

cil. In addition to Treasury participation, the Council of Economic Advisers, Peter Flanigan's Council on International Economic Policy in the White House, and the Office of Management and Budget are said to be involved. Also, some outside academic economists have contributed along with specialists in other federal agencies.

At first the studies were conducted publicly, like many other projects generated in connection with the conference. But sometime during the summer the chairman of the interagency task force, John N. Moore of the State Department, decided they should be classified.

One of the major issues being studied is the question of how the Law of the Sea conference could affect future U.S. energy supplies. A central dispute concerns the amount of control a nation will have over development of the oil and gas resources within the proposed coastal economic zone on the continental shelf. Although only a handful of nations have continental shelves extending beyond 200 miles, most nations, as a matter of self-interest, favor a coastal economic zone boundary of 200 miles offshore. The United States, whose continental shelf is even wider in some places, has remained ambivalent as to whether it favors a 200-mile limit or one including the entire continental shelf. Meanwhile, the Soviet Union favors an economic zone limit at a water depth of 500 meters or to a distance of 100 miles—a proposal that would favor the Soviet Union but few other countries. Some nations favor a much narrower economic zone limit—for example, one extending to only 40 miles, which would leave as much as 60 percent of the estimated offshore oil and gas reserves in international waters.

According to a recent United Nations study, the U.S. continental shelf is estimated to have approximately 400 billion barrels of potentially recoverable oil, or as much as ten times the proven reserves of the United States and three times those of Saudi Arabia. Under many of the proposals before the conference, some of those U.S. reserves could go to other nations—either through direct exploitation or through international sharing mechanisms. These are the kinds of questions under review.

A further complication is the issue of what would become of the income from offshore oil and gas development. In 1970, U.S. officials mentioned—but did not formally propose—that as much as 50 to 66 percent of the revenues

from ocean resource development be directed to developing countries, in accord with the principle that the ocean's resources are the "common heritage" of mankind. Since then, U.S. officials have avoided naming percentages, but have continued to back the revenue-sharing proposal in principle.

Revenue sharing also enters into the negotiations because the United States and several other countries have said that they favor some revenue sharing from deep seabed mining activities. Although the preliminary negotiations have focused on what kind of international organization should license deep-sea development and divide up the spoils, the current economic reviews are said to be looking at revenue sharing. Treasury officials are said to be skeptical of the concept's feasibility, and to be trying to figure out how much revenue might be involved.

Should it conclude that the notion is unsound, the United States may have to jettison an important element of its position in the conference. Hitherto the revenue-sharing proposals have helped the U.S. in its role as purported world leader; moreover, they are a bargaining chip in dealing with some developing countries who, under revenue sharing, would stand to benefit.

The list of other issues involved in the Law of the Sea is long, and the present economic review is said to cover many parts of it. Fisheries and environmental questions are said to be included. Military considerations are said not to be. Officials would neither confirm nor deny that scientific research—or some aspect of the U.S. position on that issue—is included in the reviews.

Even if the current interest of Shultz and Simon in the Law of the Sea ends with the economists altering existing U.S. positions, the reviews will have achieved one other thing. The architects* of the new Federal Energy Office, set up in response to the fuel shortage, were sufficiently aware of the conference to include a Law of the Sea office among those reporting to the FEO's Assistant Administrator for International Policy and Programs. This is a contrast to the other agencies concerned with sea law: even in the State Department, those working on the meeting operate out of a temporary branch of the legal affairs office. By and large, in other agencies, those involved are on a temporary assignment,

* Among whom were Shultz and Simon.

on loan from some other, permanent office.

A less concrete but perhaps more important result of the recent burst of activity spurred by Shultz and Simon is that, in the course of it all, both these officials got their feet wet on oceans issues and became interested in the conference outcome. Even those bureaucrats who grumble about the new entrants concede that the review exercise has also drawn attention to the conference in their own agencies. "They [Treasury] took it to the top, and in the long run that will bring Law of the Sea to the attention of the other Secretaries." Among them is Henry Kissinger, who, so far, is said to have paid little attention to Law of the Sea matters.—DEBORAH SHAPLEY

RECENT DEATHS

Edna W. Bailey, 90; professor emeritus of education, University of California, Berkeley; 10 October.

Arthur J. Bendick, 85; clinical professor emeritus of radiology, Medical School, Mt. Sinai Hospital; 26 October.

Charles A. Brown, 45; chairman, zoology department, Howard University; 31 October.

Joseph J. Burns, 65; professor of education; Villanova University; 9 November.

Robert D. Dripps, 62; vice president for health affairs, University of Pennsylvania; 30 October.

George R. Eastwood, 89; professor emeritus of agriculture, Ohio State University; 8 October.

Warren J. Kaufman, 51; professor of sanitary and radiological engineering, University of California, Berkeley; 10 November.

Bruce Konigsmark, 45; chief of neuropathology, School of Medicine, Temple University; 31 October.

Lawrence S. Kubie, 77; lecturer emeritus in psychiatry, Johns Hopkins University; 26 October.

Ernest Little, 85; dean emeritus, College of Pharmacy, Rutgers University; 30 October.

Ernest Sondheimer, 50; professor of biochemistry, College of Environmental Science and Forestry, State University of New York, Syracuse; 11 October.

Leon J. Taubenhaus, 61; former clinical professor of preventive medicine, School of Medicine, Boston University; 4 November.