

institutions to govern the seabed beyond national jurisdiction would be lost. Some developed states would almost certainly take unilateral action authorizing their own nationals and other legal entities to explore and exploit the deep seabed beyond the limits presently claimed by any state. Certain developing states might well respond by new kinds of unilateral action asserting national jurisdiction over these same areas. Indeed, they have said they would do so. Disputes over fishing rights, environmental jurisdiction, under-sea resource rights, conflicting delimitation claims, rights of passage in straits and claims to the deep ocean seabed could surface all over the globe. The conclusion is obvious. The Law of the Sea Conference has gone too far in developing new concepts and eroding the "old international law" for it to be permitted to fail at this stage. The particular interests of individual states, be they powerful or weak, maritime or coastal, land-locked or geographically disadvantaged, coincide with the general interest of the international community as a whole in the over-riding need for a successful conclusion to the Law of the Sea Conference. This is no longer merely a desirable objective. It is an international imperative.

### Conclusions

It seems clear that the international community is facing the choice, on the one hand, of a very real danger to peace and security - quite apart from the damage to the UN - should the Conference fail, or, on the other hand, an opportunity to demonstrate the heights to which mankind can rise when we are