

states existing in 1956. Here, too, collections by subject matter of treaties concluded by a given country are taken into consideration where not already included in part II.

Owing to the nature of a reprint edition, neither the collected treaties of states that have emerged since 1956 nor more recent collections of then already existing states could have been taken into account. One should try to fill this gap. The book reviewed here shows this gap very clearly since, for the period covered, it is itself a most valuable source of information. It has been out of print for too long a time.

ECKART KLEIN
University of Mainz

CORRESPONDENCE

TO THE EDITORS-IN-CHIEF:

May I ask space for a brief comment on Mr. Kirgis, Jr.'s review of my book *Israel and Palestine* (The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1981) in 76 AJIL 875-76 (1982).

Your reviewer flatly asserts that the argument of my first four chapters is that "the Palestinian Arabs have no right of self-determination, or other valid territorial claim . . . because the post-World War I arrangements recognized a Jewish national home in all of Palestine."

This assertion is not correct. The basic thesis of the opening chapter on "the time frame" of Jewish and Arab self-determination rights is that the liberation or self-determination principle was already applied, after World War I, to both Jewish and Arab national aspirations, and resulted in about a dozen Arab sovereignties over an area hundreds of times greater and richer than the tiny allocation to Israel (pp. 9-26).

The argument, then, is that any *ex post facto* separate claims of Palestinian Arabs as part of the Arab nation should be targeted "not on Israel alone, but on the Arab States and Israel in common and in some due proportion to the benefits they respectively received in the overall allocation" after World War I.

Mr. Kirgis, Jr. claims to have "shorn" my argument of "its rhetoric."

Readers of your *Journal* may already have suspected that his account may also (or rather!) have shorn my argument of its argument—and not merely on the above matter. I confirm and regret that that is indeed the case.

JULIUS STONE
*Hastings College of the Law
University of California*

Reply by Professor Frederic L. Kirgis, Jr.:

Professor Stone's selective quotation from my review makes it sound as though I attributed to him a rejection of any legitimate Arab territorial claim anywhere in post-World War I Palestine. He did not make such an extreme assertion, nor did I attribute it to him. Had Professor Stone quoted the full