

## **МОРСКОЕ ПРАВО**

---

УДК 341.61

**Шехаб Хосам Хамид,**

профессор, доктор наук, Министерство высшего образования,  
Юридический колледж Университета Тикрита (Ирак)

**Аль Али Насер Абдель Рахим,**

кандидат юридических наук, доцент,  
Российский университет транспорта (МИИТ)

**Чеботарев Владимир Евгеньевич,**

кандидат экономических наук, доцент,  
Российский университет транспорта (МИИТ)

### **Принцип особых обстоятельств и его применимость при демаркации морских границ между Ираком и Кувейтом**

**Аннотация.** Процесс определения морских территорий всегда занимал видное место в спорах, возникающих из-за конфликтов интересов в этих важных регионах мира, и важность определения морских границ особенно проявляется в узких морских районах, где страны имеют различные интересы. Чтобы обеспечить стабильность и мир в этих морских районах, необходимо найти наилучшие пути и средства определения этих границ для достижения справедливости при их определении. В статье анализируется Конвенция 1982 года, которая создала некоторые принципы и методы определения морских границ, среди которых были указаны особые обстоятельства. Принцип средней линии может быть принят в обычных случаях, с помощью которых можно достичь справедливых результатов, но этот принцип может быть недействителен в других случаях, и, если бы этот принцип был применен в этих случаях, он показал бы нам неприемлемые результаты. Морские расширения прибрежных государств связаны с высшими жизненными интересами государства с точки зрения экономики, безопасности и военного аспекта, что делает споры, возникающие в результате определения морских границ между противоположными или соседними странами, характерными не только своим обилием и разнообразием, но также и их переплетением и сложностью, обусловленной их актуальностью для экономических, географических и политических вопросов в районе определения морских

границ, а также юридическими вопросами, возникающими в процессе делимитации.

**Ключевые слова:** морские пространства; делимитация; морские границы; Конвенция ООН по морскому праву; демаркация; исторически сложившиеся правовые основания или иные особые обстоятельства.

**Hossam Hamid Shehab,**  
Prof. Dr., Ministry of Higher Education,  
University of Tikrit, College of Law (Iraq)

**Al Ali Naser Abdel Raheem,**  
Candidate of Law, associate professor,  
Russian University of Transport (MIIT)

**Vladimir Ev. Chebotarev,**  
Candidate of Economic Sciences, associate professor,  
Russian University of Transport (MIIT)

### **The principle of special circumstances and its applicability in the demarcation of maritime boundaries between Iraq and Kuwait**

**Abstract.** The process of defining maritime areas has always had a prominent place in disputes resulting from conflicts of interest in these important regions of the world and the importance of defining maritime boundaries stands out in narrow sea areas where countries with diverse interests meet. In order to ensure stability and peace in those maritime areas, it is necessary to search for the best ways and means to determine those boundaries to achieve justice in the determination. The current paper has analyzed the 1982 Convention, which created some principles and methods in determining maritime boundaries, and among those principles was the principle of special circumstances. The principle of the midline can be adopted in normal cases through which fair results can be achieved, but this principle may not be valid in other cases and if this principle was applied in those cases, it would show us unacceptable results. The maritime extensions of coastal states are connected with the supreme vital interests of the state in terms of economic, security and military aspects, which makes disputes resulting from the determination of maritime borders between opposite or neighboring countries not only characterized by their abundance and diversity, but also by their intertwining and complexity due to their relevance to economic,

geographical and political issues in the area where maritime boundaries are determined, as well as the legal points raised by the delimitation process.

**Keywords:** maritime spaces; delimitation; maritime boundaries; UN Convention on the Law of the Sea; demarcation; historical legal grounds or other special circumstances.

---

### **Research Structure**

In order to address the subject of the principle of special circumstances and the possibility of its application between Iraq and the rest of the neighboring countries, we decided to address it through five demands, in the first of which we deal with the principle within the framework of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, in the second we deal with the factors considered special circumstances, in the third requirement, we tackle how to work with special circumstances, in the fourth requirement the principle within the framework of the International Court of Justice, and in the last requirement we will address the possibility of adopting it and applying it to the Iraqi coast.

#### **1. Principle under the 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea**

During the sessions of the Third Conference on the Law of the Sea, there was no disagreement on the method of determining the territorial sea between opposite or adjacent states, and the Conference decided on the same provision as the Geneva Convention [1, p. 94]. Originally, the determination should be made by agreement between the countries concerned and this agreement should be embodied in the form of bilateral or regional treaties or conventions. In the absence of agreement, Article (15) of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 1982 stipulates the following (where the coasts of two states are opposite or contiguous, neither state is entitled in the absence of an agreement between them otherwise to extend its territorial sea beyond the middle line, on which each point is equal in its distance from the nearest points on the baseline from which the breadth of the territorial sea of each of two states is measured, but this provision does not apply where it is necessary due to a historical evidence or other special circumstances to determine the territorial sea boundaries of each state in a manner contrary to this provision) [2, p. 125].

#### **2. Factors considered special circumstances**

Referring to Article 12 of the 1958 Convention, we find that it did not give the expression of special circumstances a clear and precise definition, except for the reference to historical rights, as well as Article 15 of the 1982 Convention, it did not specify what is meant by special circumstances, nor did it clarify what they are and their nature that justifies the introduction of another boundary line [3, p. 79].

This position may be justified, as the diversity and multiplicity of special circumstances from one case to another makes it difficult to set a table or definition for them as the special circumstances may be geographical related to the presence of islands or the shape or length of the coast, geological related to the presence of mineral wealth at the bottom, and may be related to fishing and navigation and the extent of the population's dependence on it to meet their food needs or the presence of other factors.

Considering this, we can take three factors of special circumstances, namely geographical factors, geological factors, and factors related to fishing and navigation.

**Geographical factors.** One of the geographical factors affecting the principle of special circumstances is the unusual composition of the coast and its length and the presence of islands near or far from the coast. The International Law Commission set in 1953 conditions that allow moving away from the middle line or equal dimensions whenever required by the unusual composition of the coast, as indicated by several opinions at the Geneva Conference in 1958 to take special circumstances because of the great variation of complex geographical conditions with some coasts [4, p. 12] and The delegation of the United Kingdom also noted that special circumstances might include the presence of a large or small island in the zoning area [5, p. 242] The International Law Commission had considered the presence of islands in areas of the continental shelf to be the major cause of the application of special circumstances. The Rapporteur-General, Mr. François, explained that the departure from the application of the general rule becomes necessary when there is a small island close to the coast of a particular state but belonging to a second state, and the Commission also referred in its commentary to the draft article to the existence of islands as a case of special circumstances [4, p. 120].

Shekhrawada also stated that the existence of islands is considered a special circumstance, and, on this basis, it is not possible to take all the islands in the maritime area to be demarcated, because this leads to unfair results. As for small islands and rocks, they are often neglected when measuring marine areas, especially in narrow seas in which the coasts of more than one country meet or adjoin each other [6, p. 30].

To illustrate this, we may find an island so small in the middle of shallow waters or islands may be located so close to the main shore that they may be justified in considering them as part of the main shore during the establishment of boundaries to divide maritime boundaries. Islands may also exist despite their proximity to the shore of a state (a) but they are under the sovereignty of another state (b) which is the state opposite or adjacent to the state (a). All these circumstances not only explain the difficulty of applying the principle of the midline and equality of dimensions, but also explain why the Geneva Conference and the 1982 Conference could not establish any specific conditions or provisions on the impact of the presence of islands in determining maritime boundaries [5, p. 243].

Some writers offer us suggestions on the issue of determining the maritime boundaries of the existence of islands to avoid unfair results that may result from the application of the principle of equality of distance. These suggestions stem from the fact that this issue (a special circumstance) in the sense contained in the articles of the Geneva Conventions of 1958 and these proposals [4, p. 124] are:

1) Islands shall be considered in the determination of maritime areas under the principle of equidistance if any part of them is located within 24 nautical miles from the mainland, with a distance of 12 nautical miles being generally recognized as the maximum distance of the breadth of the territorial sea.

2) The location of the islands is an important factor in the process of determination, as the presence of an island belonging to a country far from it but at the same time close to the mainland of another country can create prominent prejudices which calls for finding a formula to reduce its impact.

3) The size of the island is not necessarily a special circumstance that allows moving away from the principle of equality of distances, but this size if it comes within a mixture of other factors such as the location of the island, its population and its economic importance can be a factor that cannot be ignored in determining the borders.

Some writers support the idea of adopting the principle of special circumstances in these cases in which the islands of one country are located close to the coast of another state and the treatment of each case according to its circumstances such as the population of the island and the economic status of each of the two countries concerned specifically.

**Geological factors.** Reference has been made repeatedly to the economic value of mineral reserves and their storage at the bottom of the sea, as well as to the special rights to explore minerals, and to the unity of these reserves as factors that can constitute special circumstances. Among the jurists who took this approach was Mr. Hudson as he referred to the economic value of mineral reserves as a factor related to the issue of identification. Mr. Mouton also referred in one of his lectures to the existence of common reserves located at the border areas as a special circumstance. In the discussions taking place at the meetings of the Geneva Conference of 1958, Mr. Kennedy, one of Members of the British delegation to the conference pointed out the special circumstances if one of the two countries specifically concerned possesses special exploration rights. In its ruling in the North Sea cases, the International Court of Justice mentioned known or confirmed natural resources as a factor that should be taken into consideration when conducting negotiations between the parties to the conflict. Although the court neglected to mention how the exploration took place and whether it was done jointly or in another way, it is likely that it left that to the agreement of the parties. The court's ruling stated that the importance of the geological appearance was further confirmed by the care given to it by the International Law Commission at the beginning of its research, as it worked to investigate the accurate information of the characteristics of this appearance, as

seen in the special form of its definition found on page (131) of the first part of the annual book of the International Law Commission for the year 1956. The court went on to say that the dependency of the continental shelf on the countries in front of whose coasts it is located is a real matter, but it is useful to consider the geological situation of this shelf for the purpose of determining whether the direction taken by some shapes and structural features of the coasts can affect the definition of boundaries.

The Court also referred to the unity of the reserves stored on the seabed as a factor to be considered in the determination of the areas of the continental shelf between neighboring states and said that the natural resources of the seabed in those parts constituting a continental shelf were the subject of the basis of the legal system arising in the wake of the Truman Declaration [4, p. 129]. The Court explained how the North Sea countries dealt with this issue by concluding some conventions such as the convention of March 10, 1965 between the United Kingdom and Norway and the convention 6 October 1965 between the Netherlands and the United Kingdom, and the convention of 14 May 1962 between the Federal Germany and the Netherlands on the joint plan for the exploration of natural resources in the EMS ESTURAY area, as the front boundary was not definitively determined [4, p. 129]. However, some do not agree with this idea and believe that these resources cannot constitute a special circumstance unless there were special rights for a country over those resources before 1945.

**Factors related to navigation and fishing.** The International Law Commission referred in 1953 to the question of the delimitation of boundaries in the territorial sea between opposing states mentioning that there were special reasons such as navigation and fishing rights in which it was imperative to stay away from the middle line. The Commission also referred in 1956 to the departure from the equidistance line in cases necessitated by the existence of navigable channels.

Mr. Kennedy pointed out that among the special circumstances is the possession of fishing rights by states or the existence of navigational channels as two forms of special circumstances, as well as Judge Nero explained that navigational channels along with other factors are considered special circumstances. This was also confirmed by the delegation of the United Kingdom at the Geneva Conference, considering fishing rights and the existence of navigational channels among the special circumstances [5, p. 242].

Considering the above factors when considering cases of delimitation of maritime areas and considering all special circumstances in conditions of their availability, is in fact nothing but an application of the principles of justice and fairness that the International Court of Justice has given its attention to and given all importance in that process of determination.

### **3. How to work with special circumstances**

Article 12 of the 1958 Geneva Convention and Article 15 of the 1982 Convention on the Law of the Sea explain how special circumstances should be

considered in cases where the principle of midline or equivalence of distances cannot achieve justice. Article 15 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 1982 stipulates that «when the coasts of two states are opposite or contiguous, neither state shall be entitled, in the absence of an agreement to the contrary, to extend its territorial sea beyond the midline on which each point is equally distant from the nearest points on the baseline from which the breadth of the territorial sea of each state is measured, but this provision shall not apply when it is necessary due to historical grounds or special circumstances to delimit the territorial sea of each state in a manner contrary to this provision [7, p. 129].

Looking at article 12 of the 1958 Geneva Convention and article 15 of the Convention on the Law of the Sea, they contained three elements to define:

1. Agreement of neighboring and opposing countries on the determination of borders between them.

2. Dependence on the principle of the midline and the equality of distance in the determination.

3. Considering the principle of special circumstances if historical factors or other special circumstances exist [8, p. 136].

Considering this, the Convention took the idea of submitting the agreement and considering it the basis for determining the borders between the opposite and neighboring countries. When there is no agreement between the opposite and neighboring countries on the delimitation of the borders, and in the absence of another line justified by special circumstances, then in this case the borders will be determined by the middle line between the opposite countries and equal distance between neighboring countries. Thus, the Convention favored the method of special circumstances over the midline and equality of distance in cases where special circumstances so require.

This was confirmed by the provision of Article 6 of the discussions of the International Law Commission, which prepared the draft conventions, and in the Commission's last report to the United Nations General Assembly in 1956.

It is worth noting that the failure of the parties of the dispute to reach an agreement between them on the delimitation of maritime boundaries is, according to some jurists, among the cases of special circumstances mentioned in Article 6 of the Geneva Convention in 1958 [5, p. 341].

The combination of the rule of equal distances and special circumstances gives the way to the application of customary law that the determination is made in accordance with the principles of justice and equity, because the rule of equal distances and special circumstances aims to achieve justice in the determination of maritime areas [9, p. 121].

Thus, we find that the principle of equality of distance and special circumstances express completely different situations. The method of equality of distance applies in the absence of special circumstances and those special circumstances apply in the event of special circumstances can be adopted. So, we cannot talk about a gradation between them. It has been pointed out that Article

6 of the Geneva Convention in 1958 has considered the rule of equality of distance as the general rule and that special circumstances are the exception, but this view is questionable as it is not certain that natural cases that take the principle of the midline are more frequent than exceptional situations that justify the adoption of special circumstances, and even if this is true, this does not lead to the method of equal distances being the highest degree of being the most frequent.

Attempts have been made to transfer this discussion to the procedural field and talk about evidence. It was said that the situation is supposed to be «normal» unless the state that opposes the application of the principle of equality of distance proves the existence of special circumstances, in other words the gradation appears due to the burden of proving the existence of special circumstances on the shoulders of the state that claims that (special circumstances) exist. This is what Britain claimed in its dispute with France, which was presented to the Court of Arbitration, but the Court indicated that Article 6 of the 1958 convention on the continental shelf did not establish equality of distance and special circumstances as two separate rules, but rather constitute a single rule that combines equality of distance — special circumstances. Therefore, it can be questioned from a legal point of view that there is a burden to prove special circumstances as the existence of a single rule means that the question of whether «special circumstances permit another determination» is an integral part of the rule that provides for the principle of equality of distance [10, p. 141].

#### **4. Principle within the framework of the International Court of Justice**

The principle of special circumstances and the fair results it has achieved, which other methods of determination have failed to do, has had an impact on the resolution of many maritime disputes relating to maritime spaces. This has been confirmed by the International Court of Justice and the special arbitration courts during the consideration of cases of disputes before them. Thus, it was strongly accepted during the 1958 Geneva Conference and the third United Nations conference on the Law of the Sea in 1982. Among the important cases that adopted the principle of special circumstances before the International Court of Justice was the North Sea case between Germany, the Netherlands and Denmark. Germany demanded to follow the principle of special circumstances and exclude the principle of the middle line in determining the maritime boundaries among itself, the Netherlands and Denmark after negotiations among those countries failed and resulted in only a partial agreement for a certain distance from the border and the rest of the distance was agreed to be submitted to the International Court of Justice.

Germany's main motivation for using the principle of special circumstances was that the sea parts near the coast are deeper than the distant parts, which is the opposite of what we find in ordinary coastal structures. In light of this unusual composition, it leaves Germany with a small share compared to the rest of the countries according to the Geneva Convention, as Germany was to obtain



an area of 24,000 km<sup>2</sup> of the continental shelf of the North Sea, while Denmark would get 56,000 km<sup>2</sup> and the Netherlands 61,000 km<sup>2</sup>, which is of course unfair to Germany [3, p. 133]. This led Germany to demand the application of other methods and neglect the rules of Article 6 on the midfield and the application of the principle of special circumstances of the same article [4, p. 133].

The International Court of Justice has held that the principle of equal distance is a new principle and not a customary principle and that, due to foreign or external causes, the use of the equal distances rule as a method of determination is not binding [2, p. 84]. The judgment of the International Court of Justice referred to the mineral hoards on the seabed and to the geological appearance in order to determine whether the direction taken by certain forms and structural features of the coasts could affect the delimitation of boundaries and the other factors to be taken into account in the determination of the areas of the continental shelf between neighboring and opposite states.

The International Court of Justice had adopted the principle of special circumstances in the Norwegian fisheries case between Norway and the United Kingdom when it ignored the existence of the Norwegian trench zone and consequently the limits of the Norwegian continental shelf reached the middle line between it and the other corresponding and neighboring states. If the Court had applied the criteria set forth in the Geneva Convention on the continental shelf, Norway could have been deprived of a very large area of the continental shelf if the water depth were much more than two hundred meters as this area could not be subjected to the criteria for determining the continental shelf.

Not taking that area into account when making the determination in that case was an application of the principle of special circumstances and an application of Article 6 of the Geneva Convention [11, p. 96].

This area would have deprived Norway of a large part of its continental shelf if the latter had adopted the definition of the continental shelf as it is in article 1 of the Geneva Convention in 1958 because the depth of the water in this area was more than two hundred meters which represents the maximum under the depth criterion. The Court stated that although the principle of the middle line had been used between Norway and the United Kingdom, it could not do so till after the Norwegian trench area had been excluded [12, p. 5].

### **5. Application of the principle of special circumstances on the Iraqi coast**

Sources disagree on the determination of the length of the Iraqi coast. Some sources estimate it to be 55.56 km extending from Ras Al-Bisha in Al-Faw and ending in um Qasr, and most of it is located within the Khor Abdullah channel and only a distance of no more than a few nautical miles is located directly facing the Arabian Gulf [13, p. 46].

Iraq is considered one of the affected countries geographically, as it has a very short coastline when compared to the coastlines of neighboring countries, in addition to its extreme concavity. This consequently led to the shape of the Iraqi coast being a triangle with small vertices, with its base resting on the coast in an area where the regional seas intersect and their extensions to both Kuwait and

Iran which may deprive it of the possibility of expansion in the economic zone and the continental shelf. It is very close to the situation of the German coast in the North Sea, which is located between the coasts of the Netherlands and Denmark. They are similar in terms of their concave shape, in addition to being in the middle among the coastal countries. The Iraqi coast can be divided into three parts, the coast facing Kuwait extends with a narrow canal, Khor Abdullah, and ends with two ends, the first at Umm Qasr and the second at Khor Al-Zubair, and a coast adjacent to Iran, represented by the mouth of the Shatt al-Arab in the Gulf and a coast facing the open sea, preceded by two ports: Al-Amaya and Basra which are oil ports. The Iraqi coast also includes five other ports [2, p. 206].

In addition to the fact that both countries have one seaport; Germany has no other port except the North Sea. The same case is for Iraq, which has a single outlet towards the Arabian Gulf, as well as the abundance of oil resources in both the Arabian Gulf and the North Sea. Thus, it is logical and just to determine Iraq's maritime borders according to what the International Court of Justice decided its ruling in favor of Germany in the North Sea.

Since there is a part of the Iraqi maritime border that has not yet been determined, represented by the maritime marker (162) facing the area (Fisht Al-Aij) to the beginning of Khor Abdullah, as well as the maritime border with Iran, it is better to adopt the principle of special circumstances in addition to adopting the principle of equality of distances whenever appropriate.

Iraq has realized the importance of the principle of special circumstances as it is more suitable for application on the Iraqi coast as well as achieving justice for the distribution of those marine areas which prompted it to adopt it and call for it at the fifth session of the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, indicating that the geographical, political and economic conditions of countries anticipate the difficulty of adopting a single rule for determination, which necessitates the adoption of a set of criteria at the same time.

As for Security Council Resolution 833 regarding the demarcation of the border between Iraq and Kuwait, which avoided considering the principle of special circumstances in determining it and ignored the historical rights in Khor Abdullah for Iraq, which had the right to reclaim the entire creek being the only outlet for Iraq through which ships leading to Umm Qasr passed. It was proven that Iraq had spent millions of dollars for silt removal operations in that region in addition to the historical rights that Iraq was exercising. The Kuwaiti side did not exercise such rights in Al-Khor, and thus the Security Council's decision is considered unfair to Iraq [14, p. 342]. Hence, Iraq should restore and develop the relationship between it and the state of Kuwait to redraw its remaining maritime borders with an agreement that considers Iraq's interests in this part of the maritime region, which is its only outlet because the agreement is the best means for the process of demarcating borders in general and maritime borders in particular. It gives freedom to the countries concerned to choose between the appropriate means of demarcating borders according to the principle of equal

distances or the principle of special circumstances, and this in turn leads to creating a kind of stability in relations among countries.

Considering this, the Arab Gulf states resorted to the adoption of the agreement in many bilateral agreements to determine the maritime borders among them. What is distinctive in these agreements is that they applied the two principles together (the principle of equal distances — the principle of special circumstances), including the agreement concluded between Bahrain and Saudi Arabia in 1958, the bilateral agreement between Iran and the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia in 1968, the bilateral agreement between Qatar and Abu Dhabi in 1969.

It is noticeable that these agreements have adopted the principle of special circumstances in several respects:

1. Using the middle line as a starting point at the beginning of the negotiations, but later these agreements adopted other criteria to reach a fair and satisfactory agreement for all parties.

2. Neglecting small islands, especially those far from the coast and close to the center of the Gulf, in defining the boundary line due to the special circumstances of the region, while the nearest islands have been given half the impact more than once.

3. These agreements adopted standards and principles that differed from the principle of the midline in cases of oil reserves in the areas of the continental shelf to reach fair solutions.

It is best in the time being for the maritime borders to be determined by a meeting of the concerned countries in the region without excluding any country, as the process of exclusion may lead to unfairness to the countries outside the frameworks of understanding among the countries concerned due to the latter's efforts to determine the maritime borders according to their interests regardless of the interests of other countries. It is noted that after the year 1991, and the political and economic circumstances that befell Iraq, the rest of the countries excluded Iraq's involvement in the border demarcation process. We find that Kuwait and Iran have begun to conduct negotiations on demarcating the maritime borders between them without including Iraq with them. Although those negotiations were not translated into reality, these attempts in themselves constitute a major violation of the principles and rules of international law towards Iraq. To give each party their right, all those countries concerned must enter into drawing their maritime borders relying on justice and good neighborhood and the application of the suitable special circumstances principle to determine such borders.

## References

1. Hassan Hosni Moussa. The International Law of the Sea // Dar Al-Fikr Weltanweer. — Mansoura, 2013.
2. Muhammad Thamer Al-Saadoun. The border dispute between Qatar and Bahrain. — Baghdad, 2001.
3. Adel Amin Khaki. The Iraqi Continental Shelf in International Law. — Baghdad, 1970.

4. Jinan Jamil Sukkar. Determining the maritime areas of the coastal states in the Arabian Gulf. — Baghdad, 1970.
5. Nabil Ahmed Helmy. Continental Extension and the Modern Rules of the International Law of the Seas. Dar Al-Nahda Al-Arabiya, 1978.
6. Dhari Rashid Al-Yassin. Bilateral Maritime Agreements between the Arab Gulf States // Al-Mustansiriya University, Institute of Asian and African Studies, Legal Studies. Series. — № 2. — Baghdad, 1986.
7. Salah al-Din Amer. The International Law of the Sea: A Study of the Most Important Provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 1982 // Dar al-Nahda al-Arabiya. — 1983.
8. Muhammad al-Haj Hammoud. The International Law of the Seas, Areas of National Jurisdiction // Al-Adib. — Baghdad, 1990.
9. Dr. Badriya Abdullah Al-Awadi. General Provisions in the International Law of the Sea (with an applied study on the Arabian Gulf). — Kuwait, 1988.
10. Amira Fouad. The Legal System of the Continental Shelf : Master's Thesis. — Algeria, 2014—2015.
11. International Court of Justice: Summary of Judgments, Opinions and Orders Issued by 1948—1991.
12. Bassam Ahmed. Determining the maritime borders between opposite and adjacent countries // Tishreen University Journal for Research and Scientific Studies. — 2015. — Issue 37. — № 5.
13. Saadoun Shalal Zahir. Iraq's Problems on the Marine Border // Journal of Geographical Research. — 2002.
14. Qasim Muhammad al-Janabi and Ruba Sahib Abd. The Problem of Demarcating the Iraqi-Kuwaiti Border and Departing from the Provisions of Chapter Seven // Journal of the College of Basic Education, University of Babylon. — 2013. — Issue 12. — June.