AGORA International Journal of Juridical Sciences, http://univagora.ro/jour/index.php/aijjs
ISSN 1843-570X, E-ISSN 2067-7677
Vol. 19, No. 2 (2025), pp. 346-355

THE INTERVENTION IN LIBYA: LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS AND THE FIRST DECADE AFTER GADDAFI

A.I. BOGDAN

Adrian Ionuț Bogdan
Babeș-Bolyai University of Cluj-Napoca, Romania
E-mail: adrianionutbogdan@gmail.com

Abstract: *The 2011 international intervention in Libya constitutes a pivotal case in contemporary debates on the use of force, humanitarian intervention, and the Responsibility to Protect (R2P). Authorized by United Nations Security Council Resolutions 1970 and 1973, the intervention was justified as a necessary measure to prevent imminent mass atrocities against civilians, particularly in the city of Benghazi. While the operation was widely regarded as legally grounded and normatively legitimate in its initial phase, its long-term consequences have generated sustained legal, political, and ethical controversy. This article provides a comprehensive analysis of the Libyan intervention by examining its legal basis, operational implementation, and the first decade following the collapse of the Gaddafi regime. It argues that although the intervention likely succeeded in averting an immediate humanitarian catastrophe, it failed to ensure sustainable post-conflict stabilization. The absence of a coherent strategy for institutional reconstruction, security sector reform, and political reconciliation contributed to prolonged state fragmentation, civil conflict, and regional destabilization, particularly in the Sahel. By situating the Libyan case within broader debates on R2P and collective security, the article highlights the risks associated with ambiguous Security Council mandates and premature international disengagement. It concludes that future humanitarian interventions must integrate a robust "Responsibility to Rebuild" in order to reconcile civilian protection with long-term peace and governance.*

Keywords: *Libya, intervention, protests.*

Introduction

The 2011 intervention in Libya represents one of the most controversial episodes in the post–Cold War evolution of international law governing the use of force. Conducted under the authorization of the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) and framed as a humanitarian intervention grounded in the doctrine of the Responsibility to Protect (R2P), the Libyan case was initially celebrated as a landmark moment for the protection of civilians. However, more than a decade later, Libya remains mired in political fragmentation, armed conflict, and institutional collapse, raising profound questions about the legality, legitimacy, and long-term consequences of the intervention.

This article examines the Libyan intervention from a legal and political perspective, focusing on three interrelated dimensions: (1) the context and escalation of violence that precipitated international action; (2) the legal basis of the intervention, with particular emphasis on UNSC Resolutions 1970 and 1973 and the role of R2P; and (3) the immediate and longer-term consequences of regime collapse, with special attention to the first decade following the

fall of Muammar Gaddafi. By situating the Libyan case within broader debates on humanitarian intervention and post-conflict responsibility, the article seeks to assess whether the intervention fulfilled its stated objectives and what lessons it offers for future international action.

Chapter I: Context of the Libyan Crisis (February–March 2011)

1. The Arab Spring and the Outbreak of Protests

The uprising in Libya must be understood within the wider regional wave of political unrest known as the Arab Spring. Beginning in late 2010 in Tunisia and rapidly spreading across North Africa and the Middle East, these protests were driven by grievances related to authoritarian governance, corruption, economic stagnation, and social inequality (Anderson, 2011). In Libya, demonstrations erupted in mid-February 2011, particularly in the eastern city of Benghazi, historically marginalized by the Gaddafi regime.

Initially, the protests were largely peaceful and echoed demands seen elsewhere in the region: political reform, accountability, and an end to decades of autocratic rule. However, Libya's political structure—characterized by the absence of strong state institutions, political parties, or a professional national army—rendered the situation especially volatile (Vandewalle, 2012). Unlike Tunisia or Egypt, Libya lacked institutional buffers capable of managing a transition through negotiation or elite compromise.

2. Escalation into Armed Conflict

The regime's response to the protests was swift and violent. Security forces and loyalist militias employed live ammunition, heavy weaponry, and air power against demonstrators and opposition-held areas. Reports from international organizations and media outlets documented indiscriminate attacks on civilians, mass arrests, and the use of mercenaries (Human Rights Watch, 2011).

As violence escalated, opposition groups began to arm themselves, leading to the rapid militarization of the uprising. By late February 2011, Libya had effectively descended into a non-international armed conflict. The regime's rhetoric further intensified international concern: Muammar Gaddafi publicly vowed to hunt down opponents "house by house," a statement widely interpreted as signaling an imminent large-scale massacre, particularly in Benghazi, which had become the de facto center of the rebellion (Kuperman, 2013).

3. Fears of Mass Atrocities and Crimes Against Humanity

The prospect of mass atrocities played a decisive role in shaping international responses. United Nations officials, regional organizations, and Western governments warned that the situation in Libya met the threshold for crimes against humanity. The combination of explicit threats by regime leaders, the demonstrated use of disproportionate force, and the collapse of internal restraints on violence created a sense of urgency within the international community (Bellamy, 2011).

These concerns were reinforced by the memory of past failures to prevent atrocities, most notably in Rwanda and Srebrenica. Against this backdrop, Libya was framed as a test case for the international community's willingness to act decisively to protect civilians when a state manifestly fails to do so. This framing would prove crucial in the subsequent legal justification for intervention.

Chapter II: The Legal Basis of the Intervention

1. United Nations Security Council Resolution 1970 (26 February 2011)

The first formal international response came with the adoption of UNSC Resolution 1970 on 26 February 2011. Acting under Chapter VII of the UN Charter, the Security Council unanimously adopted a set of coercive but non-military measures aimed at curbing violence and pressuring the Libyan regime.

Resolution 1970 imposed a comprehensive arms embargo, prohibiting the supply of weapons and military assistance to Libya. It also introduced targeted sanctions, including travel bans and asset freezes, against key members of the Gaddafi regime. Most notably, the resolution referred the situation in Libya to the International Criminal Court (ICC), marking only the second such referral by the Security Council after Darfur (Akhavan, 2011).

Importantly, Resolution 1970 did not authorize the use of force. Instead, it reflected an initial preference for diplomatic, legal, and economic pressure. The ICC referral underscored the gravity of the alleged crimes and signaled that individual criminal responsibility would be pursued. However, the rapid deterioration of the situation on the ground soon led many states to conclude that these measures were insufficient to prevent mass civilian casualties.

2. United Nations Security Council Resolution 1973 (17 March 2011)

As Gaddafi's forces advanced toward Benghazi in March 2011, the Security Council adopted Resolution 1973, which constituted the central legal basis for the subsequent military intervention. The resolution was adopted with ten votes in favor and five abstentions (China, Russia, Germany, India, and Brazil), reflecting significant divisions within the Council.

Resolution 1973 authorized member states "to take all necessary measures" to protect civilians and civilian-populated areas under threat of attack, while explicitly excluding "a foreign occupation force of any form on any part of Libyan territory." It also established a no-fly zone over Libya and strengthened the arms embargo (UNSC, 2011).

The phrase "all necessary measures" has long been interpreted in Security Council practice as authorizing the use of force. In this case, the mandate was framed narrowly around civilian protection, rather than regime change. Nevertheless, the resolution provided the legal foundation for extensive air operations against Libyan government forces.

3. The Role of NATO and the Responsibility to Protect (R2P)

Following initial strikes by a coalition of states, operational command was transferred to NATO, which launched Operation Unified Protector in late March 2011. NATO's declared mission consisted of three elements: enforcing the arms embargo, maintaining the no-fly zone, and protecting civilians.

The intervention was widely presented as the first explicit application of the Responsibility to Protect doctrine to justify military action. R2P, endorsed by the UN General Assembly in 2005, rests on the premise that sovereignty entails responsibility, and that when a state manifestly fails to protect its population from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing, or crimes against humanity, the international community has a responsibility to act collectively (Evans, 2008). In the Libyan case, proponents argued that all three pillars of R2P were engaged: the Libyan state had failed in its protective role; peaceful means had been exhausted; and military intervention was necessary and proportionate to prevent mass atrocities (Bellamy & Williams, 2011). Critics, however, would later argue that the implementation of Resolution 1973 stretched the civilian protection mandate beyond its intended scope.

Chapter III: The Fall of the Gaddafi Regime

1. Military Developments and the Collapse of State Authority

Following the adoption of UNSC Resolution 1973, military operations intensified rapidly. Airstrikes conducted under NATO command systematically targeted Libyan government forces, command-and-control centers, air defense systems, and armored units threatening opposition-held areas. Although the official mandate emphasized civilian protection, the degradation of regime military capabilities had the indirect effect of tilting the balance of power decisively in favor of rebel forces.

By the summer of 2011, opposition groups, loosely coordinated and supported by NATO airpower, advanced westward from Benghazi toward Tripoli. The fall of the capital in August 2011 marked the effective collapse of central authority. Regime institutions disintegrated, and loyalty-based security structures fragmented almost overnight. Unlike other authoritarian regimes in the region, the Libyan state was highly personalized around Muammar Gaddafi, lacking autonomous bureaucratic or military institutions capable of surviving his removal (Vandewalle, 2012).

This institutional fragility would prove decisive in shaping Libya's post-conflict trajectory. While the immediate military objective of neutralizing the regime's capacity to attack civilians was achieved, the destruction of remaining state structures left a profound governance vacuum.

2. The Death of Muammar Gaddafi

On 20 October 2011, Muammar Gaddafi was captured near his hometown of Sirte while attempting to flee following the city's fall to rebel forces. He was subsequently killed under circumstances that raised serious concerns regarding extrajudicial execution and violations of international humanitarian law. Although the exact sequence of events remains contested, multiple investigations suggested that Gaddafi was alive at the time of capture and died shortly thereafter while in the custody of opposition fighters (Amnesty International, 2012).

From a legal perspective, Gaddafi's death underscored a critical tension inherent in the intervention. While the UNSC mandate did not authorize regime change or the targeted killing of political leaders, NATO operations had created the conditions that made the regime's collapse—and Gaddafi's death—inevitable. This outcome fueled later accusations that the intervention had exceeded its legal mandate and transformed a civilian protection mission into a de facto operation of regime change (Kuperman, 2015).

3. The National Transitional Council and the End of NATO Operations

In the immediate aftermath of the regime's collapse, the National Transitional Council (NTC) emerged as the provisional governing authority. Recognized by numerous states and international organizations, the NTC pledged to guide Libya toward democratic elections, constitutional reform, and national reconciliation.

NATO formally concluded Operation Unified Protector on 31 October 2011, declaring that its mandate under Resolution 1973 had been fulfilled. From a narrow legal standpoint, the intervention was thus brought to an orderly close. However, the international community's disengagement occurred at a moment when Libya's internal security situation was highly unstable and the capacity of transitional authorities remained extremely limited.

The absence of a robust post-conflict stabilization or peacebuilding mission—whether under UN or regional auspices—would soon emerge as one of the most consequential shortcomings of the intervention.

Chapter IV: The First Decade Post-Gaddafi (2011–2021)

1. Institutional Vacuum and the Absence of a Unified State

The collapse of the Gaddafi regime did not result in the emergence of a cohesive post-revolutionary state. On the contrary, Libya entered a prolonged period of institutional vacuum. The country lacked a unified national army, an effective police force, and functioning judicial institutions. Instead, security was exercised by a patchwork of revolutionary militias organized along local, tribal, ideological, and regional lines (International Crisis Group, 2013).

These militias, initially celebrated as liberators, quickly became autonomous power centers. Attempts by transitional authorities to disarm, demobilize, and reintegrate fighters proved largely unsuccessful. In many cases, militias were instead incorporated into nominal state structures while retaining their independent command chains, thereby further undermining state coherence (Lacher, 2015).

2. Political Fragmentation and Competing Claims to Legitimacy

Political fragmentation deepened as transitional processes stalled. Although Libya held elections for a General National Congress in 2012, political polarization and institutional weakness prevented effective governance. By 2014, the country had fractured into two rival centers of power.

In western Libya, a government based in Tripoli claimed legitimacy and later evolved into the UN-recognized Government of National Accord (GNA). In the east, the House of Representatives (HoR), operating from Tobruk, aligned itself with forces led by General Khalifa Haftar. Each authority claimed constitutional legitimacy, maintained separate security forces, and received backing from different international actors.

This duality of governance effectively institutionalized Libya's division. Repeated attempts at political reconciliation, including UN-mediated agreements, failed to achieve durable implementation due to mutual distrust, external interference, and the absence of enforcement mechanisms (UNSMIL, 2019).

3. The Role of Armed Groups and the Rise of Extremist Actors

The prolonged security vacuum created fertile ground for extremist organizations. Between 2014 and 2016, the Islamic State exploited the chaos to establish a territorial foothold, particularly in the coastal city of Sirte. The group capitalized on local grievances, porous borders, and the collapse of state authority to recruit fighters and conduct attacks.

Although ISIS was eventually defeated territorially in 2016 by Libyan forces supported by U.S. airstrikes, its rise illustrated the broader regional consequences of Libya's instability. Even after its territorial defeat, extremist cells remained active, continuing to pose a security threat at both national and regional levels (Wehrey, 2017).

4. Migration and the Humanitarian Crisis

One of the most visible and enduring consequences of Libya's post-2011 instability has been its transformation into a primary transit hub for irregular migration toward Europe. The collapse of border controls, law enforcement institutions, and judicial oversight created an

environment in which human smuggling and trafficking networks flourished. Migrants from Sub-Saharan Africa, the Horn of Africa, and parts of the Middle East increasingly relied on Libyan routes to reach the Mediterranean, often under extremely dangerous conditions.

Numerous reports by international organizations documented widespread human rights abuses against migrants and asylum seekers in Libya, including arbitrary detention, torture, forced labor, sexual violence, and extortion (Amnesty International, 2017; UNHCR, 2018). Detention centers, frequently operated by militias nominally affiliated with state authorities, became sites of systematic abuse. These practices highlighted the broader erosion of the rule of law and raised serious concerns regarding the complicity of local actors benefiting from migration control arrangements with external partners.

From a legal perspective, the humanitarian crisis exposed a paradox: while the 2011 intervention had been justified primarily on civilian protection grounds, the post-conflict environment subjected both Libyan civilians and foreign migrants to sustained patterns of violence and exploitation. This outcome contributed to growing skepticism regarding the capacity of military intervention alone to deliver durable human protection outcomes.

5. External Involvement and the Internationalization of the Conflict

As internal fragmentation deepened, Libya increasingly became the arena for a complex proxy war involving regional and global powers. Competing external interventions, often justified by counterterrorism, ideological alignment, or strategic interests, exacerbated instability and undermined diplomatic efforts.

On one side, Turkey and Qatar provided political, military, and logistical support to authorities in Tripoli, including assistance to armed groups aligned with the Government of National Accord. On the opposing side, Egypt, the United Arab Emirates, and France supported the eastern-based authorities and the Libyan Arab Armed Forces led by Khalifa Haftar. Russia's involvement, particularly through private military contractors associated with the Wagner Group, further internationalized the conflict (Wehrey, 2020).

These interventions violated, in practice if not always formally, the arms embargo imposed by the UN Security Council. The resulting militarization entrenched divisions and reduced incentives for compromise among Libyan actors. International mediation efforts, led primarily by the United Nations Support Mission in Libya (UNSMIL), were repeatedly undermined by the strategic calculations of external sponsors.

The Libyan case thus illustrates how humanitarian interventions can evolve into prolonged proxy conflicts when post-intervention governance structures remain weak and external actors pursue divergent agendas.

6. Economic Fragmentation and the Centrality of Oil

Libya's economy, overwhelmingly dependent on hydrocarbon revenues, was profoundly affected by post-2011 instability. Oil infrastructure—including fields, pipelines, and export terminals—became strategic assets contested by rival factions. Armed groups repeatedly blockaded production facilities to extract political concessions or financial gains, leading to dramatic fluctuations in output (International Monetary Fund, 2019).

The fragmentation of economic governance mirrored political divisions. Competing claims over control of the Central Bank and the National Oil Corporation further complicated revenue management and public spending. As a result, inflation rose, public services deteriorated, and living standards declined sharply for much of the population.

These economic dynamics reinforced conflict incentives. Control over oil infrastructure provided leverage both domestically and internationally, while the absence of transparent revenue-sharing mechanisms undermined trust between rival authorities. The Libyan case demonstrates how economic reconstruction is inseparable from political and security stabilization in post-conflict contexts.

Chapter V: Arguments in Favor of the Intervention, Critiques, and Lessons Learned

1. Arguments Supporting the Intervention

Proponents of the 2011 intervention emphasize its immediate humanitarian rationale. At the time of UNSC Resolution 1973, there was widespread concern that Libyan government forces were poised to carry out large-scale atrocities in Benghazi. Subsequent analyses suggest that NATO's intervention likely prevented an imminent assault that could have resulted in significant civilian casualties (Bellamy, 2015).

Supporters further argue that the intervention aligned with the emerging normative framework of the Responsibility to Protect. Libya was widely perceived as a case in which a state had manifestly failed to protect its population, peaceful measures had been exhausted, and timely military action offered the best available means of averting mass violence. From this perspective, the intervention represented a principled application of collective security mechanisms rather than unilateral coercion.

Finally, advocates contend that the intervention demonstrated the continued relevance of the UN Security Council as the central authority for authorizing the use of force, thereby reinforcing the legal framework governing international peace and security.

2. Legal and Political Critiques

Despite these arguments, the intervention has been subject to sustained criticism. One central concern relates to the interpretation of the mandate provided by Resolution 1973. Critics argue that NATO exceeded the resolution's civilian protection mandate by pursuing military objectives that effectively ensured regime change, despite the absence of explicit authorization to remove Gaddafi from power (Kuperman, 2013).

This perception was particularly salient among states that abstained from the vote, including Russia and China, which later cited the Libyan case as evidence of mandate abuse. The resulting erosion of trust within the Security Council has been widely identified as a key factor behind subsequent deadlock on crises such as Syria.

Another major critique concerns the absence of a comprehensive post-conflict strategy. While significant resources were devoted to military operations, comparatively little attention was paid to institution-building, security sector reform, or national reconciliation. This omission contributed directly to the prolonged instability that followed and highlighted the limitations of narrowly framed humanitarian interventions.

3. Responsibility to Rebuild and the Limits of R2P

The Libyan experience has fueled renewed debate over the concept of a "Responsibility to Rebuild" as an integral component of R2P. Scholars argue that protecting civilians during active hostilities is insufficient if international actors disengage immediately after regime collapse, leaving societies vulnerable to renewed violence and state failure (Evans, 2014).

In this sense, Libya exposed a structural weakness in the implementation of R2P: while the doctrine emphasizes prevention and reaction, it remains underdeveloped in terms of post-conflict obligations. Without sustained international engagement, the normative promise of R2P risks being undermined by outcomes that fall short of durable peace and human security.

Regional Impact: Libya and the Destabilization of the Sahel

The destabilization of Libya following the 2011 intervention had profound consequences beyond its borders, particularly in the Sahel region. The collapse of Libyan state authority facilitated the uncontrolled spread of weapons, ammunition, and experienced fighters across porous borders into neighboring countries such as Mali, Niger, and Chad. These dynamics significantly altered regional security balances and contributed to the escalation of conflicts far from Libya itself.

One of the most direct consequences was observed in Mali, where Tuareg fighters who had previously served in Gaddafi's security forces returned home heavily armed. Their involvement played a decisive role in the 2012 rebellion in northern Mali, which was subsequently exploited by jihadist groups linked to al-Qaeda. Similar patterns emerged in Niger and Chad, where arms trafficking and militant mobility intensified pre-existing security challenges (Lacher, 2013).

From a legal and policy perspective, these spillover effects raise critical questions about the scope of responsibility associated with international intervention. While UNSC Resolution 1973 was territorially limited to Libya, the regional consequences of state collapse underscore the interconnected nature of security in fragile regions. The Libyan case thus illustrates how the failure to stabilize a post-intervention state can generate secondary crises that undermine regional and international peace and security.

Conclusions

The 2011 intervention in Libya stands as a defining moment in the evolution of international norms governing the use of force, humanitarian intervention, and civilian protection. Legally grounded in United Nations Security Council Resolutions 1970 and 1973, and politically justified through the doctrine of the Responsibility to Protect, the intervention initially appeared to mark a successful convergence of legality and legitimacy. In the immediate term, it arguably achieved its core objective: preventing an imminent assault on civilian populations, particularly in Benghazi.

However, the longer-term trajectory of Libya compels a more critical and nuanced assessment. The collapse of the Gaddafi regime, while welcomed by many Libyans and external actors, resulted in the near-total disintegration of state institutions. The absence of a unified security apparatus, effective governance structures, and a shared political vision transformed Libya into a fragmented and contested political space. Over the subsequent decade, this fragmentation manifested in prolonged civil conflict, humanitarian crises, economic decline, and persistent foreign interference.

From a legal standpoint, the Libyan intervention exposed ambiguities inherent in Security Council mandates authorizing "all necessary measures." While such language provides operational flexibility, it also creates space for divergent interpretations that can undermine trust among major powers. The perception that NATO exceeded its civilian protection mandate by facilitating regime change contributed directly to later paralysis within

the Security Council, most notably in relation to the Syrian conflict. In this sense, Libya had consequences not only for the country itself, but for the functioning of collective security mechanisms more broadly.

Normatively, Libya represents both the high point and the Achilles' heel of the Responsibility to Protect. It demonstrated that the international community can act swiftly and decisively when mass atrocities appear imminent. At the same time, it revealed the doctrine's limitations when intervention is not accompanied by sustained post-conflict engagement. The failure to operationalize a meaningful "Responsibility to Rebuild" undermined the protective gains achieved during the intervention and left Libya vulnerable to renewed violence and state failure.

Ultimately, the Libyan case suggests that humanitarian intervention cannot be evaluated solely on the basis of immediate outcomes. Legal authorization and moral intent, while necessary, are insufficient in the absence of long-term political, institutional, and economic strategies. Future interventions must grapple more seriously with the post-conflict phase, recognizing that the responsibility to protect civilians does not end when hostilities cease, but extends to the creation of conditions in which sustainable peace and governance can emerge.

REFERENCES

1. Akhavan, P. (2011). Are international criminal tribunals a disincentive to peace? Reconciling judicial romanticism with political realism. Human Rights Quarterly, 31(3), 624–654.
2. Amnesty International. (2012). Libya: Rule of law or rule of militias? London: Amnesty International Publications.
3. Amnesty International. (2017). Libya's dark web of collusion: Abuses against Europe-bound refugees and migrants. London.
4. Anderson, L. (2011). Demystifying the Arab Spring. Foreign Affairs, 90(3), 2–7.
5. Bellamy, A. J. (2011). Libya and the responsibility to protect: The exception and the norm. Ethics & International Affairs, 25(3), 263–269.
6. Bellamy, A. J. (2015). The responsibility to protect turns ten. Ethics & International Affairs, 29(2), 161–185.
7. Bellamy, A. J., & Williams, P. D. (2011). The new politics of protection? Côte d'Ivoire, Libya and the responsibility to protect. International Affairs, 87(4), 825–850.
8. Evans, G. (2008). The responsibility to protect: Ending mass atrocity crimes once and for all. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
9. Evans, G. (2014). R2P down but not out after Libya and Syria. Global Responsibility to Protect, 6(1), 1–8.
10. Human Rights Watch. (2011). Libya: Government attacks on protesters. New York.
11. International Crisis Group. (2013). Trial by error: Justice in post-Qadhafi Libya. Brussels.
12. International Monetary Fund. (2019). Libya: Selected issues. Washington, DC.
13. Kuperman, A. J. (2013). A model humanitarian intervention? Reassessing NATO's Libya campaign. International Security, 38(1), 105–136.
14. Kuperman, A. J. (2015). Obama's Libya debacle. Foreign Affairs, 94(2), 66–77.

15. Lacher, W. (2013). Fault lines of the revolution: Political actors, camps and conflicts in the new Libya. SWP Research Paper, Berlin.
16. Lacher, W. (2015). Libya's fragmentation: Structure and process in violent conflict. IEMed Mediterranean Yearbook, 273–278.
17. UNHCR. (2018). Desperate journeys: Refugees and migrants arriving in Europe and at Europe's borders. Geneva.
18. UNSC. (2011). Resolution 1973 (2011). United Nations Security Council.
19. UNSMIL. (2019). Political process in Libya: Challenges and prospects. United Nations.
20. Vandewalle, D. (2012). A history of modern Libya (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
21. Wehrey, F. (2017). The burning shores: Inside the battle for the new Libya. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
22. Wehrey, F. (2020). This war is out of control: Why Libya's conflict is spiraling. Foreign Affairs.