

Will the U.S.-Led Solution Track for Libya Succeed?

(Translated)

Al-Rayah Newspaper - Issue 605 - 24/06/2026

By: Ahmed Al-Muhathab

It goes without saying that Libya is currently grappling with a crisis across both the political and military spheres. Massad Boulos, Trump's advisor on African affairs, proposed a solution to this crisis. However, it failed to garner support from certain influential domestic factions, as the plan targeted some of them while seeking to curtail the power of others. Consequently, opposition arose, and obstacles were placed in the path of its implementation. Among these obstacles were protests and acts of unrest demanding the departure of the United Nations mission from Libya. Critics accuse the mission of delaying a resolution by manufacturing shifts in the process and introducing new elements to the problem—elements that were neither part of the original deliberations nor causes of the conflict itself.

Many participants brought together by the UN mission to discuss solutions found themselves suddenly bound by new conditions that no one had originally requested, thereby altering the course of the dialogue. Thus, the mission is perceived as siding with those who wish to prolong the crisis—aligning with the desires of the United States and certain European nations, given America's control over the situation.

Expelling the UN mission has now become an objective in itself for the public, driven by an awareness of the role the mission, plays in the crisis. It has become evident that the U.S. utilizes the mission to extend the duration of the conflict.

A new development in this context is the emergence of calls to expel Africans entering the country without official documentation—so-called "illegal migrants"—leading to incidents where individuals with dark skin have been pursued and targeted.

It has been observed that certain entities are exploiting and encouraging this situation, and accusations have circulated that the UN mission is working to settle Africans in Libya to serve the interests of European nations. On the surface, the American proposal appears to offer the country salvation from the armed and political factions that exacerbate existing divisions and fragmentation. Each of these armed groups controls a specific state institution or facility—such as the Central Bank, the only airport in western Libya, or the seaports—while some dominate entire provinces or key municipalities.

Consequently, opposition to this proposal comes primarily from those factions that benefit from the status quo.

A closer look reveals that the proposal offers no real solution to the country's plight—namely, the domination by Western agents, particularly those of the United States. Instead, it serves merely as a palliative for the public's suffering and a deception aimed at the politically engaged populace, intended to hoodwink the public for a time. The U.S. proposal stipulates a two-year timeframe, after which a new ruse will likely be introduced to prolong the crisis. This strategy allows the U.S. to address other regions of the Islamic world under its sway and to bolster agents whose positions are precarious—such as in Sudan or Syria.

It has become evident that the domestic situation in Libya is becoming increasingly volatile. This is particularly true as the public becomes aware of the UN mission's collaboration with certain European nations to turn Libya into a hub for illegal migration—leading to an influx of migrants from Central Africa amidst rising racial tensions. This dynamic serves various interests, compounded by opportunists who exploit mob sentiment under the guise of social concern. Furthermore, activist groups have mobilized against the UN mission, demanding its departure due to its dubious role in schemes to permanently settle migrants and prolong the crisis to prevent a resolution. In short, Libya is currently navigating a phase of “poisoned solutions” proposed by the United States. These proposals are intended as palliatives to prevent a military explosion—a scenario the U.S. believes would lead to an uncontrollable situation.

The U.S. has ostensibly presented its proposed solution, the key elements of which include:

1. Abolishing the General Command, effectively Haftar's institution.
2. Establishing three military zones:
 - a. The Benghazi Military Zone, led by Khaled Haftar.
 - b. The Southern Military Zone, led by Officer Ali Qanna—a veteran officer associated with remnants of the former regime.
 - c. A Western Libya Military Zone, extending from Abu Grein to Ras Ajdir on the Tunisian border, headed by Major General Al-Namroush.
3. Appointing a new Minister of Defense.
4. Dissolving the eastern government and merging its ministers into the Dbeibah government.
5. Installing Saddam Haftar as head of the Presidential Council—effectively the country's ruler in the public eye—a position currently held by Mohamed al-Menfi.
6. Granting the new Dbeibah government—now bolstered by ministers from the east—a 24-month mandate to hold parliamentary and presidential elections.
7. Dissolving both the House of Representatives and the High Council of State following the elections.

There are additional provisions concerning the Central Bank and the National Oil Corporation, though these are not central to the local conflict.

Mohamed al-Menfi, the Chairman of the Presidential Council, Khaled al-Meshri, the previous Chairman of the High Council of State of Libya, and Aguila Saleh, Speaker of the House of Representatives of Libya, the Tobruk-based parliament, were quick to oppose the proposal.

It also faced opposition from certain national figures, such as Mohamed Sawan, head of the Democratic Party, affiliated with the Muslim Brotherhood. He described it as a “top-down deal” and, in a lengthy commentary on the proposal by Massad Boulos, characterized it as “a quick-fix deal to reshuffle the political landscape.” In a commentary, prominent analyst Mohamed Mahfouz noted that the proposal triggered

reactions from various factions; segments of the de facto powers—including Aguila Saleh and MPs from his parliament representing the West, South, and East, as well as figures within the High Council of State and the Presidential Council, alongside various influential figures and political parties—rejected the plan. Local television stations, such as Libya Al-Ahrar, and international outlets like Al Jazeera dedicated airtime to criticizing the initiative. Al Jazeera Net, for instance, published a piece titled “Partnership of the Strongest or Entrenching the Status Quo?” arguing that the US initiative is effectively moving toward imposing a pragmatic settlement focused on legitimizing the current spheres of influence and sharing power between the Haftar family in eastern Libya and the Dbeibah family in the west.

Meanwhile, the Arab Post website published an extensive report titled “Will the Boulos Initiative Turn into a Deal to Redistribute Power Between the Haftar and Dbeibah Families...?” The report shed light on behind-the-scenes, undisclosed meetings aimed at forging a new governance formula that combines the influence of the East and West without first holding elections.

International and Italian media outlets—such as Jeune Afrique magazine—also revealed details of secret meetings held in Rome that brought together ...involving pivotal figures representing both sides—specifically Ibrahim Dbeibah, National Security Advisor and cousin of Prime Minister Abdul Hamid Dbeibah, and Saddam Haftar, son of the Commander-in-Chief of the armed forces in eastern Libya.

Press reports regarding the foundations of the settlement indicate that the US approach relies on extreme pragmatism and managing stability through the actual power centers on the ground. It focuses on direct bilateral understanding and distilling the political process down to the two figures wielding the most financial and military influence—Ibrahim Dbeibah and Saddam Haftar—in order to bypass the complex disputes between the High Council of State and the House of Representatives, while centering the initiative on the economy and the oil sector.

However, these discussions have sparked a series of objections from the de facto powers on the ground; consequently, the US initiative is likely to fail, meeting the same fate as previous attempts. Therefore, it is essential to establish an intellectual foundation upon which the country’s conflicting and hostile forces can unite. There is no basis capable of uniting these hostile factions other than Islam in accordance with the Words of Allah (swt) Who said, ﴿وَمَنْ يَبْتَغِ غَيْرَ الْإِسْلَامِ دِينًا فَلَنْ يُقْبَلَ مِنْهُ﴾ **“And whoever seeks a Deen other than Islam, it will never be accepted of him.”** [TMQ Surah Aali Imran: 85].