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Abstract
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France’s and the UK’s Responses to the Libya Crisis
Supervisor: Amr Sabet
Examiner: Kjetil Duvold

This paper aims at analysing the 2011 Libyan crisis and France’s and the UK’s response to it. The research questions formulated in this study is: 1) Should the principle of responsibility to protect override state sovereignty? 2) Did the principle of responsibility to protect violate Libya’s sovereignty? 3) How did France and the UK perceive the situation in Libya and how did they respond to it? The theoretical framework consists of two theories to help answer the questions formulated; the principle of responsibility to protect and neoclassical realism. The theories are later connected to humanitarian intervention, security concerns and the security dilemma. In the analytical framework, I will attempt to understand how France and the UK interpreted the situation in Libya, what they thought was a suitable response to the crisis and how they responded to it. The conclusion of this study is that the intervention in Libya can be divided into two different interventions: the protection of civilians and the regime change. The first part of the intervention did not violate Libya’s sovereignty as it was rightfully justified with the responsibility to protect principle but the second part of the intervention was violating Libya’s sovereignty as a regime change cannot be justified by the principle, which makes the research question very complex. Related to responsibility to protect and sovereignty the study will debate if the principle of responsibility should override state sovereignty.
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1 Introduction

1.1 Background of the Topic
Libya is a country in the northern parts of Africa but is often seen as both an African and Arab country. Because of its location and because of its oil Libya has been a metropolitan to the Sub-Saharan region. Many people from neighbouring countries have come to Libya as it has been seen as one of the wealthiest African countries.¹ When the protests in Libya started Qaddafi had already ruled the country for almost 40 years. During his rule there have been speculations about human rights abuses and exporting of terrorism internationally. In 1992 the United Nations (UN) wanted to address Libya’s sponsoring of terrorism but when Qaddafi refused to cooperate the international community imposed sanctions and isolated the country. After the sanctions Libya tried to restore its reputation in the international community and restored many of its old ties with other countries. In 1999 for example Libya restored its relationship with the United Kingdom (UK). Both the UK and France had ties with Libya and were interested in the oil in the country. When the crisis first broke out in Libya France was hesitant to intervene in the conflict, but as the conflict continued they saw the need for an intervention and was the first country to advocate for the adoption of Resolution 1973. Civilians in Libya were to be protected through the implementation of Resolution 1973.² By adopting Resolution 1973 the United Nations Security Council invoked the principle of responsibility to protect and authorized its first ever use of force since the principle was implemented.³ Although the principle of responsibility to protect only applies to a few categories – genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity, the international community is expected to react when another state is using violence against its own people. However, the UN Security Council must authorize an armed intervention but it is preferable if states did not use unilateral force when they intervene. Mass atrocities, genocide and the use of military force has also been seen as a security problem in the world.⁴ As already clarified the principle of responsibility to protect is a principle which should be invoked to protect the citizens in a state. The principle of responsibility to protect and security

are therefore very much connected to security threats. In the case of Libya the crisis posed a
number of security and humanitarian concerns for many European countries, as an ongoing
dispute could have created a refugee crisis or other issues related to security. It is therefore
likely to believe that the principle was not only used to protect civilians but also to prevent
issues related to national security. Which raises the question if the UK and France intervened
in Libya to protect the citizens, to enhance their own security or if their national interest
played a part in the decision to intervene? Another question which can be raised is if the
invocation of responsibility to protect justified the intervention or if they violated Libya’s
state sovereignty?

1.2 Aim and Question
This study will analyse the theories of responsibility to protect and neoclassical realism as
connected to humanitarian intervention, security and the security dilemma. By theorizing the
principle of responsibility to protect and neoclassical realism this paper aims at understanding
how France and the UK interpreted the situation in Libya and why they responded to it in the
way they did. The focus of the study will be on France and the UK in order to analyse how
and why they acted the way they did during the crisis. It aims at understanding the actions
taken and to understand if they interpreted the crisis differently. By using the principle of
responsibility to protect we can see if the intervention was justified by invoking the principle
or if the UK and/or France violated Libya’s sovereignty. To serve the aim of the study, the
following research questions have been formulated:

- Should the principle of responsibility to protect override state sovereignty?
- Did the principle of responsibility to protect violate Libya’s sovereignty?
- How did France and the UK perceive the situation in Libya and how did they respond to
  it?
2 Theoretical Framework

2.1 Definitions

To give the reader a better understanding of what the theories means, definitions of the chosen theories and on some of the key words will be given before putting them into a context and explaining them further.

- Responsibility to Protect – a principle that can be invoked by the international community if there are signs of mass atrocities within a state.\(^5\)
- Neoclassical Realism – a theory within International Relations, aims at explaining the structure of the international system and its interaction with domestic factors. Foreign policy and decision making are important within this theory.\(^6\)
- Security Dilemma – a two-levelled dilemma: the dilemma of interpretation and the dilemma of response.\(^7\)
- Anarchy – the international community lacks sovereignty, it doesn’t exist any superiors to the states.\(^8\)
- Humanitarian intervention – the threat or use of force by a state or international organization with the purpose of protecting the citizens in a state from human rights violations (such as genocide, ethnic cleansing, war crimes and crimes against humanity).\(^9\)

2.2 Responsibility to Protect

One of the most important ideas in world politics has been the idea that state sovereignty means that you have domestic and international responsibilities as well as some privileges. One of the responsibilities coming with state sovereignty is the protection of people being threatened by mass atrocity.\(^10\) When talking about the principle of responsibility to protect we can see that states want to protect the citizens of the world from mass atrocities. After the

\(^8\) Lobell E. S, Ripsman M. N & Taliaferro W. J, *Neoclassical Realism, The State, and Foreign Policy*
\(^10\) Maley W & Thakur R, *Theorizing the Responsibility to Protect*, p.3
mass atrocities in the second World War the international community was determined to stop the world citizens from suffering from mass atrocities. Unfortunately, many nations have witnessed genocides and the international community has not been able to stop such mass killings and crimes against humanity. To protect citizens from mass atrocities the principle of responsibility to protect was adopted unanimously in the United Nations General Assembly in 2005. This principle was a chance to build up an international community who stands up for the victims of atrocities. Since implementing the principle of responsibility to protect the international community can do more to prevent mass atrocities. The principle means that sovereign states have a responsibility to protect their own populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity. This principle only works if the member states of the United Nations work together to honour the principle as some states lacks capacity and legitimacy to protect their citizens from these crimes. If a state fails to protect its citizens from these crimes (either because of a lack of capacity or because of deliberate intent) the international community is supposed to respond to this in time and decisively. The international community can respond through diplomatic, humanitarian, or any other peaceful means and during an intervention like this all the tools that the Security Council has are made available. The tools that the Security Council holds can sometimes mean the international community will respond with military force.\textsuperscript{11} The principle of responsibility to protect stands on three pillars:

(1) the primary responsibility of states to protect their own population from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity, and from their incitement; (2) the duty of states to assist each other to build the capacities necessary to discharge the first responsibility; (3) the international community’s responsibility to take timely and decisive action to protect populations from the four crimes when the state in question fails to do so.\textsuperscript{12}

What the principle is being used for is now clear, but when exactly is the international community supposed to intervene? In theory, it exists two basic principles regarding when the international community is supposed to intervene:

A. State Sovereignty implies responsibility, and the primary responsibility for the protection of its people lies with the state itself.

B. Where a population is suffering serious harm, as a result of internal war, insurgency, repression or state failure, and the state in question is unwilling or


\textsuperscript{12} Bellamy J. A, Responsibility to Protect: A Defense, p. 2-3
unable to halt or avert it, the principle of non-intervention yields to the
international responsibility to protect.\textsuperscript{13}

But intervening militarily in another state using the principle of responsibility to protect is
very rare and is something that is only done if there is a very severe case where no other
means help. Military force is only supposed to be used when it can do more good than it does
harm. When attempting to use military force it first needs to be authorized by the UN General
Assembly, UN Security Council or regional organizations such as NATO. The principle of
responsibility to protect is not being questioned by any state today (despite states like North
Korea and Venezuela), which legitimizes the principle. However, there is a lack of consensus
on how the principle is to work in reality.\textsuperscript{14} States want to protect the citizens of the world
from mass atrocities using the principle of responsibility to protect but it exists different
interpretations of the principle and the current situation is what makes the decision making of
invoking the principle different. What states chose to do is different depending on the
interpretation in the decision making, some states might proceed forward with a humanitarian
intervention while some states might choose not to invoke the principle and not intervene in a
specific situation.\textsuperscript{15} When analysing the theorization of responsibility to protect it is possible
to see that the categories that justify an invocation of the principle are the same categories
which have been listed as some of today’s security threats. The principle of responsibility to
protect and security is very much connected through the categories. It could be argued that a
security threat could call for an invocation of the principle. By connecting responsibility to
protect to security issues it is also possible to connect the principle with International
Relations theories.\textsuperscript{16} The connection between responsibility to protect and neoclassical
realism will be drawn through the security dilemma and humanitarian intervention. A security
dilemma is a dilemma of interpretation and response which both the principle of responsibility
to protect and neoclassical realism deals with.\textsuperscript{17} Before invoking the principle decision makers
will have to interpret the principle and decide how to respond. The uncertainty of how to
interpret and use the principle creates a security dilemma. The first level of the security
dilemma deals with the interpretation of the principle.\textsuperscript{18} How do decision makers interpret the

\textsuperscript{13} Evans G & Sahmoun M, \textit{International Commission on Interventions and State Sovereignty}, Responsibility to
Protect, (International Research Center, Ottawa CA, 2001), XI
\textsuperscript{14} Bellamy J. A, \textit{Responsibility to Protect: A Defense}, p. 4-10
\textsuperscript{15} Beach D, \textit{Analyzing Foreign Policy}, (Palgrave Macmillan, UK, 2012) p. 13
\textsuperscript{17} Booth K & Wheeler J. N, \textit{The Security Dilemma – Fear, Cooperation and Trust in World Politics}, (Palgrave
\textsuperscript{18} Booth K & Wheeler J. N, \textit{The Security Dilemma – Fear, Cooperation and Trust in World Politics}, p. 3-4
principle? The principle is not supposed to be invoked unless a population is suffering serious harm, but when exactly is a population suffering serious harm? This is what decision makers will have to interpret. Decision makers are interpreting the principle differently and it may not always be clear if the principle should be invoked or not. Looking at the case of Libya, France and the UK were in favour of invoking the principle while Germany for example did not want to invoke the principle. Decision makers in the three countries have made different interpretations of the principle and the conflict in Libya. The second level of the security dilemma is the dilemma of response. After deciding to invoke the principle of responsibility to protect decision makers will have to decide on how to respond. The international community is unsure of how to use the principle which creates a dilemma of response. The two-levelled security dilemma is connected to the principle of responsibility to protect as the principle deals with the dilemma of interpretation and response. The security dilemma is what is connecting the principle to international relations theories. When the principle of responsibility to protect is being invoked, the principle allows states to do a humanitarian intervention in another country.

2.2.1 Humanitarian Intervention

One of the biggest challenges facing the international community today is how to respond to mass atrocities. One of the responses to mass atrocities is humanitarian intervention. Humanitarian intervention is the action taken by governments to stop other governments in a foreign state from oppression, persecution or other human rights abuses within the foreign state. The international community are in a constant dilemma of how to protect the human rights and keep the human security in check, humanitarian intervention is one of the tools available to secure people suffering from mass atrocities. Many scholars believe that the meaning of humanitarian intervention lacks a clear definition, presumably because another state’s intentions are never clear and therefore it is hard for decision makers to know when to intervene and when not to. However, humanitarian intervention is being linked to the protection of people suffering from mass atrocities. A humanitarian intervention is:

1. Carried out in, or intended to affect events within, a foreign state or states – it is an intervention;

2. Aimed at the government of the target state(s), or imposed on and only accepted reluctantly by it/them – it is thus coercive, albeit not necessarily involving the use of force;

3. Intended, at least nominally (and at least to some extent actually), to avert, halt, and/or prevent recurrence of large-scale morality, mass atrocities, egregious human rights abuses or other widespread suffering caused by the action or deliberate inaction of the *de facto* authorities in the target state(s).

Humanitarian intervention involves violating another state’s sovereignty but many times no one will question the justification or the legitimization of the intervention. When a state is acting in another state at the request of a government or a non-state actor (such as the UN) internationally it is usually seen as a legitimate intervention. But if a state take actions in another state without the request from a government or the UN the humanitarian intervention will be seen as illegitimate. If the intervention in Libya were to follow this logic, the intervention would have been seen as legitimate internationally as the intervention was imposed by the UN Security Council through Resolution 1973. It is important to remember that there is a distinction between humanitarian action and humanitarian intervention. Humanitarian action is usually action in a foreign state which have not been requested through a government or a non-state actor, humanitarian action can sometimes mean using force in a foreign state. Humanitarian intervention is imposed by the request from a government or a non-state actor, a humanitarian intervention does not necessarily mean that military force is being used although it is the most common way of doing a humanitarian intervention. But it is important to remember military force is only being used when its necessary. When a government or a party is claiming de jure (practice by law) or de facto (the practice in reality) authority in a state, foreign power will provide military assistance to deal with the domestic crisis, this assistance is not referred to as an intervention unless there is a civil war within the state. With other words when a state is intervening in another state it only counts as an intervention when there is a severe situation in another country, such as an internal conflict. Humanitarian interventions are often seen as something that is breaking the praxis within international relations even if the intervention is well within international law. But since the UN implemented the principle of responsibility to protect in its charter, states

---

22 House of Commons Foreign Affairs Committee, *Libya: Examination of Intervention and Collapse and the UK’s Future Policy Options*
can take action by a humanitarian intervention by invoking the principle.\textsuperscript{23} The humanitarian intervention in Libya met the requirement of the last resort meaning no other option other than the use of force was seen fit. Before intervening military in another country other reasonable measures must be attempted. In the case of Libya any other means besides the use of force would probably not have stopped an attack on the people in Benghazi. Because no other measure (diplomatic and/or economic sanctions) could have stopped the internal conflict it was believed that the intervention met the requirement of the last resort. Humanitarian interventions are also related to the security dilemma. Most states within the international community see it as their responsibility to intervene in a country if it is necessary. The question then is not if a state is to intervene but rather how to intervene, what measures will be taken? The uncertainty of how to intervene can be related to the dilemma of response in the two-levelled security dilemma.\textsuperscript{24} Humanitarian intervention is connected to responsibility to protect, when invoking the principle the UN Security Council is authorizing an humanitarian intervention. Realism is debating about states’ national and foreign politics. Neoclassical realism is focusing on the structure of the international system and domestic factors. In neoclassical realism, it is believed that the amount of power and state’s motivations towards the international community is shaping the foreign policy. Whether a state is advocating or opposing a humanitarian intervention depends on a states’ foreign policy.\textsuperscript{25} Humanitarian intervention is not only connected to the principle of responsibility to protect, it is connected to neoclassical realism and the security dilemma as well. Humanitarian intervention is what is connecting the theories of this study together. When there is a conflict a security dilemma occurs, after interpreting the conflict the principle of responsibility can be invoked, when invoking the principle a dilemma of response occurs. The different state’s will have to determine what kind of humanitarian intervention they want to proceed with, how they chose to proceed depends on the amount of power a state has in its possession and its foreign policy – with other words the response is driven by the neoclassical approach.\textsuperscript{26}

\textsuperscript{23} Simms B & Trim J. B, \textit{Humanitarian Intervention: A History}, p. 4-5
\textsuperscript{26} Simms B & Trim J. B, \textit{Humanitarian Intervention: A History}, p. 4-5
2.3 Neoclassical Realism

Realism is the dominant theory in international politics. Its central role is debating about states’ national security and foreign politics. Realism is often focusing on national interest as well as on military and economic power. In scholarly debates realism is often described as a theory in international relations that debates about how states can achieve security. Realism includes many different approaches, one of the approaches being neoclassical realism. Neoclassical realism is studying the structure of the international system and domestic factors and the interaction between the two. It is believed that the amount of power and state’s motivations toward the international community can shape their foreign policy. The structure of the international system and the motives of individual states is used to explain the variations in foreign policies of the same state over time or in different states facing the same type of external constraints. By explaining the variations in foreign policy it is possible to understand the strategies of individual states. In neoclassical realism – as in other approaches within realism – it is believed that politics is a struggle for states because states want power and security but it is an uncertainty in the world which makes it harder to gain more power. The states have a central role within neoclassical realism and are the most important actors in international politics. In neoclassical realism –just as in the other realistic approaches anarchy is playing an important role. Anarchy is the lack of sovereignty above the international community, in other words it does not exist a higher power than the sovereign states. Anarchy is not necessarily objected as a positive or negative thing but rather as a state in the international system. In the neoclassical approach anarchy is believed to be the reason for conflicts in the world. Since the international system and foreign decision making are the basics in the neoclassical approach, states are important, most definitions that exist on the word state say that a state is a set of institutions that is placed within a territory and has a violence monopoly within that territory. But in neoclassical realism the state is a systemic force who drive for external behaviour. This mean that states are enhancing their security by foreign security policies. By analysing the foreign security policy you can explain a state’s behaviour. A state’s behaviour is, most of the time, driven by the amount of power the state has in its possession. It is argued that the impact of power on foreign policy is indirect as systematic pressure must be interpreted and translated by a decision maker. Every threat and opportunity must be interpreted by a decision maker before undertaking any strategy or implementing military, diplomatic or foreign economic policies. Decision makers are playing

27 Collins A, Contemporary Security Studies, p. 14-15
a central role in neoclassical realism as the decision makers are the ones to assess international threats, they decide the foreign policy and they mobilize the resources necessary for foreign and security policies. The foreign policy is always based on what power the state has and what domestic constraints it has as well as other state’s interest. In neoclassical realism the perception of relative power and domestic constraints are two intervening variables between the international pressures and the foreign policy. Relative power is deciding how states will define their interests as well as how or if they will act on these interests. However, the international system is not offering any solution on how each state will act within those interests, every state will act differently. The lack of help of the international system is related to anarchy. Neoclassical realists do not believe in a sovereign government over the states, it is therefore hard for states to know how to respond to certain events. To avoid an unnecessary conflict decision makers will have to interpret the other state’s actions and interest. The uncertainty that the anarchic system brings to the neoclassical approach in the international system is connected to the security dilemma. Decision makers will have to interpret other state’s interest and actions and from that interpretation decide on a proper response. Neoclassical realism and the security dilemma are tricky because it is hard to test power and power can also change rapidly within a short period of time. The dilemma of interpretation can be tricky as a state can appear to have much power but materialistic the amount of power may be less than it appears to be. Even if a state has more or less power decision makers will still have to interpret what the state’s interest is. The amount of power a state have in its possession combined with the state’s interests creates an uncertainty for decision makers, it is this uncertainty that creates the security dilemma within neoclassical realism.

29 Lobell E. S, Ripsman M. N & Taliaferro W. J, Neoclassical Realism, The State, and Foreign Policy, p. 27-29
30 Lobell E. S, Ripsman M. N & Taliaferro W. J, Neoclassical Realism, The State, and Foreign Policy, p.29
2.4 The Security Dilemma

A security dilemma is something that most states are faced with as it often is a security dilemma that creates an interaction between sovereign states. The interaction between states occur because every state want to provide for their own security, this is often done with military force. The weapons that the states can use when using military force can either provide the states with protection or they can threaten other states. It is these weapons that create the security dilemma. Decision makers will have to try to understand and interpret the situation and the motives with regard to the weapons a state has in its possession. The security dilemma is often described as the quintessential dilemma which means that states with weapons in its possession can create fear and uncertainty. A state can have weapons in its possession without any intention of using it to threat or attack another state, they can have it as self-protection. But the possession of these weapons can still create fear and other states will have to understand the other state’s motives, if the motives are misunderstood it can be disastrous. But it is important to remember that sometimes other states do intend to attack another state, weapons are not always used purely for self-defence. Theories about the security dilemma share some similarities with the theory of realism. Just as in realism security dilemma theorists are talking about anarchy. Anarchy means that the sovereign states are the highest power, it does not exist any political power above the states. According to theorists, anarchy is creating a world of uncertainty, weapons and fear.\(^{31}\) John Herz and Herbert Butterfield are two theorists who define the security dilemma as a two-levelled dilemma:

> The security dilemma is a two-level strategic predicament in relations between states and other actors, with each level consisting of two related lemmas (or propositions that can be assumed to be valid) which force decision-makers to choose between them.\(^ {32}\)

The first level that Herz and Butterfield are talking about is the most basic one and is the dilemma of interpretation of the motives, intentions and the capabilities of other states. The dilemma of interpretation refers to the predicament that are facing decision makers when they are being confronted in a way that could affect the security. Decision makers will have to try to interpret the military policies and the political postures of the other state. The dilemma of interpretation is a result of uncertainty, decision makers will have to interpret the motives and decide if the weapons in another state’s possession is for self-protection or for offensive


purposes. The second level is the dilemma of response. After the decision makers have interpreted the situation they need to decide on the proper response. If the decision maker makes the interpretation that the other state is friendly and only has the weapons to enhance its own security the decision maker can choose to respond by some form of signal or a letter that they will not attack. But sometimes the decision makers are not sure of the other state’s intentions are and can response with military force, if the other state’s intention was to enhance its own security the decision makers have created hostility when hostility was not there in the first place. When a sense of hostility is created – even though it was not the intention – a security paradox has been created.\textsuperscript{33} In the case of Libya it was a dilemma of how to interpret the situation and there were also a number of security and humanitarian concerns which the United Nations Security Council alongside some independent states laid out, affecting the international community. One of the concerns being brought up was the trafficking of weapons and what they were being used for. The decision makers in each individual state will have to interpret the situation and try to understand if the security and humanitarian concerns pose an actual threat.\textsuperscript{34} It was also a dilemma of how to respond as some states chose to intervene and some states chose not to intervene in the conflict. It is likely to think that decision makers interpreted the situation differently and therefore chose to respond to it differently.\textsuperscript{35}

\textsuperscript{33} Booth K & Wheeler J. N, \textit{The Security Dilemma – Fear cooperation and Trust in World Politics}, p. 4-5
\textsuperscript{35} Overbeck M, \textit{European Security}, European Debates During the Libya Crisis of 2011: Shared Identity, Divergent Action
3 Method and Material

3.1 Method

In political science it doesn’t exist a single definition of the case study, it exist a variety of definitions. The case study method is big in its variation, it can be either a single case study or a comparative case study or it can be an experimental case study. Many case studies today are single-site studies which means that the study allow the researcher to put their study into a real-life context (called the Chicago School approach). This approach is rather inductive and is centred around the human being and by using this approach the aim of a study should be to learn and understand social realities that characterized settings and actors (here Libya is the setting and decision makers in France and the UK are the actors).\(^{36}\) The Chicago School approach will be used in this study as it is suitable for the aim of the study. The case study is defined differently. According to the definition by *Uppsatser och Rapporter*, which is related to the Chicago School approach, a case study is defined like this:

investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context: when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident in which multiple sources of evidence are used.\(^{37}\)

The definition given in the book is one of the most common definitions but John Gerring is arguing that the definition is not completely accurate. He is arguing that the definitions existing on the case study are very flawed and sometimes hard to understand. To give a better understanding to what the case study is he is defining the case study as an intensive study of a single unit for the purpose of understanding a larger class of (similar) units. A unit can be anything from a state, a revolution or an election or a political party.\(^{38}\) Gerrings criticism aside, both definitions of the case study mentioned here are of use in the study. Backman writes that the case study allows you to put your subject into a real-life context which in this study is crucial. To analyse how France and the UK responded to the Libyan crisis it is of great importance to analyse the actual event and put France’s and the UK’s responses to it into a real-life context. The definition given by Gerrings is also valuable for the study as he emphasizes that the usage of a single unit will help with the understanding of larger units. By understanding why France and the UK responded the way they did to the Libyan crisis it might help understand why they have acted or have not acted in a certain event before or after


the crisis. Furthermore, Gerrings is talking about the N-question. The number of cases in the study – hence the N-question – can be either small or large. The most common rule is that the number equals the amount of cases showcased in the study. Following that rule this would be a small-N study with three cases. Libya would stand for one and France and the UK would stand for case number two and three. But Gerring is shining another light on the N question, stating it is not three different cases but a study comprised of three different units. Following Gerrings logic this would be a small-N case study with three comprising units being Libya, France and the UK. Since this is a case study including three different states and their role in the Libyan crisis it would be more suitable for the study to say that it is not a case study including three different cases but to use Gerrings logic saying this is a small-N case study comprising three units. The Chicago School approach is also dealing with the N question, where the difference between units and cases are being described. Saying that this study is a study with three cases would mean that this is a study consisting of three different cases, it is not. Saying that this is a study consisting of three units would mean that this is a single case study that is carried out in one bounded setting such as a government or a country or a certain event. If one were to say that this in fact is a three-cased study one would say that the researcher is studying three different events, which is not accurate. The study aims at researching the French and British intervention in Libya, which is one single event and therefore it is accurate to call this a small-N study consisted of three comprised units. It is sometimes argued that a study analysing a larger scale of cases are more valid but a small-N study consisted of one case with three units can in fact lay the foundation of the understanding of a certain event as the different units are connected to each other. The case method has been criticised for not being scientifically accurate. It has also been criticised for the lack of comparison, some critics say that a study need at least two comparative variables if it’s supposed to be generalizable. This criticism aside, the case study method using a small-N study with three comprising units will serve the aim of this study the best.

39 Gerrings J, American Political Science Review, What Is a Case Study and What Is It Good For?
40 Mills A, Encyclopedia of Case Study Research, Case Study Research in Political Science
3.1.1 Validity and Generalization

Validity measures if you are studying what you said you were going to study.\textsuperscript{42} To make sure the study has validity it is important to remember the research questions and only mention facts that are related to the research questions. In the study, I do believe I have been able to somewhat connect the theories to each other and to the research questions. Looking in the analytical framework I can see that the facts that have been laid out is relevant to the research questions. In the results the facts that have been laid out in the analytic framework is coming together to answer the research questions. The results may not have been what was anticipated and the research questions are somewhat complex but they are being answered and the study does not lack validity. A high validity is often promising a high dependability. Dependability requires that the researcher is using dependable material. In this study, no instruments such as interviews or questioners have been used, the material have only been from literature and internet websites. The material has been from scientific literature and from official webpages, therefore they have been interpreted as reliable sources. The dependability can sometimes be shaped because of different interpretations that the researcher has made but given the material was fairly easy to understand, that should not be a problem for the dependability of this study.\textsuperscript{43} It is a bit hard to generalize the study as only two countries that were involved in the intervention have been studied and the overall responses to the Libyan conflict cannot therefore be generalized. More countries were involved in the handling of the conflict in Libya but for a study with an aim of studying specific countries it would not be good for the validity to study more countries. It would also be very hard to study a big number of countries considering the limited time of 10 weeks. It has been established earlier in the study that some countries were sceptic to an armed intervention while some countries were advocating it. It is clear that every country interpreted the conflict differently and an armed intervention is therefore not the norm in this case. A study that is generalized means that the theory or model used in the study can be the same in a broader context or a broad assumption. It is not possible to make a broad assumption of the response to the Libyan crisis it is however possible to reuse the model used in this study to analyze other countries in a similar context.\textsuperscript{44} It could be argued that it is possible to make a broad assumption about the results in this study. If I were
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to look at one or two more interventions or conflicts and see that the countries who were in favor of an armed intervention was that in the other conflicts as well, and the one’s opposing an armed conflict in Libya opposed it in a previous conflict it could be argued that it is possible to make a broad assumption of the results. It would mean that there is some kind of connection between how different countries stand in the intervention dilemma and would perhaps mean that some countries have a certain view on the principle of responsibility to protect and which means they believe are legitimate to use or most likely some countries perform hard power and other countries soft power. It is possible to reuse the study model and it is perhaps possible to make a broad assumption of the results and that would be in favor for the generalization of the study. But the generalization of the study can be discussed. It has been hard finding any literature that combines the two theories: responsibility to protect and neoclassical realism, but by connecting both theories to humanitarian intervention and the security dilemma it was possible to find some common ground for the theories. It was also hard to find information about the security concerns and what standpoint the UK and France had there. The material on the security and humanitarian concerns originate from the UN Security Council and will have to be representing the UK and France. Since they both are permanent members in the Security Council it is likely to believe that they both shared those security and humanitarian concerns. How the UK and France interpreted the situation in Libya and how they carried out the response to it is pretty much all based on a UK report which the Foreign Affairs Committee from the House of Commons have provided. The report provided me with valuable information and was also one of very few information pieces in English that dealt with France’s standpoint in the crisis.

3.1.2 Scope
This essay will focus on the 2011 Libyan crisis and how Europe responded to it. Since Europe is a big continent with many different states the scope will be focused on France and the UK. France and the UK shared some similarities in how they wanted to pursue with the crisis in Libya. Analysing how they debated and why they decided on a certain foreign policy could therefore be interesting and it is of more value to the study to use two states who at least contemplated using military force as it is the writers believe it will give more to the study than choosing a neutral state for example. Germany was one of the states not wanting to intervene in Libya with military force but wanted to impose economic or diplomatic sanctions instead, it could be interesting to use Germany in the study instead of either France or the UK. However,
France and the UK have a history of being allies (despite under the de Gaulle administration when France distanced itself from the UK and the US) and that could prove interesting in the analyse.

3.1.3 Approach
The approach of the study will be to theorize the principle of responsibility to protect and neoclassical realism, it is important to connect these two theories to each other and to security. When analysing what the French and British responses were to the Libyan crisis it will be favourably to ask the questions: how do they interpret the situation, what do they want to do and what did they do? By asking these questions it will lay the foundation of the understanding of the intervention. By asking the second question we can see how the crisis was interpreted and what foreign policy decisions was being made at the time by the then decision makers. By asking the third question it is possible to analyse what kind of response the states choose and how they actually responded to the Libyan crisis. To analyse this and to answer the research question a literary study will be done on primary and secondary sources.

3.1.4 Material
Material wise it is possible to use a variation of primary and secondary sources. Primary sources usually come from official websites or interviews. What is important to remember when using primary sources is that sometimes material coming from official websites can be a bit biased. The secondary sources will mainly consist of scientific articles and books. Using secondary sources results in moving away from the problem with the primary sources and in many aspects the secondary sources can be better as someone else has critically reviewed the material. There can still be some problems using secondary sources but to minimize the risk surrounding those problems it is important that the material is from scientific articles or scientific literature and not an article from the local newspaper. Primary sources that could be of interest is official reports showcasing official statements where it is also possible to see how the states debated over the issue. In this study primary sources will be used to deal with the security concerns and the intervention. This study will mostly be based on secondary sources theorizing and problematizing the research field.
3.1.5 Disposition

The essay starts with an introduction section where a brief background to the topic will be given. Following the background, the aim and the research questions will be presented. Following the introduction the theoretical framework will be presented, a small definition section will be presented before the theories are being connected to each other and explained further. This is to give the reader a better understanding of the meaning of the theories. The essay will be based on these theories and they will also be put into a relevant context and connected to each other in this section. The method will be presented after the theoretical framework. In the same chapter as the method the scope will be discussed as well as the approach and material. Previous work will be presented under the chapter literary review, which will belong to the method and material chapter. The analytical framework will deal with the interpretation and the intervention of Libya and will be based on the theoretical framework. The results of the research questions and a final discussion will be presented in the conclusion.

3.2 Literary Review

Michael Smith is one of many who have done research on security problems. The first thing that needs to be done when talking about security problems according to Smith is to determine what a security problem is and who or what should be secured. Security often involves both politics and polities and therefore, it is the states that should be secured. When talking about secured states it can be its territory, its citizens or it can be its sovereignty. States are often seen as the most important actors when it comes to security because they have a responsibility to keep their citizens secured. Another reason to why states are so important when talking about security issues is because resolutions for enhanced security is usually taken through international cooperation between states. It is hard to predict what a security problem may be as the problem itself usually is not seen until a current event, this can also make it harder to decide what a security problem actually is. What security researchers are relatively clear about today is that security problems can take many different shapes and some of the security issues are facing us today or have faced us are: refuge crises, genocides, infectious diseases, terrorism and suicide bombers just to mention a few.\(^{45}\) Whenever security is discussed it is important to remember the security dilemma. The security dilemma is a two-levelled dilemma

consisting of the dilemma of interpretation and the dilemma of response. As previously written it can sometimes be hard to decide what a security concern or a security threat is. The uncertainty is connected to the security dilemma. When it is a security dilemma decision makers in a country or an organization must interpret the situation, is it a security threat or not? Depending on the interpretation of the situation a country can chose to respond or not respond. This is where the second level of the security dilemma comes in. If decision makers interpret the situation as a security concern or a security threat they now must settled on the proper response. The response is usually a humanitarian intervention either by implementing economic and political sanctions or intervening militarily in another country. Even if we now know that security is related to states and that it is the population within the states that should be secured, we cannot know if a current situation is posing a security threat until decision makers have interpreted the situation. And even then, it can still be hard to know if it is a security threat or not as every decision maker will interpret the situation differently.46

Looking at the security issues facing us today, we can see that genocide is one of them which is one of the categories included in the principle of responsibility to protect.47 The principle of responsibility to protect is a relatively new principle, however the literature about the principle is quite extensive. Responsibility to protect in relation to humanity and security have not been well researched about but is raising questions in the international community. Adrian Gallagher and Garrett W. Brown are two researchers who have been studying the principle and its relation to humanity. When talking about responsibility to protect and its relations to humanity it is often in relation to crimes against humanity, which in theory is right but in practice policy makers and politicians are often drawing a connection between responsibility to protect and common humanity. In 1999, the then UN Secretary General Kofi Annan said:

if humanitarian intervention is, indeed, an unacceptable assault on sovereignty, how should we respond to a Rwanda, to a Srebrenica – to gross and systematic violations of human rights that affect every precept of our common humanity?48

The question that he raised is stating that human rights violations affect the whole world and not just the victims, and it can also pose a threat to our security. In the World Summit Outcome Document, humanity is only mentioned when talking about crimes against humanity but as previously stated, both policy makers and politicians put great emphasizes on humanity
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when talking about the principle. The values of humanity should be the same to everyone around the world and the politics and policies must change, at least that is what many politicians think. When the crisis of Libya struck and the principle of responsibility to protect was invoked many advocates for the principle argued that the actions that needed to be taken for the sake of humanity had been successful and the intervention in Libya was proof of that. Critics against the principle however, did not think that a policy change had been made and did not think that the principle of responsibility to protect had become the core principle of humanity. The US has long been one of the states wanting to connect responsibility to protect to humanity and stated that the ongoing problems in Syria was not a problem for Syria itself but a problem for humanity as basic standards of humanity was not respected. The intervention of Libya and the ongoing dispute in Syria have broaden the debate of the responsibility to protect. However, the United Nations have been criticised for not putting any emphasize on humanity when it comes to protecting and securing citizens around the world. Many believe that the crimes listed within the principle of responsibility to protect should be called inhuman as the crimes have such an effect on not only the victims but on the international community as a whole. Even though many have tried to emphasize the relations between responsibility to protect and humanity, it still lacks an understanding between the connection of the two. One believe however is that the principle of responsibility to protect is promoting common humanity. And even if it lacks a clear understanding of the connections between responsibility to protect and humanity and security and it lacks a consensus of how the principle works, we do know that crimes against humanity have an impact on the victims, on the international community as a whole and on security which is why the principle is so important.49

4 The Libya Crisis and the Intervention

4.1 The Crisis

On February 15th, 2011, a mass protest took place in Benghazi and a few days later a well-known human rights attorney was detained because of his work in the 1990’s representing families of massacred political prisoners. After the mass protest the civil war in Libya escalated rapidly. Some scholars believe that the civil war escalated rapidly because of various reasons: Libya lacked a civil society because Qaddafi had supressed institutions, it did not exist a middle class and the military did not face any political clouts. It was also believed that Qaddafi’s security force was not very professional. Another reason to why the war escalated very quickly was because when the uprisings started it was not peaceful, many protesters armed themselves. As the war escalated it got attention in world media and many outside actors such as the UN, the EU and other states condemned the Qaddafi regime’s use of violence. But Qaddafi did not stop the violence against his own people and just four weeks after the protests the UN Security Council passed Resolution 1973 on March 17th authorizing an intervention in Libya to protect the civilians. On March 19th, two days after the Resolution passed, NATO launched its military strikes in Libya. Even though the outside world was condemning the attacks Qaddafi refused to stop the attacks on his own people and the crisis in Libya became a high priority issue for many western states. The civil war in Libya divided the European countries and it became very clear at the time that the European Union did not have a common foreign policy. Both the French and the British governments advocated for a military solution and was leading the work on Resolution 1973. The resolution was supposed to be the base of a no-fly one in Libya. Other governments –such as the German one – choose not to intervene in Libya. The German government did not want to take military action but wanted to take economic or diplomatic action instead and support the rebels with weapons. The Germans did not think an intervention in Libya was in their national interests and an intervention could do more harm than it could do good.

---
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4.2 Security and Humanitarian Concerns

The United Nations Security Council (where both France and the UK are permanent members and are therefore being represented through the Security Council) alongside the European Union, the African Union and some individual states listed the security concerns that Libya posed, both regionally and internationally. At the time, the concerns listed was not seen as security threats but rather as security concerns. One of the biggest security concerns was the weapon smuggling. Many nearby states told the Security Council that they were aware of weapon smuggling at their boarders. The weapons were smuggled from Libya into the near Sahel region without the concerned states being able to stop the smuggling. At the time, it was believed that the weapons being smuggled were very advanced and could do great harm. Most of the weapons were smuggled by people going back to their home countries and former mercenaries, the weapons were believed to be hidden in the desert before being sold to terrorist organisations. Many of the neighbouring states enhanced their security at the borders to try to stop the inflow of the weapons. The smuggling of the weapons was not only beneficial for terror organisations but for other organisations connected to crimes as well and it increased the arms trade in some African countries. Because the weapons being smuggled were believed to be advanced and sold to terrorist organisations this was seen as a regional and international security concern. All actors cooperating with the Security Council on this matter wanted a better coordination to stop the outflow of weapons, they also wanted regional actors to bring up the issue of illegal weapon transfer and they also emphasized the importance of the weapons not being used for any armed violence. The Sahel region was of special concern for the international community as they saw an increasing of terrorist and other criminal activities in the region. The activities included abduction of Western people for ransom and hostilities with security forces. The recruitment by terrorist and criminal groups increased during the Libyan crisis, and was a great danger for youths and returning people (as these were often targeted). Terrorist groups in the region proliferated during the Libyan crisis which enhanced the concern of radicalisation among youths. The increased risk of radicalizations was of great concern for the international community –including France and the UK. The tension in the Sahel region enhanced as terrorist group Al-Qaida was believed to be cooperating with drug trafficking organisations and the leader of the National Movement for the Liberation of the Azaoud declared his desire to get rid of the terrorist group from his territory which enhanced the hostilities. The international community had a great concern for the spreading of terrorist groups and the fact that weapons seemed to disappear during a
convoy which was later thought to have been stolen by terrorist groups. The risk of terror attacks and further radicalisation was at the time great. The increased risk of terror crimes and weapon smuggling has proven to have destabilizing effects on the entire Northern region in Africa. Drug trafficking and organised crime activities have increased drastically due to the smuggling of weapons and is of great concern for the UN and its members. The lack of border controls was also of great concern for the UN and its members as they were afraid that terrorists could be in movement and endangering civilians. Both African countries and non-African countries see the importance of controlling the security concerns. Regionally border controls will be better and constitute prosecutors specially for terrorist crimes is of importance, these prosecutors should then be able to work together with Interpol. Because of the importance to stop the crimes in the region and to stop the weapon and human trafficking national actors in Africa will get support from the UN and the international community will also help by support the work against transnational organized crimes and terrorism. All states should also do their best to protect the migrants in the region as well as the ones seeking protection outside of the region.\textsuperscript{54} 

As of security concerns there are not just the concerns of organised crimes and terrorist. There are also security concerns related to humanitarianism. The United Nations has long been planning humanitarian aid services in the region but it is hard to get access to the most vulnerable territories and during the Libyan crisis it became even harder. Some of the territories formerly receiving aid from the UN is now in the control of terrorist groups and humanitarian operations is therefore hard to plan. Without humanitarian operations in these areas the UN is afraid that terrorist groups will try to recruit members from the most vulnerable areas in the region. Another concern affecting the humanitarian aid programme is the climate in some specific areas such as the Sahel-Sahara region were humanitarian operations are crucial for survival. Humanitarian operations are important for the migrants, for the people living in the Sahel-Sahara region and for the people living in the most affected areas, the UN and its members should therefore continue to support regional actors in their humanitarian operations as well as continue their own humanitarian operations.\textsuperscript{55} As of 2011 the number of migrants coming to Europe increased due to the ongoing crisis in Libya and Tunisia. Since refugees are entailed to protection under international law this could pose a


great concern for not only France and the UK but for all members in the European Union. A refugee crisis would probably be of great concern for the French administration as they have been reluctant to receive refugees. Their reluctance to accept a large number of refugees have been justified with the security threat refugees poses. Fast after the number of refugees from Tunisia and Libya increased France – who otherwise is a part of the Schengen deal – reinforced its border controls to protect themselves from the increased security threat a refugee crisis poses. More European countries followed France’s move and reinforced border controls, just as France did those European countries justified it by stating that a refugee crisis is posing a security concern. As of the UK they would not be affected as much as other European countries would in a refugee crisis as they negotiated their right to receive less refugees in the 2009 Lisbon Treaty. As the number of migrants increased the number of human smugglers also increased. The crisis however was not limited to Europe, even though the number of migrants coming to Europe increased, the number of migrants unable to leave Libya also increased. In September 2011, it was believed that around 1 000 refugees and migrants were trapped in the Tripoli shore. The people coming to the shore were civilians who tried to escape the conflict that had now moved on from Benghazi to Tripoli. Some of the civilians wanted to flee to Europe, some of them just wanted security. But the shores in Tripoli wasn’t safe for the civilians, they had nowhere to live and it was hard for aid organizations to help the people hiding out there. The civilians fleeing the fighting in Tripoli were forced to live in boats in the Tripoli shore, which made them extra vulnerable. Many of the civilians who were stuck in the shore were old and sick people, it was therefore of importance that aid organisations could get to the shores. This was a security concern which was a direct consequence of the internal war in Libya and the fact that it was an ongoing dispute made it difficult for aid organisations and other countries to ensure the civilians security and protection. The security concerns as well as the humanitarian concerns created a security dilemma and a dilemma of how to respond to the crisis.
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4.3 How Did France and the UK Interpret the Conflict?

During the 2011 Libyan crisis the United Kingdom and France were faced with both levels of the security dilemma: the dilemma of interpretation and the dilemma of response. France was the first country to take initiative on the matter and they led the international community’s work on the Libyan crisis alongside the UK and the United States. In March 2011, they chose to support an intervention in Libya to protect civilians caught in the cross fire through Resolution 1973. David Cameron who was the British Prime Minister at the time thought the threat to civilians was extensive, and was very keen to intervene in Libya. For the UK, the happenings in Libya became hard to interpret as the understanding of the events in Libya was very limited and no one in the UK monitored these events. It was also hard for decision makers in the UK to interpret the situation as it was a lack of understanding of why the events took place and why they took place in Benghazi and not in the capital Tripoli. It was also brought to light that the UK did not have any diplomats in Libya and had no insight in the country what so ever. The decision makers in the UK were afraid that groups connected to jihadism was growing during the crisis, but yet again the UK lacked information about the events and it was also a lack of information of how many people who was forced to join jihadist and other terror groups. However, Libyan extremists had been known before because of its close connections to al-Qaeda, it was therefore likely for British decision makers to believe that terrorist groups benefited from the crisis. The decision makers in the UK did not have much to go on intelligence wise when trying to understand the situation in Libya, instead a speech Qaddafi gave on TV became highly important for the understanding of the situation.

In the speech Qaddafi is talking about repeating history and his revenge on the people in Benghazi where the rebellion first started but in the same speech he also said that if the rebels put down their weapons they would come to no harm. The Brits feared that a lot of people would be in danger and a lot of people would die if Qaddafi were to attack the people of Benghazi. However, some decision makers in the UK thought the evidence of mass atrocities and danger for civilians was not enough to advocate for an intervention, they thought they needed to have more proof and a better picture of what was happening in the country.

According to some members of the British parliament, history had proven as well as recent events that Qaddafi did not attack any civilians and therefore an intervention was not justified. Even though it was a lack of evidence on Qaddafi attacking civilians and a lack of insight in the events, Prime Minister Cameron, who was the highest placed decision maker in the UK

thought civilians were in danger. What made Cameron so sure of the danger for the civilians was the speech previously mentioned where Qaddafi threatened the people in Benghazi. Cameron could not be sure that an attack would take place, but at the same time he could not be sure that it would not happen and it could cost a lot of people their life’s if an attack were to happen. Decision makers in the UK interpret the situation in Libya as a danger for the civilians which could have implications regionally and internationally.59

France was the first state to propose Resolution 1973. Initially France did not want to intervene in the conflict but as of March 2011 the French Foreign Minister said that the situation in Libya was very alarming and the civilians were according to him in great danger. The French under President Sarkozy were not only concerned about the civilians in Libya but they were also concerned about their own national interests and a possible refugee crisis. France is the home for many Libyan exiles, many of whom had connections within the French establishment and were keen for a change in Libya, they pressured the French decision makers to intervene in the conflict. As the conflict escalated the French will to intervene in the conflict became higher. However, for the French the conflict in Libya was not just a situation where they cared about the civilians, it was also a situation where France could enhance their national interest and Sarkozy could enhance his own political interests. According to people who had spoken to President Sarkozy he had five reasons to be interested in Libya during the crisis and his plan of an intervention. The plan of doing an intervention in Libya was evolving around the following five issues:

a. A desire to gain a greater share of Libya oil production,
b. Increase French influence in North Africa,
c. Improve his internal political situation in France,
d. Provide the French military with an opportunity to reassert its position in the world,
e. Address the concern of his advisors over Qaddafi’s long term plans to supplant France as the dominant power in Francophone Africa.60

The five issues would serve French national and political interest and it would enhance their position in Africa. The UK have national and political interest in Africa as well (even though they weren’t the reason to why Brits started talking about an intervention) it became a topic
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after the French declared their interests. If France were to intervene in the conflict alone it would mean that they would enhance their position in Africa at the same time as the UK’s position in Africa would decline. The UK’s interests in Africa are about the same ones as the French interest and a joint intervention would mean enhancing both country’s positions in the region. After hearing that French interests played a significant role in the interpretation of the conflict in Libya it is likely to believe that UK decision makers had a change of heart about a possible intervention in Libya. France was interested in maintaining its national and political interests in Africa but French decision makers were also worried that jihadist movements and other terror groups were recruiting members and spreading in the most vulnerable areas. The increase of terror groups posed a regional threat. France was fearing a possible refugee crisis as a direct consequence of the conflict, which was not anything they wanted to happen. France had long been reluctant to take in a large number of refugees in their country and had reinforced its border controls because of the security threat open borders and refugees posed. The security threat related to the fear of taking in terrorists into the country, growing terrorist organisations combined with a refugee crisis was therefore something French decision makers were worried about. France did interpret the situation in Libya differently than the UK did. At first the UK interpreted the conflict as a danger for the civilians while France interpreted the conflict as a danger for civilians, a risk of terrorist organisations growing, a risk for a refugee crisis and a chance for them to enhance their position in Africa by advocating their national and political interests in the region while it was in a vulnerable state. After the French interpretation of the conflict the UK was no longer just worried about the civilians in Libya. If France were to intervene in Libya alone they would strengthen their position in Africa while the UK’s position would decline. The conflict in Libya was not just France’s chance at advocating its interests in Africa, it became the UK’s chance at doing the same. Looking at how France and the UK interpreted the conflict in Libya, we can see that national interests played an important part in their desire to intervene in the conflict. In the neoclassical approach national interests are important for the survival and the security of the state. The national interests are connected with the state’s own understanding of its national interests.
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One of the interests France had for intervening in Libya was to give the French military a chance to reassert its position in the world. This means that France believed they should be one of the strongest military powers in the world and that is their understanding of their national interests. For France and the UK, it was important to enhance their position in Libya and the Sahel region which is in line with the neoclassical approach. If states can pursue their national interests are completely dependent on domestic factors. During the Libyan conflict, Libya and the Sahel region was in a vulnerable state which made it much easier for France and the UK to pursue their national interests in Libya and the Sahel region.66 In the neoclassical approach we also have anarchy, it is believed that anarchy is making states act selfish in order to survive. Neither France nor the UK would be a failed state if they chose not to intervene in the conflict but their political and national interests in Libya and the Sahel region may have been decreased unless they intervened in the conflict. The fact that France and the UK based their decision to intervene on their political and national interests could be seen as an act of selfishness in line with the neoclassical approach.67

4.3.1 Invoking Responsibility to Protect in Libya

When the principle of responsibility to protect was invoked it was the first time the UN Security Council authorized the use of force in such a case like Libya. The invoking of the principle has been criticised as France and the UK (who also had national interests in Libya) where the ones advocating for the invocation of the principle. But some say that the international community can’t move beyond national interests and they are along with legal considerations, world opinions and humanitarian impulses playing a part in decision making, the criticism is therefore not justified according to some people. However, any time a humanitarian intervention is being considered foreign decision making is hard. Humanitarian intervention is an intervention using force or peaceful means (which is what the principle is authorizing). The aim of a humanitarian intervention is to stop mass atrocities and protect the civilians but even though the aim is to protect the civilians there is always a risk that they might get hurt if they cross arms way. The UN Security Council had previously authorized individual states to invoke the principle but the Libyan crisis was the first time the UN Security Council authorized the international community to intervene in another country to
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protect the citizens. Some scholars have stated that Libya was a perfect case to invoke the principle as it fit into all the criteria’s, however, some say that’s not true as national interest were playing a part in the invocation of the principle. The invocation of the principle has been further criticised as the principle also authorises re-building but France and the UK who initially led the intervention did not help with the re-building of Libya. Some critics say that you can’t invoke the principle unless you stay for the re-building to. The fact that a state is supposed to stay in the country for the re-building of the country make the principle and the case of Libya even more complex.\(^68\) Considering France and the UK had national interests in Libya and the African region it would have made sense that they would help with the re-building in Libya. France and the UK wanted to increase their position in Libya and Africa, they saw their opportunity when the crisis broke out and wanted to make sure their interests were being increased and therefore justified an intervention in Libya by invoking the principle of responsibility to protect.\(^69\) After Libya was declared free France and the UK left Libya, they did not stay for the re-building of the country (even though the UK did do a reconstruction plan for Libya). After the intervention, the country has been unstable and the economy is declining and Libya is on the verge of yet another civil war. The principle of responsibility to protect justifies the intervening states to stay in a country in order to re-build it after a conflict. France and the UK could therefore have been staying in Libya –rightfully- if they wanted to, but instead they left the country. Considering the national interests that they had in Libya it is interesting that they did not want to stay in the country to re-build it. If they had helped with the re-building they could have increased their position in the country even further, instead it is likely to believe it is now declining. A country that is on the verge of yet another civil war is not a country were French and British national interests are increasing unless they intervene. Now if they had stayed in Libya and taken part in the re-building of the country – that the principle of responsibility to protect justifies – they could have increased their position in Libya but they chose to leave the country and that makes the intervention and the principle more complex.\(^70\) Even though some have criticised the intervention in Libya and criticised the invocation of the principle of responsibility to protect some have argued that Libya was a textbook case of how the principle is supposed to work. It was also believed that
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due to the fact that the Security Council enforced a no-fly zone when invoking the principle, they minimalized the civilian casualties. According to the United Nations Charter every state has the responsibility to protect its own population. The international community thought the Libyan government failed to uphold its responsibility to protect as Qaddafi was threatening his own people and sent his own army to “deal with the protester”, according to Qaddafi they were to show no mercy. The international community saw this as a sign of the Libyan leader committing mass atrocities and they felt the need to intervene in the conflict in order to prevent further atrocities. The international community feared the brutality that the Libyan government was showing and they saw the need for a quick response within the frameworks of the principle of responsibility to protect. Many states reacted quickly to the crisis in Libya and enforced travel bans, sanctions and the freezing of assets before agreeing on invoking the principle of responsibility to protect. After enforcing sanctions and travel bans the international community decided to invoke the principle of responsibility to protect through Resolution 1973. The quick response was in some cases connected to national interests and the motives have therefore been questioned. But some scholars argue that national interests are a natural influence in decision making. Many states were of the impression that the conflict in Libya was a clear case where the principle could be invoked, they did however not know how the principle was going to be used and that is why the principle was not invoked in Resolution 1973 until March.

4.4 How Should France and the UK Respond to the Conflict?

After interpreting the conflict in Libya, the UK and France were now faced with the security dilemma again. They had to interpret the principle of responsibility to protect (dilemma of interpretation) and they had to settled on a response (dilemma of response). The UK explored options for solving the crisis using political means, however the UK intervention was supposed to be a joint mission with France and France was not willing to solve the crisis using political means. However, the reason for French reluctance to solve the conflict peacefully is unclear. Both Cameron and Sarkozy –who were the highest decision makers at the time – thought a military intervention in Libya was the best option. Since they both
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thought a military intervention would be best, they both advocated this strongly in the UN Security Council suggesting a no-fly zone over Libya. The suggestion was made by introducing Resolution 1973 which if implemented would enforce a no-fly zone. The Resolution would invoke the responsibility to protect principle and would allow all necessary measures to protect the civilians and justifying it by invoking the principle of responsibility to protect.\(^3\) It would take some time before a proper response was decided on. France and the UK were reluctant at first to intervene in the conflict, while state’s such as Germany and the European Union were advocating for sanctions from the start. After the crisis had been going on for a while, the UK and France started advocating for a military intervention in Libya. But many states including Germany and the US did not want to intervene in the crisis using military means which made it difficult to settled on a proper response. Germany for example did not want to intervene in the conflict with military force as they thought it would do more harm to the civilians than it would do good for them. Of course, France and the UK could have settled on an intervention on their own but due to their responsibilities towards the European Union and its common foreign and security policy they wanted to explore the options of a joint intervention before settling on their own. As the Union was unable to make a joint decision the French president called for an emergency meeting in Paris in March of 2011. Invited to the meeting was some leaders from European states, the US and some representatives from Arab states. The states invited to the meeting were to decide on a joint response and evaluate the options for invoking the principle of responsibility to protect.\(^4\) This is where the first level of the security dilemma comes in. They would have to interpret the principle and interpret what kind of intervention the principle could justify. The principle is supposed to be invoked when civilians are suffering serious harm because of internal war, insurgency, repression or state failure. France and the UK made the interpretation that civilians in Libya were in danger because of an internal conflict and could therefore invoke the principle if they wanted. But they also wanted to enhance their position in Africa by advocating their own national and political interests and they wanted a regime change in Libya. It could be argued that France and the UK thought the population was being suppressed by the current government and therefore a regime change was necessary and made the interpretation that the principle of responsibility to protect could justify a regime change.

\(^3\) House of Commons Foreign Affairs Committee, *Libya: Examination of Intervention and Collapse and the UK’s Future Policy Options*

The security was very clear in the case of Libya, many states interpreted the conflict differently and no state was to act alone in an eventual intervention. However, the UK and France did advocate strongly for a military intervention. After the emergency meeting called by France it seemed as the UK, France and the US had agreed on a proper response to the conflict. They would bring up the suggestion of a no-fly zone and a military intervention to the UN Security Council. Germany, China and Russia chose to abstain from the voting as the other members in the Security Council voted for the suggestion. The UN Security Council had just decided on a joint response to the crisis and for the first time in UN history they invoked the principle of responsibility to protect by adopting Resolution 1973. France and the UK thought a military intervention in Libya was their best option for securing the civilians and promoting their political and national interests. But before a state makes its final decision it is common that all options available have been explored. However, this did not seem to be the case for France and the UK in the matter of the Libyan conflict. France advocated strongly for an armed intervention from the beginning and British Prime Minister David Cameron thought an armed intervention would be best to. Members from the House of Commons in the British Parliament have later criticised Cameron for not exploring other options such as political and economic sanctions against Libya. The fact that France and the UK did not look at any other option than a military intervention is not a coincidence. According to foreign policy scholars, decision makers will always go with the policy that is most beneficial for the state. If France and the UK wanted to promote their interests in Libya and the Sahel region the only option that would prove in their favour would be a military intervention because that would be the most beneficial response for the sake of their political and national interests in the region.
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4.5 How Did France and the UK Respond to the Conflict?

On March 20th, 2011, France started its airstrikes in Libya claiming it was important the attacks started immediately before Qaddafi’s military seized Benghazi. France justified the airstrikes by invoking the principle of responsibility to protect. Shortly after France started its airstrikes the UK did the same. The military intervention was carried out through Resolution 1973. During the first two weeks the intervention was led by France and the UK, after that NATO handled the operational command to carry through Resolution 1973. Originally Resolution 1973 only enforced a no-fly zone over Libya but authorized the states to take any necessary means to protect the civilians. However, the Resolution did not authorize any forces on the ground in Libya, it did not authorize the states to take a stand in the regime change and it did not authorize any post-conflict reconstruction. Both France and the UK thought it was crucial to respond with both airstrikes and military combats on the ground, which means that they responded to the crisis in a way which was not authorized by the Resolution and therefore not by the UN Security Council. The Resolution also concluded that the members of the UN would provide the rebels with weapons. The goal of the intervention was to protect the civilians in Benghazi, by using air force and military force. On the ground, France and the UK along with the other states taking part in the intervention managed to defeat Qaddafi’s regime in less than 24 hours. After achieving the goal of protecting the civilians in Benghazi France and the UK stayed in Libya to carry on their mission. Some critics say that France and the UK should have left Libya after defeating Qaddafi’s regime in Benghazi but both France and the UK argued that the threat to the civilians was not limited to Benghazi and therefore they needed to continue the intervention. France and the UK along with its allies in the intervention continued their intervention in Libya and added a response to their mission. They believed that they could protect the civilians in Libya by targeting command and control centres, indirectly this sometimes meant targeting individuals. Once again France and the UK moved pass Resolution 1973 as the targeting of command and control centres was not authorized by the resolution. One of the targets for the continued mission was the residence of Qaddafi, some say that the targeting of Qaddafi’s residence was in fact targeting Qaddafi himself, however the UK justified the targeting of the residence by claiming that Qaddafi’s residence was a highly important command and control centre. During the intervention France and the UK became afraid of large-scale loss of civilians, to prevent this they decided they
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needed to get rid of Qaddafì. Their wish to get rid of Qaddafì may be one explanation to why they suddenly targeted his residence, but nevertheless a regime change was not authorized in Resolution 1973 or by the United Nations. Some members within the British parliament have later stated that Prime Minister David Cameron had assured them that the only goal with the intervention was to protect civilians, which was what he was then seeking permission for. But in April Cameron along with Sarkozy and American President Barack Obama declared in a joint letter that they were going to pursue the intervention in Libya with the purpose of overthrowing Qaddafì as the leader, they did not however give a reason to why they wanted to pursue with a regime change. France and the UK (with the support from the US) continued their intervention in Libya using air force and military means on the ground. In October 2011 Qaddafì was killed and France and the UK declared Libya as a free state. France and the UK withdrew from the country shortly after this. When France and the UK responded to the crisis using military force to overthrow Qaddafì they also contributed to the destabilisation of the country. After Qaddafì was killed, everything he had built during his reign fell with him.

Libya did no longer have a government, they did not have any administration and the rule of law did no longer exist. The UK therefore decided to respond to the aftermath of the crisis by making a stabilisation plan. They did however not stay in Libya for the re-building of the country.¹⁸⁰ The UK did not justify the stabilisation plan with the principle of responsibility to protect but the principle could have been invoked as it allows states to contribute to the reconstruction of states.¹⁸¹ Some members in the British parliament blame the then British Prime Minister Cameron for the destabilisation of the country and stated that if France and the UK had not been so decisive on responding with military force the country might still be stable. Instead of responding with military force the proper response should have been negotiations in early 2011. Members of the British parliament believed that by responding with negotiations they could have protected civilians and made a political reform in a peaceful way.¹⁸² Some scholars have later criticised the intervention and especially the use of the principle of responsibility to protect. The principle is an emerging norm in the international community and some believe that it can affect the implementation of the norm which would also affect the use and interpretation of it. The principle of responsibility to protect should

¹⁸⁰ House of Commons Foreign Affairs Committee, *Libya: Examination of Intervention and Collapse and the UK’s Future Policy Options*
¹⁸¹ Evans G & Sahnoun M, *International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty, Responsibility to Protect*
¹⁸² House of Commons Foreign Affairs Committee, *Libya: Examination of Intervention and Collapse and the UK’s Future Policy Options*
only be invoked when there is signs of mass atrocity, human rights violations and genocides, some scholars therefore criticised the way France, the UK and the United Nations used the principle of responsibility to protect to justify its intervention in Libya as the critics claims there was no clear signs of the mentioned atrocities. Critics, France and the UK interpreted the conflict and the principle of responsibility to protect differently and that shows that the security dilemma was very much alive in the Libya crisis.\textsuperscript{83} France and the UK decided to intervene in Libya by the use of force. Security foreign policy is usually defined by the threat, the use and the control of military force. When it comes to security a state’s behaviour depends on the relative power the state has in its possession.\textsuperscript{84} Following this logic it is not a coincidence that France and the UK chose to intervene militarily in Libya. They both wanted to enhance their security (the French were afraid of a refugee crisis) and they both wanted to increase their position in Libya and the Sahel region.\textsuperscript{85} Both France and the UK had more relative power than Libya and therefore a military intervention would most likely prove in their advantage. In the realistic approach, it is not unusual that states chose to go to war. In fact, there are five major reasons for the beginning of a war:

1. War is a natural product of the anarchical system.
2. Major wars occur when there are dramatic shifts in the relative strength of great powers (hegemonic stability theory).
3. Major wars occur to prevent the rise of a hegemon (balance-of-power theory).
4. More general “rationalist” theories of the expected utility of war.
5. Minor wars are diversionary tools to distract the public from the poor domestic performance of the government.\textsuperscript{86}

Some of the above-mentioned theories are explaining major wars, which is not relevant in the case of Libya, but some of them are explaining why minor wars break out. It is a difference between internal conflicts and major conflicts and therefore these theories can not explain why an internal conflict broke out in Libya, it can only explain the response.\textsuperscript{87} The French and British response to the Libyan conflict was justified by the principle of responsibility to
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protect and was therefore a humanitarian intervention. Scholars who advocate for the principle of responsibility to protect and for humanitarian interventions would argue that the response was not a war as it was a response to a conflict where France and the UK intervened to protect the civilians.\textsuperscript{88} But it is a second dimension to the response, the political and national interests that France and the UK had in Libya and the Sahel region, they did not intervene in Libya solely for the sake of the civilians, they intervened for their own gaining as well. Bringing in the neoclassical approach in this, states always want to gain more power which is exactly what France and the UK had an opportunity to do if they responded to the crisis by military force. According to the neoclassical approach anarchy is the reason for conflicts in the world. The French and British respond to the crisis would be – according to a neoclassical approach – that the response is a natural product of the anarchical system, with other words the first theory of the above-mentioned five theories.\textsuperscript{89} But the intervention was justified by the principle of responsibility to protect and most scholars therefore see the French and British intervention as an humanitarian intervention and not as a war, but of course the nature of the intervention can be discussed even further with the help of neoclassical realism and theories of humanitarian intervention. What can be said with certainty of the French and British response to the conflict is that it was driven by political and national interests to promote their position in Libya and the Sahel region and gain more power which is following the lines of the neoclassical approach.\textsuperscript{90}

\textsuperscript{89} Beach D, \textit{Analyzing Foreign Policy}, p. 17-22  
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5 Conclusion

5.1 Results

Should the principle of responsibility to protect override state sovereignty? After years of witnessing genocides and mass atrocities the international community thought it was time to do something about it. In 1999 UN Security Council General Kofi Annan made a statement emphasizing the importance of the international community being able to respond to mass atrocities. The statement made by Annan was the beginning of the principle of responsibility to protect. In 2005 the principle was adopted unanimously in the United Nations General Assembly and the principle of responsibility to protect became the international communities answer to mass atrocities and genocides. And today, the principle is well respected in most of the countries, North Korea and Venezuela have not recognized the principle. The international community can with the help of the principle know when an intervention is justified. However, the principle is much more complex than it seems to be and it deals with the security dilemma. The international community is however agreeing on the fact that the principle of responsibility to protect should override state sovereignty. When a state is seeking to invoke the principle that state will have to interpret the principle, it might be clear to one state that the principle should be invoked but another state can interpret the principle differently and make a different decision. It is hard to say for sure that the principle of responsibility to protect should override state sovereignty, the international community might think so theoretically but in reality many more elements needs to be dealt with before invoking the principle.

Did the principle of responsibility to protect violate Libya’s sovereignty? To justify the invocation of the principle of responsibility to protect there must be clear evidence of genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes or ethnic cleansing. A state can also intervene if a population is suffering serious harm because of internal war, insurgency, repression or state failure. Looking at the Libyan crisis neither France nor the UK or the UN had any evidence of genocide, war crimes, crimes against humanity or ethnic cleansing in Libya which
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could have justified the invocation of the principle of responsibility to protect. But it was an internal conflict in the country and the people in Libya was suffering, which is enough for invoking the principle of responsibility to protect.\textsuperscript{93} But France and the UK wanted to enhance their position in Africa, national and political interest can not be justified by the principle of responsibility to protect. However, some scholars argue that national interests are a natural influence in decision making and is therefore a justified reason for invoking the principle of responsibility to protect. But many more scholars believe the opposite.\textsuperscript{94} In the neoclassic approach advocating for your national interests in order to gain more power is not unusual and once again it is possible to see the connection between the response and the neoclassical approach.\textsuperscript{95} By connecting the principle of responsibility to protect to neoclassical realism we might get an answer to why it was justified through the principle. According to neoclassical theorists, states are always looking to gain more power and to enhance their security, and every decision that is being made is driven by the amount of power a state has in its possession. Both France and the UK believed there was some important security concerns related to the crisis which made it possible for them to enhance their position in the region. Of course, those security concerns did not only let them enhance their position in the region they were – of course – worried of the impact the security concerns might have. This is connected to the security dilemma as they had to interpret the security concerns and then decide on a proper response, which was to invoke the principle of responsibility to protect. Going back to the principle of responsibility to protect, the principle can be invoked when a population is suffering because of internal war, the wish to protect the civilians was therefore justified by the invocation of the principle. But France and the UK wanted to intervene because of their political and national interests which cannot be justified by the principle. They also wanted to get rid of Qaddafi and make sure there was a regime change in Libya, Regime changes are not justified by the principle of responsibility to protect. If France and the UK believed the Libyan government under Qaddafi was repressing the population the regime change could have been invoked rightfully. However, there is not any records that proves that France and the UK thought the population was suffering because of repression. The protection of civilians and the invocation of the principle was authorized in resolution 1973. However, this Resolution only authorized a no-fly zone and nothing else. As of the regime change and
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intervening Libya on the ground with military combats was not authorized by the resolution and was purely driven by national interests and the principle of responsibility to protect is not justified here. Like previously stated the regime change could have been justified by the principle if France or the UK thought the government was repressing the population Libya, however it does not exist any evidence that the French nor the Brits thought the government was repressing the population and therefore it cannot be argued that the principle could justify the regime change. The crisis can be divided into two separate interventions, the first one being the implementation of a no-fly zone where the principle was invoked with right. Since the principle was rightfully invoked Libya’s sovereignty was not violated. But the second part of the intervention was when France and the UK chose to stay in Libya even though they had completed their mission to protect the civilians in Benghazi. In this second part of the intervention they wanted a regime change and regime changes are not justified by the principle of responsibility to protect unless it is interpreted that the population is being repressed by the current government but the UK and France did not make that interpretation. And it should therefore not have been used to justify a further intervention. However, this is a very complex matter and it is connected to the security dilemma of interpretation and response. If a state makes the interpretation that the government is repressing the population one could easily make the interpretation that the principle of responsibility to protect can justify a regime change. But based on the interpretation France and the UK did there is not evidence of repression from the government and the regime change should not have been justified by the principle of responsibility to protect and therefore it could be argued that the regime change was in fact violating Libya’s sovereignty. In order to tackle the humanitarian crisis, France and the UK could have thought that the removal of Qaddafii was in fact protecting the civilians and a regime change was just a means to the humanitarian goal. The primary objective of the intervention was the protection of the civilians and the intervention was rightfully justified by the principle of responsibility to protect. If the primary objective had been a regime change and not the protection of the civilians the intervention could not have been rightfully justified by responsibility to protect and the intervention would have violated Libya’s sovereignty. But the decision makers in France and the UK never gave a
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reason to why they thought a regime change was necessary, we cannot therefore possibly know if the regime change was a means to protect the civilians and the question becomes very complex.\(^9\) It is interesting that France and the UK justified their intervention and the regime change in Libya with the principle of responsibility protect. If the international community is well aware of and are agreeing on when to invoke the principle both France and the UK would have known that it wasn’t justified to invoke it for a regime change. The question is very complex but it seems as though the primary objective of the intervention was to protect the civilians in Libya and that is rightfully justified by the invocation of the principle of responsibility to protect and Libya’s state sovereignty was most likely not violated. But it is possible to discuss the regime change and some would argue that the regime change was violating Libya’s state sovereignty.

*How did France and the UK perceive the situation in Libya and how did they respond to it?*

The UK and France shared some common concerns for the ongoing conflict in Libya. They were both worried about security and humanitarian concerns which was a direct consequence of the Libyan crisis. Some of the security and humanitarian concerns were regional concerns but some of them were concerns internationally. Weapons were being trafficked over the borders and placed in the hands of terror and crime organizations, terror organizations recruited youths fleeing from the crisis, aid could not be provided in some of the affected areas. For France, the increasing chance of terror crimes was the most important concerns as this posed a threat regionally but could be an international threat as well.\(^1\) For France some of the security concerns where connected with the fear of a refugee crisis. France had already closed its borders to manage the inflow of refugees, stating a high inflow was a security risk. The UK was not as worried of an eventual refugee crisis as they had negotiated about the Schengen deal and had closed borders already.\(^2\) At first the UK were only focused at the civilians in the beginning. If Qaddafi were to revenge the rebels in Benghazi the UK believed the civilians there were in great danger. The UK thought that the endangerment of the civilians could have implications regionally as well as internationally. For France the fear of a refugee crisis and political and national interests played a big part in the interpretation of the conflict. The oil in Libya was of interest for the French as well as its potential to increase their influence in the African region. The UK had national interests in Libya and the African region

---

\(^2\) Park J, *New York: Council of Foreign Relations, Europe’s Migration Crisis*
as well, and they were not going to let France increase its influence in Africa at the cost of British influence declining. After it was clear what the French had in sight, the British interests in the conflict became more than protecting the civilians.\textsuperscript{102} Even though France and the UK interpreted the situation slightly different in the beginning they were on the same page regarding an intervention. They both advocated for a military intervention in Libya to protect the civilians in Benghazi. With the implementation of Resolution 1973 the UN Security Council invoked the principle of responsibility to protect. The resolution authorized a no-fly zone over Libya and within 24 hours the UK and France had reach its goal of protecting the civilians in Benghazi. However, after the goal was reached they both stated that it was not only the people in Benghazi who needed protection and they stayed in Libya. In April British Prime Minister Cameron, French President Sarkozy and the American President Obama stated in a joint letter that they would continue their intervention in Libya with the purpose of overthrowing Qaddafi, but in the letter, they never stated why they wanted a regime change. After the joint statement had been made official, France and the UK started air striking and intervened military with combats on the ground. The regime change, the air striking and the military combats were not authorized by Resolution 1973 and the continued intervention have been criticized for not being in the Libyan people’s interests but in French and British national interests. Qaddafi was killed in October 2011 and shortly after this both France and the UK withdrew their forces from Libya.\textsuperscript{103}
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