

a terrorist group cease existing as such and become a political party?" An answer suggested by Watson's essay is that through participation in the electoral process, terrorist organizations become party-like. Yet if such is the criterion, then Sendero Luminoso, which refuses to engage in any political dialogue with Peru's established political system, can hardly be called a political party as is done in the essay by Hazelton and Woy-Hazelton.

Little distinction is made between political violence and terrorism. Just what forms of political violence directed against society should be considered terrorism? It might have been appropriate, for instance, for the book to include a chapter on "state terrorism," such as that which occurred in Argentina in the 1980s.

Along with abundant information on the political party-terrorist group nexus, there are many useful insights to be found within the pages of this book. The reader just has to look very hard to find them.

Shannon Lindsey Blanton
University of South Carolina

Young, Peter R., ed. *Defence and the Media in Time of Limited War*. London and Portland: Frank Cass, 1992.

In an increasingly competitive academic world it is now almost a necessity, in terms of both of economics and international status, for a major conference to spawn a book of its proceedings. This particular book represents the papers given at the three day *International Conference on Defence and the Media in Time of Limited Conflict*, held jointly by Queensland University of Technology and the Australian Ministry of Defence in Brisbane in 1991, which led to the founding of the International Defence Media Association. All sixteen papers or addresses have already appeared in some form in a special edition of the journal *Small Wars and Insurgencies*, also published by Frank Cass. Announced by its organizers as the first ever international conference on the subject, the conference was also intended to establish a specifically Australian perspective on military-media relations, staking a claim to eminence in the field.

The issue of military-media relations is a complex and subtle one, which first attracted academic attention within the field of conflict studies little more than a decade ago, and has dramatically increased in importance since then. The conference organizers were right to celebrate its emergence as a fully fledged sub-discipline of security and conflict studies, and of international relations in general, without which modern understanding of the discipline as a whole is necessarily incomplete. However, as a comparatively new field it is still deficient in much basic theory and research, and the conference book inevitably reflects this rather confused situation. The organizers were also unfortunate to have begun planning

in June 1990 for a conference to take place in April 1991, while the subject was still dominated by the Gulf War, but before any proper analysis of that war had taken place.

The editor has divided the book into three main sections. The first, an attempt by several contributors to redefine limited war largely in terms of intervention theory, is only partly successful. The most useful contribution comes from Peter R. Young himself, who supports the idea that tension arises from governments attempting to invoke for limited war the issues of patriotism more properly associated with total war. The second section consists of case studies from Vietnam, the Falklands, Northern Ireland, Grenada and the Gulf War. Although Carlyle A. Thayer's destruction of the myth that Vietnam was lost through the media is a model of its kind, the essays in this section vary greatly in quality, and it is noteworthy that even the best of them reflect an acknowledged synthesis of previously published research. The range of sources available also highlights the urgent need for proper scholarly studies on the history of war reporting in general since the nineteenth century, and on the present conflict in Northern Ireland in particular. The final section, on specifically Australian experiences of military-media relations, includes an excellent paper on Australian public opinion of defence issues by Ian McAllister and Toni Makkai.

Inevitably, with so many contributors, there is a lack of consistency in the quality of the essays. What is significant is that the main division is clearly between those who teach and those who practice. Most of the academic contributors (all from Australia), submitted carefully written research papers, complete with footnotes. Virtually without exception, however, the military, official or media contributors provided highly anecdotal *extempore* opinions, which frequently amount to little more than posturing or asserting positions of mutual antagonism. The editor has taken the controversial decision to include these contributions in the book as direct transcriptions, and while this helps convey the flavor of the conference, the result in terms of a book is frankly something of a mess, with references in papers to events which are not recorded, or appear later in the book. Also, while it is perhaps valuable to have actual words recorded, it is distressing for the reader to find a senior officer repeating some old myth in a desire to denigrate the media, only to find the same myth destroyed in an academic paper in the same book. The editor might at least have spared his contributors' blushes: the unfortunate speaker on terrorism who believed that Carlos Marighela and "Carlos" the Jackal were the same person may never live it down, and this is by no means the worst mistake that the book has to offer.

It is a measure of how fast the subject of media-military relations is moving, both in practice and in scholarly theory, that the contributions in this book already appear rather dated. The central issue of preserving operational security, on which the military contributors placed absolute stress, has now been rendered largely irrelevant by developments in communications technology and military intervention practice. The inevitability of antagonism between the military and the media,

on which many participants also laid stress, based on theoretical positions regarding freedom of speech or the role of the state, is now also being replaced by more pragmatic research into the actual relationship between the military and the media on operations. It is probable that in many cases the true relationship between the two is best described by comparison with alliance warfare, in which the aims of the allies do not match completely, but are by no means automatically opposed.

The main value of *Defence and the Media in Time of Limited War* is therefore as a primary source marking the views and opinions of those who took part in the Brisbane conference, and the state of military-media relations as an academic discipline in Australia at the time. In these terms the book is a success, and both the editor and the conference organizers should be well pleased with what they have achieved.

Stephen Badsey
Royal Military Academy, Sandhurst