Asian Journal of
Social and Humanities

Discourse Analysis of Nato's Intervention In Libya In 2011

Umar Suryadi Bakry
Universitas Jayabaya, Indonesia
E-mail: usbakry@pascajayabaya.ac.id

*Correspondence: usbakry@pascajayabaya.ac.id

KEYWORDS	ABSTRACT
humanitarian intervention, constructivism, discourse analysis, libya	The issue of humanitarian intervention has again become a discussion in the realm of international relations studies in connection with the outbreak of NATO military intervention in Libya in 2011. A fierce debate among both theorists and practitioners began when NATO carried out a humanitarian intervention mission into Libya by bombing Libyan military bases. This study seeks to understand the controversial events of NATO's humanitarian intervention in Libya by using an approach born after the end of the Cold War, namely constructivism. Meanwhile, the type of research used is qualitative research using discourse analysis and interpretive analysis. The results of the study show that the majority of UN member states have indeed accepted humanitarian intervention as a new norm in international relations, but this new norm has been abused by a number of countries to protect their material national interests. At least in the case of NATO's intervention in Libya, the process of accepting humanitarian intervention norms (including human rights norms and democracy) did not take place through the process of communicative action as Habermas believes. The process of accepting these new norms tends to go through a coercion approach as introduced by Wendt. Then based on the analysis of the discourse, it can be concluded that there has been a hegemony of communication by Western society, especially regarding the discourse of atrocities committed by the Gaddafi regime, so that this opens up the possibility of humanitarian intervention.

Introduction

The issue of humanitarian intervention has become the most heated discussion in international relations over the past decade (Welsh, 2004). A fierce debate among both theorists and practitioners began when NATO carried out a humanitarian intervention mission into Kosovo in 1999 by bombing Serbian army bases. Discussions on humanitarian intervention have intensified especially since the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS) published a report titled, "Responsibility to Protect" (R2P), in December 2001. The report is a response to UN Secretary-General Koffi Annan's 2000 speech to the UN General Assembly in which he called on the

international community to agree on a collective basis of action to intervene in heinous mass crimes, including genocide, war crimes, crimes against humanity and ethnic cleansing (Gärtner, 2011).

The practice of humanitarian intervention "legalized" by the R2P doctrine is seen by some experts and practitioners as a threat to the establishment of the principles of diplomacy and international relations, especially the idea of the principle of non-intervention and non-interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign state (Belloni, 2002). In addition to being a threat to sovereignty norms, the issue of humanitarian intervention has also caused international law to become an uncertain value (Chesterman, 2002). The practice of humanitarian intervention also further strengthens the enactment of new norms in international relations, namely human rights and the use of force. In other words, the use of force (military) in international relations is considered legitimate as long as it is oriented to the interests of respect or protection of human rights (HAM).

Now the discourse on humanitarian intervention is heating up again in connection with the NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) military intervention in Libya. With the logic of protecting the human rights of the Libyan people, since March 19, 2011 NATO has carried out military attacks on Libya. This intervention has been approved by the UN Security Council through Resolution No. 1973. NATO's military intervention, which is also supported by a number of Arab countries such as Jordan, Qatar, and Oman, has succeeded in overthrowing the government of Muammar Gaddafi. Since September 2011 Libya has been under the rule of the opposition that is fully supported by NATO. The former Libyan leader himself was killed in a joint military operation carried out by opposition and NATO forces in the city of Sirte on October 20, 2011.

The phenomenon of military attacks under the guise of humanitarian intervention missions seems to have become a mode for Western countries to resolve various political crises in developing countries in the post-Cold War era. Humanitarian intervention modalities to end political crises and human rights violations in post-Cold War developing countries have been implemented in East Timor, Rwanda, Bosnia, Darfur (South Sudan), Kurds (Northern Iraq), Haiti, Sierra Leone, Bosnia-Herzegovina, and Kosovo. The political background that drives the implementation of humanitarian interventions differs from country to country. However, everything cannot be separated from the alleged incidents of gross human rights violations in these countries.

Based on the description above, the author is interested in conducting research on the phenomenon of humanitarian intervention using a theory or perspective of international relations that was born after the Cold War, namely constructivism and discourse analysis. One of the factors that the author considers is that research on the phenomenon of humanitarian intervention using the theory or paradigm of international relations born after the Cold War such as constructivist perspective and discourse analysis is still very limited.

Research Methods
Type of Research

This research uses a qualitative method. The main reason underlying the selection of this qualitative method is to answer the research question asked, namely how the discourse analysis and constructivist perspective understand the events of NATO's humanitarian intervention in Libya in 2011. As Maxwell said, the choice of research method must be determined by the research question that the answer is to be sought.

Maxwell also said that in addition to the reason for answering the research question, the selection of the method must also be based on the research purpose (Maxwell, 2013).

The purpose of this research is to gain an understanding of the phenomenon of humanitarian intervention which has become a hot issue in the study of International Relations in the last decade. Through research, it is hoped that in-depth information and data can be obtained so that the meaning behind the phenomenon can be found. Specifically, the phenomenon to be studied is the case of NATO's humanitarian intervention in Libya which lasted from March to October 2011 which led to the fall of the Moamar Gaddafi regime.

Because it is a qualitative research, this research is not specifically intended or focused on building a generalization, but rather to obtain the meaning behind the phenomenon of NATO's humanitarian intervention in Libya. Even if in its implementation the author is forced to make generalizations, the nature of transferability is only (only possible in the bond of context and time). This study emphasizes the collection of objective data that is natural from the phenomenon of NATO's humanitarian intervention in Libya.

Research Approach

To analyze or gain an understanding of the above research object, a constructivism approach will be used. There are two reasons behind the choice of this approach. First, constructivism is a contemporary paradigm in the study of International Relations that has not been widely used by other researchers to understand the phenomenon of international relations, especially the phenomenon of humanitarian intervention. Second, the constructivism approach is in accordance with the qualitative research method used in this study, because the constructivism approach emphasizes more on understanding the nature of international relations.

As Hurd (2008) said, constructivism is an approach in the study of International Relations that emphasizes more on the social and relational construction of relations between countries and what these countries want (Hurd et al., 2008). In other words, constructivism is more reflective of the values, norms, identities, and interests of countries, so the use of this approach is expected to better understand the social interaction behind the phenomenon of international relations, especially the phenomenon of NATO's humanitarian intervention in Libya.

Data Collection Techniques

The data collection technique (collecting the data) used in this study is triangulated, namely using a combined or simultaneous data collection technique. The selection of the types of collection techniques in this study is more based on practical considerations, especially regarding cost and time limitations. As Maxwell said, the selection of data collection techniques in qualitative research is very important to consider practical considerations.

With these practical considerations, in this study, several data collection techniques such as literature techniques, documentation techniques, historical record techniques, and interview techniques using internet facilities are used. Each data collection technique is used to network different data according to the needs of this research. Interview techniques, for example, are used to obtain more in-depth information from informants, namely people who have seen firsthand the phenomenon of NATO's intervention in Libya and the events behind it using email and skype.

Data Analysis Techniques

To analyze or interpret the data obtained through some of the above data collection techniques, discourse analysis techniques are used. This technique is used to analyze the considerations behind the decision-making process of leaders of NATO countries and the United Nations regarding the need for humanitarian intervention in Libya. The use of discourse analysis is important because it is part of a constructivist approach that emphasizes the politics of meaning and the process by which IP actors create a picture of international political reality. Through this analysis, it will be known how the messages and realities of international relations are constructed, produced, reproduced, and distributed to the international community.

Results and Discussions
Research Results

With the logic of protecting the human rights of the Libyan people, since March 19, 2011 NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) has carried out a military attack on Libya. This intervention has been approved by the UN Security Council through Resolution No. 1973. NATO's military intervention, which is also supported by a number of Arab countries such as Jordan, Qatar, and Oman, has succeeded in overthrowing the government of Muammar Gaddafi.

The intervention in Libya began on March 19, 2011. The French began military action by attacking Gaddafi's combat units south of Benghazi. France also began by destroying Libya's air defense system. After that, other NATO countries that joined the multinational coalition launched an attack on Libya.

To cripple Gaddafi's military power, NATO countries deployed massive combat power. The United States (US) has alerted 42 F-16 fighter jets at Italy's Aviano Air Base. The UK deployed a number of Tornado GR4 jets equipped with more than 100 Tomahawk missiles. France deployed 20 Mirage and Rafale fighter jets. Norway sent six F-16 fighter jets, while Spain had three F-18 fighters and one tanker. Italy fielded dozens of Tornado, F-16 and Eurofighter fighter aircraft. Sweden is committed to sending eight JAS39 Gripen fighter jets and an aircraft that will serve as an early warning system of the Saab 340 AEW&C. Denmark includes six F-16AM fighter jets and a C-130J-30 super hercules. Canada assigned 7 CF-16 fighter jets, 2 CC-150 Polaris type newswriting aircraft, and 2 CC-177 type transport aircraft. Even two Middle Eastern countries that are clearly not members of NATO, the United Arab Emirates (UAE) and Qatar, participated in the attack mission to Libya. The UAE is preparing F-16 aircraft at Decimomannu Air Base in Italy, which is a base for NATO forces to attack Libya, while Qatar contributes with 6 Mirage 2000-5EDA fighter jets and 2 C-17 type transport aircraft. In addition to these countries, a number of other countries also participated in the intervention mission to Libya, including Jordan, Greece and the Netherlands. Meanwhile, one of the NATO members, Germany, decided not to join the military attack mission to Libya.

Each coalition member state gave a different term or name for their military offensive mission to Libya. France gave the official name "Operation Harmmatan", the British called it "Operation Ellamy", Canada used the name "Operation Mobile", while the US gave the mission term "Operation Odessey Dawn". However, in the terminology of international relations, the NATO military operation mission to Libya is known as humanitarian intervention. This term is also used by the United Nations as stated in UN Security Council Resolution No. 1973.

One of the major challenges faced in analyzing humanitarian interventions is the variety of definitions of humanitarian interventions themselves. According to Welsh, the

field of legal, ethical or political analysis affects the definition chosen to explain humanitarian intervention. The debate began with whether the humanitarian intervention was limited to providing humanitarian aid or whether it was explicitly authorized by the UN Security Council to take action, in this case the military. Welsh emphasizes the definition of "coercive interference in the internal affairs of a state, which involves the use of armed force, with objectives of the elimination of extraordinary human rights violations or the prevention of widespread human suffering."

After the Cold War, it was recorded that many countries were under military intervention from other countries. Humanitarian aid in Bosnia, Cambodia, Somalia, Iraq and finally Libya shows how humanitarian intervention has become the norm in contemporary international politics. Liberal and realist theories do not provide a good explanation for this behavior. The interest of these theories is only geostrategic and economic, even though many cases of humanitarian intervention do not pay attention to geostrategy and economics. The clearest example can be seen in the case of Somalia, where military actions carried out in the country do not even have strategic or economic importance.

The current pattern of humanitarian intervention raises the issue of what interests behind a country's interference in the domestic affairs of other countries. In most cases, the targets of the intervention are not very important to any measure of geostrategic or economic importance. The normative context in the intervention pattern is important because it forms the conception of interests. Standard analytical assumptions about other states or actors pursuing their interests seem to leave behind a blur of sources of interest.

Changes in intervention behavior from time to time are related to changes in normative standards presented by countries regarding the goals and means of military intervention. Specifically, the normative understanding of which human beings are valuable for military protection and about the ways in which such protection should be implemented has changed, and the behavior of the state has also changed. This correlation confirms the strong explanation of norms. The failure of alternative explanations to understand changes in intervention behavior patterns increases the credibility of normative approaches.

Humanitarian intervention seems strange from the conventional perspective of international political behavior because it is not in harmony with the conception of interests they mentioned. Realists emphasize geostrategic or political gains by intervening in a country. Neoliberals will emphasize economic and trade interests. However, the benefits for humanitarian intervention after 1989 have become difficult to identify. The U.S. military action in Somalia in 1989 was a case of intervention with no clear interest. Economically, Somalia is not very important to the United States. To refer to security interests is also difficult to find in this intervention case.

In the case of Libya, humanitarian intervention is interesting to study, because according to some experts, this case is the first example of the implementation of Responsibility to Protect (R2P). In the relatively short time since the implementation of the 1973 UN Resolution, many scientists have provided a number of analyses regarding the intervention in Libya. Much of this scholarly debate has centered on the legitimacy of the intervention in Libya, often looking at the extent to which the intervention could be placed within the normative framework established by the R2P. The analysis in this dissertation involves norms, sovereignty and interests in the perspective of constructivism. For this reason, it is good to review the perspective of humanitarian intervention theory.

In the case of international humanitarian crises, international relations theorists and political philosophers have outlined a number of norms to weigh whether an intervention is necessary and valid or not. This has become a debate among scientists. There is an opinion that humanitarian intervention is necessary because protecting human beings is the responsibility of a nation. Michael Walzer stated that intervention should be a response to actions that "shake the consciousness of humanity" (Walzer 2002). Thus, Walzer would not approve an intervention in Libya, because the threatening actions carried out by the Gaddafi government had not yet been carried out at the time of the intervention (Walzer, 2002).

In contrast to Walzer, Fernando Teson offered a more lenient approach to justifying humanitarian intervention. He states that "a justifiable intervention must aim at ending tyranny or severe anarchy... This standard does not have to require the existence of a genocide or similar mass crime."(Tesón, 2017) Referring to this criterion, humanitarian intervention can be justified. In a speech on March 16, 2011, Gaddafi declared that the rebels would be burned to the ground. He said he would clean Libya, inch by inch, house to house, alley to alley, person to person, until the country is clean of dirt and garbage." He stated that he would not forgive the rebels. These statements give clues that Gaddafi is endangering his own people, and intends to end the lives of Libyans who disobey him.

The third view comes from Nicholas Wheeler, who puts himself halfway between Walzer and Teson. Wheeler allows humanitarian intervention by filtering between the protection and restoration of human rights. According to Wheeler, humanitarian interventions should have the following categories: saving human lives, concerning major issues such as genocide, mass killings and mass deportations and in the case of preventive interventions, there must be strong evidence of future massacres. Intervention, according to Wheeler, should be a last resort and decision-makers should be confident that it will have humanitarian outcomes (Wheeler, 2000). Referring to Gaddafi's March 16, 2011 speech, in which he clearly stated his intention to end the lives of Libyans who rebelled against him, the terms of Wheeler's proposed intervention could be used to prevent atrocities on a large scale.

The norms of intervention show that within the academic community, if we accept that there should be a norm on humanitarian intervention, there is a wide range of possibilities. R2P, introduced by the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS) in December 2001, has been endorsed by the 2005 UN World Summit (UNGA).

To make an intervention valid, the R2P doctrine establishes a number of principles of humanitarian intervention. In the ICISS document, the first principle of R2P is that interventions are carried out if there is "a large-scale loss of life, whether actual or perceived, with genocidal intent or not, which is the product of the deliberate actions of the state, or the neglect or inability of the state to act, or the failure of the state to act." In the case of Libya, this intention to lose lives on a large scale existed when Gaddafi gave his speech on March 16, 2011. Second, the primary intention of the intervening state must be to "stop or prevent human casualties."

The condition to achieve this condition is that the intervening country should be multilateral. Often, the main motives of the intervening state are debated. However, the authority to intervene in the military is vested in the UN Security Council for human protection purposes. So what NATO is doing, based on the 1973 resolution, which is seen by some as the first resolution to put this new norm into practice, seems legitimate. The adoption of such a resolution was unprecedented in the history of the Security Council,

so it was a sign that the United Nations ordered international military action against one member state to prevent mass killings, instead of acting after the killings had occurred.

However, criticism of NATO's humanitarian interventions has been swirling. In the midst of Libya's civil war, at least 100 countries, dated October 18, 2011, as well as supranational bodies and several other countries, have transferred their diplomatic recognition to the NTC.

NTC officials have asked for foreign aid to resolve the dispute with the Gaddafi regime in Libya. The NTC also asked for supplies of medicine, money, and weapons. The problem arose when the NTC promised to pay these debts to donor countries with oil deals and assets of Gaddafi and his relatives that had been frozen after the war ended.

Pattison argued that while the situation in Libya could justify NATO's humanitarian intervention on the basis of R2P, "regime change forced by outsiders to support rebel movements" could not be justified (Pattison, 2011). Pattison's opinion refers to a track record of forced regime change that tends to do more harm than good. He then questioned whether "the main intention of the intervention was to protect civilians or to overthrow Gaddafi".

If the main intention of the intervention forces was the overthrow of Gaddafi, it is clear that the use of the R2P doctrine to achieve international legitimacy has absolutely no humanitarian end goal. Jan Maessen said it was interesting to distinguish between the UN, regional and national levels. He questioned the position of different actors regarding the possibility of regime change legitimized by the 1973 resolution?

The debate over humanitarian intervention also revolves around the question of partiality. According to Allin and Jones, it is impossible to carry out a successful humanitarian intervention without 'picking sides,' and thus without aiming, implicitly, to overthrow the leader being opposed. Allin and Jones gave examples of the experiences of Bosnia and Kosovo that show that humanitarian intervention cannot be neutral. Here the intervention team chooses a party. So while there is an implicit goal to overthrow Gaddafi in the case of Libya's civil war, the choice of parties by the intervention forces is to prevent human rights abuses. That way, the humanitarian nature of the intervention is not affected.

The second criticism of the Libyan intervention is based on the opinion that there is an inconsistency in the situation in which the international community decides to act. According to Allin and Jones, the Libyan intervention is seen as illegitimate because the US, France and Britain have not intervened in countries such as Bahrain, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Syria, and Saudi Arabia, where authoritarian regimes and human rights abuses are also clearly occurring. According to Maessen, the international community's decision not to intervene in these countries seems to make it clear that R2P is not the main motive for the international community's actions. Therefore, there is an opinion that there is an ulterior motive that strongly determines the international community to carry out intervention actions. Thus, the R2P doctrine is not the main principle that is the basis of humanitarian intervention (Maessen, 2012).

However, all these opinions do not make the intervention carried out by the international community lose its legitimacy. The follow-up question is: how does the constructivist perspective view NATO's humanitarian intervention in Libya?

There are two big opinions regarding NATO's humanitarian intervention in Libya. First, which states that NATO's involvement in the civil war in Libya shows an imperial madness. This opinion was expressed by Venezuela's president, Hugo Chavez. The second is the opinion of Daniel Serwer. He stated that the attack on Libya was purely a

humanitarian intervention, not an imperialist aggression. In the United States itself, there is much debate about the constitutionality of President Obama's decision to carry out airstrikes to establish an air-free zone in Libya. The debate has expanded to the issue of the U.S. interest in protecting America beyond its borders .

On March 28, 2011, President Obama confirmed the U.S. involvement in Libya in a speech. President Obama argues that the U.S. involvement in Libya is based on the humanitarian needs of a foreigner in which the U.S. feels called to respond to the cries for help of the Libyan people. Obama claimed "to put aside America's responsibility... would be a betrayal for the American people themselves." Rodriguez questioned: If countries act in accordance with their own interests and material capacities, as exemplified by the dominant paradigm (realist), why are human values and commonalities important? This is where the important constructivism paradigm lies in analyzing the R2P doctrine.

Since the publication of Nicholas Onuf's book, "World of Our Making" in 1989, constructivist theory in international relations has placed itself on a firm foothold. Constructivist theory is based on the simple idea that humans are social creatures, and the world is our own (socially constructed). The agents (individuals, nations, etc.), thus take on the meaning of their own existence, the meaning of each other and the world around them. According to Onuf, agents and structures fill each other (Onuf, 2012).

Constructivism focuses on norms and values, but does not negate interests, nor is it an antecedent of rationality. Finnemore and Sikkink note: "Agents create rational strategies to reshape choices, identities or social contexts. Agent interactions and agent-structure interactions provide value to interests."(Finnemore & Sikkink, 1998). However, interests are limited by the agent's behavioral norms. It is this norm of behavior that shapes the interaction. Agents must consider the limits set by structures, norms and conventions. According to Onuf, the process of navigating through normative structures in the pursuit of interests is a rational choice.

Constructivism in international relations emphasizes that the international order is always socially constructed from time to time. Concepts such as the state, nation, borders, interests and other institutions that we now understand are the result of social construction.

States, as well as individual agents are limited by the interaction of agents and structures that complement each other. Changes in identity and interests will also result in changes in the international structure. Anarchy and sovereignty are thus not objective facts, because they are all social constructions manifested through the interaction of states with each other. Wendt said that the anarchic structure of international relations is constructed through mutual recognition of the sovereignty of each other, only if the behavior of the state really wants to recognize it. This is where Wendt then declared: "Anarchy is something the state makes."(Wendt, 1992)

Analysis/Discussion

In the field of social sciences, discourse analysis can be viewed and used in various ways. It is known as a social theory as well as an approach to the question of power and identity. In addition, discourse analysis is used as a method to analyze texts. In contrast to the type that focuses on linguistics, where discourse is usually interpreted as the language of speech or writing, discourse analysis in the social sciences places attention on social practices and contexts. He sees language as a contributor to how the social context is organized.

In other words, language does not directly reflect reality. Instead, it contributes to the formation of reality. As a result, language has the ability to limit our way of thinking and then, the way we act. Jogersen and Philips stated that there are three main schools in the field of constructive social discourse analysis: Laclau and Mouffe's discourse theory, discursive psychology and critical discourse analysis (AWK). They argue that all three "can be applied in the analysis of many different social regions... and on the exploration of the role of language used in broad social and cultural development."

Power relations are the core of AWK. Interpretation is seen as the foundation of knowledge, where power concerns the ability to make certain knowledge recognized as "true". Because it controls what is allowed and possible, discourse recommends only certain actions and specific practices. As Jorgensen and Philips note, change in discourse has the ability to prescribe actions, which in turn make changes in society. The interaction of discursive practices in the social world is a major influencer and is crucial for change. Through discourse, the way we treat phenomena will change and then contribute to development in the social and political space. That way, discourse can be seen as a social practice through the use of language. Language is constructed in a social context but can also make the construction of society a social phenomenon constructed through the use of language. Discourse is so productive and has the ability to create meaning.

Norms, socially constructed values and knowledge, form discourse, which ultimately leads to relatable reactions. These reactions can result from actions. The discourse analysis used in this thesis is to examine how the discourse on human atrocities and human rights violations in Libya will make or prevent humanitarian interventions carried out by NATO. This thesis will discuss how discourse can open or close the possibility of intervention. Language is seen as having the ability to make some things possible, and some things impossible. In this thesis, it will be emphasized how words have power, where if someone talks about something in a specific way, that person will also be on a specific path of thought, which can ultimately make us treat the subject of discourse in line with our thoughts. Thus, this thesis will examine how interpretation during the conflict in Libya can open or close the possibility of intervention.

Basically, international relations refer to cross-border relations between countries, organizations and other actors. The study of international relations contains questions concerning the causes of war and peace, poverty and environmental issues. There are at least four main schools in the theory of international relations. These schools of thought raise some core questions concerning international relations.

The first school is realism, which focuses on power when analyzing international politics. Because the state has supreme power, realism almost exclusively focuses on the state as an active agent, as opposed to other schools of international relations, which recognize organizations, companies, and individuals as agents. For realists, these agents are seen as secondary. Thus, power and state are the two main phenomena for realism. The second school is liberalism. The liberal perspective is built on the idea that international relations assume that individuals and countries are rational and that they are capable of navigating relationships in order to promote the common good in a world characterized through interdependence. The third school is radicalism, which seeks to explain the relationship between production, social relations and power. The basis for radicalism is Marxism, which is considered a social theory and political philosophy rather than a theory of international politics. Marxism is based on Karl Marl's thinking about economic change and class conflict. While the fourth school is constructivism.

This thesis chooses constructivism as the theoretical foundation. The choice of constructivism as the theoretical basis is based on this research involving the interpretation of atrocity and how the knowledge generated from these interpretations, can shape social practices. The constructivist perspective taken by this thesis wants to state that construction will lead to the use of definitions, which will then create strategies and rules for action. The actors are thus directed towards a path, and end up at a starting point of the suggested intervention action.

Constructivism is a series of substantive theories of different international relations and social theories that explore the social world, the actions that take place within that world and the relationship between actors and structures. Constructivism emerged at the end of the twentieth century. This theory raises questions about ideas such as sovereignty, identity and citizenship. Constructivism believes that individuals, countries and international communities are socially constructed. That way, the agents are constructed through international. As a result, making norms and practices central to international relations from a constructivist perspective. That social construct is always changing and depends on the context. Construction, in the sense of constructivism, refers to a formation of national interests, through structural and conductive factors.

Individual and collective identities are thus seen as the main facts from a constructivist perspective and state behavior is constructed by beliefs, norms and identities. Power is at the heart of a constructivist, as it is for realists and liberals. For a constructivist, power is not limited to material power. Power is seen by constructivists in a discursive sense. The phenomenon is thus constructed socially through discursive forces. If a belief or norm becomes important and recognized in a social context, then it has power. Language also has power, according to constructivists, and is not only seen as a means of communication. The interaction between material and social reality is the essence of constructivism.

As a social theory, constructivism focuses on the social construction of reality. The philosophical element of constructivism states that international relations are constructed by ideas and norms. According to Wendt, the social structure has three basic elements, namely: common knowledge, material resources and practice. According to Wendt, the content and distribution of ideas have an impact on the constitution of the material base, where biology and human nature are incapable of explaining the behavior of individuals and states, because these elements depend on social phenomena. According to Wendt, the content of interests is shaped by the idea and meaning of power in international politics is shaped by the distribution of interests.

To analyze the discourse of the conflict in Libya, we can start from the rhetoric of the civil war that is widely used by the international community. Although civil war is difficult to define when one describes conflict as a civil war, there is no compelling reason to prove or undermine the claim. Vatz stated, "no situation can have a nature independent of the perception of its interpreter or independent of the rhetoric chosen to characterize it." In essence, the speaker influences the viewer's perception of the conflict by the way they use the word "civil war." (Vatz, 1973)

In the first days of Libya's turmoil, Saif Gaddafi gave a frantic speech on Al-Jazeera television. His speech, televised on February 20, 2011, carefully used the language of civil war to predict a future of chaos and great death for Libya. Excitedly, Saif tried to label the protesters as "drunks under the control of hallucinogens or drugs" and "these drunks driving tanks in downtown Benghazi."

He then re-emphasized the potential for chaos:

> Libya is different, if there is a disturbance, it will break up into several countries. There were three countries 60 years ago. Libya has tribes unlike Egypt. There are no political parties here. This is a country composed of tribes. Everyone knows each other. We will be in a civil war like in 1936.

Saif also used the ancient tactics of authoritarian rulers by claiming that the next government will not be able to effectively share oil profits in this resource-rich country. He continued:

> There will be chaos, we will have to leave Libya if we cannot divide the oil. Everyone wants to be Sheik or Emir, we are not Egypt or Tunisia so we are in a big challenge. […]
> Brothers, there's a $200 billion project at stake right now. We will agree on this matter soon. We will be able to protect our country, unlike our neighbors. We will do it without the problems that Egypt and Tunisia are currently experiencing. There is no tourist attraction. We will have a new Libya, a new flag, a new national anthem. Otherwise, be prepared to start civil war and chaos and forget about oil and fuel.

If we pay attention to the use of the word "civil war" in the context of Saif's speech, it is intended for the Libyan people to be convinced that civil war will only lead to chaos and more suffering similar to Egypt and Tunisia.

Saif also used the opposite statement that "Libya is a tribe not like Egypt." In times of crisis, a leader will try to unite his people. However, by declaring that Libya is more of a "tribe" than a nation, it implies the division of society rather than unity.

By implying the chaos of a tribal state, he used authoritarian rhetoric tactics that claimed that his people needed a strong leader to ensure order in times of chaos. It is also important to note that Saif uses the "us" vs. "them" scenario. We are defined as good Libyans as outsiders and "drug addicts" who threaten the peace and development of Libya, a country that is willing to change. Saif's use of civil war discourse is intended to sum up Libya's future chaos.

Two days later, Muammar Gaddafi stood on stage to give a speech after the beginning of the turmoil in Benghazi. Like his son's panicked speech, Gaddafi called on Libyans to stop fighting while promising to punish those who caused the problem to arise. He claimed that the government would make concessions and new committees would be formed to carry out appropriate reforms within the government. He said that there would be a civil war in Libya if the fighting was not stopped:

> Be still so that you can hear. This is really dangerous... I haven't even ordered the use of bullets. Any use of weapons against the authorities, whoever causes the murder will be sentenced to death... Civil war, whoever causes or acts towards civil war, and these acts lead to civil war... You want to be like Somalia? This will lead to civil war, if you don't hold them back. Civil war, whoever is caught and declared to be the cause, to weaken the unity of the country. Look at Duma... They brought tanks, and on live TV, Yeltsin, they hit the Duma building and they left like rats.

In this part of the speech, Gaddafi often made comparisons to Somalia and the chaos caused by the civil war. He also stated: "I am the chairman of the people's

revolution. It takes security, strengthens security, respects the authority, the authority of the people."

By declaring himself the "chairman of the people's revolution," Gaddafi tried to reassert his position of power and authority in Libya despite protests and turmoil that had the effect of eroding the legitimacy of his rule. In this speech, it is also important to note that he mentioned the term "rat" more than eleven times to describe the rebels.

In Saif's speech, his audience was the Libyan people. Although he called them "American Oil Companies," he referred only to them as outside influences rather than direct enemies. It does not create a "us" vs. "them" scenario in which the US or the West are included as enemies.

The "us" vs "them" scenario is described as an internal rather than an external issue. Instead, he focused on the chaos and destruction that had already occurred. His desire to give concessions if the people have the desire to stop. Saif's speech used the word "kita" a lot as an attempt to promote unity instead of the chaos that was happening in his country at that time.

Clearly, Saif has a different audience than NATO and the NTC. He used the term civil war as a direct threat to the Libyan people. Muammar Kahadafi, like his son, used the civil war as a threat to the Libyan people. The use of the word civil war by the two may also be directed at the United States to avoid the possibility of intervention by the United States and its allies. But after Gaddafi failed to meet UN and NATO demands for a ceasefire, his defence fell on deaf ears by the international community.

NTC uses different rhetoric. By naming their group a "transitional council" instead of a revolutionary council, they managed to gain legitimacy and control over Libya. The NTC cautiously rejected the civil war rhetoric conveyed by Gaddafi. They stated, "We must discard the myth that this conflict is a triple civil war, or an armed conflict drawn along geographical lines. The battlefield may have seen the country split in two, but it is not... The Libyan people reject the Gaddafi regime and remain firmly united."

Using this kind of rhetoric, the NTC wants to discourse the conflict in Libya as Gaddagi against everyone. In the question and answer the NTC simply responded, "We are the Libyan people." With this kind of subtle rhetoric, the NTC then gained the full support of the Libyan people without having to become so radical that it deprived them of the UN and NATO intervention support they so desperately needed to paralyze Gaddafi's government forces.

Their description of the tribal system that could spark a civil war allowed the NTC to balance their actions:

> The tribes and their members, while acknowledging the importance of tribal relations, are essentially the Libyan people. Tribes are fighting side by side against the Gaddafi regime across Libya's main towns and villages. They fought side by side as Libyans, to liberate Libya.

One of the overarching themes of comparing the rhetoric of various actors is the question of legitimacy. Without legitimacy, any speech or statement would be nothing but empty rhetoric. A rhetorician with legitimacy can promote their goals to a general audience who recognizes their views as truthful. When analyzing different texts, the importance of civil war language and legitimacy becomes clear.

All of these rhetorical makers had an important motivation for using the language of civil war. A civil war is basically a conflict that involves the government and outside

powers in an effort to gain legitimacy (Petrasek, 2000). For the government involved, legitimacy is obtained through the resistance of every insurgency that arises. This can be done either by force or reform, although this method has its own strengths and weaknesses. Both Saif and Muammar Gaddafi realized that despite their strong will, the events in Benghazi proved that they could not "keep themselves in power" if their insurgency grew. Realizing this, they promoted a reform system as clearly stated by Saif, "We will have a new Libya, a new flag, a new national anthem. The lack of legitimacy caused by years of human rights violations, the regime's false promises to the people, the lavish lifestyle of the Gaddafi family, and even the frantic tone of their speeches caused the Libyan people to reject the messages they conveyed.

For the NTC, legitimacy is the main goal. Their legitimacy with the Libyan people and the international community is the result of their engagement with the UN and NATO from the beginning. They choose the use of language carefully, both in statements and in the news references they issue to the press, insisting that they will follow the rules of international law, and the realization that a chaotic revolution will be against long-term goals. Based on the greatness of the NTC's rhetoric, the discourse of the international community is moving towards electing the NTC. That way, NATO intervened, after the NTC managed to win the discourse they rolled out.

Conclusion

NATO's humanitarian intervention in Libya also deviated from the doctrine of R2P and the 1973 UNSC Resolution itself. As described in the analysis section of this dissertation, several countries (notably France, Britain and the US), explicitly stated that the Gaddafi regime must fall. They voiced a regime change in Libya even before the intervention began. This was not in the spirit of R2P or Resolution 1973 because neither justified regime change. Even France went a step further by accepting NTC members and recognizing them as Libya's legitimate authority, while Libya was still in civil war.

Although the 1973 Resolution authorizes the use of "all necessary means" to protect civilians and residents in residential areas, it does not see a viable solution to conflict through military means. In its preamble, the resolution called for an immediate ceasefire and a complete cessation of all violence and attacks on civilians. The text of the resolution implies that the crisis must be stopped through peaceful and non-partisan means. By explicitly siding with the NTC in the early stages of the crisis, we can argue that this is an act of non-compliance with the 1973 Resolution, as well as the R2P doctrine.

Based on the above description, it can be said that this study confirms that there is still a weakness in the constructivist perspective associated with the case of NATO's humanitarian intervention in Libya. The constructivist premise that the growing acceptance of new norms in the practice of international relations, such as respect for human rights and democracy, underlies the behavior of countries in international interactions, has not yet been fully realized in the case of NATO's intervention in Libya. In its implementation, human rights and democracy norms are merely instruments for countries to justify their material national interests.

In addition to human rights and democracy norms, humanitarian intervention itself is a new norm accepted by the international community. The majority of UN member states have indeed accepted humanitarian intervention as a new norm in international relations, but this new norm has been abused by a number of countries to protect their material national interests. At least in the case of NATO's intervention in Libya, the process of accepting humanitarian intervention norms (including human rights norms and

democracy) did not take place through the process of communicative action as Habermas believes. The process of accepting these new norms tends to go through a coercion approach as introduced by Wendt.

Another premise of constructivism that interest is a product of identity also does not fully apply in the case of NATO's humanitarian intervention in Libya. The interests at work behind NATO's humanitarian intervention in Libya are more derived from material national needs, rather than the product of identities that seek to be associated in international relations.

Umar Suryadi Bakry

References

Belloni, R. (2002). Kosovo and beyond: Is humanitarian intervention transforming international society? *Human Rights & Human Welfare*, *2*(1), 4.

Chesterman, S. (2002). Legality versus legitimacy: Humanitarian intervention, the security council, and the rule of law. *Security Dialogue*, *33*(3), 293–307.

Finnemore, M., & Sikkink, K. (1998). International norm dynamics and political change. *International organization*, *52*(4), 887–917.

Gärtner, H. (2011). *The Responsibility to Protect (R2P) and Libya*.

Hurd, I., Reus-Smit, C., & Snidal, D. (2008). *The Oxford handbook of international relations*. Oxford University Press Oxford.

Maessen, J. (2012). The Libyan Intervention, Triumph and Downfall of the Responsibility to Protect in One. *Unpublished Master dissertation) Leiden University Leiden, The Netherlands*.

Maxwell, J. A. (2013). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach: An interactive approach*. sage.

Onuf, N. (2012). *World of our making: Rules and rule in social theory and international relations*. Routledge.

Pattison, J. (2011). The ethics of humanitarian intervention in Libya. *Ethics & International Affairs*, *25*(3), 271–277.

Petrasek, D. (2000). *Ends & Means: Human Rights Approaches to Armed Groups*. ICHRP.

Tesón, F. R. (2017). Humanitarian intervention: Loose ends. In *The Just War Tradition: Applying Old Ethics to New Problems* (bll 67–87). Routledge.

Vatz, R. E. (1973). The myth of the rhetorical situation. *Philosophy & rhetoric*, 154–161.

Walzer, M. (2002). Arguing for humanitarian intervention. *The new killing fields: Massacre and the politics of intervention*, 19–36.

Welsh, J. M. (2004). *Humanitarian intervention and international relations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wendt, A. (1992). Anarchy is what states make of it: the social construction of power politics. *International organization*, *46*(2), 391–425.

Wheeler, N. J. (2000). *Saving Strangers: Humanitarian Intervention in International Society*. Oxford University Press.