

trading partner, the United States, also seem willing to tie Canada's energy security to the volatile politics of the oil-producing Arab countries.

Professor Lyon is well enough versed in the language of international politics to know that a declaration of "even-handedness" by Canada would be taken by all parties concerned as a pro-Arab stance. While not affecting the politics of the Middle East dispute in any significant way, such a decision by Ottawa would only further increase Israel's sense of isolation and desperation.

In their overwhelmingly positive response to the Sadat initiatives, and in their reaction to the Beirut killings, the people of Israel have shown themselves both willing to make real sacrifices for peace and to be a nation with a high moral standard. The issue now before Canada is whether it is going to encourage Israel along the road to peace or discredit itself entirely by joining those who can see evil nowhere else in the world except in the streets of Jerusalem.

A solution to the Middle East dispute, including a solution to the tragedy of the Palestinians, requires wisdom and courage by those, including the United States, who have a direct responsibility for the future of those troubled lands. What it does not require is self-interested commercialism hiding under self-righteous moralism by those nations who do not share the burdens of peace and war.

Joel J. Sokolsky
Center of Canadian Studies
The Johns Hopkins University
Washington, DC

Sir,

It is surprising that Professor Peyton Lyon would seek to advance his thesis by making the unsupported allegation that "Justice Ivan Rand and Lester Pearson played a decisive role in the creation of the state of Israel, and frequently displayed an anti-Arab bias." (My italics.)

That they played a decisive role in the creation of the state of Israel by their support of the partition of Palestine is, of course, correct. That in doing so, or at any other time, they displayed "anti-Arab" bias is surely quite unwarranted; I happened to serve during the period in question at Canada's Permanent Mission to the United Nations, and I can recall nothing either from their public statements or from private deliberations at the Mission that in any way could be construed as supporting Professor Lyon's allegation.

Mr. Justice Rand, Canada's member of the original eleven-nation UN Special Committee on Palestine (UNSCOP), joined in its seven-member majority recommendation of partition in 1947 — but doing so surely did not make them anti-Arab. Mr. Pearson chaired the First Committee at the UN Special Session of the General Assembly in 1947, which established UNSCOP, and he was a member — with the USA, UK, USSR and Guatemala — of the Working Group established at the 1947 Regular Session of the Assembly to consider partition. He too supported partition, but that did not make him anti-Arab.

Although the Zionist movement and the Jewish Agency for Palestine supported what for them was the painful compromise of partition, and although the Arab nations bitterly opposed it, that does not make a proponent

anti-Arab, or a supporter pro-Zionist. At the General Assembly's culminating vote on November 29, 1947, thirty-three states favored partition, thirteen opposed and ten abstained. That did not make the thirty-three supporting members "anti-Arab" any more than were the authors of Britain's famous (Peel) Royal Commission report who, a decade earlier, made the original recommendation for partition. Would it not be more reasonable to assume that Messrs. Pearson and Rand, in supporting partition, honestly believed it to be not the best of all possible worlds but the lesser of evils, and the only way they could devise at that time towards solving a complex and intractable problem? It is worth recalling, in the retrospect of today, that it did provide in 1947 for an independent Palestinian state — quite in addition to Jordan — but this was rejected totally by the Arabs.

Sidney A. Freifeld
Ottawa, Ont.

Falklands interpretation challenged

Sir,

I was really disappointed to see in such an authoritative journal an article such as the one on the Falklands war, under the title "Reflections on the Anglo-Argentinian War" by J. Nef and F. Hallman.

The authors are certainly entitled to their opinions, but this report is clearly inadequately researched from many points of fact. I am not an expert on Argentina and, indeed, I have never met a real expert on this very complex country. However, I have travelled South America extensively, aided by a better than average working knowledge of Spanish; I also have a son-in-law who was born and reared in Argentina and who still has many connections and close friends living there. Furthermore, in late June I took part in a discussion, led by a senior member of the British government, on Britain's strategy in seeking to protect this remote piece of land in the south-western Atlantic.

I first take issue with the authors over their emphasis on the fact that the motivation in both countries was political opportunism to divert attention from domestic difficulties. It is possible that General Galtieri wanted some diversion from the national economic crisis, but when you are bankrupt it is hardly the time to engage in a very expensive war. The truth is that Argentinians are taught from infancy that the Malvinas is Argentine territory, stolen from them by successive nations, including Britain. Indeed, until my son-in-law went to school in England, he firmly believed this, and was considerably disturbed to find that it was not the truth. The Malvinas is an emotional issue in Argentina. It has no economic significance to them. They have tremendous resources of fertile lands and pampas, minerals, etc. They have extensive sedimentary areas that are prospective for oil, which they have consistently messed up by poor government policies. To say that they were looking for the potential underwater oil resources near the Falklands is ridiculous. As one who spent forty years in that business, that area has been known during my entire experience and nobody has ever thought it was worthwhile exploring. Argentina has on other emotional