From the editors

Security as a public good is worth thinking about more deeply. 'Public goods' are goods which are consumed publically or freely, and in a non-competitive and non-exclusionary manner, i.e., consumption by party X does not impact upon party Y directly, and both parties have an equal opportunity to benefit.[1] We can, therefore, suggest that security is a 'public good' at the international level and that states play a role in the provision of such a 'public good'. Accordingly, if one accepts this, how states insert themselves into global peacekeeping efforts, anti-piracy initiatives, or even the selling of arms within otherwise sovereign territories, should be considered carefully. This is because states cannot claim ignorance when it comes to how their weapons or troops might fit into the wider social, political and economic environments.

Similarly, involvement in the provision of global 'public goods' such as security is not without its risks. Who enjoys the benefits accruing from security and stability such as enhanced infrastructure and economic development? Who gets to take the credit? Would the effort and expenditure invested in ending conflicts be worthwhile, if these efforts are not rewarded during peacetime? States may choose to mitigate the risks associated with military involvement through a more brazenly self-interested involvement in conflicts. Or they may want to closely align their military involvement with their need for military spending 'back home'. With these considerations in mind, African leaders would need to think carefully about the supposed unconditionally of 'public goods' within the African space.

The extent to which states can offer these 'public goods' is further influenced by their history, foreign policy, and by their current standing in the global

order. For example, South Africa's involvement in Africa is laden with political and historical meaning which arguably inhibits its manoeuvrability as well as its credibility as a provider of security as a 'public good'. Which public goods can be meaningfully provided by South Africa in Africa? Does South Africa's involvement in the Southern African Development Community (SADC) help to engender suitable neutrality? On the other hand, peace missions involve many countries and multinational groups of personnel. The extent to which one can say that peace can be attributable to a single country's intervention is becoming somewhat limited. Rialize Ferreira's article suggests that post-conflict transformation is a highly complex matter, leaving much scope for those involved in the conflict to lapse back into violence, and thereby tempering the potential benefits flowing from such peace. Reintegrating soldiers after a protracted conflict is a particularly challenging matter. Ferreira highlights the importance of the military in these complex transformation processes, as states move from conflict situations towards democracy through the complex process of peacebuilding. The implication of Ferreira's paper is that post-conflict transformation is the first part of a much larger process of societal transformation. The benefits reaped from its success are to be seen slowly and possibly not at all, with considerable risks for those countries and militaries involved.

Societal transformations have impacts well beyond the extent of their immediate territories, thereby presenting a continuous threat to regional or even global security. Think, for example, of the triggering of wide-scale migrations due to Islamic State's (IS) expansion, giving rise to migration problems elsewhere. This is further complicated by the fact that IS demands recognition as a proto-sovereign state. Hussein Solomon's article also benefits from contextualisation within the concept of public good. The author intimates that, as part of its attempts to become a state, IS also provides public goods within its territories. To probe the deeper success of IS, Solomon, therefore, explores the

use of political and economic instruments used by IS as it effectively embraces hard and soft strategies to win support and followers.

Paradoxically, Sweden's impartial image on the international stage supports its ability to pass as an inherently well-meaning and generally peaceful exporter in the arms industry. Sweden's insertion into security as a 'public good' is therefore predicated on its sophisticated military technology, especially in the aeronautics sector. But, as Wayne Coetzee suggests, these initiatives are the product of more calculating processes relating to Sweden's engagement with the international community. Sweden achieves this through a close alignment of national interests and preferences in military production; shifts in defence and security policy; and, of course, aspects related to leveraging its national identity.

This edition further explores the nexus between military theory and history. Antonio Garcia analyses the theory of manoeuvre warfare through the history of the 1914-1915 South African campaign in German South West Africa. Reflecting on manoeuvre theory, which holds that mobility is more important than firepower, Garcia notes how the mobility of the commandos ensured tactical and operational surprise resulting in a decisive outcome.

Pieter Labuschagne's article looks at role of, and reaction to, armed black units during the South African War by concentrating on those units under the command of Olaf Bergh in the Free State. Bergh's Black Scouts operated in the unregulated and unsecured spaces and while the impact of these units at a military level was relatively insignificant, their impact at a psychological level reverberated for decades after the War.

The phenomenon of the 'military bully' has largely been overlooked within South African military psychology research. However, the topic merits further study as unchecked bullying may lead to power abuses and mission failure. Donovan Kalamdien and Audrey Lawrence seek to address this gap with their typology of the military bully which represents a novel conceptual framework for understanding this phenomenon. The model makes a theoretical

and practical contribution as it presents the tools for the identification and rehabilitation of military bullies as well as offering scope for further empirical analysis.

Once again, the editors, recognise the steady hands of past editors and their support in taking the journal confidently into the future. We also thank the editorial committee and our reviewers for their diligence and thoroughness throughout the review process.

The Editors,

Justin van der Merwe

Raymond Steenkamp Fonseca

---

[1] Kaul, I., Grunberg, I. and Stern, M. (1999). *Global Public Goods: International cooperation in the 21st Century*. 1st ed. New York: Oxford University Press, p.xii