

work in science, we will try to arrange suitable adjustments to allow the applicant time and facilities to make up such deficiencies.

We will solicit our colleagues who teach and do research in Negro colleges and universities to collaborate in research projects and to participate for stated periods in the work of our laboratories and departments.

The declaration bears the signature of 32 scientists from 18 institutions. We should like to ask the readers of *Science* to join us in this declaration by getting in touch with the undersigned.

TERU HAYASHI

Department of Zoology, Columbia  
University, New York 10027

### The Continental Shelf

In the editorial of 2 April (p. 25), the statement is made that under the Convention on the Continental Shelf, adopted at Geneva in 1958, a coastal state's right to explore and exploit "the adjoining seabed and subsoil out to wherever the sea is 200 meters deep . . . is exclusive; no other state can stake a claim within this limit. At greater depths, possession goes with ability to exploit." This carries the implication that beyond depths of 200 meters a coastal state's right to exploit the seabed is not exclusive. In other words, a foreign country having the technical capacity could occupy such offshore areas along our coasts and start operations for exploiting the natural resources of the seabed and subsoil. If true, this would be a serious deficiency in the Convention, but it is not the case.

Article 1 of the Convention, which defines the continental shelf, was the culmination of several drafts prepared by the commission beginning in 1951. In its first draft, the commission adopted the criterion of exploitability for the granting of rights in the coastal state, rather than the mere existence of a continental shelf in a geologic sense. In its 1953 draft, exploitability was abandoned as a test of jurisdiction in favor of a fixed legal edge, which the commission felt was essential in any legal concept. It therefore adopted the limiting depth of 200 meters (approximately 100 fathoms)—the depth at which the continental shelf in the geologic sense generally comes to an end and the continental slope begins. This was considered to be sufficient for

practical purposes at the time and probably for many years to come. In the final draft in 1956, both concepts were adopted—the fixed legal edge of 200-meter depths and the exploitability test. While maintaining the limit of 200 meters as the normal limit corresponding to present needs, the commission was of the opinion that where exploitation is practical, there is no justification for applying a discriminatory legal regime to such regions. The final language adopted by the commission and embodied in Article 1 of the Geneva Convention reads as follows:

For the purposes of these articles, the term "continental shelf" is used as referring to the seabed and the subsoil of the submarine areas adjacent to the coast but outside the area of the territorial sea, to a depth of 200 metres or, beyond that limit, to where the depth of the superjacent waters admits of the exploitation of the natural resources of the said areas.

Throughout its commentaries on the final draft article, the International Law Commission emphasized that it was departing from the geologic concept of the continental shelf and was embodying something more than the 200-meter limit. Indeed, there was sentiment in the commission that favored the use of the term "submarine areas" instead of "continental shelf," but the latter term was retained because of its wide use in the literature. This understanding of the scope of the term "continental shelf" in Article 1 is fundamental, because subsequent paragraphs of the Convention, which spell out the nature of the rights granted, make use of the term. Thus, Article 2, paragraph 1, provides that "The coastal State exercises over the continental shelf sovereign rights for the purpose of exploring it and exploiting its natural resources"; paragraph 2 specifies that the rights referred to in paragraph 1 "are exclusive in the sense that if the coastal State does not explore the continental shelf or exploit its natural resources, no one may undertake these activities, or make a claim to the continental shelf, without the express consent of the coastal State"; and finally, paragraph 3 provides that "the rights of the coastal State over the continental shelf do not depend on occupation, effective or notional, or on any express proclamation."

It would be difficult to read into this language an intent to establish two kinds of rights—exclusive and nonexclusive—in the offshore submerged areas. It would have been strange indeed for the United States, which was

first to enunciate a continental-shelf doctrine for the purpose of protecting a coastal state's offshore natural resources from foreign exploitation (the Truman Proclamation of 1945), to support an international convention that posed the possibility of a foreign country's appropriating the submarine areas beyond our geologic shelf. Nor does it seem reasonable that the smaller maritime nations with less advanced technology would have acquiesced in such an agreement. The Geneva debates record no such apprehension.

AARON L. SHALOWITZ

1520 Kalmia Road, NW,  
Washington, D.C. 20012

### Too Much of Too Little

One basic characteristic of American journals received no mention in the recent series of letters concerning editorial practices.

It is almost impossible for an American author to work on a subject extensively for several years and then present all the evidence he has accumulated, together with his interpretation, in a sizable article. There is a premium on short papers dealing with small segments of the work. The total number of pages published by the time the study is completed greatly exceeds the number that would be required for one comprehensive paper in which a much more adequate job could be done. In spite of the shortage of space in our journals it is still easy to publish any number of neat little case reports with one or two figures, one table, and a review of the literature (in which it is proved that the Black and White syndrome should properly be known as the Schwarz and Weiss syndrome because the latter authors described the condition one year earlier in the *Verhandlungen* of some obscure society). But it is so difficult to publish the one longer paper that most of us have learned by bitter experience to submit the short ones.

It would seem fitting, in view of the justly growing concern about the mushrooming of the literature, to give primary editorial consideration not to neat, compact form but to accommodating as much new information and constructive, stimulating thought as possible.

PETER GRUENWALD

Sinai Hospital of Baltimore,  
Baltimore, Maryland