

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-86912-6 - Interpretation and Revision of International Boundary Decisions

Kaiyan Homi Kaikobad

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

## Interpretation and Revision of International Boundary Decisions

This book seeks to examine a legal theme which occurs typically with respect to judgments and awards given by international courts and tribunals in the matter of boundary disputes. The theme in question is predicated on the fact that, from time to time, litigating States will find difficulties with these awards and judgments and seek to delay implementation of the decision or modify the alignment determined by the tribunal. The reason why dissatisfaction features prominently in boundary and territorial decisions is because questions of title and territorial sovereignty nearly always go to the very core of statehood, creating situations of unease at best and conflict at worst. Thus, while disputing States may resort to adjudication and arbitration for the settlement of a boundary problem, that alone is no guarantee that the dispute will thereafter terminate. Indeed, the author shows convincingly that the history of arbitration, going as far back as ancient Greece, is closely intertwined with problems of territorial claims and frontier disputes. Two remedies frequently relied on by litigating States in this context are those of interpretation and revision. The author sheds light on how, when and in what circumstances a tribunal is able to interpret or revise either its own or another tribunal's decisions on boundary problems. By exploring these issues, the author seeks to provide a rigorous analysis in an area of law which has escaped the attention of many international lawyers.

---

KAIYAN HOMI KAIKOBAD is Reader in International Law, Department of Law at the University of Durham

---

CAMBRIDGE STUDIES IN INTERNATIONAL AND COMPARATIVE LAW

Established in 1946, this series produces high quality scholarship in the fields of public and private international law and comparative law. Although these are distinct legal sub-disciplines, developments since 1946 confirm their interrelation.

Comparative law is increasingly used as a tool in the making of law at national, regional and international levels. Private international law is now often affected by international conventions, and the issues faced by classical conflicts rules are frequently dealt with by substantive harmonisation of law under international auspices. Mixed international arbitrations, especially those involving state economic activity, raise mixed questions of public and private international law, while in many fields (such as the protection of human rights and democratic standards, investment guarantees and international criminal law) international and national systems interact. National constitutional arrangements relating to ‘foreign affairs’, and to the implementation of international norms, are a focus of attention.

The Board welcomes works of a theoretical or interdisciplinary character, and those focusing on the new approaches to international or comparative law or conflicts of law. Studies of particular institutions or problems are equally welcome, as are translations of the best work published in other languages.

General Editors	James Crawford SC FBA <i>Whewell Professor of International Law, Faculty of Law, and Director, Lauterpacht Research Centre for International Law, University of Cambridge</i>
	John S. Bell FBA <i>Professor of Law, Faculty of Law, University of Cambridge</i>
Editorial Board	Professor Hilary Charlesworth <i>Australian National University</i>
	Professor Lori Damrosch <i>Columbia University Law School</i>
	Professor John Dugard <i>Universiteit Leiden</i>
	Professor Mary-Ann Glendon <i>Harvard Law School</i>
	Professor Christopher Greenwood <i>London School of Economics</i>
	Professor David Johnston <i>University of Edinburgh</i>
	Professor Hein Kötz <i>Max-Planck-Institut, Hamburg</i>
Advisory Committee	Professor Donald McRae <i>University of Ottawa</i>
	Professor Onuma Yasuaki <i>University of Tokyo</i>
	Professor Reinhard Zimmermann <i>Universität Regensburg</i>
	Professor D. W. Bowett QC
	Judge Rosalyn Higgins QC
	Professor J. A. Jolowicz QC
	Professor Sir Elihu Lauterpacht CBE QC
	Professor Kurt Lipstein
	Judge Stephen Schwebel

A list of books in the series can be found at the end of this volume.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-86912-6 - Interpretation and Revision of International Boundary Decisions

Kaiyan Homi Kaikobad

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

# **Interpretation and Revision of International Boundary Decisions**

---

Kaiyan Homi Kaikobad

*University of Durham*



**CAMBRIDGE**  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-86912-6 - Interpretation and Revision of International Boundary Decisions

Kaiyan Homi Kaikobad

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

---

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 8RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press,  
New York

[www.cambridge.org](http://www.cambridge.org)

Information on this title: [www.cambridge.org/9780521869126](http://www.cambridge.org/9780521869126)

© Kaiyan Kaikobad 2007

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception  
and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,  
no reproduction of any part may take place without  
the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2007

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

*A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library*

ISBN 978-0-521-86912-6

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for  
the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or  
third-party internet websites referred to in this publication,  
and does not guarantee that any content on such  
websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-86912-6 - Interpretation and Revision of International Boundary Decisions

Kaiyan Homi Kaikobad

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

---

In memory of my sister

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-86912-6 - Interpretation and Revision of International Boundary Decisions

Kaiyan Homi Kaikobad

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

Every question in the judgment relating to the moneys and boundaries of Apollo I will decide as is true to the best of my belief, nor will I in any wise give false judgments for the sake of favour, friendship or enmity; and the sentence passed in accordance with the judgment I will enforce to the best of my power with all possible speed, and I will make just restoration to the god. Nor will I receive gifts, neither I myself nor any one else on my behalf, nor will I give aught of the common moneys to any one or receive it myself. These things I will thus do and if I swear truly may I have many blessings, but if I swear falsely may Themis and Pythian Apollo and Leto and Artemis and Hestia and eternal fire and all gods and goddesses take from me salvation by a most dreadful doom, may they permit me myself and my race to enjoy neither children nor crops nor fruits nor property, and may they cast me forth in my lifetime from the possessions which I now have, if I shall swear falsely.

Oath taken by the Delphian Amphictiones, 117 BC (M. N. Tod,  
*International Arbitration Among the Greeks*, Oxford, 1913, p. 116)

Contents

<i>List of maps</i>	xiii
<i>Preface</i>	xv
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	xviii
<i>Table of cases</i>	xxi
<i>List of abbreviations</i>	xxvi
<b>Part I Introduction</b>	
1 Introduction	3
I. Preliminary observations	3
II. Fundamental parameters and perspectives	11
<b>Part II The settlement of territorial and boundary disputes</b>	
2 Problems in settlement	17
I. Preliminary observations	17
II. Territorial settlements: international law, armed conflict and self-determination	22
a. General	22
b. Post-conflict settlements: territorial and boundary issues	23
c. Concluding analysis	29
III. Territorial settlements: peaceful methods, dissatisfaction and legal effects	31
a. General	31
b. Specific issues and disputes	32
1. Problems based on State and government succession	33
2. Problems based on unilateral renunciation	41

X CONTENTS

3. Problems based on unilateral rejection of boundary awards and decisions	43
4. Problems based on constitutive legal considerations	46
c. Concluding analysis	52
IV. The arbitration and adjudication of territorial and boundary disputes: dissatisfaction and international law	53
a. Arbitration and territorial disputes: historical background	53
b. Arbitration and territorial and boundary disputes: consolidation	60
c. Sources of dissatisfaction and dispute: treaties and arbitral and judicial decisions	68
d. Arbitral and judicial decisions: nullity, revision and interpretation	70
V. Concluding analysis: dissatisfaction, finality and reconciliation	77

**Part III Judicial remedies: interpretation**

3 The interpretation of judgments and awards	85
I. Preliminary observations	85
II. Evolution of the notion of interpretation	86
a. General	86
b. The Hague Peace Conferences	86
c. Developments since 1907 and the Great War: the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice	89
d. The Statute of the International Court of Justice	92
e. Judicial contribution in the development of the notion	93
4 The classification of the notion of interpretation	95
I. Preliminary observations	95
II. Interpretation as incidental to the main case	95
III. Main case interpretation	97
5 Legal issues regarding interpretation	102
I. Preliminary observations	102
II. Interpretation and the role of consent	102



	CONTENTS	xi
III. Admissibility of requests for interpretation		115
a. The existence of a dispute		116
b. Operative part of the decision		117
c. Meaning and scope of the decision		124
d. Restrictions <i>ratione temporis</i>		125
e. Restrictions based in treaty interpretation		130
IV. Purpose and scope of interpretation		135
a. Bona fide need for clarification		135
b. Restrictive aspects of interpretation		138
c. Tests for interpretation		141
d. Modification, revision and <i>res judicata</i>		143
e. The admission and rejection of requests: anomalous features		156
f. Interpretation in the context of the general task of the tribunal		161
V. Interpretation and the principle of <i>res judicata</i>		162
a. General points of contact		163
b. Reconciliation and harmonisation		170
6 Principles of interpretation		175
I. Preliminary observations		175
II. Words, meanings and the general practice of international tribunals		178
III. Presumption against a breach of the law		180
IV. Materials, conduct and relevant circumstances: admissibility and probative weight		193
V. The principle of effectiveness		210
VI. The doctrine of acquiescence, recognition and estoppel		211
VII. General recapitulation		225
 <b>Part IV Judicial remedies: revision</b>		
7 The revision of judgments and awards		231
I. Preliminary observations		231
II. Brief history of the evolution of the notion of revision		233
a. Early writers and the nineteenth century		233
b. The Hague Peace Conferences and other treaties		236
c. Developments since the Great War: the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice		243
d. The inter-war years		248

e.	Developments since 1945	248
f.	Judicial contribution to the development of the notion	250
8	General features of revision	252
I.	Preliminary observations	252
II.	Revision as a remedy based in consent	252
III.	Revision as a remedy to be exercised in exceptional circumstances	257
9	The classification of the notion of revision	261
I.	Preliminary observations	261
II.	Revision incidental to the main case	261
III.	Main case revision	262
10	Issues of admissibility	265
I.	Preliminary observations	265
II.	Substantive criteria	267
a.	Discovery of fact	267
b.	The existence of newly discovered facts or evidence	271
c.	Decisive character of newly discovered facts or evidence	278
1.	Decisive facts qua facts	278
2.	Evidence as decisive fact	281
3.	Decisiveness of fact and evidence at the admissibility and merits stages	289
d.	Negligence in discovery	292
III.	Procedural criteria	298
11	Selected substantive and procedural aspects of revision	302
I.	Preliminary observations	302
II.	Revision and res judicata	303
III.	Revision and indirect delimitation	311
IV.	Revision at the merits stage	313
VI.	General recapitulation	319
 <b>Part V Conclusions</b>		
12	Conclusions	325
 <i>Select bibliography</i>		340
<i>Index</i>		353

Maps

1	<i>Anglo-French Continental Shelf</i> arbitration	120
2	<i>Tunisia v. Libya Continental Shelf</i> arbitration	126
3	<i>Costa Rica v. Panama Boundary</i> arbitration	148
4	<i>Argentina v. Chile (Palena)</i> arbitration	172
5	<i>Argentina v. Chile (Laguna del Desierto)</i> arbitration	181
6	<i>Dubai v. Sharjah</i> arbitration	199

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-86912-6 - Interpretation and Revision of International Boundary Decisions

Kaiyan Homi Kaikobad

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

## Preface

The genesis of this work started interestingly enough. I was invited by Scarborough College, then part of the University of Hull, to read a paper on the relation between geography and the international law of the sea. I began to research and write the paper, but noticed soon enough that far too much attention had been paid to just one aspect of the various issues identified for discussion and decided then to redress the matter and restore some balance to the project. The aspect in question dealt with the topic of dispute settlement, with particular emphasis on the difficulties attending the judicial and arbitral settlement of maritime delimitation disputes. The conference at Scarborough over, I went back to the work accumulated on dispute settlement and set upon re-examining the issues in greater detail, but once again realised that there were still a number of matters which warranted discussion at greater length, and that, importantly, these matters were not confined to maritime delimitation; indeed, they encompassed delimitation issues on land as well.

Nonetheless, I elected to focus on the problems attending the adjudication and arbitration of maritime delimitation disputes and went on to publish my work in the periodical *The Law and Practice of International Courts and Tribunals*, but the fact that there was still a significant gap in the literature on related matters proved to be a strong catalyst for further investigation. Eventually, after more writing and research, the decision was taken to provide a detailed account of just two important but relatively unexplored aspects of the powers generally exercised by international tribunals, namely, the powers of interpretation and revision of judgments and arbitral awards. This decision was prompted by two facts. In the first place, the interpretation and revision of decisions of such tribunals were, as between themselves, sufficiently related in juridical terms as to constitute a doctrinal unity. In the second place, and as against other areas of

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-86912-6 - Interpretation and Revision of International Boundary Decisions

Kaiyan Homi Kaikobad

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

xvi

PREFACE

the law, these two categories were sufficiently discrete and self-contained to justify rigorous examination at length. It was convenient therefore to separate them from other aspects of the scrutiny already carried out with a view to producing a sustained monograph on the selected topics.

Certainly, in some ways, the scope of the subject-matter is narrow in that the powers of revision and interpretation examined in this study are limited to decisions adopted by international courts and arbitral tribunals with respect to boundary disputes. This, of course, reflects in part the original survey referred to above. It is evident that a piece of work, which has its genesis in a conference paper devoted to the geographical and legal aspects of the maritime territory of coastal States, would be limited by one underlying feature of this topic, namely, questions of title to territory.

The fact, however, is that, despite the limited scope of the subject-matter examined, there is a good amount of international law to be investigated, discussed and analysed within the area of territorial and boundary disputes. It is of interest that, on the one hand, as Felix Frankfurter and James M. Landis wrote in 1925 on the Compact Clause of the United States Constitution and interstate adjustments, boundary disputes are so obstinate to litigious treatment that the more complicated interstate controversies are less amenable to court control. On the other hand, territorial entities frequently opt for the settlement processes of arbitration and adjudication (indeed, as this work attempts to show, the history of arbitration is clearly entwined with such disputes). But it is also the case that, from time to time, States seek nevertheless to revisit matters decided by international tribunals, and, on occasion, seek even to claim that the award or judgment is null and void. The simple fact is that, given the enormity of the interests at stake, a theme constantly to be found in this area of law and politics is the perennality not only of boundary and territorial problems but also of disputes with respect to settled disputes. This theme, importantly, exists not only at the national level between disputing provinces and the states of a federation or confederation but also at the international plane between sovereign nations. In a nutshell, boundary disputes and decisions provide a fertile ground for the study of the international tribunal's powers of revision and interpretation.

While it constitutes a significant reason for keeping the subject-matter within its narrow confines, this theme does not constitute the main argument for choosing this topic of international concern. The essence of the matter is that this book is not primarily dedicated to scrutinising the law and practice of international tribunals with specific reference to the powers of revision and interpretation. It is primarily intended to

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-86912-6 - Interpretation and Revision of International Boundary Decisions

Kaiyan Homi Kaikobad

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

PREFACE xvii

contribute to the body of learning in the law of title to territory. In an important sense, then, this book is an attempt to reflect upon issues of law relating to matters dealing with territory and international boundaries in the context of dispute settlement by way of adjudication and arbitration. It was this fact which informed the decision to exclude consideration of revision and interpretation on a universal basis, for that would have required examining the jurisprudence of all the global and regional international tribunals in the international legal system, including those dealing with matters of international trade, human rights and economic integration.

This, it is easy to see, would have altered fundamentally not only the character of the book but also its essential object and purpose as outlined above. It is for this reason that this study is prefaced by a legal account of some of the salient difficulties associated with the settlement of boundary and territorial disputes by way of treaties. The point of interest is that these difficulties, which include those arising from the succession of States to treaties and the unilateral denunciation and rejection of boundary treaties, judgments and awards, are treated separately from a discussion regarding the legal aspects of the dissatisfaction experienced by States in connection with the arbitration and adjudication of boundary and territorial disputes. A significant aspect of this relates to the discussion of the nullity of boundary awards and judgments.

The fundamental premise of this analysis is that a core area of the law of title to territory is comprised of the settlement of boundary and territorial disputes by way of adjudication and arbitration and accordingly that due attention must be paid to the powers of international tribunals to interpret and revise their judgments and awards. This approach is highlighted, *inter alia*, by the fact that these two judicial remedies are not always *incidental* to the main case and that therefore applications for the interpretation and revision of boundary treaties can, in some circumstances, be treated as the main case itself. There is, of course, no profit in pre-empting matters here beyond identifying another salient feature of this study. Thus, although the latter is concerned with the interpretation and revision of boundary decisions, the law regarding the purpose, scope, interpretation and application of these remedies is not confined to boundary or territorial issues, and it follows therefore that the law on the matter is of universal application.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-86912-6 - Interpretation and Revision of International Boundary Decisions

Kaiyan Homi Kaikobad

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

## Acknowledgments

It would not have been possible for me to write this book without the help of colleagues, friends and family members. I wish, therefore, to take advantage of these pages to record a few words of gratitude. In the Law Library on Palace Green in Durham, I have received enormous help, co-operation and indeed indulgence from a number of members of staff. Out of many, Miss Sheila Doyle, Mrs Anne Farrow, Ms Sally Hoddy, Ms Barbara Johnson and Ms Judy McKinnell have been particularly kind to and co-operative with me on every occasion. Patiently helping me with my queries and requests, the Law Library staff has been a great pillar of support. I am also grateful to Mr Shaun Hunter for his advice and help on a number of occasions. Despite having repeatedly to teach me how to work the microfilm machine, Mr Hunter seemed to embody the very notion of equanimity. Among the varied student staff, my sense of gratitude extends in particular to Miss Lucy Carey and Ms Fiona Tolan for their co-operation and assistance regarding book loans and returns over a number of years.

In the Main Library, Ms Jackie Knowles, Mrs Trixie Khoja and Ms Judith Walton have always been extremely kind to me and have on occasion gone out of the way to help. I am grateful to Mrs Khoja for, among other kindnesses, facilitating the loan of confined large-size atlases and to Ms Walton for managing efficiently my numerous requests for inter-library loans. To Mr Mamtimyn Sunuodola, the Area Studies Librarian, I extend my sincere gratitude for helping me obtain official documents issued by the Government of China by way of Chinese-language websites and for doing so with great skill and cheerful co-operation. One member of staff deserves special mention. Mr David Sowerbutts, the former Librarian, whose expertise in locating books and articles on every topic imaginable was a genuine asset to the Library, and I, for one, a regular consumer of his expertise. I sincerely thank him for all his help.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-86912-6 - Interpretation and Revision of International Boundary Decisions

Kaiyan Homi Kaikobad

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

I must also mention several members of the Department of Law with a view to thanking them for their unstinted support, and I therefore express my gratitude to Miss Helen Hewitson, Mrs Sheila Jobling and Ms Claire Purdue for helping me in a variety of ways, including helping me with typing, photocopying, the ordering of books and general co-operation; and to Mr Rupert Prudom, the computer officer, for advice and assistance in information technology. For compiling the bibliography, I am very thankful to Miss Joanne Emerson, and, I must add, for her pointing out various eccentricities in several footnotes which her careful eye for detail was quick to notice.

For the cartography, my gratitude goes out to Mr David Hume and Mr Chris Orton in the Design and Imaging Unit of the Department of Geography. Their outstanding professionalism was matched by the enthusiasm and alacrity with which they drew the maps.

Several of my colleagues stand out for their graciousness. Professor Michael Bohlander was always at hand with words of advice, and both he and Professor Rosa Greaves, now Professor of European Law at the University of Glasgow, were happy to help with the translations of various French-language documents and articles. Mr Antonis Antoniadis willingly gave me his time on many occasions and never hesitated to help with advice on European Union/Community documentation. I am of course very grateful to all three of them. I also thank Dr Claire McIvor, now a lecturer at the University of Birmingham, for buoying me up from time to time with words of encouragement and support, and also to Professor Bob Sullivan, now Barber Professor of Jurisprudence at the University of Birmingham, a good friend and a great colleague. I do, however, reserve a special word of gratitude for Professor Colin Warbrick, now at the University of Birmingham, who, with his insightful comments and suggestions, has not only enhanced the strengths of this monograph but who, more generally, has been a beacon of inspiration for my teaching and research.

I must also thank staff members of the Cambridge University Press and especially Ms Finola O'Sullivan, Mrs Brenda Burke, Ms Jane O'Regan, Wendy Gater and Jodie Barnes for putting up with a large number of requests, queries and suggestions. The co-operation extended to me with respect to the late submission of the manuscript, and various aspects of editing, including the compilation of the table of cases, chapter organisation and footnote management has not been lost on me, and I want to record here my sense of gratitude to them and to the Press as a whole, not forgetting the copy-editorial manager and her team. A key figure in the



Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-86912-6 - Interpretation and Revision of International Boundary Decisions

Kaiyan Homi Kaikobad

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

XX

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

whole process, Professor James Crawford, the Series Editor, provided useful suggestions and incisive comments for which I am extremely grateful. It is, however, important for me to add that, despite all the help received by me from various persons, including those mentioned above, I alone stand responsible for all the flaws and weaknesses present in this book.

It would be remiss of me not to express my thankfulness to several post-graduate students and research assistants, all of whom were courteously helpful in a large number of ways, including the photocopying of articles, securing print-outs of documents and articles, tracing books and instruments from electronic databases and for providing informal translations of documents. Here, I have to thank Dr Eleni Katselli, now lecturer at the University of Newcastle, and Mr Zeray Yihdego, Mr Francis Oni and Mr Jacques Hartman. Ms Sangeeta Shah, now at the University of Nottingham, deserves a special word of thanks for the meticulousness and conscientiousness with which she responded to all my requests and for twice helping me to procure a large set of documents after she had left the Law Department in Durham.

At home, the assistance given by our nephew, Master D. Murrell, cannot go unacknowledged. For the help he gave me by reading and dictating a good many long passages for verbatim insertion and verification, I thank him. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, I owe a debt of gratitude to my long-suffering wife for her abundant patience, cheerful encouragement and unwavering confidence in me, grounded, no doubt, in a deep sense of understanding of a profession which seems to absorb all hours of the working day and weekends. Without these assets, my work would have floundered a long time ago, and so I do thank her profusely indeed.

Durham

March, 2006.

Table of cases

International Court of Justice

Arbitral Award of 31 July 1989 (Guinea-Bissau v. Senegal), ICJ Reports 1991, 53 .....73, 75, 107, 145, 333

Arbitral Award of the King of Spain (Nicaragua v. Honduras), ICJ Reports 1960, 205.....74, 75, 143

Asylum Case (Colombia v. Peru), ICJ Reports 1950, 266 .....94

Asylum Case (Colombia v. Peru), Request for Interpretation of the Judgment of 20 November 1950, ICJ Reports 1950, 395....94, 116–17, 135, 142–3, 156, 163, 167

Botswana v. Namibia, ICJ Reports 1999, 1045 .....21

Burkina Faso v. Mali, ICJ Reports 1986, 554.....314

Cameroon v. Nigeria Land and Maritime Boundary (Preliminary Objections), ICJ Reports 1998, 275 .....122, 167–8

Cameroon v. Nigeria Land and Maritime Boundary (Interpretation of the Preliminary Judgment), ICJ Reports 1999, 31 ....122–3, 135–6, 141–3, 158–9

Corfu Channel case (UK v. Albania), ICJ Reports 1949, 244 .....309–10

Costa Rica v. Nicaragua, Application of 29 September 2005.....131, 134

Genocide in Bosnia (Yugoslavia v. Bosnia and Herzegovina), Application for Revision of the Judgment of 11 July 1996...279, 290, 305

Germany v. Iceland (Interim Protection), ICJ Reports 1972, 30 .....290

Gulf of Maine (Canada v. US), ICJ Reports 1984, 246.....77, 308, 314, 318

Jan Mayen case (Norway v. Denmark), ICJ Reports 1993, 38 .....283

Land, Island and Frontier (El Salvador v. Honduras), Application for Revision, ICJ Reports 2003, 392 .....256, 258–9, 261, 265, 267, 268–70, 271–7, 280–1, 283, 284–8, 290, 292–4, 297, 299–300, 309, 338

Land, Island and Maritime Frontier case (El Salvador v. Honduras), ICJ Reports 1992, 351.....77, 272, 314

Libya v. Chad, ICJ Reports 1994, 6 .....42

Lockerbie case (Libya v. UK), ICJ Reports 1998, 9 .....104

Minquiers and Ecrehos (France v. United Kingdom), ICJ Reports 1953,  
 47 .....69

Nicaragua v. Honduras (Maritime Boundary), Application of 8 Decem-  
 ber 1999 .....131, 134

North Sea Continental Shelf case (Denmark and the Netherlands v.  
 Germany), ICJ Reports 1969, 3 .....41, 78, 318

Qatar v. Bahrain (Hawar Islands and Continental Shelf) (Jurisdiction  
 and Admissibility First Phase), ICJ Reports 1995, 112 .....296–7

Qatar v. Bahrain (Hawar Islands and Continental Shelf), ICJ Reports  
 2001, 40.....100, 283

South-West Africa Voting Procedure Advisory Opinion, ICJ Reports  
 1955, 67.....94, 328

Status of South-West Africa Advisory Opinion, ICJ Reports 1950,  
 128.....94, 328

Temple of Preah Vihear (Cambodia v. Thailand), ICJ Reports 1962,  
 6 .....315, 335

Tunisia–Libya Continental Shelf, Application for Revision and Inter-  
 pretation of the 1982 Judgment, ICJ Reports 1985, 192 .....94, 96,  
 113–15, 124–5, 129–30, 136–7, 140, 143, 159–62,  
 169–70, 177, 179, 251, 257–8, 278–80, 289, 296,  
 302, 310–13, 327, 329, 338

Tunisia–Libya Continental Shelf, ICJ Reports 1982, 18.....94, 115, 126,  
 250–1, 311–12, 318

United Kingdom v. Iceland (Interim Protection), ICJ Reports 1972, 12...290

**Permanent Court of International Justice**

Certain German Interests in Polish Upper Silesia (Germany v. Poland),  
 PCIJ Reports, Series A No. 7 (1926), 4 .....209

Chorzów Factory (Germany v. Poland) (Interpretation of Judgments  
 Nos. 7 and 8), PCIJ Reports, Series A No. 13 (1927), 4.....94, 123, 124, 143,  
 162, 171, 196, 209

Interpretation of Article 179 of the Treaty of Neuilly (Greece v.  
 Bulgaria), PCIJ Reports, Series A No. 3 (1924) .....93–4

Interpretation of Judgment No. 3 (Bulgaria v. Greece) (Interpretation  
 of Treaty of Neuilly), PCIJ Reports, Series A No. 4 (1925) 4.....112, 117

Jaworzina Boundary Advisory Opinion, PCIJ Reports, Series B No. 8  
 (1923), 6.....7, 12, 46–52, 94, 100, 109–11, 178, 195, 205–6, 253–4, 328

Legal Status of Eastern Greenland (Denmark v. Norway), PCIJ Reports, Series A/B No. 53 (1933), 22 .....336–7

Monastery of Saint-Naoum Advisory Opinion, PCIJ Reports, Series B No. 9 (1924), 6.....12, 94, 100, 112, 178–9, 194, 206, 254–5, 260, 263, 268, 272, 307, 308, 328, 338

Mosul Boundary Advisory Opinion (Interpretation of Article 3, Paragraph 2, of the Treaty of Lausanne), PCIJ Reports, Series B No. 12 (1925), 6.....7, 74–5, 337

Status of Eastern Carelia Advisory Opinion, PCIJ Reports, Series B No. 5 (1923), 7 .....112, 328, 337

**Permanent Court of Arbitration**

Eritrea v. Ethiopia Boundary Delimitation award, 41 (2002) ILM 1057.....8, 44–5

Eritrea v. Ethiopia (Decision on Interpretation), [www.pca-cpa.org/PDF/EEBC/Decision24June2002.pdf](http://www.pca-cpa.org/PDF/EEBC/Decision24June2002.pdf).....123, 164

Grisbadarna case (Norway v. Sweden), 4 (1910) AJIL 226.....69, 107, 165, 307–8, 315, 336

Island of Palmas or Miangas (The Netherlands v. US), 22 (1928) AJIL 867.....69, 107, 282, 308, 336

Island of Timor (The Netherlands v. Portugal), *Scott's Hague Court Reports* 354.....107, 336

North Atlantic Coast Fisheries (Great Britain v. US), *Scott's Hague Court Reports* 141.....107, 204–5, 208–9, 298, 308, 336

Pious Fund of California (Mexico v. US), 2 (1908) AJIL 898 .....121

Red Sea Islands and the Continental Shelf (Eritrea v. Yemen) (1996), 119 ILR 417 .....107, 127

**Arbitral decisions**

Alabama Claims (Great Britain v. US), 62 BFSP 233 .....294

Alaska Boundary (Great Britain v. US), 15 UNRIAA 485....186–9, 207, 223–5

Argentina–Chile Boundary Award, 95 BFSP 162 .....97, 333

Aves Island, 5 Moore 5037 .....71

Bagge India–Pakistan Boundary Award, *Gazette of Pakistan Extraordinary*, 5 February 1950.....98, 190

Battus v. Bulgaria, 5 *Annual Digest* 458.....251

Beagle Channel (Argentina v. Chile), 52 ILR 227; 17 (1978) ILM 724...69, 71, 109, 300, 307, 310–11

Bolivia–Peru, 3 (1909) AJIL 1029 .....68–9

xxiv      TABLE OF CASES

Brazil v. British Guiana, 99 BFSP 930 .....190

Brcko (Final Award) (Bosnia and Herzegovina v. Srpska), 38 (1999) ILM  
536 .....72

British Guiana v. Venezuela (1899), 89 BFSP 57.....43–4, 54, 74, 75, 190,  
240, 241, 283

British Petroleum v. Libya, 2 Wetter 610; 53 ILR 297 .....276

Bulama Island case (Great Britain v. Portugal), 5 Moore 1920 .....66

Buraimi Oasis case (Saudi Arabia v. UK/Trucial States v. Saudi Arabia) ....76

Chamizal (Mexico v. US), 5 (1911) AJIL 785.....70

Cleveland Award (Nicaragua v. Honduras), 79 BFSP 555 .....131, 134

Colombia v. Costa Rica, 92 BFSP 1038 .....45, 147

Colombia v. Venezuela (1891) 1 UNRIAA 296 .....219

Colombia v. Venezuela (1922) 1 *Annual Digest* 84 .....219–21

Costa Rica v. Panama (1900), 92 BFSP 1036.....98, 146–55, 185

Costa Rica v. Panama (1914), 108 BFSP 439; 11 UNRIAA 528 .....45, 71, 98,  
195, 329

Dubai v. Sharjah Land and Maritime Boundary, 91 ILR 543 .....13, 99, 164,  
192, 195, 197, 198–201, 207, 215–16, 328

Ecuador v. Peru .....73

Guatemala v. Honduras, 2 UNRIAA 1307 .....308, 316

Guinea-Bissau v. Senegal, 83 ILR 1.....69, 73, 75

Guinea–Guinea-Bissau Continental Shelf case, 77 ILR 636 .....298

Heim and Chamant v. Germany, 1 *Annual Digest* 379.....251, 277

Honduras v. Nicaragua (1906), 11 UNRIAA 111 .....131, 183

Honduras v. Nicaragua, 30 ILR 76.....167–8, 183–5

Iraq–Kuwait Boundary Demarcation Commission, 94 ILR 1 .....7, 23–4, 71

Laguna del Desierto (Argentina v. Chile), 113 ILR 1 .....97–8, 155, 168–9,  
173–4, 178, 180–3, 185, 196–7, 201–2, 210, 262, 332

Laguna del Desierto (Argentina v. Chile), Request for Revision and  
Interpretation of 1994 Judgment, 113 ILR 194.....98, 116, 139–40,  
155, 163, 173–4, 202, 204, 221–2, 259–60, 261, 266, 338

Moore (George) case (Mexico v. US), 5 Moore 1357 .....236, 282

Neufilze v. Germany and Deutsche Bank, 4 *Annual Digest* 491 .....251

New Haven v. New Netherlands (England v. Netherlands) (1647),  
2 Hazard 710 .....60–1

Newfoundland and Labrador v. Nova Scotia (Second Phase),  
[www.boundary-dispute.ca/index.html](http://www.boundary-dispute.ca/index.html).....318

Northeastern Boundary (Great Britain v. US), 18 BFSP 1249 ....65, 66, 67, 71

Palena case (Argentina v. Chile), 16 UNRIAA 111; 38 ILR 16 ...98, 145–6, 155,  
171–3, 176, 179, 196, 308, 331, 333

Pelletier v. Lazare, 5 Moore 1749 .....236  
Pennsylvania v. Connecticut (1782), *Journals of the Continental Congress*,  
1774–1789, Washington DC, 1904–37, vol. 24 6.....61–2  
Portendic Claims (UK v. France), 42 BFSP 1377 .....157–8  
Radcliffe India–Pakistan Boundary Award (1947), *Gazette of Pakistan*  
*Extraordinary*, 17 August 1947.....98, 189–90  
Rann of Kutch case (India v. Pakistan), 50 ILR 1 ...107, 308, 315–16, 318, 319  
River St Croix (Great Britain v. US) (1794), 1 BFSP 807.....63–4  
Sabotage Claims (US v. Germany), 25 (1931) AJIL 147; 27 (1933) AJIL 345;  
33 (1939) AJIL 345; and 34 (1940) AJIL 154.....282–3  
San Juan de Fuca (Great Britain v. US), 62 BFSP 188 .....208  
Schreck case (Mexico v. US), 2 Moore 1357 .....281  
Trail Smelter case (Canada v. US), 3 UNRIAA 1911 .....13  
United Kingdom–France Continental Shelf Delimitation (First  
Decision), 54 ILR 6.....80, 96  
United Kingdom–France Continental Shelf (Interpretive Decision),  
54 ILR 142 .....96, 116, 118–22, 127, 128, 137–40, 143–5,  
166–7, 174, 197, 256, 318, 327, 331

**European Court of Human Rights**

Pardo v. France, (1996) 22 EHRR 563 .....270–1, 288

**Switzerland**

Schaffhausen v. Zurich (1897), 15 (1921) AJIL 149.....191–2

**United States**

Gherebi v. Bush and Rumsfeld, 352 F 3d 1278 (2003) .....21  
Iowa v. Illinois, 147 US 1 (1893).....192  
Johnson v. Eisentrager, 339 US 763 (1950).....21  
Kansas v. Colorado, 185 US 125 (1902).....13  
Mississippi v. Illinois, 200 US 496 (1906) .....13  
New Hampshire v. Maine, 414 US 810 (1973) .....213  
New Hampshire v. Maine, 434 US 1 (1977).....214  
New Hampshire v. Maine, 532 US 742 (2001) .....165, 211–18  
Rhode Island v. New Hampshire, 12 Peters 657 (1838).....13  
Virginia v. Maryland, 540 US 56 (2003); 157 L Ed 2d 461 .....216–18  
Wisconsin v. Michigan, 295 US 455 (1935).....13

# Abbreviations

AJIL	<i>American Journal of International Law</i>
BFSP	<i>British Foreign and State Papers</i>
Hazard	<i>Historical Collections; Consisting of State Papers, and Other Authentic Documents; Intended as Materials for an History of the United States of America</i> , Philadelphia, 1792, vol. 2
ICJ	International Court of Justice
ILM	<i>International Legal Materials</i>
ILR	<i>International Law Reports</i>
Moore	<i>History and Digest of the International Arbitrations to Which the United States Has Been a Party</i> , Washington DC, 1898, vols. 2 and 5
PCIJ	Permanent Court of International Justice
UNRIAA	<i>United Nations Reports of International Arbitral Awards</i>
Wetter	<i>The International Arbitral Process</i> , New York, 1979, vols. 1 and 2