Discussion

RYU Yeon-Taek[*]

I'd like to make some comments that can be related to Woodman's paper. Reaching an agreement on a common name for a sea adjacent to several countries is obviously a difficult and sensitive task, since the name of the sea reflects the culture, history, and identity of the people living nearby. This is well proven by concurrent use of different names in the editions of "Limits of Oceans and Seas: S-23" published so far. There are seven cases of concurrent name usage in its first edition in 1929: eight cases in the 2nd edition in 1937, and ten cases in the 3rd edition in 1953. Even in the unpublished final draft of the 4th edition circulated in 2002, three cases of concurrent name usage were included. Examples of concurrent naming in the 1st edition of S-23 are Greenland Sea or Norwegian Sea, The Archipelago or Aegean Sea, Andaman Sea or Burma Sea, South China Sea or Nan Hai, Yellow Sea or Huang Hai, Naikai or Inland Sea, to name a few. Examples of concurrent naming in the 2nd edition are Greenland Sea or Norwegian Sea, The Archipelago or Aegean Sea, Andaman Sea or Burma Sea, South China Sea or Nan Hai, Yellow Sea or Hwang Hai, Naikai or Inland Sea, and so on. Examples of concurrent naming in the 3rd edition are Balearic Sea or Iberian Sea, Aegean Sea or The Archipelago, Gulf of Iran or Persian Gulf, Andaman Sea or Burma Sea, South China Sea or Nan Hai, Yellow Sea or Hwang Hai, Seto Naikai or Inland Sea, and etc. Examples of concurrent naming in the final draft of the 4th edition (unpublished final draft) are English Channel or La Manche, Dover Strait or Pas de Calais, Bay of Biscay or Golfe de Gascogne. These cases show how the international community has endeavored to respect indigenous names used by local people with different languages and cultures. In addition, these cases also demonstrate that dual naming can be deployed for certain maritime features.

The coastline of the sea located on the eastern side of the Korean Peninsula is shared by four countries: South Korea, North Korea, Japan, and Russia. Within the sea area are found the territorial waters and Exclusive Economic Zones (EEZ) of each country. It is therefore not appropriate to name this area after one particular country when several countries share sovereignty and jurisdiction.

---

[*] Professor, Chungbuk National University, Korea.

In Woodman's paper, he argued that "in the international community, the name *Sea of Japan* is not identified with Japan in any ownership sense." However, for Koreans, the name *Sea of Japan* is intertwined with the legacy of Japanese colonial rule in a symbolic manner.

Regarding the positioning of the two names, namely, *East Sea* and *Sea of Japan*, Woodman pointed out that if the disposition of the names is in a single horizontal line, the name *Sea of Japan* will be closer to Korean Peninsula and the name 'East Sea' will be closer to the Japanese Archipelago. I think that there is no fixed rule of sequencing and positioning of dual names. Regarding this positioning issue, a possible option is to use dual names, using each name within territorial waters or EEZs without (or with) the delineation of the limits of each sea.

In the Introduction of the final draft of the 4th edition of S-23, it is stated that "When contention exists in the use of names, an attempt has been made to reach unanimous agreement but in cases where this has not been possible, reference has been made to IHO Technical Resolution A4.2, paragraph 6. It is also stated that "When two or more names are indicated for a feature, cartographers may decide which name or names to use. While the international practice of States for the naming of oceans and seas is indicated in this publication, in some instances national practices may differ."

In reality, map publishers and map users make a choice between the concurrent use of *East Sea* and *Sea of Japan* and the sole use of *Sea of Japan* and no name at all for the sea area concerned.

In his paper, Woodman argued that it would be possible to avoid the problem associated with dual naming by using a place-holder name for the Sea, namely a third name or contextual naming. However, using a third name or contextual naming is conditioned on the agreement among the countries directly concerned.

Next, I'd like to make some comments that can be related to Professor Tanabe and Watanabe's paper.

In your paper, you argued that there are two types of names based on cardinal directions. You mentioned that the first type of names is based on cardinal directions depicting features in the absolute "direction from one's location." However, I think the phrase of "direction from one's location," is also connected to "relative location of the two geographical features" which is the element of the second type of names based on cardinal directions. Those two types of names have similarity in terms of having reference point anyway.

In addition, Tanabe and Watanabe pointed out that there are many 'East Sea's in the world. By a same token, there are many 'North Sea's in the world. As Tanabe and Watanabe mentioned, Hokkai in Japan means North Sea. Tanabe and Watanabe implied that the name of *East Sea* for the sea area between Korea and Japan is not suitable name for international use. However, I cannot clearly grasp the logic behind why the name of *East Sea* for the sea body between the Korean Peninsula and the Japanese Archipelago cannot be accepted internationally while the name of 'North Sea" in Europe has been accepted internationally although North Sea in Europe is located to the east of U.K.