

EDITORIAL
E-Journal Spring 2011 Edition

By: Ewa Unoke Ph.D. (Editor)

In long-neglected societies, *political exclusion* can lead to poverty, crime, violence, and terror. In her radical, deconstructionist essay, *Gayatri Spivak* asks, "Can the Subaltern Speak?" My aim, here, is to respond to Spivak's question from the *subaltern* theoretical perspective in order to explain the current waves of Arabworld uprising. First, I will define the term, subaltern, as the voiceless, poor person or political constituency of the long-forgotten, long-marginalized and politically excluded peoples of the world. My response to Spivak's question is, yes! The subaltern can speak. But, in the age of the Obama change wave, large youth population, and millennial technology, the subaltern is now speaking many languages – that of fearlessness, resistance, revolution, and war.

Mohammed Bouazizi, the 27-year-old Tunisian hawker, did not set out to become a legendary figure within the Arabworld. Rather, his life's dream was to "save enough money to be able to rent or buy a pickup truck." With only an equivalent of a High School diploma, he could only earn a living by pushing his cart all day long, selling vegetables.

On December 17, 2010, Mohammed's livelihood was threatened when his unlicensed cart with its goods was confiscated by a policewoman. When he tried to pay an equivalent of \$7, the policewoman allegedly spat on Mohammed's face, slapped him, and "insulted his dead father." Amidst such humiliation and dejection, Mohammed, the breadwinner for a family of eight, headed for the provincial headquarter to report his ordeal. But, "they refused to see him." At about 11: 30 am, Mohammed Bouazizi poured gasoline all over his body and set himself on fire. On January 04, 2011, he died. Tunisian citizens were outraged. To help assuage public anger, the Head of State, and long-serving dictator, Zine el Abidine Ben Ali, on December 28, 2010, had visited Mohammed in the hospital. But, things had fallen apart and the center could no longer hold. How, indeed, Karl Marx's predictions have become so timely in our times, "when things get out of kilter," the proletariat will take action, mobilize and take over their government. Call it an anarcho-syndicalist and populist revolution.

According to Mohammed's neighbor, "We were silent before but Mohammed showed us that we must react. Now, we expect things to change. I want my freedom and my rights. I want to work. I want a job." Mohammed Bouazizi has become not only famous but a legend as the revolution which he started has spread throughout the Arabworld like wild fire – Egypt, Libya, Yemen, Bahrain, Syria, and more. For Gamal Hassanein, the protagonist of the Egyptian revolution, it also began with a slap from a police officer. "He stole my dignity with that slap," said Gamal. Like Tunisia, the authoritarian President of Egypt, Hosni Mubarak who had ruled the country for over three decades was forced to resign. The lessons which authoritarian and transactional leaders should learn are that the four elements of political exclusion are intricately intertwined with one another. When any group of citizens are politically, economically, or strategically excluded, such neglected society will likely decline into poverty. And, poverty will lead to crime, violence, and terror.

The question which the conservatives and liberals are asking is whether or not the Arab revolution threatens the *national interest* of the United States, whether or not the President has violated the constitution by unilaterally going to war in Libya without authorization by the Congress? The *national interest* of the U.S centers on: security, economic, and ideology. Are these interests at stake in Libya? The Defense Secretary, Gates says, "No." The Secretary of State, Clinton, and President Obama explain that the U.S. intervention on the no-fly-zone, and support for the 'rebels' is based on humanitarian grounds in order to avoid another Rwanda so to speak. In the ensuing foreign policy dilemma, the **Obama Doctrine** emerges: a move towards multilateralism, limited use-of-force; no ground force, minimal military expenses, minimal casualty with the aim to unseat Moammar Gaddafi, the dictator who, allegedly, has committed numerous crimes against humanity and peace.

What is beginning to emerge in the U.S. foreign policy is the end of the **Bush Doctrine of Preemptive Action**, and unilateralism. In the wake of the Obama Doctrine, the classical, theoretical, and ideological frameworks of *idealism* and *realism* have been deconstructed, shattered, or ignored. Many questions then arise: Is supporting a rebel opposition in a sovereign state a democratic enterprise? Is American intervention which could help to avert another global **Holocaust** a breach of international law? Article five of NATO stipulates that, "an attack on one member is an attack on all." Did Libya attack any member state of NATO? If not, why is NATO in Libya? Is the United Nations now a member of NATO? If Libya is a member of the African Union, why is the AU so silent over the plight of its member state? Why did NATO, the U.S. and the UN not intervene in similar African and Arab states such as in Biafra, Rwanda, Liberia, Sierra Leone, Egypt, Yemen, Iran, and Syria? Maybe, the Libyan foreign policy dilemma will help to create a new international rule of law in which **humanitarian interest** is recognized above **national interest**. The world ought to reconsider how to deal with past social injustices, *power politics*, bad leadership, and the long-silenced majority, especially when the subaltern has learned to speak the languages of asymmetrical warfare, and resistance. It is self-evident, that the future belongs to the subaltern. The international system can no longer afford to ignore human rights abuses and the calls for self-determination by some of the ethnic sub-nations of the world. The Arab wave will spread rapidly to other parts of the marginalized societies, especially Africa. And the consequences will be unspeakable bloodbath and destruction of property. For now, the U.S., NATO, and Gaddafi have made international relations - 'understanding of the behavior of nations,' amusingly more comical, more confusing, and more complex.

Dear Community,

This Spring Semester, 2011, we will only publish this editorial, and I invite your comments, accordingly. The Provost and the Editorial Board have approved the publication of ALL the e-journal articles since its inception in 2007. This is to commemorate the three years of our existence and the journal's contributions to knowledge.

Editor