

**Examples of Expected Answers from the Korean Side to the
“Open Questionnaire to Members of the Korean Parliament who
Landed on Takeshima,” and Examples of Replies Based upon
Historical Facts and International Law**

February 22, 2019

**League of Members of Parliament Acting for the
Protection of Japanese Territory**

At the “Tokyo Assembly Demanding Early Resolution of the Takeshima Problem” convened on November 21 last year, we announced an “open questionnaire” to the members of the Korean Parliament who landed on Takeshima Island. That questionnaire format letter, requesting proof and evidence of the claim that Korea maintains territorial possession of Takeshima, was immediately sent to the said Korean Parliament Members by mail. It was also posted on our League’s Twitter and Facebook accounts in the Japanese, English and Korean languages.

Regrettably, however, none of the Korean Parliament members has sent their response yet. In fact, some questionnaire

letters were returned to our office with their envelopes just opened. For your interest, around the same time a postcard was sent by Korean junior high school students to junior high school students here in Japan, expressing opinions on the territorial possession of Takeshima. A response was subsequently sent to the Korean junior high school students by the Japanese side, in an attempt to explain the historical facts and legal interpretations pertaining to the wrong understanding of the Korean side on this issue.

To resolve the issue of territorial possession of Takeshima, a matter on which Japan and Korea clearly have different opinions, there is a critical need for discussions to be held on the foundation of international law, historical facts and justice. In that sense, we find it very unfortunate that the members of the Korea Parliament have chosen not to respond to requests for an exchange of opinions – which even schoolchildren have found possible.

In order to facilitate exchange of opinions, our “League of Parliament Members Acting for Protection of Japanese Territory” has taken the liberty of preparing materials under the titles of “Examples of Expected Responses from the Korean Side” and “Examples of Replies Based upon Historical Facts and International Law.”

These materials have been prepared in concise and simple fashion so that general public will understand the content easily. Please understand, furthermore, that the stated replies from the Korean side are based strictly upon our own projections. Accordingly, in the event that members of the Korean Parliament feel that they would provide different responses, or hold ideas grounded in other arguments, we sincerely request them to express such positions.

In closing, it is our most profound hope that these materials will serve as an opportunity for opening up discussions between the members of the Parliaments of Korea and Japan, in an attempt to lead to resolution of the Takeshima territorial problem.

1. Question No. 1

The Question

Korean side insists that “Takeshima has been recognized at a part of Utsuryo Island geographically.” What are the evidence and documents that indicate it? Please explain.

Example of Korean answers expected by us (from Dokdo educational reference material ‘Meeting my territory Dokdo’ by Northeast Asian History Foundation in 2011 same as below)

Geographically, Dokdo is located near Ulleungdo and can be seen with the naked eye.

The residents of Ulleungdo naturally had recognized Dokdo as an attached island for a long time. The Joseon (Korean) government publication Sejong Sillok Jiriji (Geography Section of the Annals of King Sejong’s Reign)(1454), which provides a geographical record of Korean territory, states, “Usan [Dokdo] Mureung[Ulleungdo]...The two islands are not far apart from each other and thus visible on a

clear day.”

Example of answers based on historical facts and international law

As a basis for making Dokdo as a Korean territory, it is interpreted that Usando can be seen from Ulleungdo , "Sejong reality" and "Geography magazine", but in Goryeosa and Sinjeung Dongguk Yeoji Seungnam (Revised and Augmented Survey of the Geography of Korea) which were compiled before and after that, the location of Usando wasn't clarified, and on later maps, Usando is regarded as the current Jukdo.

And it is not considered in the finalization of the territory that the distance is close to the territory of the country or the island can be seen. Therefore, "seeing with the naked eye" isn't the basis of possession.

Whether it is near or not in distance from own territory or whether the island is visible or not, are not taken into account in determining the territory in international law. Therefore, they cannot be the evidences for territorial integrity.

Question No. 2

The Question

Korean side insists that “Historical facts that Korea has recognized and governed Takeshima as the part of Korean territory, are recorded in the official documents of Korea.”

What are the documents that prove it? Please explain.

Example of Korean answers expected by us

The records which shows that Dokdo is Korean territory are History of the Three Kingdoms, 1145; the Joseon (Korean) government publication Sejong Sillok Jiriji (Geography Section of the Annals of King Sejong’s Reign), 1454; Sinjeung Dongguk Yeoji Seungnam (Revised and Augmented Survey of the Geography of Korea), 1531; and Man’gi Yoram (Manual of State Affairs for the Monarch), 1808.

Especially in Man’gi Yoram (Manual of State Affairs for the Monarch), 1808, which states, “Ulleung [Ulleungdo] and Usan [Dokdo] are both territories of Usan-guk [Usan State], and Usan

[Dokdo] is what Japan refers to as Matsushima [the old Japanese name for Dokdo].” This passage indicates that Usando in the Korean side literature is the Matsushima in Japan(present Takeshima).

Example of answers based on historical facts and international law

Man’gi Yoram cited the article of Tongguk munhon pigo published in 1770, and the original document of "輿地志" cited by the "Tongguk munhon pigo" states "Usan is Ulleungdo". This fact means that Usando became Japan's so-called Matsushima from "Tongguk munhon pigo" in 1770.

Based on the literature compiled in 1770, Usanguk and Usando which were described on the documents of " History of the Three Kingdoms ,1145", " the Joseon (Korean) government publication Sejong Sillok Jiriji (Geography Section of the Annals of King Sejong’s Reign)(1454)", " Sinjeung Dongguk Yeoji Seungnam (1531), can not be Matsushima (present Takeshima).

3. Question No. 3

The Question

Korean side insists that “Until the attempt to include Takeshima by the notice of Shimane Prefecture in 1905, Japanese Government recognized that Takeshima was not the part of its territory. This can be confirmed by formal documents of Japanese Government such as ‘Order of Dajokan’ in 1877.” What is your understanding on historical details and facts how the islands described as ‘Takeshima and another island’ in the Order had been recognized in Japan? Please explain.

Example of Korean answers expected by us

In October 1876, Shimane prefecture asked the Ministry of Home Affairs for whether Takeshima (Ulleungdo) and Matsushima (Dokdo) should be in Shimane prefecture in cadastral research and mapping work inside the pipe by Shimane prefecture. In March 1877, the Ministry of Home Affairs concluded that "This problem is the problem finished in

the 17th century, and Ulleungdo and Dokdo have nothing to do with Japan."

However, the Ministry of Home Affairs judged that this issue was an important case related to the Japanese territory, and at that time it asked the Dajokan (Grand Council of State of Japan) for the final decision. On March 29, 1877, after considering this questionnaire, based on measures such as the prohibition of making passage towards Ulleungdo by the Tokugawa shogunate at the end of the 17th century, the Dajokan stated "Regarding Ulleungdo and Dokdo have nothing to do with Japan. It was shown on Isotakeshima Ryakuzu.

On this map, Dokdo is described as Matsushima which is the name of Dokdo in Japan at that time. As you can see, Japan clearly admits that Ulleungdo and Dokdo are not Japanese territory before 1905.

Example of answers based on historical facts and international law

"Isotakeshima Ryakuzu" was made by Shimane prefecture, not made by the Dajokan. Therefore, this "Isotakeshima Ryakuzu" is not a basis for the current Takeshima to be Matsushima which the Dajokan judged as "Takeshima [Ulleungdo] and one other island ". Tateshima(Argonaut island) and Matsushima (Dajure island) are drawn on the charts and maps of those days when the Dajokan Order was issued. However, Takeshima (Argonaut island) was regarded as an island that didn't exist afterwards, and it turned out that Matsushima (Dajure island) was the current Ulleungdo.

Kitaizawa Masanori who summarized the "Takeshima Kosho" under the order of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs said that "Today's Matsushima is the island that was called "Takeshima" in Genroku 12(1699), and they (Ulleungdo and Jukdo) are not historically Japanese territory." After this time, the Japanese government called Ulleungdo Matsushima. Matsushima, the Dajokan said as " Takeshima [Ulleungdo] and one other island ", was not the current Takeshima.

4. Question No. 4

The Question

Korean side insists that “After the WWII, Takeshima returned to Korean territory and the Government of the Republic of Korea is exercising solid territorial sovereignty.”

What is the ground and documents based on international law?
Please explain.

Example of Korean answers expected by us

Looking at the drafting document of the San Francisco Peace Treaty created before November 1949, the United States recognized Dokdo as Korean territory. Dokdo isn't described as the territory Japan has to give up, but ... can not be interpreted Dokdo as Japanese territory. After the World War II, General Headquarters of the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers(GHQ) separated Dokdo from Japan until the San Francisco Peace Treaty came into effect. GHQ applies the Allied Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers Instruction Note (SCAPIN) No. 677 (1946.1.29) which regulated the area where

Dokdo was excluded from Ulleungdo in Japan during the Japanese occupation period.

The fact that GHQ handled Dokdo from the Japanese territory in isolating it followed the established postwar disposal policy of the Allied Powers by the Cairo Declaration (1943) which stipulated that Japan abandoned the territories “which Japan has taken by violence and greed.” and the Potsdam Declaration (1945), etc... Dokdo is returned to Korea in 1945 due to Japan's defeat, the San Francisco Peace Treaty confirmed this.

Example of answers based on historical facts and international law

Even if the area "which Japan has taken by violence and greed" is included in the Cairo Declaration, it can not be said that Takeshima (Dokdo) was included in the area. It is clear from the fact that Usando in History of the Three Kingdoms, 1145, the Joseon (Korean) government publication Sejong Sillok Jiriji (Geography Section of the Annals of King Sejong's Reign), 1454;

Sinjeung Dongguk Yeoji Seungnam (Revised and Augmented Survey of the Geography of Korea), 1531; and Man'gi Yoram (Manual of State Affairs for the Monarch), 1808 was not the current Takeshima (Dokdo) either.

In addition, In paragraph 3 of SCAPIN No.677 which is a memorandum on the separation of some outline areas from politically and administratively Japan from SCAPIN No. 677 which states that the exercise of administrative power shall be suspended, "(a) Ulleungdo, Takeshima, Jeju island ..." is described as an area excluded from the scope of Japan, but in paragraph 6 of the memorandum of understanding, "This directive None of the provisions in paragraph shall be interpreted as indicating the Allied Policies on the final decision of small islands in the Allied Supreme Commander Directive, Section 8 of the Potsdam Declaration " It is clear that it is not a territory disposal.

Lastly, in connection with this "San Francisco Peace Treaty", on July 19, 1951, Jan Yuchan, who is ambassador to the United States, submitted a request for the draft of the "San Francisco Peace Treaty" to the US Government. In the request

form, Japan urged the inclusion of "Jeju Island, Kumon Island, Ulleungdo, Takeshima, Hikarijima" as the territory that Japan abandons.

On the other hand, the US government announced on 10th August of the same year, " As regards the island of Dokdo, otherwise known as Takeshima or Liancourt Rocks, this normally uninhabited rock formation was according to our information never treated as part of Korea and, since about 1905, has been under the jurisdiction of the Oki Islands Branch Office of Shimane Prefecture of Japan. The island does not appear ever before to have been claimed by Korea." Thus refused the Korean request of change.