

Discussion

Jan A. WENDT*

Presentations given by Isolde Hausner ‘Toponyms and cultural heritage: A peaceful partnership or forced alliance?’, Lee Young Choon, ‘Same perspectives on the history of the *East Sea*’ and Lee Sang-tae, ‘Sea of Joseon’ appearing in public documents in Japan’ in terms of content, their facts and cognitive evaluation very high.

Isolde Hausner, in her speech, focused on the development of the concept and research of toponyms, also presenting their nature from the point of view of ‘critical toponymy’ emphasizing new scientific concepts in onomastics and in human geography. The next part of the presentation focused on toponymy and politics. She pointed to the role of historical, cultural and archival factors in solving potential conflicts. And to the need for fair balance and the kind of "branding policy" between Policy making and Policy keeping. The conclusions to emphasise resolving conflicts with names based on a compromise that was not fully satisfactory to stakeholders, but would be acceptable to them.

We would like toponyms and cultural heritage to be part of a peaceful partnership but they often become a factor for forced alliance. Sometimes there is no relationship between geographical conditions and geographical names or names are used by politicians or geographers for their own purposes. In this context, the question arises whether we are mature enough to reach a compromise on disputed or unrecognized geographical names.

In his speech, Lee Young Choon introduced a number of aspects that characterize the East Sea. Through the geological conditions of the formation of the basin, he came to characterize the physical and geographical aspects of the sea. In the next part of the presentation he emphasized the peaceful character of East Sea over the centuries, described in both Japanese and Korean material. He marked that in the period from the Bronze Age to modern times, only three times the East Sea basin was allowing warfare. During the Mongol invasion of Japan (1274), during the Japanese attack on Korea (1592) and during the Russian-Japanese war (Battle of Cushima 1905).

* Professor, Gdańsk University, Poland.

The most interesting part of the work, apart from an indication of the rising missile threat from North Korea, was about the name of the *East Sea* and / or the *Japan Sea*. In chronological and geographical terms, the Korean, Chinese and Japanese endonym of *East Sea* were presented. These names of the *East/Japan Sea* delight with their richness and diversity, from Sea of Japan (by M. Ricci, 1602), Mer de Coree (J-B. Tavernier, 1679), Mer Orientale / Mer de Coree (G. Delisle, 1700/1705), to popularize the name Sea of Korea or the Mer de Coree (H. Moll, 1715; R. de Vaugondy 1750) until appearing again since the Ricci Mateo times, *Sea of Japan* in 1815. The author left the audience with the belief that his work would help with better understanding of the unique character of the East Sea.

I believe that the large emotional loads associated with the name *East Sea* or *Sea of Peace* or *Japan Sea*, both on the Japanese and Korean sides, make it difficult to believe in a quick and compromise solution to the problem of the name of this sea.

However, this work by Lee Sang-tae has made me, geographer and historian, the most impressed. A solid Benedictine query in the Japanese archives deserves the highest recognition. In the following parts of his presentation he proved indisputably that since B.C. The name *East Sea* was commonly used, both in Korea and in Manchuria. It was not until the times of Mateo Ricci (1602) that the name Japan Sea appeared in written sources. Similarly, in the Japanese documents, the *East Sea* can be found repeatedly on the definition of the sea between Japan and Korea. Not only in private or geographical records, but also in official Japanese documents in parallel with the name Sea of Korea. With such a large collection of data it is difficult to discuss the scientific name *East Sea* or even the *Korean Sea*.

This does not change the fact that the demands put forward by the author and do not concern issues of academic discourse but political. The fact that the name *East Sea* or *Sea of Korea* was officially used in Japan until the mid-nineteenth century and that the Japanese authorities used the term Sea of Korea, unfortunately, did not affect the adoption of it today.

In summary, presented papers in this session brought on the one hand, the new approach of 'critical toponymy', on the other hand familiarized geological, geographical, historical and cultural aspects associated with the name *East Sea*. I am afraid, however, that in the modern world, in the absence of interest in Japanese subject matter, finding a compromise requires a long time and a lot of effort, not only on the Korean side. Perhaps it help if the sound of the relatively unknown European public and scientists would hear the problem. It seems that good results could be achieved by organizing many small, regional conferences in which the Korean side might have the opportunity to present its position. It is also expedient to increase the publication activity with the use of the name *East Sea*, to popularize its use in scientific papers and in popular geographical, historical or interdisciplinary literature, broadly presenting the interesting and rich culture of Korea and Japan.