

УДК 321

THE “ARAB SPRING” AND THE US PARTICIPATION IN THE “HUMANITARIAN INTERVENTION” IN LIBYA

“АРАБСЬКА ВЕСНА” І УЧАСТЬ США В “ГУМАНІТАРНІЙ ІНТЕРВЕНЦІЇ” В ЛІВІЇ

Mammadova Naila Khudagulu

PhD student, Baku Slavic University, naila4@rambler.ru

Scientific supervisor: prof. Mammadov Habil Nurkishi

Мамедова Наиля Худагулу

Дисертант Бакинського Слов'янського університету, naila4@rambler.ru

Научный руководитель: проф. Мамедов Хабиль Нуркиши оглу

Abstract. *The article examines in detail the attitude of the United States to the “Arab Spring”, issues related to their participation in the “humanitarian intervention” in Libya. In order to better analyze the Obama administration’s approach to the spread of democracy in foreign policy practice, it is necessary to look at how it reacts to events taking place in the context of democratization around the world. After the terror of 2001, new elements of the manifestation and methods of applying the “humanitarian intervention” of the United States are emerging, one of the clearest examples of which is America’s participation in humanitarian intervention in Libya.*

Key words: *USA, Libya, Humanitarian intervention, Arab spring, democracy, rights and freedoms, Obama administration.*

Анотація. *У статті детально розглядається ставлення Сполучених Штатів до “арабської весни”, питання, пов’язані з їх участю в “гуманітарній інтервенції” в Лівії. Щоб краще проаналізувати підхід адміністрації Обами до поширення демократії в зовнішньополітичній практиці, необхідно подивитися, як вона реагує на події, що відбуваються в контексті демократизації по всьому світу. Після терору 2001 року з’являються нові елементи прояву і методи застосування “гуманітарної інтервенції” Сполучених Штатів, одним з найяскравіших прикладів чого є участь Америки в гуманітарній інтервенції в Лівії.*

Ключові слова: *США, Лівія, гуманітарна інтервенція, арабська весна, демократія, права і свободи, адміністрація Обами.*

Introduction. The main event on which the Obama administration’s policy on the spread of democracy was tested was the popular uprisings, which were described as the “Arab Spring” and covered many countries of the Middle East and North Africa. In the face of the popular uprisings that began in Tunisia on December 17, 2010, and then spread to many countries, leading to the overthrow of leaders in Tunisia, Egypt, Libya and Yemen, it was very difficult for the Obama administration to clarify its policy. This is due to the fact that the Obama administration, realizing the historical mission of the United States, faced a dilemma to correct the negative image of its predecessor regarding the spread of democracy in the Arab world and its mission to support democratic uprisings. In addition, in some countries, the organization of demonstrations against leaders who are US allies has made it difficult for the Obama administration to explain its position.

The purpose of the research is to determine the place of the idea of spreading democracy in the foreign policy of the Obama administration and study it on the example of humanitarian intervention in Libya.

The latest literature review. In recent years, scholars have paid considerable attention the “Arab Spring” related to their participation in the “humanitarian intervention” in Libya. Here we can specify the works of such authors as Marshall A., Asgarova N.N., Stewart P. and others who have covered this problem.

Research results. The promises made by Obama during his coming to power instilled confidence in the peoples living in the region that peace and stability will be established in the Middle East, which can be expected. The spread of various versions that Obama was a Muslim gave people confidence that this hope could be justified. The movement, called the “Arab Spring”, was initiated by people inspired by universal ideas and thoughts demanding an end to the authoritarian regime and bribery, freedom, and social justice. The difference between the policies pursued by Obama and Bush was only that Obama focused his attention not on military power, but on the discontented masses and their activities promoted through social networks [Əsgərova, 2018, pp.116-117].

The “Arab Spring” in the Middle East has once again reminded the whole world of the concept of “humanitarian interventions”. First of all, we are talking about the events in Libya in 2011. The outbreak of the civil war in February 2011 was caused by various factors. The driving force was educated youth who actively used modern social networks (for example, Facebook). Young people were dissatisfied with the socio-economic and political situation in the country: high unemployment and food prices, the inability to move up the social ladder, the rule of lawlessness, complete lack of political rights in conditions of corruption, rigid authoritarianism. In addition, there was a traditional enmity between the clans: conflicts between the eastern province – Cyrenaica and the Western – Tripolitania [Intervyu s Vitaliem Naumkinyim, 2011].

Despite serious arguments in favor of internal trends that led to the start of protest movements, unlike other countries in the Middle East that were swept up in a wave of protest movements, external intervention in Libya played an important role.

The events in the Balkans in the 1990s were logically repeated in Libya in 2011. After the outbreak of armed clashes, the UN Security Council imposes sanctions against the regime of Muammar Gaddafi by resolution 1970 of February 26, 2011. In the document, the UN Security Council member countries demanded to stop human rights violations, ensure the arrival of international observers in the country, impose an arms embargo, and call on all countries to freeze the accounts of Muammar Gaddafi, his relatives and friends [U.N. Security Council Resolution № 1970, 2011].

Nevertheless, the postulates of the resolution are clearly violated: Libya has received weapons for both government troops and rebel groups. Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov said in an interview on September 27, 2011: “We believe that the reputation of the UN Security Council has been damaged, because, in my opinion, no one has obviously ever violated decisions in such a rude way. It has already been openly acknowledged that even the 1970 resolution, adopted by consensus and providing for the introduction of a full military embargo on arms trade and military services with Libya, was violated” [Intervyu s Vitaliem Naumkinyim, 2011]. Such activities contributed to the further aggravation of the conflict and foreshadowed the possible armed intervention of international forces.

Western countries saw the main source of all the troubles in Libya in the ruler Muammar Gaddafi. His personality was in the center of attention of the entire world community, as was the figure of Milosevic. He became the main criminal accused of violating human rights. As a result of the intolerance of government forces towards the opposition and an increasing number of armed clashes, on March 17, 2011, the UN Security Council adopted resolution 1973 banning flights of Libyan aircraft [U.N. Security Council Resolution № 1973, 2011]. At the same time, in this document, the members of the UN Security Council called on other countries and regional organizations to take all necessary measures to protect the civilian population throughout Libya, but ruled out the occupation of the territory of Libya by another state. As in the case of Kosovo, NATO countries, mainly the United States and France, have begun to actively carry out humanitarian and

military intervention in Libya, declaring to the whole world that they are protecting the rights of the Libyan civilian population fighting for liberation from a ruthless dictator.

The United States reacted for the first time to the protests in Libya, which began on December 17, 2010, on February 24. The fact that Obama stressed the need for the world to take a unified position in the face of the crisis, and told then US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton that he would go to Geneva, Switzerland, for consultations with other countries, was a hint of the US desire to share responsibility here. By saying that the Gaddafi government must respond, Obama thus demonstrated that he has the right to protest in Libya.

The harsh steps taken by Muammar Gaddafi to suppress the protests have again put the US-Libyan relations in a tense state. The Obama administration has started imposing sanctions again, severing relations with Gaddafi. Obama decided to freeze Gaddafi's assets in the United States in the amount of about \$ 30 billion, so as not to use them against the opposition during the revolution. \$150 million of these assets were used to support the opposition. The most obvious step, showing the extent to which the uprising that began in Libya affected relations, was made by White House Press Secretary Jay Carney. Carney said Gaddafi's legitimacy had fallen to zero. After these statements, the United States gradually resumed its support for the opposition and moved away from a joint decision in which Gaddafi would also participate.

Senior officials of the Obama administration actively participated in the information and psychological conflict during the Libyan war. U.S. Secretary of State H. Clinton accused the forces of Libyan leader Muammar Gaddafi of using violence against women as a "tool of war" in June 2011. Hillary Clinton said the United States is "deeply concerned" by news of widespread violence in Libya and "concerned" by news of the use of sexual violence by governments in the Middle East and North Africa to punish protesters. "There have been cases of violence, physical intimidation, sexual harassment and even so-called "virginity tests" in the countries of the region" [Clinton Accuses Gaddafi of Using Rape as a Tool, 2011].

At the same time, one of the key respondents of Amnesty International, who was in Libya for three months after the start of the uprising against Gaddafi, said: "We have not found any evidence, not even a doctor who knew about at least one person who was a victim of violence or someone who was subjected to violence" [Marshall, A. G., 2011].

Looking at the real situation in this process, we can say that Barack Obama shaped his Libyan policy based on three factors. These are: 1. Comprehensive economic sanctions 2. Travel restrictions on Libyan citizens 3. The role of the United States in possible military intervention and methods of intervention.

With the outbreak of unrest in Libya, economic sanctions quickly came into force, as well as travel restrictions were imposed. The possibility of intervention, the third and most important point, has been an issue that the Obama administration has been working on and has been striving for a long time.

The US distancing itself from the situation in Libya, first of all, showed the goal of developing a policy in accordance with the development of events. Two days after President Obama's statement, adopted on February 26, 2011, the UN Security Council began to involve him in the process in Libya. This decision condemned Gaddafi's violation of human rights against his people. The Obama administration's intervention in Libya began with the imposition of economic sanctions ten days after the unrest began. This situation can also be seen as a manifestation of Obama's desire to intervene in Libya. It can be said that the US desire to intervene in Libya stems from the Obama administration's security concept. The idea that instability in Libya could lead to an influx of refugees to Europe and that this situation could negatively affect US European allies played an important role in the intervention. Indeed, the flow of refugees from and through Libya, led by Italy and Greece, has from time to time led to humanitarian crises in the Mediterranean.

Barack Obama wanted to reflect the lessons learned from the mistakes of the George Bush era regarding foreign policy under the following headings:

1. Interventions will be costly.
2. The US should not act alone.

3. Regional interventions are possible indirectly, in other words, by proxy.

4. The US must act together with global and regional organizations when it comes to humanitarian intervention.

The processes taking place in the Middle East and North Africa in the early years of Obama's presidency required the United States to develop new methods and concepts in foreign policy. In foreign policy, Obama's priorities were not to repeat the mistakes of the George Bush era and to increase the economic power of the United States. After the overthrow of these regimes, the United States, which had been developing relations with authoritarian regimes in these regions for many years, it was important to reflect the priorities of decision-making processes in foreign policy, as well as the policies they would follow. It was expected that the United States would approach the new era taking into account national interests. If we look at this issue specifically in Libya, Barack Obama said that he made the biggest mistake during his presidency in Libya.

Relations between the United States and Libya, built during the George Bush era on the basis of "neither friendship nor enmity," have entered a new era. But improving relations could further strengthen the regime in Libya and lead to maintaining the status quo. Muammar Gaddafi's regime was by no means an ideal partner for US interests. How should the US deal with the increasingly authoritarian Gaddafi regime? In response to this question, two reviews came to the fore. These are: 1) it is better to intervene in Libya than to stay away from it, especially given the existence of other countries and the advantages they can take advantage of. 2) While Muammar Gaddafi is in power, the US should stay away from Libya. Staying clean is a better choice than getting tangled up in the Libyan issue and getting dirty.

The second opinion has lost its influence over time. The US had more advantages in an oil-rich country like Libya. In addition, the attempts of the Gaddafi regime to improve relations with the United States were enough for Washington to forget about the second opinion. The first glance was noticeable even under Barack Obama. Being in Libya was a better choice than staying outside Libya.

During the time of Barack Obama, the 2010 National Security Document, planned in contrast to the Bush Jr. era, had an extensive conceptualization of security and a very specific understanding. With Obama, the concept of US security has changed dramatically. According to George Bush, countries like Iraq and Afghanistan had to be transformed and democratized militarily. Because democracy was considered a moral responsibility and a strategic benefit. In this regard, while the George W. Bush administration pursued a more interventionist and narrow security perception policy, Obama's priorities were different. According to Obama, the United States should remain a superpower, but for this it is necessary to create a powerful economic potential. In this context, the Obama administration, unlike the Bush administration, preferred to share the responsibilities of the United States around the world with its allies rather than take on them alone. For Obama, who considered the American economy a priority, it was "stupid" to incur economic losses as a result of international interference, and interference should be avoided. Shortly after taking office, the situation in the Middle East and North Africa provided an important opportunity to test Obama's foreign policy [Stewart, P., 2011].

As reflected in the statements of President Obama and Secretary of State Hillary Clinton in the following days of unrest in Libya, Muammar Gaddafi's use of force against his people was a violation of human rights, and this situation could not be ignored. Although this side of events is reflected in the statements, the price of oil exceeded \$ 100 per barrel for the first time since 2008 after the events in Libya, which has rich oil reserves. It was predicted that such a situation would damage the economies of the US and the EU. On the other hand, while long-standing bad relations with Libya tended to improve under Bush, Gaddafi was a leader who was viewed with suspicion in terms of being a reliable partner for the United States. That's why a democratic Libya without Gaddafi was the most suitable option for the United States. It was also very important that the axis of strategically important Libya shifted to the west in response to China's growing influence on the African continent.

The fact that the US does not want to act independently in connection with the events in Libya, but rather prefers to act by making joint decisions with international organizations such as the UN and NATO, was also reflected in Obama's statements. However, in order to make a decision in this direction from the UN Security Council, it was necessary to coordinate two states; Russia and China. On the other hand, NATO's commitment to unanimous decision-making required all member countries to be ready to intervene. Among the states that avoided an open position at the beginning of the events were Germany and Turkey.

The UN Security Council met on March 17, 2011 to decide what happened in Libya. Five permanent members and ten non-permanent Member States voted. The USA, Great Britain, France, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Colombia, Gabon, Portugal, Lebanon, Nigeria, South Africa abstained, China, Russia, India, Germany and Brazil abstained. The resolution was adopted with 10 votes in favor and 5 abstentions [OON: Mezhdousobnaya borba v Livii privodit k massovyim peremescheniyam naseleniya, 2021].

After the decision, a meeting was held at noon on March 19, 2011 with the participation of French President Nicolas Sarkozy, UN Secretary – General Ban Ki-moon, US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, British Prime Minister David Cameron and German Chancellor Angela Merkel. After the meeting, airstrikes were carried out in Libya. On March 27, NATO Secretary General Rasmussen announced that NATO would take over all military operations in Libya to ensure full implementation of the UN resolutions of 1970 and 1973. NATO assumed full military responsibility on March 31. In a NATO statement on April 1, it was announced that the Libyan mission consists of three elements. The mission in question was defined as the control of the international arms embargo on Libya, the introduction of a no-fly zone and the protection of civilians from the threat of attack or attack [Stewart, P., 2011].

The essence of the intervention in Libya was based on the doctrine of the so-called “responsibility to protect” adopted by the United States before the “Arab Spring”. This doctrine is based on three main approaches. These approaches:

1. Obligation to protect against genocide, war crimes and crimes against humanity;
2. The obligation of developing countries to protect mutual support of the situations specified in the first approach;
3. The obligation to protect, aimed at intervening in the situations specified in the first approach, through the UN.

The form and logic of intervention in Libya were ready for the United States, since this doctrine was to become the basis of humanitarian interventions. However, the goal of humanitarian intervention with the concept of responsibility for preservation has turned into an insincere policy with logistics and significant intelligence support provided to the opposition in Libya before the intervention.

The intervention was aimed at overthrowing the regime, not humanitarian content. US Secretary of Defense Robert Gates announced that the main purpose of the intervention in the first stage would be to attack regime soldiers, cut supply lines and target ammunition depots. This situation showed that the original goal was to overthrow the regime, not to end the humanitarian crisis. According to the statement of the US Ambassador to the UN, Susan Rice, the belief that Muammar Gaddafi's uprising in Libya could lead to a situation similar to what happened in Rwanda became the basis for supporting intervention.

On August 4, 2011, the Obama administration adopted the directive on “Mass Crimes” (PSD-10) [Presidential Study Directive on Mass Atrocities, 2011]. This document reflected the prevention of mass crimes as the main area of national security and moral responsibility of the United States. Most importantly, the directive gave the United States the right to fight massive human rights violations using both economic sanctions and warships [Stewart, P., 2011]. Thus, the country's leadership assumed that the concept of “humanitarian interventions” could be used in the future.

The example of the Bosnian, Kosovo and Macedonian crises in the Balkans shows how and what methods the United States used to achieve its goal. Here we can draw many parallels with the

policy of the United States and NATO regarding the situation around Libya (2011). In the conflict in Libya, Washington avoided direct armed intervention, actually authorized by the UN Security Council (as in the conflict in Kosovo in 1999), as well as direct support for the opposition (as in Serbia in 2000) and active information warfare (Albanian freedom fighters of Kosovo, Libya used such efforts as creating a positive image of the opposition and involving allies (as in the NATO operation in Kosovo) and actively lobbying their interests and evading agreements that they do not consider useful (as in Macedonia in 2001). The methods and mechanisms of action of the United States and its allies in Libya were not new, all of them have already been actively and successfully tested within the framework of the concept of “humanitarian interventions” under the guise of fighting for human rights in the Balkans.

The military campaign, which lasted almost 8 months, led to the overthrow of the Gaddafi government and the liquidation of the Jamahiriya, a special public (according to some experts of the state) body that existed in Libya from 1977 to 2011. Power in the country has passed into the hands of the National Transitional Council. The intervention also led to the outbreak of the Second Libyan Civil War and the strengthening of the Islamic State in Libya. After that, a stable Government has not been formed in the country, and a high level of political instability remains. It was not possible to establish the total number of dead and wounded. According to some reports, more than 700 civilians were killed and more than 4,000 wounded. According to other estimates, 1,100 people were killed and 4,500 injured as a result of the bombing by NATO aircraft [Zhertvyi natovskih bombardirovok v Livii, 2012, p.54]. During the armed conflict, more than 400,000 refugees were forced to leave Libya [OON: Mezhdousobnaya borba v Livii privodit k massovym peremescheniyam naseleniya, 2021].

In practice, Obama has ensured that the United States does not act alone on the issue of intervention in Libya. As with the interventions in Iraq and Afghanistan, he avoided direct military intervention, which would have resulted in high costs. In Syria, it was necessary to make huge efforts to overthrow the regime of Bashar al-Assad supported by Iran and Russia. In this context, Obama has achieved another goal by participating in Syria not directly, but by proxy.

Conclusions. Thus, NATO’s humanitarian intervention in Libya under the leadership of the United States ultimately did not lead to the full restoration of the violated rights of Libyans, the emergence of a new democracy, where power simply changed, and the Middle East country, which has been leading in recent years in terms of social welfare, plunged into the vortex of civil war. In other words, the humanitarian intervention in Libya has not been successful. Along with the failure of democratization in Libya, the gaps in power created a favorable environment for Al-Qaeda and ISIS and made Libya a potential source of terrorist organizations. Although the Libyan Government’s military operations to clean up these organizations have significantly reduced the influence of terrorist organizations, the struggle for power has dragged Libya into a civil war.

References

1. Clinton Accuses Gaddafi of Using Rape as a Tool (17.06.2011) // Hindustan Times. URL: www.hindustantimes.com/world-news/Ameri-cas/Clinton-accuses-Gaddafi-of-using-rape-as-a-tool/Article1-710387.aspx (09.03.2021).
2. Əsgərova, N.N. (2018). Müasir mərhələdə ABŞ-ın Yaxın Şərq siyasəti: Tarix üzrə fəlsəfə doktoru elmi dərəcəsi almaq üçün təqdim olunmuş Dissertasiya. Bakı, 2018, 157.
3. Marshall, A. G. (26.08.2011). Lies, War, and Empire: NATO’s “Humanitarian Imperialism” in Libya. URL: www.andrewgavinmarshall.com/2011/08/26/lies-war-and-empire-nato%E2%80%99s-%E2%80%9Chumanitarian-imperialism%E2%80%9D-in-libya/ (09.03.2021).
4. Presidential Study Directive on Mass Atrocities. (04.08.2011). The White House. August 04, 2011. URL: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2011/08/04/presidential-study-directive-mass-atrocities> (дата обращения: 04.10.2021).
5. Stewart, P. (26.08.2011). Libya and the Future of Humanitarian Intervention // Foreign Affairs. August 26, 2011 URL: <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/68233/stewart-patrick/libya-and-the-future-of-humanitarian-intervention> (дата обращения: 19.07.2021).

6. U.N. Security Council Resolution № 1970. (26.02.2011). Adopted by the Security Council at its 6491th meeting, on 26 February 2011. URL: [http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/ UNDOC /GEN/N11/245/58/ PDF /N1124558.pdf?OpenElement](http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N11/245/58/PDF/N1124558.pdf?OpenElement) (дата обращения: 01.07.2022).
7. U.N. Security Council Resolution № 1973. (17.03.2011). Adopted by the Security Council at its 6498th meeting, on 17 March 2011. URL: <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2011/sc10200.doc.htm#Resolution> (дата обращения: 12.02.2022).
8. Zhertyi natovskih bombardirovok v Livii (2012) // Zarubezhnoe voennoe obozrenie, 2012. -# 1 (778), с.48-56
9. Intervyu ministra inostrannyih del S. Lavrova telekanalu «Rossiya-2». 27 sentyabrya 2011 g. URL: <http://www.vesti.ru/doc.html?id=581160> (data obrascheniya: 08.11.2021).
10. Intervyu s Vitaliem Naumkinyim (04.03.2011) // O situatsii na Blizhnem Vostoke i ne tolko / “Kommersant’-Online”,. URL: <http://www.kommersant.ru/doc/1596489>, (data obrascheniya: 21.10.2020).
11. OON: Mezhdousobnaya borba v Livii privodit k massovyim peremescheniyam naseleniya. (30.10.2021) -URL: <http://www.un.org/russian/news/ru/print.asp?newsid=22683> (data obrascheniya: 30.10.2021).
12. Ofitsialnyiy Tripoli nazval chislo pogibshih ot bombardirovok NATO. (14.07.2011) - URL: <http://www.km.ru/v-mire/2011/07/14/voina-v-livii/liviya-obyavila-chislo-pogibshikh-ot-bombardirovok-nato> (data obrascheniya: 30.10.2021).