



Universal Jurisdiction and Somali Piracy Crisis (2005-2012): Assessing The Effectiveness and Limitations of the UNCLOS Piracy Regime

Article History

Name of Authors:

Oghenekevwe Orighoyegha^{1*}

Affiliation:

¹Bournemouth University, Bournemouth, England, United Kingdom

Corresponding Author

Oghenekevwe Orighoyegha

How to cite this article:

Orighoyegha Oghenekevwe Universal Jurisdiction and Somali Piracy Crisis (2005-2012): Assessing The Effectiveness and Limitations of the UNCLOS Piracy Regime. J. Int. Commer Law Technol., 2026;7(1):1624-1631,

Received: 21-06-2026

Revised: 24-07-2026

Accepted: 16-08-2026

Published: 30-09-2026

Doi: 10.61336/jiclt/20267109

©2026 The Author(s). This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>)

Abstract: The Somali piracy crisis (2005–2012) constitutes the most significant test of the international legal framework governing piracy under the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS). During this period, Somali pirate groups launched hundreds of attacks against commercial vessels transiting the Gulf of Aden, threatening maritime security, freedom of navigation and global trade. The crisis prompted an unprecedented international response involving multinational naval operations, regional prosecution arrangements, United Nations Security Council interventions and the extensive application of universal jurisdiction under Articles 100 and 105 of UNCLOS. This article critically evaluates the effectiveness of the UNCLOS piracy regime through the lens of the Somali piracy crisis. Using a doctrinal legal methodology, it analyses UNCLOS provisions, Security Council resolutions, judicial decisions and state practice relating to the apprehension, transfer, detention and prosecution of suspected pirates. The article argues that while UNCLOS provided an indispensable legal foundation for international cooperation and the exercise of universal jurisdiction, the Somali crisis exposed significant limitations within the contemporary piracy framework. These included jurisdictional constraints arising from the high-seas requirement, the absence of a mandatory obligation to prosecute, reliance on third-state prosecution arrangements, uncertainties surrounding attempted piracy and the growing influence of human rights obligations on enforcement decisions. It concludes that the successful suppression of Somali piracy depended not on UNCLOS alone but on a broader network of Security Council authorisations, regional initiatives and multinational cooperation, highlighting the need to modernise the piracy regime to address contemporary maritime crime more effectively.

Keywords: International Maritime Law, Maritime Security and Governance, Piracy Prosecution, Somali Piracy, UNCLOS-Universal Jurisdiction

INTRODUCTION

The suppression of piracy occupies a distinctive position within international law. For centuries, pirates have been regarded as *hostis humani generis* (enemies of all mankind), permitting states to exercise jurisdiction irrespective of the nationality of the offenders, victims, or vessels involved [1]. This principle of universal jurisdiction was subsequently codified in the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS), which remains the principal international legal framework governing piracy [2]. Articles 100 and 105 require states to cooperate in the repression of piracy and authorise the seizure and prosecution of pirate vessels on the high seas. The regime reflects the longstanding view that piracy threatens not only individual states but also the shared interests of the international community, including freedom of navigation, maritime commerce and international security.

The Somali piracy crisis between 2005 and 2012 represents the most significant contemporary test of this legal framework. During this period, Somali pirate groups transformed piracy from a localised criminal activity into a transnational maritime security threat affecting some of the world's most strategically important shipping routes [3]. Operating from Somalia's ungoverned coastline, pirate networks conducted hundreds of attacks across the Gulf of Aden and the Western Indian Ocean, disrupting global trade, increasing shipping and insurance costs and endangering seafarers [4]. The scale and persistence of these attacks generated an unprecedented international response involving multinational naval deployments, extensive inter-state cooperation and widespread reliance upon the universal jurisdiction provisions of UNCLOS. The Somali experience provides a unique opportunity to evaluate the practical effectiveness of universal

jurisdiction in combating contemporary maritime crime. Although UNCLOS provides a comprehensive framework for piracy suppression, the Somali crisis exposed a growing mismatch between the Convention's traditional conception of piracy and the operational realities of contemporary organised maritime crime. In particular, the crisis raised important questions concerning the capacity of the UNCLOS regime to address jurisdictional complexities, support effective prosecutions and respond to increasingly sophisticated forms of transnational maritime criminality.

Existing scholarship has examined Somali piracy from several perspectives, including the effectiveness of naval operations, the scope of universal jurisdiction and the relationship between state failure and maritime insecurity [5]. However, relatively little attention has been devoted to assessing whether the apparent success of counter-piracy efforts demonstrates the effectiveness of the UNCLOS regime itself or, alternatively, reflects the contribution of supplementary legal and institutional mechanisms operating beyond the Convention. This distinction is important because it goes to the heart of whether universal jurisdiction under UNCLOS remains sufficient for addressing contemporary piracy. This article addresses that gap by critically examining the Somali piracy crisis as a test of the effectiveness and limitations of the UNCLOS piracy regime. It argues that although UNCLOS provided an indispensable legal foundation for international cooperation and piracy suppression, the successful suppression of Somali piracy was attributable not to universal jurisdiction alone but to a broader framework of complementary legal, institutional and operational measures developed to address deficiencies within the UNCLOS regime. Using a doctrinal legal methodology, the article analyses UNCLOS provisions, judicial decisions, relevant state practice and associated international legal developments to assess both the enduring value and the limitations of universal jurisdiction in contemporary maritime security governance.

Universal Jurisdiction Under UNCLOS

Universal jurisdiction constitutes one of the most distinctive exceptions to the traditional territorial basis of criminal jurisdiction in international law. Historically, piracy has been regarded as a crime of exceptional international concern because it occurs beyond the jurisdictional reach of any single state and threatens the collective interests of the international community [6]. This understanding gave rise to the classical characterisation of pirates as *hostis humani generis* (enemies of all mankind), permitting all states to exercise jurisdiction regardless of the nationality of the offenders, victims, or vessels involved [7]. The rationale for this exceptional jurisdiction lies in the recognition that piracy

endangers freedom of navigation, maritime commerce and the stability of the international maritime order. The principle was codified in the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS), which remains the primary legal framework governing piracy. Articles 100 to 107 establish a regime intended to facilitate international cooperation and enforcement against piracy on the high seas. Article 100 requires all states to cooperate "to the fullest possible extent" in the repression of piracy, reflecting the collective nature of the threat and the necessity of coordinated action. Although the provision imposes a general duty of cooperation, it leaves states considerable discretion regarding the mechanisms through which that obligation is implemented.

The substantive definition of piracy is contained in Article 101. It defines piracy as illegal acts of violence, detention, or depredation committed for private ends by the crew or passengers of a private ship or aircraft against another ship, aircraft, persons, or property on the high seas or outside the jurisdiction of any state. Article 105 provides the enforcement mechanism for this regime by authorising any state to seize pirate vessels on the high seas, arrest suspected offenders and submit them to prosecution before its domestic courts. Unlike ordinary criminal jurisdiction, which generally depends upon territoriality or nationality, Article 105 permits prosecution solely because piracy is regarded as an offence against the international community as a whole. Consequently, the UNCLOS piracy regime represents one of the clearest and most enduring examples of universal jurisdiction in contemporary international law. The theoretical justification for this framework extends beyond criminal accountability. Universal jurisdiction therefore serves a broader public function than criminal punishment. It protects freedom of navigation and secures the collective interest of the international community in maintaining open and secure maritime trade routes.

Despite its significance, several structural limitations are embedded within the UNCLOS framework. First, piracy is confined to acts committed on the high seas or outside the jurisdiction of any state, excluding conduct occurring within territorial waters [8]. Secondly, Article 101 requires that piracy be committed for "private ends", a requirement that has generated uncertainty regarding the treatment of politically motivated maritime violence[9]. Thirdly, although Article 105 authorises states to prosecute suspected pirates, it imposes no obligation to do so. The Convention therefore grants jurisdiction without establishing a corresponding duty to prosecute or extradite. These limitations become particularly significant when applied to contemporary organised piracy. The Somali piracy crisis (2005–2012), the most substantial test of the UNCLOS regime since its codification, exposed the practical consequences of these

limitations and raised important questions about the adequacy of universal jurisdiction in addressing modern forms of transnational maritime crime. Accordingly, the Somali experience provides an important lens through which to assess both the enduring strengths and structural weaknesses of the UNCLOS piracy regime.

Somali Piracy and the Operation of Universal Jurisdiction

Somali Piracy as a Contemporary Test of UNCLOS: The Somali piracy crisis (2005–2012) represents the most extensive practical application of the UNCLOS piracy regime since its codification. The collapse of state authority in Somalia enabled piracy to evolve into a sophisticated ransom-based criminal enterprise operating across the Gulf of Aden and the Western Indian Ocean [10]. Supported by financiers, facilitators and logistical networks, pirate groups expanded their operational reach through the use of mother ships and targeted key international shipping lanes [11]. The resulting threat to maritime commerce prompted an unprecedented international response involving multinational naval operations, extensive inter-state cooperation and reliance upon the universal jurisdiction provisions of UNCLOS [12]. At the legal level, states increasingly relied upon Articles 100 and 105 UNCLOS, which provided the principal basis for maritime interdiction and the exercise of universal jurisdiction over suspected pirates. The Somali crisis therefore provides a unique opportunity to assess both the strengths and limitations of the UNCLOS piracy regime when confronted with a contemporary form of organised maritime criminality.

Strengths Revealed by the Somali Experience

The principal achievement of the UNCLOS piracy regime was its capacity to facilitate collective action against a transnational maritime threat. Articles 100 and 105 provided a common legal foundation for multinational naval operations, intelligence sharing, maritime interdiction and domestic prosecutions. Together, these provisions enabled states to coordinate enforcement efforts across jurisdictions and address piracy beyond traditional territorial and nationality-based constraints. Although Article 100 establishes only a broadly framed duty of cooperation, it nevertheless supplied an important normative and legal framework for sustained multinational action. The multinational response involving the European Union Naval Force's Operation Atalanta, NATO's Operation Ocean Shield and Combined Task Force 151 demonstrates the extent to which states were able to operationalise these provisions in practice [13]. This coordinated exercise of enforcement powers contributed significantly to protecting freedom of navigation and global maritime commerce [14]. Pirate

attacks in the Gulf of Aden and the Western Indian Ocean threatened one of the world's most strategically important shipping corridors, yet, naval patrols, vessel protection measures and the exercise of universal jurisdiction, substantially reduce successful attacks, enhance maritime security and protect international shipping [15]. The Somali experience therefore reaffirmed the continuing importance of the UNCLOS piracy regime in safeguarding both international shipping and the broader collective interests of the international community.

Domestic prosecutions provide further evidence of the practical operation of universal jurisdiction. In *United States v Abduwali Abdukhadir Muse*, arising from the 2009 attack on the MV Maersk Alabama, the United States successfully prosecuted a Somali piracy suspect captured far beyond its territorial jurisdiction [16]. Similarly, in *Republic v Hassan M Ahmed*, the Kenyan courts confirmed that piracy remains subject to universal jurisdiction and may be prosecuted irrespective of territorial or nationality links [17]. These decisions reinforced the continuing legal viability of universal jurisdiction within contemporary piracy suppression efforts

Universal Jurisdiction in Practice: Authority Without Obligation

Despite these successes, the Somali piracy crisis reveals that the practical effectiveness of universal jurisdiction was considerably more limited than its formal legal framework suggests. While UNCLOS supplied states with authority to apprehend and prosecute suspected pirates, it did not guarantee that prosecutions would occur. The crisis therefore exposed an important distinction between the existence of jurisdiction and its exercise in practice. Article 105 authorises states to prosecute piracy offenders but imposes no corresponding obligation to do so. Consequently, many states participating in counter-piracy operations declined to prosecute suspects because of evidentiary difficulties, financial costs, detention obligations, asylum concerns and the need to comply with human rights standards [18]. This reluctance contributed to the emergence of the widely criticised practice of "catch and release", whereby suspected pirates were disarmed and released without prosecution [19]. Equally significant was the concentration of prosecutions in a limited number of willing jurisdictions, particularly Kenya and Seychelles. Although universal jurisdiction theoretically permits all states to prosecute piracy, responsibility in practice fell disproportionately upon a small group of regional states [20]. This suggests that the effectiveness of universal jurisdiction depended less upon the legal framework itself than upon the willingness and capacity of individual states to undertake prosecutions.

The Somali experience therefore challenges claims that the success of counter-piracy operations can be attributed solely to universal jurisdiction under UNCLOS. Rather, prosecutions frequently depended upon supplementary mechanisms, including transfer agreements, domestic implementing legislation, regional judicial cooperation and sustained political commitment [21]. Universal jurisdiction enabled enforcement, but it did not itself guarantee prosecution. The Somali experience therefore demonstrates that universal jurisdiction provides an enabling framework for enforcement, but its practical operation depends upon political will, prosecutorial capacity and institutional support. While UNCLOS supplied the jurisdictional basis for counter-piracy operations, effective implementation ultimately relied upon broader cooperative and institutional arrangements operating beyond the Convention itself.

Limitations of The UNCLOS Piracy Regime

The Somali piracy crisis exposed significant limitations within the UNCLOS piracy regime despite demonstrating the continuing relevance of universal jurisdiction. While Articles 100 and 105 provided an essential legal foundation for counter-piracy operations, the crisis revealed structural deficiencies that constrained the regime's effectiveness when confronted with contemporary organised piracy. These limitations concerned the territorial scope of the Convention, the absence of a coherent prosecution framework, the growing influence of human rights obligations and the disconnect between the traditional conception of piracy embodied in UNCLOS and the realities of modern criminal networks.

Territorial Jurisdiction and the Limits of the High-Seas Model

A central weakness of the UNCLOS framework is its geographical restriction of piracy to acts occurring on the high seas or outside the jurisdiction of any state [22]. While consistent with the traditional conception of piracy, this approach proved inadequate during the Somali crisis. Pirate groups routinely launched attacks in international waters but transported hijacked vessels and hostages into Somali territorial waters, where detention, logistics and ransom negotiations were coordinated [23]. Consequently, important elements of piracy operations occurred beyond the reach of Article 105 enforcement powers. This limitation became particularly acute because Somalia lacked the institutional capacity to police its territorial waters effectively. Pirate groups were therefore able to exploit these waters as operational sanctuaries. The adoption of United Nations Security Council Resolution 1816, authorising cooperating states

to undertake counter-piracy operations within Somali territorial waters with the consent of the Transitional Federal Government, reflected recognition that UNCLOS alone was insufficient to address the spatial realities of Somali piracy [24]. The necessity of Security Council intervention demonstrates that the Convention's high-seas model struggled to address piracy originating from areas characterised by state collapse and weak maritime governance.

The Prosecution Deficit: Jurisdiction Without Accountability

The Somali experience also revealed a significant gap between jurisdictional authority and criminal accountability. Article 105 authorises states to prosecute piracy suspects but imposes no obligation to do so. Unlike treaties incorporating the principle of *aut dedere aut judicare* (extradite or prosecute), UNCLOS leaves prosecution to state discretion. In practice, many states participating in counter-piracy operations were reluctant to prosecute suspects because of evidentiary difficulties, financial costs, detention obligations and asylum concerns [25]. This reluctance contributed to the widely criticised practice of "catch and release", whereby piracy suspects were apprehended and disarmed but subsequently released without prosecution [26]. Although such interventions disrupted attacks, they often failed to establish meaningful accountability. The absence of an obligation to prosecute also created a burden-sharing problem. While universal jurisdiction theoretically permits all states to prosecute piracy, responsibility became concentrated in a small number of willing jurisdictions, particularly Kenya, Seychelles and Mauritius [27]. Effective prosecutions therefore depended heavily upon transfer agreements and regional cooperation arrangements developed outside the UNCLOS framework. The Somali crisis consequently demonstrated that jurisdiction alone does not ensure accountability. Rather, successful prosecutions required supplementary legal and institutional arrangements capable of filling gaps left by the Convention.

Human Rights Constraints on Enforcement

The Somali piracy crisis further demonstrated that universal jurisdiction operates within an increasingly complex human rights environment. States engaged in counter-piracy operations remained bound by international obligations relating to fair trial rights, detention standards, non-refoulement and protection from inhuman or degrading treatment [28]. These considerations had practical consequences for apprehension, detention, transfer and prosecution decisions. Capturing states frequently assessed whether the transfer of suspects to regional prosecuting

jurisdictions might expose them to unfair trials, inadequate prison conditions, or capital punishment [29]. Human rights concerns also influenced decisions regarding whether suspects should be prosecuted domestically, particularly where long-term detention or post-sentence asylum claims appeared likely [30]. The significance of these developments lies not in the incompatibility of human rights law and counter-piracy enforcement, but in the fact that UNCLOS provides little guidance on how such obligations should be reconciled. Consequently, the practical operation of universal jurisdiction increasingly depends upon legal considerations lying beyond the Convention itself.

Attempted Piracy and Organised Criminal Networks

Perhaps the most fundamental limitation exposed by the Somali crisis concerns the continuing reliance of UNCLOS upon a traditional conception of piracy. Article 101 focuses on completed acts of violence, detention, or depredation committed at sea. The Convention was designed to address individual acts of maritime predation [31], whereas contemporary piracy increasingly operates through organised criminal networks involving financiers, facilitators, negotiators and logistical actors who may never participate directly in attacks at sea [32]. As a result, significant components of modern piracy often fall beyond the Convention's traditional focus on direct perpetrators and completed attacks. This disconnect became particularly evident in relation to attempted piracy. Naval forces frequently intercepted suspects possessing weapons, ladders, grappling hooks and other equipment strongly suggestive of preparations for piracy. Yet UNCLOS does not expressly define attempted piracy as an independent international offence [33]. Consequently, domestic courts were often required to rely upon national legislation and judicial interpretation to determine whether preparatory conduct attracted criminal liability. The differing approaches adopted by states undermined the consistency that universal jurisdiction is intended to promote.

More broadly, Somali piracy demonstrated that contemporary maritime crime extends well beyond the piracy attack itself. The profitability and sustainability of piracy depended upon complex onshore support structures that financed operations, coordinated logistics and facilitated ransom negotiations. Many of these actors fall outside the traditional scope of piracy liability under UNCLOS. The Convention therefore remains focused on direct perpetrators, whereas contemporary piracy increasingly resembles a form of organised transnational criminality. The Somali crisis consequently exposed a wider structural mismatch between the classical model of piracy embodied in UNCLOS and the realities of modern maritime criminal enterprises.

Beyond UNCLOS: The Role of Security Council Resolutions

Security Council Adaptation of the Piracy Regime: The limitations identified above did not render UNCLOS irrelevant. Rather, they prompted the development of supplementary legal mechanisms designed to facilitate the practical implementation of the piracy regime. During the Somali piracy crisis, the United Nations Security Council adopted a series of resolutions, most notably Resolutions 1816, 1846, 1851 and 1897, which complemented the UNCLOS framework by addressing jurisdictional, operational and enforcement challenges that the Convention was not designed to resolve [34]. Rather than displacing UNCLOS, these resolutions enabled its effective application under the exceptional conditions created by Somalia's prolonged state collapse. The Security Council performed three important functions. First, it expanded the territorial reach of counter-piracy enforcement. As discussed above, UNCLOS confines piracy enforcement largely to the high seas and other areas beyond national jurisdiction, [35] creating difficulties where pirate operations were coordinated from Somali territorial waters. Yet Somali pirate groups routinely operated across both international waters and Somali territorial waters, using coastal areas as safe havens for detention, logistical coordination and ransom negotiations. Resolution 1816 addressed this enforcement gap by authorising cooperating states, with the consent of Somalia's Transitional Federal Government, to undertake counter-piracy operations within Somali territorial waters. This exceptional authorisation effectively extended the reach of international enforcement beyond the limits ordinarily recognised under UNCLOS, demonstrating that the Convention alone could not adequately respond to piracy originating from a failed state.

Secondly, the Security Council strengthened international cooperation. Although Article 100 UNCLOS imposes a duty upon states to cooperate in the repression of piracy, it provides little guidance regarding the institutional mechanisms required to facilitate such cooperation. Resolutions 1846 and 1851 encouraged closer coordination among states, international organisations and regional actors, promoting intelligence sharing, operational cooperation and joint enforcement efforts. These measures transformed the broadly framed obligation contained in Article 100 into a more practical framework capable of supporting sustained multinational counter-piracy operations. The resolutions therefore complemented UNCLOS by providing the political and operational structures necessary to translate legal obligations into effective collective action.

Thirdly, the Security Council sought to address weaknesses in prosecution and enforcement. As

discussed in Section 4, universal jurisdiction did not automatically translate into effective criminal accountability. Therefore, although UNCLOS grants states jurisdiction to prosecute pirates, it provides limited guidance regarding the investigation, transfer, detention and prosecution of suspects [36]. Resolution 1897 recognised that effective piracy suppression depended not merely on apprehending offenders but on establishing credible mechanisms for criminal accountability [37]. The Resolution consequently encouraged greater cooperation in investigation and prosecution, supported regional judicial capacity-building and reinforced efforts to develop prosecution frameworks capable of converting arrests into successful convictions. These efforts helped address some of the accountability gaps that emerged from the discretionary nature of prosecution under Article 105.

The Somali experience therefore illustrates that the success of international counter-piracy efforts cannot be attributed to UNCLOS in isolation. Rather, it resulted from the interaction between the Convention's universal jurisdiction framework and supplementary Security Council measures designed to overcome jurisdictional, institutional and operational deficiencies. The resolutions did not replace UNCLOS; instead, they revealed its limitations and supplied the additional authorities necessary for effective enforcement. More broadly, they demonstrate that universal jurisdiction remains an indispensable foundation for piracy suppression but requires complementary legal and institutional mechanisms if it is to function effectively against contemporary forms of organised maritime crime.

CONCLUSION

The Somali piracy crisis constitutes the most significant contemporary test of the universal jurisdiction regime established under the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS). This article has demonstrated that universal jurisdiction remains both legally significant and operationally relevant in the suppression of piracy. Through Articles 100 and 105, UNCLOS provided the legal foundation for international cooperation, maritime interdiction and the prosecution of suspected pirates, thereby reaffirming the continuing importance of piracy as an offence of universal concern and the central role of universal jurisdiction in protecting maritime security and freedom of navigation. At the same time, the Somali crisis exposed important deficiencies in the UNCLOS framework that became apparent when the Convention was applied to a sophisticated form of transnational maritime criminality. The crisis revealed the challenges of relying on a legal regime originally designed to address traditional acts of maritime predation when confronted with organised criminal networks operating across

multiple jurisdictions and maritime zones. As a result, the practical operation of universal jurisdiction frequently depended upon legal, institutional and operational mechanisms operating beyond the Convention itself.

The principal contribution of this article is to challenge the assumption that the success of Somali counter-piracy operations demonstrates the effectiveness of the UNCLOS piracy regime in isolation. The Somali experience instead reveals a more nuanced reality: universal jurisdiction provided the legal authority necessary for enforcement, but effective piracy suppression depended upon a broader governance architecture comprising Security Council authorisations, regional prosecution arrangements, multinational naval operations and capacity-building initiatives. The crisis therefore demonstrates not the sufficiency of universal jurisdiction, but its dependence on complementary legal and institutional mechanisms. Accordingly, the Somali experience suggests that the future effectiveness of international piracy suppression will depend not only on preserving the universal jurisdiction framework established by UNCLOS, but also on strengthening the broader governance structures that enable that framework to operate effectively in practice. As maritime security challenges continue to evolve in regions such as the Gulf of Guinea, the Red Sea and Southeast Asia, successful responses are likely to require the same integrated approach that ultimately contributed to the suppression of Somali piracy.

REFERENCE

1. Harding, Christopher. "Hostis Humani Generis: The Pirate as Outlaw in the Early Modern Law of the Sea." *Pirates? The Politics of Plunder, 1550-1650*, edited by Claire Jowitt, Palgrave Macmillan, 2007, p. 20.
2. United Nations. *United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea*. Adopted 10 Dec. 1982, entered into force 16 Nov. 1994, art. 100.
3. He, Zhaoyang, *et al.* "Assessment of Global Shipping Risk Caused by Maritime Piracy." *Heliyon*, vol. 9, 2023. Ágoston, Pászka Imre. "Maritime Piracy as an International Crime in the 21st Century." *Belvedere Meridionale*, vol. 30, 2018, p. 96.
4. International Maritime Organization. *GISIS Reports on Acts of Piracy and Armed Robbery Against Ships: Annual Reports 2005-2012*. He, Zhaoyang, *et al.* "Assessment of Global Shipping Risk Caused by Maritime Piracy." *Heliyon*, vol. 9, 2023.
5. Lucas, Edward R. "Somalia's 'Pirate Cycle': The Three Phases of Somali Piracy." *Journal of Strategic Security*, vol. 6, 2013, p. 55. Weldemichael, Awet Tewelde. "International Counter-Piracy as a Means and an End." *Piracy in Somalia: Violence and Development in the Horn of Africa*, Cambridge University Press, 2019, p. 171. Treves, Tullio. "Piracy, Law of the Sea and Use of Force: Developments off the Coast of Somalia." *European Journal of International Law*, vol. 20, 2009, p. 399.

- Gardner, Maggie. “Piracy Prosecutions in National Courts.” *Journal of International Criminal Justice*, vol. 10, 2012, p. 797.
- Paige, Tamsin. “Piracy and Universal Jurisdiction.” *Macquarie Law Journal*, vol. 12, 2013, p. 131.
- Qureshi, Waseem Ahmad. “The Prosecution of Pirates and the Enforcement of Counter-Piracy Laws Are Virtually Incapacitated by Law Itself.” *San Diego International Law Journal*, vol. 19, 2017, p. 95.
- Ehiane, Stanley and Dominique Uwizeyimana. “Exploring Maritime Piracy and Somalia National Security.” *International Journal of Membrane Science and Technology*, vol. 10, 2023, p. 3128.
- Sumaila, U. Rashid and Mahamudu Bawumia. “Fisheries, Ecosystem Justice and Piracy: A Case Study of Somalia.” *Fisheries Research*, vol. 157, 2014, p. 154.
6. Shearer, Ivan Anthony. “Piracy.” *Max Planck Encyclopedia of Public International Law*, edited by R. Wolfrum, Oxford University Press, 2010, para. 2.
7. Galgano, Francis A. “Hostis Humani Generis’: Pirates and Global Maritime Commerce.” *Research in Globalization*, vol. 8, 2024, article 100188.
8. United Nations. *United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea*, art. 101. Guilfoyle, Douglas. *Shipping Interdiction and the Law of the Sea*. Cambridge University Press, 2009, pp. 31–33.
9. Geiß, Robin and Anna Petrig. *Piracy and Armed Robbery at Sea: The Legal Framework for Counter-Piracy Operations in Somalia and the Gulf of Aden*. Oxford University Press, 2011, pp. 61–73. Guilfoyle, Douglas. “Counter-Piracy Law Enforcement and Human Rights.” *International and Comparative Law Quarterly*, vol. 59, 2010, pp. 141, 144–146.
10. Murphy, Martin N. *Somalia, the New Barbary? Piracy and Islam in the Horn of Africa*. Hurst & Company, 2011, p. 32. Lehr, Peter. *Violence at Sea: Piracy in the Age of Global Terrorism*. Routledge, 2007, p. 129.
11. Rubin, Alfred P. *The Law of Piracy*. University Press of the Pacific, 2006, pp. 343–350. Hansen, Stig Jarle. *Piracy in the Greater Gulf of Aden: Myths, Misconceptions and Remedies*. Norwegian Institute for Urban and Regional Research, 2009, pp. 17–24. Pham, J. Peter. “Putting Somali Piracy in Context.” *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, vol. 28, 2010, p. 325. World Bank. *The Pirates of Somalia: Ending the Threat, Rebuilding a Nation*. World Bank, 2013, pp. 85–111.
12. United Nations Security Council. *Report of the Secretary-General Pursuant to Security Council Resolution 1950 (2010)*. 25 Oct. 2011, S/2011/662.
13. Guilfoyle, Douglas. “Piracy off Somalia: UN Security Council Resolution 1816 and IMO Regional Counter-Piracy Efforts.” *International and Comparative Law Quarterly*, vol. 57, 2008, pp. 690–696. European Union External Action Service. [Reference incomplete in the supplied information].
14. Treves, Tullio. “Piracy, Law of the Sea and Use of Force: Developments off the Coast of Somalia.” *European Journal of International Law*, vol. 20, 2009, pp. 399, 401–403. Bueger, Christian. “Learning from Piracy: Future Challenges of Maritime Security Governance.” *Global Affairs*, vol. 1, 2015, pp. 33–36.
15. International Maritime Organization. *Interim Guidance to Private Maritime Security Companies Providing Privately Contracted Armed Security Personnel on Board Ships in the High-Risk Area*. MSC.1/Circ.1443, 25 May 2012. *Best Management Practices for Protection against Somalia-Based Piracy (BMP4)*. Aug. 2011.
16. *United States v. Abduwali Abdukhadir Muse*. 756 F. Supp. 2d 391 (S.D.N.Y. 2010).
17. *Republic v. Hassan M. Ahmed*. [2009] eKLR.
18. Kontorovich, Eugene and Steven Art. “An Empirical Examination of Universal Jurisdiction for Piracy.” *American Journal of International Law*, vol. 104, 2010, pp. 436, 445–447. Guilfoyle, Douglas. “Counter-Piracy Law Enforcement and Human Rights.” *International and Comparative Law Quarterly*, vol. 59, 2010, p. 144.
19. Kontorovich, Eugene. “A Guantanamo on the Sea: The Difficulty of Prosecuting Pirates and Terrorists.” *California Law Review*, vol. 98, 2010, pp. 243, 252–259.
20. Karim, M. D. Saiful. “Prosecution of Maritime Pirates: The National Court Is Dead, Long Live the National Court?” *Wisconsin International Law Journal*, vol. 32, 2014, pp. 64, 82–85.
21. Geiß, Robin and Anna Petrig. *Piracy and Armed Robbery at Sea: The Legal Framework for Counter-Piracy Operations in Somalia and the Gulf of Aden*. Oxford University Press, 2011, pp. 190–209. Gardner, Maggie. “Piracy Prosecutions in National Courts.” *Journal of International Criminal Justice*, vol. 10, 2012, pp. 797, 800–809.
22. United Nations. *United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea*, art. 101.
23. Hansen, Stig Jarle. *Piracy in the Greater Gulf of Aden: Myths, Misconceptions and Remedies*. Norwegian Institute for Urban and Regional Research, 2009. Bahadur, Jay. *The Pirates of Somalia: Inside Their Hidden World*. Vintage Books, 2012.
24. United Nations Security Council. *Resolution 1816 (2008)*. Adopted 2 June 2008, S/RES/1816 (2008).
25. Kontorovich, Eugene and Steven Art. “An Empirical Examination of Universal Jurisdiction for Piracy.” *American Journal of International Law*, vol. 104, 2010, p. 445.
26. Kontorovich, Eugene. “A Guantanamo on the Sea: The Difficulty of Prosecuting Pirates and Terrorists.” *California Law Review*, vol. 98, 2010, pp. 243–259.
27. Karim, M. D. Saiful. “Prosecution of Maritime Pirates: The National Court Is Dead, Long Live the National Court?” *Wisconsin International Law Journal*, vol. 32, 2014, pp. 64–85.
28. Guilfoyle, Douglas. “Counter-Piracy Law Enforcement and Human Rights.” *International and Comparative Law Quarterly*, vol. 59, 2010, p. 144.
29. *Medvedyev and Others v. France*. (2010) 51 EHRR 39.
30. Geiß, Robin and Anna Petrig. *Piracy and Armed Robbery at Sea: The Legal Framework for Counter-Piracy Operations in Somalia and the Gulf of Aden*. Oxford University Press, 2011, pp. 202–215.
31. United Nations. *United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea*, art. 101.
32. World Bank, United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime and INTERPOL. *Pirate Trails: Tracking the Illicit Financial Flows from Pirate Activities off the Horn of Africa*. World Bank, 2013.

33. *Re Mohamud Mohamed Dashi & Others*. [2010] KEHC 4129 (KLR).
United Nations. *United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea*, art. 101.
34. United Nations Security Council. *Resolution 1816*. 2 June 2008, S/RES/1816.
United Nations Security Council. *Resolution 1846*. 2 Dec. 2008, S/RES/1846.
United Nations Security Council. *Resolution 1851*. 16 Dec. 2008, S/RES/1851.
United Nations Security Council. *Resolution 1897*. 30 Nov. 2009, S/RES/1897.
35. United Nations. *United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea*, art. 101.
36. United Nations. *United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea*, art. 105.
37. Nanda, Ved P. and Jonathan Bellish. "Moving from Crisis Management to a Sustainable Solution for Somali Piracy: Selected Initiatives and the Role of International Law." *Case Western Reserve Journal of International Law*, vol. 46, 2013, pp. 43, 59–64.