

time in English, introduce the reader to the accounts of Koryŏ and Chosŏn dynasty Buddhist monks and Confucian scholars, engaging critiques on historical figures and philosophies, and explications of Neo-Confucian ideas recorded in the *Tongmunsŏn*.

## References

- Handel, Zev. *Sinography: The Borrowing and Adaptation of the Chinese Script*. Leiden: Brill, 2019.
- Kim Chongch'ŏl 金鍾喆. "Chosŏn wangjo sillok e nat'an an Tongmunsŏn e taehan p'yŏngga" 朝鮮 王朝實錄에 나타난 東文選에 대한 평가 [Evaluation of the *Tongmunsŏn* from the Veritable Records of the Chosŏn Dynasty]. *Tongbang hanmunhak* 東方漢文學 20 (2001): 163–178.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Tongmunsŏn p'yŏnch'an ch'eje ūi sŏnmunhak chŏk yuhyŏngsŏng kwa kŭ ūimi" 東文選 편찬체제의 選文學의 類型성과 그 의미 [The compilation principles and selection methods of the *Tongmunsŏn*]. *Tongbang hanmunhak* 東方漢文學 24 (2003): 43–60.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Tongmunsŏn ūi ibae wa pŏnsŏk* 동문선의 이해와 분석 [Understanding and analysis of the *Tongmunsŏn*]. Sŏul: Ch'ŏngmun'gak, 2004.
- King, Ross. "Ditching 'Diglossia': Describing Ecologies of the Spoken and Inscribed in Pre-modern Korea." *Sungkyun Journal of East Asian Studies* 15, no. 1 (2015): 1–19.
- Kornicki, Peter Francis. *Languages, Scripts, and Chinese Texts in East Asia*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018.
- Wei, Xin. "Song China's Role in Shaping Late Koryŏ Literature: An Analytical Survey of the *Tongmunsŏn*." *Acta Koreana* 10, no. 1 (2007): 37–68.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Literary Chinese Cosmopolis." PhD diss., University of Oxford, 2017.
- Xiao Tong, comp. *Wen Xuan or Selection of Refined Literature*, trans. David R. Knechtges. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996.

CHRISTINA HAN  
 Wilfrid Laurier University  
 chan@wlu.ca

*International Impact of Colonial Rule in Korea, 1910-1945*. Edited by Yong-Chool Ha. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2019. 352 pp. (ISBN [Paperback]: 9780295746692) doi: 10.18399/acta.2020.23.2.009

Given that the interpretation of Korean history during the Japanese colonial period has been colored far more by domestic and international political rather than academic concerns, this book, which broadens the scope of the historical discussion of Japanese colonialism into the international context, is a valuable addition to the field. By examining the international aspects of Japanese colonial rule, or to be more accurate, ideas about Korea and Korean ideas

about international affairs and their legacy since the end of the Japanese occupation, this book reminds us that Koreans, who had not been meaningful players in international affairs, were also members of the global community and that their perception of international politics shaped diplomatic policies after colonial rule.

The book consists of three parts. Part I contains three chapters that focus on the efforts Japan made to create and spread the image of a vulnerable Korea in the international community. Chapter 1, written by Hakjoon Kim, deals with how these efforts were designed to gain international approval for Japanese colonial rule. The following chapter by Sang Sook Jeon further develops this idea and claims that the Japanese were probably more interested in creating an international image of Korea than the Koreans themselves were, since Japanese national and imperial identity could not be validated without a comparison with Korea. Chapter 3, “Japanese Propaganda in the United States from 1905,” written by Andre Schmid, shows that Japanese colonial ideology was widely accepted in the American mainstream press. Even the conflict in interests between Japan and the United States did not undermine Japanese propaganda efforts, and only individual policies were criticized rather than the legitimacy of Japanese colonialism itself.

Unlike Part I and Part III, which present Koreans as “object,” Part II analyzes the voices of Koreans as “subject.” Chapter 4, “The Impact of the Colonial Situation on International Perspectives in Korea: Active Imaginations, Wishful Strategies, and Passive Action,” written by Yong-Chool Ha and Jung Hwan Lee, examines editorials about international issues published by the *Chosŏn Ilbo* 朝鮮日報 and *Keijo Nippo* 京城日報 during the 1920s. Ha and Lee present an interesting paradox for colonized Koreans: The Korean elite and the masses were “unusually” interested in international affairs, but they could play no meaningful role in international politics. This discrepancy led to “wishful thinking, unrealizable strategies, and powerless action” (p. 106). Chapter 5, “Modern Utopia or ‘Animal Society’? The American Imaginaries in Wartime Colonial Korea, 1931-1945” by Yumi Yoon, focuses on the views of the Korean elite on the role of the United States in international politics.

Part III analyzes how England, the United States, Russia, China, and Japan “perceived” Korean history and culture. Various sources are analyzed such as Anglo-American diplomatic documents in Chapter 6, “The British and American Perceptions of Korea during the Colonial Period”; reports of missionaries, correspondents, diplomats and intellectuals in Chapter 7, “Russian Perception of Koreans and the Japanese Colonial Regime in Korea during the First Quarter of the Twentieth Century”; and the travelogues and investigation reports of Chinese government officials and intellectuals in Chapter 8, “Chinese Understandings of Korea in Modern Times, 1910-1945: Observations and Reflections.” In Chapter 9, “Publicizing Colonies: Representations of ‘Korea’ and ‘Koreans’ in *NIPPON*,” a special issue on Korea that featured in the Japanese graphic magazine *Nippon* is reviewed. Unlike the so-called Western world, the Russians and Chinese, as neighbors of Korea, had ample opportunities to face the reality of Japanese colonization through their own experiences. As a result, Russian observers of Korea were not swayed by Japanese propaganda about “lazy” Koreans due to the presence of “diligent” Korean immigrants in their own country. Chinese visitors

to Korea also knew that the primary motive behind the Japanese modernization of Korea was not an enlightening mission but rather the maintenance of their colonial regime. The Chinese experiences of Japanese expansionism influenced their views of Korea: Following the Japanese invasion of continental Asia, critical attitudes toward Japanese colonization spread among Chinese intellectuals.

Despite its substantial contribution to research on the Japanese colonial period in Korea, the book is not without its failings. First of all, it at times lacks a consistent academic dialogue. In some chapters, for example, those written by Hakjooon Kim and Andre Schmid, thorough reviews of the secondary literature are noticeably absent. At least since the 2000s, there has been a flowering of historical research on how the international community viewed Korea, but this research is almost entirely neglected in this volume. As a result, the conclusions of some chapters do little to advance our knowledge, despite the analysis of interesting primary sources. For example, it is hardly questionable that Japan's propaganda activities existed, and as a result of this propaganda, which portrayed Korea as "the Other" of Orientalism, Japanese colonization was widely accepted as a historical necessity. This is the conclusion of Hakjooon Kim, a conclusion shared by much previous research. Chapter 6 suffers from a similar deficiency. Daeyeol Ku analyzes the diplomatic policy of Britain and the United States toward Korea on the basis of primary sources without any reference to recent historical research. As such, it is difficult for the reader to gauge in what sense his research is innovative. In particular, when it comes to the trusteeship decision over Korea which was extensively examined in Korean academia, it is difficult to understand how the author could have disregarded such research.

The lack of engagement with secondary sources is even more problematic in Chapter 5. Moon scrutinizes political essays published in *Chogwang* 朝光, *Chungang* 中央, *Pip'an* 批判 and *Samch'ŏlli* 三千里 in order to look at the "imaginary" views of the United States among ideologically-confrontational Korean groups: nationalists, supporters of the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperty Sphere, and socialists. In fact, Korean nationalists and socialists had a similar perception of the United States. As such, if their attitudes toward the United States were a central issue in their respective camps, we could say their similar perceptions were "a sign of dialogue." However, we cannot just assume that the United States was crucial to the power struggles between Korean intellectuals during and after the colonial period without evidence or explanation.

My second issue with the book is the definition of "perception," potentially one of the most important words in this volume. What does "perception" mean? In Chapter 6 (p. 182), Ku states, "the notion of perception originates from the idea that knowledge is a social product" and "all knowledge is social in nature and this social relationship is a perceived relationship." Is "perception" different from "frame," "stereotype," or "imaginary" as used in Chapter 6? The lack of a clear definition of "perception" makes Part III incoherent and makes me wonder why the title of Chapter 6, which mainly deals with the diplomatic policy of Britain and the United States, is "The British and American Perceptions of Korea during the Colonial Period." A clearer explanation of perception might go some distance toward

alleviating this lack of clarity

Thirdly, Britain and United States are two different states and there is no reason for them to represent the West, although many scholars tend to cast them in that role. As Part III successfully shows, though, all the countries examined view Korea in accordance with their own national interest. Then, why are Britain and the United States lumped together without any clear justification? As for the West, the author of Chapter 6, appears to use the two phrases “the two Western Powers” and “the Western Powers” interchangeably.

Finally, the historical context of the primary sources must be explained in terms of the changing times in which they were produced. In Chapter 7, fairly diverse sources are examined: documents written by Russian missionaries living in Korea, Russian experts on Korea, Russian correspondents and diplomats, and Russian officers. By what criteria did Kurbanov select these sources? What were the contexts of their production? How important were these sources in shaping perceptions of Korea? Without answers to those questions, the chapter remains an arbitrary examination of several “Korea-related materials.” As such, it is interesting, but not sufficiently analytic. It is important to critically probe the context of the texts.

Despite these issues, *International Impact of Colonial Rule in Korea, 1910-1945* provides a rewarding experience for readers who want to embrace the colonial experience of Korea from a viewpoint other than narrow nationalism. The two goals of this book are “to introduce the various facets of Colonial Period international affairs ... and how they impacted colonial rule,” and “to provide a platform for understanding not only what happened during the Colonial Period but also for analyzing the long-term implications of the international impacts on the Colonial Period in Korea and how that relates to the present time” (p. 1-2). In the final pages of this volume, the reader can easily see that these two goals have been achieved. The book is a reliable resource for any reader looking to get a grasp on the international dimension of Japanese colonialism and a sense of Korean views about the wider world.

SOO-HYUN MUN  
*Hanyang University*  
munshyun@hanyang.ac.kr

*Seoul: Memory, Reinvention, and the Korean Wave*. By Ross King. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2018. 330 pp. (ISBN: 9780824872052) doi: 10.18399/acta.2020.23.2.010

Ross King's *Seoul: Memory, Reinvention, and the Korean Wave* is a very ambitious book in its scope. Sprawling, erudite, and peripatetic, it covers a historical timeline stretching from ancient times to the Chosŏn era (朝鮮, 1392-1897) to the present, and touches on many controversial issues regarding national historiography, economic development, urban planning, architectural styles, and last but not least, popular culture. Geographically, its reach extends far beyond the