In the wake of the American bombing of Libya in April, major international terrorism appeared to go into remission; the summer of 1986 passed quietly by comparison with the first half of the year. The extent to which this can be attributed to the American action is uncertain. No one familiar with the problem of terrorism expected the bombing to solve it or the lull to prevail indefinitely. Hence, the recent events in Pakistan, Turkey and Europe, however tragic and shocking, were probably not unexpected. The Middle East crisis remains the principal source of global terrorism and this is unlikely to change in the near future. Much of it occurs in Western Europe and, as Dennis Pluchinsky indicates in his article, this trend is not likely to change either. Indeed, he notes "a dangerous and growing trend" away from traditional Middle Eastern targets in Europe (Arab-Palestinian, Israeli and Jewish) toward a wider range of Western targets. Incidents which have occurred since his article was completed tend to lend weight to his disturbing prognosis.

Terrorism apart, it is difficult to identify a subject which has gripped western attention recently as much as the crisis in South Africa. That country's internal unrest, the outcome of which obviously holds significant implications for the nation's future, has tended to overshadow the major 'foreign' component of the South African crisis: the conflict in Namibia. Richard Dale explores this stalemated war and concludes that owing to domestic South African political and economic reasons, and the intrusion of the 'East-West' dimension, the short-term outlook for resolution of the Namibian question is bleak, characterized by *immobilisme*.

Thus far, the latter half of this century has not been notable for producing profound military thinkers — writers of the intellectual stature of J.F.C. Fuller or Basil Liddell Hart who, however maligned or ignored in their time in their own countries, nonetheless had a significant influence on international military thought. The late Herman Kahn is a possible exception and there may be others: Michael Howard, Bernard Brodie, and Samuel Huntington come to mind. Yet, these are all essentially civilians: the 'thinking soldier' remains a rarity, owing largely to the nature of profession of arms in the West. Not so in the "East" where the rigorous study of military thought carries an official *cachet* and where Clausewitz is taken very seriously. Stripped of their ideological adornments, some of the results are admirable indeed; The Sea Power of the State, issued under the name of Soviet Admiral Sergev Gorshkov is one of these. And it may not be going too far to suggest that Marshal N.V. Ogarkov has emerged as the leading "thinking soldier" of our day - a matter which, if true, ought to be cause for concern, and for study, military establishments. among our Marv FitzGerald examines Ogarkov's writings on the nature of modern war — "the new revolution in Soviet military affairs" - and draws particular attention to the emphasis on conventional operations, the diminishing utility of nuclear weapons, and the opportunities afforded by high technology. Since Ogarkov's writings carry an implicit official seal of approval, they deserve serious study by western military strategists.

The opinions expressed in the articles, reviews and other contributions are those of the authors alone, and do not necessarily represent those of the Centre for Conflict Studies or of the University of New Brunswick.