The Rise and Fall of Liberal Peace in Libya

Siyum Adugna Mamo

Siyum Adugna Mamo, Jimma University, Ethiopia. (e-mail: seyoum.adugna@ju.edu.et)

The Rise and Fall of Liberal Peace in Libya

SIYUM ADUGNA MAMO

Abstract

In the wake of the 2011 "Arab Uprising", liberal elements were haunting in Tunisia, Egypt and Libya – countries which experienced the uprising at its early stage. The liberal elements triggered the youth particularly in Libya to boldly oppose their long-serving Libyan president, Muammar Qaddafi. In what followed, the West not only interfered to help the rebels and become involved in a direct military intervention in the guise of humanitarian intervention, it also tried to install a liberal peace in the process of state reconstruction and peacebuilding in the aftermath of the revolution that ousted Qaddafi. The intervention had an implicit agenda of regime change and installing liberal peace in post-Qaddafi Libya. However, the intervention descended the country into a protracted civil war that the country has been suffering from for more than six years after the downfall of Qaddafi, instead of bringing peace and stability to the Libyans. The liberal peace that was rising during the revolution and immediately after the fall of Qaddafi through the liberal ideals that triggered the Libyan revolutionaries ruptured as the country descended into protracted civil war among different factions due to Western intervention. The aim of this desk research is therefore to unpack the rise and fall of liberal peace in Libya. Employing discussion of the debate over liberal peace in Libya as a core methodological analysis, this paper argues that the liberal peace that the West attempted to install in the country failed mainly because it was rooted in hegemonic liberal values, which are incompatible with Libyan tribal society, and disregarded the indigenous peacebuilding mechanisms. This paper concludes that liberal peace, which privileges the international over the local, is irreconcilable with post-conflict environments in the Global South and hence was unable to solve the Libyan crises. Therefore, emphasis should be given to indigenous peacebuilding mechanisms, which are less recognized and understudied compared to liberal peace which is over-studied and hegemonized, to bring a resonant and sustainable peace in post-conflict environments of the Global South.

Introduction

Once a stable and peaceful country, particularly before the downfall of the Great Socialist People's Libyan Jamahiriya regime led by Muammar Qaddafi and its experience of the 2011 popular uprising, Libya is one of the failed states without a functional and strong national government. Although the Western liberal countries have played a pivotal role in the process of state reconstruction and peacebuilding after the fall of Qaddafi, the country is still suffering from a protracted civil war that occurred in the aftermath of the overthrow of Qaddafi.

The West praised the 2012 Libyan election –the first of its kind in post-Qaddafi Libya– as the beginning of installing a liberal peace in the country, although "rapid democratization, including the holding of early elections, proved highly destabilizing with the electoral processes exacerbating tensions' in post-conflict environments" (Hoffman, 2009, p. 10). In line with this Western praise, Vandewalle (2012, p. 9) rushed to write that "Libya stands out as one of the most successful countries to emerge from the uprisings that have rocked the Arab world over the past two years" in the early days of post-Qaddafi Libya. But, the country has been struggling to bring itself out of the chaos that it descended into because of the power grip by different armed factions arisen after Qaddafi's fall. Even in 2017 – six years after the revolution – Libya stands as one of the failed states of the North-African region. The country descended into chaos as the protracted civil war among various armed groups developed (Cypher, 2016). Furthermore, more recently the country became a safe haven for terrorists from different regions, including the Middle East.

The 2011 Western intervention resulted in a new failed state on the African continent (Kuperman, 2015). As was forecast during and after the revolution that "Libya would become the world's next failed state, torn asunder by its tribal and regional rivalries and corrupted by both oil money and the same divide-and-rule politics that had kept the previous regime entrenched for over four decades," Libya became a failed state without a strong government or institutions that keep peace and order (Vandewalle, 2012, p. 10). Surprisingly it "had seven prime ministers in less than four years" after the fall of Qaddafi's regime (Kuperman, 2015, p. 67). The fall of Qaddafi, as Zoubir and Rózsa (2012, p. 1279) rightly pointed out, was the "beginning of an even harder phase to build a polity in which good governance, rule of law, respect for human rights, justice and citizenship will replace the cronyism, injustice, clientelism, violations of human rights and tribalism."

Wondering why the problem in Libya remains unresolved six years after the fall of Qaddafi's regime, the author's intention in this paper is to examine the Western attempt to install liberal peace in the process of state reconstruction and peacebuilding in post-Qaddafi Libya. Liberal peace not only is based in Western liberal values and ideals and has an interventionist and universalist approach, but also claims epistemological superiority over the counties of the Global South (Heathershaw, 2013; Richmond, 2006). Particularly, hoping to expound the puzzle behind the rupture of liberal peace in Libya, this paper aims to unpack the rise and fall of liberal peace in the oil rich North-African country in the wake of the 2011 popular uprising. In so doing, the paper tries to show the limits of liberal peace in addressing post-conflict crises in non-liberal countries of the Global South.

The paper argues that though liberal peace is relevant for the liberal countries of the West, it is incompatible in post-conflict environments of non-liberal countries of the Global South and unable to transform and manage the conflict in such countries of the region. This

is why the Western liberal peace project failed and has been unable to solve the Libyan crises after the 2011 popular uprising that ousted its long-serving leader, Muammar Qaddafi.

Liberal Peace – at a glance

It is difficult to detach the philosophy of liberal peace from its root in the culture of the Occident within which its founding father Emanuel Kant wrote his famous writing Perpetual Peace in 1985. The three central precepts of Kant's perpetual peace includes: (1) "liberal states are less likely to initiate conflict against other liberal state than they are against illiberal sates"; (2) "liberal states are less likely than illiberal states to initiate conflict against other states"; and (3) "liberal states are less likely to experience domestic violence than illiberal states and the more the number of liberal states increases the more peaceful the globe will become" (Danilovic & Clare, 2007, pp. 401-403). Moreover, Kant's perpetual peace has three central tenets – "Republican representation, an ideological commitment to fundamental human rights, and transnational interdependence" as Doyle (2005, p. 463) writes. The West uses these precepts and strands to frame (and reframe) liberals as friends whereas non-liberals are the enemies. This has also been the dominant discourse of the hegemonic Occidental culture for decades. For instance, making the three strands inextricably related stating that they "operate together and only together, and not separately," Doyle in principle supported the liberals to control the political and socioeconomic domain of non-liberal countries in the Global South (Doyle, as cited in Salih 2012, p. 172).

At this juncture, it is of crucial importance to mention the ultimate end of liberal peace. The goal of liberal state reconstruction and peacebuilding in post-conflict environments shows the way the liberals control the political and socioeconomic domain of non-liberal states. According to Salih (2012, p. 183), "the ultimate goal of liberal peacebuilding in postwar societies is economic reconstruction and democratic state building." What is behind this rhetoric is the Western attempt to control non-liberal countries in the Global South. However, the West is not always successful in this process of economic reconstruction and democratic state building which eventually serves their interest in the war-torn countries in this region. This is exactly what has been observed in Libya during the last six years after the 2011 popular revolution which ousted Muamar Qaddafi.

Qaddafi's Libya and the 2011 uprising

Prior to Qaddafi's reign, Libya was ruled by a monarchy between 1951 and 1969 that divided the country into three provinces – Tripolitania, Cyrenaica, and Fezzan – based on tribal lines (Vandewalle, 2012, p. 10). There were suspicion and antagonism among the tribes. The monarchy "did little to smooth over the mutual suspicions that" divide the nation (Vandewalle, 2012). After he came to power in 1969, Qaddafi founded the body politic on tribal basis like the Monarchy that preceded him. This gradually resulted in weaknesses and even the absence of formal government institutions in the country. As Zoubir and Rózsa (2012, p. 1270) state,

> As Qaddafi's regime depended more and more on the tribal leaders, other non-governmental forms of organisation were increasingly suppressed, while the tribal character of his rule and guidance became increasingly manifest (e.g. the bay'a, the pledge of allegiance by the tribal leaders in a written form on show for everyone to see, and his way of living—in a tent—and his way of wearing traditional Libyan clothing, etc.).

Qaddafi, who came to power from a small tribe when compared to the Warfalla and the Magariha – "the two biggest tribes in Libya," was able to successfully rule over the biggest tribes for more than four decades deciding systematically to "rely on and build his power on the tribes" through creating what he called "Leadership Committees" that empowered tribal leaders (Zoubir & Rózsa, 2012, pp. 1269-1270).

The controversial former Libyan leader, Muammar Qaddafi, who came to power "through a military coup d'état in 1969" and ruled the country for such long period of time, was criticized by the West that he "ran an authoritarian and repressive regime" (Payandeh, 2012, p. 372). When the 2011 popular uprising erupted in Benghazi – the birthplace of the 2011 Libyan revolution, "Qaddafi reacted brutally, promising to crush the rebellion without mercy" (Zoubir & Rózsa, 2012, p. 1268). This was a move that not only fueled the revolution, but also paved the way for Western intervention in the country. From its inception, he not only downplayed the peaceful and unarmed protests that had occurred mainly because of his grip on power for more than four decades, but also likened the protesters with rats and the "threatening 'zanga zanga' (cleansing of street by street) speech he gave provided the justification and basis for Western intervention" (Zoubir & Rózsa, 2012, p. 1268). Moreover, the "shooting of demonstrators by the security forces signaled the beginning of the end of Qaddafi's rule" beyond being a triggering factor for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's (NATO) intervention (Zoubir & Rózsa, 2012, p. 1272). His direct order to shoot civilians and the involvement of hired mercenary troops not only exacerbated the revolution, but also deteriorated confidence of the military in their Commander-in-Chief as they started to distance themselves, ignoring his commands to quash unarmed civilians. As a result, Qaddafi lost both internal and external support as he tried to brutally quash the popular revolution which "was more about power than about socioeconomic concerns" (Zoubir & Rózsa, 2012, p. 1271). This set the ground for NATO's intervention into Libya.

2011 NATO intervention

Was the 2011 NATO intervention into Libya purely humanitarian? The pronouncement "humanitarian intervention" was not only a hoax made by the West, Obama and his liberal allies, but also was the mask that covered NATO's project of regime change. Going beyond the mandate given to it by the United Nations Security Council under UN Resolution 1973, which legalized the intervention, NATO became involved in the task of regime change in the country (Adebajo, 2016; Kuperman, 2015; Weiss & Roy, 2016). It not only equipped the rebels with military machinery and sent military advisors to Libya to assist the rebels, but also became directly involved militarily in the ensuing war. After securing a no-fly zone over Libya through UN Resolution 1973, it easily bombarded the regime's stronghold both from the air and from the Mediterranean Sea. As Zoubir and Rózsa (2012, p. 1273) succinctly put it,

> Far from resolving the conflict, the no-fly zone and the incessant bombings by NATO forces created a situation of no return, for they thwarted any political solution and gradually demonstrated that the intent was no longer (or perhaps never was) to protect civilians, as was the objective enunciated in UN Resolution 1973, but to bring about regime change, for which neither NATO nor any other country was mandated under the said resolution.

Under the guise of the "responsibility to protect" Western countries led by France – a country that took the lead during the intervention under the former United States (US)

Secretary of State Hillary Clinton's strong involvement to organize the anti-Qaddafi block – through Resolution 1973 authorizing "all necessary" means to protect civilians on March 17, 2011, intervened into Libya (Becker & Shane, 2016b; Payandeh, 2012). The responsibility to protect "is a far more interventionist agenda for peace than ever before: the liberal peace works only by creating a basis for liberal states and organizations to intervene to correct abnormalities in others' political, social and economic practices" (Richmond, 2006, p. 306). Immediately after, on 19th March 2011, NATO began shelling Libya. The rebels, supported by NATO, intensified their efforts and culminated the war with the murder of Qaddafi. This signaled the end of Qaddafi's regime (Bose & Thakur, 2016; Kuperman, 2015). However, after the fall of Qaddafi's regime, instead of forming a central government capable of unifying and organizing the country, Libya gradually descended into civil war, unlike Tunisia and Egypt – countries which equally experienced the Arab uprising.

Libya's disintegration into chaos and civil war attributed to the intervention and the way that the West handled post-Qaddafi Libya. This is corroborated by Hoffman's argument that "in a number of cases, rather than fostering peace, the interventions by the international community led to a resurgence of political violence" (2009, p. 10). Particularly, it is attributed to the lack of clear vision and political roadmap for the post-Qaddafi Libya. There was nothing that the Western liberals had in plan for Libyan reconstruction and peacebuilding after the fall of Qaddafi's regime. This is evident in Obama's latter position that the "biggest mistake of his presidency was failing to anticipate the fallout and prepare for the aftermath of Gaddafi's ouster" (Bose & Thakur, 2016, p. 347). The tasks of state reconstruction and peacebuilding based specifically on the Libyan reality should have secured some primacy before the liberals' rush to install their preferred National Transitional Council (NTC) – the pro-democracy coalition which they believed would best serve their interests.

The Rise of Liberal Peace in Libya

The 2011 Arab uprising and the West's attempt to install their version of democracy before the uprising played a significant role in making the Libyan revolutionaries conscious of the liberal ideals. During the early days of the revolution, it was observed that the slogans and the revolutionaries' mantra across those countries which experienced the Arab uprising were all the same: democracy, employment, equality, the rule of law, human and democratic rights, etc. – the main components of liberal peace (Richmond, 2006, p. 292). The liberal ideas continued dominating the Libyan airwaves with the Western intervention and their support of the prodemocracy NTC – an organized and Western-backed rebel group formed during the uprising "on 27 February and declared itself on 5 March the legitimate representative of the Libyan people and the Libyan state" (Zoubir & Rózsa 2012, p. 1276).

Moreover, in the July 2012 election, which was much-admired by the West but criticized as "premature" and was made simply to "please the West," was another indication that signaled liberal ideals and liberal peace taking root in the country (Becker & Shane, 2016a, 2016b). The election showed the commitment of the NTC and their Western allies to establish a democratic government based on liberal ideals. The West praised the election for the "high turnout and little violence"; it involved "international observers" who reported a "fair election" and "the first peaceful transition in Libya's history" (Becker & Shane, 2016a, 2016b). These were further indication of the rise of liberal peace in Libya, despite the threats it faced. The threats, which both the West and its favorite the NTC failed to see, included the

different warring factions divided along different interests; the tribal nature of Libyan society that its ousted leader (and the monarchy before him) supported for more than half a century; the absence of institutions that could maintain law and order; lack of acceptance of pro-Western people in the NTC by the divided rebels; and the NTC's failure to bring about any semblance of unity.

Although there were pockets of success stories that may sound Libya's optimism in the future for a very short period of time after Qaddafi's fall, they were not rooted in Libyan sociopolitical, cultural and spiritual context and the tribal nature of its society on which Libyan society is founded, as opposed to the modern government institutions that are missing in Libya since the monarchical reign. Emphasizing "democratisation and good governance, respect for the rule of law, the promotion and protection of human rights, the growth of civil society and the development of open market economies" (Hoffman 2009, p. 10), the West missed the actual sociopolitical, cultural and religious context of the Libyan nation in the process of state reconstruction and peacebuilding in post-Qaddafi Libya. As Bose and Thakur (2016, p. 347) wrote, "ongoing volatility, violence and instability in Libya continued to cast a long shadow about the country's viability and commitment to a liberal democratic culture." If the progress that was observed immediately after the fall of Qaddafi would have continued, political instability could have been restored, peace and security provided, and the economy risen etc. Above all, Libya would have been an "important exception to the so-called resource curse: the seemingly immutable rule that oil-exporting countries are bound for authoritarianism and stagnation" if NATO and its allies had had a clear plan for after they helped oust Qaddafi (Vandewalle, 2012, p. 15).

The Fall of Liberal Peace in Libya

Once a stable and peaceful state, Libya turned into "a war-torn country" known for its vandalism and the place where armed factions constantly struggle for power (Vandewalle, 2012, p. 9). In 2017, more than six years after the revolution, the country is under two rival governments – the Libyan National Army based in the east of Libya and led by the renegade general Khalifa Haftar and the UN-backed Government of National Accord based in Tripoli – which is still struggling to hold any power. The country "finds itself with [these] two warring governments, each controlling only a fraction of the country's territory and militias" (Kuperman, 2015, p. 68). After the fall of Qaddafi's regime, Libyans have been unable to rid themselves from the protracted civil war and reconstruct their state based on the liberal trajectories that the West wants and needs the country to take.

One of the main reason for the fall of liberal peace in the country is the West's failure to take into account the role of the Libyans as key stakeholders in the state's reconstruction and peacebuilding processes. They effectively ruled out indigenous conflict management and transformation processes rooted in tribal society of Libya. The West's rush to install the pro-democracy TNC that promoted their liberal ideals and which "will best serve Western political and economic interests as a result of the support extended to" it indicates their indifference to such indigenous wisdom (Zoubir & Rózsa, 2012, p. 1277). Moreover, the West failed to understand the tribal nature of the state that Qaddafi established for almost half a century, and in which he considering himself as "tribal chief" in the Jamahiriya – "operated within the tribal framework" (Zoubir & Rózsa, 2012, p. 1271). This tribal nature of the state, which even the opposition chose to defeat Qaddafi during the revolution, not only weakened but also lacked formal government structure. Even he himself held political power

regardless of any clear political title. This made the process of installing democracy and liberal peace a difficult venture in the country from the outset. As Hoffman (2009, p. 11) interestingly wrote;

> The push for a liberal peace represents naivety and misunderstanding about the nature of politics in most post-conflict societies. Western institutions and practices of accountability are not easily transplanted to non-western political and legal cultures. The emphasis on individual rights, obligations and accountability doesn't sit easily within cultures that emphasise community and the family over the individual. But the core problem, notably in Africa, is that the modern [democratic] state, which is a necessary precondition for the success of the liberal peace, does not really exist. Instead we find forms of neo-paternalism – personal rule, 'Big Man' politics, nepotism and clientelism.

The liberal peace that started to take root in Libya shortly after the fall of Qaddafi's regime was momentary. The West's failure to rebuild Libya after they destroyed the long serving regime threw the country into chaos. Despite the absence of republican representation, fundamental human rights, and transnational cooperation – elements of liberal peace, Libya, as a state which was to "experience conflict and liberal peace intervention became a predatory, marginal or ineffectual presence" (Richmond & Mac Ginty, 2014, p. 178). The pro-democratic members of the NTC and their liberal allies were rushing to install liberal peace without creating a democratic state – a precondition for liberal peace. As Doyle, as cited in Salih, 2012, p. 172) succinctly states, "building the liberal peace, therefore, requires the building of liberal or democratic states as the preferred outcome of post war reconstruction." This fits into the claim that the intervention in Libya was not purely humanitarian. Instead, the project of changing the Qaddafi regime to the one that best serves the Western interest was behind the intervention in Libya which was a precondition to the liberal peace project that often has to do with free trade, economic cooperation and neoliberal trajectories of development. As Hoffman succinctly wrote;

> The pursuit of a liberal peace is a cover for the political and economic interests of the West. Not only has liberal peacebuilding done more harm than good, it is in reality an exercise in power that seeks to subjugate the non-west by creating dependency through chronically weak states. (2009, p. 11)

Today, more than six years after the fall of Qaddafi, Libya has turned into a place where there is complete "lawlessness," "assassinations," and the "worst kind of vigilantism" is observed (Becker & Shane, 2016b). Does the "responsibility to protect" allow the West to destroy a government and its institutions and then just abandon? Libya today is analogous to a ship abandoned in the middle of unpleasant ocean (because of its currents) without a captain. It has been put into the ocean of lawlessness, assassination, factional violence, illegal human and arms smugglers, two rival governments contending for power, confrontation between the Seculars and the Fundamentalists; a safe-haven for terrorist fighters and abandoned.

Mr. Abdallah, the Libyan party chef, explaining the situation that liberal peace created to the writers of the Libyan Gamble says "[t]hey [the West] created the monsters we are dealing with today – which is these militias that are so empowered they will never subordinate themselves to any government" (Becker & Shane, 2016b). The "monsters" are going beyond Libya and succeed in being a formidable security threat in countries beyond

Libya. It is feeding and fueling terror activities, among others, in Nigeria, Mali, Tunisia, Gaza, Syria, and Iraq. Cognizant of this, Zoubir and Rózsa state;

> More worrisome is the acquisition of sophisticated weapons, stolen from the Libyan stockpiles, by al-Qaida in the Islamic Maghreb (AQIM). This has complicated the instability in the Sahara–Sahel, but will no doubt also increase illegal trafficking in arms and drugs, let alone terrorist activities. These weapons, and the insecurity in Libya, have emboldened AQIM troops inside and outside Libya, who are now equipped with missiles that they can use against military and civilian aircraft. Clearly, the civil war in Libya had generated uneasiness in the Sahara–Sahel states, especially the already fragile states, for many of the weapons stolen from Libya's stockpiles ended up strengthening AQIM's already considerable arsenal and strong capabilities. (2012, pp. 1274-1275)

The killing of Christopher Stevens – the American consulate to Libya – on September 11, 2012 and his three colleagues by the infiltrated terrorists in Benghazi not only showed "both the power of radical Islamist militias and the inability of the government in Tripoli to provide security and maintain order across the country," but also alarms as "lawlessness and corruption are pervasive, and fundamental questions about the structure and operation of Libyan political and economic institutions remain unanswered" (Vandewalle, 2012, p. 8). It further shows the deteriorated security situation and deep-rooted sectarianism in the country.

Juxtaposing the situation on the ground with a glimpse of the preamble of UN Resolution 1973, which stated that the situation in Libya "continues to constitute a threat to international peace and security," it is arguable that the resolution and the intervention were historical mistakes of the West (United Nations, 2011, p. 2). This is corroborated by Barack Obama's "regrets about Libya" (Kuperman, 2015, p. 77). The situation in Libya remains a threat to international peace and security for the last six years after the fall of Qaddafi. Nobody, even the liberals themselves, cannot deny that the conflict remained within the country beyond the time that Qaddafi was killed.

It may not come as a surprise when the crises in Libya is related to Hillary Clinton's loss in the 2016 US presidential election. As Kuperman (2015, p. 74) writes, "the harm from the intervention in Libya extends well beyond the immediate neighborhood." One of the factors that contributed to Clinton's loss is the crisis and the harm that the West created in Libya. The newly-elected US President, Donald Trump, used the failure of the West in Libya to hit the democratic candidate during the election campaign. He repeatedly aired this failure during the live TV debates of the presidential campaign where he put the democratic candidate in a situation where she was unable to defend herself. As she was one of the prominent figures behind the intervention and persuaders of France (and later the UK) to take the lead in the intervention, she was expected to organize the same states to devise Libya's future. Yet, Clinton and her liberal allies failed to come up with a sound political roadmap that fitted Libyan reality. This left the country to fester into disintegration and chaos, and later, contributed to her loss of the presidential election.

Without considering the fact that regime change –the ultimate end of the intervention in Libya (Payandeh, 2012, p. 382)– led "to a heightened risk of civil war in the short run," the West failed to help Libyans to establish their own government that could fit Libyan reality

rather than one based on Western liberal values (Hegre, Ellingsen, Gates, & Gleditsch, 2001, p. 35). This shows the twofold limitations of the liberals: not to allow the Libyan people to establish a government based on their own sociopolitical and spiritual context and to allow the civil war to continue after they succeeded in their project of regime change. Libya would have been in a far better situation if, at least, they tried to work for a peacebuilding that considered local and international angles, as Richmond (2010) argued. This is an important nexus since it is difficult for the local to escape the international because "'indigenous peacebuilding' is partially produced by what internationals find, initiate or are willing to fund" and because of the current global governance arrangement that "links all levels of governance from the local to the global" (Heathershaw, 2013, p. 279). It is much more difficult for the global to work alone in specific context where the international is "met by local resistance and indigenous alternatives" (Heathershaw, 2013, p. 276). Taking this into account, Richmond interestingly stated that "peacebuilding should therefore be led by local rather than international agencies if emancipation is to occur in a way that is resonant" (2010, p. 682). However, this can only work if the liberals value the metaphysical, epistemological and sociocultural and spiritual values of the local "in its own voices" (Richmond & Mac Ginty, 2014, p. 175) using the criteria of the local since liberal peace "may not set suitable standards for the evaluation of non-Western" worldviews and epistemologies (Richmond, 2010, p. 669).

Since the West was unable to penetrate easily into Libya and ransack resources during the Qaddafi regime because of the regime's critical stance towards the West, they had to devise a system that helped them easily gain access to the country's resources. To this end, they have projected that Libya should become a democratic liberal state that has a government based on liberal ideology and open to international trade and shouldn't interfere in the economy. Implying the significance of liberal economic policy with which the West interfered into Libya and continued until the project of regime change, Vandewalle states that "without major economic reforms, Libya will not be able to move beyond its status as a rentier state...Libya's new leaders must forcefully intervene in the market now to reduce the state's presence in economic affairs over the long run" (2012, p. 14).

The intervention in Libya happened despite calls from The African Union (AU) Peace and Security Council and the Council of the League of Arab States not to intervene. Further, it happened despite Qaddafi's repeated demand for dialogue. The AU had also calls for the establishment of a government based on the Libyan and African context though the liberals didn't want to give attention to it. The West didn't want to hear these voices since they were busy with their intensified shelling. They were busy being at war with the non-liberal Great Socialist People's Libyan Jamahiriya since they, as liberal peace theory taught them, are always "in war with non-liberals" (Doyle, 2005, p. 464). This is rooted in the deep culture that this theory frames – liberals are friends and allies, whereas non-liberals are the enemies. This tendency of "privileging the liberal over the social" which results "keeping intact many of the root causes of conflict," as Salih (2012, p. 183) would say, is a serious limitation of liberal peace. What is important is a need to;

> Recognize that peace is multi-faceted, pluralistic and that when the competing conceptions of peace circulating within a society run up against each other, there is no absolutist account that provides a privileged perspective from which to judge one being better than the other. Instead there needs to be an ongoing, continuous process of collective reasoning that

injects more perspectives, more voices that can actually be heard, into an understanding of how peace might best be conceived and enacted in a given context. (Hoffman 2009, p. 11)

Therefore, any attempt to bring peace and order in Libya needs to consider the tribal nature of Libyan society. The different factions and brigades observed in Libya today shows the significance of providing attention to the tribes that constitute Libyan society. To bring about genuine reconciliation and peace and order, the tribes are a core element. As the strength and stability of the government might be based on "its capacity to broker national reconciliation, i.e. reconciliation among the tribes," a strong coalition that is committed to such an end is a vital necessity (Zoubir & Rózsa, 2012, p. 1278). Furthermore, since "a government which does not garner the support of the tribes and is not based on the tribal pattern of social organization will be unable to secure legitimacy," a central government with its institutions and organizations that are based in the Libyan sociopolitical, cultural and spiritual realm is important (Zoubir & Rózsa, 2012). Only such a government with the support of internal and external stakeholders can bring about national reconciliation and sustainable peace among the many armed factions. Sustainable peace in Libya, in Hoffman's (2009, p. 11) words, requires a;

> Move away from the paternalistic, technocratic one-size-fits-all approach to peacebuilding. Shifting to a more bottom up, society building approach, there is a need to engage creatively and constructively with local dynamics without falling into the trap of 'romanticising the local' or entrenching existing structures of violence and/or inequality. A peace that is built on the ground needs to reflect the interests, needs and aspirations of local populations rather than those of the international peacebuilding community.

It is important to help Libya solve its problems, taking into account the nationals (locals) –indigenous wisdom of conflict management and transformation– and the internationals rather than imposing a Western version of liberal peace disregarding the locals. As Richmond notes, "if a sustainable peace is to be constructed, there can be no exit until both locals and internationals have agreed that such a version of peace has actually been achieved" (2006, p. 304). The Libyans should not be expected to immediately accept democracy with which they are not familiar. Libyans, as Vandewalle (2012, p. 8) writes, have "no experience with democracy…Qaddafi had prevented the development of real national institutions." Hence, the decision to accept democracy and liberal peace should be left to the Libyans themselves.

Conclusion

Though liberal peace is important for liberal countries where their governance arrangement is based already on liberal values, this theory hardly manages and transforms conflict in non-liberal societies of the Global South. These societies have their own governance arrangements, which is distinct from the liberals and rich in indigenous wisdom, that provides opportunities for such wisdom –embedded in the world-views, epistemologies, sociocultural, spiritual, ethnic, and other positionalities of these societies– to play an important role in managing and transforming conflict. Using liberal peace, which is incompatible to the context of these societies, to solve the problems is misappropriation of the theory. This is why it was unable to succeed and ruptured in Libya. In almost all African countries, each and every tribe and ethnicity has its own governance arrangements within which particular systems of conflict management and peace building is embedded. These

ethnicities use what is called alternative conflict management systems, which includes arbitration, mediation and negotiation, with the name and process of their own version based on their particular context. Such conflict management and resolution systems embrace forgiveness, reconciliation, healing the wounds and conflict transformation which the hegemonic liberal peace lacks. Liberal peace theory, which is usually reactive rather than proactive, suppresses conflict rather than managing or transforming it. This can create a new violence –resulting a protracted conflict like the one witnessed in Libya– particularly from those parties who believed that they suffered during the previous conflict.

Yet, these indigenous arrangements of conflict transformation are not recognized by most governments of countries in the Global South, let alone the foreign liberals. They are not being used in post-conflict environments in this region. They are also understudied as compared to liberal peace which come to be hegemonic and over-researched. Researches in the field of peace and conflict studies, both in the Global North and South, are occupied by this hegemonic discourse and neglect these arrangements. Therefore, to embark on conflict management and peacebuilding in a resonant way in post-conflict environments of the Global South, it is important to give adequate attention to the specific governance arrangements of the region's tribal societies and study these governance arrangements that are rich in indigenous wisdom of conflict management and resolution. Moreover, it is also important to enable policymakers to include such wisdom in the policies of these nations and to help indigenous citizens to use their own theories instead of looking to and waiting on the West for solutions to its problems. Libya would have been in a far better situation if one of these methods of conflict management had been considered.

References

Adebajo, A. (2016) The revolt against the West: intervention and sovereignty. *Third World Quarterly, 37*(7), 1187-1202.

Becker, J., & Shane, S. (2016a, February 27). *The Libya Gamble Part-I: Hilary Clinton, Smart Power' and a dictator's Fall.* The New York Times. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2016/02/28/us/politics/hillary-clinton-libya.html

Becker, J., & Shane, S. (2016b, February 27). *The Libya Gamble Part-II: A New Libya, with Very Little Time Left.* The New York Times. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2016/02/28/us/politics/libya-isis-hillary-clinton.html

Bose, S., & Thakur, R. (2016). The UN Secretary-General and the Forgotten Third R2P Responsibility. *Global Responsibility to Protect*, *8*(4), 343-365.

Cypher, J. M. (2016). Hegemony, military power projection and US structural economic interests in the periphery. *Third World Quarterly, 37*(5), 800-817.

Danilovic, V., & Clare, J. (2007). The Kantian Liberal Peace (Revisited). *American Journal of Political Science, 51*(2), 397-414.

Doyle, W. M. (2005). Three Pillars of the Liberal Peace. *American Political Science Review, 99*(3), 463-466.

Heathershaw, J. (2013). Towards better theories of peacebuilding: beyond the liberal peace debate. *Peacebuilding, 1*(2), 275-282.

Hegre, H., Ellingsen, T., Gates, S., & Gleditsch, N. (2001). Towards a Democratic Civil Peace? Democracy, Political Change, and Civil War, 1816-1992. *American Political Science Review, 95*(1), 33-48.

Hoffman, M. (2009). What is left of the Liberal Peace?. *LSE Connect*, *21*(2), 10-11.

Kuperman, A. J. (2015). Obama's Libya Debacle: How a Well-Meaning Intervention Ended in Failure. *Foreign Affairs*, *94*(2).

Payandeh, N. (2012). The United Nations, Military Intervention, and Regime Change in Libya. *Virginia Journal of International Law, 52*(2), 355-403.

Richmond, O. P. (2006). The problem of peace: understanding the 'liberal peace'. *Conflict, Security & Development*, *6*(3), 291-314.

Richmond, P. O. (2010). Resistance and the Post-liberal Peace. *Millennium Journal of International Studies, 38*(3), 665-692.

Richmond, O. P., & Mac Ginty, R. (2014). Where now for the critique of the liberal peace. *Cooperation and Conflict, 50*(2), 171-189.

Salih, M. A. (2012). Coming to Terms with the Liberal Peacebuilding in Post-War Liberia and Sierra Leone. In D. J. Francis (Ed.), *When War Ends: Building Peace in Divided Communities* (pp. 167-184). Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing.

United Nations. (2011). *Security Council Resolution 1973*. New York: United Nations.

Vandewalle, D. (2012). After Qaddafi: The Surprising Success of the New Libya. *Foreign Affairs, 19*(6), 8-15.

Weiss, T. G., & Roy, P. (2016). The UN and the Global South, 1945 and 2015: past as prelude? *Third World Quarterly, 37*(7), 1147-1155.

Zoubir, Y. H., & Rózsa, E. N. (2012). The end of the Libyan dictatorship: the uncertain transition. *Third World Quarterly*, *33*(7), 1267-1283.