

Evaluating the Implementation of RtoP Doctrine in Libya: A Critical Analysis

Abhiroop Singh Kumawat*

Abstract

Responsibility to Protect (RtoP) Doctrine was developed by the United Nations and its member states as well in 2005 at United Nations World Summit to protect the civilians from mass killings in a particular sovereign state by the international community via several means i.e., starting from the diplomatic means to the last resort of military intervention. Though, NATO's military intervention in Libya under this RtoP Doctrine's UNSC Resolution 1973, gave the world different and unwanted outcomes and raises the very critical question about the legality of the military intervention in a state, which then led to the state into a civil war. Thus, the purpose of this article is to evaluate and assess the implementation of the RtoP doctrine in the case of Libya to get a better understating of this norm and to know that how the Libyan case of RtoP did not provide productive outcomes and what were the reasons behind its failure, and how the credibility of this norm had been undermined.

Key Words: *Responsibility to Protect, Libya, United Nations Security Council, Military Intervention, NATO.*

Introduction

In the 90s, in the cases of Kosovo, Rwanda, and Somalia, etc. where mass atrocities happened, which created so many calls for intervention on the humanitarian ground by the international community. This kind of intervention is defined by Evans and Sahnoun (2002: 99) as “coercive action against a state to protect people within its borders from suffering grave harm”. These interventions are often represented as a just and moral action to stop the genocide, war crimes, act against humanity, and ethnic cleansing by

*Research Scholar (UGC NET-JRF), Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi 110067, E-Mail abhiroopsingh232@gmail.com