

work. This was also the experience of those who worked with him on the *Journal* over the years.

* * * *

And so one of the great ones has gone from our field. I cannot help but remember the words of another great one—Richard Baxter—in his address at the ILA–American Society joint fall luncheon in 1976:

My own generation has not necessarily been models of scholarship. I am reminded of the two lines . . .

“Where’s Mortimer, where’s Mowbray?
Nay what is more and most of all,
where is Plantagenet?

“They are entombed, in the urns and
sepulchers of mortality.”

Not merely a great scholar and student of international law has gone. Also a dear friend, and mentor, to many of us who follow.

KEITH HIGGET*

CORRESPONDENCE

TO THE EDITOR IN CHIEF:

January 30, 1990

In the July 1989 issue of your distinguished *Journal* (at pp. 590–95), a summary of the arbitral award of September 29, 1988, concerning the boundary dispute between Egypt and Israel (usually referred to as the *Taba* case) was published. The authors, Haihua Ding and Eric S. Koenig, succeeded in giving a short outline of this very complex case and of the problems involved. On a few points, however, I wish to add some details, which may shed light on several specific matters.

On reading page 593, the impression may arise that the Tribunal decided in favor of the Parker pillar location for the disputed pillar No. 91. But, although the Tribunal certainly favored this location, it could not and did not decide on this spot since neither of the parties had claimed it. The Tribunal accepted the location advanced by Egypt for pillar 91, a place that is horizontally at a distance of 284 meters and vertically at 64 meters from the Parker location.

The southernmost pillar established by the Tribunal (pillar No. 91) is at a distance of 170 meters from the shore, and the Tribunal was not authorized to determine the course of the boundary from this pillar to the gulf. Thus, the award did not fully solve the boundary dispute. But after the award was rendered, the parties conducted negotiations on the continuation of the line, and on February 26, 1989, they reached an agreement (slightly supple-

* Of the Board of Editors.

mented on March 7, 1989) according to which the line ends on the shore at a place corresponding roughly to the location of the former Parker pillar. This location left to Israel about 250 meters of shoreline beyond Egypt's original claim, but the hotel and the shore facilities are on the Egyptian side (*see* 28 ILM 611 (1989)).

In the Ras el Naqb area (p. 594 of the summary), the close-to-a-straight-line criterion was adopted only for pillar 88. With regard to pillar Nos. 85, 86 and 87, the Tribunal decided in favor of the locations claimed by Egypt since pillars existed at those locations and they conformed to the boundary line drawn on various maps.

RUTH LAPIDOTH*

* Professor of International Law, The Hebrew University, Jerusalem.