

A Tribute to Democracy and Peace by Contemporary Korean History Researchers of the Age of Division

Hanguk hyeondaesa 1 [A History of Contemporary Korea, vol. 1], by Jeong-ae Angim, Gwangseo Gi, Boyeong Kim, Gwang-un Kin, Suja Kim, Byeongjun Jeong, Changhyeon Jeong, Jina Jeong, Yong-uk Jeong, Yeonggi No, and Yeongjo Yang. Seoul: Pureunyeoksa, 2018, 324 pp., KRW 17,900, ISBN: 979-1-156-12119-0 (paperback)

Hanguk hyeondaesa 2 [A History of Contemporary Korea, vol. 2], by Taegyun Bak, Seokryul Hong, and Changhyeon Jeong. Seoul: Pureunyeoksa, 2018, 512 pp., KRW 25,000, ISBN: 979-1-156-12120-6 (paperback)

In Times of Peace, Reflecting on the Cold War and the Age of Division

The two volumes of *Hanguk hyeondaesa* reviewed here cover the contemporary history of Korea, the last part of the Korean History Society's history series published by Pureunyeoksa. The series itself is a continuation of previous publications from this Society such as *Hanguk yeoksa immun (An Introduction to Korean History)* (Pulbit, 1995) and two volumes of (*Saeroun*) *Hanguksa giljabi (A [new] Guide to Korean History)* (Jisik Saneoupsa, 2007). Unlike these earlier series, which were compilations of historiography by period or theme, and geared towards historians or history students, the present series introduces the research of the Korean History Society to both specialists and the general public.

The volumes on the history of contemporary Korea within this series were authored by the central figures currently leading contemporary Korean history research. Volume one covers the period of the "eight years post-liberation" and was written, in the order of their respective chapters, by Jeong Byeongjun, Jeong Yong-uk, Kim Gwang-un, Jeong Changhyeon, Angim Jeong-ae, Gi Gwangseo, Jeong Jina, Kim Boyeong, No Yeonggi, Kim Suja, and Yang Yeongjo. The authors of volume two, which is on the period from the Rhee Syngman government after the Korean War to the current Moon Jae-in government in 2018, are again in the order of their chapters, Hong Seokryul,

Bak Taegyun, and Jeong Changhyeon. All of them are quite literally the leaders of the field of Korean history, and many of them belong to “generation 1” or “generation 1.5” of contemporary Korean history research.¹ In other words, the majority of them are prominent experts in their own fields as well as teachers of students currently studying contemporary Korean history. As a group, they are not that heterogeneous in terms of their overall tendencies. Both generations typically started their undergraduate studies around the mid-1980s and aspired to academically embody the zeitgeist of the 1980s. A good number of them began with research aiming to explain what exactly happened during the three years after liberation (i.e., 1945-1948), and continued to study the relationship between North and South Korea (hereafter, North-South relations) and the realization of democracy in the age of division after the 1950s. This book faithfully reflects the accomplishments of contemporary Korean history research that began in the 1980s and is still underway, and thus lends itself to be a monograph on the history of a period.

Although its composition is conventional, the book is distinct in that the narrative continues up until the present, a feature rarely seen in previous accounts of contemporary Korean history. The authors of this book define the contemporary history of Korea by seeing North and South Korea’s contemporary history as “the development of democracy, division, and the process to overcome conflict,” and then chronicle this history starting from 1945 up to 2018. The second volume’s inclusion of a final section on the recent

1. Contemporary Korean history settled as a discipline within the field of Korean history only after the 1980s. Following Seo Jungseok, the first to receive a doctorate in contemporary Korean history and thus embark upon its study as an academic pursuit, the first generation of researchers, such as Do Jinsun, Jeong Yong-uk, Jeong Changhyeon, Hong Seokryul, and Jeong Byeongjun, laid the groundwork, centering their research on the first three years post-liberation. Researchers of older and younger generations then gathered around the Korean History Society, expanding the range of generations focusing on contemporary Korean history. The field subsequently saw the emergence of other organizations committed to researching modern and contemporary Korean history, such as the Institute for Korean Historical Studies (Yeoksa munje yeonguso), as well as the increase in students majoring or specializing in contemporary Korean history. In this review, I call those researchers—with the exception of Seo Jungseok—who started their undergraduate studies in the mid- to late 1980s and received their master’s and/or doctoral degrees in the 1990s “generation 1” of the Korean history academic community. Those who set foot into and completed their academic studies later than them but were either their fellow or junior students I call “generation 1.5.” I am aware, though, that these terms may not be wholly appropriate, given that there is not much age difference among the members of both groups. There is no clear delineation between both generations in our academic circle, and I would like to state here in advance that these are arbitrary terms used for the purpose of this review.

progress made in North-South relations shows how this book is ultimately also a tribute to “peace” by those contemporary Korean history researchers who had ventured into their undergraduate studies in the 1980s. There are, however, slight differences in format, tone, and length in terms of how the two volumes articulate the message of this dedication.

First, volume one deals with the “eight-year history post-liberation,”² which encompasses the liberation and division of the Korean peninsula as well as the Korean War—basically the origins of the current state of the Cold War and division. This period has in fact received the most attention in the field of contemporary Korean history since the 1980s. Its history—beginning from the influence of the United States and the Soviet Union early in the Cold War, the clashes between North and South Korea, and the conflicts between leftists and rightists—is reproduced in great detail based on an in-depth analysis of historiographical research. Each theme is appropriately assigned to the author that would do it the most justice considering the theme of their doctoral dissertation and principle area of expertise. The volume is thus well-suited for both specialists and the general public. The content is arranged to follow a temporal sequence, but the narration centers on the main issues that have emerged in the research in contemporary Korean history. It is also worth noting how the accounts of North and South Korea follow the same narrative structure. The volume, however, suffers from a lack of sufficient discussion on the Moderates, and there are inconsistencies in the way certain historical events and terms are phrased.

On a different note, volume two is a daring attempt in many ways. This volume covers the period following the eight-year history post-liberation, thus dealing with the history of the divided Korean peninsula. The period from the Rhee Syngman regime (1948-1960) to the Moon Jae-in government (2017-present) is described almost strictly chronologically. The vast number of pages—more than five hundred—is written by three researchers, among

2. The term “eight-year history post-liberation” stems from the understanding that the state of Cold War and divided reality of the present-day Korean society was formed between 1945 and 1953—i.e., during the eight years post-liberation. To put it another way, the term points out how the division and separate occupation of the Korean peninsula by the United States and the Soviet Union, the conflict between leftists and rightists, the intensification of the Cold War, and the Korean War all formed a force defining the Korean society of today. This topic has long stimulated discussion. See, for example, Choe and Jeong 1989; Bak 1989.

which one composed the section on North Korean history. Since contemporary history following the 1960s is still under discussion, the narrative circulates around keywords such as democracy, economic development, and reunification that represent the areas in which the research has seen most progress. The lack of sufficient prior research to draw upon gives the authors a measured tone in which they seem to be narrating their entire life's work. Additionally, the affect towards "peace" becomes increasingly passionate towards the end of the volume, giving it some character.

In the following, I will briefly summarize each volume's characteristics and topics, and discuss the issues they give rise to.

The Eight-year History Post-liberation, and the Absences

On the one hand, the organization of the first volume is flawless. Content-wise, this volume may as well be the culmination summing the research in contemporary Korean history that arose after the 1980s. On the other hand, volume one is conventional. For a long time, the main goal of conducting research on contemporary Korean history was to create an alternative to resolve societal issues through "analyzing the foundation of where we are at the moment." In this context, the past became something to ruminate on in the present. The eight-year history post-liberation consequently became regarded as a political piece of evidence that could explain the present-day state of Cold War and division on the Korean peninsula. This in turn inevitably entailed the dearth of attention paid to other themes. In short, the organization of this volume epitomizes the very landscape of research in contemporary Korean history. In this sense, the content is essentially constituted of two themes: politics and economy (volume two also shares this feature). Within this kind of narrative structure, attempts to foreground other "supplementary" themes can only go so far. But how can we view different things without changing where we are looking from? That said, considering the limitations in having to compress and encapsulate contemporary history into part of a larger history series, I believe the authors did their best within their given options both historiographically and in writing a book for the general public.

Volume one presents several key topics—external factors, i.e., the United States and the Soviet Union, the leftist-rightist antagonism that brought efforts

to establish a unified government to failure, and the separate-government policy—which represent numerous issues that have been raised since the publication of *Haebang jeonhusa ui insik* (*The Perception of the History Before and After Liberation*) in the late 1980s. Where the focus of the narrative lies, and how heavily each issue is covered does differ. This volume comprehensively summarizes earlier publications such as diachronic or introductory books and monographs on contemporary Korean history, reflecting recent research findings. And this volume also displays a few features distinct from such previous texts.

First, the volume provides a well-rounded and practically finalized recapitulation of the United States' policy towards the Korean peninsula around the time of liberation. The authors, most of the experts who freely draw upon U.S. documents, nicely wrap up the numerous issues that have been brought up until now. For example, research findings on the origins of the “38th parallel,” a point of controversy from the very start; the United States' “honed” policies towards the Korean peninsula; and how John R. Hodge, the military governor of the United States Army Military Government in Korea that occupied the southern half of the peninsula at that time, was highly conscious of the “military aspects,” thus serving as a prelude to the Cold War early on are narrated in a calm and composed tone.

Second, subject matter that had already been dealt with in previous books is reframed. For instance, prior research on the three-year history of the post-liberation aimed to explain this period through the structural aspects based on the “revolution argument,” which was the crux of the clashes between North and South Korea, and the leftists and rightists. Such a stance inevitably brought in the individual view of the author. In contrast, the narrative structure chosen here better fits an introductory text; important events and issues—the division into North and South Korea, the failure to establish a unified government, the cause of the Korean War, and so on—are described in a chronological order and based on the causal relationship between them. There are, however, several important areas that need to be more fleshed out, including discussions on the Moderates or Middle Factions, the significance of the Moscow Conference of 1945, and the North-South Joint Conference of 1948.³

3. This review does not cover the following issues in detail: how the United States military government and Rhee Syngman's camp responded as the declaration of the Moscow Conference of 1945 was being

Third, several areas are seen in a different light than by previous studies, and there also seems to be some disagreements among the authors' historical terminology. A typical example is the lack of consensus over which historical terms and perspectives should be used, pertaining to the "North-South Joint Conference of 1948," "land reform," and the "base of democracy." First of all, earlier research tended to firmly establish the distinction between the "North-South Joint Conference of 1948," which was held in Pyeongyang on April 19, between April 21 and 23 in 1948, and the "North-South negotiation" process, which was held afterwards in response to the demands of Kim Gu and Kim Gysik. The difference in North Korea's intentions was factored in, and the latter meeting was distinguished by its focus—as Kim Gu and Kim Gysik wanted it to be—on negotiating the course towards reunification.⁴ Here, however, the majority of the authors do not properly differentiate the two and provide only an account of what used to be defined as the former. Next, the inconsistencies in the authors' terminology add to the problem. In the case of land reform, only the facts are pointed out in relation to one another, apparently due to the lack of agreement among previous research. The main points of contention in earlier research were the significance of land reform, how it was implemented until right before the Korean War and what was its effect, and the nature of major participating parties.⁵ But here, the differences between the ideas of Jo Bong-am, the proposal of the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, and the ideas of various political parties are glossed over. Instead, the attention is shifted to the actual results, such as the fact that a substantial amount of farmland had already been sold before the land reform and how the conversion from landlord to capitalist failed due to the outbreak of the Korean War. Finally, the account on North Korea's political system reform of 1946 curiously employs the term "base (*geungeoji*) of democracy" instead of the usual democracy "camp" (*gijiron*). One could surmise that the new term was used in lieu of the existing

conveyed to Korea; how the leftists and rightists reacted after the decision was delivered; and how, after the leftists announced their support of the declaration on January 2, 1946, the dynamic of independence activists versus the pro-Japanese camp in Korea shifted to an antagonism between the leftists and rightists by way of the "trusteeship situation." For more detail on these issues, see Jeong 2003, 359-472.

4. However, this may stem from the differences in perspective between Seo Jungseok and the first generation researchers. In fact, Seo did indeed criticize other researchers for not making this distinction in his book. I am not aware of any responses issued by the other researchers. See Seo 2013, 84-85.
5. For further detail, see Hong 2001.

one perhaps because there are still debates to be resolved over the revolution theories of North and South Korea's leftists during the three years following liberation and the early policies of North Korea.

While the book deserves credit for what it does discuss, I would have liked to see the authors elaborate on other themes. The absence of such is all the more unfortunate considering how well finished this volume is—that is, one can easily imagine how developed those other discussions would have also been. And, in regard to some of the themes, I find the glaring omission of them rather problematic than merely unfortunate. For instance, the book seems to have little interest in examining a more diverse range of topics such as women, migration in terms of the Korean diaspora including ethnic Koreans residing in Japan or the repatriation of prisoners of war to third world countries, and certain massacres other than the Jeju Massacre of April 3, 1948. The research in women's history from liberation to the present in particular has long explored a variety of themes through the lens of gender and sexuality including labor, population and childbirth, the issue surrounding control, and the U.S. military camptowns.⁶ Practically none of this, however, is reflected here in a book surveying that very period. Similarly, although an increasing number of stories on ethnic Koreans residing in Japan or ethnic Japanese residing in Korea are coming to light, the book does not give them the attention they warrant. The most blatant oversight, though, is the lack of any careful examination of “massacres,” a fraught and extremely traumatic topic contemporary Korean history had to cope with, apart from the spotlight cast on the Jeju Massacre of April 3. While volume one contextualizes the Korean War and its history meticulously, the sacrifice of multiple sides and the developments of the massacres are not covered in sufficient detail. Given how these massacres and what they entailed continue to be brought to light both officially and privately after the South Korean Truth and Reconciliation Commission was concluded, there should have been greater efforts to address them in this book as well.⁷

All in all, volume one provides a clear, concise, and accurate summation

6. See, for example, Yi 2015; Jo 2018. Introductory books reflecting such research have also been increasing. See, for another example, Song 2018.

7. After the investigation into the massacres during the Korean War, there continue to be publications, both in the form of reports or books, by former Commission members including Han Seonghun and Sin Gicheol on their activities in the Commission. See, for example, Han 2014; Sin 2014.

of the historiographically significant issues in contemporary Korean history. However, the way several themes are overlooked in this process clearly raises some questions.

“Democracy” and “Economy”: Putting behind Unproductive Debates with the New Right

The arrangement and content of volume two is intriguing in a number of ways. The extremely succinct overview of the 1950s is unusual, as is the inclusion of the current (2018) North-South relations within the academic frame of contemporary Korean history. In compliance with the implicitly maintained disciplines, this field has not considered the present to be a topic of academic inquiry. Although the themes dealt in “contemporary history studies” were diversified, researchers have not readily tackled these controversial issues whose historical sources are very few, additionally. Most of the historians set the limits of their narration up to the 1987 June Struggle. I suspect that the transfer of power following the “candlelight vigils” in South Korea and the new momentum that followed reinforced the authors’ perception that a more fundamental reflection on the past was due, and the aura of peace following the sudden progress in North-South relations further buoyed them to push the bar up to 2018 (the present).

Alternatively, volume two can be seen as a definite, historically well-developed answer finally issued by the field of contemporary Korean history in response to their indirect but fierce battles with the New Right. To be sure, this may be an individual scholar’s feat, since only three authors contributed to this volume and each surveyed a different period separately rather than collaborating. Be that as it may, their narratives nevertheless reflect the whole field’s years of research leading up to this long-perfected reply in face of the excessive and vitriolic questions from the Korean New Right, which had been long “obsessed” with Park Chung-hee and the “economic development.”

The New Right movement in Korea began in earnest around the launch of the “Textbook Forum” in January 2005, with An Byeongjik serving as chairman of the board. Nationalism was starting to disintegrate just around then, and the New Right joined forces with the “Liberal Alliance” (Jayujuui yeondae), formed by South Korean political scientists,

western history specialists, and a group of now-converted former student activists, and condemned contemporary Korean history circles for harboring a “self-demeaning view of history” (*jahak sagwan*). The New Right movement virtually harassed and disturbed Korean historical studies and even prevented research from making any progress, by dragging historians into time-consuming debates over the necessity to enact the Day of the Founding of the Republic of Korea (*geongukjeol*), or falsely accusing them of harboring a self-demeaning view of history and not recognizing the legitimacy of the Republic of Korea. Born in the 1980s, the field of contemporary Korean history had originally made it their mandate to criticize the post-liberation divided state of the Korean peninsula and the dictatorship that came into being. The ill-timed entrance of the New Right, however, with the questions they hurled upon the stage, ended up holding back the field of contemporary Korean history from advancing. If we were to divide researchers of contemporary Korean history into decades, those belonging to the first- and second-generation groups were strongly critical towards the North-South division and anticommunism. The third generation and part of the second generation, however, were exposed to a different environment: these were the ones that witnessed the influx of postmodernism from the United States and Europe around the 1990s and, over a long period of time, discussed how to balance this new epistemology with that of Korean history. The field of modern Korean history in fact was enriched both quantitatively and qualitatively during this process. Thanks to the contribution of countless researchers at that time, discussions on the everyday life and rules of the so-called colonial modernity were made possible. Right at the moment when the field of contemporary history could have shared such achievements, however, the New Right, armed with their retrogressive statism (*gukgajuui*), made their inopportune entrance. Behind the façade of “de-nationalism,” the New Right was actually harboring a logic of statism, that is, an extreme far-right statism. The controversies over the legitimacy of the state, the disputes over pro-Japanese collaborators, the diatribes about North-South relations, and so on were in actuality regressive interrogations that, at this point, only served to stunt the expansion of Koreans’ horizons out into the world. It is true that these themes could be discussed in a variety of ways within a classroom. But those former “young forties”—the New Right—kept at it to the point of ultimately arguing for

state-authored history textbooks, aiming to inculcate the values embedded in their arguments into the minds of the new generation.⁸

As a result, a good number of the prime figures both in and outside of the field of contemporary Korean history were forced to engage in battle against the New Right. Many scholars who had been discussing and debating the relationship between the state and the individual and the issue of agency became entangled in disputes over the legitimacy of the Republic of Korea. That the Day of the Founding of the Republic of Korea controversy finally resulted in the new Moon Jae-in government's hailing only the 1919 Provisional Government of the Republic of Korea as the origin of all independence movements in Korea is one of the starkest examples of politics harming the field of history.⁹

In this regard, the significance of volume two is twofold. One is that it is the culmination of the best efforts of the field's main figures to comprehensively summarize what can be counted as contemporary history up until this very moment, with what sources they could manage to compile at this moment. This was possible by looking at this period through the frame of North-South relations and focal points of democracy and economy, and thus relegating all the rest as secondary. The other is that it can be read as a finalized answer put forth by Korean history circles in response to the New Right's political onslaught that shook and perturbed them as well as other fields. This, in turn, was possible since research on Korea's economic history, one of the largest points of contention with the New Right, gradually saw progress as new light was shed on the economic assistance from the United States, and as the Park Chung-hee era (1963-1979) attracted a more diverse range of interest. The specific qualities of volume two then, including the aspects I have just mentioned, could be summarized as the following.

First, as I have mentioned earlier, the leading authorities in this field provide a dense, chronological survey of the entire period from the Rhee Syngman era to the Moon Jae-in government. The resulting product is a

8. For more discussion on the emergence of the New Right in South Korea and the logic of their arguments, see Han et al. 2009; Kim 2015; An et al. 2016.

9. Shedding more light on the Provisional Government of the Republic of Korea itself is not anything wrong to do, and in fact admirable. The only problem is that the excessive attempts to link the Provisional Government to the current regime runs the risk of marginalizing and intimidating the historical evaluation of other various forms of independence movement forces and their activities.

diachronic history that could also serve as a textbook.¹⁰

Second, this volume presents a comprehensive and historically well-supported answer that can finally counter the binary framework the New Right has held on to for a long time. The principle concern running through volume two is how to view democracy and the economic development of South Korea based on a rigorous examination of the relationship between the United States and South Korea. More specifically, the narration of the Park Chung-hee era revolves around the direct and indirect connections between economic development in South Korea and the South Korea-United States relations; the normalization of diplomatic relations between Japan and South Korea; the historical significance of dispatching troops to Vietnam; and the significance of the regime's policy to prioritize heavy industry. In addition, expanding the narration, which previously ended at the Roh Tae-woo regime (1988-1993), to the International Monetary Fund crisis of South Korea during the Kim Young-sam government (1993-1997) enables the incorporation of a "financial" point of view, thereby finally being able to complete a historical assessment of South Korea's economic development from a larger perspective. In other words, this is a comprehensive meta-response from the field of history to the New Right's all-or-nothing type questions that demand a choice between economy and democracy. Within only three authors, such a skillful response can only be the result of the growth and tireless will of the field of contemporary Korean history.

Third, although somewhat emotional in tone, this volume provides an overall chronological survey of the history of North Korea from Kim Il-sung to Kim Jong-un against the backdrop of recent advances in North-South relations. Contemporary North Korean history after liberation also suffered from being written only up to the 1990s, similar to how the contemporary history of Korea, or more accurately, of South Korea was documented. Moreover, most researchers either from political science and sociology or from the New Right who wrote regarding North Korean history chiefly described North Korea as a main enemy (*jujeok*). Even the field of history was unable to produce anything beyond the 1990s. Above all, most of these previous publications were written amid the stagnation of North-South relations, leading to a rather pessimistic conclusion such as how North Korean people were still starving. But in the

10. Most of the diachronic history written by contemporary Korean history researchers before then ended with the June Struggle of 1987.

case of this volume, the authors write of North-South relations and the history of North Korea based on the overall resolution of the problem that originated in the eight-year history post-liberation while fully noting the rapid progresses made in 2018 between North Korea and the United States as well as between North and South Korea. The title of the last chapter itself, “the End of the Cold War in View of World History and the Great Shift in Contemporary Korean History,” is already quite obviously bursting with joy. Adding a great deal of detail to the period after the 1990s, and daring to conduct a historical analysis of the Kim Il-sung and Kim Jong-un eras has, in this case, culminated in the birth of a well-written introductory text that does not require North and South Korea to be seen separately.

The limitations of this volume will be discussed in the final chapter below.

Our Task, or Perhaps Hope: A World beyond the View of the First- and Second-Generation Researchers

The two volumes of *Hanguk hyeondaesa* ultimately share a common worldview. This signifies the conclusion of a phase of research in contemporary Korean history that had accumulated since the eight-year, post-liberation history. At the same time, it means that things must change. Until now, the central concern in the field of history has been casting light on the innumerable sacrifices that had taken place during the formation of the state and the nation, which has led other issues to be relatively neglected. But how long will this kind of macrohistory, this kind of narration revolving around politics and economy be able to continue? The historical imagination up to now operates within the mold of an almost textbook-like framework within which the politics, then the economy, and then the socioculture are progressively laid out. Of course, this format by no means marred the critical awareness of contemporary Korean history researchers back when there was one common concern informing the entire narrative structure.

However, times have changed. The authors of this book regard the present as originating from the candlelight “resistance”; yet, to the generation of today, the candlelight vigils are less the origins of a struggle than they are a “cultural” performance. For them, life is not a long pilgrimage one must fight through in pursuit of one’s goal. Life is instead a continuum of

instances, and those candlelights were lit at the moment many unmeasurable affects and various factors happened to intersect. Coincidental factors such as these make it difficult to form a logical narrative from a larger perspective. Historians before did their utmost to structure the contemporary history of Korea and thus created a range of subdivisions. Previous books providing a general overview of contemporary Korean history were also written following this format.¹¹ Some books attempted to analyze the structure through the lens of everyday life.¹² Other, more recent studies have focused more on the individual.¹³ The field of history, however, has still not gotten over its struggle with structure. But how does one capture the absences, the fleeting instances that are revealed from within the structure? Will historians be able to capture the vast affect that constitutes our times?

All of this is still being tried out. The earlier generations of contemporary Korean history researchers—generation 1, generation 1.5, and perhaps part of generation 2—all shared the same worldview: the truth was there waiting on the altar, and many historians took it upon themselves to be Indiana Jones. The Holy Grail, waiting at the end of all the trials and tribulations, went into the hands of s/he who strived the hardest. Now, however, there is no Holy Grail; there is only chaos. Democracy and economic development are believed to have been completed; yet, the Korean society is still mired in turmoil. History education in high schools and universities has crumbled from the pressures and demands of university entrance examinations and of having to find employment. Historians are out on the street, not to protest but to make a living. What kind of role can history play at such a time? In this sense, this book is perhaps the complete gift set sent to the generations of the past as well as the current generation, with the best efforts of the historians who gathered under the same mission for one last time. What kind of gift will the next generation be able to put together for their contemporaries or the generation following them? I look forward to it.

11. See, for example as ones of the most popular contemporary Korean history books aimed towards the general public that also covers socio-culture, Seo 2013; Yeoksahak yeonguso 2018.

12. For instance, see Kim et al. 2016.

13. See, for example, Manin mansaek yeonguja Network 2018.

References

- An, Byeong-u, Manyeol Lee, Sang-gwon Han, Jun-sik Lee, Kwang Jo, Cheolho Han, Dong-gi Lee, Ewha Lee, and Yukhoon Kim. 2016. *Geori eseo gukjeong gyogwaseo reul mutda: simin haksae gwa hamkke haneun geori yeoksa gangjwa* [Asking State-authored Textbooks on the Streets: History Lectures on the Streets with Citizens and Students]. Seoul: Gukjeonghwa jeoji Network minjok munje yeonguso.
- Bak, Myeongrim. 1989. "Seoron: haebang, bundan, Hanguk jeonjaeng ui chongchejeok insik" [Introduction: The General Perception of Liberation, Division, and the Korean War]. In *Haebang jeonhusa ui insik 6* [The Perception of the History before and after Liberation, vol. 6], edited by Myeongrim Bak, 21-26. Seoul: Hangila.
- Choe, Jangji, and Haegu Jeong. 1989. "Haebang pal-nyonsa ui chongchejeok insik" [The General Perception of the Eight-year History Post-Liberation]. In *Haebang jeonhusa ui insik 4* [The Perception of the History Before and After Liberation, vol. 4], edited by Jangjip Choe, 11-16. Seoul: Hangilsa.
- Han, Honggu, Taeheon Jeong, Manyeol Lee, Joongseok Seo, and Young-cheol Jeong. 2009. *Daehan minguk ui jeongtongseong eul mutda* [Asking the Legitimacy of the Republic of Korea]. Seoul: Cheolsu wa Yeonghui.
- Han, Seonghun. 2014. *Gamyeon gwollyeok: Hanguk jeonjaeng gwa haksal* [The Masked Authority: The Korean War and Massacres]. Seoul: Humanitas.
- Hong, Seongchan, ed. 2001. *Nongji gaehyeok yeongu* [A Study on Land Reform]. Seoul: Yeonse University Press.
- Jeong, Yong-uk. 2003. *Haebang jeonhu Miguk ui dae Han jeongchaek* [American's Policies towards Korea Before and After Liberation]. Seoul: Seoul National University Press.
- Jo, Eunju. 2018. *Gajok gwa tongchi: ingu neun eotteoke jeongchi ui munje ga doeeonna* [The Family and Governance: How the Population Became a Political Issue?]. Seoul: Changbi.
- Kim, Hanjong. 2015. *Yeoksa gyogwaseo gukjeonghwa wae munje inga* [Why is Enacting State-authored History Textbooks a Problem?]. Seoul: Chaek gwa hamkke.
- Kim, Jongyeop, et al. 2016. *Hanguk hyeondae saenghwal muhwasa (1950-1980 nyeondae)* [The History of the Everyday Culture of Contemporary Korea, (1950s to 1980s)]. 4 vols. Seoul: Changbi.

- Manin mansaek yeonguja Network, ed. 2018. *Hanppyeom Hanguksa: Hanguksa bak ui Hanguksa* [A Handspan of Korean History: Korean History Outside of Korean History]. Seoul: Pureunyeoksa.
- Seo, Jungseok. 2013. *Sajin gwa geurim euro boneun Hanguk hyeondaesa* [Contemporary Korean History Seen through Photographs and Pictures]. Revised and enlarged edition. Seoul: Ungjin jisik House.
- Sin, Gicheol. 2014. *Gungmin eun jeok i anida: Hanguk jeonjaeng gwa minganin haksal geu ireobeorin gori reul chajaseo* [The People are not the Enemy: The Korean War and Civilian Massacres, Looking for the Missing Link]. Seoul: Hereucheunain.
- Song, Chanseop, Soo Heo, Gyujin Choi, and Imha Yi. 2018. *Geundae ro ui jeonhwan: saeroun sigonggan ui tansaeng gwa sal mui byeonhwa* [The Transition to the Modernity: The Birth of a New Time and Space, and Transformations in Everyday Lives]. Seoul: Jisik ui nalgae.
- Yeoksahak yeonguso, ed. 2018. *Hamkke boneun Hanguk geunhyeondaesa* [Reading Modern and Contemporary Korean History Together]. Revised edition. Seoul: Seohae munjip.
- Yi, Imha. 2015. *Haebang gonggan ilsang eul bakkun yeoseongdeul ui yeoksa* [The History of Women who Changed the Everyday of the Liberation Space]. Seoul: Cheolsu wa Yeonghui.

HAN Bongseok (delet3@hanmail.net)

Ewha Womans University

Translated by Jong Woo PARK

