

7-1-1969

The United Nations and the Bed of the Sea

Clark M. Eichelberger

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digital.sandiego.edu/sdlr>

 Part of the [Law of the Sea Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Clark M. Eichelberger, *The United Nations and the Bed of the Sea*, 6 SAN DIEGO L. REV. 339 (1969).

Available at: <https://digital.sandiego.edu/sdlr/vol6/iss3/2>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Law School Journals at Digital USD. It has been accepted for inclusion in *San Diego Law Review* by an authorized editor of Digital USD. For more information, please contact digital@sandiego.edu.

THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE BED OF THE SEA

*Clark M. Eichelberger**

Worldwide sentiment is growing that the bed of the sea, which occupies seventy percent of the earth's surface, as yet unclaimed, should be reserved from national claims of sovereignty and regarded as a common heritage of mankind. It should be reserved for peaceful purposes only. All nations, maritime, landlocked and developing, have an equity in this heritage. An authority of the United Nations should so administer it. For common ownership of this vast area to be recognized, and for it to be internationally administered, would be one of the greatest advances in the history of world organization. Instead of national rivalry, a power struggle and a colonial race, this concept would enable mankind, working together, to develop new forms of international cooperation.

Those who oppose such a concept and would admit the right of an unlimited exploitation of the sea-bed base their justification (a) on the right of conquest which has caused so much harm throughout history, and (b) on an unfortunate and vague phrase in the Continental Shelf Convention.

Mankind is making an effort to bring the last two frontiers—outer space and the bed of the sea—under a regime of United Nations law. By a series of bold resolutions first suggested by President Kennedy in 1961, the General Assembly resolved that the law contained in the Charter of the United Nations should be applied to outer space; that the celestial bodies were not subject to appropriation by any state and that atomic weapons or other weapons of mass destruction should not be carried on space ships. These principles and others have been incorporated in a United Nations treaty¹ which nations are now signing. It may be many years before resources of the celestial bodies can be exploited for the benefit of earth, but technology is advancing so rapidly that nothing should be ruled out.

* Executive Director, Commission to Study the Organization of Peace.

1. Treaty of Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies, G.A. RES. 2222(XXI) Annex, 21 U.N. GAOR Supp. 16, at 13.

At the present time the bed of the sea is the subject of United Nations discussion. Economically, it is much more important than space exploitation for mankind because it contains valuable resources that are now attainable.

Twelve years ago the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace stated that "with respect to the bed of the high seas beyond the continental shelf and to outer space, which are outside the jurisdiction of any state, we urge the General Assembly to declare the title of the international community and to establish appropriate administrative arrangements."² The special Study Committee which prepared that section of the report recommended more expressly "that the floor under the high seas should be recognized as 'res communis'."³ Similar views were expressed elsewhere.

This concept is growing. On July 13, 1966, President Johnson said:

Under no circumstances, we believe, must we ever allow the prospects of rich harvest and mineral wealth to create a new form of colonial competition among the maritime nations. We must be careful to avoid a race to grab and to hold the lands under the high seas. We must ensure that the deep seas and the ocean bottoms are and remain, the legacy of all human beings.⁴

Senator Claiborne Pell of Rhode Island has been a pioneer in the belief that the seabed is a common heritage of mankind. He has taken a very valuable step in proposing a draft treaty for consideration by the Senate of the United States in which he suggested some general principles and an international regime for orderly and equitable use of the ocean floor. The United Nations Committee of the World Peace Through Law Center on July 13, 1967, adopted a resolution which provided as follows:

Whereas, new technology and oceanography have revealed the possibility of exploitation of untold resources of the high seas and the bed thereof beyond the continental shelf and more than half of mankind finds itself underprivileged,

2. STRENGTHENING THE UNITED NATIONS. TENTH REPORT OF THE COMMISSION TO STUDY THE ORGANIZATION OF PEACE, 1957, at 41.

3. *Id.* at 213.

4. Remarks of the President, Commissioning of the New Research Ship, the *Oceanographer*, Navy Yard Pier 2, July 13, 1966.

underfed, and underdeveloped, and the high seas are the common heritage of all mankind,

RESOLVED, that the World Peace Through Law Center (1) Recommend to the General Assembly of the United Nations the issuance of a proclamation declaring that the non-fishery resources of the high seas, outside the territorial waters of any State, and the bed of the sea beyond the continental shelf, appertain to the United Nations and are subject to its jurisdiction and control.⁵

Various groups abroad have taken similar positions, including the British Parliamentary Group for World Government and the International Institute of Peace and Conflict Research in Stockholm.

As an unconscious prelude to political consideration of the seabed, the United Nations Economic and Social Council, in 1966, asked for economic studies of the resources of the sea. It adopted a resolution (1112XL) requesting the Secretary-General, in cooperation with the Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development, the specialized agencies, particularly the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, and interested Member Governments, to make a survey of the present state of knowledge of the mineral and food resources of the sea, beyond the Continental Shelf, but excluding fish, and of the techniques for exploiting them. As part of the survey, he was asked "to attempt to identify those resources now considered to be capable of economic exploitation, especially for the benefit of developing countries. . . ."⁶

On December 6, 1966, the Twenty-first General Assembly passed a more comprehensive resolution on the subject. In addition to the survey previously requested by the Economic and Social Council, the Assembly asked for "a comprehensive survey of activities in marine science and technology, including that relating to mineral resources development, undertaken by members of the United Nations family of organizations, various Member States and intergovernmental organizations concerned, as well as by universities, scientific and technological institutes and other interested organizations."⁷

5. Resources of the High Seas, Resolution 15 of the Geneva World Peace Through Law Conference, adopted July 13, 1967.

6. Resolution 1112(XL), 40 U.N. ECOSOC, Supp. No. 1, at 3 (1966).

7. G.A. RES. 2172(XXI) 21 U.N. GAOR, Supp. No. 16, at 32.

The specialized agencies of the United Nations were very much concerned. The Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission of UNESCO had begun far-reaching scientific studies of the sea and seabed.

A political bomb shell was dropped in the Twenty-second General Assembly of the United Nations in 1967, by Dr. Arvid Pardo, the representative of Malta to the United Nations. His proposal provided for the:

Examination of the question of the reservation exclusively for peaceful purposes of the seabed and the ocean floor, and the subsoil thereof, underlying the high seas beyond the limits of present national jurisdiction, and the use of their resources in the interests of mankind.⁸

Dr. Pardo's letter to the Secretary-General of the United Nations asking that the item be put on the General Assembly agenda was eloquent indeed.

1. The seabed and the ocean floor are estimated to constitute approximately five-sevenths of the world's area. The seabed and ocean floor, underlying the seas outside present territorial waters and/or the continental shelves, are the only areas of our planet which have not yet been appropriated for national use, because they have been relatively inaccessible and their use for defense purposes or the economic exploitation of their resources was not technologically feasible.

2. In view of rapid progress in the development of new techniques by technologically advanced countries, it is feared that the situation will change and that the seabed and the ocean floor, underlying the seas beyond present national jurisdiction, will become progressively and competitively subject to national appropriation and use. This is likely to result in the militarization of the accessible ocean floor through the establishment of fixed military installations and in the exploitation and depletion of resources of immense potential benefit to the world, for the national advantage of technologically developed countries.

3. It is, therefore, considered that the time has come to declare the seabed and the ocean floor a common heritage of mankind and that immediate steps should be taken to draft a treaty embodying, *inter alia*, the following principles. . . .⁹

8. U.N. Doc. A/6695 (1967).

9. *Id.* Memorandum, at 2.

Ambassador Pardo's initiative will prove historic and may prove to be one of man's greatest advances.

It is one of the ironies of history that although man has used the waters of the sea long before his recorded history to travel, to settle, to fight, to conquer and to fish, his efforts to explore and exploit the deep seabed are practically less than a generation old.

Unlike the seabed, most of the good earth above the water as well as some not so good, has been claimed by sovereign powers. Some people have been on their lands since the beginning of recorded history. Other land was settled by conquest. As means of travel developed there were few lands and few islands that did not fall under the authority of some state.

Many of the migrations and the conquest of the new world were by sea. Those stories are ones of courage and grim adventure. They account for much of our superstition, history and literature. Many centuries were needed for people to migrate by way of the Bering Sea to what is now North and South America. Some fragmentary stories tell of the endurance and courage of the early adventurers. A boat load of Phoenicians, swept away by the winds from a convoy making its way around Africa, drifted into the eternal East-West winds to South America. The message left by these adventurers 2,000 years before Columbus has generally been authenticated. The New York Times in 1968 quoted the message as follows:

We were at sea together for two years around the land belonging to Ham [Africa] but were separated by a storm [lit., "from the hand of Baal"] and we were no longer with our companions. So we have come here, 12 men and 3 women, on a new shore which I, the Admiral, control. But auspiciously may the exalted gods and goddesses favor us!¹⁰

Although man laid claim to the dry land, its continents, its islands and its frozen wastes of the Antarctic, he did not lay claim to the bed of the sea. It held nothing but terror for him. He did not know what was there. He had no way of going there, no hope of staying there and no chance of harnessing whatever resources were there. Resources of the deep sea were matters of mythology. The Chinese believed that four dragons ruled the sea;

10. N.Y. Times, May 16, 1968, at 49.

that they lived in great palaces and their diet was of opals and pearls. Consequently, this seventy percent of the earth's surface, the seabed, was unclaimed, unexplored and unwanted.

Over the centuries a very considerable international law developed which applied to the surface of the sea. The early maritime laws, developed by merchants and traders because they were badly needed, assumed a binding character, although they were not laws passed by a sovereign authority. They were based on custom and practice, found suitable to the needs of a community which knows no national boundaries. Possibly the first maritime code was the Rhodian Law dating from the Third or Second Century B.C. Its principles, accepted by both Greeks and Romans, lasted a thousand years. One could trace these various codes down to modern times.

One of the most important laws of the sea was that of freedom of the seas, dating from the time of Grotius. It was gradually accepted and except in wartime man has been free to travel, to fish anywhere on or slightly beneath the surface of the sea.

A small belt of territorial waters was agreed to. It is referred to as a Three Mile Limit which, roughly speaking, was thought to be the range of a cannon on shore. This distance has been extended to six miles and twelve miles by some states. There are even a few states in western South America that have claimed a territorial sea of 200 miles, warning fishing vessels to keep out of their rich fishing lands.

Not more than a few years ago man discovered that there was oil in shallow waters offshore and consequently thought more about the continental shelf. In 1945, President Harry S. Truman proclaimed for the United States the exclusive use of the American continental shelf. His proclamation indicated a distinction between the seabed and the waters above. Therefore, a citizen of the United States could drill in the seabed of the continental shelf exclusively without interfering with the freedom of the seas insofar as travel, fishing, etc., were concerned beyond the territorial sea.

A United Nations Conference in Geneva in 1958 adopted the Convention on the Continental Shelf. In it the continental shelf was defined as follows:

Article 1

For the purpose of these articles, the term “continental shelf” is used as referring (a) to the seabed and subsoil of the submarine areas adjacent to the coast, but outside the area of the territorial sea, to a depth of 200 meters or, beyond that limit, to where the depth of the superjacent waters admits of the exploitation of the natural resources of the said areas; (b) to the seabed and subsoil of similar submarine areas adjacent to the coasts of islands.

Article 2

1. The coastal State exercises over the continental shelf sovereign rights for the purpose of exploring it and exploiting its natural resources.

Had the Convention established the continental shelf to a depth of 200 meters and stopped there, much trouble today would have been avoided. But the “beyond” clause has proved to be a most harmful provision and may lead to untold difficulties. The purpose of this provision is difficult to determine; apparently few of its drafters realized its consequences. At the time of its adoption there was little idea of the extent of the resources of the deep seabed, and the technology of drilling there was scarcely contemplated. However, as in the case of outer space, technology has advanced rapidly. In August 1968, a research vessel drilled a shallow hole into a knoll in the Sigsbee Deep, a part of an abyss 12,000 feet under the surface of the Gulf of Mexico, and found petroleum there—the first definite proof of the existence of oil beyond the continental margins. Consequently there are those who argue that this unfortunate clause in the Convention permits a nation to extend its claims indefinitely until it reaches the claims of a rival at midpoint in the oceans.

Following Ambassador Pardo’s initiative of 1967, debate in the General Assembly began slowly. The developing states, with few citizens having technical training, were hesitant to take part in the debate. Most of the great powers, not knowing where their interests lay, wished that the matter had never been projected. Nevertheless, a debate began which resulted in the establishment by the Assembly of an *Ad Hoc* Committee of 35 members who were charged with “Examination of the question of the reservation exclusively for peaceful purposes of the seabed and the ocean floor, and the subsoil thereof, underlying the high seas beyond the limits of present national jurisdiction, and the uses of

their resources in the interests of mankind."¹¹ The *Ad Hoc* Committee had three sessions and produced a report for the 23rd General Assembly in 1968.

That General Assembly adopted four resolutions. The first established a permanent committee of forty-two to "study the elaboration of the legal principles and norms which would promote international cooperation in the exploration and use of the seabed and ocean floor . . . (and) the reservation exclusively for peaceful purposes of the seabed and the ocean floor without prejudice to the limits which may be agreed upon in this respect"¹² It was agreed that the draft resolutions of principles presented to the *Ad Hoc* Committee and to the First Committee of the General Assembly should be passed on to the Standing Committee.

The second resolution set in motion studies for marine pollution control. A third requested the Secretary-General to "undertake a study on the question of establishing in due time appropriate international machinery for the promotion of the exploration and exploitation of the resources of this area, and the use of these resources in the interests of mankind. . . ."¹³ The fourth accepted and implemented the United States suggestion for an International Decade of Ocean Exploration.

Thus, the historic debate which began with the introduction of the Maltese resolution in the 22nd General Assembly is now continuing in the Standing Committee of 42. Here, it is expected to continue for years until much of the problem is resolved.

Discussions were held in the 22nd and 23rd General Assemblies as well as in three sessions of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, and the deliberations of the first substantive session of the Standing Committee. How does one assess the progress that has been made? It is very encouraging or somewhat disappointing, depending upon the approach of the observer.

Basically, something very important has happened; something unthought of a year ago. Most nations are now agreed that there is an area of the seabed not subject to annexation or national claims. It is generally agreed that the

11. G.A. RES. 2340(XXII). 22 U.N. GAOR, Supp. 16, at 14.

12. G.A. RES. 2467(XXIII)A (1968).

13. G.A. RES. 2467(XXIII)B at 3.

resources from this area be reserved for mankind, with particular emphasis on the developing peoples. It is also accepted that the seabed should be used for peaceful purposes only. The resolution passed unanimously by the 23rd General Assembly declared that the regime should be guided by "legal principles and norms." This is interpreted by the majority of the delegates to indicate an agency of the world community. Many years later, as more mature human beings survey the long effort to build a legal world community, these agreements in retrospect will be very important indeed.

On the other hand, disappointment has been expressed that within these general principles there are wide differences of opinion, and that so little leadership is being given by the great powers to formulate and implement them. One of the fundamental disagreements is over the size of the area of the seabed to be reserved for mankind and the size of the continental shelf. Should the continental shelf be narrow, thus preserving a large area of resources for mankind, or should the continental shelf be quite wide, withdrawing from the common heritage the resources of the continental slope and rise? The Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, in its 19th Report said:

The Convention on the Continental Shelf should be revised so as to provide that national exploitation rights over seabed resources end at the 200-meter depth line or 50 nautical miles from shore, whichever occurs further out. This would be more equitable for States with narrow continental shelves. The figure of 200 meters approximates the average depth for the end of the shelf, and 50 nautical miles approximates the average lateral extent of the shelf. The Commission does not feel that it is feasible to return to a simple 200-meter cutoff, and it considers the above recommendation to be more equitable than any other suggestions (such as 500-meter or even 2500-meter depth lines).¹⁴

The United States Presidential Commission on Marine Science, Engineering and Resources, in its report of January 1969, said:

The Commission recommends that the United States take the initiative to secure international agreement on a

14. THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE BED OF THE SEA, NINETEENTH REPORT OF THE COMMISSION TO STUDY THE ORGANIZATION OF PEACE, March 1969, at 24.

redefinition of the 'continental shelf' for purposes of the Convention on the Continental Shelf. The seaward limit of each coastal nation's 'continental shelf' should be fixed at the 200-meter isobath, or 50 nautical miles from the baseline for measuring the breadth of its territorial sea, whichever alternative gives it the greater area for purposes of the Convention.¹⁵

The proposed Agreement should further provide that an intermediate zone might be created "but only to the 2,500-meter isobath, or 100 nautical miles," whichever gives the coastal states the greater area for the purposes for which the intermediate zones are created. Only the coastal state or its licensees should be authorized to explore or exploit in this zone. However, in all other respects, "exploration and exploitation in the intermediate zone should be governed by the framework recommended above for the areas of the deep seas beyond the intermediate zone."¹⁶ The agreement would provide for revenues to be divided between the coastal state and the international authority for the developing states.

Wide difference of opinion exists as to what is meant by the seabed being reserved for peaceful purposes only. The Soviet Union would interpret the principle as meaning the banning of military installations on the entire seabed, including the continental shelf beyond territorial waters. The United States proposes an agreement to prevent the emplacement of atomic weapons and other weapons of mass destruction on the seabed and ocean floor.

The possibility of a treaty to insure the uses of the seabed for peaceful purposes is being discussed at the Eighteen-nation Disarmament Conference. The Soviet Union has presented a treaty which outlines its position as expressed in the United Nations *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Sea. The United States has continued to stress the primary importance of barring atomic weapons and other weapons of mass destruction from the seabed and ocean floor.

One of the arguments commonly advanced by those who refuse to grasp the greatness of the opportunity before the nations is that little should be done in the way of adopting principles until

15. OUR NATION AND THE SEA, A PLAN FOR NATIONAL ACTION. REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON MARINE SCIENCE, ENGINEERING AND RESOURCES, January 1969, at 145.

16 *Id.* at 151.

more is known of the sea and its possibilities. This doctrine is an invitation to the capable maritime powers to take as much of the seabed as they can, expecting the national flag to protect them. Once having established their claims and having made large investments for exploration and exploitation, it is hard to imagine their voluntarily pulling back for an international regime. It is not necessary for nations to know the extent of the minerals of the sea, or how rapidly they can be reached practically, for them to agree on principles safeguarding these resources for mankind.

A wide difference of opinion also exists as to what legal arrangement or authority should implement these principles. The phrase used in the terms of reference of the Permanent Committee is to "discuss legal principles and norms." The majority of nations, particularly the smaller and developing countries, wish an international authority or agency under the United Nations. The Soviet Union has objected to the Permanent Committee discussing the possibility of a United Nations agency on the sea. Its delegates argue that such an authority is impossible because it would contain representatives of so-called "capitalist" and so-called "socialist" states. This objection ignores the fact that many different agencies of the United Nations contain both so-called socialist and so-called capitalist states.

Another argument directed against the immediate establishment of an international agency to administer the sea's resources is that successful maritime powers cannot place their economic interests in the hands of a parliamentary majority of the General Assembly in which the underdeveloped States have a majority vote. It should be remembered that the resources of the sea and seabed are the common heritage not only of the maritime powers but of the developing States and the landlocked States as well. All of them will be a factor in determining the regime of the future.

No one is suggesting that the General Assembly be the administrative or regulatory body. The General Assembly and the treaty to be adopted incorporating the basic principles should be the legal authority for the regime. However, the agency itself should be able to function with the efficiency of the International Bank, the International Atomic Energy Agency or the United Nations Development Program. The agency must be made up of experts, and its governing body must be weighted carefully. Of course, the United Nations is presently without the organiza-

tional machinery that could perform the task of controlling the sea. Even national governments seldom have the machinery ready to undertake new tasks. Machinery of government is created to fulfill imperative needs. The wisdom of the nations will enable them to create through the United Nations the machinery that is now necessary.

Certain economic interests are under the illusion that they have a right to appropriate as much of the seabed as they can successfully digest. An oil group recently objected to part of the licensing fee for development of the seabed going to a program for world development. The group argued that if the United States government wanted to contribute to the underdeveloped peoples it could do so. But why, it argued, give away the taxpayer's money? In other words, the group assumed that the United States government had the right to issue licenses as far into the seas as it wanted to, and that the licensing fee would belong to the United States. The question that then arises is who gave the United States the right to issue licenses far into the ocean bed? This thinking must be denied immediately, if nations are to avoid a power struggle for the sea.

Discussion in the United Nations Permanent Committee has centered primarily on the seabed. This was wise. Obviously there are many other problems with which an authority for the sea must concern itself. Pollution is one. Roger Revelle, distinguished oceanographer, outlines the following five additional functions for what he calls the new International Ocean Agency: (1) conservation of high seas fisheries; (2) establishment of regulations to prevent pollution by tankers and other ships at sea; (3) surveillance of nuclear submarines; (4) promotion of international cooperation in oceanography; and (5) equitable control of large-scale modifications of ocean weather.¹⁷

Much of the discussion in the legal sub-committee of the Permanent Committee centers on the possibility of a declaration of principles and how comprehensive it should be. Obviously it will take time to draft a treaty for an international regime for the seabed. However, principles should be agreed to immediately. They would give guidance to those responsible for drafting the treaty. In addition, they would prevent claims made and positions

17. Roger Revelle, *Man and the Sea in the 21st Century*, June 1968 at 6 (Commission to Study the Organization of Peace).

taken by various governments which would make the drafting of a treaty difficult. Various drafts of principles were submitted to the *Ad Hoc* Committee which were forwarded to the Permanent Committee. They were submitted by the United States, India, Belgium, the developing States, with a more limited agreed set of principles set forth by the United Kingdom.

The Commission to Study the Organization of Peace with all of these proposed principles in mind formulated what it believes are the ideal comprehensive principles which should be adopted as quickly as possible. They are as follows:

1. The seabed and ocean floor, and the subsoil thereof, which underlie the high seas and which lie beyond the generally recognized limits of national jurisdiction, are the common heritage of mankind.

2. A precise boundary for this area should be defined with all possible speed. This area should be as large as possible so as to preserve the largest amount of resources for the benefit of mankind and to diminish the possible area of controversy.

3. The resources of this area should be developed for the benefit and in the interest of all mankind, taking into account the special needs of the developing States. All States, including the landlocked, have an equity in the resources of this area.

4. No State should be permitted to claim or exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction or any exclusive rights over this area, and no part of this area should be subject to national appropriation by any means whatsoever.

5. This area should be open to scientific investigation, without discrimination, and international scientific cooperation and technical assistance should be fostered by the United Nations, as well as its specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency, so as to enable all States to participate in such investigations and to have access to their results.

6. All activities in this area should be conducted in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, hitherto accepted principles of international law, and this Declaration, and should not cause any unjustifiable interference with the freedom of the high seas.

7. All activities in this area should conform to guidelines aimed at protecting the rightful interests of all States and at minimizing such harmful effects as:

impediments to navigation and fishing; interference with the laying and the maintenance of submarine cables and pipelines; pollution of the sea and the seabed; and damage to animal and plant life.

8. The seabed, and subsoil thereof, should be used for peaceful purposes only. In particular, no military bases and fortifications should be established on the seabed; no nuclear weapons or other weapons of mass destruction should be emplaced on it, implanted in it, or affixed to it, and no such weapons especially designed for use on the seabed should be deployed thereon. Use of military personnel or equipment for scientific research should not, however, be prohibited.

9. The United Nations, in cooperation with its specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency, should take adequate measures to ensure the observance of these principles.

10. The orderly utilization of the resources of the seabed, and subsoil thereof, requires an appropriate international regime, established by the United Nations. This regime should include arrangements for dedicating a reasonable portion of the value of such resources to international community purposes, including the economic, social, scientific and technological progress of the developing countries. All States seeking commercial exploration or exploitation rights should be treated equally and without discrimination by the international regime, which should allocate leases on the basis of competitive criteria. The international regime must also take into account the economic interests of the developing States.¹⁸

Ambassador James Russell Wiggins, then head of the U.S. Mission to the United Nations, appearing before the First Committee of the General Assembly dealing with the peaceful uses of the seabed and the ocean floor, made the following statement:

We stand upon the threshold of an undiscovered country, at the very frontier of a new world, a virgin region untouched by man, shrouded in the mystery of the vast deep. If, in the Fifteenth Century, at such a pause in unfolding human destiny, Europe had embraced a like chance to give order to the development of the New World that Columbus discovered, how differently would it have proceeded? It is sobering to reflect on the lives that were lost in the long

18. THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE BED OF THE SEA, NINETEENTH REPORT OF THE COMMISSION TO STUDY THE ORGANIZATION OF PEACE, March 1969 at 21-22.

competition for the control of the continent; of the treasures of civilization that might have been preserved.

Let us profit by melancholy precedent as we adventure into that new vast world that lies beneath the seas. Let us not disfigure this new world with the wasteful exploitation that springs from uncontrolled avarice, or the dreadful debris that rises from the field of battle. Let us go forth into our last new world committed to the purposes of Twentieth Century man and all his posterity down through the ages.¹⁹

19. Statement before Committee I of the General Assembly, 29 October 1968. U.N. Doc. A/C.1/PV.1590, at 17.