

SENATE ADVICE AND CONSENT  
TO THE LAW OF THE SEA CONVENTION

URGENT UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Testimony of

**John Norton Moore**

Before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee

October 14, 2003

# SENATE ADVICE AND CONSENT TO THE LAW OF THE SEA CONVENTION

Testimony delivered by

John Norton Moore\*

*"The day is within my time as well as yours,  
when we may say by what laws other nations  
shall treat us on the sea."*

*Thomas Jefferson*

## **C**HAIRMAN RICHARD G. LUGAR AND HONORABLE MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE --

Senate advice and consent to the 1982 Law of the Sea Convention is strongly in the national interest of the United States. Ratification of the Convention will restore United States oceans leadership, protect United States oceans interests, and enhance United States foreign policy. For these reasons the Convention is broadly supported by United States oceans organizations, including the United States Navy (one of the strongest supporters over the years), the National Ocean Industries Association<sup>1</sup>, the United States Outer Continental Shelf Policy Committee<sup>2</sup>, the American Petroleum Institute<sup>3</sup>, the Chamber of Shipping of

---

<sup>1</sup>On June 6, 2001, the National Ocean Industries Association submitted a resolution to the Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee declaring: "The National Ocean Industries Association (NOIA) is writing to urge your prompt consideration of the Convention on the Law of the Sea . . . . The NOIA membership includes companies engaged in all aspects of the Outer Continental Shelf oil and natural gas exploration and production industry. This membership believes it is imperative for the Senate to act on the treaty if the U.S. is to maintain its leadership role in shaping and directing international maritime policy."

<sup>2</sup>On May 24, 2001, the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) Policy Committee adopted the following recommendation: "[T]he OCS Policy Committee recommends that the Administration communicate its support for ratification of UNCLOS to the United States Senate . . . ."

<sup>3</sup>See the statement of Ms. Genevieve Laffly Murphy on behalf of the American Petroleum Institute at the recent oceans forum of the Center for Oceans Law and Policy, Oct. 1, 2003. Ms. Murphy stressed the energy security interest of the American petroleum industry both in access to the continental shelf beyond 200 miles and in protection of navigational freedom. *See also* the letter from the president of the American Petroleum Institute to the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations

America<sup>4</sup>, The Center for Seafarers' Rights<sup>5</sup>, the Chemical Manufacturers Association<sup>6</sup>, and the congressionally established National Commission on Ocean Policy.<sup>7</sup> This testimony will briefly explore reasons for United States adherence to the Convention. First, however, it will set out a brief overview of the Nation's oceans interests and history of the Convention.

### ***Background of the Convention***

As the quote by Thomas Jefferson illustrates, the United States, surrounded by oceans and with the largest range of oceans interests in the world, has a vital national interest in the legal regime of the sea. Today those interests include naval mobility, navigational freedom for commercial shipping, oil and gas from the

---

of October 1, 1996, which states: "The American Petroleum Institute wishes to express its support for favorable action by the Senate on the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS). API favors ratification of the revised treaty because it promotes unimpeded maritime rights of passage; provides a predictable framework for minerals developed; and , sets forth criteria and procedures for determining the outer limit of the continental shelf. The latter will be accomplished by the soon-to-be established Commission on the Limits of the Continental Shelf."

<sup>4</sup> In a letter to the Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee of May 26, 1998, the president of the Chamber of Shipping of America writes: "[t]he Chamber of Shipping represents 14 U.S. based companies which own, operate or charter oceangoing tankers, container ships, and other merchant vessels engaged in both the domestic and international trades. The Chamber also represents other entities which maintain a commercial interest in the operation of such oceangoing vessels. Over the past quarter century, the Chamber has supported the strong leadership role of the United States in the finalization of the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) into its final form, including revision of the deep seabed mining provision. We believe the United States took such a strong role due to its recognition that UNCLOS is of critical importance to national and economic security, regarding both our military and commercial fleets. ... Mr. Chairman, we appreciate your consideration of these issues and strongly urge you to place the ratification of UNCLOS on the agenda of your Committee. The United States was a key player in its development and today, is one of the few industrialized countries who have not yet ratified this very important Convention. The time is now for the United States to retake its position of leadership."

<sup>5</sup> On May 26, 1998, the Director of the Center for Seafarers' Rights wrote the following in a letter addressed to the Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee: "The 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea creates a legal framework that addresses a variety of interests, the most important of which is protecting the safety and well-being of the people who work and travel on the seas. I urge you to support ratification of the 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea."

<sup>6</sup> In a July 17, 1998 letter to the Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the President of the Chemical Manufacturers Association wrote the following: "The Law of the Sea Convention promotes the economic security of the United States by assuring maritime rights of passage. More importantly, the Convention establishes a widely-accepted, predictable framework for the protection of commercial interests. The United States must be a full party to the Convention in order to realize the significant benefits of the agreement; and to influence the future implementation of UNCLOS at the international level. On behalf of the U.S. chemical industry, I strongly encourage you to schedule a hearing on UNCLOS, and favorably report the Convention for action by the Senate."

<sup>7</sup> On November 14, 2001, the National Commission on Ocean Policy adopted a resolution – its first on any subject -- providing: "The National Commission on Ocean Policy unanimously recommends that the United States of America immediately accede to the United Nations Law of the Sea Convention. Time is of the essence if the United States is to maintain its leadership role in the ocean and coastal activities. Critical national interests are at stake and the United States can only be a full participant in upcoming Convention activities if the country proceeds with accession expeditiously."

continental margin, fishing, freedom to lay cables and pipelines, environmental protection, marine science, mineral resources of the deep seabed, and conflict resolution. Consistent with these broad interests the United States has been resolute in protecting its ocean freedoms. Indeed, the Nation has fought at least two major wars to preserve navigational freedoms; the War of 1812 and World War I. In point II of his famous 14 Points at the end of World War I, Woodrow Wilson said we should secure “[a]bsolute freedom of navigation upon the seas . . . alike in peace and in war.” And the Seventh Point of the Atlantic Charter, accepted by the Allies as their “common principle” for the post World War II world, provided “such a peace should enable all men to traverse the high seas and oceans without hindrance.”

In the aftermath of World War II the United States provided leadership in the First and Second United Nations Conferences to seek to protect and codify our oceans freedoms. The first such conference, held in 1958, resulted in four “Geneva Conventions on the Law of the Sea” which promptly received Senate Advice and Consent. One of these, the Convention on the Continental Shelf, wrote into oceans law the United States innovation from the 1945 Truman Proclamation -- that coastal nations should control the oil and gas of their continental margins. During the 1960's a multiplicity of illegal claims threatening United States navigational interests led to a United States initiative to promote agreement within the United Nations on the maximum breadth of the territorial sea and protection of navigational freedom through straits. This, in turn, led some years later, and with a broadening of the agenda, to the convening in 1973 of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea. In this regard it should be clearly understood that the United States was a principal initiator of this Conference, and it was by far the preeminent participant in shaping the resulting Convention. Make no mistake; the United States was not participating in this Conference out of some fuzzy feel good notion. Its participation was driven at the highest levels in our Government by an understanding of the critical national interests in protecting freedom of navigation and the rule of law in the world's oceans. Today we understand even more clearly from “public choice theory,” which won the Nobel Prize in economics, why our choice to mobilize in a multilateral setting all those who benefited from navigational freedom was a sound choice in controlling individual illegal oceans claims.<sup>8</sup> And the result was outstanding in protecting our vital

---

<sup>8</sup>The reason supporting this is most easily understood as the high cost of organization of those affected by illegal oceans claims; claims which were externalizing costs on the international community. A multilateral strategy of response to such

navigational and security interests. Moreover, along the way we solidified for the United States the world's largest offshore resource area for oil and gas and fishery resources over a huge 200 nautical mile economic zone, and a massive continental shelf going well beyond 200 miles.<sup>9</sup>

Despite an outstanding victory for the United States on our core security and resource interests a lingering dispute remained with respect to the regime to govern resource development of the deep seabed beyond areas of national jurisdiction. Thus, when the Convention was formally adopted in 1982, this disagreement about Part XI of the Convention prevented United States adherence. Indeed, during the final sessions of the Conference President Reagan put forth a series of conditions for United States adherence, all of which required changes in Part XI. Following adoption of the Convention without meeting these conditions, Secretary Rumsfeld served as an emissary for President Reagan to persuade our allies not to accept the Convention without the Reagan conditions being met. The success of the Rumsfeld mission set the stage some years later for a successful renegotiation of Part XI of the Convention. In 1994, Part XI, dealing with the deep seabed regime beyond national jurisdiction, was successfully renegotiated meeting all of the Reagan conditions and then some. Subsequently, on October 7, 1994, President Clinton transmitted the Convention to the Senate for advice and consent.<sup>10</sup> Since that time no Administration,

---

illegal claims, far from being simply a fuzzy effort at cooperation, effectively enabled coordination of nations to promote the common interest against such illegal claims. Counter to the perception of some that a unilateral U.S. response is always the best strategy, a multilateral forum was indeed the most effective forum for controlling such threats to our navigational freedom. Moreover, since a majority of *coastal* nations are completely "zone locked," that is, they have no access to the oceans without traversing the 200 mile economic zones of one or more neighboring states, a multilateral strategy continues to offer an important forum for rebutting illegal unilateral oceans claims threatening navigational freedom. The fact is, because of this "zone locked" geography, a majority of nations should never either favor extending national jurisdiction beyond 200 nautical miles nor permitting interference with navigational freedom in the 200 nautical mile economic zone.

<sup>9</sup>The Convention powerfully supports United States control of its fisheries resources. Indeed, with respect to fisheries, the United States is already a party to the "Agreement for the Implementation of the Provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982 Relating to the Conservation and Management of Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks," a treaty that implements certain fisheries provisions of the Law of the Sea Convention. Senator Ted Stevens provided crucial leadership in Senate advice and consent to this implementing Convention.

<sup>10</sup>For the letter of transmittal to the Senate and official United States Government article-by-article commentary on the Convention, see SEN. TREATY DOC. 103-39, *reprinted* in U.S. Department of State Dispatch Supplement, Law of the Sea Convention: Letters of Transmittal and Submittal and Commentary (Feb. 1995, Vol. 6, Supp. No. 1). For the most authoritative article-by-article interpretation of the Convention, see the multi-volume *Commentary on the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea 1982*, prepared under the auspices of the Center for Oceans Law and Policy of the University of Virginia School of Law. MYRON H. NORDQUIST (ED.), UNITED NATIONS CONVENTION ON THE LAW OF THE SEA 1982: A COMMENTARY (1985-2003 Martinus Nijhoff Publishers).

*Urgent Unfinished Business*

Democratic or Republican, has opposed Senate advice and consent – and United States ratification.

At present the Convention is in force; and with 143 states parties it is one of the most widely adhered conventions in the world. Parties include all permanent members of the Security Council but the United States, and all members of NATO but the United States, Denmark and Canada – and Canada is expected to join in the immediate future as soon as the European Union formally adopts an important fisheries agreement implementing the 1982 Convention. The Convention unequivocally and overwhelmingly meets United States national interests – indeed, it is in many respects a product of those interests.

If one were to travel back in time and inform the high-level members of the eighteen agency National Security Council Interagency Task Force which formulated United States oceans policy during the Convention process – an effort never matched before or since in the care with which it reviewed United States international oceans interests – that the Convention today in force, powerfully meeting all United States oceans interests, would not yet be in force for the United States nine years after being submitted to the Senate, the news would have been received with incredulity. As this suggests, the Senate should understand that United States oceans interests, including our critical security interests, are being injured – and will continue to be injured – until the United States ratifies the Convention. Among other costs of non-adherence we have missed out on the formulation of the mining code for manganese nodules of the deep seabed; we have missed participating in the development of rules for the International Law of the Sea Tribunal and the Commission on the Limits of the Continental Shelf, and in ongoing consideration of cases before the Tribunal as well as ongoing consideration of the Russian continental shelf claim now before the Continental Shelf Commission; we have had reduced effect in the ongoing struggle to protect navigational freedom and our security interests against unilateral illegal claims; and we have been unable to participate in the important forum of Convention States Parties.

Why should the United States give advice and consent to the Law of the Sea Convention? I will summarize the most important reasons under three headings:

**I.**

***Restoring United States Oceans Leadership***

Until our prolonged non-adherence to the 1982 Convention, the United States has been the world leader in protecting the common interest in navigational freedom and the rule of the law in the oceans. We have at least temporarily forfeited that leadership by our continued non-adherence. United States ratification of the Convention will restore that leadership. Specifically, ratification will have the following effects, among others:

- The United States will be able to take its seat on the Council of the International Seabed Authority. The authority is currently considering a mining code with respect to polymetallic sulfides and cobalt crusts of the deep seabed. Council membership will also give us important veto rights over distribution of any future revenues from deep seabed exploitation to national liberation groups;
- The United States should, at the next election of judges for the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea, see the election of a United States national to this important tribunal. Since this Tribunal frequently considers issues relating to navigational freedom and the character of the 200 mile economic zone it is a crucial forum for the development of oceans law;
- The United States should, at the next election of members of the Commission on the Limits of the Continental Shelf, see the election of a United States expert to the Commission. This Commission is currently considering the Russian claim in the Arctic that is of real importance for the United States (and Alaska) and for appropriate interpretation of the Convention respecting continental margin limits. Over the next few years the Commission will begin to consider many other shelf limit submissions, beginning next with Australian and Brazilian claims. This is also the Commission that ultimately must pass on a United States submission as to the outer limits of our continental shelf beyond 200 nautical miles. The early work of the Commission, as it begins to develop its rules and guidelines, could significantly affect the limits of the United States continental shelf.

*Urgent Unfinished Business*

Not to actively participate in the work of this Commission could result in a loss of thousands of square kilometers of resource-rich United States continental shelf;

- The United States will be able to participate fully in the annual meeting of States Parties that has become an important forum for ongoing development of oceans law. Of particular concern, United States presence as a mere observer in this forum has in recent years led to efforts by some to roll back critical navigational freedoms hard won in the LOS negotiations where we were a leader in the negotiations and our presence was powerfully felt; and
- The United States will be far more effective in leading the continuing struggle against illegal oceans claims through our participation in specialized agencies such as the International Maritime Organization; in bilateral negotiations such as those with the archipelagic states; in acceptance by other states of our protest notes and our ability to coordinate such notes with others; and generally in organizing multilateral opposition to threats to our oceans interests and the rule of law in the oceans.

***II.***

***Protecting United States Oceans Interests***

A second set of important reasons for United States adherence to the Law of the Sea Convention relate to the particularized protection of United States oceans interests. Some of the more important and immediate of these include:

- More effectively engaging in the continuing struggle to protect our naval mobility and commercial navigational freedom. Protecting the ability of the United States Navy to move freely on the world's oceans and the ability of commercial shipping to bring oil and other resources to the United States and for us to participate robustly in international trade overwhelmingly carried in ships is the single most important

oceans interest of the United States. This interest, however, is also the single most threatened interest; the continuing threat being the historic pattern of unilateral illegal oceans claims. As of June 22, 2001, there were at least 136 such illegal claims.<sup>11</sup> This struggle has been the key historic struggle for the United States over the last half century and gives every indication of continuing. Adhering to the Convention provides numerous ways for the United States to engage more effectively in protecting these interests. An immediate and important effect is that we are able on ratifying the Convention to attach a series of crucial “understandings” under Article 310 of the Convention as to the proper interpretation of the Convention, as have many other nations – too many of which have made erroneous interpretations as yet unrebutted by United States statements.<sup>12</sup> Moreover, as a party we will be far more effective in multiple fora in protecting the many excellent provisions in the Convention supporting navigational freedom. Indeed, much of the struggle in the future to protect our vital oceans interests will be in ensuring adherence to the excellent provisions in the Convention. Having won in the struggle to protect these interests within UNCLOS we now have a substantial advantage in the continuing struggle -- we need only insist that others abide by the nearly universally accepted Convention. Obviously, that is an advantage largely thrown away when we ourselves are not a party. And for our commercial shipping we will be able to utilize the important Article 292 to obtain immediate International Tribunal engagement for the release of illegally seized United States vessels and crew. It should be emphasized that the threat from these illegal claims is that of death from a thousand pin pricks rather than any single incident in response to which the United States is likely to be

---

<sup>11</sup> The best general discussion of these illegal oceans claims and their effect on United States interests is J. ASHLEY ROACH & ROBERT W. SMITH, *EXCESSIVE MARITIME CLAIMS*, 66 U.S. Naval War College International Law Studies (1994), and J. ASHLEY ROACH & ROBERT W. SMITH, *UNITED STATES RESPONSES TO EXCESSIVE MARITIME CLAIMS* (2d ed. 1996).

<sup>12</sup> United States “understandings” under Article 310 could either be formulated and attached to the Convention by the Executive Branch at the time the United States ratifies the Convention or they could be attached to the Resolution of Senate Advice and Consent. I believe the second of these alternatives would have the greatest effect in the ongoing “struggle for law” as to the correct interpretation of the Convention. Given the highly technical nature of these understandings I would be pleased to work with the Committee to provide a draft of understandings for your consideration. It should be clearly understood that these are not “reservations” altering the correct legal meaning of the Convention. Such reservations or exceptions are barred by Article 309 of the Convention except as specifically permitted by the Convention, as, for example, in Article 298 of the Convention concerning optional exceptions to the compulsory dispute settlement provisions.

willing to employ the military instrument. Moreover, some of the offenders may even be allies of the United States, our NATO partners, or even over zealous officials in our own country who are unaware of the broader security interests of the Nation;

- More effective engagement with respect to security incidents and concerns resulting from illegal oceans claims by others. Examples include the new law of the People's Republic of China (PRC) providing that Chinese civil and military authorities must approve all survey activities within the 200 mile economic zone, the PRC harassment of the Navy's ocean survey ship the *USNS Bowditch* by Chinese military patrol aircraft and ships when the *Bowditch* was 60 miles off the coast, the earlier EP-3 surveillance aircraft harassment, Peruvian challenges to U.S. transport aircraft in the exclusive economic zone, including one aircraft shot down and a second incident in which two U.S. C-130s had to alter their flight plan around a claimed 650 mile Peruvian "flight information area," the North Korean 50 mile "security zone" claim, the Iranian excessive base line claims in the Persian/Arabian Gulf, the Libyan "line of death," and the Brazilian claim to control warship navigation in the economic zone;
- More rapid development of the oil and gas resources of the United States continental shelf beyond 200 nautical miles. The United States oil and gas industry is poised in its technology to begin development of the huge continental shelf of the United States beyond 200 miles (approximately 15% of our total shelf). But uncertainties resulting from U.S. non-adherence to the Convention will delay the substantial investment necessary for development in these areas. Moreover, U.S. non-adherence is causing the United States to lag behind other nations, including Russia, in delimiting our continental shelf. Delimitation of the shelf is an urgent oceans interest of the United States;<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> For a state-of-the-art assessment of the extent of the United States continental shelf beyond the 200 mile economic zone see the work of Dr. Larry Mayer, the Director of the Center for Coastal and Ocean Mapping at the University of New Hampshire. As but one example indicating the great importance of performing this delimitation of the shelf well – and the importance of the United States participating in the resulting approval process in the Commission on the Limits of the Continental Shelf – Dr. Mayer's work shows that sophisticated mapping and analysis of the shelf would enable the United States to claim an additional area off New Jersey within the lawful parameters of Article 76 of the Convention of approximately 500 square kilometers just by using a system of connecting seafloor promontories. The work of Dr. Mayer has been funded in part

- Reclaiming United States deep seabed mineral sites now virtually abandoned. United States firms pioneered the technology for deep seabed mining and spent approximately \$200 million in claiming four first-generation sites in the deep seabed for the mining of manganese nodules. These nodules contain attractive quantities of copper, nickel, cobalt and manganese and would be a major source of supply for the United States in these minerals. Paradoxically, “protecting” our deep seabed industry has sometimes been a mantra for non-adherence to the Convention. Yet because of uncertainties resulting from U.S. non-adherence these sites have been virtually abandoned and most of our nascent deep seabed mining industry has disappeared. Moreover, it is clear that without U.S. adherence to the Convention our industry has absolutely no chance of being revived. I believe that as soon as the United States adheres to the Convention the Secretary of Commerce should set up a working group to assist the industry in reclaiming these sites. This working group might then recommend legislation that would deal with the industry problems in reducing costs associated with reacquiring and holding these sites until deep seabed mining becomes economically feasible;
- Enhancing access rights for United States marine scientists. Access for United States marine scientists to engage in fundamental oceanographic research is a continuing struggle. The United States will have a stronger hand in negotiating access rights as a party to the Convention. As one example of a continuing problem, Russia has not honored a single request for United States research access to its exclusive economic zone in the Arctic Ocean from at least 1998, and the numbers of turn-downs for American ocean scientists around the world is substantial. This problem could become even more acute as the United States begins a new initiative to lead the world in an innovative new program of oceans exploration;
- Facilitating the laying of undersea cables and pipelines. These cables,

---

through an innovative forward-looking grant supported by Senator Judd Gregg of New Hampshire. This work, however, is important for the Nation as a whole, and particularly for Alaska, which has by far the largest shelf beyond the 200 mile economic zone.

*Urgent Unfinished Business*

carrying phone, fax, and internet communications, must be able to transit through ocean jurisdictions of many nations. The Convention protects this right but non-adherence complicates the task of those laying and protecting cables and pipelines; and

- It should importantly be noted in protecting United States oceans interests that no U.S. oceans interest is better served by non-adherence than adherence. This is an highly unusual feature of the 1982 Convention. Most decisions about treaty adherence involve a trade off of some interest or another. I am aware of no such trade off with respect to the 1982 Convention. United States adherence is not just on balance in our interest – it is broadly and unreservedly in our interest.

***III.***

***Enhancing United States Foreign Policy***

The United States would also obtain substantial foreign policy benefits from adhering to the 1982 Convention; benefits going quite beyond our oceans interests. These benefits include:

- Supporting the United States interest in fostering the rule of law in international affairs. Certainly the promotion of a stable rule of law is an important goal of United States foreign policy. A stable rule of law facilitates commerce and investment, reduces the risk of conflict, and lessens the transaction costs inherent in international life. Adherence to the Law of the Sea Convention, one of the most important law-defining international conventions of the Twentieth Century, would signal a continuing commitment to the rule of law as an important foreign policy goal of the United States;
- United States allies, almost all of whom are parties to the Convention, would welcome U.S. adherence as a sign of a more effective United States foreign policy. For some years I have chaired the United

*Urgent Unfinished Business*

Nations Advisory Panel of the Amerasinghe Memorial Fellowship on the Law of the Sea in which the participants on the Committee are Permanent Representatives to the United Nations from many countries. Every year our friends and allies ask when we will ratify the Convention and they express their puzzlement to me as to why we have not acted sooner. In my work around the world in the oceans area I hear this over and over -- our friends and allies with powerful common interests in the oceans are astounded and disheartened by the unilateral disengagement from oceans affairs that our non-adherence represents;

- Adherence would send a strong signal of renewed United States presence and engagement in the United Nations, multilateral negotiation, and international relations generally. At present those who would oppose United States foreign policy accuse the United States of “unilateralism” or a self-proclaimed “American exceptionalism.” Adhering to the Law of the Sea Convention will demonstrate that America adheres to those multilateral Conventions which are worthy while opposing others precisely because they do not adequately meet community concerns and our national interest;
- Efforts to renegotiate other unacceptable treaties would receive a boost when an important argument now used by other nations against such renegotiation with us was removed. This argument, now used against us, for example in the currently unacceptable International Criminal Court setting, is: “[W]hy renegotiate with the United States when the LOS renegotiation shows the U.S. won’t accept the Treaty even if you renegotiate with them and meet all their concerns?”; and finally
- The United States would obtain the benefit of third party dispute settlement in dealing with non-military oceans interests. The United States was one of the principal proponents in the law of the sea negotiations for compulsory third party dispute settlement for resolution of conflicts other than those involving military activities. We supported such mechanisms both to assist in conflict resolution

## *Urgent Unfinished Business*

generally and because we understood that third party dispute resolution was a powerful mechanism to control illegal coastal state claims. Even the Soviet Union, which had traditionally opposed such third party dispute settlement, accepted that in the law of the sea context it was in their interest as a major maritime power to support such third party dispute settlement.<sup>14</sup>

### ***Conclusion***

Senate advice and consent to the 1982 Convention on the Law of the Sea is strongly in the national interest of the United States. There are powerful reasons supporting United States adherence to the Convention; reasons rooted in restoring U.S. oceans leadership, protecting U.S. oceans interests, and enhancing U.S. foreign policy. I would urge the Senate to support advice and consent to the 1982 Convention at the earliest possible time.

---

<sup>14</sup>The 1994 submission of the LOS Convention to the Senate recommended that the United States accept "special arbitration for all the categories of disputes to which it may be applied and Annex VII arbitration [general arbitration] for disputes not covered by ... [this]," and that we elect to exclude all three categories of disputes excludable under Article 298." See U.S. Department of State Dispatch IX (No. 1 Feb. 1995).

## About John Norton Moore

---

\*John Norton Moore is the Walter L. Brown Professor of Law at the University of Virginia School of Law and Director of the Center for Oceans Law and Policy and the Center for National Security Law. He formerly served as the Chairman of the National Security Council Interagency Task Force on the Law of the Sea, which formulated United States international oceans policy for the law of the sea negotiations, he headed D/LOS, the office which coordinated both State Department and Interagency Policy on the law of the sea, and he served in the international negotiation as a Deputy Special Representative of the President and a United States Ambassador to the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea. Subsequently, he chaired the Oceans Policy Committee of the Republican National Committee and was a member of the National Advisory Committee on Oceans and Atmosphere (NACOA). In 1982, before the successful renegotiation of Part XI of the Treaty, he wrote to the incoming Reagan Administration opposing United States adherence until the problems with Part XI had been resolved. This letter was instrumental in triggering the Reagan review which in turn led to the successful Rumsfeld mission and ultimately effective renegotiation of Part XI.