

## IN THIS ISSUE

As this issue was being prepared for publication, Pakistani troops were deploying to Somalia, as part of the United Nations' forces assigned to protect relief efforts in that country. A little more than 18 months earlier, Pakistan had contributed a brigade to the coalition forces that defeated Iraq. As Michael Bishku's article shows clearly, these "internationalist" activities were entirely consistent with the evolution of Pakistani foreign policy over the first thirty years of the country's existence. That policy has emphasized Islamic unity, close ties with the Middle East and a pro-Western stance as the means to achieve national identity for a culturally diverse state and national security *vis-a-vis* its powerful sub-continent rival, India.

The notion that democracies are "soft" and cannot sustain many casualties in revolutionary wars without a collapse of political will gained the status of an unchallengeable truism in the wake of the Vietnam war. It even resurfaced during the Persian Gulf crisis and war of 1990-91, when Iraq threatened to defeat the coalition forces "in a sea of blood." Saddam Hussein apparently believed that his regime could survive significant battlefield losses and that coalition governments could not. Michael Engelhardt examines this assumption and concludes that, at least in respect of insurgent conflicts, regime type does not matter; both dictatorships and democracies can be defeated. Furthermore, he asserts that the inclination of democracies to liquidate costly commitments can be seen as a strength, an affirmation of their democratic character, rather than a weakness.

Intelligence studies is still a relatively new and developing field, but a "dominant paradigm" has already emerged; traditionally, intelligence studies focus on foreign intelligence activities and the organizations that conduct them. Stuart Farson sets out to shift the focus of attention to domestic intelligence activities by examining the actual and potential contribution of criminology to this field. He asserts that criminology offers methodological benefits for examining issues common to both foreign and domestic intelligence, and thus may serve as an inter-disciplinary forum for integrating the two fields.

---

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 the University of New Brunswick.

---