

## Discussion

LEE Won-deog\*

This session's main topic is international relations, naming disputes and solutions. Three papers were presented.

Professor Peter Kang's paper deals with the naming dispute of South China Sea from the geopolitical point of view. Professor Peter Roell's paper focuses on the importance of crisis management of South China Sea in the international politics' perspective. Professor Lee Chang-Wee's paper puts emphasis on the problem of delimitation of maritime boundaries around the Korean peninsula in international law's view.

Even though the majors of these three professors differ from international politics to geopolitics to international law, all three papers commonly deal with East Asian Sea issues. Although I lack professional knowledge on the East Asian Sea issues because my field of study is Japanese politics and Korea-Japan relations, I enjoyed reading these papers and gaining knowledge and information in this field.

One thing I realized from reading the papers is that East Asian countries are competing and conflicting over the interest and power the sea provides and that the naming dispute is not simply about geographical problems but also about such profit and power for each nation. In order to peacefully deal with the dispute and ultimately pursue safety and peace of the sea, I believe that establishing an international order or rules that all nations can agree to and follow is the most important step.

Since there is a time limit, I will be commenting on and asking questions about each of the three papers in order.

---

\* Professor, Kookmin University, Korea

First, regarding Prof. Kang's paper.

The naming of the sea now has the tendency to becoming very closely related to claiming the territorial sovereignty rather than a simple geographical reference. To this, I agree.

In this sense, the other East Asian nations are voicing oppositions to the name "East China Sea" because it feels as if China's exclusive profit is being advocated. Hence, Professor Kang's claiming that the South China Sea be renamed as geographically neutral "Southeast Asia Sea" is very creative and clever that I fully agree with it.

There are two reasons why he can argue this.

First, since the 15th century, even China called South China Sea Jiaozho Yang (ancient name of Vietnam), Sea of Cham. But, this had no implications on territorial sovereignty and simply had geographical reference.

Second, after the concept of EEZ was declared in 1982, the toponyms started having political and economic meanings, coastal states around South China Sea began naming their nearby seas according to their own profits. For example, East Sea by Vietnam, Luzon Sea or West Philippines Sea by the Philippines.

Here, I have two questions for Prof. Kang.

Number one. I think it is very likely that China will be fiercely opposed to the renaming of the toponym of the sea. Is there a specific way to draw out China's cooperation on this issue? Does it not require full agreement from the IHO in order to change the toponym?

Number two. Seeing from Professor Kang's paper, *Japan Sea* also share the same problem of feeling as if Japan is given exclusive rights. Despite the fact that the names "East Sea", "Joseon Sea", Korea Sea" appear on the old maps, since the 19th century, after Imperial Japan, the name "Japan Sea" has become the general name in the international society. And so this is hard for both South and North Korea to accept. Accordingly, until international consensus is settled, Korea is advocating the simultaneous use of *Japan Sea* and *East Sea* instead of just Japan Sea. What do you think about this? From a third person's point of view?

Moving on to Professor Peter Roell's paper:

It is a relief that the Senkaku issue between Japan and China in the East China Sea is in the process of making a crisis management mechanism through Japan–China summit.

Due to China's expansionism in sprately in South China Sea and the establishment of a rig in the sea near Vietnam, the conflict over South China Sea has become intensified. The solution to this conflict as well as crisis management mechanism is highly in need.

In order to solve the East and South China Seas' conflicts, international law, cooperation and negotiations among nations are important rather than using physical force. To settle the conflict, it is necessary to build trust among nations and also for EU Intelligence Center to strengthen the monitoring of East Asian conflicts. The ten recommendations Prof. Rorell suggests were very meaningful and advisable.

Recently, many of the East Asian nations on one hand seem to maintain either military alliance or close partnership with America and on the other hand rely heavily on China for economic market. Although reliance levels differ for each, Japan, Korea, Australia, New Zealand and more all are representative nations. In reaction to China's sudden rise to hegemony, the United States is trying to stop and protect those countries that are being influenced.

Here, I would like to raise two questions for Professor Roell.

First: East Asia is going through a kind of power transition now. Can the Asia–Pacific area be under peaceful control through the new type of major–power relationship as China advocates, or is clash between America and China inevitable?

The second question relates to the first question: You have a pretty low evaluation of China's current military power in East Asian Sea. How long do you think it's going to take for China to match up with the U.S.–Japan alliance?

Lastly, let me comment on and ask some questions to Professor Lee.

Maritime boundaries delimitation around the Korean peninsula is still flexible and unsettled. The only certain agreements are Agreement on the Boundary of the Northern continental Shelf in 1974 and Korea–Japan fisheries agreement over the *East Sea* in 1999. But despite the fisheries agreement, not much is settled about continental shelf, EEZ, meaning that there is still much room for conflict.

The reasons for the difficulty of settling the maritime boundaries delimitation between Korea and Japan are: 1) conflict over the Dokdo issue 2) the difference between the two nations' opinions on the settlement criteria over continental shelf, EEZ.

The paper was very clear-cut and detailed. Very easy to understand. It helped a great deal in understanding the maritime issues around the Korean peninsula.

Here, I will raise three questions:

First one: I think it's realistically impossible to settle the maritime boundaries delimitation between Korea and Japan because there exists the Dokdo issue between them. Is it realistically possible to try settling the maritime boundaries delimitation regardless of the Dokdo issue? In other words, what do you think about preceding the continental shelf, EEZ agreement and leaving Dokdo issue in the shade (dana age)?

Second: The paper argues that there is a huge implication that the maritime boundaries delimitation issue has on naming problem. What exactly is this implication? This is an extreme hypothesis, but if the delimitation of East Sea is settled, does it mean that the west side of East Sea can be named *East Sea* and the east side Japan Sea?

The last question is: Although when compared to Dokdo, it is a rather small issue, there exists ee-uh island issue between Korea and China. Does this affect the settlement of continental shelf, fishery, or EEZ? Or is it a simple territorial issue regardless of profit?