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Today my presentation have brought very practical information which might be helpful for classroom education and have explained the nature of the invisible naming war between Korea and Japan.

Even though the geographical themes have been shifted from one to another over the history of geography since the times of Greek, there is one theme, toponymy which has remained an important subject and a basic element for the study of regional geography.

It is the well-known fact that it has been taken over many centuries in order to correct a monumental collection of incorrect place names in Ptolemy's comprehensive atlas. For geography teachers and researchers, it is essential to understand the nature of place nomenclature. In addition to geographers needs and interests, recently geographical place names have become much more important. All people need place names to communicate with each other and place names become key elements in socio-economic activities such as cartography, census and relief operations, postal services, trade, and the like.

Also, when the names of certain places, especially containing or sharing historical meaning and national feelings such as a part of national anthem and ritual objective as God of the sea, are not properly used, a controversy is flamed in national and international circles.

This paper will discuss an example of such international controversy of a place name. The name in question is that used for the part of the ocean to the
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east of Korea and separating Korea from Japan there are two conflicting names for this water body, 'East Sea' and 'Sea of Japan'. In most world maps and atlases used around the world today, Korea's 'East Sea' is indicated as the 'Sea of Japan', and therefore an immediate correction is warranted. Now this issue is my country’s geographical and national concern. In addition, since 1992 it has been on the discussion agenda in UN Conferences on the Standardization of Geographical Names and UN Group of Experts on Geographical Names.

In my paper I would like to discuss three things. First, I’ll briefly present the history of this particular name, describe the international standardization process by IHO (International Hydrographic Organization) in 1929, and review my government’s recent efforts to restore the old name and replace the Sea of Japan in various sector of international meetings and the concerned agencies. My presentation relies on the first draft of my research on the relevant studies and old maps/documents. Still this study is incomplete.

To this end, it is necessary to review the historical background of the term ‘East Sea’ and how Korea’s East Sea has been recognized by neighboring countries and other western countries in the past. Also, to prepare a strategy to change the name ‘Sea of Japan’ back to ‘East Sea’, it is necessary to understand the process of how the ‘East Sea’ was unjustifiably turned into the ‘Sea of Japan’ in the 20th century.

1. Where is ‘East Sea’/‘Sea of Japan’?

The sea is located in the body of water between the Korean peninsula and the Japanese islands. It is called an Asian mediterranean and has an area reaching to just over one million square kilometers. The total area of this mediterranean is almost equivalent to one ninth of the United States, and five times of the Korean peninsular. The average depth of the water is 1,684 meters, but the deepest point is 4,049 meters. The total coast line of the sea makes up more than 6,000 km. About 36% belong to the Japanese segments, 16.4% to Korea, and others to Russia. There are four exits toward the Pacific: Korea Strait in the south, Tsugaru-Kaikyo strait and La Perouse strait in the west, and Tatarskij in the north. Traditionally, the sea provided fishing ground to neighbouring countries. It was especially important for catching whales.
However, these days the sea's locational importance is increasing in terms of the development of deep sea natural resource, sharing Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ), ecological deterioration due to dumping nuclear wastes, airspace sharing, and military strategic space.

2. Name of 'East Sea' in Korean Writings and Ancient Maps

Historically, Koreans has used the term, 'East Sea' in writings since 59 B.C. Examples can be found in numerous records including the Monument of King Kwanggaeto (411), the Samguk sagi (History of the Three Kingdoms, 1145) and Samguk yusa (Memorabilia of the Three Kingdoms, 1284). Moreover, the still extant 'Map of Eight Provinces' in the Shinjong tongguk yoji sungnam (A revised edition for the Augmented Survey of the Geography of Korea, 1530)

(Fig. 1) The Map of Eight Provinces, 1530
From Shinjong tongguk yoji sungnam(A revised edition of the Augmented Survey of the Geography of Korea, 1530)
uses the term ‘East Sea’ (Fig. 1). In addition, a 16th century *Tongguk chido* (Map of Korea) uses the term ‘*tong cho taehae*’ (Great Sea of the Lower East). A map of *Yongnam* (the southeastern region of the peninsula) which was made in the 1740’s and a map of Korea which was officially created in the mid-18th century also used the name, ‘East Sea’. Hence, there is much evidence that ‘East Sea’ has been used for centuries.

Reference to the ‘East Sea’ was also constant in numerous maps created after the 18th century. Many geography textbooks published and used before the annexation of Korea by Japan in the early 20th century made reference to the ‘East Sea’, ‘Sea of Choson’, or ‘Sea of Korea’. However, already by the early 20th century, there were some textbooks which made reference to the ‘Sea of Japan’. Every textbook published after 1910 refers to the East Sea as the ‘Sea of Japan’.

### 3. China, Russia, and Japan’s Use of ‘East Sea’

According to Chinese sources, China has known of the ‘East Sea’ since the Tang Dynasty; however, they called it just ‘Sea’ or ‘Great Sea’. With the establishment in 698 of the Kingdom of Parhae by Koreans, the Chinese began calling the East Sea the ‘Sea of Parhae’. China used the term, ‘East Sea’, during the Liao Dynasty (947–1125), the Sung Dynasty (960–1279), the Chin Dynasty (1122–1234), the Yuan Dynasty (1271–1368), the Ming Dynasty (1368–1644), and the Qing (Ch’ing) Dynasty (1644–1912) (Fig. 2). At times during the Yuan and Ming Dynasties, the Chinese referred to the East Sea as ‘Ching Hai’ which means ‘Sea of Whales’ because there were a lot of whales found there. During the Ming and Qing Dynasties, the Chinese referred to the northeastern area of the East Sea as ‘East Sea’ and the southern area as the ‘South Sea’. Around 1884 during the Qing Dynasty, some scholars and bureaucrats occasionally used the term ‘Sea of Japan’ in some documents. However, the Russia–Japan Treaty of 1905 was the first documented use of the term ‘Sea of Japan’ at a government level.

The ‘Kunyuwanguoditu’ is a world map printed in Beijing in 1602. It was translated into Chinese from a world map kept by a Jesuit priest, Matteo Ricci, and it referred to the East Sea as the ‘Sea of Japan’ (Fig. 3). It is the oldest
Chinese map known to use the term ‘Sea of Japan’. However, this map does not have much significance because it was a translated map made by a foreigner living in China. In addition, it is believed that the production of the map was influenced by information obtained from Japan rather than from Korea. This map did not have much impact on subsequent Chinese maps. The next time the term ‘Sea of Japan’ appeared on a Chinese map was about 1875. Russian maps of East Asia were all created after 1639 when Russians first arrived in the Pacific coast region. In 1687, Nic Witzen’s ‘Noord en Oost Tartarye’ referred to the East Sea as ‘Oceanus Orentalis’. N. Goman’s 1725 map used the term 'Eastern Ocean', and in a 1734 map, I. Kirilov referred to the East Sea as ‘Vostochnoe’, meaning ‘East Sea’. The Map of Asia printed by the renown Petersbourg Academy of Sciences in 1745 also referred to the East Sea as ‘Koreiskoe Mope’, or ‘Sea of Korea’ (Fig. 4). Other famous maps printed in Russia from 1745 to 1791 used the term ‘Sea of Korea’. Adam
Johann von Krusenstern (1770-1846), a Russian who explored the East Sea called it the ‘Sea of Japan’ as did a French explorer, La Perouse (1741–c.1788), who explored the East Sea in 1787. However, Russians called the East Sea the ‘Sea of Korea’ in their last officially published map of 1844 (Fig. 5). Thereafter, it appears that the Russian Navy and numerous maps followed the European style in making geographical references.

The term ‘Sea of Japan’ as an exonym adopted by foreigners, the name used in a specific language for a topographic feature situated outside the area where that language has official language, was used after the middle of the 19th century in many prestigious maps made in Japan. Until 1870, even Japanese maps referred to East Sea as the ‘Sea of Choson (Korea)’. All of the following maps referred to the East Sea as the ‘Sea of Choson’: Takahasi Kageyasu’s 1809 ‘Sinteibankokuzenzu’ (Fig. 6), Abe Kinin’s 1838 ‘Bankokuzenzu’, Sugita Gendan’s 1850 ‘Chigakuseisozu’, Matsuda Rokuzan’s 1855 ‘Chikyubankokuzenzu’, and the 1870 ‘Meizikaiteibankokuyochibunzu’.

(Fig. 3) World Map(Kunyuwanguoditu) of Matteo Ricci, 1602 published in Beijing
However, all maps published in Japan thereafter referred to the East Sea as the 'Sea of Japan'. From this, it can be inferred that the Japanese government directed, as a matter of policy, that the name 'Sea of Japan' be used. Especially, geographical references and names were changed in Matsuda Rokuzan's 1854 map and his 'Bankokuzenzu' of 1871. Hasimoto Chyozuki's 1871 'Sinseiyobuzenzu' called the East Sea the 'Sea of Japan'. From this, we can assume that changes were being made at this time, because the term 'East Sea' was not found in any of the Japanese maps published after 1871. At this time, references to the 'Sea of Japan' began to appear in Chinese maps as well.
<Fig. 5> The Map of the Polar Sea and the Eastern Ocean, compiled by on base of the up-to-date surveys in the Hydrographic Department of the Navy Ministry, Russia, 1844

<Fig. 6> Takahasi Kageyasu’s Map of Japan, 1809
4. ‘East Sea’ in Western Old Maps

Before the shape of Korean peninsula emerged in the old maps and atlases, the eastern sea of the Asian continent was generally called and named as the Oriental sea, Chinese sea, and Eastern sea. There is no universal sea name for this particular mediterranean sea, because the rough coastal line of the continent was not given shape until the publication of Mercator’s world map in 1569.

The map which was created by Godhino de Eredia of Portugal in 1615 was the first map published in Europe to have called the East Sea as ‘Mar Coria (Sea of Korea)’. Moreover, the East Sea is called ‘Mare di Corai (Sea of Korea)’ in Sir Robert Dudley’s 1647 ‘Carta Particolare della Isola de Giapone’ which was made in England (Fig. 7).

During the late 17th century to 18th century the French cartography was led
by famous Cassini and de Lisle families. Almost for one century they have indicated ‘Mer Orientale or Mer De Coree’ in their map publications. The map of the North Pacific published by J. N. de Lisle of France in 1750 after his exploration of Northeast Asia also called the East Sea ‘Mer De Coree’.

In England Herman Moll (fl.1681-1732) produced a map of Japan in 1710 and 1712. In these maps ‘Sea of Korea’ was indicated. The Map of Asia which appears in E. Bowen’s World Atlas in 1744 and 1752 also referred to the East

(Fig. 8) Asia by E. Bowen, 1752
Sea as the ‘Sea of Korea’ (Fig. 8). Furthermore, ‘Sea of Corea’ appeared in the first edition of the 1771 Encyclopedia Britannica (Fig. 9). All of the aforementioned maps prove that the East Sea was widely known as the ‘Sea of Korea’ during the 17th and 18th centuries.

However, since the East Sea was referred to as the ‘Sea of Japan’ in La Perouse’s map of 1797, maps produced thereafter in Europe began to use the term ‘Sea of Japan’ with greater frequency. In fact, both ‘Sea of Korea’ and ‘Sea of Japan’ co-existed until the first half of the 19th century. It is difficult to find out how ‘Sea of Japan’ replaced ‘Sea of Korea’ in the latter half of the 19th century because a review of all existing ancient maps has not been completed. However, it is believed that such a replacement was a reflection of easier information availability of Japan than Korea as Japan’s military power had expanded and the recognition of Japan had increased in the international community.

(Fig. 9) Asia Map of Encyclopedia Britannica, First Edition, 1771
5. ‘Sea of Japan’ Made Officially by International Hydrographic Organization in 1929

In the early 20th century, while Korea was under the colonial rule of Japan, the name East Sea was eradicated from the world maps. The eradication of references to the East Sea started when a resolution was adopted at the first
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(Fig. 10) The Japan Sea by IHB, 1929
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Conference of the International Hydrographic Organization to establish the limits of oceans and seas and attach appropriate local names for safe navigation. A Japanese delegation attended this conference, but there was no Korean delegation. According to the resolution, the East Sea was registered by Japan as the ‘Sea of Japan’ in 1923. No other country raised any objection. Consequently, the 1929 Monaco Conference adopted a resolution to publish Special Publication No. 23 entitled *The Limits of Oceans and Seas*, which was based on data collected previously, and to make this publication an internationally accepted document. Thereafter, the mapmakers of the world used the standardized names of places on this publication and the name ‘East Sea’ lost its place on the world maps. New editions of *The limits of Oceans and Seas* were published in 1937, 1952, and 1986 and to date, the East Sea remains as the ‘Japan Sea’ (Fig. 10).

6. Efforts and Progress of Koreans to Reclaim East Sea on World Maps

Historically speaking, the East Sea has been used for a long time not only in Korea but also in neighboring countries such as China, Russia, and Japan, as well as in Europe. That is, the ‘East Sea’ was the established name of the sea just as the ‘North Sea’ is in Europe, rather than being a mere reference about direction. Moreover, it would not be appropriate to allow the term ‘Sea of Japan’ to continue to be used. For example, how do you think the French would feel if the Mediterranean Sea which is surrounded by many countries were to be called the sea of Italy.

In our view, the sea in question should have a neutral name, and should thus not be named after any single country. Lying between the Korean peninsula and the Japanese archipelago, and extending north towards Russia, that body of water does not belong to any one of the encircling countries. Naming such a sea area after a particular country gives the false impression that it belongs to that country, which leads to unnecessary discord between neighboring countries.

Very early efforts to restore the original name of the sea came from the annual meeting of six major Chinese Academic Associations including Chinese Geographical Society, Plant Society, Science Society, Animal Society, Meteorological Society and Mathematic Society held in Chongqing city in July
of 1943. Delegates discussed how it should be replaced with a new name, but they did not reach an agreeable name. However, all of them agreed the fact that the name of Sea of Japan implied the Japanese imperial expansion and the origin of the second war (see Appendix 1).

In the documents written since the early 1970s, many citizens and scholars pointed out the inadequacy of naming the East Sea the 'Sea of Japan'. Shortly after joining the United Nations, at the 1992 Sixth U.N. Conference on the Standardization of Geographical Names (UNCSGN), the Korean Government requested that this incorrect usage be ended. At that time, we made a strong case to the international community seeking support for the use of the name 'East Sea' based on the general rule of cartography as stated in the resolution III/20(1977), namely, the joint consultation among countries concerned and multiple recognition of different names pending the agreement on a common name (see Appendix 2).

At that time, the U.N. advised Korea to consult relevant countries. Of course, Japan opposed any change in the name. At the 1994 New York and 1996 Geneva Meetings of the U.N. Group of Experts on Geographical Names, Korea made public the inadequacy of using the name 'Sea of Japan'. Most recently, in January 1998, in UNCSGN held in New York the Korean Government fully supplied all related information on the East Sea and requested the working committee to develop a draft resolution on this issue (See Appendix 3). Even the UNCSGN did not adopt immediately, the Conference adopted Chair's summary (See Appendix 4). And the Expert meeting and working group will further discuss this matter some details in the near future.

Besides these, in April 1997, Korea requested that 'Sea of Japan' be changed to 'East Sea' in The Limits of Oceans and Seas at the 15th International Hydrographic Conference held in Monaco, based on IHO's resolution A.4.2.6, adapted on 13 March 1974, endorsed the principle of simultaneous recognition of different names of a shared geographical feature when sharing countries do not agree on a common name (see Appendix 5). Consequently, it is expected that the 1999 edition of The Limits of Oceans and Seas will reflect Korea's request. In addition, the Korean Government continues to contact renowned map publishers, broadcasting companies, newspaper companies and magazine publishers throughout the world and to request that they use the name 'East
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China, Mongolia, Korea, and Japan

(Fig. 11) China, Mongolia, Korea, and Japan, Premier World Atlas by Rand McNally, 1997
'East Sea' in lieu of 'Sea of Japan'. Furthermore, in order to persuade Federal Government of USA, I met informally major members of U.S. Board on Geographical Names.

Premier World Atlas published by Rand McNally, a U.S. map company, has started to use both 'East Sea' and 'Sea of Japan' since 1997 (Fig. 11). However, Britannica went further. Political Map of Britannica CD 98 released in last March this year follows the same step like Rand McNally. Precise Democratic People's Republic of Korea Humanitarian Response Planning Maps prepared for US Agency for International Development in December 1997, Washington, D. C. indicates 'Sea of Japan (East Sea)'. Also, Democratic People's Republic of Korea Landform and Land Cover produced in 1998 by the United Nations Environment Programme Global Resources starts to write 'East Sea'. Those two maps evidentially show how USA and UN are, even very slow, moving to adopt the proper name of the sea. Especially, a part of 'Japan and Korea' in The Cartographic Satellite Atlas of World published by WorldSat International, Inc. in Canada, 1997 used 'TONG-HAE/NIPPON-KAI(SEA OF JAPAN)' as romanization of the endonym, the name used in the principal language spoken in the region in which the feature is located.

Now I urge National Council for Geographic Education (NCGE) members with knowledge of the true story of the naming process of the sea during recent history will inform your students of how important understanding place geography in classroom really is.

7. Conclusion

The whole history and nature of the problem is complex and delicate because of very important and sensitive matter between Korea and Japan. Geographical names often have serious implications for a nation's identity, culture, language and history. Thus, resolving this issue is not merely a question of a printer changing the name on a map. Rather, it is part of the efforts by the Korean people to redeem their past legacy and redress the unfairness that have resulted from it. Therefore I would like to request that, when you are teaching regional geography, you ask your students why they think maps and atlases recently published are simultaneously using both the names.
The issue is simple but a resolution is difficult. My government followed UN suggestion and IHO resolution, and sought to engage Japan in a constructive dialogue to find a mutually acceptable solution. However, no progress has been made, because Japan refuses to enter into serious discussion. This attitude unfortunately appears unlikely to change in the foreseeable future.

Therefore, Koreans view that, as an interim measure pending final agreement between the two countries on a common designation, the two names 'East Sea' and 'Sea of Japan' should be used simultaneously in all official documents, maps, and atlases, in accordance with general rules of international cartography. According to recent information, all of American military persons who are stationed in Korea camps should be taught to use and write the proper name of 'East Sea' instead of 'Sea of Japan'. You use my gift map of 'Korea and Vicinity' for educational material when you get back home and your school. Use the map to illustrate to your students that the place names they learn are dynamic cultural concepts. They have great significance and the names we use for places affect our thoughts and feelings about those places. As them to consider how they would feel in the name of their school, town or nearby landmarks were changed in ways that indicated they were no longer in control of the features in question.

In the year 2000, Korea is going to host 29th International Geographical Congress (IGC) in Seoul. This conference might be the target year to replace 'East Sea' instead of 'Sea of Japan' throughout the world. I am asking earnestly all of you if you have discovered any new information on the issue, please inform me and come to Korea to present your research.
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III/20 Names of Features beyond a Single Sovereignty
(1977 Athens)

The Conference,

Recommends that resolution 25 of the Second United Nations Conference on the Standardization of Geographical Names be reworded as follows:

The Conference,

Considering the need for international standardization of names of geographical features that are under the sovereignty of more than one country or are divided among two or more countries,

1 Recommends that countries sharing a given geographical feature under different names should endeavour, as far as possible, to reach agreement on fixing a single name for the feature concerned;

2 Further recommends that when countries sharing a given geographical features do not succeed in agreeing on a common name, it should be a general rule of international cartography that the name used by each of the countries concerned will accepted. A policy of accepting only one or some of such names while excluding the rest would be inconsistent in principle as well as inexpedient in practice. Only technical reasons may sometimes make is necessary, especially in the case of small-scale maps, to dispense with the use of certain names belonging to one language or another.
Draft Resolution of 1998 UN Conference on the
Standardization of Geographical Names (New York)

11. Standardization of names of maritime features beyond any sov-
ereignty

The Conference

Recognizing the continued need for an international standardization of
geographical names for features lying beyond any national sovereignty,

Recalling Resolution 21 of the Third Conference (III/21), which noted that the
International Hydrographic Organization has designated a technical committee to
improve the procedure for the naming of oceans and seas (i.e. maritime features)
beyond the limits of national jurisdiction,

1. Recommends that countries bordering a given maritime feature beyond
any national sovereignty should endeavor, as far as possible, to reach
agreement on a single name for the feature concerned;

2. Further recommends, as a development of Resolution 25 of the second
conference (II/25) and Resolution 20 of the Third Conference (III/20), that where
agreement on a single name for the feature concerned cannot be reached, then
as an interim measure and allowing for the practicalities of scale, the different
names already in use should be employed in international cartography;

3. Further recommends that in cases where a single name for a given
maritime feature cannot be agreed upon, then the liaison facility between the
United Nations Conference on the Standardization of Geographical Names and
International Hydrographic Organization should be utilized so that such matters
may be referred to the International Hydrographic Organization for
consideration.
(Appendix 4)

UNSGN President's Summing-up (January 1998)

On a point of procedure, I must point out, however, that it cannot really be feasible to include the statements in a report that has not been taken cognizance by the Conference. I would rather suggest that those documents be submitted to the Group of Experts, as you yourself recommended, for further discussion by the Group of Experts.

It is clear to the Conference that we are not going to reach consensus on this very delicate issue. Therefore, I would urge and encourage the respective parties concerned to seek advice, taking into account previous resolutions of the Conference applicable to features beyond any sovereignty or beyond national sovereignty, and in light of those resolutions and according to those resolutions to try to reach an agreement.
A 4.1 Uniform policy for handling Geographical Names

1. - With the purpose of obtaining approximate uniformity in the geographical names appearing on the nautical documents of maritime countries, it is recommended that each national hydrographic office:

   (a) On its charts and other nautical documents of its own coasts, show names that are in exact agreement with the forms prescribed by the most authoritative source. Each country will thus provide complete and authoritative name coverage in its own official script, whether Roman or non-Roman, for the use of all other national hydrographic offices that issue charts on various scales, and other nautical documents, for the same area.

   (b) On its charts and other nautical documents of foreign coasts where the Roman alphabet is officially used by the sovereign country, show names that are in exact agreement with the most authoritative usage of the country having sovereignty. These names should be obtained directly from new and revised editions of the nautical charts and other documents of the country having sovereignty or confirmed by correspondence with that country. Where such names as officially written use accents or diacritical signs, these should be retained, even, and indeed particularly, when names are printed in capital letters.

   (c) On its charts and other nautical documents of foreign coasts where the script of the sovereign country is other than the Roman alphabet, show names that are obtained by applying the various international systems for romanization approved by the United Nations to the names appearing on the most authoritative sources of the country having sovereignty or confirmed by correspondence with that country.

Note: Among countries where the Roman alphabet is official, international uniformity in transcription systems would be advantageous to the various national governments. It is accordingly recommended that national Hydrographic
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Offices place before their governments the desirability of obtaining uniformity and urge the continuation of efforts for effective agreements through the United Nations. (See also C1.2).

(d) On its charts and other nautical documents of all foreign coasts, use for the generic part of complex geographical names the word (in its Roman-alphabet form) used by the country having sovereignty. e.g. Falsterborev. By following this practice, the geographic generic term will not be translated but will appear, in its Roman-alphabet form, on the charts of all nations.

(e) On all its charts and other nautical documents, apply its conventional national usage to names of countries, major territorial divisions and boundary features, and to the oceans and international subdivisions thereof. The names used internationally may also be shown but in a subordinate manner. This system will be applied until an international convention by the United Nations on standardization of internationally recognized names has been adopted.

A 4.2 International standardization of Geographical Names

1. - It is resolved that the IHO should maintain continuous contact with the United Nations Organization, and specifically with the United Nations Group of Experts on Geographical Names, for all studies or actions relating to geographical names involving or affecting hydrographic publications. The Bureau should insure that actions previously taken on hydrographic matters, with respect to names, within the IHO are brought to the attention of appropriate United Nations Conferences or working groups. The Bureau also promulgate to Member States information on all significant developments on this subject as they occur.

2. - It is recommended that, since national standardization of geographical names is an essential preliminary to international standardization, Hydrographic Offices encourage and support the establishment of national names authorities, following the principles and procedures recommended by the resolutions on this subject adopted by the United Nations Conferences on Geographical Names.

3. - It is recommended that the IHO Co-operate with the United Nations Group of Experts on Geographical Names with the object of achieving international standardization of names of maritime and undersea features.
4. - It is further recommended that co-operation should, in particular, be extended in the under-mentioned activities of the United Nations Group of Experts:

(a) Study of existing national and international practices concerning the delineation and naming of oceans and seas, including their integral subdivisions, beyond the limits of national jurisdiction, with a view to recommending improvements in current nomenclatural practices and procedures.

(b) Drawing up a system for naming undersea features beyond a single sovereignty and proposing it as a basis for preparing an international convention on the subject.

(c) Standardizing the definitions of undersea feature "terms and definitions" in order to promote their acceptance and use by names authorities.

(d) Developing procedures for international standardization of naming new undersea features as they are discovered, defined and identified in the future.

5. - It is recommended that when Hydrographic Offices produce gazetteers or geographical dictionaries, these publications be standardized as far as possible in accordance with resolutions on the subject adopted by the United Nations.

6. - It is recommended that where two or more countries share a given geographical feature (such as, for example, a bay, a strait, channel or archipelago) under a different name form, they should endeavour to reach agreement on fixing a single name for the feature concerned. If they have different official languages and cannot agree on a common name form, it is recommended that the name forms of each of the languages in question should be accepted for charts and publications unless technical reasons prevent this practice on small scale charts. e.g. English Channel/La Manche.