January 5, 1976

Mrs. Elisabeth Mann Borgese P.O. Box 4068 Santa Barbara, Ca. 93103

Dear Elisabeth:

Presumably you received my cable expressing my general approval of the latest version of the Okinawa declaration. This refers particularly to the points I had raised previously re the limited values to be derived from deep ocean minerals, the effect of their exploitation on the "New World Economic Order" and the need to simplify the structure of the Sea Bed Authority in more realistic relation to its mission.

My suggestion re deleting the word "undiminished" from the fourth paragraph was based on the fact that non-renewable mineral resources are bound to be diminished if they are to be exploited as suggested in the latter part of the same paragraph.

I wonder also about the implication of the suggestion on page 3 that the 200 mile limit be related to continental shelves eather than the proposed economic zones. Is this meant to oppose the economic zone concept and substitute a new definition of continental shelves as a revision of the 1958 Convention on Continental Shelves? If so this could require consideration of other details of the 1958 Convention. This would include, for example, expansion of the limit by a process of exploitation which could expand the limit previously based on depth. Would exploitation be able to expand the limit beyond 200 miles?

Furthermore, the 1958 Convention gave jurisdiction only over sessile resources on or below the Sea Bed. Living resources are not covered by the Continental Shelf convention but were to be covered by the Economic Zone provisions. By what means will proper management of living resources in coastal areas be achieved?

My question simply is are we really advocating abandonment of the Economic Zone concept in favor of an approach by way of a new Continental Shelf convention?

Assuming that the questions I have raised here will not be dealt with at the meeting in Malta I shall be interested to know what action may be taken relative to them in some other way.

With best regards,

Copy of cable sent from New York, December 31,

to Mrs. E. M. Borgese
International Ocean Institute
Royal University
Malta

Reasonably satisfied with statement. Suggest deletion of "undiminished" from fourth paragraph. Question also effect of substitution of the Continental Shelf approach for Economic Zones on management of living resources.

Mrs. Elisabeth M. Borgese Box 4068 Santa Barbara, Ca 93103

Dear Elisabeth:

Thanks for the copy of comments from Silviu on the proposed IOI declaration of Okinawa.

Irrespective of Silviu's misgivings I think it would be a mistake to skip issuing a declaration. Those who sponsored and attended the Conference expect some sort of summary of what transpired and the implications of the discussions as these might be considered by delegates to the next session of UNCLOS.

It is not to be expected that there could be general agreement on any positions that might be taken on controversial matters.

Silviu seems to suggest that the text must not be offensive to the "most militant nations of the Third World" by any challenge of their rights to that portion of the "heritage of mankind" that will become nationalized by both rich and poor coastal states by establishment of 200 mile economic zones. Since the effect of this action is probably self evident the Declaration can draw attention to it without being accused of taking sides.

The favorable position of the group which Silviu refers to as "internationalists" has not been the result of ""grabbing" practically everything available in the world". It is the result of their having been endowed with natural resources of minerals, soils and climates which they have cultivated by the application of advanced technologies which they are willing to share with the poorer nations under appropriate arrangements.

For example, the United States has been doing a great deal by its subsidized exports of food for the benefit of the "poor and undernourished" people of the world.

I see no harm in questioning the tactics of the Third World in achieving their legitimate objectives. Suggestions of more realistic approaches don't necessarily imply that the suggester "knows better what their real interests are". Such suggestions are quite applicable to "their real interests" as they themselves have described

what is being dealt with is the best way to achieve their real interests, not how to describe them. For example, my criticism of the structure of the proposed Sea Bed Authority deals not so much with its immediate application but, rather, with its chance of becoming a successful model for application of a similar approach to the ultimate goal of a broader based approach to future resource management that will be more favorable to the poorer nations.

Perhaps you will want to relay my remarks to Silviu for such additional comments as he may wish to offer.

with best regards.

December 23, 1976

Mr. Frank LaQue Claridge Drive Verona, N.J. 07044

Dear Frank:

Thanks for your thoughtful letter. I have sent a copy on to Silviu.

I have been working sixteen hours a day, finishing the research project on the new international economic order and the law of the sea and am therefore slightly behind schedule with some other urgent matters.

Thus I had intended to put together my suggestions for the Council Statement before leaving. But this cannot be done now. It will be the first thing I do on the other side of the ocean, and you will re-eive it, hopefully before the New Year.

All the very, very best for Christmas and the New Year.

Yours as ever,

Elisabeth Mann Borgese

4000 1

December 8, 1975

Mrs. Elisabeth M. Borgese Box 4068 Santa Barbara, Ca 93103

Dear Elisabeth:

Thanks for the copy of comments from Silviu on the proposed IOI declaration of Okinawa.

Irrespective of Silviu's misgivings I think it would be a mistake to skip issuing a declaration. Those who sponsored and attended the Conference expect some sort of summary of what transpired and the implications of the discussions as these might be considered by delegates to the next session of UNCLOS.

It is not to be expected that there could be general agreement on any positions that might be taken on controversial matters.

Silviu seems to suggest that the text must not be offensive to the "most militant nations of the Third World" by any challenge of their rights to that portion of the "heritage of mankind" that will become nationalized by both rich and poor coastal states by establishment of 200 mile economic zones. Since the effect of this action is probably self evident the Declaration can draw attention to it without being accused of taking sides.

The favorable position of the group which Silviu refers to as "internationalists" has not been the result of ""grabbing" practically everything available in the world". It is the result of their having been endowed with natural resources of minerals, soils and climates which they have cultivated by the application of advanced technologies which they are willing to share with the poorer nations under appropriate arrangements.

For example, the United States has been doing a great deal by its subsidized exports of food for the benefit of the "poor and undernourished" people of the world.

I see no harm in questioning the tactics of the Third World in achieving their legitimate objectives. Suggestions of more realistic approaches don't necessarily imply that the suggester "knows better what their real interests are". Such suggestions are quite applicable to "their real interests" as they themselves have described

× 0 0 0

What is being dealt with is the best way to achieve their real interests, not how to describe them. For example, my criticism of the structure of the proposed Sea Bed Authority deals not so much with its immediate application but, rather, with its chance of becoming a goal of a broader based approach to future resource management that will be more favorable to the poorer nations.

Perhaps you will want to relay my remarks to Silviu for such additional comments as he may wish to offer.

With best regards,

December 5, 1975

Mrs. Elisabeth Borgese P.O. Box 4716 Santa Barbara, Ca 93103

Dear Elisabeth:

Confirming our conversation in Washington, I shall not be able to attend the meeting of the I.O.I Planning Council in Malta in January.

I understand a revised draft of the Okinawa Declaration will be considered by the Council at that time. I would appreciate being given an opportunity to review the text prior to the Malta meeting so that I may be able to submit comments in writing for consideration along with other comments during the Council meeting.

I was glad to have the opportunity to talk to you in Washington. The conference appeared to be well organized and very successful. It should prove to be helpful to the Center.

With best regards,

November 25, 1975

Mrs. Elisabeth M. Borgese P.O. Box 4068 Santa Barbara, CA 93103

Dear Elisabeth:

Thanks for your note re the possibility of additions to the draft statement prepared by Richardson and Gordon so as to include comments on the structure and functions of the proposed Sea Bed Authority. Of course I don't require or expect that the exact wording and length of my intervention will be used.

I hope that the final version will note that the resources to be dealt with for the next 15 years or so will be limited to ferromanganese nodules providing not more than 10% of the world's needs for the nodule metals with consequent small impact on the "new world economic order". It should note also that if the authority is to serve as a model for management of resources as a concept it should be designed to do this sufficiently efficiently to become an effective and attractive model.

Finally, it should be capable of adaptation to changes in the U.N. agency structure that may come out of the studies re this, currently underway.

As stated previously I hope that the final version will deal appropriately with the important details I have emphasized here.

I am glad that Max Bruce sees no difficulties from the section on the boundaries of national jurisdiction.

Yours sincerely,

Copy: Mrs. F. McAllister

November 10, 1975

Mrs. Elisabeth M. Borgese P.O. Box 4068 Santa Barbara, Ca 93103

Dear Elisabeth:

Upon reviewing the draft text of the Okinawa declaration to be issued on behalf of the Planning Council I was naturally disappointed by finding no comments on the proposed structure and scope of the Sea Bed Authority as proposed in the negotiating text for Committee I.

You should recall that I brought this up during the review of the first draft at the final meeting of the Planning Council in Okinawa. My intervention occurred just as the meeting was about to break up so that we could get to the airport in time. I presented what I wanted included. This was not opposed at the time and it was agreed that I would submit my contribution in writing to Sir Edgerton Richardson to be combined with his draft. I did this. Since then I sent you a copy of what I provided Sir Edgerton. It would appear that either you or Sir Edgerton, or both, decided to exclude my remarks, or something based on them, from the declaration.

I still think that something should be said about the structure and near future scope of the authority and that my remarks were valid and pertinent. They dealt with a topic that occupied the attention of the conference and its working groups and which should not be ignored in a document identified as dealing with whatever was discussed at Pacem in Maribus VI.

In addition to this there should be some reference to the discussion of restrictions on freedom of research which also occupied the attention of the delegates. This is dealt with in another note I sent you.

Finally, I suspect that Max Bruce will be concerned by the statement in the declaration that takes sides in a continuing dispute as to limits on national jurisdiction by proposing a 200 mile or 100 mile limit for continental shelves where these are now greater under the terms of the 1958 convention. Max may be embarrassed and inhibited in Canada by the position being taken by the Council in the declaration which is at odds with the position taken by Canada.

If my interventions as a member of the planning council not opposed by other members of the council when presented are to be ignored arbitrarily in statements of a council position I shall be forced to decide whether my service on the council should be continued.

Please let me know what action you propose to take re use of my contribution to the declaration.

Copies: Maxwell Bruce F. McAllister Sincerely, frank

November 18, 1975

Mrs. Frances B. McAllister P.O. Box 1874 Flagstaff, Arizona 86001

Dear Frances:

Naturally I was disturbed by your letter of resignation from the Planning Council of the I.O.I. I noted that it was addressed to the members rather than to the chairman. Presumably it will have to be acted upon by the Council. I am wondering when this might be arranged and how the Council will react.

Presumably some of the members of the Council will be at the Pacem in Terris conference in Washington early next month. Do you think a meeting of those present could be arranged? If so, should we try to persuade Elisabeth to call a meeting there?

The discussion could include some of the matters covered in your letter of November 4th and your subsequent discussions with her.

Your comments will be welcome.

Sincerely,

NV

GA

11+4

232103 NKL UR

02 1426 047915

RCA TELEGRAM 5

232103 NKL UR

FR1

MRS. E.M. BORGESE
INTERNATIONAL OCEAN INSTITUTE
ROYAL UNIVERSITY
MALTA, MONACO(FRANCE)

S/N 03609

REASONABLY SATISFIED WITH STATEMENT.

SUGGEST DELETION OF UNDIMINISHED FROM 4TH PARAGRAPH.

QUESTION ALSO EFFECT OF SUBSTITUTION OF THE CONTINENTAL SHELF

APPROACH FOR ECONOMIC ZONES ON MANAGEMENT OF LIVING RESOURCES.

FRANK LA QUE

NNNN®

RCA TELEGRAM 51

GA