

Book Review Bloodlessly

Kimberly Reece

Bloodlessly (2020), written by Dr. Ewa Unoke, is a book about state power, world government, and security. Dr. Unoke starts the book by introducing four known victims of state power.

Next, he writes of how “the universal purpose of politics is security” (Unoke, 2020, p. 23), and then goes on to explain how all nationstates pursue the possibility of such politics. He also speaks of the nation states, of which there are 195 recognized in the world today. These states can have many allies and many enemies, and these can change with time. But the permanent interests, or national interests, of the nation states do not waiver. Although national interests can “sometimes differ from country to country, however, there are three basic interests which govern the choices and foreign policy decisions of both the developing and developed countries: ideological, economic, and security interests” (Unoke, 2020, p. 29). Dr. Unoke takes a closer look at state power and violence, citing three forms of violence a nation state can exact on its enemies. And finally, he considers the idea of collective security.

As stated before, the book begins with four case studies. These include two people and two groups, all well-known victims of state power. First, Jamal Khashoggi. In an article in the BBC News, Jamal Khashoggi was referred to as “a prominent Saudi journalist, [who] covered major stories, including the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and the rise of the late al-Qaeda leader Osama Bin Laden, for various Saudi news organizations. For decades, the 59-year-old was close to the Saudi royal family and also served as an adviser to the government. But he fell out of favor and went into self-imposed exile in the US in 2017. From there, he wrote a monthly column in *The Washington Post* in which he criticized the policies of Prince Mohammed, who had become the kingdom's de facto ruler. In his first column for the *Post*, Khashoggi said he feared being arrested in an apparent crackdown on dissent overseen by the prince.” (BBC, 2019). The article goes on to say that he had originally gone to the consulate to obtain divorce papers but was told he would have to return to get the final paperwork. He was seen going into the consulate on October 2, 2018. His fiancée, Ms. Cengiz, waited for over ten hours for him to come out, but he never did. Conflicting stories regarding his death leave the details of his murder still unknown. Jamal Khashoggi had the right to Freedom of Speech, but this right was taken away from him.

The second case study refers to Dele Giwa. Dele Giwa was “known for exposing the corrupt practices of the military government” (Unoke, 2020, p. 5). Dele Giwa received a parcel bomb at his residence. He was rushed to the hospital where he later died. According to a report, the veteran being “in burning pains took a look at the Medical Director who was said to be his friend and told him: ‘Tosin, they’ve got me.’ ” (Agbo, 2019). Two days before the incident he had told another of his friends, Prince Tony Momoh, that he feared for his life. Dele Giwa also had the right to Freedom of Speech and Freedom from Fear. These rights were taken away from him.

The next case study involves the Biafran children. What gives the Nigerian military regime the right to starve millions of children as an act of war? For the UN to turn their backs on these children is a disgrace. They were just as much in the wrong as the Nigerian military regime. Also, where were the other nations when this was happening? Was there no one that could have gone up against the Nigerian military regime to stop what was happening to those children? These children deserved better. These children were living in fear as they starved to death. They didn’t have the right to Freedom from Fear and Freedom from Want.

The last case study talks about the Tutsi Citizens. Is revenge a good reason to massacre 800,000 Tutsi citizens? The Hutu people believed they were seeking revenge after the “President of Rwanda, Juvenal Habyarimana, was killed when his plane was shot down” (Unoke, 2019, p. 7). The Hutu people believed it was an act of rebellion by the Tutsi rebels. But did that give them the right to massacre innocent Tutsi citizens? I’m sure there were rebels among the 800,000 that were killed, but I’m sure there were also men, women, and children murdered who were undeserving of such treatment. The Tutsi citizens were not given the right of Freedom from Fear.

When speaking about state power and security, Dr. Unoke (2020, p. 23) expresses that “Virtually all nation states seek the promises of politics – power, peace, freedom, prosperity, justice, and security. Security can be defined as the absence of fear or actual threat from military invasion, conquest, war, aggression, and socio-economic problems such as hunger, poverty, disease, and education.” Security interests are of the utmost importance to nation states. Nation states must form alliances and defend themselves for their survival, while also keeping its citizens safe from violence and crime. Economic interests are important so that the growth and development of the nation states can continue. Ideological interests can vary dramatically between nation states as the system of governments differ from each other. Dr. Unoke (2020, p. 52) believes that “the

United States has no permanent friends and no permanent enemies, but permanent national interests.” Protecting the cultural aspect of each nation state is necessary to keep the states strong. The United Nations is an organization seen as Euro-American “victors’ political creature for the assimilation and control of non-Western societies and peoples” (Unoke, 2020, p. 27). The United Nations needs to be refurbished and remodeled if there is any hope of seeing an end to aggression, terrorism, and war among nation states. “Although the United Nations has good intentions, it has not been quite successful in the pursuit of its primary goals of peace and security” (Unoke, 2020, p. 55). Some goals of the United Nations that have not been fully met are border problems, economic security, health security, travel and communication, population, water resources, environment, and religion. Dr. Unoke (2020, pp. 61-62) explains that for a new world order there are three contending themes in international relations. The first is unipolarity, which is the domination of one country solely with military power. The second is bipolarity, which is the division of power between two superpower nations. Finally, the third is multipolarity, which refers to the presence of various great powers: nations with large prosperous economies, populations, and military power. “As structured now, member states’ governments control the UN. However, nation states are the perpetrators of aggression and war against each other. If the global community is willing to make the transition from a culture of war to a culture of peace, then the United Nations needs a radical reform agenda” (Unoke, 2020, p. 94). The “three forms of violence the state can inflict on its opposition: war, repression, and terrorism” (Unoke, 2020, p. 35). War is an ugly way to gain power, territory, and land yet there have been many wars throughout history. Dr. Unoke (2020) states that “every act of government creates either opposition or disagreement. It doesn’t matter what policy the government adopts; some citizens will surely protest or find faults (p. 38). Repression is everywhere. Some forms of repression are secret, some take the form of massacres, and some involve “torture, forced labor, abuse of women, and forced disappearances and summary executions” (Unoke, 2020, p. 39). The last form of violence Dr. Unoke (2020) discusses is terrorism. He says that “state terror produces fear and uncertainty. Its purpose is to intimidate the opposition by using overwhelming power to deal with people perceived to be anti-government” (p. 41). Terrorism is a danger to both nation states and individuals.

“The most important element in the pursuit of a country’s foreign policy is power. Powerful countries stand greater chances of achieving their foreign policy goals, while poor and weak

nation states have little or no chance to fulfill their own goals” (Unoke, 2020, p. 51). Dr. Unoke (2020, p. 51) explains that there are five fundamental components in the pursuit of national interest which are: 1) Military power, 2) Economic power, 3) Geography, 4) Modern Technology, and 5) National resolve. Regarding militarily, the US is more powerful than any other country in the world. Economically, the US is one of the richest countries in the world. And, ideologically, Americans are proud of their way of life, including owning property, their right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Dr. Unoke (2020) explains, “the doctrine of collective security rests on the assumption that wars are likely to occur among the political actors that make up the international system, but that such wars are preventable through collective defense. The central idea of collective security is that peace is indispensable. Therefore, in relations among nations, its principle is ‘One for all, and all for one.’ This statement presupposes that the fabric of human society has become so tightly interwoven that a breach of peace and security anywhere will likely threaten disintegration everywhere. In the absence of any viable world government, the most realistic approach towards the maintenance of regional, world peace, and national security in our deeply-polarized world lies in collective security.” (pp. 66-67).

“According to international relations scholar Inis Claude, the hope of establishing a successful collective security system has been the primary motivating force behind the political and commercial entities of our time. He further argues that the dominant purpose or supreme ideal of collective security is to prevent any nation or combination of countries from achieving a dominant position.” (Unoke, 2020, p. 69).

There are eight models that have attempted to establish a collective security system.

These models include:

1. The League of Nations Model: “The very first attempt at establishing a collective security system, in the Western world view, was made with the League of Nations” (Unoke, 2020, p. 70). If war or a threat of war was made against a member of the League, all members of the League would act to safeguard peace. League members did not want to be all-in like that, so the League failed.

2. The UN Collective Security Model: “The UN Charter is an improvement on the Covenant of the League of Nations” (Unoke, 2020, p. 71). However, even after new provisions were added to the Charter, there still seems no hope that collective security is an attainable goal.

3. The NATO Security Model: Unified Decentralization. This organization consisted of 15 nation states including the United States, Canada, Ireland, Norway, Britain, Denmark, Belgium, Portugal, Netherlands, Luxembourg, France, Italy, Greece, Turkey, and West Germany. This organization went by the rule that “an armed attack against one member-state is an attack on all. Each member state retains full freedom of action regarding its commitments (financial, political, military, etc.) but where all partners have agreed to pool resources, they have accepted unified direction by NATO leadership” (Unoke, 2020, p. 74).

4. The Warsaw Pact Model: Centralized Separation. This organization was very similar to NATO, with early members of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Poland, Romania, and the Soviet Union. “The structure had a central command under which member states were to place their armed forces under the control of a Soviet commander-in-chief, who organized training and deployment” (Unoke, 2020, p. 75). The Warsaw Pact failed due to the collapse of the Soviet Union.

5. The OAS Model: Collective Peacemaking. The OAS Model differs from NATO and the Warsaw Pact in that it met annually, had what was known as the Permanent Council, and had one ambassador per member state. It was founded in 1947 by Argentina, Columbia, Costa Rica, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Venezuela, the USA, and Uruguay “with the common will that an armed attack against an American state shall be considered as an attack against all American states” (Unoke, 2020, p. 75). The OAS Model was able to keep away aggression from outside their respective regions.

6. The OAU and AU Models: “The role of the OAU was the defense of the sovereignty and territorial integrity and independence of member states. Members states pledged to harmonize and coordinate their general policies towards achieving ‘cooperation for defense and security’” (Unoke, 2020, p. 76). The OAU dissolved in 2002 and replaced it with the African Union.

7. The ECOMOG Model: “The Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) established a military force, which was the Economic Community of West African States Monitoring Group (ECOMOG) to help restore law and order in Liberia.” (Unoke, 2020, pp. 77-78). The ECOMOG triumphed and served as Africa’s institutional mechanism for conflict resolution. It was considered by some to be the finest peace-keeping model.

8. The Elder Statesmen Mediation Model: “It is a traditional African conflict resolution concept for elders to mediate in disputes and crises. The elder statesman mediation approach generally lacks the capacity and strategic strength to effectively settle intra- or interstate conflicts or regional crises” (Unoke, 2020, p. 82). However, African leaders have failed. Dr. Unoke (2020) has hope that “in this age of the internet and technological advancement, humanitarian interest and national interest are beginning to overlap on world issues such as international trade, nuclear non-proliferation, nationalism, self-determination, terrorism, poverty, migration, and global environmentalism. In these areas, countries will likely find themselves working together instead of working on their own, and in the 21st century, self-interest will likely merge with national, humanitarian, and cultural interests. As the global community moves toward collective security, such factors as interdependence, shared interests, and ideologies will likely unite and not divide nation states” (pp. 92-93). He makes a valid point when he says, “The peace we seek is in our hands: ‘We, the People.’” (Unoke, 2020, p. 94).

I don’t know if world government will ever be achieved or accomplished. Have we come too far with the many wars, repression, and terrorism to ever reach the goal of collective security?

This book is relevant to American Government because it speaks of state policy and politics and how the US can affect and be affected by other governments. It also speaks on world government and finding ways to achieve peace within the nation states. I had never thought or read about collective security. I honestly didn’t even know what it was before reading the book. I learned a considerable amount from the book and would recommend it to others who are interested in world government, collective security, the United Nations, and state power.

Works Cited

Agbo, Njideka, TheGuardian, Dele Giwa: The Flaming Journalist, 2019,
<https://guardian.ng/life/dele-giwa-the-flaming-journalist/>.

BBC News, Jamal Khashoggi: All you need to know about Saudi journalist's death, 2019,
<https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-45812399>.

Unoke, Ewa, Bloodlessly, The Danger of State Power without World Government, 2020.