

...st episodes in recent years. Who were they?

The leader was Juhayman bin Mohammed bin Seif al-Oteibi and his most important follower was Abgallah al-Qahtani. They and others in the attacking group were members of Saudi Arabia's Wahabi sect, and the remainder were Yemenis, South Yemenis, Sudanese, Iraqis, Kuwaitis and Egyptians. All were extreme xenophobes, fanatically opposed to Christians, Jews—and Shi'ite Moslems.

To believe Mr. Adeli and Aya-tollah Khomanei, you have to believe that the Saudis beheaded the wrong people!

Sidney A. Freifeld

Emigration

Sir:

(Re: article by J.C.M. Ogelsby "Faltering Revolution Sparks Mass Exodus from Cuba" in *International Perspectives*, May/June 1980.) If the exodus of people from one country to another is an evidence of the country of origin, I would like to comment on the following: in Latin America, the highest percentage of (legal and illegal) immigration is in Venezuela. Since 1975, particularly after the deterioration of the political and economic conditions of several countries in the *cono sur* (i.e., Argentina, Chile and Uruguay) some 400,000 people have come to Venezuela. In addition, there is a constant wave of other Latin Americans (Colombians, etc.) that arrive at the rate of some one thousand persons per day. This makes a grand total of over three million foreigners living in Venezuela, or some 20 percent of the population.

On the other hand, there are many people here emigrating to the United States, i.e., Florida, because they think that the situation here is unbearable. Many claim that Miami is partially owned by Venezuelans, and I believe it. A third point is that many people in Latin America wish they could go to the United States, particularly if an emigration

system 'a la cubana' was to be offered to them. Finally, I believe that if the United States were to open its doors to everybody, I wonder how many millions would go there, including many from the Western European countries. Probably then, the Americans would have to emigrate *en masse*.

I think that many, right or wrong conclusions, can be reached here, but Dr. Ogelsby, for one, should stay studying history and leave Political Science to political scientists.

Luis Salomon Barrios,
Barquisimeto, Venezuela

Territorial Waters

Sir:

The excellent article by Mr. Carl E. Law on "Freedom of Innocent Passage versus Territorial Expansion" (see *International Perspectives* July/August 1980) justifiably commands the attention not only of the interested citizen but of the professional as well. On its first page there is a minor matter, in no way impairing the fundamental quality of the piece, which should be discussed.

The long standing and frequently reiterated proposition that the old three mile limit of territoriality (the marine league) sprang from the maximum range of coast artillery in the early formative years of international law cannot be sustained. In the 16th and 17th centuries no one had a piece of ordnance that could hurl its projectile for anything like 3½ statute miles, nor do

military historians concerned with materiel recount such an extraordinary cannon.

Is it not possible that the marine league, as a once commonly accepted measure of the extent of territorial waters, came forth because, at that range, a sentry of then average height, standing at sea level, could first become aware of a vessel as it came over the curve of the earth from hull-down concealment? This is a matter which at least could be verified empirically through modest experimentation involving a few five footers with normal eye sight and a sailing vessel of appropriate size.

In any event, none of this belies the profit to be derived from careful consideration of Mr. Law's article. It merely twinges my pedant nerve to find this oft-repeated error conveyed still once more.

Melvin P. Straus,
El Paso, Texas.
U.S.A.

Note to our readers

In the article by Jack Ogelsby on the Cuban exodus (*International Perspectives*, May/June 1980) an editorial change led to the distortion of the author's meaning. A sentence which read "... (Castro) achieved a long-held Cuban goal of gaining the support of a major European power—the U.S.S.R.—in order to balance the presence of the United States.", incorrectly cited the Soviet Union as the only European power favoured by Cuba to act as a counterbalance to the U.S. Professor Ogelsby wishes to point out that after gaining independence, Cuba looked to Great Britain, then a major power, to fulfil that role and only later did Cuba turn to the U.S.S.R. after the balance of power shift in international relations made it the obvious choice. The editor apologizes for the error.