

The *East Sea*: Peace, Education, and Geographical Naming

Joseph P. STOLTMAN*

INTRODUCTION

My initial introduction to the *East Sea* geographical naming issue was in 2000 in South Korea. Years earlier as a student, I was familiar with the body of water between the Korean Peninsula and the Japanese Archipelago. It had been cartographically displayed as the *Sea of Japan* in my elementary and high school textbooks in geography and history. There was never any question raised regarding the name. It was authoritative and accurate to my young eyes and map reading assignments from my teachers, and my own inquisitive meanderings as I explored the world on maps. However, there was a hidden dimension beneath the map pages that my classmates and I were viewing and accepting as accurate. It was the hidden story of the body of water and the name that was not on the maps we were using in our studies. The hidden sea name would not be printed on western world maps or in western world textbooks until early in the 21st century. The hidden name was the *East Sea*, the name given to the same body of water by Korean people 1000 years ago.

There was more to the name of the body of water than appeared in atlases, maps, and textbook used by multitudes of students and others outside of Korea. The name *East Sea* was practically unknown to practitioners of geography in the west, except for the few who researched toponyms, both historical and contemporary. My encounter in 2000 with the *East Sea* geographical naming issue was quite by chance, but it left an indelible mark on my mental map of the world's oceans and seas. Why had not I, as a schoolboy and more recently as a university professor of geography, become aware of the naming issue. Moreover, the *East Sea* name had been reintroduced to geopolitics by the Republic of Korea in 1992 at the United Nations Conference on the Standardization of Geographical Names. It had taken eight years for the *East Sea* naming issue to attract my attention, and I was interested in geographical names. The name *East Sea* would simply not register with most people unfamiliar with the significance of the name within Korean culture.

* Professor, Western Michigan University, U.S.A.

Since 2000, I have become increasingly attentive to the *East Sea* geographical naming issue. The inclusion of the *East Sea* name on all maps is an important goal for the Koreans, but has been resisted intently by the government of Japan. As a means to open dialogue regarding the naming issue, the Koreans have suggested that dual naming, or the inclusion of both names on the water body. Dual-naming the body of water with each of the names, both *East Sea* and *Sea of Japan*, has been offered as an acceptable first step in resolving the naming issue. There has been little progress among government boards of geographical names to accept the suggestion of dual naming. This is largely the result of policies that adhere to a “one geographical feature one name”. While governmental organizations have adhered to the “one geographical feature one name”, the map, atlas, and textbook publishers have accepted the need for dual naming and their products have increasingly represented the body of water between the Korean Peninsula and the Japanese Archipelago with two names. However, beyond the peninsula and the archipelago, there is little interest in the geographical naming issue as a priority in the foreign ministries or departments of state in other countries.

I believe there are four important considerations within the context of the *East Sea/Sea of Japan* geographical naming issue. They are peace, civic participation, educational value, and the philosophy of right. Each adds value to knowing about geographical naming issues, or the right to know. Each of the four has a distinct role and none are mutually exclusive of the others.

PEACE

As one observes 21st century conflicts, peace is readily discussed, but peace has often proven to be an elusive. There are always places engaged in war somewhere in the world. We read about the ravages of war every day, 24/7, on our social media and real-time global communications. War rather than peace dominates the attention of news media. Belligerent nationalist, regular, irregular, and stateless militant groups ravage populations and cross international borders. The intent is to terrorize, exploit, and control the local people.

On the other hand, there are distinct rays of hope for peace from a number of different places and occasions. Europe as a region has enjoyed more than 70 years of peace, the longest in its modern history. The blemishes on that record are the conflicts in the former Yugoslavia post-1989 and the all too frequent acts of terrorism in the more recent past. Europe, often visited by war in its history, has set a new model for the attainment of peace built on international collaboration to address political, social, and economic issues. Regular dialogue and a shared belief in cooperation have demonstrated that the summative values aspired to by Europeans complement their individual and national values. The forthcoming departure of the United Kingdom from the European Union is not a test of Europe’s ability to sustain peace. The United Kingdom can leave the European Union, but the United Kingdom cannot leave Europe. Europe has a major stake in maintaining the peace despite economic, political, and social issues that fray the edges of regional stability and national commitments to resolve those issues in a peaceful manner.

On a global geographic scale, we cannot abandon the prospects of a peaceful world without conflict and war. The 2016 Nobel Prize for Peace provides an example of the fickle nature of peace and the hopes for ending the conflict in Colombia that has raged for decades. Since 1901, the Nobel Prize has been awarded to individuals and to organizations. The Nobel Prize was awarded to 24 international organizations, with the International Committee for the Red Cross and United Nation affiliated agencies awarded prizes more than once. The Quakers, long recognized for their promotion of peace, were awarded the prize in both the United Kingdom and United States in 1947. The only political unit to receive the prize was the European Union, which received the award in 2012 (Nobel Media AB, 2016). During the 115-year period of the award, 104 individual Nobel laureates have received the award.

Why is the Nobel Prize for Peace important in the contexts of territory, boundaries, toponyms, and national identity? I think each of the individuals and organizations that received the Nobel Prize have reflected visions of peace that we do not consider often enough. We tend to view peace as the cessation of hostilities. However, what follows peace agreements? I want to delve into what may be the larger meaning of peace for the organizations and individuals who have been awarded the Nobel Peace Prize.

Peace researcher Istban Kende (1989) studied the meaning of peace as it was viewed over a lengthy period of time, and mainly in Europe. The period he researched was from the late Middle Ages to the mid-19th century. I would add that this period was not particularly well known for its peacefulness (Wallace-Hadrill, 1975), and represented some of Europe's most horrific periods of conflict.

Kende's research focused on how changes in the human ideas about the world altered their views of peace. He examined the human elements of society, geopolitics, and economic production with the expectation that each of those contributed to a context for peace. During the period of kingdoms and empires, it was either war or marriage that formed territorial and political entities and compacts which brought about peace. The period of colonization in the 17th, 18th, and 19th centuries resulted in distant wars waged outside of Europe, often involving indigenous peoples caught within spheres of control by European countries. The cessation of colonial territorial wars was, in most cases, a peaceful arrangement for people of European ancestry living in the colonies. However, that was not the case for indigenous people who had been subjugated and forced to adapt a lifestyle or participate in an exploitive economic system that was detrimental to their existence.

Often the ending of one war signaled the preparation for another territorial claim for economic or military advantages, leading to yet another war. Peace was often short lived. There were few efforts, other than marriage or subjugation, that encouraged the continuation of peace. With that absence of preparation and fostering of peace, Kende developed a principle that we do not often hear expressed at the conclusion of conflict. It is a significant observation from across the ages. In Kende's words, it was the principle that "Peace is More than No War" (Kende, 1989).

PEACE IS MORE THAN NO WAR

Peace is often viewed simply as the absence or cessation of war. However, peace is more than no war. Peace also includes the future improvement of life and well-being of individuals and groups of people who were affected by war. Peace provides the opportunity for and realization of social justice. When wrongs or inequities were standard fare during times of conflict, the arrival of peace provides the opportunity to address those wrongdoings through reconciliation or rule of law. The end of apartheid in South Africa, civil war in Uganda, dictatorship in Chile, and military junta in Argentina were examples of transitional social justice accompanying the movement from conflict to peace. The arrival of peace is an opportunity for introspective reflection – both about the past and the future – for people and their political, military, social, and economic institutions. Planning for peace is equally as important as is planning for war.

The arrival of peace is not just the signing of documents ending a conflict; that is just the first step. Changing the views of issues as being resolvable rather than irresolvable requires considerable work. Dialogues, negotiations, collaboration, and the absolving of long standing issues in order to attain harmony among the parties involved is required. Peace is more than just no war. It is progress towards stability and cooperation between and among peoples and countries in the absence of conflict.

What is necessary to preserve peace? After basic human needs are met, the peace dialogue must ensure that the topics representing painful aftermaths to a period of conflict are addressed and that a peaceful future is uppermost among individuals and institutions. Among the many ideals to which people subscribe at the end of conflict are human rights that provide a clear vision for the future. For example, the principle that all people are entitled to a free, quality education that addresses human rights, freedom of education, and global diversity (Unesco, 2016) is a necessary component of the peace process. When stewarded well, peace results in reforms in the social well-being of the population. Peace permits the weaving of new relationships among countries and closer interactions between and among peoples in ethnically diverse contexts. Peace should bring a steady improvement in the quality of life for everyone. The rising tide of peace should carry all boats to a higher, more satisfying well-being. Make no mistake; it is necessary to abolish war in order to have peace, but peace thrives on its own in the absence of war when dialogues of commitment to a peaceful future persist. Peace is not frozen in time, but is dynamic and continually challenges the status quo. Peace enables new visions of the future. Peace unleashes the capacity to contribute to a positive worldview among all people, but especially those who have witnessed the negative aspects of conflict.

Participatory government and openness of personal expression and dialogue with others are complementary elements of peace. The emergence of social movements by individuals and groups provides the opportunity to express needs and aspirations, and to look both inward and outward from a national to an international perspective. I refer to this as civic participation. Constructing the social fabric of peace is an important element of moving forward when there is no war and civic participation is fostered. Getting people to examine and discuss the issues they face in forging a better world for

them and pursuant generations are a powerful contrast to thoughts of war. Understanding the world and the individual contexts that people share are similar to the functioning of a busy intermodal transportation center. Each individual passing through the center has a particular destination, but collectively we share the means – trains, subways, airlines, automobiles, bicycles – that we expect to get us to our destination. An enduring peace is comparable to the intermodal transportation center where people aspire to a destination and are prepared to make choices regarding the journey.

There was international shock when the Columbian electorate voted on October 2, 2016, to reject the peace agreement negotiated after 52 years of conflict between the government and the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC) movement. There have been numerous explanations for the negative vote cast against the agreement by 50.2% of voters. Was it a vote against peace? Or, was it a vote that peace means more than no war? Analyses of the vote revealed numerous elements of the agreement that constituent groups did not like. There was not a clear winner and loser in the agreement. Specific aspects of the conflict, such as kidnappings, executions, and war crimes were not addressed adequately to meet the expectations of some groups and individuals. It was an example that peace means more than no war, and much that needed to occur for a lasting peace was going to occur after the fighting stopped. A second peace accord was negotiated and signed on November 24, 2016.

We do not know for certain the eventual outcome of the peace process in Columbia. However, we do know that there are considerations of justice, rule of law, and reconstitution of a civil society that needs to occur during the peace. Columbians have declared that dialogue and civic participation are the most effective weapons. While the conflict in Columbia raged, there was little opportunity to address the issues that would follow the arrival of peace. Columbians had viewed the same conflict from different sides and it is now necessary for the two sides to convince constituents that peace is more than no war. It will require civic participation and dialogue beyond the ballot box to reconcile the remaining issues of social justice and moral responsibility, both importing building blocks for a sustained peace.

THE RIGHT TO KNOW: MARITIME NAMING

Restoring the name of a body of water to its original name seems to have the characteristics of a peaceful process, a process built on evidence, social justice, and civil deliberations. The right to know about the naming issue is protected in societies that have open and free access to educational materials that result in deliberations and informed positions. It is a prime example for students that the war ended, but the issues were not pursued. Peace requires more than the end of war.

The *East Sea* geographical naming issue proposed to the international community of experts and government officials is leftover from military conflict and subjugation through colonialism on the Korean Peninsula in the early 20th century. It is an example of the principle that peace is more than no war, but where the aftermath of the war left some elements unaddressed that were residual from the period of colonization and war. Accounts from the colonial period of 35 years on the Korean Peninsula clearly suggest it consisted of cultural annihilation and the deprivation of human dignity for the Korean

people at the hands of the Japanese civil and military authorities. There were also international deprivations for Korea since its status as a country with a foreign policy and its participation in policy decisions ceased to exist under the colonial government. As with colonial and military occupations throughout history, the colonial control of the Korean Peninsula was intended to diminish the existence of Korean culture and ethnicity.

One example of the total control that was exercised by Japan over Korea was the International Hydrographic Organization (IHO) conference in 1928 and its subsequent report (International Hydrographic Bureau, 1928). This occurred at a critical time in the authorizing of internationally acceptable marine names, including the water body east of the Korean Peninsula.

The *East Sea* was the name used by Koreans, but was not included on the agenda for the IHO conference in 1928. Historical and geographical documents regarding the traditional name, *East Sea*, were not presented as evidence to be deliberated in the 1929 decision by the International Hydrographic Organization's (IHO) decision to adopt the toponym, Japan Sea, for the water body to the east of the Korean Peninsula. Two major reasons led to the IHO adoption of Japan Sea as the officially recognized name. First, the Korean Peninsula was a militarized colony of Japan in 1929 and did not have a Korean representative at the IHO conference on sea names. Second, the most expedient decision was to accept the geographical name most widely used by the world's cartographers and map publishers at the time. Missing from the discussion was evidence regarding the longevity of the *East Sea* name and its importance within Korean culture. The decision on a single name lacked moral considerations and social justice. The official name, *Sea of Japan*, was adopted.

Korea remained a colony of Japan until the end of World War II in 1945. However, the changes made in geographical names in Northeast Asia by the colonial administration of Japan were not fully revisited with the intent of righting colonial wrongs. Post World War II political changes in Northeast Asia were to focus for the next four decades on the belief that peace means no war. Issues that could have been confronted and resolved were deeply buried in the appendices of the volume being written on post-colonial peace topics and never reached a level of prominent dialogue.

Choi (2009) and other scholars from Korea and other countries proposed at the beginning of the 21st century that it was necessary to rectify the residual effects of the 20th century colonialism in Northeast Asia. A reconciliation of the colonial period and its misdeeds would help reinstate the international and inter-human relationships for the 21st century (p. 141). In short, those would require the open discussion of the *East Sea/Sea of Japan* dual naming resolution between South Korea and Japan in addition to Japanese claims to Dokdo, and the long standing humanitarian issue of comfort women forced into servitude by the Japanese military during World War II. The resolution of each of those issues gained in prominence as the future of peace and harmony within the northeast Asian region unfolded.

It is not likely that hostilities between Japan and South Korea would occur in the 21st century over a geographical name. However, the naming issue does present undercurrents that affect the development and continuation of positive international relationships and foreign policies of the countries. While historically obscure to many people, the *East Sea* geographical naming issue is embedded within national norms in both countries. It is deeply important within Korean culture.

Another residual 20th century issue, the Korean comfort women during World War II, was resolved with an apology by the Japanese Prime Minister Abe to South Korean President Park Geun-Hye on December 28, 2015. The agreement to end the 70-year issue was not a perfect resolution of the human rights and human dignity issues and people in both South Korea and Japan questioned or opposed the agreement. However, the agreement and the apology were accepted. International media referred to the agreement as a “win for traditional diplomacy” (Easton, 2015). While it took 70 years to reach an agreement, it does provide hope for the future resolution of the *East Sea* geographical naming issue.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF RIGHT

Hegel, the 19th century philosopher, proposed that countries and people must follow an approach to the resolution of issues that promotes fair-minded cooperation. Engagement in cooperative deliberations is necessary to lay the groundwork and to reach a resolution to a persistent issue. This must be accomplished in an equal and free fashion among the members of society as a common responsibility (Hegel, 2001). Governments, the official peace pursuing agencies, have first responsibility to pursue discourse in favor of maintaining peace. Representative governments are comprised of the people who have both a right and a responsibility to be mindfully engaged in pursuing the benefits of peace. Hegel’s theory, known as the philosophy of right, provided the perspective and opportunity to view the world positively and not simply accept what the world offered. The Koreans are reflecting Hegel’s theory of viewing the world not as it is currently, but as it should be had fair-mindedness and justice been applied in the 20th century.

Immanuel Kant suggested in 1795 in his essay entitled *Perceptual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch* (Kant, 2003), that a true peace among countries may be achieved only if the different entities are participating in a republican (synonymous with democracy) form of government. Kant’s “true peace” is perhaps equivalent to the belief that peace is more than no war. The peace must resolve issues at the time a peace is brokered, or they will persist as residuals for future generations and perhaps fuel the fires of a future conflicts and wars. Both philosophical positions by Hegel and Kant hold promise for the resolution of the *East Sea* geographical naming issue. But, can we wait 70 more years longer?

The *East Sea* geographical naming issue needs several modifications in order to achieve the dual naming, *East Sea/Sea of Japan*. On the one hand, there has been considerable progress made with publishers of maps and textbooks. International cartographic preferences to display both names on maps of local to global scale have increased in the past several decades. There are justified and well-reasoned arguments that both *East Sea* and *Sea of Japan* represent valid dual names on the map. The strength of the argument

for dual naming becomes compelling when archival documents, old maps, verbal accounts, and cultural traditions of the sea name enter into the equation. This is in South Korea's favor. However, the name *Sea of Japan* once dominated the cartographic and map publishing industry globally. Western influences in spreading the name *Sea of Japan* or Japan Sea is attributable to Europe and the center of global explorations. What appeared on one map was copied to other maps as definitive sources. Had *East Sea* been on the early Dutch and English Maps, then it would perhaps have attained the dominance enjoyed by Japan Sea for such a long time. However, the right to know cannot rest on chance. The right to know requires valid, documented information. That alone should bring closure to the question.

On the other hand, progress in convincing the international and governmental organizations of the historical and cultural basis for adding *East Sea* on all published maps and charts has been slow. The naming issue is widely recognized. The United Nations Conference on the Standardization of Geographical Names (UNCSGN), the International Hydrographic Organization (IHO), and the official Boards of Geographic Names for various countries have been approached to review and respond to Korea's request for dual naming based on past evidence and examples of dual naming used with other water bodies. The reluctance to endorse dual naming is justified on the recommended policy that countries sharing a geographical feature with different names should strive to reach an agreement on a single name. If unable to reach an agreement on a single name, then the names used by each of the countries should be accepted.

In theory, it seems like a readily adoptable solution, but in practice it is diplomatically and internationally difficult. It would be widely acceptable if Japan and both Koreas were to engage in a dialogue intent on reaching an acceptable compromise on the naming issues. The compromise could be dual naming, or it could be the renaming of the water body to represent its eastern and western areas with the preferred name by each coastal country, or it could result in a third name that is agreeable to the countries involved (Choo, 2014).

However, it will take dialogue among the countries in Northeast Asia to reach an agreement that can then be presented to the international and national organizations that are the gatekeepers of geographical naming. How might this forward progression on the resolution of the issue occur? I believe it is addressed by the concept of right to know, following on Hegel's philosophy of right.

How is the dual naming of the *East Sea/Sea of Japan* factored into the normal lives of individuals? Let me use the United States as an example. I have held discussions with individuals and groups on the naming issue, but I have not systematically collected research evidence. My reflections are strictly informal observation. It is relatively common for a person in the United States to have no knowledge of the name *East Sea*, and in most cases be unfamiliar with the United States Board of Geographic Names and their official position of one geographic feature, one name. Nearly all U.S. students study the history and political geography of the 20th century. In most curricula they study the colonial activities in Asia, World War II and its aftermath. However, in 1945 the war ends and the focus is turned almost exclusively to Europe, the Iron Curtain, and

the Cold War. It is as if the end of the war resolved all the issues in Northeast Asia. The Korean War is presented in the context of the Cold War ideologies erupting in military conflict on the peninsula. The school textbooks and the curricula present little about the residuals of colonialism and military occupation in Northeast Asia from 1910 to 1945.

There is no national curriculum in the United States. The local educational authorities are the responsibility of individual states. However, there are two common elements that may be observed among most educational authorities. The first similarity is the textbook options for U.S. students in middle and high school. The textbooks are the products of four or five publishing companies which tend to produce similar content for the national market. While some variation can occur, it is generally well known that features in one textbook, if they are successful, will be introduced in other books for the same subject at the same grade. The Commonwealth of Virginia requires, by law, that all social studies books adopted for use in the state are required to use dual naming for the *East Sea/Sea of Japan* if copyrighted after 2015. The Virginia law has the effect of introducing dual naming throughout the United States since no publisher wants to miss the opportunity to sell textbooks in Virginia schools.

Another curriculum characteristic observed in most state curricula is the treatment of democratic values. Those values are presented in the foundational documents for the American democracy, namely the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution with its Bill of Rights. They are often referred to as guiding principles for democracy or core democratic values. Among them are equality and justice. Students examine past and present issues through the lenses of contemporary events and historical and geographical contexts globally. The democratic values become powerful standards to judge the behaviors of governments and individuals, both historically and currently.

The *East Sea* geographical naming issue is appropriate for the application of those values by students in geography and social studies classes. They have the right to know. The issues are embedded within the context of Northeast Asia during the first half of the 20th century. The Korean people suffered immensely under the colonial, military government of the Japanese from 1910 until 1945. This was an injustice. It was during this period that the Korean position on the name *East Sea* for the water body between the two countries was decided without Korean representation or participation. It is the remembrance that the *East Sea* name was largely replaced on most of the maps and charts by *Sea of Japan* as the official name that reminds the Koreans of the injustice. It occurred during a time when Koreans had no voice as a people or as a long established cultural group in Northeast Asia.

Why did this happen and what can be done to resolve injustices such as this? That raises the right to know question for students studying geography, history, and social studies in the 21st century, but with a rearview mirror revealing the events of the prior century. The introduction of dual naming for the *East Sea/Sea of Japan* in educational materials is the entry point for examining social justice as a component of the naming issue. The question could be: Why are two names being promoted for the same body of water? This geographic and historical question may be used to begin an inquiry regarding the residual effects of colonialism on present day societies, with the *East Sea* being used as

a case study. In 21st century education, there is an emphasis on beginning the topics studied with a compelling question. The question engages the students, and in the case of the *East Sea*, there are adequate resource materials available to complete in-depth research regarding the question.

The students' compelling question leads them to discover there are two sides to the *East Sea* naming issue. Each side provides narratives, official documents, maps, photographs, and nearly all have electronic access with linkages that delve more deeply into particular elements of maritime issues. The inquiry may also reveal the policy positions that countries take on issues of geographical dual naming, and in particular with the *East Sea/Sea of Japan*. However, the question regarding whether the dual naming would resolve the residual issue from the period of the early 20th century would remain for informed reasoning and speculation. Only the resolution will provide the answer.

WHAT IS NEXT FOR THE EAST SEA NAMING ISSUE?

While government agencies and geographical naming boards have either been reluctant to or have not approved dual naming, the publishers of maps, atlases and school textbooks have adopted the policy to include both *East Sea* and *Sea of Japan* names on their published materials. Electronic maps are similar and most include both names. However, in some cases the scale of electronic images determines appearance of the names. The general population of school students and people who used electronic maps are being introduced to dual naming of the *East Sea/Sea of Japan*. At some future time the wide spread use of dual naming will influence official policy on the practice and it will become the toponymical norm.

Peace and harmony is a goal for each of the countries in East Asia. The South Korean position favors the dual naming, *East Sea/Sea of Japan*, in the belief that it represents a first step in resolving the geographical naming of the sea as well as other residual issues from the colonial period. This compromise position to accept dual naming would normally receive a counter proposal that would start the dialogue between South Korea and Japan regarding the geographical naming. Such a diplomatic discussion would perhaps bring the two sides into closer alignment on the issue. A dialogue between officials of both countries would extend to increased recognition of the deep cultural attachments to the *East Sea* name by Koreans. This would result in a broader base of support for dual naming among other countries within and outside Northeast Asia.

There must be a continued international collaboration with publishers of maps and textbooks regarding the inclusion of the *East Sea* geographic name concurrently with the *Sea of Japan* name on maps and navigational charts. The dual naming has increased steadily the past decade. Publishers of current maps want their products to represent the most recent preferences in toponyms, and the dual naming has become the popular, if not official, cartographic standard in print and electronically.

Increase the participation by groups of geography, history, and social studies teachers and textbook authors with visits and field studies in South Korea. The diffusion factor from such visits is quite high since teachers pass their knowledge from the visit/field study to their students. A good deal of enthusiasm accompanies the lessons that teachers prepare about

South Korea, and special attention to the geographical naming issue represents a practical example of political geography for students. The networks of geography teachers in the United States, for example, diffuses the dual naming information through teacher workshops, webinars, social media, and at professional conferences. Teachers also design lessons and units of study devoted to the Korean Peninsula that includes the geographical naming issue.

Enlist the collaboration by people of Korean ancestry living in other countries. Generational drift is likely to occur as people of Korean ancestry living elsewhere become more removed from the issues affecting the Korean Peninsula. Keeping people of Korean ancestry informed about activities and progress on the dual naming issue can become a cohesive element for Korean people globally. This outreach to people of Korean ancestry would explore potential avenues for and initiate grassroots political activities at the local and national levels of government. Constituent groups have the influence necessary to convince their policy makers of the importance of an issue such as the *East Sea/Sea of Japan* dual name.

Provide regular updates to Boards on Geographic Names regarding changes in the adoption of dual names on maps, atlases, and in school textbooks. Inform national and international agencies responsible for geographical naming policies that the dual naming provides recognition that the name, *East Sea*, is the cultural heritage of the Korean people.

Stress the importance of the political and social outcomes that would result from an agreement on the dual naming. The dual naming would remove one of the several remaining obstacles to a full post-colonial reconciliation between Japan and South Korea. The dual naming issue has a human dimension impact that goes beyond the name itself. The official recognition and use of the *East Sea/Sea of Japan* dual geographical naming would peacefully settle a long standing issue that is viewed as unfair due to the lack of representation in the naming decision made by the IHO in 1928.

A major step in resolving the naming issue would be for Japan and South Korea to arrange for a special delegation from each country to recommend solutions to the *East Sea/Sea of Japan* naming issue. Such a meeting or series of meetings could be hosted in a third country, with the expectation by the governments of the two countries would conceive a jointly prepared, viable solution to the issue.

CONCLUSIONS

Paul Woodman aptly compared geographical naming issues to the view one has of a mountain with its angles, valleys and peaks (Woodman, 2015). Each subsequent group to explore the naming issue brings a different perspective reflective of the context, the time, the additional evidence, and the persistence of emotional attachment. Conclusions must consider the entire context of the geographical naming, just as one must view a mountain from all sides before proposing an explanation for its presence.

The *East Sea/Sea of Japan* dual naming issues is similar to a mathematical problem where one plus one equals two, but in this case the product is somewhat more than two. There are mutual benefits in foreign relations, international collaboration, good will

between neighboring countries, as well as other benefits that accrue in discovering the cultural heritage that a name conveys. When the benefits of cultural heritage and correcting the account of past indiscretions are combined, then the sum of dual naming is greater than one plus one. A peace that is more than no more war rests on the resolution of issues, such as geographical naming. Improved international relations, shared responsibility for maintaining harmony and peace in Northeast Asia are the intended outcome of civic discussions between the countries. Peace is more than no war. It is the quest for social justice and harmony. The philosophy of right proposed by Hegel (2001) reminds us that governments have a first responsibility to pursue discourse in favor of maintaining peace. Representative governments are comprised of the people who have both a right and a responsibility to be mindfully engaged in pursuing the benefits of peace. The *East Sea, Sea of Japan* dual naming issue is an opportunity for discourse in pursuit of peace and harmony in Northeast Asia, a true benefit to the region.

REFERENCES

- Choi, Y. H. (2009). From Poetry to Ethics: Mapmakers on Naming of the Sea Between Japan and Korea. *The Journal of East Asian Affairs*, 23(1), pp. 115-144.
- Choo, S. (2014). Achieving the Impossible? The Status Quo of the *East Sea/ Sea of Japan* Issue and Possible Way Forward. In The Society for East Sea (Ed.), *Proceedings of the 20th International Seminar on Sea Names: Sea, Sea Names and Peace in East Asia (Gyeongju, South Korea)* (pp. 247-255). Seoul: The Society for East Sea.
- Easton, Y. (2015). "The Comfort Women Agreement: A Win for Traditional Diplomacy". *The Diplomat*. 2015-12-31.
- Hegel, G. W. F. (2001). *Philosophy of Right* (S. W. Dyde, Trans.). Kitchener: Batoche Books.
- International Hydrographic Bureau. (1928). *Limits of Oceans and Seas*. Monaco: Imprimerie Monegasque: Monte-Carlo Retrieved from https://docs.lib.noaa.gov/noaa_documents/NOAA_related_docs/IHO/SP23_ocean-limits/1st_ed_1928/SP23_1st.pdf.
- Kant, I. (2003). *To perpetual peace: a philosophical sketch*. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing.
- Kende, I. (1989). The History of Peace: Concept and Organization from the Late Middle Ages to the 1870s. *Journal of Peace Research*, 26(3), pp. 233-247.
- Nobel Media AB. (2016). "All Nobel Prize Winners". www.nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/peace/laureates/index.html. Retrieved 2016-10-05.
- Unesco. (2016). *Implementing the Right to Education*. Paris: United National Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.
- Wallace-Hadrill, J. M. (1975). War and Peace in the Earlier Middle Ages: The Prothero Lecture. *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 25(1975), pp. 157-174.
- Woodman, P. (2015). Wrap-up and Conclusion. In The Society for East Sea (Ed.), *21st International Seminar on Sea Names: Sea Names: Heritage, Perception, and International Relations (Helsinki, Finland)* (pp. 317-319). Seoul: The Society for East Sea.