

**AMBASSADE DU JAPON
RABAT - MAROC**

Rabat, le 16 janvier 2012

Monsieur le Directeur,

Suite au courrier que je vous ai envoyé en date du 11 août 2011 relatif à l'appellation de « Mer du Japon », j'ai l'honneur de vous adresser, ci-joint, une copie de la lettre de Monsieur Hidco NISHIDA, Représentant du Japon au Groupe de Travail sur la Révision de la S-23 sur les limites des Océans et des Mers (S-23 WG) à l'Organisation Hydrographique Internationale (OHI), au Vice Amiral Alexandros MARATOS, Président du S-23 WG ; informant de la réaction du Japon à la lettre de la République de Corée, datée du 10 janvier 2012.

En vous en souhaitant bonne réception, je vous prie d'agréer, Monsieur le Directeur, l'assurance de ma haute considération.

CC. Copie adressée à Messieurs Lahcen AZOULAY, Directeur des Affaires Juridiques et des Traités au Ministère des Affaires Etrangères et de la Coopération, et le Colonel Mohamed KHALIFY, Chef de la Division Hydrographie, Océanographie et Cartographie de la Marine Royale.



Toshiaki TAKAKU

Premier Secrétaire chargé des Affaires Politiques

Réception d'ordre	
Direction des Organisations Internationales	
Affecté	17 JAN 2012
N°	

Monsieur Azzedine FERHANE
Directeur des Nations Unies
et des Organisations Internationales

MINISTERE DES AFFAIRES ETRANGERES
ET DE LA COOPERATION

RABAT

الوزارة المغربية للتعاون والتنمية	
ع	موسول
17 JAN 2012	
81 80 1 2	

Vice Admiral Alexandros MARATOS

Chair of the Working Group on the Revision of S-23 (Limits of Oceans and Seas)

President

International Hydrographic Bureau

4, quai Antoine 1^{er}, B.P. 445

MC 98011 MONACO CEDEX, Principaute the Monaco

Reference: Republic of Korea Letter dated January 10th, 2012

Dear Vice Admiral Alexandros Maratos,

Thank you very much for circulating the ROK's letter dated January 10th, 2012, responding to Japan's letters and papers.

Since the ROK's letter does not seem to raise substantially any new points, please be advised that Japan's response to this letter are in principle all included in our previous correspondences.

Please just be reminded on the following two points:

(1) The ROK has not commented to date on (a) ROK government's official nautical charts (102A)'s use of the name Japan Sea up until its edition in 1993, (b) the ROK government (National Geographic Information Institute)'s official report in 2007/11/20 explicitly stating that the name Japan Sea became "rapidly in wider use since 1830" onward and well before Japan's international debut, and (c) the ROK's documented total silence on and acceptance of the name Japan Sea in the IHO for 40 years since it became a full-fledged member in 1957 (including during the 20 years since 1977 when the work to revise the S-23 started, and the 11 years since the first draft of the revised S-23 was circulated using the name Japan Sea). Please be reminded that these ROK's official positions are unequivocally in line with common international perception that the name Japan Sea is just one of the international names for seas and oceans, no different from the Pacific Ocean or the Philippine Sea and many others, developed over the centuries by (mainly European) maritime powers and sailors. I attach again the ROK documents for

your reference. These indicates that the issue of the global use of the name Japan Sea being somewhat related to “the advent of *Japanese* imperialism” in the 20th century, as claimed by the ROK, could not have existed from the outset, and did not exist for the ROK either until this was suddenly brought up as a political issue in the 1990’s.

- (2) As official records unequivocally indicates, the ROK’s claim that the first edition of the S-23, published in 1929, adopted the name Japan Sea based “solely on Japan’s claims” is simply not true. I also suggest that the IHB respond to the ROK’s claim that a particular part of its collective decision in 1929 was somewhat flawed and illegitimate and therefore needs correction.

Japan will be opposed to the IHO’s allowing, as well as rewarding, any IHO member country’s unnecessarily questioning established international names such as Pacific Ocean, Indian Ocean, the Philippines Sea, South China Sea, or Japan Sea, thereby disrupting the IHO’s pursuit of “greatest possible uniformity in nautical charts and documents”, which is essential for the safety of international navigation.

I trust that the WG and other IHO members see the necessity to further consider the “Way Forward”, while being reminded that WG members expressing support and favouring the “Way Forward” or the continued use of the name Japan Sea, far outnumbers the countries expressing support for the concurrent use of two names, which are currently reduced to the two Koreas. Therefore, if the S-23WG is to accept the ROK’s logic on this matter, the ROK’s proposal of “concurrent use” is the one that should be abandoned.

Lastly but not least, I would like to reiterate the GOJ’s intention to spare no effort in cooperating with the Chair Group and other WG members in the preparation of the IHC.

Yours Sincerely,

your reference. These indicates that the issue of the global use of the name Japan Sea being somewhat related to “the advent of *Japanese* imperialism” in the 20th century, as claimed by the ROK, could not have existed from the outset, and did not exist for the ROK either until this was suddenly brought up as a political issue in the 1990’s.

- (2) As official records unequivocally indicates, the ROK’s claim that the first edition of the S-23, published in 1929, adopted the name Japan Sea based “solely on Japan’s claims” is simply not true. I also suggest that the IHB respond to the ROK’s claim that a particular part of its collective decision in 1929 was somewhat flawed and illegitimate and therefore needs correction.

Japan will be opposed to the IHO’s allowing, as well as rewarding, any IHO member country’s unnecessarily questioning established international names such as Pacific Ocean, Indian Ocean, the Philippines Sea, South China Sea, or Japan Sea, thereby disrupting the IHO’s pursuit of “greatest possible uniformity in nautical charts and documents”, which is essential for the safety of international navigation.

I trust that the WG and other IHO members see the necessity to further consider the “Way Forward”, while being reminded that WG members expressing support and favouring the “Way Forward” or the continued use of the name Japan Sea, far outnumbers the countries expressing support for the concurrent use of two names, which are currently reduced to the two Koreas. Therefore, if the S-23WG is to accept the ROK’s logic on this matter, the ROK’s proposal of “concurrent use” is the one that should be abandoned.

Lastly but not least, I would like to reiterate the GOJ’s intention to spare no effort in cooperating with the Chair Group and other WG members in the preparation of the IHC.

Yours Sincerely,

Hideo Nishida

Japan Representative to the S-23 WG

Cc: Ing.egn chef Michel Huet, Secretariat of S-23 WG