producing an exemplary work for its methodological approach, meticulous treatment of firsthand sources, and the extra effort he made – such as the interviews with the protagonist's descendants – to collect complementary evidence to back up the existing textual evidence.

Throughout the book, Sands' relationship with Allen has been relatively well illustrated with the various quotes. But why and how Sands' conflicts with Li Yong-ik ended up as described, or how Sands actually came to be employed as advisor to the Chosŏn court in the first place, could have been explained in more depth, considering Sands' apparent influence at the top level despite some contradictory narrative and a little self-conceit on his part.

One thing could be mentioned on the technical side. Too often, two or more quotations by two or more different persons are combined in one citation in the notes. This might leave some readers wanting to know which is which, if they wish to locate exactly where each quotation fits. Additionally, it is curious that while Sands writes of 'Corea' in March 1898, he speaks of 'Korea' in August 1899 (pp. 25, 29).

Overall, Patterson has brought to life many hitherto unknown, intricate layers that characterized not only intergovernmental rivalry enveloping the Taehan Empire but also personal-level intrigue centered on Sands and involving Horace Allen and other foreign diplomats as well as Chosŏn court officials, weaving them in an abundant amount of direct quotations throughout this volume in such a way that readers may find themselves easily relating to the characters of the story. The end result is this pleasantly readable biographical work, well-researched and insightful, that will be found worthy of attention by scholars of East Asian history, politics, and culture during the era of high imperialism.

CHUN Jihoon
Ruhr-Universität Bochum
jihoon.chun@rub.de

Namhee Lee. ***Memory Construction and the Politics of Time in Neoliberal South Korea.*** Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2022. 232 pp. (ISBN: 9781478016342).
doi:10.18399/acta.2023.26.2.013

Memory Construction and the Politics of Time in Neoliberal South Korea is in essence about the "afterlives" of the *minjung* project[1] but is also about how neoliberalism has had a profound impact on historiography in post-1987 South Korea. The book illustrates how it is not only the economy, social and political systems, and culture that have undergone neoliberal transformations, but also how collective memory has been reshaped by neoliberal rationality. It is an essential guide for scholars and students interested in post-1987 South Korea given

[1] In her previous monograph, the author defines the minjung project as "the articulation and projection of minjung as endowed with a coherent and unifying political identity." Namhee Lee, *The Making of Minjung: Democracy and the Politics of Representation in South Korea* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2007), 2.

its compelling archival research on academic scholarship, journalism, and literary works along with its analyses of politics and social movements. Outside of Korean studies, the book will also be rewarding for those interested in global authoritarianism/populism, memory studies, and (media) historiography. While the book stresses the need to remember its emancipatory and egalitarian aspirations, this is expressed without romanticizing the *minjung* project. Rather, the author indicates that history should engage not only with national achievements but also with repressed elements of the past.

Two central frames of the book are the "regime of discontinuity" and the "politics of time." The author uses the regime of discontinuity to delineate "claims of a total break from the past" (14), i.e., narratives that silence or distort a certain kind of memory by erasing connections between past and present. The regime of discontinuity became a defining ethos of the 1990s, which was manifested in various discourses announcing paradigm shifts "from *minjung* (people) to *simin* (citizen)" (2) and from the political to the cultural. Lee conceptualizes the politics of time as the tendency to render illegible and outmoded "all the events and development that do not conform to contemporary South Korea's dominant liberal democratic ideal" (3). The regime of discontinuity and the politics of time effectively resulted in "a neoliberal disavowal of the minjung project" (22).

Chapter 1 traces how the paradigm shift from the people (*minjung*) to the citizen (*simin*) took place and how it was described in a particular way in post-1987 South Korea. During the process in which this shift ushered in the notions of the citizen and liberal democracy, depictions of it marginalized the *minjung* project as no longer relevant. The author shows that the *minjung* discourse could not sustain its vitality amid the rapid capitalist development of the country and the subsequent diversification in class structure. At the same time, however, the new notions such as those mentioned above that replaced the *minjung* discourse were inadequate as a response to the challenges of neoliberalism. Probing the ways in which the paradigm shift was narrated as well as the shift itself, Lee writes: "The discourse of the paradigm shift, while proffering much-needed and justified criticism of minjung discourse, has also functioned, however inadvertently, to legitimize contemporary structures of power" (44). By tracking the political and economic developments that led to democratization, neoliberalization, and a variety of social movements, the chapter also engages in a theoretical discussion of (neo)liberal citizenship to show how the labor movement in South Korea in the 1990s gained social citizenship only by subjecting labor to the demands of the state and of capital.

Chapter 2 focuses on literary works loosely called *huiltam* (literature of reminiscence) in order to probe how the twin processes of democratization and neoliberalization brought about a shift from the political to the cultural in the 1990s. As a phenomenon of the 1990s, *huiltam* by and large deals with memories of the 1980s, penned mostly by writers who had been involved in or were sympathetic to the *minjung* movement. It revolves around former undonggwŏn —"an epithet referring to either the South Korean democratization movement of the 1980s as a whole or its individual participant, or both" (9)—who became *sosimin* (petite bourgeoisie) and lost their revolutionary hope and vision. Lee looks at the genre from both

negative and positive perspectives. On the one hand, *huiltam* is a component of the regime of discontinuity that casts the post-1987 period as a radical departure from the previous era. On the other hand, some *huiltam*, particularly works by female writers (e.g., Kong Chiyŏng, Kim Insuk), functions as a "form of remembrance" that documents "the unrealized hopes, dreams, betrayals, and failures of the minjung movement and the undongkwŏn" (21). This reconceptualization of *huiltam* is anchored in Walter Benjamin's suggestion that "history be viewed as a sort of counterhistory of the defeated, forgotten, and oppressed" (47). Lee also stresses "the need to reconstruct the present through a continuous engagement with the past" (66). Thus, rather than dismissing *huiltam* as regressively nostalgic or hopelessly self-pitying, its "dogged dwelling on loss, the past, and political failures" has "a potential to give rise to interest and action in the present world." (70). This theme is revisited in the epilogue.

Chapter 3 examines the "Park Chung Hee syndrome," unanticipated admiration for the former dictator expressed publicly by politicians, public figures, and ordinary Koreans, which is used as the opening vignette for the book. It arose in the late 1990s, manifesting the regime of discontinuity of the period. While the media represented the syndrome as a spontaneous and grassroots phenomenon, Lee argues that the conservative mass media and key political and literary figures were instrumental in its development. To this end, she meticulously examines memoirs, biographies, and literary works that became the foundational revisionist texts for Park Chung Hee and, more broadly, for post-1945 Korean history. Journalism played a pivotal role in the reconstruction of memories of the Park Chung Hee period. By paying close attention to "the troika of media conservatism known as Cho-Joong-Dong" (a shorthand for the three national papers *Chosun ilbo*, *Joongang ilbo*, and *Donga ilbo*) in producing social memory, Lee defines mass media as a "historiographical apparatus." Increasingly uncomfortable with Kim Young-sam's reform drive, the newspapers juxtaposed his incompetence with Park Chung Hee's aura of the strongman, which effectively sowed "doubt in the public not only about the process of democratization but also the value of democracy itself" (80). The chapter also delves into bestselling literary works of the 1990s written by such writers as Yi Inhwa, Kim Chinmyŏng, Kim Chŏnghyŏn, Yi Munyŏl, and Pok Kŏil . Again, the Cho-Joong-Dong troika played a crucial role in providing these authors with a platform and promoting some of them as social intellectuals.

Chapter 4 explores the rise of the New Right and its triumphalist discourse. The main argument of this chapter is that the New Right rewrites history in ways that recast the centrality of the state and bring the primacy of the market to the fore in every aspect of public life. Tracing the emergence of key New Right texts such as *Reunderstanding of Pre- and Post-liberation History* (*Haebang chŏnhusa ŭi chaeinsik*, 2006), *The Alternative Textbook: Modern and Contemporary Korean History* (*Han'guk kŭnhyŏndaesa: Taean kyogwasŏ*, 2008), and practices such as the push to designate August 15, 1948, as the founding day of the Republic of Korea (Founding Day campaign), Lee takes New Right scholarship seriously and provides a remarkable critique of its historical revisionism. The chapter demonstrates in great detail how New Right scholars working on Syngman Rhee and Park Chung Hee undermine their own scholarship by making circuitous arguments and ignoring historical complexities. The modern Korean history rewritten by the

New Right is "a narrative that sees history as linear, teleological, and progressive" in which "the South Korean state has successfully withstood various challenges … to arrive at the present moment of democracy and economic success" (120).

The epilogue is beautifully written and engages with Walter Benjamin's historiography , among other theories of historiography, in ways that tie previous chapters to the questions of the present and justice. The chapter provides additional empirical accounts of how New Right scholars have reconfigured the "comfort women" and forced laborers as *homo economicus* without thought for historical context, not to mention the pain and injustice suffered by the past generation. Again, such triumphalist narratives, which use the politics of time to assign to the past "what they perceive as undesirable phenomena and persons in the chronological present" (134), are by nature exclusionary. This politics of time is not limited to New Right scholarship. It has been clearly on display in public condemnations of the victims and their families in tragedies such as the Sewol Ferry disaster and the Seoul Halloween crowd crush. History is not just about accumulating more information but about intermingling the past and the present. As Lee, echoing Benjamin, puts it, "remembrance of the past injustice is not only a necessary condition but the only possible way for true emancipation of the present" (131).

Memory Construction and the Politics of Time in Neoliberal South Korea opens new avenues for the study of neoliberalism and social memory. Lee does an admirable job of providing empirically and theoretically rich accounts of collective memory in post-1987 South Korea. By offering a cultural history of the 1990s and 2000s, the book deepens our understanding of South Korea's ongoing turn to right-wing populism. Of particular interest to anyone who works in the broader field of Korean Studies outside the discipline of history is the observation that some New Right intellectuals have embraced postcolonial scholarship in charting their triumphalist narratives of neoliberal capitalist development of South Korea. They have embraced such scholarship "for its focus away from nation" and "to 'recenter' the 'individual' as a category of historical analysis" (107). Lee's nuanced analysis of the New Right's appropriation of critique provides readers with insights about similar appropriations that are widespread in contemporary South Korea. Lastly, the book's careful attention to the role of journalism in the regime of discontinuity provides a wakeup call for scholars of media studies. Given the rapid circulation of New Right scholarship on YouTube and KakaoTalk, the book can potentially act as a catalyst impelling scholars to explore how social media have become a historiographical apparatus in South Korea.

Reference

Lee, Namhee. *The Making of Minjung: Democracy and the Politics of Representation in South Korea.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2007.

Bohyeong KIM
Vanderbilt University
bohyeong.kim@vanderbilt.edu