

1968

The Meaning of Limited War

A. J. Ashurst
U.S. Navy

Robert McClintock

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digital-commons.usnwc.edu/nwc-review>

Recommended Citation

Ashurst, A. J. and McClintock, Robert (1968) "The Meaning of Limited War," *Naval War College Review*: Vol. 21 : No. 1 , Article 17.
Available at: <https://digital-commons.usnwc.edu/nwc-review/vol21/iss1/17>

This Book Review is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at U.S. Naval War College Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Naval War College Review by an authorized editor of U.S. Naval War College Digital Commons. For more information, please contact repository.inquiries@usnwc.edu.

McClintock, Robert. *The Meaning of Limited War*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1967. 239 p.

Here is presented a series of case studies in limited war, several of which are based upon the personal experiences of the author. The book was written while Ambassador McClintock was assigned as the State Department Adviser to the President of the U.S. Naval War College. The stated purpose of the book "is to study the nature of past, present, and probable war in the last half of the twentieth century," and in the words of the author "is . . . written by a professional diplomat for the elucidation of the citizen who is concerned."

The author's analysis of the past and present limited wars, i.e., wars where there is no direct confrontation between nuclear powers, indicates that each has the common properties of: (1) the use of surrogate forces, (2) the respect of sanctuaries, (3) the inclusion of the new Communist political invention of "wars of national liberation," and (4) the use of international organizations for either debate and/or settlement. It is these factors which place the wars of today in the political rather than the military arena, and, at least to the author, it is not so much whether we win or not, but, rather, are we still there when the game is over? The nuclear stalemate has made general war "a terminal folly," and if the free world, primarily through the use of sea-power, can make national wars of liberation unproductive, eventually differences between nations and ideologies can be settled only at the conference table. For as the author states, "It is the thousand year view that the statesman must assume, and in this perspective the diplomat may take hope from history." Perhaps.

The Meaning of Limited War is easy and interesting reading, and although

the military officer may take exception to, and, in some cases, umbrage at, specific portions or vignettes, the book does provide insight into the meaning of "limited war" from a diplomatic point of view.

A. J. ASHURST
Commander, U.S. Navy

Mtshali, B. Vulindlela. *Rhodesia: Background to Conflict*. New York: Hawthorn Books, 1967. 255 p.

The author of this book is a South African Zulu who is currently working on a Ph.D. degree in political science at New York University. His discussion of the problem of Rhodesia is obviously from the viewpoint of the Black African, and Mr. Mtshali makes no claim for impartiality. His book is, however, straightforward and well documented. It seeks to examine the background of colonial development in Rhodesia and to trace the events which led to Rhodesia's unilateral declaration of independence in 1965. In his analysis of the Rhodesian controversy the author is highly critical, not only of Britain, the United Nations, and the Organization of African Unity for their inability or failure to take effective action against the regime of Ian Smith, but also of the disunity within the African nationalist movement in Rhodesia itself. The volume points out that the political energies of the Africans have been seriously dissipated by the utter failure of the black nationalist organizations to act in unison against the white-dominated Rhodesian Government. The author acknowledges that power is now securely in the hands of the white settlers and that Rhodesian independence is a fait accompli which will be extremely difficult to reverse. His conclusion, however, that the crisis in Rhodesia has done irreparable damage to relations between black and white throughout Africa is hard to contest.