

## Discussion

PARK Nohyoung\*

With respect to the presentation of Professor Hausner, she suggested a need for the definition of ‘dual naming’ and ‘multiple naming’ in the Manual for the national standardization of geographical names of the UN Group of Experts on Geographical Names. The suggested approach might be considered for international standardization of geographical names. She also gave a fresh idea on the culture aspect of geographical names especially in the context of the UN system including the UNESCO. It is to be emphasized that toponyms are recognized as ‘part of the intangible cultural heritage’ in the Resolution IX/4 of the UN Conference on Standardization of Geographical Names. In particular those criteria for protecting geographical names as cultural heritage in Resolution X/3, as appropriately highlighted by Prof. Hausner, should be more studied and further developed. By depositing the acceptance in 2004 and in 2005 respectively, Japan and Korea are States Parties to the 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, which entered into force in 2006.

With respect to the presentation of Mr. Pokoly, he explained the practice of Hungary on the alternative names of a maritime feature by focusing on the Caribbean Sea. As always, his presentation was so clear and vivid with a lot of evidences.

With respect to the presentation of Prof. Raper, he explained the status of the East Sea in terms of international law. He surprised us with his thorough knowledge of law in addition to his own expertise in geography. His effort for suggesting a draft resolution in his presentation should be appropriately appreciated. His every valuable point should be discussed, only a few points are discussed due to time limit. First, with respect to this original presentation, one fact should be explained on the meeting of the International Hydrographic Organization (IHO) in 2012. Japan suddenly gave a proposal to the effect that Japan Sea is the only name for the sea between Korean

---

\* Professor, Korea University, Korea

Peninsula and Japanese Archipelagos. Nevertheless, Japanese proposal was given only one support. That was Japan herself. Thus, the use of “Japan Sea” as the only name for the sea area was rejected. Although the proposal of Japan was opposed by several members, it should be admitted that most members of the IHO seemed to be hesitant to get involved in the discussion. Thus, the message in the meeting of the IHO at that time was that the matter should be resolved by the mutual agreement between the countries concerned. Second, as Prof. Raper mentioned, “the limits used in the SP-23 have no legal or political significance whatsoever.” What this means really should be understood properly. To put it simply, this means that other values such as history, culture and identity with respect to geographical names should be respected. This understanding may have something common with what Prof. Hausner suggested on the toponymic heritage previously. Third, Prof. Raper rightly mentioned that the East Sea is not “under the sovereignty of more than one country” as defined in the preamble to Resolution III/20 after finding that it is a geographically shared feature. However, that preamble has another point of consideration. That is “geographical features ... are divided among two or more countries”. Although it should be more developed, this consideration may certainly fit the case of the East Sea. This point of consideration in the preamble has been intentionally ignored by Japan in order to reject the applicability of this Resolution to the case.