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PREFACE

The twentieth century witnessed a new generation of national boundaries. Claims of coastal states to the continental shelf and an exclusive economic zone resulted in new entitlements. They called for co-ordination. In delineating these claims, the principle of equity took on a prominent role. Equity, beyond its traditional functions in legal history, emerged in a process of trial and error as the very foundation of the principles and methodology determining the delimitation of overlapping claims to marine space. As a result, it plays in an important role in the allocation of marine resources. This field of study allows for insights to be gained into the modern role and function of equity in international law, assessing both the potential and the limitations of distributive justice in the society of nations.

The book undertakes a detailed analysis of the evolution and process of equity in contemporary international law of the sea. It focuses on the relationship of legal rules on delimitation, in particular equidistance, and of equitable principles and relevant factors. It explores the relationship of law and equity in complex individual cases and particular circumstances which do not lend themselves to the application of ready-made, hard and fast legal rules. The operation of maritime boundary delimitation is essentially based upon a genuine rule of equity. It is determined by a number of standards, employing in the final analysis a topical method of weighing and balancing different and competing interests in a methodologically sound manner. The study seeks to further clarify and contribute to the methodology which, in an abundant series of adjudicated and negotiated cases, has been subject to trial and error. No case is like another. Conclusions cannot be readily drawn. And yet, it is submitted that common and shared methodologies, features and consistencies can be identified and further developed. It is hoped that the book will make a contribution in conceptualizing underlying principles and the methodology which eventually may be applied to other fields of law.

xxiii
The book starts with a review of traditional and contemporary functions of equity in international law, showing not only its complementary and corrective functions, but also the aspirations for justice in international law and relations. Part I of the book addresses the advent of the maritime zones and their limited implications for distributive justice. Part II deals with the new boundaries, reviewing state practice and the abundant case law based upon which the doctrine of equity evolved in a process of trial and error. Part III of the book develops the underlying principles of delimitation, identifies the standards to be taken into account and sets out the methodologies for the adjudication of complex cases and for negotiations.

This book is of interest both to the field of maritime boundary delimitation and to legal theory. It offers a complete analysis of more than fifty years of maritime boundary delimitation and should assist lawyers and diplomats in future negotiations and adjudication of complex cases. For legal theory, it is hoped that it is able to demonstrate that recourse to modern equity essentially entails a constructive approach, building on the underlying foundations of a particular concept, taking into account a host of pertinent factors and interests in a topical manner. The discussion of the relationship of equidistance and of equity offers insights into the relationship of rules and equity. Whether courts depart from the law on the basis of equity, or whether they take equitable principles into account in assessing exceptions to a rule, the process is inherently fact-intensive and creative. It is far removed from the traditions of syllogism and the idea of applying pre-existing rules to a particular fact. Relevant factors and interests need to be identified in a transparent manner and brought to the table and balanced against each other. The legitimacy of the decision depends greatly on the pertinence of reasoning and argumentation. Equity has come a long way from correcting the law, providing foundations and a proper methodology based upon which results are composed, rather than simply found.

Insights from maritime boundary delimitation therefore can also be rendered fruitful not only in related areas but also in other areas addressing fact-intensive issues of distributive justice in international law, even beyond the allocation of natural resources. It may inspire other fields of international law, in particular human rights, trade regulation, investment protection, competition law, and environmental...
law. In conclusion, equity revisited reveals an innovative method of legal discourse in search of justice and solutions supporting peaceful and friendly relations among nations.

March 2014
Thomas Cottier
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