

Editorial Comment

This edition of the *Journal of Military and Strategic Studies* is proud to present four outstanding papers. Once again, we have attempted to provide our readership with a diverse range of articles. At first glance, it would appear that they have little in common except for their high standards of scholarship. However, upon closer examination, all four share several common themes. Each highlights the importance of careful analysis of security issues. Each of the four articles address issue areas that do not follow orthodox thinking.

Robert Bedeski's essay on Canadian and Chinese perspectives on arms control and verification is an intriguing examination of the differing perceptions that both states have regarding the concept of transparency in arms control. Bedeski makes it clear that efforts to simply translate Canadian understandings and conceptualizations of the term into Chinese understandings and conceptualizations will not succeed. To a large degree, Chinese history and culture places a very different meaning on the term verification as understood by Canadian and (western) arms control experts and negotiators. As such, any effort to engage the Chinese in discussions on arms control must account for these differences. These findings are particularly timely given the United States' efforts to fundamentally alter the existing international arms control regime through the development of National Missile Defence systems and the expected rewriting or abrogation of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty. While the ABM is a bilateral agreement between the United States and Russia, many analysts have argued that any change to it will alter the existing international arms control regime. It is likely that there will be calls to enter into new international negotiations that will have to include China. If this does happen, then Bedeski's analysis provides important insight into this scenario.

Ian Moffat's examination of the value of Corbett is a fresh look at a historical figure. Moffat raises a point that may elicit challenges from other experts. He argues that the importance of Corbett's writings equals or exceeds those of Alfred Mahan. Although Corbett never served as a member of the forces, in Moffat's view, Corbett's writings were based on a more realistic assumption as to the nature of seapower than were Mahan's. While perhaps not settling the issue of who was the better analyst of seapower, Moffat's study does illustrate the importance that can be played by the civilian researcher. It is clear that Corbett has played and continues to play an important role in the study and utilization of seapower.

Heather Smith's examination of environmental security through a critical theory perspective raises some very important points regarding this subject. While all may not agree with the findings of her arguments, her article shows that a realist assessment of environmental security cannot be assumed to be the only mode of analysis. It is clear from Smith's analysis that the significance of the environment to international security will only increase in the coming years. The issues and questions that she raises through her critical analysis are central for any understanding of such conflicts in the coming years.

The examination provided by Martin Watts provides a detailed and persuasive argument of the manner in which gender and race integration in the US military has not advanced to the degree that many assume that it has. Using a sophisticated means of analysis, Watts provides a convincing case that only the US Navy has achieved "occupational integration" in recent years. In an era of increased demands for skilled members of American society to join the volunteer forces, such a finding has serious, long-term implications for recruitment for the American forces. This is particularly serious when one considers the fact that long-term demographics predictions in the US suggest that Americans of European ancestry will soon be in the minority. How will the American forces maintain the numbers required to maintain a highly skilled armed forces if it does not offer all Americans equal participation in all of the forces occupations?

These four articles examine very different issues. However, each of them highlight the significance of undertaking a security examination that challenges existing orthodoxy. Bedeski's warning as to the need to fully understand China must be made in the proper cultural, linguistic and historical context. Moffat's conclusion as to the influence of civilians in the understanding of the use of force are important for all modern states, and is particularly true for states that are attempting to deal with downsizing and the

revolution in military affairs. Existing service personnel will need civilians to complement, and perhaps lead, their efforts to place the strategic environment in its proper context. Smith's warnings on the need to include a critical analysis in the face of increasing environmental problems are well taken and will continue to challenge all members of the international system. Finally, Watts' evidence regarding the difficulty of integrating all members of a modern and multi-cultured society into the armed forces is an issue that expands beyond the United States.

In sum, these are four challenging essays that provide important insights into the study of military and strategic studies.

Rob Huebert

Editor