due to their limited powers and influence in the international arena.

Accordingly, despite the fact that one of the assumption of realism is the existence of anarchy in the international arena and that they are not answerable to somewhat high ranked authority, realism recognize the presence of intercontinental norms. Finnemore (1998) emphasizes on the importance states as rational actors and this rationality which cannot be detached from any politically important chapter of normative change and that state sovereignty norms should be respected in the international; system. Furthermore, according to the realism perspective, national interests are characterized by security, military preponderance and power and these

tenets help state to retain its sovereignty norms. In order for states to achieve what they want in the international system they use various means like cooperation as in the case of Libya apart from using international bodies to advance their interest in Libya.

2.2 The legitimacy of military intervention in Libya

2.2.1 Just War theory

The legitimacy of military intervention in a country is justified when certain aspects according to the dictates of the Just War Theory are taken into consideration to justify the intervention. The research analysed the just war theory in order to provide an informative and balanced view of the Libyan military invasion in 2011 and the implications of the Western countries' military interventions in Libya. As propounded by St Augustine the legitimacy of war has its origins and he is of the view that peace is difficult to attain in the history of humans due to the state of anarchy characterised by the reality of sin, likelihood of the eruption of wars as well as violence (Jones, 1998). Augustine's belief is based on upholding the dictates of the Just War Theory whose principles are *just ad bellum*, *just in bello* and *Jus post bellum*.

2.2.2 Jus ad bellum

These are the principles or ethos of waging wars on legitimacy grounds and a pronouncement to alternatively embark on an armed conflict. The *Jus ad bellum* is enshrined on the justification of waging wars as well as determining decisions on either to or not to declare a war. According to Orend (2012), *jus ad bellum* has six recognised criteria for waging a war which are as follows:

- Just Cause – first and foremost, the most critical criteria of *jus ad bellum* is to recognise the just cause. According to Paul (2006), the merely satisfactory reason for the just cause when there is physical aggression hence the need for self-defence to thwart the probable acts of aggression or oppressive government. More so, it is permissible to wage wars that are aggressive in a bid to retaliate or punish an aggressor for wrong doing or to forestall an attack which is anticipated. Human rights and those of states should be taken into consideration. Moreover, if the territorial boundaries of a state are threatened and its sovereignty at the verge of facing aggression from the external force, states are permitted to resort to war. Accordingly, looking on the other side of the coin, if a state fails assure its own general populace with the fundamental freedoms and rights, the outside authority is permitted to launch humanitarian intervention.

- Legitimate Authority and Public Declaration – this aspect asserts that a competent and proper authority has been empowered to initiate the waging of a war or decision to go to war. Hence, accurate processes should be followed by the authority and the decision must be publicly declared with the purposes being plainly outlined. On this note proper authority needs to into consideration the meaning of sovereignty, the state, and what is the appropriate nexus between the government and the governed (Paul, 2006).
- Right Intention – it stipulates that, waging a war should be done for the just cause reasons, have precise goals and readiness to embark on negotiation. Apart from, the foregoing, war should not be for sake of revenging, killing and also there must be no sinister motive behind. Lecamwasam (2013) reiterated that war must be waged without exercising violence, meanness, regret or remorse and this is in line with of a just cause.
- **Probability of Success** - reasonable success is a pre-requisite for waging just war though it is lacking by itself. The Just War Theory stresses that there should be a reasonable probability of success to foil the just cause and right intention principles and the cost-benefits of an operation must be premeditated (Lecamwasam, 2013).
- **Proportionality** - Proposes that the good anticipated to be brought by a war has to outweigh the entire distress it inflicts.
- **Last Resort** -it is imperative that alternative means should be taken into consideration such as diplomacy and economic sanctions before waging a war as the last resort. Paul (2006) noted that, it is known that generals or leaders lose grip over forces and powers unleashed by war hence referred to by Clausewitz as the fog of war resulting into so many casualties and to some extent loss of lives

According to Orend (2005), the just cause is more of a necessity suggesting that the war should be waged necessarily in the circumstances of attaining peace. However, it is worth noting that the criteria of the *jus ad bellum* are subject to debate because states do not unanimously agree on the interpretation of the foregoing principles. Consequently, due to the use different explanations on how war is waged, states sometimes end up violating principles set forth by *jus ad bellum*. To this end, this lack of a universal interpretation contributed towards the

violation of the jus ad bellum principles during the 2011 Libyan invasion by the Western countries and NATO on the pretext of the R2P.

2.2.3. Jus in Bello

According to McMahan (2009), the principles of jus in Bello are important through promoting justice when conducting a war even if the war was unjustly waged breaking jus ad bellum. The two comprehensive principles which stipulate the rules of a just conduct during a war are discrimination and proportionality. The principle of discrimination quintessence on the appropriate targets in war, whilst the principle of proportionality is based on how much force is ethically suitable. In addition, a third principle can be added to the aforementioned two principles, which is the principle of responsibility which demands an inspection of where accountability lies in war.

- Discrimination and Non-Combatant Immunity - war should be focused on the combatants who are involved in the armed conflict. The innocent civilians are believed to be outside the field of war and their existence should not be reasonably part of the essence of war, hence, it sounds unjust or unfair to indiscriminately attack them. However, it is impossible to fight in a war without any casualties therefore, collateral civilian casualties referred to as collateral are permissible. Walzer (1977) asserts that the government should not hide behind its finger for indiscriminately killing due to failing to detect the opponents or combatants, hence the attack should be stopped if there is uncertainty encountered
- Proportionality – this entails restraining the magnitude and violence of warfare in order to reduce casualties and devastation. More so to inhibit the innocent from being further injured, proportionality should be considered in the use of force.
- Responsibility – those proxies of war are required to be responsible in any actions they partake and generally uphold morality. Walzer (1977) noted that the aspects that stem from the responsibility principle encompasses the morals between the agents of war who are also able to obey orders as well as the moral status of ignorance.

Internal jus *in Bello* involves human rights protection of human rights by the state to its own people against coerced conscription, repression of important rights and fundamental freedoms through emergency regulations (Macmahan 2005). This can be

explained by the involvement of NATO in Libya under the doctrine of the R2P. This whole essence of NATO in Libya was to protect the people from Gaddafi's ruthless killings. Innocent people lost their lives as a result of those killings International Humanitarian Law especially on armed conflicts incorporates the Jus in Bello into its systems in order to strike balanced standards of military and humanity obligation. Accordingly, the focus is now directed towards the expansion of the theory to *jus post bellum* meaning impartiality in the ending of a war to bring about just peace.

2.2.4 Jus post bellum

There are three options that crop up following war termination whereby the military has been conquered, victorious, or decided to ceasefire hence, there is need to apply justice principles to every situation. Surprisingly, international law provides insufficient guiding principles for the course of action that need to be followed once armed conflicts or warfare are terminated, thus, the reason why Libya remained in anarchy after the 2011 armed rebellion. Dimeglio (2005) supports this by articulating that, this lack of guideline results into the winners forcibly dictate pace and impose ideas on the issue of justice. The concept of post conflict resolution is gaining momentum in the contemporary world to fill the vacuum and offer sufficient guidelines for the aftermath of the war behaviour. The Jus post bellum principles are elucidated briefly below.

- Just Cause for Termination or rights vindication - during settlement there is need to look into consideration fundamental rights and civil liberties such as the right to life and liberty should be secured whose violation sparked the war, before terminating a war. The decision to end a war should reflect a picture that the situation is now in a better and some if not all problems were solved which means that revenge against the losing counterpart is not permissible (Orend, 2012).
- Proportionality, Public Declaration and Authority – it asserts that public pronouncement to the peace settlement should be as well as recognized by a legitimate authority. Orend (2012) hinted that, terms of the peace agreement should be proportionate to the constitutional rights that were initially disrupted to avoid unconditional surrender.
- Discrimination – A suitable differentiation should be done regarding to leaders, soldiers and civilians in the country where negotiations are taking place. More so, revengeful measures must not be exercised versus the losers and civilians are guaranteed immunity from retaliatory post war procedures (Orend, 2012).

- Punishment – All military personnel and political leaders should be held accountable or responsible for the war crimes committed if there are any, and face fair judgement and public international prosecution and these punishments should be executed with objectivity forthwith.
- Compensation – the loser need to be compensated by the winner so as to commence with reconstruction following the destruction caused by the war. Orend (2012) opines that, financial compensation may be directed subject to proportionality and discrimination.
- Rehabilitation – the aim of rehabilitation is for the winner to create a society which is just through necessitating change and a complete overhaul broken-down institutions in an aggressor's regime. Thus, the conqueror may compel changes in the aggressor's institutions such as emancipation or capacity building on human rights and demilitarization to bring about a reformed and just society in the post war era. (Lecamwasam, 2013).



Just War Theorists are of the opinion that, a war should meet all principles of the just war theory for it to be pronounced as just though the interpretation of certain just war criteria becomes very controversial due to the fact that some states abuse them to their own benefit, hence the essence of the theory being undermined. Consequently, accurate assessments during the course of the war are necessary though they are susceptible to heated discussions. The issue of interpretation within the Just War theory has left a lot to be desired in the case of the Libyan crisis of 2011 through setting a platform for a wide range of arguments concerning the intervention in Libya by NATO.

Dimeglio (2005) reasoned that, the Just War theory is significant in examining a war situation because it occupies an intermediate role between the normally used philosophies thus pacifism and political realism, in discussing the morality of war. Dimeglio (2005) added that while pacifism bemoan resorting to war as an immoral act which is also unjustifiable under any situations, political realism upholds the perception that war unrestrained by morality and lies beyond . In addition, a war should have a clear determination of averting harm to others and genuinely prevent genocide, ethnic cleaning and war crimes for it to be just accordance with the Just War Theory. Euka (2018), noted that insurgence and resorting to arms amplified when the rebels became assured of the external intervention hence, NATO and its associates heavily depended more on the use of propaganda to justify their intervention in Libya.

2.3 Interest of the Western Countries in Libya

The intervention of Western countries and NATO had an agenda which was based on national interest. Pougala (2011) noted that, these western countries had a solid plea to spread liberal democracy, capitalism through the free market approach cultural propensities and US has unintentionally cements to this argument through openly claiming that it would not interfere in states where national interest could not be pursued (Poulaga, 2011). Therefore, national interests take the centre states whenever such states interfere in the political progressions of other sovereign states on the pretext of humanitarian or ethical justification. Therefore, the well intentioned states claim to interfere in armed conflicts of a sovereign state under the guise of humanitarian concerns yet they harbour self-centredness and post-imperialism (Dunne, 2013).

The wave of democratisation is another factor which led Western countries to intervene in Libya because Gadhafi was being viewed as a dictator apart from being a stumbling block towards the project of democratisation in Africa at large. Thus, the involvement of the US backed NATO military intervention undoubtedly exhibited sinister motives of the US and its allies which were to implement political reforms in a dictatorship state under the rule of Gaddafi. In addition, the US is behaving like a world-wide war monger mainly bearing economic and security interests in mind, hence, unfortunately Libya became another victim of circumstances and was ruined so that the super powers could make hefty profits from the wreckage (Chipaike 2012).

Western countries wanted cheap oil which is abundant in Libya. According to the Guardian (2011), some African leaders heavily opposed the behavior of the western countries claiming that the Western countries and the US backed NATO military intervention wants to pursue its neocolonial ambitions in Africa by marginalizing the AU and failing to considering the latter's approach to the 2011 Libyan crisis and encouraging for political negotiation in Libya. Conversely, more so, African icons like Thabo Mbeki participated in vocal campaign versus the US backed NATO's military intervention, the no-fly zone forbids any visit and the UN had refused special authority for the Committee to fly to Libya (<http://www.politicsweb.co.za>).

In light of the above, Stuenkel (2015) noted that, the Western countries through the so called interventionist coalition which included countries such as the US, Britain and France were at loggerheads and in direct diplomatic hostility with the sovereigntist confederacy of states which consists of Russia and China. In view of the above, the latter was of the opinion that the

Western coalition had exceeded the logic of the Resolution 1973 and were dubiously misled into accommodating the military intervention under the umbrella of R2P despite that China and Russia had vetoed against the move (Stuenkel: 2015). In addition, Hobson (2016) emphasized that, the demise of Gaddafi's regime resulted into anarchy in Libya as rival tribes and militias, together with Al Qaeda and Islamic State, scrambled for power and some pessimistic authorities proclaimed the R2P in Libya. In addition, Thielborger (2012) stresses that the instance of Libya displayed the rise of a new muscular liberalism which challenges the opportune position of state sovereignty under the contemporary international permissible context. However, the "sovereignists" perceived that there was a well laid plan in pursuit of the regime change agenda in Libya on the pretext of the concept of R2P.

The UN-backed, NATO-led intervention brings into focus uneasiness about "crossing the sovereignty line and getting into other people's business" (Crocker et al., 2007: 231). Crocker et al (2007) further pointed out that, outsiders are not essentially best fortified to intervene; as they do not have self-evident mandate to intervene without advancing their own national interests to the detriment of the state they profess to set free. In addition, Jentleson (2004) upholds that notwithstanding claims of neutrality or non-involvement, there is no 'non-position' for international actors. Jentleson (2004) further noted that while international actors may profess neutrality, be it limiting their involvement to humanitarian rescue, protecting civilians and the territory or simply staying out, one way or the other, these actions affect the state's territorial integrity.

Jean-Paul Pougala propounded an argument that, the Western countries' actual reason for waging a war in Libya was due to the threat that Gaddafi seem to pose to them. More so Gaddafi's pioneered project, RASCOM (Regional African Satellite Communication Organization) to which he contributed US \$300 million towards the project irked the West. The said project would enable Africa to have its own satellite for communication purposes implying that Europe would lose US \$500 million annually for the lease of its satellite by Africa for communication (Pougala, 2011). He further argues that Gaddafi's project of a United States of Africa would point to Africa being united and strong, hence not easy to exploit and thus this was viewed as a threat by the Western countries. In addition, Gaddafi's opposition of a plot to make Northern Arab African Countries to detach themselves from the mainstream African Continent under the auspices of the European Union's dream of a Union for Mediterranean also posed a threat to Europe's hegemony. The Western countries viewed Gaddafi as the

stumbling block towards their agenda of creating UMP, hence, as a way of advancing their agenda, to the R2P was indirectly used.

Again, Gaddafi's military and financial aid to South Africa in the fight against the apartheid regime made the Western countries to detest him and thus view him as the an enemy (Pougala, 2011). Pougala (2011) further pointed out that, the behavior of the Western countries in Libya becomes questionable leaves much to be desired and comes under spotlight when the same seem not to be visible and actively involved in countries such as Bahrain, Yemen and Syria where the R2P concept matters the most as large numbers of people have died. This is supported by Nuruzzaman (2014) who argues that, dishonorable militant groups such as the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant or the anti-government Islamic Front in Syria which involves the Al-Nusra an al-Qaeda linked group are alleged to have performed heinous crimes against humanity wanton summary executions, murders and torture. Rebel fighters in Syria have been condemned by the Human Rights Watch for crimes against humanity, hostage taking, rape, and brutal killings. The Western countries in the case of Syrian crisis did not intervene using the doctrine of the R2P as they did in Libya. This raises so many arguments on the invasion by Western countries in Libya (Nuruzzaman, 2014).

The above argument led scholars like Duffield (2012) to conclude stressing that, the Western Countries' willingness and ability to help in bringing about some transformation politico-social relations to enable Libyans to be independent political agents able to have control on their peace and security is not the main discourse. However, the bottom-line of the intervention relates to the Western Countries' capabilities to have control over the prevalent security risks of globalization's disorderly boundaries, even though continuing the capacity of mass society to consume beyond its means (Duffield, 2012).

2.4 Responsibility to Protect

According to Jabri (2011), the military intervention in Libya has been legitimated by its promoters bend at civilians' protection on the one hand, and the Cameronist scope of thinking of lessening the effects and outcome of a supposed failed state closer to Europe's borders, on the other hand. Thus, a balance between security imperatives and the protection of the liberty of Libyans informed the militarized security policy towards Libya. Consequently, such an equilibrium must not be sentimentalized as redemptive or emancipatory, for it is intricately connected to the grave syntax of conflict, which joins supremacy and violence in the direction of resentment against dissimilar and particular others (Jabri, 2011). Therefore, the politics of

security behind the R2P comes to service practices that excludes others which establish war and finds war at the cynosure of international relations (Jabri, 2011). The R2P as a liberal tool to war continues on the basis that others are the problem to be solved and the de-politicized subjects/objects being well-informed for their personal advancement (Evans, 2012). Accordingly, Gadhafi's regime and the Libyan victims are viewed as objects of international intervention according to the R2P discourse.

The concept of "*The Responsibility to Protect*" that has become a prominent international doctrine, contributes a lot to the crisis over humanitarian intervention following the war in Kosovo in 1999 (Newman, 2009: 93). According to Weiss (2011), since the formulation of the concept of "*Responsibility to Protect*" by the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS) in 2001, this new concept has not been put to use by not even a single international intervention. Gierycz (2010) opines that, the R2P doctrine is based on the idea that sovereignty is not a privilege, but a responsibility which focuses on thwarting and halting four core crimes: genocide, war crimes, crimes against humanity, and ethnic cleansing. The RTP can be seen as having three parts which are: First- a state's responsibility to protect its population from genocide, war crimes, crimes against humanity and ethnic cleansing (ICISS Report, 2010). In this regard the states still maintains control over own territories. Second- if a state becomes unable to safeguard its population on its own, the international community is bound and responsible to assist the state by building its capacity. In this case state sovereignty is still upheld. Third - if a state is noticeably not able to safeguard its nationals from massacres and peaceful overtures are of no effect, the international community has the responsibility to get involved first diplomatically or economically, and as a last option with military force' (ICISS Report, 2010).

Accordingly, legitimated within the emancipatory language of R2P, the Libyan intervention is the current example of an inclination in the direction of an internationalized and militarized reaction to key multifaceted humanitarian crises, enclosed by an emphasis on the victims of political violence (Bellamy, 2011). The military crusade in Libya was casually introduced to apply the United Nations Security Council Resolution 1973 in a bid to protect Libyan civilians. The resolution starts with "the immediate establishment of a ceasefire" and echoes the obligation of the Libyan powers that be to safeguard the Libyans and reiterates that groups in the armed conflict bear the primary responsibility to take all possible steps to warrant the protection of citizens (UN, 2011: 2). On behalf of the internationalized and interventionist

reason of RTP, Resolution 1973 additionally authorizes UN member states “to take all necessary measures to protect civilians and civilian populated areas of Libya” (UN, 2011: 2).

Furthermore, with regards to humanitarian obligation Ban Kim Moon perceived it crisis in the use of force in the Libyan crisis of 2011 as the only option to protect civilians in Libya (UN, 2011). On the same note, Bajoria (2011), reiterated the same sentiments that, the exercise of the R2P principle in Libya was “legally, morally, politically and militarily based on protecting the people” from the ruthless subjugation of Gadhafi primarily those of Benghazi. However, the use of negotiation and diplomacy was restrained by the international community restricted in a bid to bargain a solution to the political crisis in Libya. According to Evans (2012) the Council of Human Rights emphasised to the UNSC that the international norm on the R2P should be meant to protect civilians. Evans (2012:2), differentiated the meaning of the right of humanitarian intervention and R2P:

“First, R2P is primarily about prevention, whereas humanitarian intervention is only about reaction. Second, R2P is about a whole continuum of reactive responses – from diplomatic persuasion, to pressure, to non-military measures like sanctions and International Criminal Court process, and only in extreme, exceptional and last resort cases military action, whereas humanitarian intervention is only about military reaction. And third, R2P is about a wide range of actors, starting very much with the sovereign state itself where the problem exists, and others in the international community able and willing to assist that state prevent mass atrocities, whereas humanitarian intervention focuses only on the role of those able and willing to apply coercive military force.”

According to Mbanje and Mahuku (2012), if waging war required to enforce R2P, as it is in polarized, intractable disputes, the large powers can be expected to have the largest say on whether force use to protect R2P is efficient and effective. Because violent small power primary antagonists will presumably be less committed to protecting populations than the international community, R2P enforcement highlights the importance of major power military action. Rieff (2011) argued that the entry point for the UN backed military intervention might have been precipitated by the broadcasted statements of Gadhafi to go in every house and deal with those deemed to have offended the state. It can be argued that, the intervention in Libya was not to implement the R2P, however, this deems to affirm the position that powerful nations can willy-nilly invade weaker states. However, observable susceptibility of populations to force

use suggests that the “*Responsibility to Protect*” principally needs restrictive rather than broadening force use. This is most opportune and useful in early stages of local disputes, way before formative moments of hostile differences and hardening that ensue occur. Hence, a power intervention method in the form of conciliatory diplomacy can be considered for implementation. (Branch, 2011).

With regards to the Libyan crisis of 2011, Mbanje and Mahuku (2012) posits that, the Libyan leader vowed to squash the rebellion when it erupted in Benghazi in 2011. With the possibility of anticipated bloodshed from the repression of the uprising by the strongman Gaddafi, the Arab League requested a peace keeping force, which got authorised by the UNSC. To that effect NATO with its air power supporting the rebels the Gaddafi regime was dethroned in October 2011. Therefore, a disagreement between the Western countries and major power houses Russia and China with the latter arguing that the objectives of which they had endorsed only directs at stopping violence against civilians rather than undermining the Gaddafi regime as the former viewed it. (Mbanje and Mahuku 2012)

2.5 The effectiveness of regional and international bodies in solving political instability in Libya

2.5.1 The roles of African Union in solving political instability in Libya

According to Chipaike (2012), the Libya crisis has left a lot of questions such as AU`s ability to effect conflict resolution on the continent without the help of the outside world. It can be argued that the notion that three members of the African Union in the UNSC voted for a no fly zone under resolution 1973, and consequently bombardment of Libya by NATO shows that the aspect of collective security is lacking in the AU (Chipaike, 2012). Chipaike (2012), further implied that, the AU had shown its submission to pressure by Western countries in voting for Resolution 1973 therefore, inadvertently giving NATO the obligation to deal with an African conflict. The efficacy of home grown solutions to the challenges of Africa leaves much to be desired citing the Libyan scenario. However, while the Libyan challenges had reached unprecedented levels were civilians were dying in large numbers it was the AU`S prerogative to intervene rather than NATO`s (Chipaike, 2012). Akonor (2011) reiterated the foregoing by citing AU act, Article 4 (h) which mandates the AU to compulsorily intervene when issues of war crimes, genocide and crime against humanity happens in one of its member states. Therefore, AU did not directly and swiftly intervene in Libya in order to effect the principle of R2P due to the reason of respecting values of sovereignty, independence and brotherhood. This

shows that, AU is a toothless bulldog. Chipaike (2012) pointed out that, the AU's lack of decisiveness puts it at a weaker position as a regional organisations as this gives room for the more decisive groups like NATO to take up responsibility, as a result AU could lost respect of the National Transitional Council.

Chipaike (2012) postulates that, the AU had always wanted some kind of a political concession in Libya as is insisted on governments that involve divers political players as a strategy for management of conflicts. However, this strategy has failed in its efficacy and this indicates a lack of options in solving conflicts that are ever present in the African continent. Be that as it may the ultimate removal of Gbagbo in Ivory Coast by Qattara's military forces shows that governments of national unity are not a panacea to continued conflicts. In addition to that the continuation of quarreling amongst political members in Zimbabwe's government of national unity same as witnessed in Kenya points to a dull future with regards to transition of power. One can argue that they may be a breakdown of violence again. (Chipaike (2012) admits that, since the General Assembly had already voted in favor of giving the NTC a seat the African Union has already lost ground and became weak with regards to the Libyan crisis. Though the AU was of the opinion of the formation of a government with political inclusivity similar to that of Zimbabwe and Kenya, they ultimately followed what the United Nations vouched for in Libya.

In light of the above, Benette (2011) contends that the AU's weakness of indeterminacy, are demonstrated by the contrasting opinions held by the Nigeria and South African with regards to the Libyan crises. Benette (2011) further points that, had it been that the AU was united and had stood by the AU constitutive Act values, Libya could have been protected from UN-NATO supported war mongering bombardment crusades. In spite of the Act clearly provision of the guidelines of intervention, South Africa and Nigeria caused the AU to leave its application as the two interpreted the same differently. In addition, the AU was expected to re-organize itself after the adoption of Resolution 1973 and the ensuing NATO bombing campaign, in order to map out peace plan and communicate this to the UN and NATO, however, this was blocked by the deep divisions that marred Africa. According to All Africa (2011), South Africa and Nigeria were leading opposing factions of African states and this weakened the ability of the AU to act decisively in Libya, thereby providing room for the external interveners (Western governments') offensive attack and the attendant human deaths. Therefore, this lack of collective security enabled Western governments to point to Africa's political failure, to be responsible for protecting African security interests and also fulfil their own national interests.

As such, Libya was regarded to be a strong member chiefly for the reason that it directed the change from the OAU to AU (Shah, 2011). The former Libyan Leader Colonel Muammar Gaddafi is credited for playing a critical part in transforming the regional institution. At the time of the crisis the Libyan Leader was the chief financier of the AU more so many African nations counted on him as a reliable donor (Ibid, 2011). Between 2009 and 2010 Gaddafi served as the Chairman of the AU Assembly of Heads of State and Government, his elimination negatively affected the AU as an organization economically and politically.

In finding a political solution to the Libyan crisis of 2011 the African Union favored diplomacy and mediation. According to Nicolson (1998) the central point of diplomacy is the inhibition of disagreements from deteriorating into armed conflict, it can be argued that diplomacy is an agency by which foreign policy leads to the attainment of purposes through agreements rather than war. Therefore, the responsibility to protection encourages mediation and diplomacy and military intrusion being the last option. Ramsbotham (2011) said that the AU is explicitly authorized to use diplomacy and mediation according to article 6 of the PSC Protocol which states that the PSC will be active in the areas of peace- making, utilization of good offices, mediation and enquiry. Furthermore, the AU panel of the wise is vested with authority to institute quiet diplomacy (Ramsbotham, 2011). Successful mediation of some African conflicts by the AU like in Burundi where with the help of Nelson Mandela the Arusha Peace and Conciliation Agreement for Burundi was signed in August 2000. (ibid). According to Benette (2011);

AU expresses deep concern at the prevailing situation in Libya, which poses a serious threat to peace and security in that country and in the region ... with resulting humanitarian situation and Expresses AU's solidarity with Libya, underscores the legitimacy of the aspirations of the Libyan people for democracy, political reform, justice, peace and security, as well as for socio-economic development, and the need to ensure that these aspirations are fulfilled in a peaceful and democratic manner; in this context, Council takes note of the stated commitment of the Libyan authorities to embark upon the path of reforms.

According to Shah (2011), political negotiation was ideal owing to the reservations the AU had about the effects that would come after the war in Libya and surrounding regions. However, some reports suggest that NTC was adamant to negotiate citing AU's vagueness on Gaddafi's fate as to whether he would go or not (ibid). Initially the plan was to use political negotiation

with the hope that the situation on the ground would be such that Gaddafi would ultimately vacate the throne. The Ad-Hoc Committee on Libya was a provisional political set up used for negotiation and the fact that too much consideration and stress was given to the Committee may have prohibited the PSC from working appropriately with the prospect of reproving one of the parties on the negotiation table (Nathan, 2011). In view of the above, the efficacy of mediation and diplomacy become questionable for instance in cases of mass killing and atrocities are committed which will end up attracting the intrusion of the international community. To this end, The PSC had resorted to use of diplomacy and negotiation as the panacea to end the Libyan 2011 civil war.

According to Hengari (2011), AU's use of diplomacy and mediation while people are being endangered and slaughtered like what was happening in Libya works against the fulfillment of the responsibility to protect. Also, AU's insistence on mediation and diplomacy even though the Libyan people, international community and Arab League were crying out loud calling out for a no-fly zone from the UNSC shows how unplanned and imprecise the AU was in its road map (ibid, 2011). Though the significance of mediation and diplomacy cannot be underestimated, intervention in urgent cases where human lives are at stake cannot be undermined in any case. In light of what has been alluded to above, it is so apparent that the African Union failed to execute the responsibility to protect mandate in Libya due to lack of urgency, indecisiveness and lack of collective security in Africa as a continent, hence ended up appearing as a moribund institution in the eyes of the beholder.

2.5.2 NATO's role in solving political instability in Libya

Tulsa (2011) as cited by Evans (2012), apart from the AU's inability or failure to act as swiftly as possible to forestall the calamity imposed on Libya by the UN-backed NATO and its client National Transitional Council (NTC), a number of Western Countries like Britain, USA and France stifled the peace process in Libya. NATO denied that its goal was to kill Colonel Gaddafi, and insisted that its bombardment was to inflict enough damage so as to sway Gaddafi and his advisors to give up the reigns while at the same time safeguarding the civilian population and promoting democracy in Libya (ibid, 2011). According to Tulsa (2011) cited by Evans (2012),

NATO mission in Libya was neither for the interests of Libyan civilian population nor for democracy and human rights. The US government fully backed the Saudi monarchy and the Mubarak dictatorship but both regimes do not subscribe to the tenets of

democracy, and also violate the core creed of human rights and values. As such, he insists that the NATO invasion of Libya was for the protection of the Western and US-owned oil giant Conoco Phillips and Exxon-Mobil. He declared that protecting civilians and promoting democracy is of zero interest and concern to the ConocoPhillips and Exxon-Mobil oil giants in Libya.

Tulsa (2011) further claims that NATO's objective was to stifle a negotiated settlement in Libya. This was with a view to ensuring the downfall of the loyal security apparatus and the assassination of Gaddafi and his close associates. According to Cordesman (2011: 5), "it is uncertain how NATO can hope to destroy the Libyan command and control apparatus without targeting the people at its centre".

Cordesman (2011) noted that, NATO forces were involved in a conflict of slow destruction designed to bring about a change of regime in Libya. A change of the regime was an important extension of the letter of UNSC Resolution 1973 (2011) that authorized the execution of a no-fly zone, as well as all essential actions for the safeguarding of citizens (ibid, 2011). Instead, Britain, France, the US and senior European and NATO officials demanded that Colonel Gaddafi step down, with US president Barrack Obama observing that Colonel Gaddafi's departure from office "is good for United States... and that it is the right thing to do" (Cordesman 2011: 5).

According to Jacobson (2012), NATO neither sought peace nor demonstrated a collective political will to attain peace through dialogue in Libya. Jentleson (2004) opines that peace is obtainable without the use of military hardware; however, this was undermined in Libya by the NATO forces. Moreover, Jentleson (2004) further noted that the enforcement of a rule can be accomplished by diplomatic means, including the concurrent safeguarding of social groups and the individual, devoid of making use of military force.

According to Mertus (1999: 6), NATO's primary *raison d'être* was to indulge in wars and not necessarily manage conflicts and maintain peace, hence, NATO's conflict resolution or transformation mechanisms and techniques are not suitable and cannot be effective in resolving conflicts in Africa; instead, they cause more harm than good. Yobo (2009) reiterated that a conflict resolution framework must fit into the given conflict context in order to be relevant and that external intervenors, including NATO do not effectively analyze the power structure and the role of the state, the arms dealers and the victims of violence. According to Yobo (2009:26) in the African context, internal African structures and the negative role the Western

media plays in explaining the causes of conflict in Africa are themselves a source of conflict on the continent. The Compliance Campaign (2012) upheld the view that the Western media helped legitimize the NATO bombing campaign in Libya by partial representation of facts.

In light of what have been alluded above, the involvement of NATO in Libya showed an attempt of its kind by the Western world in the militarization of the new scramble for African resources in the contemporary times (Chipaike, 2012). It is also argued that a continuation of dictatorial tendencies by some African leaders would give Western countries which are hungry for resources the justification to militarily intervene citing internal grievances and the need to uphold protection of human rights and liberties (Murshed, and Tadjoeeddin, 2007: 11). According to Chipaike (2012: 47), when the natives rise against the state in Africa either on their own volition or by exogenous machinations there is a high propensity that, Western countries resorts to military intervention as witnessed in Libya. Hence, leadership in Africa should do what's possible to espouse the values of democracy and good government being transparent and accountable to their people. The politico-economic freedom discourse is such a strong force to ignore, thus both economic and political opportunities should be availed. Gaddafi made a blunder in that emphasized a lot economic and social aspects while leaving behind the political aspects in an effort to produce a socialist utopia (Chipaike, 2012).

2.5.3 United Nations

The response by the Security Council to the Libyan crisis is symbolic of the growing inclination towards sanction alliances and peace enforcement processes to use everything at stake to ensure human protection (Bellamy and Williams, 2011: 828). Relevantly, the Libyan crisis is the first scenario in which under Resolution 1973 of the UN the Security Council has sanctioned military intervention against an operational government under the guise of protecting civilians. This is located in the notion that rather than pursuing an instant armistice and political mediation, the "International community" immediately took military action against state targets and infrastructure (Bellamy and Williams, 2011). Such military action surpasses the boundaries regarded as all necessary measures before authorization, NATO failed to conclusively make use of all conflict resolution peaceful measures, before embarking on a military operation (Cohn, 2011). Furthermore, the military action by the allied forces went over board and go further than a no-fly-zone authorized by the UN and protection of civilians from an authoritative regime. Rather, the allied forces launched lethal bombings against Libya's national army, while providing the rebels with strategic advice and military aid in the ensuing

perpetuating the civil war. Sanctions were passed against Libya and national assets were frozen while a regime change agenda being mooted. (Prince, 2011).

UN Resolution 1973 approves Member states to “take all necessary measures, to protect civilians and civilian populated areas under threat of attack in Libyan Arab Jamahiriya” (UN, 2011: 2). It additionally stresses the “intensification of efforts to find a solution to the crisis which responds to the legitimate demands of the Libyan people” and pursues to enable political “dialogue to lead to the political reforms necessary to find a peaceful and sustainable solution” (UN, 2011: 3). Hence, whereas the practice of R2P in Libya claims to champion the safeguarding of Libyan “victims”, negotiation and peace-inducing political restructuring, its claims of being emancipatory are rendered to be false owing to it being centralized, top-down, paternalistic, state-based and institutional. However, Khan (2011) is of the opinion that, the US intervened in Libya, unwillingly when Benghazi was on the brink of falling in the hands of Gaddafi and only after both the UN and the Arab League had approved the intrusion.

2.6 The implications of the Western countries’ military intervention in Libya

According to Kuperman (2013), the conduct of domineering authorities in Libya (Operation Odyssey Dawn and Operation Unified Protector), NATO and the Arab League, directed lots of arguments to be forwarded regarding the transgression of the boundaries of SCRS. As of interest, these accounts show that the intervening powers sought to overthrow Gadhafi’s government (ibid). Since regime change was not part of the Resolution and not in any way to do with the protection civilians and restoration of international peace and security, this can be viewed as criminal use of force by Western Countries. Additionally, international humanitarian law’s violations by intervening powers could justify this conclusion (Lehmann, 2012). Abdallah (2012) opines that, the fall of Gaddafi following the Arab Spring has had enormous consequences on the sub-Saharan states since it is believed that it stirred up a combination of rebels, smugglers, refugees and vicious Islamic militant groups in the already politically weakened region.

Accordingly, taking part of the west militarily in the Libyan civil war can be said to have saved some lives, but the aerial bombings and the militarization of the resistance against the Libyan regime has ceased to lessen political violence. Hence, the Libyan struggle has become an extended conflict regarded as increasing political and human costs and the galvanization of the pro-Gaddafi apparatus, which is now fighting on two fronts: protecting Libya against

revolutionary Libyans and against the Western imperialists (ICG Report, 2011: 28). According to Pougala (2011), the recent military operation has occasioned in prolonged ferocious battle and this consequence of war mirrors the depoliticized rationality of the R2P's model of resistance, in that it helps to disempower non-violent civil confrontation and the possibility for "people polity", both of which embody a shove away from state-driven discourses and practices. Therefore, the application of R2P in Libya has been counterproductive to confrontation and emancipation.

According to Chipaike (2012), by passing Resolution (1973), the UNSC provided NATO purposefully or unintentionally the right to assist insurgents in their fight against Gaddafi under the smokescreen of the R2P. However, the actual motivations of NATO were not solely shielding citizens from the unrestrained attack by Gaddafi, takeover Libya's oil, which they had done already, and to get lucrative rebuilding contracts (ibid). Implied in all this fictional generosity is disaster as capitalism spreads its appendages to Africa and militarize the New Scramble for Africa's resources (Chipaike, 2012). However, though Libya is an opportunity for those who have been profiteering from Iraq and Afghanistan to additionally keep lining their pockets, a risk that the struggle in Libya might have opened a can of worms not only for the nation but for the entire North African region ensue. Chaos is likely to be increased to the level similar to those Afghanistan as Islamic extremism spreads and join hands with followers of the late leader and some sympathetic tribes. General discord in society might be sown and suicide bombs against the Western establishments will increase. A scramble for African resources by the interventionist nations will be witnessed. Confronted with these difficulties the African Union appears to know no way out to stop the new phenomenon of the new scramble's militarization.

According to Chipaike (2012), in spite of being the first case in point of the militarization of the new scramble for African resources, the Libya crisis also has components of volatility both inside and in the North African belt and also y Libya under Gaddafi was somehow peaceable, with no key dangers from Islamic fundamentalist elements in the region. Tuareg forces operating in the Sahel region have traditionally threatened countries such as Mali, Niger, Mauritania and their neighbors will certainly now pose a threat to Libya as well. McTernan (2011: 45) as quoted in Chipaike (2012), notes that, as Gaddafi was a financier of past Tuareg rebellions, there is a risk that groups of the nomadic people of West Africa will continue to be a source of instability.

Gaddafi's death has an effect of introducing feelings of hostility into the Tuareg groups against the NTC and its western backers. According to McTernan (2011:44) the Tuareg fighters are also believed to have struggled on the side of Gaddafi forces against the rebels and the concern is that they returned with weapons to their respective bases after the fall of the Gaddafi regime. This unlucky set-up posed a major challenge of security beyond Libyan borders due to the proliferation of an illicit trade in Libyan weapons. Thus, the Tuareg uprising in Mali was part of the fallout from Gadhafi's demise, due to this uncontrolled movement of weapons and armed elements from Libya to Mali (McTernan, 2011). Danjibo (2013) argues that the conflict in Mali was triggered by the Libyan conflict after the fall of Gaddafi; Malian Tuaregs who had served in the Libyan army returned back to northern Mali with large quantities of arms and fueled the smuggling of weapons from the fallen Muammar Gaddafi regime and the cause of conflict in Tunisia was the fact that this state harbored a vast influx of Libyan refugees. Chipaika (2012) argues that the fall of Gaddafi left a power vacuum that has promoted the proliferation of extremist groups and the movements have been influenced by the involvement of the West in North Africa and extremism in the region has been motivated by the desire to extend the Islamic State within Africa, eliminating Western influence.

Consequent to the 2011 rebellions and the fall of the Gaddafi regime, Libya has experienced a transformation of its political system, with important economic and social changes in the state and society (Combaz, 2014). Gaddafi was ousted from power by the National Transition Council (NTC), a group that consisted of different militias that opposed the Gaddafi regime, recognized by 114 UNGA members on 16 September 2011 as the only legitimate representative of Libyan people (Chivvis & Martini, 2014). Therefore, Libya became ungovernable due to the increased power held by different armed groups leading to a state of anarchy, insecurity and uncertainty that has been intensified by the proliferation of illicit arms trade and the existence of extremist jihadist movements. In addition, by supporting anti-Gaddafi forces during the 2011 uprising, NATO empowered rogue militias who were not accountable to any authority, providing them with military hardware and in the aftermath of the anti-Gaddafi revolts, these militias could not be disarmed and were too powerful to be controlled by the newly installed government (Chivvis & Martini, 2014). Libya contains over 140 different tribes and since the fall of Gaddafi these tribes have viciously fought one another for greater control and influence, so as to get recognition by the interim government and outsiders as having greater authority (Alemazung, 2010).

Furthermore, the intervention by NATO made Libya a less important player in African regional politics. Blanchard (2012:15) contends that the Libyan role in the politics of the African continent makes it a successful and strategic nation apart from the national unity on which its foundations were laid, hence, disagreement and disunity in post-conflict Libya has clearly undermined the security status of the state due to power vacuum and human insecurity was an imminent result of the intervention in Libya by the Western countries. In addition, according to the Brookings Institute paper (2019), “Libya has floundered since the overthrow of Muammar Gadhafi in 2011, and continues to struggle now. There are elements of a functional economy and governance, but otherwise only a hodgepodge of a very weak central institutions and improvised local arrangements, as militias and other actors compete for the spoils of the state. As a result, Libya remains in disarray representing a potential source of terrorism”. To this, end Libya became ungovernable due to power wrangles which emanated from the crisis hence the African Union and the international community have a mammoth task for sanity to prevail in Libya.

2.7 Chapter summary

The chapter reviewed literature from various scholars pertaining the interventionist policies of the Western countries in the Libyan crisis of 2011. The legitimacy of the NATO military intervention in Libya was reviewed through analyzing the Just War Theory. The implications of the NATO intervention were analyzed through the lenses of the realism perspective, the Just War Theory and the R2P doctrine which was refined from collective security and paying much of its attention in the aggressor to citizen centered perspective. The upcoming Chapter is going to look at the research methodology and the research designs which were used in the carrying out of this research.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

The chapter presented a discussion of how the information, was collected from various sources. an outline of the research design, data collection methods and tools which was used, sampling criteria and sources of information as well as ethical issues considered throughout the research process will be discussed as well. The research presented how reliability, validity and effectiveness of the research findings in addressing the research questions was ensured.

3.1 Research Design

This study used the descriptive research design because it assists in answering questions such as what, who, where, when, and how related to the research problem. In the case of the Libyan crisis of 2011, one must know who came up with the interventionist policies, when and where? Also, in the case of the “how”, the researcher wanted to know how the interventionist policies of the Western countries affected Libya in 2011 through NATO military intervention. The information was obtained through the use of the descriptive research design concerning the current political, economic and social situations prevailing in Libya.

The researcher used descriptive research design to gather information about the thoughts of respondents on the Libyan crisis of 2011. This is supported by James (2008) who reasons that, descriptive research design is a valuable tool for data collection pertaining the characteristics, behaviour, thoughts and attitudes of humans. According to Biscoe (2003) when collecting information collected from bigger number of cases, possibly using questionnaires, it is regarded as a survey which might make use of the readily accessible data, gathered for alternative purpose. As such, in the case of Libya, the research looked at issues surrounding the invasion of Libya by the Western countries.

Building on the above, descriptive research design defines phenomena as they exist and summarise raw data in a usable form. The descriptive research design focused at finding out views from the respondents on how they view the implications of the interventionist policies like the R2P in the Libyan crisis, hence making it the most appropriate for the research. The researcher noted that descriptive research design a fairly accurate and fair-minded description of the phenomenon to be researched. Thus, the researcher was able to collect a great deal of data from the sample that represented the population of the research. Through descriptive

research, the researcher got very valuable information about the views of various respondents and this gave more insights on issues related to the research. According to McNabb (2010: 35), descriptive research design provides wealth of information, which is easy to understand and interpret.

3.2 Research Methodology

Qualitative research methodology was used in the research because it focuses on individual assessment of opinions, attitudes and behaviour. As in this case, the researcher desired to hear the opinion and the attitude of respondents on the interventionist policies of the western countries in Libya in 2011. As such, Chiromo (2006) defines qualitative research as a term which incorporates numerous approaches to research that are relatively dissimilar from one another and there are two things in common in all qualitative methods, thus firstly, they centre on things that occur in the natural setting phenomena or in the real world. Here, the invasion of Libya was based on the aspect of power and security which the US-led-NATO wanted to achieve in the region. Secondly, qualitative involves studying the phenomena in all their complexity. The complexity of the Libyan crisis is on the agenda of the invasion. Was it for responsibility to protect or national interest based? Accordingly, in qualitative research process, data is collected through numerous forms such as in-depth interviews, questionnaires and conceptual studies.

3.3 Population of the study

The target population for the study were the Libyan Refugees and Libyan asylum seekers in Zimbabwe, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), Western diplomatic staff members, Academics and international relations analysts from recognised institutions like Bindura University of Science Education, University of Zimbabwe and Midlands State University. Libyan refugees and Asylum seekers were some of the participants in the research because they are the citizens of Libya they know better about their country, politically, economically and socially. Also, the respondents were drawn from the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) because they were the ones who are responsible for international protection to refugees and to promote durable solutions to their problems. Accordingly, the academics and international relations analysts were part of the target population because they understand why states engage in wars and why collective security is applied by states in the international system as in the case of Libya, the aspect of collective

security is seen being applied. Also, international relations analyst and academics are knowledgeable about international relations theories such as realism and idealism.

3.3.1 The Sample and Sampling Procedure

Purposive sampling was used by the researcher because it enabled the research to get respondents who are knowledgeable about the area under study. The respondents were from UNHCR staff, academics, Libyan refugees and asylum seekers, and International relations analysts because they are knowledgeable about Libyan crisis of 2011. Again, they have various reasons as to why the Western countries intervened in Libya and at the same time, they have better understanding on the implications of the interventionist policies in Libya. Graziano and Raulin (2000) highlighted that, purposive sampling means “selecting participants for their ability to provide rich information.” The researcher was enabled to prudently select cases that can exemplify and clarify on the study. This technique was also selected because it seeks to find people who have special insights about the research due to their expertise. The researcher had targeted a sample of 28 for the respondents. The researcher managed to conduct in-depth interviews with 13 key informants which comprised of 4 Libyan refugees and asylum seekers, 3 academics, 1 diplomat, 2 UNHCR staff members and 3 international relations analysts.

3.3.2 Snowballing sampling

Since the study used purposive sampling, snowballing was also used. This helped in the gathering of information as references were made to people who have the knowledge on the topic under study. According Cohen et al, (2007:114), snowball sampling is where the researcher after identifying some respondents is also assisted by these respondents to get in touch with others who are suitable to be included by the researcher, and these, in turn, identify yet others. This type of sampling was possible because UNHCR staff members were the ones who referred the researcher to the Libyan refugees and asylum seekers who were victims of the Libyan crisis of 2011. Again, the UNHCR staff had information on why refugees and asylum seekers were coming from Libya. They also have statistics on the number of Libyan refugees and asylum seekers who have, as from 2011 to date, come in the country. They also have reasons as to why Libyans are running from their own country to other countries like Zimbabwe. Academics also referred the researcher to some academics who are well versed and well conversant in the Libyan crisis of 2011, the intervention of Western countries and NATO in Libya under the banner of R2P and the bureaucratic operations of the UNSC in maintaining peace and global security and other regional bodies such as African Union. This is because at

the institutions like Universities there are many departments, but other departments have no knowledge about the impact of interventionist policies of the Western countries in Libya.

3.4 Data Collection Methods

3.4.1 Documentary review

Documentary search was used in a bid to gather information or data on the topical issues on the Libyan crisis of 2011. Books, newspapers, articles, journals, official governmental documents and internet were all used in the research. The researcher did not rely on all literature which is available on Libya but had to rely on those documents which extensively looked at legitimacy of Western countries in Libya, the role of regional and international organisations in Libya. This helped in data analysis in the next chapter, which is chapter four. McGraig (2010) confirms that, that, a report on the findings gathered of the primary source becomes a secondary source and though it is not as authoritative as the primary source, it often offers a wide-range background and research findings depth through the information or data collected is improved.

3.4.2 Interviews

The researcher gathered data using interviews, interviews involved respondents who were knowledgeable about interventionist policies of the Western countries in Libya. Denscombe (2003) categorize interview into three which are in-depth, semi-structured and structured interviews. Within this study, online and structured interviews were done through asking questions which were structured. Again, in interviews, the researcher was able to make appointments with the targeted population and thus was given time for conducting interviews. For those who were with busy offices like the UNHCR staff members and the academics, the researcher made appointments to schedule with their free time to conduct interviews. The researcher used interviews to get detailed information about the Libyan crisis of 2011. The researcher through interviews got information about the implications of the interventionist policies, the role of United Nations and African Union in solving political instability in Libya. Most of the interviews were very open when interviews were conducted to ensure that respondents disclose information which is of importance to the topic under study. The researcher opted for the interviews which are flexible as they enabled the researcher to uncover some fundamental facts, views and opinions of the respondents.

According to Kothari (2004), the interview as a method of data collection includes presentation of oral-verbal stimuli and reply in terms of oral-verbal responses McGraig (2010) is of the view that interviews are more of personal form of research as compared to the questionnaires.

The research used in depth interviews to collect data as they enabled the researcher to probe and make a follow up on various questions and grey areas about the study thus enabling the researcher to clarify certain questions from the respondents. Key informant interviews with Libyan refugees and Asylum seekers, UNHCR staff and Academics were conducted to obtain suitable answers on the Libyan crisis in 2011. Boyce and Neale (2006), asserts that in-depth interviewing involves conducting of exhaustive individual interviews using a small number of respondents to explore their perspective.

3.4.3 Questionnaires

Questionnaires were used in the research because it enabled the researcher to gather information about the interest of Western countries in Libya, role of the UN and AU in political instability and implications of the interventionist policies in Libya. These questionnaires targeted specific individuals who were well conversant with the topic under study. Questionnaires were targeting at specific individuals who were well versed on the topic under study. The researcher was very much aware that some people like Libyan Refugees and Asylum seekers might not be comfortable to discuss their state's sensitive issues in interviews, questionnaires were thus provided to fill in the gap so that such people could have the opportunity to put down their views without fear of being recognised by others. Again, questionnaires were used because of their confidentiality. The advantage of using questionnaires was that, it was economical in terms of time because most of the respondents were at a central point and also cheap and easy to administer. These questionnaires covered targeted population (UNHCR staff, Libyan refugees and Asylum seekers and Academics) at the same time, unlike with the interviews, each respondent was supposed to be interviewed at a specific time alone.

3.5 Data validity and reliability

Validity involves quality control during production process of the knowledge which is contrary to give emphasis on the inspection of the end product (Saunders, 2003). It is the duty of the researcher to ensure that the research findings are supported by data, to ensure this, the researcher engages participants more than just once in interviews to ensure reliability through

getting the same results. Use of different data collection tools also enables reliability and validity through triangulation. In this case use of triangulation of documentary evidence and interviews endured testing of validity and reliability. This was done to pre-test the instruments to ensure reliability. Reliability refers to the degree to which methods of data collection produces findings which are consistent, similar conclusions and observations from other researchers (Saunders, 2003).

3.6 Data Presentation and Analysis

The researcher presented data using tables to analyze and discuss data or information acquired from the field. Tables were used to analyze data because some of the information was gathered through questionnaires, so it needs tables to provide statistics of the number of respondents. The research made use of content analysis to analyze and present information from secondary sources like books, internet journals, reports and other sources. Also, themes were used which could have emerged from chapter 2 as a result of research objectives and also respondents from the Libyan refugees and Asylum seekers, UNHCR staff members and Academics.

Chakraborty (2009) identifies thematic analysis as analysis which is found on emerging and recurring themes in the course of a study. Warwick (1983) reiterated that most themes are self-generating but demand further elucidation and analysis using prevailing secondary data and may be the result of emerging primary data. Therefore, to present and analyze data gathered and obtained the researcher used thematic analysis with the aim of organizing data according to common themes or concepts identified in the literature. More so, the study made use of newspapers, journals, and internet as well as government gazettes to analyze the impact of the interventionist policies of the west in Libya.

3.7 Ethical Consideration

In carrying out the research, ethical considerations were given attention to because the researcher could not carry a successful research without the help of other people which means that those people involved in the research should be protected using research ethics According to Bloor (2006), ethics refers to guiding principles to enhance the practice of professionalism, which serve to advise and steer researchers in conducting a research. In the research, the principle of voluntary participation was respected because it ensures that people were not coerced to participate during data gathering by the researcher. The need to have informed consent is also closely associated with voluntary participation. Basically, this means that potential participants of the research will be fully told about the processes and risks surrounding the research so as to decide on whether to participate or not (Dawson, 2007). Ethical

considerations entails that researchers should not put participants in harmful situations where as a result of them participating in the research (Trochim and Donnelly, 2006). Another ethical consideration which was respected is of confidentiality meaning that the researcher will not directly divulge any provided information from the participants to third parties without the permission of the participants. Bloor (2006) emphasizes on the principle of to enable participants to have confidence when talking and refusing the publication of any material that might cause harm to participants. Another ethical consideration which was respected by the researcher is anonymity. Bloor et al (2007) highlight that, anonymity is the standard which is strict meaning that the participant and even the researcher throughout the study to maintain confidentiality and privacy. Therefore, the researcher used pseudonyms to uphold the aspect of anonymity.

3.8 Chapter Summary

The chapter looked at tools of data collection which was meant to produce quality and reliable results. It also looked at the research design, research methods used by the researcher population of the study. The research was guided by various research ethics for it to materialise and succeed without causing any harm to the participants and the society.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

4.0 Introduction

In this chapter presentation of findings and analysis of the data collected from various documents and respondents was done. Purposive sampling was used to collect data from the target population. The findings of the study were drawn from interviews, questionnaires and desk reviews. These were used as the data collection instruments in this study. The Chapter looks at the findings on the role of regional and international organisations like AU, UNSC and NATO. In this Chapter due to ethical considerations, pseudo names were used to present information from various respondents.

4.1 Demographic information of participants

Information in relation to the Libyan crisis was gathered from interviews, documentary reviews and questionnaires that were conducted by the researcher from Libyan Refugees and Asylum seekers in Refugees camps in Zimbabwe, Western diplomatic staff members, Academics, UNHCR staff members and International relation analysts. Some dignitaries like Western Diplomatic staff members were interviewed online due to the nature of their jobs and busy schedules. The following tables are going to illustrate interviews and questionnaires of target population responses, thus demographic information of participants.

Table 1: interview response

Target group	Target responses	Actual responses	Response %
Libyan Refugees and Asylum seeker	10	4	40%
Academics	7	3	43%
Diplomats	2	1	50%
UNHCR staff	5	2	40%
International relations analysts	6	3	50%

Table 1 above shows interviews conducted and the total number of respondents regarding the impact of the interventionist policies of the Western countries in the Libyan crisis of 2011.

Response to questionnaires

Table 2

Target population	Number of questionnaires distributed	Questionnaire returned	Response rate%
Libyan Refugees & Asylum seekers	11	5	45%
UNHCR staff members	5	4	80%
International relations analysts	4	3	75%
Academic	6	5	83%
Diplomats	2	1	50%

Table 2 above shows responses to questionnaires that were distributed and the total number of respondents regarding the Libyan crisis of 2011 vis-à-vis the interventionist policies of the Western countries.

4.2 Emerging themes

4.2.1 The legitimacy of military intervention in Libya in 2011

The researcher gathered that for military intervention to be considered as legitimate various aspects must be taken into consideration. This can be explained using the Just war theory and R2P doctrine. As reviewed in Chapter Two, from the works of Orend (2012) a military intervention by a country or countries should abide to the criteria for a just war. Accordingly, he looked at the protection of innocent by force from certain harm, the war must be openly declared, it must begin with the right intention and lastly, it must be the last resort. Respondent who is an International relations analyst had this to say:

The R2P was not properly applied because the international community restricted the use of diplomacy and negotiation in the Libyan crisis of 2011. This is totally against the dictates of the R2P doctrine as it suggests that firstly the international community

need to intervene diplomatically and military intervention is regarded as a last resort. However, this was contrary in the Libyan crisis of 2011 where military intervention was not a last resort.

The UN backed NATO interference in the Libyan crisis of 2011 demonstrated and affirmed powerful states' hegemony to invade weaker states at will. The distortion of the R2P doctrine in the Libyan crisis of 2011 portrayed it as irrelevant or unnecessary in the international system because the NATO military intervention becomes questionable. Evans (2012) reiterated the same sentiments of Makado an international relations analyst in chapter 2 where he opines that R2P is about an entire range of volatile reactions, emanating from tactful persuasion to measures which are not military such as sanctions and the processes of the International Criminal Court (ICC).

Another respondent who is also an international relations analyst pointed out that,

The R2P is a machinery of the Western-dominated 'international security agenda', which in times of serious threat, collapses the political agency of its recipients into the universal moral category of human rights. This can destroy the potential of an independent political voice of citizens and with it, the political potential of emancipatory change. R2P is failing to bring states experiencing intra-state conflicts into a partnership of human rights protection as in the case of Somalia. What the supporters of the R2P are doing is to create anarchy than finding working solutions to enhance sanity in countries experiencing political disorder and conflicts.

In addition, an academic said that,

The intervention in Libya was legitimate. Gaddafi had already started killing innocent people in his country. I agree that it is the responsibility of the Government to use force on its people, but my worry is on the killings. Is that force or murder? Looking at where the situation was, it was very irrelevant to use procedures like diplomacy and negotiations. To me what Gaddafi was doing showed that he had failed to protect people from genocide and crime against humanity.

The researcher interviewed a diplomatic staff member online from British embassy on the legitimacy of military intervention in Libya. According to Mr. Rich, a diplomatic staff member,

The intervention in the Libyan crisis of 2011 by NATO was justified because Gaddafi was practicing genocide to his own people and to that effect how can President of a country kill his own people? We should take into consideration what Libya would have looked like if NATO had not intervened. Hence, the country is better off today than it would have been if the US-led NATO and other Western powers permitted a dictator Gadhafi to continue his rampage in Libya. The intentions of Gaddafi were to kill all the rebels without recognizing their rights and at one point Gadhafi called protestors cockroaches before he vowed to cleanse the country. The aim of the intervention was to safeguard the civilians and their place of inhabitant or densely inhabited areas vulnerable to the threat of being attacked by Gadhafi.

The views of a diplomatic staff member Mr. Rich are in concurrence with those of Khan (2011) who opines that, the USA was reluctant to intervene in Libya, during the time Benghazi was on the brink of falling in the hands of Gaddafi. It was only after the United Nations and the Arab League had endorsed the intervention that USA finally intervened. The major cause for concern for the US-led military intervention was to protect the civilians from the ruthless killing and crackdown by Gadhafi following massive protests against the same. Other scholars like Mbanje and Mhuku (2012) contradict with the above sentiments as they are in concurrence with an Academic who is Mr. Mangena. Mbanje and Mhuku (2012) pointed out that, Gaddafi declared to crush the protestors. This actually shows that Gaddafi was practicing genocide against his own people because it did not end as just promises to crush the protestors. He later started attacking the protestors. The legitimacy of the intervention can be also seen through the lenses of the just war theory. According to the theory they should be a just cause and the jus cause here was to protect innocent people from the killings of Gaddafi. This is supported by Bajoria (2011) who highlights that, that the practice of R2P in Libya was legal, moral, and political as it was based on protecting the people. In line with UN (2011), Ban Kim Moon believed in the use of force as an ultimate choice in an effort to protect Libyan civilians as a sign of humanitarian responsibility.

Western countries' silence regards to intervening in the Syrian crisis shows that the R2P doctrine is so biased and is only applied when Western states see that they are going to benefit from the intervention. In the Libyan case, the aspect of proportionality was not applied which is seen through no-fly-zone which was approved by the UNSC. Accordingly, the just war theory suggests for the aspect of proportionality, right intention and just cause. According to the UN (2011), the just cause was there in the Libyan crisis and representing the internationalized and interventionist logic of R2P, Resolution 1973 further authorizes UN

member states to take all necessary measures to protect civilians in Libya. However, the aspect of proportionality was very problematic because if they wanted to be very proportional in the war, NATO should not have introduced the no-flying-zone. More so, on the issue of right intention which is suggested by the Just war theory it did not apply. The intention was to emancipate the Libyan from the political violence from Gaddafi, however, it was not done as per the R2P dictates. Hence, it can be argued that it seems as if the R2P doctrine is contrary to the emancipation of its beneficiaries from destructive forms of power. This is so owing to the notion that such recipients are merely passive beneficiaries of an exogenous, state-based security than bearers of rights. The recipients are constrained from becoming active members in their own emancipation.

The implication is that; the UN backed NATO military intervention in the Libyan crises of 2011 should have envisaged an honestly deep-seated emancipatory plan to the victims of political violence. This could have been done outside the rationality of preventative risk management of globalization's messy boundaries. This approach would have brought an appropriate legitimacy to the NATO intervention in bringing about security, peace, order and emancipation to the Libyans. Such an approach to building peace would have enabled a reasonably self-sufficient agency essential for espousing democracy, rights, needs, justice, cultural plurality and identity.

It can also be suggested that, the peace imagined by the Western countries under the R2P can be viewed as a reductionist and totalizing practice of liberating individuals from menacing state practices like those of Gaddafi through neo-liberal capacity-building. However, this reductionism of peace rejects those marginalized from possibly emancipatory public space where they can demand social justice to the extent that the Libyan nationals are vulnerable.

The questionnaires were administered to International relations analysts and Academics. The question read as follows: Do you agree that the R2P doctrine was necessary in Libya?

Table 3: Responses on the relevance of R2P doctrine in the Libyan crisis.

Respondents	Agree	Strongly agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Academics	-	2	1	2
International relations analysts	1	1	-	1
Percentage %	12 %	38%	13 %	37%

The above table shows the number and percentages of respondents for the questionnaire from their judgements and analyses, whereby 37% of the respondents strongly disagreed and 13% disagreed on the relevance of the R2P in the Libyan crisis. Those who disagreed and strongly disagreed on the R2P in Libya analysed the just war theory vis-à-vis R2P doctrine. In the Libyan crisis, the aspect of proportionality and right intention remained problematic. The US led NATO was too big to fight against the Libyan military. The R2P in Libya was being questioned by the respondents on the basis that how can military intervention by a group of states become a truly emancipatory act for the purposes of protecting civilians in another nation, from contingent practices and structures of political violence? In addition, the use of force by NATO was not imperative in Libya in its mission to protect civilians from Gadhafi's ruthless killing, instead civil war continued

However, 12% agreed and 38% strongly agreed on the relevance of the R2P in the Libyan crisis in 2011 arguing from the responsibility to protect doctrine. According to the doctrine, when a government is unable to safeguard the own people from heinous killings, it is then the

responsibility of the international community to chip in based on the humanitarian agenda. Accordingly, in the Libyan crisis, Gaddafi perpetrated human rights abuses which means that the international community had the role to play as a way of trying to bring justice, peace and unity in the country.

4.2 National interests

The issue of national interest by Western countries in the Libyan crisis remains a very controversial issue in the international fora. Various arguments have been forwarded as to go for or against the sentiments. According to Ahmed, a Libyan Refugee who was interviewed, *what we know is that Americans and other Western countries want resources like oil in our country. They try to find all sorts of arguments to support their moves. We used to enjoy in Libya during the time of Gaddafi. All graduates would get salary even when they were not employed. I am one of the beneficiaries from Gaddafi' regime in that regard. From my own look, NATO was just a wolf in sheep skin to us. Libya is now a failed state due to the military interventions which took place a couple of years back.*

In light of the above sentiments from Ahmed a Libyan refugee, he believed that Western countries thus, US, France and Britain were in need of oil which is abundant in Libya using different cunning methods to justify their means. The scramble to control Libyan resources was now on by these Western countries. In addition, power vacuum emanated in Libya which resulted into anarchy and Libya became ungovernable, hence citizens could not enjoy the benefits they used to get during Gadhafi's tenure in office. Guardian (2011), opines that the behavior of the Western countries was heavily condemned by a lot of African leaders who claimed that the former wants to recolonize African continent because the AU was somewhat marginalized by the West in the 2011 Libyan crisis.

The researcher interviewed another academic who shared his mind with the researcher. However, an Academic who was interviewed by the researcher noted that, *the US and its allies are sharpening their neo-colonial tools in different ways especially on the pretext of the "humanitarian intervention."* This was witnessed in the 2011 Libyan crisis where they took advantage of the suffering of the Libyan masses as an excuse to intervene under the banner of the R2P. Finally, UK, France and U.S were at the forefront demanding that Gadhafi must go as they condemned him as a dictator in a bid to achieve their desired hidden agenda of regime change in Libya. The regime change was facilitated by the intelligence operatives such as the

British Special Air Services (SAS) and MI5 agents who were later on captured by the rebels in Benghazi. In addition, the Daily Mail once revealed that, the presence on the ground of SAS and MI6 was sanctioned by ministers so that the former could “will link up with Special Forces already in Libya to provide protection apart from giving informal military advice to the Libyan opposition.”

Echoing the same sentiments as the above respondent, Chipaike (2012) as reviewed in Chapter two reasons that, US and its allies gained access to oil in Libya and spill over benefits by maintaining their presence in that country through overt and covert means and the move was regarded as the beginning of the new scramble for the resources in Africa. The invasion in Libya was not about R2P as alleged by many thinkers, but it was all about power and getting cheap resources in the country. The Global War on terror of 2001 in Afghanistan, US fully knowing that Osama Bin Laden was not from Afghanistan but from Saudi Arabia attacked the country because it had oil. To this end, the research finding has revealed that, the US backed NATO military intervention was meant to pursue the national interests of US, France and Britain using covert and overt means in Libya.

What is missing from the respondent is the prevailing perception on the new humanitarianism in which security, conflict and development are conceptualized by the International bodies as part of neo-liberal peacebuilding framework. Therefore, in the case of the conceptualization of violence it demands a joint humanitarian exercise of enforcement of peace, through incorporating international criminal prosecution, military intervention and intrusive means of capacity building in Libya. More so, although the concept of R2P was regarded as the central aspect in Libya, the UN backed NATO military intervention manipulated the whole essence of the R2P to make their ends meet and pursuing their national interests at the expense of the marginalized civilian population. The declared humanitarian emergence for peace enforcement was rendered useless following that conflict related humanitarian misfortunes such as social disturbances, state failure, militias, refugee flight and impeding danger of diseases and starvation to the civilian population ensued.

The table below shows the respondents who agreed or disagreed on the view that national interest led to the intervention of Libya by the Western countries. The question which was asked reads as follows: Do you agree that national interest led to the invasion of Libya by the Western countries?

Table 4: Responses on national interests and the invasion of Libya by the Western countries

Respondents	Agree	Disagree
International relations analysts	3	1
Academics	3	1
Refugee and Asylum seekers	2	-
Percentage %	80 %	20 %

The above table shows the numbers and percentages of the respondents who were asked on whether the invasion by the Western countries was based on their national interests or not. 80% of the respondents agreed that invasion on Libya was based on national interests given that the former colonial power France orchestrated the move and eventually led by the US backed NATO military intervention. The respondents pointed out that, the US backed NATO military intervention revealed a scramble between the old imperialist supremacies and the ascendant powers China and Russia to have control over Libya's huge oil reserves and generally access to the raw materials and markets in the African continent. In addition, the move by China and Russia to veto against the suppression of the revolution in Libya or North Africa deemed to threaten the interests of the imperialists in the region. These opinions are in line with Stuenkel (2015) who postulated that Britain, France and US who led the interventionist coalition involved in a direct diplomatic conflict with China and Russia because the latter felt that the former had violated the rationale of Resolution 1973 in a bid to advance their subtle machinations in Libya. It was gathered that the intervention by NATO was meant to cause chaos in Libya in order for the super powers to loot the black gold just like what US did in the 2003 invasion of Iraq whereby the latter was accused of possessing weapons of mass destruction. However, 20% of the respondents disagreed that the invasion was national interest related suggesting that it was the ultimate responsibility of the international community to defend the international human rights of the oppressed Libyan population due to the ruthless

suppression by Gadhafi in 2011. Therefore, the R2P as re-legitimized military intervention as an act of humanitarianism and the privilege of reformist politics.

4.3 Efforts by regional and international bodies in solving political instability in Libya.

4.3.1 NATO

NATO as a regional organization was involved in the 2011 Libyan crisis to solve the political instability which was in the country. However, the respondents have various suggestions on the presence of NATO. A Libyan Refugee responded in an interview that:

NATO did nothing to improve the political situation in the country. Instead of calming the political situation which was in the country, it worsened it. Many people lost their lives in the Libyan crisis of 2011, those who survived like us left Libya seeking for safe havens in other countries, that's why you are seeing us here because we are fearing for our security in Libya. Some people could not be accounted for due to the Libyan crisis of 2011 which was precipitated into a civil war by NATO military intervention.

Moussa a Libyan asylum seeker who was interviewed by the researcher said that, *the UN backed NATO military intervention used cruise missiles and attack jets to attack and this led many people to leave the country. Even the civilians like us we were targeted during the War. Had it not been the invasion by NATO I was not going to be an asylum seeker. Yes, Gaddafi was a dictator, but now looking the current situation I believe he was a better devil. In my life time I never dreamt being a home seeker and wish to go back to Libya when sanity is restored.*

In support with the above sentiments, Jacobson (2012) stresses that the NATO countries were not united when they entered Libya. This is a great challenge as instead of bringing political stability and mutual understanding between the conflicting parties, NATO neither sought peace nor demonstrated a collective political will to attain peace through dialogue in Libya. Arguably, Jentleson (2001) in Chapter 2 brings in the idea that peace is obtainable without the use of military hardware. This is very different with what happened in Libya. The use of cruise missiles and attack jets in Libya created chaos and anarchy and the country was devastated to the extent that it will take ages to recover. Tulsa (2011), noted that, the mission of NATO was not meant to protect the population or uphold human rights but the regime change agenda through replacing Gadhafi with NTC which they felt could conform to their demands. To this end, one can argue that the R2P should not be identical with the regime change agenda like

what happened in Libya where Gadhafi was dethroned from power, hence creating power vacuum.

4.3.2 African Union

The AU is an African body which was transformed from OAU in early 2000. African Union was founded on the basis that include promotion of unity and solidarity, defending of state sovereignty, eradication of all forms colonialism to enhance territorial integrity, political and diplomatic cooperation. An Academic was interviewed who brought into light that,

AU proved to be a toothless bull dog in solving the problems in the continent. AU has the African Peace and Security Architecture which has five pillars which are: Peace and Security Council, Continental Early Warning System, Panel of the wise, African Standby Force and African Peace Fund. The Peace and Security Council (PSC) is the African Union's (AU's) standing decision-making body responsible for the maintenance of continental peace and security. Article 3 of the PSC protocol outlines six objectives for the PSC. These are: to promote peace, security and stability in Africa; anticipate and prevent conflicts and others. However instead of intervening in the Libyan crisis, AU was like an alien in Libya. We later see even some African members authorizing the no flying zone. It's so pathetic to see such a move.

The AU showed its failure to declare its position in finding solutions in the Libyan crisis due to lack of unity in Africa. Therefore, this gave UN and US backed NATO an upper hand to take control in solving the political crisis in Libya because the AU member states were divided to the extent that they could not make a concrete or bold decision on how best they could intervene in Libya. To this end, disunity undermined the strength of AU to effectively and efficiently enforce the R2P in Libya to protect the civilian population. Benette (2011), pointed out that if the AU had been truly united and had abided by the principles of the AU constitutive act, it would have protected Libyans from the UN-backed NATO bombing campaign. Therefore, AU was supposed to unite in a bid to jealously safeguard the sovereignty and interests of Africa as a whole.

The researcher went on to interview another respondent who is an international relations analyst alluded that,

If AU was of people with the same thinking, that military intervention in Libya would not have happened looking at the roles of the organization. That was an African problem which needed African solutions. It's so disheartening to see some African countries going extra mile of authorizing the no-fly-zone in their

African counterpart with likes of South Africa. Remember, having NATO in the land of Africa it is an indirect way of colonization, which is neo-colonization at its highest degree.

Scholars like Chipaike (2012) supports the above sentiments as he hints that, the Libya crisis has left a lot of questions such as AU's ability to effect conflict resolution on the continent without the help of the outside world. It can be argued that the notion that three members of the African Union in the UNSC voted for a no fly zone under resolution 1973, and consequently bombardment of Libya by NATO shows that the aspect of collective security is lacking in the AU to deal with the quarrels of the magnitude.

What is missing from the scholar and the respondents is the issue of financing AU as an organization. On this note, the financing of the AU-led peace support operations is envisaged to be done by the AU Peace Fund and budget contributions are done through AU's regular budget and contributions from voluntary African and international donor community and well-wishers. The AU coffers are dry and the contributions from member states are insignificant, hence, the donor community chip in to finance towards AU budget. however, most funding from the intercontinental donors funding towards the AUPF operations comes with strings attached to such funds hence, at the end AU fails to come up with effective home grown solutions thus effective 'African solution to African problems'.

In addition, dependency negatively affects the organization (AU) due to the fact that the organization dependent on donor funding a clear indication that the organization consists of economically challenged and financially incapacitated countries. This means that for it to survive it has to dance in accordance to the tune of the donor, thus he pays the piper calls the tune. In light of the foregoing, the "Messiah" in the political situation in Libya was NATO because the organization is well financed meaning to say it is well equipped. It can be suggested that, the dependency on economy by the continent of Africa remains to be a prosperous business to the Western countries and their African ruling puppets because, there is need for extensive outside world help for any endeavor to change the economy from colonial exploitation to a more independent and lucrative. One would also argue that Africa as a continent is rich in terms of natural resources but the poorest at the same time to the extent of failing to finance the operations of AU.

4.3.3 United Nations

The United Nations as a whole was established to address the weaknesses and failures of the League of Nations in maintaining world peace and security the world over. A respondent who is a staff member at UNHCR staff said that;

When the situation was unbearable in Libya the United Nations authorized the No fly zone as a way of protecting the civilians from massive killings by Gaddafi. This was a way of counterattacking all the moves of Gaddafi which were inhumane. In fact, that was a genocide on its own. How can the President of a country do such killings to his own people? There is a dichotomy between leading and ruling. Gadhafi was no-longer leading but ruling with iron fist.

The execution of the Resolution 1973 was the first move of western countries' intervention in the 2011 Libya crisis following the approval by the UN Security Council to resort to use force for the sake of human protection from Gadhafi's vicious killings. According to the UN (2011), with regards to the threat of attack in Libyan Arab Jamahiriya from Gadhafi, the UN Resolution 1973 approves member states to resort to all necessary measures in order to protect civilians and those civilian populated

A respondent who is an International relations analyst highlighted that:

UN is nothing when it comes to the politics of the international domain. It is just used by big powers to advance their selfish interests in small countries. So many questions have been asked on who finance and why contributing so much? Why America financing so much? The fact that it is formed by states shows that it has no power over states. In the context of Libya, this sounds different.

The researcher noted that United Nations Security Council is financed by voluntary contributors from its member states and the US being the biggest contributor of the total budget in United Nations. It is interesting to note that decisions are mostly influenced by the amount that a country contributes. This means in the case of Libya, America had a lot of say because of its financial muscle towards the organisation apart from its political muscle. Hence, from the above response from Mr. Maposa the UNHCR staff member, it shows that the assumption that Western countries intervened in the Libyan crisis to pursue their national interests is subject to debate because NATO was meant to protect civilians who were being killed by Gadhafi but looking at what later happened as a result of NATO it becomes questionable that

NATO as a regional organisation wanted to protect civilians. The countries which form the NATO organisation are these very same Western countries who were involved the intervention.

4.4 The implications of the Western countries' intervention in Libya.

The involvement of the Western countries in Libya was accompanied by so many challenges in the country. These challenges impacted on the country and the general populace in varying and various ways. Moreover, a respondent who is an international relations analyst pointed out that;

Following the killing of Gadhafi after the NATO led intervention in Libya, there were divisions within the North African nation resulting into two competing governments, whereby one was led by Khalifa Haftar and the other one which is recognized internationally under the government of Fayeze al-Sarraj and the latter is a Tripoli based unity government of National Accord. Therefore, the Western involvement was a move to remove the Gadhafi led regime replacing it with an effective transnational governance regime controlled by liberal states.

Chivvis and Martini (2014), outlined that Gaddafi was ousted from power by the NTC, a group that consisted of different militias that opposed the Gaddafi regime, recognized by 114 United Nations General Assembly members on 16 September 2011 as the merely legitimate representative of Libyan people. In light of the above, Chivvis and Martini (2014) reiterated that, Libya became ungovernable due to the increased power held by different armed groups leading to a state of anarchy, insecurity and uncertainty that has been intensified by the proliferation of illicit arms trade and the existence of extremist jihadist movements. This implies that, divisions amongst the Libyans after the conflict has clearly weakened state security status due to power vacuum and human insecurity was an imminent result and impending danger of the intervention in Libya by the Western countries.

According to Mr. Tom, a UNCHR staff member,

From the statistics we gathered as from Libyan crisis of 2011 to date the number of refugees and Asylum seekers has increased from 0.002 to 0.007 %. This shows the effects of the Libyan crisis. The Libyan crisis did not affect Libya only, but even beyond its borders thus the neighboring countries like Somalia, Kenya, Zimbabwe and other countries. Due to this crisis, the borders of Libya are now so porous to such an extent that weapon movements or arms trafficking have become so widespread. The receiving countries are now forced to divert their budget and meagre resources to cater for these

home seekers. In addition, terrorism activities have also increased due to free passages and porous borders in Libya, hence terrorist groups such as Al-Shabaab and Boko Haram are now taking this as an opportunity to maximize their deadly attacks.

It is of paramount importance to note that the presence of the US backed NATO military intervention during the 2011 Libyan conflict emphasized the great danger posed to human existence in that state which resulted into an influx of traumatized and impoverished refugees from Libya. Accordingly, Danjibo (2013) draws attention to the conflict in Mali which he reasons that it was triggered by the Libyan conflict after the fall of Gaddafi. Same pointed out that, Malian Tuaregs who had served in the Libyan army returned back to northern Mali with large quantities of arms and fueled the smuggling of weapons from the fallen Muammar Gaddafi regime. Furthermore, Chipaika (2012) argues that the fall of Gaddafi left a power vacuum that has promoted the proliferation of extremist groups and the movements have been influenced by the involvement of the West in North Africa and extremism in the region has been motivated by the desire to extend the Islamic State within Africa, eliminating Western influence.

One can argue that, the military intervention in Libya backed by USA was anti-democratic due to the violence which ensued. The intervention failed to bring about a solution to the political impasse or democratic overhaul that advanced the demands that came at the behest of the rebellion in Libya when it commenced. Critical ethos such as an end to repression and upholding of democratic space which could help to protect economic and political freedoms and rights were missed. The continuation of violence due to the militarization of political struggle in Libya leads one to regard war as source of the outbreak of resentments, conflicts and skirmishes within society. Hence, the R2P stands out to be a tool by Western states to interfere with sovereign states like in Libya in which civil institutions were infiltrated and the central government lost control.

4.5 Conclusion

In this chapter a presentation, analysis and discussion of the research findings was articulated. Critical findings gathered from the research are on the legitimacy of the military in Libya. The theory of Just War was used in a bid to explain on the legitimacy of the Western military in Libya. Again, the R2P, regional and international bodies like AU, NATO and UN were discussed as a way of justifying the Western army in Libya. The proceeding Chapter is going to conclude and recommend, basing on the findings of the research.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter summarized the research embarked on by the researcher as well as drawing conclusions from various findings and make recommendations essential to the operations of regional and international bodies like Africa Union, NATO, and UN. These recommendations are also important in the field of international relations.

5.2 Summary of the Research

The study sought to assess the interventionist policies of the Western countries in the Libyan crisis of 2011. The research looked at the legitimacy of the military intervention in Libya which was centered on the Just war theory and R2P in the 2011 Libyan crisis. In addition, the research analysed the intention of NATO's military intervention whether it was meant to protect the civilians or it was hinged on hidden motives that would serve national interests of the Western countries. Of great importance were the implications of the Western countries in Libya and an analysis of the effectiveness of regional and international bodies in solving political instability in Libya to scrutinize their actions towards resolving the Libyan crisis. Worth noting is that, the scrutiny also focused on why some AU members recommended the UNSC resolution 1973 that gave NATO a leeway to intervene the Libyan crisis of 2011 resulting to the elimination Gaddafi from power.

The research consists of five chapters whereby chapter one outlined the background to the study, , statement of the problem, purpose of the study, research questions and significance of the study, assumptions of the study, limitations and delimitations of the study. The research also included definition of key terms such as Responsibility to protect, humanitarian intervention, foreign policy and national interest. Literature review is on chapter two where literature related to the research and various contemporary authors such as Guardian (2011); Mbanje and Mahuku (2012); Chikaipe (2012) and Philosophers such as St Augustine, St Thomas Aquinas, and Immanuel Kant was referred to. Furthermore, chapter three concentrated on the research methodology in which a case study of the Libyan Crisis of 2011 was used. The chapter also outlined the research design and the research instruments used during the study such as questionnaires, interviews and documentary review. The research had a targeted population thus Libyan refugees and asylum seekers, UNHCR and academics from recognized

universities such as University of Zimbabwe and Midlands State University. Sample and sampling procedures enabled the researcher to choose the rightful respondents through the use of purposive and snowballing sampling. Data collection, procedures and data analysis was also key to this research hence it was discussed in this chapter as well. Chapter four discussed in detail the findings on the impact of the interventionist policies of the Western countries in the Libyan crisis of 2011 and various research findings were obtained which were then interpreted.

5.3 Conclusions

Several conclusions were drawn from the Libyan crisis of 2011. The study sought to find out the perceptions and people's understanding on the implications of the interventionist policies of the Western countries in North African countries particularly in Libya. Worth noting is that, the R2P doctrine was used by Western countries to achieve their hidden agenda in Libya hence the country is now ungovernable politically, socially and economically as it is evidenced by the current status quo prevailing in the country. In addition, NATO's military intervention resulted into the loss of lives and the current anarchy in Libya. Research findings established that, the NATO military intervention was simply a move used by the Western countries to serve their selfish national and strategic interests on the pretext of R2P which were achieved by eliminating Gadhafi. In addition, the AU is financially incapacitated to react to African problems therefore end up relying on the Western countries to tackle African problems. On this note, some African countries endorsed the no fly zone resolution 1973 a clear indication that African countries are not united. To this end, the research concluded that NATO's military intervention has further compromised and weakened North African security not in Libya only but also its neighbouring countries which are now breeding grounds for terrorism, lawlessness and influx of refugees. Consequently, NATO's intervention in Libya in pursuit of UN Resolution 1973 actually raised eyebrows over the legality, proportionality and efficacies of NATO military action.

The Libyan crisis has indicated that international responses to protection crises in Africa are most effective when there is a solid corporation between the UN and relevant regional organizations such as the AU. The AU roadmap for a negotiated changeover to a post-Gaddafi era in Libya was not guaranteed to succeed due political polarization, instead Libya became ungovernable and anarchy took the center stage. The in-house political undercurrents in Libya made it a difficult plan to use diplomacy and negotiation to end civil wars, civil unrests and political power matrix debacle. The AU became a moribund institution as it failed to prove to

the Libyans, Africans and its credibility to peace building in case of the 2011 Libyan crisis. African countries did not present a joint position in terms of providing the financial, military or diplomatic resources required for the AU initiative to succeed. Therefore, this weakness led to anarchy in Libya and had a domino effect to other neighbouring countries such as Syria, Nigeria, Mali, Egypt and Somalia hence threatening peace and security in Africa.

The research findings revealed that, national interests took the center stage for the intervention made by the Western countries in the Libyan crisis of 2011, which was seen as a scramble amongst US, France and Britain to control natural resources in Libya particularly oil. Furthermore, the intervention in Libya by NATO had a hidden regime change agenda which was also the intention of the Western countries as they perceived Gadhafi as a threat both in Libya and in Africa at large. The abuse of the mandate to effectively launch humanitarian protection in Libya made developing countries to be doubtful pertaining the motivations of intervening states like America and Britain in future. Moreover, the aspect or concept of R2P was distorted basing on the Libyan's experience hence might be contested in future humanitarian crises. Kuperman (2013) pointed out that, the fact that NATO prolonged the war it costed more lives as compared to those saved because the intervention only prolonged and exacerbated the Libyan crisis.

Accordingly, the military intervention did not take into consideration the principles of the Just War Theory, hence the military intervention could not have been considered as a last resort to the Libyan crisis of 2011, but to use other means like mediation. Thousands of civilians in Libya were left dead and also many casualties during the intervention. NATO brutally killed Gadhafi and evacuated the North African country which was in a state of anarchy, lawless and ungovernable due to power wrangles and the country's infrastructure was destroyed. Due to the unbearable challenges such as inability to access basic needs they used to enjoy under the leadership of Gadhafi, the country registered an influx of refugees and Asylum seekers.

It can also be concluded that the military intervention by NATO in Libya was a miscalculated move looking at the aftermath of the Libyan crisis because since Qaddafi was dethroned from power, there was no central government established which led to political leadership crisis and anarchy in the country. The NTC was formed in 2011 to represent the anti-Qaddafi rebels internationally but could not politically unify the country. There was need for peaceful transition of power in Libya to be facilitated by regional and international bodies because Libya's prolonged civil war had damaged the longstanding structures of Qaddafi's regime.

5.4 Recommendations

The researcher made the following recommendations basing on the conclusions drawn from the research findings:

- There is need for the AU to be financially capacitated, well-resourced and have political will in order to intervene in its member states and solve African problems effectively. The AU is mandated to legally intervene in the territory of member states by Article 4(h) and this can only be successfully executed with enough resources and having political will. Therefore, the combination of political will and sufficient resources finally determine whether or not states should intervene to quell the crisis or problem.
- The aspect of responsibility should be considered while protecting because the loss of life instigated by NATO intervention in Libyan crisis of 2011 has been heavily disapproved. More so, it is argued that the using airpower may not be a suitable move for the mission that is meant to protect civilians at danger. The R2P should also be used by the international community to protect civilians rather than as a form of imperialism in Africa or developing countries. The international community should firstly intervene diplomatically and military intervention should be the last resort so that legitimacy would not be questionable.
- Regional bodies or organizations should execute their gate-keeping role in implementing the resolutions of the UNSC. Apparently, states gradually turn to these regional organizations or blocs as providers of security, hence the regional blocs should in turn be in a position to do so and gradually outline the range of policy options that are existing to their member states. The regional organisations should not be toothless bulldogs like what AU did during the Libyan crisis of 2011. In this regard, regional security organizations are more important and work in tandem with the UN global peace and security architecture.
- There is need for collective security within the African countries in solving African problems and coming up with solutions. African unity should be fostered among African states and offer serious attention to African crises. Without collective security, the AU finds it difficult to intervene because its member states will be lacking altruism.

Collective security can also configure Africa into a real development oriented continent.

5.5 Areas for further study

The following are key areas of potential study after this study;

- The effects of the NATO military intervention in the 2011 Libyan crisis in North African countries.
- Reasons why Western countries are interested in African countries and their former colonies.
- The post Gadhafi era and the global peace and security.
- National interests vis-à-vis Foreign policies of Western countries on the African continent.

References

Books

- Abdallah, B. (2012). *Interregional challenges of Islamic extremist movements in North Africa*. South Africa: Institute for Security Studies
- Aradau, C. (2008). *Security, Technology of risk and the political introduction*. UK: Open University.
- Baldwin, D.A. (2000). *Success and Failure in Foreign Policy*. New York: Columbia University.
- Bloor, M., and Wood, F. (2006). *Keywords in Qualitative Methods: A Vocabulary of research Concepts*. London: Sage Publications.
- Boyce, C., and Neale, p. (2006). *Conducting In-Depth Interview Guide for Evaluation Input*. Watertown: Pathfinder International.
- Branch, T.A. (2011). *Beyond ethnic politics in Africa*. US, Cambridge University Press.
- Bryman, A., and Bell, E. (2007). *Business Research Methods, second edition*. New York, United States of America, Oxford University Press Inc.
- Chipaike, R. (2012). *The Libya crisis. The militarisation of new scramble and more*. Zimbabwe: Bindura University.
- Chiromo, A.S. (2006). *Research Methods and Statistics in Education: A Students' Guide*. Mbabane: Amadi Press.
- Chivvis, S.C. and Martini, J. (2014). *Libya after Gaddafi: Lessons and implication for the future*. Washington DC: Rand Corporation
- Codesman, A.H. (2011). *The Libyan Uprising an uncertain trajectory*. Washington D.C: Centre for Strategic and Study.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., and Morrison, K. (2007). *Research Methods in education, 6th ed*. London and New York: NY Routledge Falmer.
- Crocker, C., Pamela, R., and Hampson, F. (2007). *Leashing the Dogs of War: Conflict Management in a Divided World*. Washington: US Institute of Peace Press.

- Dawson, C. (2007). *A Practical Guide to Research Methods. A User Friendly Manual for Mastering Research Techniques and Projects*. London: UK
- Descombe, M. (2003). *The Good Research Guide: For Small-scale Social Research Projects. (2nd edition)*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Dimtra, H. (2013). *Educational Research and inquiry: Qualitative and quantitative Approach*. London and New York, Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Duffield, M. (2012). *Human security: linking development and security in an Age of terror*. UK, Lancaster University.
- Dunne, T., Kurki, M., and Smith, S. (2013). *International relations theories: Discipline and diversity (3rd edition)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Finnemore, M. (1998). *International norm dynamics and political change*. United States, MIT Press.
- Gierycz, D. (2010). *'From Humanitarian Intervention to responsibility to protect'*. Australia: University of Vienna.
- Goldenstein, J.S., Pevehouse, and J.C.W. (2006). *International relations, 7th edition*. America: University of Massachusetts.
- Graziano, A.M., and Rauline, M.L. (2000). *Research Methods: A Process of Inquiry, (8th edition)*. New York: State University of New York.
- Hill, C. (2003). *The Changing Politics of Foreign Policy*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Jabri, V. (2011). *War and the Transformation of Global politics*. New York, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Jentleson, B. (2004). *Facing Ethnic Conflicts: Toward a New Realism*: Lanham: Roman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Jones, R.G. (1998) 'Peace, Violence and War'. In: B. Hoose (ED), *Christian Ethics: an Introduction*. pp. 102-107. London: Cassell
- Kothari C.R. (2004) *Research Methodology: Method and Techniques; Second Revised Edition*. Bangalore: Published by New Age International (P) Ltd.

- Kuperman, A.J. (2013). *A Model Humanitarian Intervention? Reassessing NATO'S Libya Campaign*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kvale, S. (1996). *An Introduction to Qualitative Research Interviewing*. London:, Ca Sage Publications.
- Lecamwasam, N. (2013). *Iraq invasion: A "Just War" or just a war? An evaluation of US conduct within the framework of Just War Theory*. Sri Lanka, Univesity of Colombo.
- McBurney, D. (1994). *Research Methods*. California: Pacific Grove
- McGraig T, (2010). *Qualitative and Quantitative Research Methods*. U.K: Reckitt Publications
- McNabb, D.E. (2010). *Research Methods for Political Science: Quantitative and Qualitative methods, 2nd edition*. New York: Routledge.
- Mertus, J. (1999). *Kosovo: How Myths and Truths Started a War*. California: University of California Press
- Morgenthau, H.J (1978). *Politics among Nations: The Struggle for power and peace, 5th Edition*. New York: Random House.
- Nicolson, H. (1998). *The Practice of Diplomacy: Its Evolution, Theory and Administration*. London, Routledge.
- Orend, Brian (2012). *War and International Justice*. Canada: Wilfrid Laurier Press.
- Paul, R. (2006). *Military Honour and the Conduct of War*. London: Routledge.
- Saunders, M. (2003). *Research Methods for business students*. Oxford Brookes University Business School.
- Schwarzenberger, G. (1951). *Power Politics; A Study of International Society, Revised edition*. New York: University of California.
- Thucydides (1985). *The Peloponnesian War*. Translated by Rex Warner. New York: Penguin Classics.
- Walzer, M. (1977). *Just and Unjust Wars: A Moral Argument with Historical Illustrations*. United States: Basic books
- Weiss, T.G., Collins, C. (2011). *Humanitarian Challenges and Intervention*. Colorado, Westview Press.

Yusuf, A. A., and Fatsa, O. (2012). *The African Union: Legal and Institutional Framework. A manual on the Pan- African Organisation*. Netherlands: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.

Zainal, Z. (2007). *Case study as a research method*. Malaysia: University Teknologi.

Journals and Articles

Alemazung, J. A. (2010). Post-colonial colonialism. An analysis of international factors and actors marring African socio-economic and political development. *The Journal of pan-African Studies*, Vol 3, no. 10. September 2010. Germany: University of Applied Science.

Bellamy, A.J, Williams, D. (2011, July) “The new politics of protection? Cote d’Ivoire, Libya and the responsibility to protect”, *International Affairs*, Vol. 87, No. 4, pp. 825-850, (p. 838).

Bellamy, A.J. (2006). ‘Whither the Responsibility to Protect? Humanitarian Intervention and the 2005 World Summit.’ *Ethics & International Affairs*, 20(2), pp. 143 – 169,

Biscoe, R.L. (2003). Relations among Statistical methods for assuring confidentiality of social research data. *Social science research* 1(4), pp. 403-414

Brookings Institute Paper (February, 2019). “Empowered decentralization: A city based strategy for rebuilding Libya”.

Chakraborty, B. (2009). Developing multicomponent interventions using fractional factorial designs. Volume 28, issue 21.

Danjibo, N. D. (2013). The aftermath of the Arab Spring and its implications for peace and development in the Sahel and Sub-Saharan Africa. *Strategic review for Southern Africa*. Vol 35, No 2. Nigeria: University of Ibaden.

Dimeglio, R.P. (2005). “The Evolution of the Just War Tradition: Defining Jus Post Bellum,” *Military Law Review*. 186, pp. 133.

Enuka, C. Chiemela N. (2018). Foreign Military Intervention in Libya: An Analysis of the Just War principles of Jus Ad Bellum and Jus in Bello. *Jmass communicat Journalism*. 8, pp 396

Hobson, C. (2016) “Responding to Failure: The Responsibility to Protect after Libya”. *Journal of International Studies*, Vol. 44, pp. 433-454, (p. 449).

International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (2001). "The Responsibility to Protect: *Report of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty*" .Ottawa: The International Development Research Centre, 2001.

James, T. (2008). Methods for the thematic synthesis of qualitative research in systematic reviews. *BMC medical research methodology*. 8 (1), 45.

Khan, M. (2011). The Libyan economy after the revolution: still no clear vision. *Atlantic Council, Rafik Hariri Centre for the Middle East*.

Lehman, J.M. (2012). All Necessary Means to Protect Civilians: What the Intervention Says about Relationship between the Jus in Bello and jus ad Bellum. *Journal of conflict and security Law*, volume 17, issue 1, spring 2012, pages 117-146.

Mbanje, B.B.BC., and Mahuku, D.N. (2012). Big Powers and the 'Responsibility to Protect'. *Notes on Responsibility to Protect*.

McTernan, B. (2011, October). Welcome to the neighbourhood. *The Africa Report*. Number 34, 44-45

Murphy (1996). Ethnicity and Advance Care Directives. *The Journal of Law and Ethics*, volume 24, issue 2

Murshed, S.M. and Tadjoeeddin, M.Z. (2007).Revisiting the greed and grievance explanations for violent internal conflict. *Journal of International Development*, volume 21, issue 1

Nurruzzamman (2014). The Responsibility to protect doctrine: *Revived in Libya, Buried in Syria, insight Turkey*. Vol 15, no 2, p 59. Gulf University for Science and technology.

Pham, J. (2008). What is in the national interest? *Hans Morgenthau's Realist Vision and American Foreign Policy Interests*, 30, pp.256-265.

Shah, A. (2011, April 5).Crisis in Libya. The African Union's Indifference on Libya. *Foreign Policy Association*, 2(1), pp 43-48.

Stuenkel, O. (2015). "The Impact of the Libya Intervention Debates on Norms of Protection", *Global Society*, (November, 2015), pp. 113-133, (p. 121).

Thakur, R. (2012, March). 'Libya and the Responsibility to Protect: Between Opportunistic Humanitarianism and Value-free Pragmatism,' *Institute for Security Studies (Situation Report)*, pp 45-50.

Thielborger, P. (2012). "The Status and Future of International Law after the Libya Intervention", *Goettingen Journal of International Law*, Vol. 4, (2012), pp. 11-48, (p. 15).

Warwick, D.P. (1983). Toward Ethical Guidelines for Policy Research. *Hastings Center Report*, Volume 13, issue 1.

Electronic Internet Sources

Akonor, K. (2011, June 10). *The African Union's mistake of policy and principle*. Inter Press Service. Retrieved from <http://www.ips.net>

All Africa Report (2011). "On Life Support Africa Report N°170 – 21 February" Available at: <http://www.crisisgroup.org/~media/Files/africa/horn-ofafrica/somalia/170%20Somalia%20The%20Transitional%20Government%20on%20Life%20>

Bajoria, J. (2011). 'Libya and the Responsibility to Protect'. <http://cfcr.org/libya-responsibility-to-protect/p22480>

Benette, I. (2011). "AU Failure in Libya? May be not". <http://blogs.cfr.org/patrick/2011/10/21/au-failure-in-libya-maybe-not>.

Blanchard, C. M. (2011). "Libya: Unrest and U.S. Policy." Congressional Research Service. <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/R43881.pdf>

Cohn, M. (2011). *Responsibility to Protect- The cases of Libya and the Ivory Coast*. *Global Policy Forum*. <https://www.globalpolicy.org>

Combaz, E. (2014). *Political economy of Libya after Qadhafi regime*. Applied Knowledge Service. <http://www.gsdc.org/docs/open/HDQ1084.pdf>

Compliance Campaign (2012). *Sidestepping international obligations, Dems reiterate, 'torture ban' endorse 'universal values'*. <http://compliancecampaign.wordpress.com>.

Evans, G. (2012, August). "R2P and RWP after Libya and Syria," *Keynote Address by Professor the Hon Gareth Evans, Co-Chair, Global Centre for the Responsibility to Protect*. <http://www.iciss.ca/report2-en.asp>.

Hengari, A.T. (2011). 'The AU struggles to exist on Libya'. Retrieved from <http://www.namibian.com>

International Crisis Group 'Conflict History: Sudan,' International Crisis Group. www.crisisgroup.org/home/index.

Jackobson, T. G. (2012). *Birds of a feather flock apart? Testing a critique of the clash of civilizations thesis*. *Journal of peace, conflict and development*. <http://www.bradford.ac.uk/social-sciences/peace-conflict-and-development/issue>.

McMahan, J. (2009). "Just War". In *a companion to contemporary political Philosophy*. <http://books.google.ik/books>

Nathan, G. (2011). *AU Totally Ignored by UN on Libya, the Ticklish*. Retrieved from <http://theticklish.blogspot.com/2011/03/au-totally-ignored-by-un-on-libya.html>.

Newman, M. (2009). *Revisiting the 'Responsibility to Protect'*. <http://doi.org/11111,.1467-923x.2009>

Orend, B. (2005). "War" in *Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy*. <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2005/entries/war>.

Pougala, J. (2011). *'Why the West wants the fall of Qaddafi'*. Retrieved from <http://www.rightsmonitoring.org/2011/04/why-the-west-wants-the-fall-of-gaddafi-an-analysis-in-defense-of-the-libyanrais>.

Prince, R. (2011). *In Mali, conflict continues a year after the French-led invasion. A French re-militarization of Africa, under the well-worn pretext of humanitarian intervention, is in the making. US: Foreign Policy in Focus*. <http://fpif.org/maliconflict-continues-year-french-led-invasion/>.

Ramsbotham, A. (2011). *Safe guarding Civilians*. [http://www.responsibilitytoprotect.org/files/safeguarding_civilians\[1\]](http://www.responsibilitytoprotect.org/files/safeguarding_civilians[1]).

Rieff, D. (2011). "R2P, R.I.P NYTimes.com". <http://www.currentintelligence.net/columns/2011/9/27/after-libya-and-syria-can-r2psurvive.html>.

The Guardian. (2011). *'The end of Qaddafi is welcome'*. <http://www.guardian.co>. (Accessed 07 October 2018).

Trochim, W.M, and Donnelly, J.P. (2006, October 20). *The Research Methods Knowledge Base*. Retrieved from <http://www.socialreserchmethods.net/kb/scallik.php>.

Tulsa, L. (2011). In G. Evans (ED), *“R2P and RWP after Libya and Syria,” Keynote Address by Professor the Hon Gareth Evans, Co-Chair, Global Centre for the Responsibility to Protect.*
<http://www.iciss.ca/report2-en.asp>.

United Nations. (2011). *“UN Human Rights Council recommends suspension of Libya”*,
<http://www.ohchr.org/EN/NewsEvents/Pages/HRCSpecialSessionLibya.aspx>.

Yobo, D. (2009). *“The Human Security Paradigm as a Challenge for the African Union in Promoting Peace and Security in Africa: A Case Study of the Sudan/Darfur Conflict”*.
<http://researchspace.ukzn.ac.za/xmlui/bitstream/handle/>

<http://www.politicsweb.co.za>.

<http://www.cbsnews.com/news/clinton-on-qaddafi-we-came-we-saw-he-died>

<http://www.nato.int/nato-welcome/>

APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW GUIDE.

My name is B1747665 a final year student at Bindura University of Science Education who is currently studying master's degree in International Relations. I'm carrying out a research entitled: **The impact of the interventionist policies of the western countries in the Libyan crisis of 2011.** The program requires a research project as a fulfillment of the program. This research is going to be based on your responses for its validity. Your responses will be kept strictly confidential as they will be used for academic purposes only.

Interview questions for: Academics/ International relations analysts/diplomats

- Why did the Western countries intervene in the Libyan crisis of 2011?
- What were the results of the military intervention in Libya by the Western countries?
- How effective were the regional and international bodies in solving political instability in Libya?

UNHCR staff

- How effective were the regional and international bodies in solving political instability in Libya?
- What is UNSC doing to maintain peace and security in Libya?
- Are there any laws which legitimize military interventions?
- When did you start experiencing an increase in the number of Libyan refugees and Asylum seekers in Zimbabwe?

Libyan Refugees and Asylum seekers

- Why did the Western countries intervene in the Libyan crisis of 2011?
- How the military intervention by Western countries did it affect you and your country?
- How effective were the regional and international bodies in solving political instability in Libya?

Thank you!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

APPENDIX B: QUESTIONNAIRE GUIDE.

My name is B1747665, a final year student at Bindura University of Science Education who is currently studying Master’s degree in International Relations. I’m carrying out a research entitled: **The impact of the interventionist policies of the western countries in the Libyan crisis of 2011.** The program requires a research project as a fulfillment of the program. This research is going to be based on your responses for its validity. Your responses will be kept strictly confidential as they will be used for academic purposes only. Please, kindly fill in the questionnaire accordance with your position.

Questionnaire

For: Academics/ International relations analysts/ Diplomats

1. Do you agree that national interest led to the invasion of Libya by the Western countries?

(a) Agree [] (b) Disagree [] Explain your answer in the space below.

.....
.....
.....
.....

2. In your own opinion, was the military intervention by NATO in the Libyan Crisis of 2011 legitimate? (a) Yes [] No []. If ‘Yes’ explain your answer

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

3. Do you agree that the R2P doctrine was necessary in Libya? (a) Agree [] (b) Disagree []

Explain your answer

.....

Questionnaire

For: Libyan Refugees and Asylum seekers

1. How effective were the regional and international bodies in solving political instability in Libya?

Agree { }

Disagree { }

Explain your answer.....

2. In your own opinion, what do you think should be done to ensure political stability in your country

.....
.....
.....

Thank you for taking time to answer my questions, your responses will solely be used for purposes of my research.