JUNG JOON LEE

SHOOT-ING FOR CHANGE

KOREAN PHOTOGRAPHY AFTER THE WAR

SHOOTING FOR CHANGE

BUY

SHOOTING

JUNG JOON LEE

FOR CHANGE

Korean Photography
after the War

DUKE
UNIVERSITY
PRESS

Cover art: Yong Suk Kang, from *Maehyangni P'unggyŏng*,
Maehyang-ri, 1999, gelatin silver print. Courtesy of the artist.

For the people appearing in this book
whose names I do not know

CONTENTS

Contents

DUKE

UNIVERSITY
PRESS

ILLUSTRATIONS

Plates

Figures

DUKE

UNIVERSITY
PRESS

I use the McCune-Reischauer Romanization for Korean transliteration except with regard to (1) the names of artists and scholars who have previously exhibited or published their work outside of South Korea with the current Romanization; (2) the official Romanization of cities and towns in the Revised Romanization of Korean except in transliterated captions and titles; and (3) the names of institutions, companies, and businesses that have their own Romanization known to the author. The names of Northeast Asian origin are presented as family name first, given name second, excepting names otherwise familiar from widely published Romanized transliterations. Unless otherwise noted, all translations are my own.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

These seminars helped me delve further into issues of urbanity in relation to photographic practices as civic resistance. In particular, Karen Strassler offered strong support for my work. She also handed me a copy of her first book on vernacular photography in Java in anticipation of my publication. I hope she knows what that meant to a graduate student struggling to keep afloat in New York City.

I also send my warm thanks to my students and former colleagues in the Department of Art and Design at Queensborough Community College, where I began full-time collegiate teaching. CUNY is truly a transformative place, and I am grateful to my students for teaching me what higher education can and needs to do.

I am thankful for the support of my colleagues at Rhode Island School of Design (RISD), especially Professor Emerita Mary Bergstein for her continued encouragement. It was a pleasure to work on the manuscript in conversation with Namita Vijay Dharia, whose strength and vigor in the final stages of completing her own book also provided inspiration. I thank all my colleagues with whom I engaged in enriching discussions about decolonial approaches to teaching and research as part of the Decolonial Teaching in Action faculty seminar offered by the Center for Social Equity and Inclusion. These conversations helped me look deeper into my own desire for decolonializing research and writing. My research for the book has also been supported by RISD's Professional Development Fund and Humanities Fund.

In addition to those mentioned above, several colleagues and friends have read my manuscript and provided thoughtful commentary at various stages of my writing. Rebekka Gold has provided priceless editorial suggestions and comments on this project. The Clark Institute Colloquium, led by Margaret Olin and Amos Morris-Reich, provided an opportunity to workshop an early version of my camptown portrait chapter. I am grateful to the organizers and participants of this event, including Shawn Michelle Smith, who returned thoughtful comments and warm encouragement. My deep appreciation to Erina Duganne, Heather Diack, Ann Murray, Sophie Jung, Midori Yamamura, Yu-Chieh Li, Jie Guo, Jae Won Edward Chung, and Bridget Martin for inviting me to work with them on photography and art and share my work. Eleana Kim's comments on the chapter on artworks and photographs of the DMZ and US military base sites helped me think further about the anticipation and need for change in these areas; Carla Hung, Kevin Duong, and Tamta Khalvashi also read parts of this chapter closely and provided invaluable comments, and it has been a joy to work and think with them.

DUKE
UNIVERSITY
PRESS

The Time of Korean Photography

Notes on National Photography and Temporality

Immiscible times—the temporal disquietude provoked by supernaturalisms that are never entirely enfolded or assimilated into the ever-accelerating, preemptive forward push of chronology and capital—are indexical signs of strain, stress-fissures in homogenizing, deracinating translations.

Bliss Cua Lim, *Translating Time*

Reconstituting the discourse of cultural difference demands more than a simple change of cultural contents and symbols, for a replacement within the same representational time frame is never adequate. This reconstitution requires a radical revision of the social temporality in which emergent histories may be written.

Homi K. Bhabha, "Freedom's Basis in the Indeterminate"

Shooting for Change is a book on postwar Korean photography and the discursive ways in which photography makes meaning. The project was a long

time in the making; its development has been motivated in part by the necessity of finding adequate and appropriate ways to write about photography broadly and a history of Korean photography specifically. In this endeavor, I was confronted with two major issues. First, the more I wrote about photography in and of Korea, the more questions arose about the seeming futility of approaching this body of work using those historico-authorial frameworks considered foundational in the discipline of art history for any serious photography scholarship. Furthermore, there seemed a constant demand that this history strive to define what is uniquely or comparatively "Korean" about Korean photography. I began to see a way forward by exploring transdisciplinary approaches to photographic topics. Engaging with lively dialogues on the postcoloniality of East Asia (both north and south) and its stubbornly irreducible relationship with the United States, I stopped seeing the transnationality of Korean photography as inhibiting. Instead, transdisciplinary discussions on photography, East Asian postcoloniality, American imperialism, and diaspora allowed me to think critically about the desire for a history of Korean photography as an epistemologically decolonizing practice.

Shooting for Change is therefore also a book about grappling with so-called national photography, and I start the book by probing photography's "nationality" as an ontological identificatory index. This probing also necessitates an investigation of what such questions demand of a study of photography in order for it to become legible in the academy. For this purpose, I treat temporality as a key onto-epistemic framework in producing knowledge of photography while paying close attention to the potentiality photography enables when we engage with the medium in multisensorial ways.

To expand on the discussion of temporality and national photography, I revisit photography's assumed temporal coevalness through a critique of modern temporality in the introduction. This critique is followed by a discussion on photography's contingency and catachrony, exploring how they may unravel incommensurable temporalities of national, nonwhite photography against the homogenizing temporality of modernity in knowledge production. Hence, through the work of thinkers in postcoloniality and feminist scholars in and outside of Asia and North America, I offer a temporal critique of national photography.

My critique of temporality does not seek to lay out the irreconcilable differences between the temporality of Euro-American photography and the "belatedness" of nonwhite photography in a homogenous temporal map of global photography. Rather, I hope to recoup—despite the continuing impact of

the temporality of modernity—national photography's potentiality to disrupt, per Walter Benjamin, "homogenous, empty time" perpetuated in the racialized economy of academic knowledge, and to challenge the treatment of national photography (and the even more broadly defined global photography) as evidencing the diversification of the history of photography.[1]

At the same time, I note that this project is not aimed at securing a counterposition of modern temporality in photography studies. To do so, I feel, would be to repeat the homological production of knowledge on photography that is tailored to those who find comfort in seeing things only through the framework they already know. This study on Korean photography does not exist to prove that the center-periphery of the geography of photo history can be overturned. The project rather refutes the logic of center-periphery (or ubiquitous centers), regardless of who would attain the central position through adherence to the temporality of modernity and a historicism based on it.

The specificity and criticality of the term *subaltern*, first used by Antonio Gramsci in his *Prison Notebooks* in the 1930s and taken up by Ranajit Guha in the 1980s for studies of South Asian subalterns, has its epistemic anchor in the work of the Subaltern Studies Group, through which postcolonial studies gained their criticality in the academy. Running the risk of dislocating and despecifying subalternity from that scholarly history, my own analyses of the onto-epistemology of nonwhite, non-Western photography are greatly indebted to the work of postcolonial studies scholars. After probing the temporality of national photography, I interrogate the "nation" as a category of cultural containment to be kept uncontaminated from non-Korean concepts and practices through authenticated Korean discourses and reimagine the place of the Korean diaspora in Korean photography. Finally, I provide a brief discussion on the Korean War and militarism as a broad backdrop in the context of rupturing identarian logics, complicating the spatiotemporal categorization of nationality.[2] The introduction thereby provides the context, background, and methodology by which this book addresses Korean photography.

The normalization of militarism, especially in the wake of the Korean War, is central to the context and content of *Shooting for Change*. One of the most striking impacts of war is its everydayness, its ability to become mundane and unnoticeable, its pervasiveness in life. My use of the term *militarism* in this book is about this pervasiveness, rather than referring to the military force, installations, and politics involved in it. Korean militarism—its modern formation,

expansion through the colonial period, and normalization through the Korean War and postwar military regimes—is transnational, both making and riding the geopolitical currents of northeast Asia and crossing the Pacific Ocean to the United States. The rigid formality of rank, usually according to seniority (by age or time in position), is present in any group of two or more, even in casual settings. Although this is commonly recognized as Confucian tradition in South Korea, it traces back specifically to the militarized colonial education since the early twentieth century. The phenomenon is neither obsolete nor bound by generation or location: seeing students from South Korea on my Rhode Island campus play such roles outside of the classroom, even if jokingly, I am struck by how militaristic "Ŏptryŏppŏtch'yŏ!" is, and how entrenched it remains despite its irrelevance to art school life.[3]

To examine the history of Korean photography therefore entails an investigation of photography vis-à-vis the making of the militarized nation, and what it means to practice photography in the normalized conditions of transnational militarism. *Shooting for Change* treats the transnational militarism of Korea not as a unique subject of Korean photography, but as a lens through which we may probe the officially and culturally sanctioned readings of images when returning to them at different times. To examine this relationship between militarism and photography, three key approaches are explored: treating photography as (1) a multitemporal event (being experienced in heterogeneous time); (2) a multisensorial encounter (the affect of photography); and (3) a medium of plural performativity (the becoming of a political subject). In this examination, a critique of the gendered historicization of photography in South Korea, parallel to militarism, offers a thread connecting the approaches. As such, the book owes a profound debt to studies on the gendered underpinnings of various photographic practices across the world, exposing the gendered violence of colonialism and imperialism in the writing of photo history itself. As with other parts of the book, this critique also has been inspired by recent feminist and LGBTQ+ movements and cultural productions in South Korea.

Time: An Onto-epistemic Query

"What makes these photographs uniquely Korean?" Repeatedly expected to produce knowledge addressing the medium's difference from an imagined neutral state—aestheticism free from national (and thereby cultural, ethnic,

social, etc.) context—it seems that a country's photography cannot have its meaning, or name, until it is identified as constituting a national photography. The body of photographic work is expected to represent the nation, even as the images are called upon to constitute a national photography.[4] At the same time, it must also avoid becoming yet another photography of the Other, whose identity is addressed only by virtue of its deviation from (or similarities, however behind the curve, to) European and Anglo (white) American photography.[5] To define photographs of-in-about-from Korea as Korean photography is therefore to write a history of the medium epistemologically framed by nationhood—with its culture treated as content filling that frame—and in turn to produce knowledge based on and about those differences that define the "Koreanness" of the medium.

This "national" is not merely or exactly referring to an official, or fully representative, Korean photography, but becomes an identitarian boundary of photography.[6] National in this sense is not just an index of difference but a process of Othering-as-subjectivizing, through which photography gains its identity.[7] This process, when writing a history of national photography, also establishes *the* history of photography as a priori, a core from which any less broad history of photography extends, and an acceptance of it. To wit: the point of origin for the history of photography is reckoned as the invention and development of the camera in France and England, and later from vernacular to artistic developments in Euro-America; all "other" studies are founded on this understanding, to the extent that I have heard a photo historian at a globally renowned art college call histories of photographic practices outside the West "the alternative history of photography." Such a singularized history casts any history outside of it as national, separate from yet subordinate to the core—the role of any imperialist subject.[8]

It seems, however, that the criticality of probing national photography has faded, partly in the desire to move on from the pains of identity politics, and partly as the critique of global photography has come to carry more weight. Still, the issues of locating photography are conjoined with issues of temporality—and that of modernity in particular. Before assuming this book's position in any kind of theoretical framework, it is thus necessary to understand why the temporality of photography's location is still bound to a modern temporality, which valorizes nominated difference, in order for this photography to become a subject of knowledge—and as such, it is necessary to investigate photography's onto-epistemology: the interrelatedness of the ontological and epistemological becoming.

Rey Chow explains why nonwhite culture is bound in white culture by an impossible task to become a subject of knowledge, and why shifting the research focus or frame may not resolve those issues: "To put it in very simple terms, non-white culture, in order to 'be' or to 'speak,' must: 1) seek legitimacy/recognition from white culture, which has denied the reality of the 'other' cultures all along; 2) use the language of white culture (since it is the dominant one) to produce itself (so that it could be recognized and thus legitimized); *and yet* 3) resist complete normativization by white culture."[9] Following Chow's points, even if a project examining a non-Western photo practice sets out to complicate the location of national photography—say, by focusing on global networks and circulations, or the itinerary of photography—the photography of the nonwhite culture must seek legitimacy/recognition from white culture (what academy training entails).[10] Furthermore, the researcher is required to deal with the fatigue of being expected to seek this legitimacy/recognition in the language of the singular history of photography, carrying on its obsession with identifying variants of modernism in nonwhite photography. Most importantly, while doing this diligent work, the researcher is expected to resist the history's normativization and maintain its position of difference. To add to Chow, the act of resistance against normativization ends up serving the liberal humanities enterprise—capitalizing on diversity and inclusion—that subsumes difference as an identitarian index.[11]

Hence, it is essential to approach the rise of national photography studies in the 1990s and 2000s (of which I am part) in the context of "a genealogy of colonial divisions of humanity," which Lisa Lowe discusses in *The Intimacies of Four Continents*: "The genealogy of modern liberalism is thus a genealogy of modern race; racial differences and distinctions designate the boundaries of the human and endure as remainders attesting to the violence of liberal universality. To observe that the genealogy of modern liberalism is simultaneously a genealogy of colonial divisions of humanity is a project of tracking the ways in which race, geography, nation, caste, religion, gender, sexuality and other social differences become elaborated as normative categories for governance under the rubrics of liberty and sovereignty."[12] As such, before launching a study of national photography, or "cultural" photography even, the normativization of nation as an episteme of photography needs to be called to task.[13]

Jasbir Puar joins Chow and Lowe in probing what feels like an epistemological gridlock. Quoting Chow, Puar argues, "'Difference' produces new subjects of inquiry that then infinitely multiply exclusion in order to promote inclusion. Difference now precedes and defines identity. Part of Chow's

concern is that poststructuralist efforts to attend to the specificity of Others has become a universalizing project that is always beholden to the self-preferentiality of the 'center,' ironically given that intersectionality functions as a call for and a form of antiessentialism."[14] Therefore, how the "national" in national photography is defined may differ among studies as they attend to the specificity of Others and potentially call upon the intersectionality provided by various other studies. Yet the query itself is predicated on "the self-referentiality" of a Euro-American approach to what requires definition, and for whom the definition is aimed. Sometimes the question leads to nuanced analyses. Other times, nationality is treated as inherent.

"What does photography tell us about Korea?" The question presupposes that research on photographs produces knowledge fulfilling the "aboutness" in the question—in this case, *about* ethnographic indexes of Korea, made identifiable, and definable, in photographs.[15] Approaching the subject of knowledge production not from a critique of "difference as an episteme" but from the epistemology of "aboutness," Kandice Chuh notes the impoverishing effect of studying that "aboutness" as a measure of relevance and means for gatekeeping: "Aboutness functions as an assessment of relevance and, within the racialized economy of academic knowledge[,] preserves the (racist) epistemologies of (neo)liberalism through a reproductive logic that is utterly unqueer."[16] Chuh sees that "the determination of what something (a novel, a field of study, a lecture) is 'about' often is conducted as a way of avoiding engagement with 'difference,' and especially with racialized difference"; and, often, this avoidance ends up being masked by a focus on the difference, not an engagement with.[17]

While I acknowledge that this assessment may appear critical of the inquisitive nature of ethnographic scholarship, Chuh is not referring merely to the legitimacy of academic inquiries, but to the epistemic violence it bears on subjects that may only gain its legitimacy through its (acceptable) difference and relevance (e.g., "national" photography's relationship to modernity showcasing variations and relevance). Thus, the nationalizing of photography, borrowing from Chuh, is a way to "compartmentalize knowledge" in order to normativize what may be unruly and prickly—by sweeping it under the rug of *the* history of photography and pulling it out when difference needs to be showcased to uphold and solidify the ever-expanding field. The discipline of aboutness determines "what counts as knowledge, expertise and specialization" and is "taken up as and into the structures of the university in an architectural and intensified way."[18] Moreover, given the normativizing

effect of the question *about* Korea, we must also ask what it means to produce a history of Korean photography that is also part of the so-called global history of art, when much of the effort (sometimes its entirety) has to be dedicated to a critique of, as Lisa Yoneyama puts it, "the homogenizing myths of nationalist epistemology."[19]

How, then, can this project of writing *about* Korean photography sustain its onto-epistemic reason? Can epistemological correctives undo "the (racist) epistemologies of (neo)liberalism" in the humanities studies of photography? Navigating through the possibilities and limits of difference and aboutness, I am mindful of the fact that "epistemological correctives cannot apprehend ontological becomings; the complexity of process is continually mistaken for a resultant product," as Puar writes.[20] Accordingly, I do not attempt epistemological correctives by prescribing a methodology for national photography. Indeed, such epistemological correctives cannot apprehend or account for the process of ontological becomings—here, the becoming of Korean photography. Hence, the probing of the onto-epistemic in the *writing* of Korean photography is itself part of the becoming of Korean photography, and it is not a curative for the national methodology.

Puar's onto-epistemic query helps in rethinking the political applicability of representation. Working through Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari's theory of assemblage, Puar states the recognized subjects of representation—based on identificatory categories of differences for intersectionality to be enacted—are assumed to be "the dominant, primary, or more efficacious platform of political intervention"; on the other hand, assemblage, "a Deleuzian nonrepresentational, non-subject-oriented politics is deemed impossible." The identification of the subject, a priori of intersectionality, appears to assure the possibility of political transformation; however, unlike intersectionality, assemblage is based on disidentification of concrete representational categories, through "lines of flight, movements of deterritorialization and destratification."[21]

This exposes the frictional relationship between assemblage and intersectionality. Though not oppositional, they are irreconcilable. Treating the affect of both assemblage and intersectionality not as incompatible concepts or fallouts but as frictional praxes in my studies of photography, I engage with the (im)possibilities of national photography through this friction, irreconcilability, and incommensurability: not just in terms of location but the equally critical issue of temporalities in the writing of photography. The analysis of temporality as an onto-epistemological investigation of photography reveals

how the writing of photography arranges the irreconcilability of temporalities (between Western and the non-Western, or nonwhite, photography) in the homogenizing time of modernity so that they can be seen from the represented location of a normative position. Through the analysis, I propose a becoming of Korean photography, its onto-epistemology, not despite but for its potentiality in friction.

The Location of Enunciation

In the writing of national photography, modernity has been a constant episteme. Fundamentally, modern constructs are at the forefront of the very term "national photography." Beyond the relative youth of the medium, present understandings of nation and nationhood are grounded in modern (and Eurocentric) political concepts and denominations of (current) power structures.[22] A potential virtue of modernity as episteme is its normative position from which different times are called upon, and certainly, a history of photography that champions all national histories of photography is more easily realized if national photographies are charted according to a standard time. How a national photography is defined then depends on how one situates national traits commensurate to this global time—that is, the subjects of a national photography are identified from the standpoint of modern temporality, even though their national contexts (of different times) are provided as a distinguishing backdrop. In this reading, where a national photography embodies temporal incommensurability, modernity as episteme works to reconcile with this incommensurability by continuously expanding, while focusing on "aboutness" which ultimately evades the processes of the onto-epistemic becoming of differences—the systemic workings of (neoliberal) inclusion and diversity in the academy. This temporality, although in plain sight, is often overlooked, as photography is theorized and widely accepted to be inherently multitemporal. The reading of multitemporal events through a photograph risks being glossed over as an epistemic work of multitemporalities when, in fact, epistemic projects are often in friction with the "homogenous, empty time" of the normativizing location.[23]

One reason why the temporality of modernity has successfully championed all temporalities is its reading of different times, which, in fact, cannot be done without modernity's "ex-nominating" power. Addressing a persistent failure in photo studies, scholars such as Christopher Pinney problematize

a focus on the global, which ends up centering Europe and North America as photography's location yet again. Pinney questions why "global" has only referred to the medium's travel between Europe and Anglo (white) America and the rest of the world, eliding travel between Europe and Anglo (white) America—a practice of differentiation rather than difference. Following Roland Barthes's notion of "ex-nomination" in the bourgeoisie erasure of its appellation in the political arena as avoiding being named, "undergo[ing] a real *ex-nominating* operation," Pinney espouses the term to describe how certain photography gets freed from its location and others do not: "The space of 'Euro-America' is 'ex-nominated,' rendered un-marked and un-located . . . [as] the ex-nominated heartland."²⁴

The itineracy of photography should be dealt with more critically, he continues, which will then "help erode the localizing and territorial boundaries which certain approaches to photography in its nominated forms have sought to establish."²⁵ He hopes that a method comparing "differently-located practices of photography"—what he calls "a parallel itineracy of method" for studying a "World System Photography"—will transcend the current model of nomination, and eventually denominate all practices of photography. While this proposal addresses the issues of locating photography in the ever-expanding field of photo studies, and I find the concept of "nomination" and "ex-nomination" effective (and refer to it throughout this chapter), I do not wish to rush toward the "System" as a way of connecting dots. Primarily, such a focus on "parallels" returns to the question of difference, determining how a located practice comparatively differs from one another. Inevitably, photographies compete with each other from their location in this "World System," fighting through postcolonial entanglements in hopes of being denominated one day.²⁶

Significantly, Barthes finds the temporality of death—conjured and permanently suspended in his widely admired book *Camera Lucida*—a denominating essence of photography; however, the experience of death, both as "real" and suspended, is expected to differ by culture, society, locality, economy, and individual, as Barthes himself once had discussed many years before the book in his critique of the *Family of Man* exhibition and rejects the exhibition's conflation and its universalizing effect.²⁷ While by no means refuting Barthes's evocative work on the essence of photography on the grounds of diversity,²⁸ I want to pay attention to how his multitenses and multispaces become unequivocally commensurable, without ever being required to either be nominated or ex-nominated, or, conversely, to "provin-

cialize" each place and time—to use Dipesh Chakrabarty's proposition in rethinking the place of knowledge production in the context of historicism and subalternity. The multimoments and places, in fact, can be summoned without, for example, the provincialization of Barthes's Paris at his present; on the road to "Beith Lehem" near Jerusalem in August Salzmann's photograph—that is, taking on Salzmann's place and time represented in the photograph; and the time of Jesus, as Salzmann's time conjures it up in Barthes at his present. According to Barthes, his consciousness gets dizzy in these three tenses, even without having to locate each time: "my present, the time of Jesus, and that of the photographer."[29]

While the temporalities Barthes presents to us are not unusual (one's own time, the time of the photographed event, and those of other related historical moments), I am reminded by Chakrabarty's, Bhabha's, and Chow's examinations of modern and postcolonial subjectivization and exemption. The dizzying of Barthes's consciousness is caused by him looking at Salzmann's photograph and conjuring the times and locations of Salzmann's photo taking, and of Jesus. But following Chakrabarty, the French poststructuralist and his chosen subjects are indeed exempt from the "provincialization" (including the explicated specification) of their historical and political context tied to their spatiotemporality in a process that constantly haunts non-Western, nonwhite photography.

After all, who needs to nominate Jesus and his spatiotemporality (or Barthes's and thus Salzmann's) when it is indeed predicated on the Gregorian temporality of the Christian world synchronizing the times of the rest of the world?[30] But even without acknowledging that, the place of Barthes's enunciation, ironically, ex-nominates them; and the parahistorical connections formed between the tenses are welcome. Apparent to those who are, consistently and relentlessly, nominated within the discourse of globalism, it is, indeed, the force of whitewashing, the "ghostly matters" of hauntology appearing in non-Western, nonwhite photography.[31] At this point, it is important to remember a critique, twenty-some years earlier, of the *Family of Man* exhibition, in which Barthes cynically questioned why the exhibition organizers did not ask Emmett Till's parents what they thought about the exhibition, and posited the homogenization of death (of mankind) he saw there as "everyone dies, though differently, therefore we are one people." The discussion in *Camera Lucida* is a welcome redaction of his position that, "however universal, they are the signs of an historical writing," but his initial approaches cannot be forgotten by perpetually nominated subjects.[32]

Scholarly attention to race, repression, and reproduction has helped unravel the paradoxes laden in the essence of photography (e.g., the temporality of death in photography) and the repression of multisensorial experiences of the medium for privileging visuality. Notably, Fred Moten has pointed out Barthes's universalizing shift from his essay on the *Family of Man* exhibition to *Camera Lucida*; Moten unpacks what is at stake with the performance of modernity in Barthes's "regressive return to 'that-has-been' and/or to where-you-been[,] the staging area for the performance of that violent and ruptural collision that is both the dramatic life of blackness and the opening of what is called modernity."[33] Moten (and most notably Tina Campt) unravels photography's sonic, haptic, and somatic qualities in Black life that unsettle the vision-privileging poststructuralist regime of senses. According to him, the sound of photography, the reverberating sonority of the photographic encounter, is "vulgar" and "shouty" for Barthes because it distracts from the visuality of the photograph and its ability to prick: "Wounding photography is absolutely visual; that is the only way you can love it."[34] Moten observes that the repression of phonic substance in semiotics is applied to the semiotics of photography in *Camera Lucida*: "That the semiotic desire for universality, which excludes the difference of accent by excluding sound in the search for a universal language and a universal science of language, is manifest in Barthes as the exclusion of the sound/shout of the photograph; and, in the fundamental methodological move of what-has-been-called enlightenment, we see the invocation of a silenced difference, a silent black materiality, in order to justify a suppression of difference in the name of (a false) universality."[35]

Working through Moten's critique, the interconnectedness of temporality and sensoriality is irreducible. The universalizing appeal of modern temporality silences the foreign sound of the photograph, be it animalesque howl (analogized as the sound of crying Korean mothers who lost their children by Western journalists) or "mo(ur)nin(g)" of Black visuality (through Emmett Till's photograph).[36] The shout of the historicality of Emmett Till's photograph should not and cannot be muted in the temporality of universal humanism. Hence, to attend to the multisensoriality of photography is to reconsider its onto-epistemology and intersectionality, "to listen to (and touch, taste, and smell) a photograph, or a performance, . . . to attune oneself to a moan or shout that animates the photograph with an intentionality of the outside."[37]

Furthermore, Shawn Michelle Smith reveals how Barthes's punctum and studium are conflated in the process of objectifying the subject of the photograph and in order to evade his own objectification, especially in his writing on the portraits of Black people in *Camera Lucida*—namely William Casby, with whom he sees "the essence of slavery laid bare," and James Van Der Zee's aunts and uncle, whose deductive racialized identification, interestingly, leads him to remember his own white aunt.[38] Smith examines the ways in which Barthes deals with his own anxiety about race and reproduction (as well as death), and, as Moten has also noted, about universalizing the Black subject via studium (turned punctum) and ultimately making all photographs self-referential, to the effect that all photographs are about him and of him.[39] In closing the chapter on race and reproduction, Smith then graciously turns the pointer to herself to enact what Barthes has done to photographs by picking up a photograph of Barthes and finding that she "can meet Barthes part way," forming kinship through this image he left behind, thereby performing the very act of seeing oneself in Others, a kind of homage to the melancholy Barthes invokes via family photographs.[40] The affective work of individuating the universality of *Camera Lucida*, nevertheless, "does not give over as easily to a history of subalternity," as David Eng notes; as Smith aptly examines, that uneasiness exposes Barthes's ex-nomination of his place of enunciation in universalizing photography and its arrested subjects.[41]

Barthes unquestionably paved the road for affective engagement with photography on a profoundly intimate level. A critique of canonic works often puts the critic of far less significance in the risky position of being seen as not understanding the point or even being merely reactionary. But as Moten, Smith, Puar, Chow, and Chakrabarty demonstrate, perceiving an approach that ex-nominates even as it claims the opposite is common enough. Indeed, it is an issue that is obvious to the Other even as it feels impossible but necessary, per Spivak, to tackle time and again.[42]

Photography's Contingency and the Disjuncture of History

And contingency as the *signifying time* of counterhegemonic strategies is not a celebration of "lack" or "excess" or a self-perpetuating series of negative ontologies. Such "indeterminism" is the mark of the conflictual yet productive space in which the

arbitrariness of the sign of cultural signification emerges within the regulated bound-
aries of social discourse.

As commonly understood today, (national) photography reflects, among
other things, the urgency and desire to remember events and how that ur-
gency and desire translates an event by reproducing and re-viewing the image
in other times and spaces. Collective memory and commemorative photo-
graphs are a case in point: for memories and postmemories of events to be
conjured by photography, the ritualistic repetition of time and encounters
(e.g., annual commemorations) is a must. Commemorative events, for ex-
ample, typically deploy photography to affectively associate the events with
certain groups of people. For nationally shared events, photographs of the
event are used to create postmemories for the people who did not directly
experience it.[43] This conjuring of memories and postmemories can even
determine who becomes a national subject—who shares this memory when
called upon, and who does not.

In this context, the reproduction of images articulates a desire to not only
remember an event in specific ways, but to designate the timing for conjur-
ing up those memories, and doing so unites the remembering subjects by
synchronizing their time. The time of modernity hence aids national photog-
raphy in establishing a boundary that defines what the national is and how
this national is accepted as an empirical practice of, in this case, photography.
Remembering events that frame a history of a nation through photography
is therefore also a practice of nation making. And for nation-states such as
the Republic of Korea that grapple with volatile geopolitical positioning, this
means of nation making has been both invisible and overwhelming.

National photography becoming a product of the temporality of mo-
dernity haunts the history of Korean photography. There is the constant de-
mand, or claim, that Korean photography's Koreanness distinguishes itself
from other histories, that in the seeming act of reclaiming its history, it must
become legitimate, a subject identifiable, and thus written in normativizing
language of *the* history of photography, while resisting being completely nor-
mativized. To claim its national identity on this plane is therefore to accept
the force of the homogenizing time and participate fully in the epistemologi-
cal project of modernity, but nonetheless remain as its transcendental Other.

Given that this participation is often acknowledged, and indeed cele-
brated, as producing a much-needed history, is writing a history that prob-

lematizes the very framework of the national even desirable for photo studies? What is a way out of this conundrum, or is looking for a "solution" likewise problematic? Demanding a fast solution to what fundamentally requires decolonial praxes may overlook the struggle many photographers and photo studies scholars deal with and ignore the work they have already been doing.

Rather than looking for such a solution elsewhere, it may begin when we stop trying to manage the temporal disjuncture of photography, and instead seize it as the position from which to write the medium's history against identitarian logic.[44] Temporal disjuncture as an epistemic event is close to how I understand Walter Benjamin's "contingency" of photography:[45] a way of distinguishing between the remembering of multiple moments through photographs and the persistent disobedience of different times in photography.[46] In "Little History of Photography" (1931), Benjamin writes, "No matter how artful the photographer, no matter how carefully posed his subject, the beholder feels an irresistible urge to search such a picture for the tiny spark of contingency, of the here and now, with which reality has (so to speak) seared the subject, to find the inconspicuous spot where in the immediacy of that long-forgotten moment the future nests so eloquently that we, looking back, may rediscover it."[47] The critical point of Benjamin's contingency, which we recognize in our time (of the past about the future), does not lie in the fact that these multitenses are conjured up when looking at a photograph, but rather in the fact that the spark has been in our unconscious and we now come to arrest it, "that we should seize hold of this memory."[48]

Blasting open homogenous, empty time, the spark of contingency is what photography allows us to do with history, with our own political agency: to arrest it, to write it (appropriating a memory), and to make history. The blast-opening of the continuum of homogenous temporality is a step toward taking ownership of and making visible or sensible the temporality, agency, and (even) incommensurability of national photography. Hence, the political potentiality in seizing "the inconspicuous spot" in photography opens a possibility to do away with the need for methodology turning differences into identitarian indexes.

Likewise, Chakrabarty sees potential in "minor" history beyond writing "good" minority history, provided "we stay with heterogeneities without seeking to reduce them to any overarching principle that speaks for an already given whole."[49] Chakrabarty here warns about the routinization of innovation, in that "successfully incorporated 'minority histories' may then be likened to yesterday's revolutionaries who become today's gentlemen."[50] In that

sense, to write about the difficulties of national photography is to work through "minor" methods, rather than to write a minority history of modernity, which uses a majoritarian framework.[51] One way to work through such methods is to let what Avery Gordon terms "the primitive of the past" take us with its unruliness:[52] We need not be frightened when social life, "fraught with ghosts, does not obey our rules of method and our disciplinary organization of it."[53] We need not be frightened to view "the disjointed nature of any particular 'now' one may inhabit."[54] And we need to let photography touch us to sense the disjointed nature of the particular "now," for "a plurality of time existing together, a disjuncture of the present with itself."[55]

Siegfried Kracauer, however, while sharply critiquing the hollowness of history as chronology, brings attention to what he sees as the dialectical nature of time—as period (shaped time) and as chronology—and acknowledges that Benjamin overlooks this dialectic as he "drives home the nonentity of chronological time without manifesting the slightest concern over the other side of the picture."[56] In fact, for Kracauer, the incommensurability of time does not mean different times cannot exist coevally but that both "the incoherent series of shaped times and chronological time as a homogenous flow" exist as a dialectic.

At this point, I am reminded, by Kracauer and Homi Bhabha, that the space of temporality and the discursiveness of modernity has not yet been questioned. Bhabha asks, "What is this 'now' of modernity? Who defines this present from which we speak? This leads to a more challenging question: *What is the desire of this repeated demand to modernize? Why does it insist, so compulsively, on its contemporaneous reality, its spatial dimension, its spectatorial distance*?"[57]

Modernity, Bhabha contends, is "about the historical construction of a specific position of historical enunciation and address."[58] This position, which I take as the foundation of one's positionality as a speaking self (a modernist subjectivization), is treated as a temporal break: "the *time-lag* between the Great Event and its circulation as a historical sign of the 'people' or an 'epoch,' that constitutes the memory and the moral of the event as a *narrative*, a disposition to cultural communality, a form of social and psychic identification."[59] The privileged distance from the event, required for "bearing witness" or being "subjected," is what he calls historical "belatedness." Bhabha's time-lag (via Frantz Fanon's thoughts on "the signifying time-lag of cultural difference"[60]) does not signify a perpetual state of the subaltern's belatedness to modernity, but enables "a representative position through the spatial distance, . . . a specific position of historical enunciation and address."[61]

If the contingency of photography can be taken as a resistance against the temporal alignment to partake in homogenous, empty time, Bhabha's notion of postcolonial "belatedness" bespeaks this refusal. The time-lag is a place from which one makes perceptible the incommensurability of time in the enunciation of events—and, for my purpose, in the writing of a history of photography. I find a prickliness in the time-lag's refusal to "catch up" and synchronize with the temporality of modernity, its refusal to desire a place in its globality. The refusal insists that the time-lag of postcoloniality not be discarded simply as a colonial signification of Western superiority, but instead be reckoned with to make visible and sensible where liberal historicism fails—for example, in the ex-nomination of the dominant theory of the social. In that regard, Bhabha sees "the ethnocentric limitations of Michel Foucault's spatial sign of modernity" and explains how Foucault arrives at a "'correlative,' overlapping temporality" with the example of the French Revolution:

> Through Kant, Foucault traces "the ontology of the present" to the exemplary event of the French Revolution and it is there that he stages his sign of modernity. But it is the spatial dimension of "distance"—*the perspectival distance from which the spectacle is seen*—that installs a cultural homogeneity into the sign of modernity; a Eurocentric perspective at the point at which modernity installs a "moral disposition in mankind." The eurocentricity of Foucault's theory of cultural difference is revealed in his insistent spatializing of the time of modernity. Avoiding the problems of the sovereign subject and linear causality, he nonetheless falls prey to the notion of the "cultural" as a social formation whose discursive doubleness—the transcendental and empirical dialectic—are contained in a temporal frame that makes differences repetitively "contemporaneous," regimes of sense-as-synchronous. It is a kind of cultural "contradictoriness" that always presupposes a correlative spacing. Foucault's *spatial distancing* seals the sign of modernity in 1789 into a "correlative," overlapping temporality.[62]

In line with Bhabha and Chakrabarty, Bliss Cua Lim problematizes the closing-in of the time-lag and synchronizing the time of differences in the cinematic language of time in the horror genre, especially in Asian films as adopted (translated) by Hollywood. Bringing the analysis of historical temporality to the cinema of the fantastic, Lim offers a temporal critique of cinema through which the ghostly return of history, writ large with colonial

violence and contemporary exploitations, haunts our present. According to Lim, "Modern time is thus projected in every direction to include even what exists outside of or prior to its minting as a concept, entertaining an 'ideal of objectivity,' a belief that its conception of history is the 'overarching language,' the universal narrative to which all specific instances can be subsumed."[63] To put the modern world on this plane, the camera, for instance, is expected to represent a simultaneity of that moment of the shutter clicking and the event unfolding before the camera.

The expected simultaneity between the click and the event is (like a clock) a "spatialized misconstrual of time, . . . the familiar-but-false sense of correspondence or synchronicity between the inner duration of consciousness and the homogeneous time of the clock"—the regimes of sense-as-synchronous.[64] This simultaneity between the camera and the event is therefore an imagined one: the viewer "sees" this "moment" as part of the universally shared time that can be measured with and against all other spaces by virtue of being in the same time. Moreover, in practice, the viewing and reading of a photograph hardly ever stops at seeing it as an instant. As if the photographed event is part of a process or progression, context is almost always conjured up (sometimes by the photograph, other times by the curator, viewer, author, etc.) to connect the imagined moments within those processes and progressions. The modern temporality of the camera highlights the different times a photograph summons on the lineal map of temporality, while the place from which the summoning occurs remains critical to the concept of ex-nomination.[65]

Even so, the image produced as an impression of the very moment that the clock is punched does not merely tell the time of the photo making. All the actions involved with the experience of a photograph are part of the photograph itself as an event, rather than of the event captured in the photograph, as Ariella Aïsha Azoulay puts it.[66] Adding to Azoulay, I argue that the photographed event cannot be actualized as such ever again, because the event of photography undoes the homogenizing instant framed by the photographer, rupturing the near-universal faith one might have that an image forever captures a moment of the past. The event of photography is indeed an Event, in that it defies historicization as a representation of a particular moment in the past. Rather, it encompasses many more "time-lags" and in-betweens and the distance of the temporality through which one makes photographic meaning, including in the hands of the photographer or the viewer, on computer screens, in galleries, on social media, and in protests—

and even when the images await re-viewing in archives, as part of the Event. So, if the camera is a clock, we should ask an image: "What time is it there?"[67]

The concept of "time-lag" relates deeply to what Lisa Yoneyama calls "catachrony" and "temporal discombobulation," a glitch to the regimes of sense-as-synchronous. Yoneyama examines catachrony as a kind of temporal catachresis in reference to a moment when a Japanese politician, commenting on the controversy over the relocation of Futenma base in Okinawa, "remember[s] the wrong things at a wrong moment," in this case, by referring to a novel set in the time of the Meiji government on the annexation of Okinawa, rather than the US military-colonial settlement. Yoneyama points out how bringing up the Ryukyu Disposition in the context of what was largely seen as an issue of US military imperialism brought attention to the impossibility of considering the histories of pre–World War II Japanese empire and postwar US empire in Okinawa separately, even as they do not align coevally. Catachronies, therefore, can "generate an *unlearning* that critically unsettles the way we believe we know our history."[68]

The concept of catachrony is critical to examining teleology in national photography, in that defining photography within a national frame is a project of modern temporality which obscures temporal discombobulation and conflates multiple spatiotemporalities in homogenous, empty time through epistemic labor—labor provided in particular by researchers of color, whose race and ethnicity are counted on for the practice of diversity within the academy, which then expects them to produce the scholarship of diversity. By catching the moment of catachrony in and outside of the photographs discussed in this book, we too have the opportunity to *unlearn* the way we believe we know our history.[69] As Chakrabarty puts it, "what underlies our capacity to historicize is our capacity not to."[70] Accordingly, this book aims not to be *about* the "Koreanness" of photography in the modern time but a query on an onto-epistemology of Korean photography's history in the making.

Unfixing National Photography

Writing in 2002, as the field of photo history was culturally diversifying, Rey Chow criticized how "culture" came to function "as a shield that hides the positivism, essentialism, and nativism—and with them the continual acts of hierarchization, subordination, and marginalization—that have persistently accompanied the pedagogical practices of area studies."[71] The phenomenon

is relevant to not only pedagogical practices in area studies in the United States but also to a seeming counterhegemonic project of photo history a year earlier. A small circle of photo historians in South Korea, associated with the Research Institute of the History of Photography (RIHP), published an anthology of essays in celebration of the sixtieth birthday of the late Ch'oe Injin, the founder of the institute.[72] The topics of these essays range from Korea's first contact with photography in the nineteenth century to the practice of ethnographic photography during colonial rule. Among them is an essay critiquing the state of the history of photography in Korea, positing that the history of Korean photography must find a new methodology distinct from the "Western" mode determined by "Western art history."[73]

The essay argues that until 2001, study of the history of Korean photography had adopted the methodology of Western art history without giving it much thought and as a result, produced poorly examined studies. It contends that photo historians considering Korean photographs must avoid applying "Western categorizations" of photography—"art photography, media photography, commercial photography, landscape photography, portrait photography, fashion photography, and documentary photography"[74]—as these categories merely reflect "Western ways of thinking, governed by Western tradition, institutions, and mentality"[75] and fail to take into consideration the particular sociopolitical conditions affecting the aesthetics of photography in Korea. It concludes by suggesting that early photography in Korea is conceptually and aesthetically closer to traditional Korean ink painting than to photographic works outside Korea—and that, therefore, photography in Korea, especially early photographs, should be studied within the context of the artwork of traditional Korean media.[76]

The essay's call for a uniquely Korean methodology for a history of photography may appeal strongly to anyone interested in non-Western subjects. While positioning a Korean methodology against a Western mode (assuming there is one single methodology that applies to all studies of art history in "the West," and a respective one in Korea) aptly addresses what may have been overlooked in the study of photography in Korea, it also echoes a purist approach rooted in the perception of "authenticity"—ironically applying the homogenous, sovereign notion of time in Western modernity.[77] The founding of the United Nations in 1945, the writing of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948, and the drafting of Geneva Conventions in 1949, as Monica Kim lays out, contributed to the conception of the South Korean nation-state as having the sovereign power to contain its people and culture

(and their behaviors), which cultivated the liberal democratic view of the world as a "family of nations."[78]

Other issues arise from the desire for uniquely Korean studies of photography. If photography is a medium used by people throughout the world, and if this use reflects certain traditions and conventions established by different peoples in different parts of the world, how should one argue that photography automatically becomes a medium contained within the modern concept of the Korean nation, which is, already, based on "the very notion of nation we use today [which] is modern and Western in its origins, largely having to do with the rise of the world system of nation-state"?[79] And, what about the changing perceptions of nation and citizenship, closely related to issues of gender and race, which result in the realpolitik of citizenship and national belonging that are often overlooked in defining the Korean nation-state?

Then, what kind of an authentically Korean methodology could identify an authentically Korean photograph?[80] Granted the possibility of applying an authentic, non-Western methodology in examining a work of Korean photography, could it produce a kind of history separate from the hegemonic expectation that cultures outside of Euro-America be "pure," uncontaminated by the political, sociocultural, intellectual, and aesthetic productions of the West? The desire for purity and authenticity in cultures outside of the European and Anglo-American is equally troubling.

Indeed, the essay pleads for the "feeling of nationality" against the imperialist subject (the West) that taints the authenticity of Korean photography.[81] Naoki Sakai problematizes this feeling as he traces the systematic introduction of nation and nationalism by Fukuzawa Yukichi in East Asia in the nineteenth century, and the ways that Fukuzawa aimed at modernizing Japan through "the creation of the institutional conditions for the feeling of nationality."[82] Sakai points out that this "feeling of nationality" permeates "knowledge production in the humanities, particularly in area studies," and "refuse[s] to view nationality as something given," reversing the order from national to transnational.[83]

This reversal of the order of priority ("while never rejecting our struggle with colonial modernity") is key to Sakai's interrogation of how the "transnational" is defined in subordination of the "national." He argues "that nationality is a restricted derivative of transnationality, and [the] guiding question is how the transnational, the foundational modality of sociality, is delimited, regulated, and restricted by the rules of the international world."[84] Likewise, for RIHP to work toward an anticolonial methodology for Korean photography,

rethinking the order of priority in national photography could be useful; as such, the "national" or "Western" categories of photography do not define Korean photography, but Korean photography defines the new categories of, and for, a history of photography as a praxis of anticolonial knowledge production.

Moreover, looking for a methodological antithesis would not so much undo as replicate, in a supposedly authentic form, the problems of "Western" approaches that RIHP tries to avoid—by reproducing what modernity casts as the unique cultural essences of non-Western Others to be preserved within state boundaries and the feeling of nationality. Per Lydia Liu, "Universalism thrives on difference. It does not negate difference so much as absorb it into its familiar orbit of antithesis and dialectic. The situated articulation of cultural difference has been embedded in the universalizing processes of past and present all along, and it is these processes that determine what counts as difference and why it should matter."[85] This universalism, which in photo studies can be applied to the "global" of global photography, complicates and expands on the comparativeness of location.

The "national" in Korean photography is inescapably relational—relational in its onto-epistemology and in its incommensurable yet shared time. Consequently, an epistemological shift from "Western" to "authentically" Korean will fail to decolonize its history of photography unless we work out its interrelatedness with ontology. To propose a different ontology, as Lim puts it, "is to conceive time precisely as a relation: *a profoundly plural relation with difference*,"[86] to imagine and embrace "the contours of a temporal coexistence with otherness that is both prior to every encounter but not pregiven or foreclosed[,] a shared time around which we ford differences, when the very fording—not overcoming, but precisely wading through otherness—discloses the variegation of the present."[87]

As such, *Shooting for Change* does not equate "transnational" with "international," "global," or any entity that does not fit well in the "national" framework, but, following Bhabha, critically explores what enables the location (and the time-lag) of its enunciation. If the "national" in Korean photography is at stake, what is at stake in the transnationality of Korean photography? Or, by contrast, what makes this transnationality a stable episteme of Korean photography? To explore these questions, I locate the time-lag, or spatiotemporal distance, of the Korean diaspora—which enables the positionality of the addressing self—in the transnational Korea. Korean nationality and its effect (and affect) on photography is thus unfixed from a limited, parochial state of being.

Chapter Summaries

The main body of the book is organized thematically into three parts, following photographic practices from vernacular and art to documentary and archival, while treating the formative periods in nation building and transnational militarization as backdrop and cultivator for photographic works.

The first part of the book explores, through the concept of catachrony, the ways in which photography both creates and ruptures the rhetoric of the tripartite national relationship—comprised of the family, *minjok* (ethnonational subjects of Korea), and nation-state—and their collective memory. Chapter 1 examines how Korean War–era photographs of war orphans—especially those including UN service members, focusing on their relational dynamics—come to frame contemporary memory making of the war, particularly as the photographs are remediated in contemporary Korean War commemorative events. The narrative of victimhood became a common literary and visual rhetorical device in the decades following the Korean War, and its symbolism continues to dictate popular Korean War imagery. Using examples from American and British archives, the chapter problematizes the remembering of the Korean War through war orphan imagery, as it perpetuates, for example, an infantilization of the nation—one that demands regrowth and remasculinization through a patriarchal ideology shaped by transnational militarism. This rhetoric has also affected Korean diasporic communities outside of Korea emerging from the Korean War, such as those involving interracial adoption.

Continuing the theme of photographic family narratives through catachrony, chapter 2 discusses family photographic portraits through a dual lens: photography's capacity to convey the changing family narrative through portraiture and how family pictures embody the desire under the *kukka* (nation-state, here more specifically the military regime) to transform Korean society from colonial and war-ridden to modern and industrial. The chapter analyzes the changing styles of family photo-portraiture and their entanglement with familial vis-à-vis state interests in the twentieth century. This examination exposes how the photographic portraiture of family has embodied and mediated the patriarchal, developmentalist ideology of the Korean military regime, inseparable from the colonial elites' desire for personal and nationwide transformation.

Photography has been a key medium for documenting civilian protests. The second part of the book focuses on the ways that three major moments

of public protests—in 1960, 1987, and 2008—converge as a multitemporal event of photography and continue to resonate, as in the weekly candlelight vigils against President Park Geun-hye leading to her impeachment in March 2017. Iconic reportage photographs first emerged from South Korea in 1960, ultimately igniting a nationwide democratization movement against the military government in 1987, and the civic response to these images transformed the relationship between photography and political movements in South Korea. Chapter 3 examines the politics of photography in South Korea from the years of the military government's censorship of media and cultural production through the dramatic changes in the 1980s as bloodshed peaked with the democratization movements led by students and labor activists against the regime.

In less than two decades, online viewing and sharing of photographs became ubiquitous, as evident during the 2002 and 2008 candlelight vigils that swept South Korea; this is photography manifested as part of political activism. Exploring the event of photography as performativity in plurality, chapter 4 examines how the photography of the 2008 events was also about the making of what I call a photo public, the plural performativity of new political subjectivity. Through this exploration, the chapter reconsiders the relationship between polity, performativity, and the political event, as photography becomes the site/sight of the event's political potentiality.

The third and final part of the book, composed of chapters 5 and 6, probes the visualization of the spaces of transnational militarism—namely, the Demilitarized Zone (DMZ) and US military camptowns in South Korea. US military camps and installations continue to occupy territories that are, for most Korean civilians, imagined spaces—fiercely protected and in practice kept utterly separate from them—residing beyond the sovereignty of South Korea in the name of peacekeeping. Adjacent to the military base camps, camptowns became a zone between the nonmilitary civilian land and the territory of the state of exception according to the US-Korea Status of Forces Agreement. The photographic works in question are those of United States Forces Korea base camptowns and towns adjacent to the DMZ. The final section of the book teases out what may become possible when we begin to explore affective possibilities beyond looking and identifying the subject of camptowns via photographic representations. The works of photography presented throughout this book engage with endlessly intriguing questions of nation, militarism, and memory. Looking forward to the pleasures and pains of delving into these photographs, I hope the readers of *Shooting for*

Change continue to encounter the medium through a series of questions asked here—partly to unsettle the easy identitarian borders made for the sake of securing its place in Eurocentric epistemologies—and continue to explore the relationships that photography mediates between us.

That being said, there is one profound nation-centric limitation to this exploration to be addressed. By now, the reader must have noticed a glaring lacuna in the discussion of Korean photography: the absence of North Korea, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK). It is easy enough to find photographs of DPRK by photographers (not all but mostly Western) emphasizing the conditions of the totalitarian state, such as mass games and mobilized crowds for state events, often in stereotyping and Orientalizing ways. There are occasional exceptions, including the work of Chris Marker in 1957, from a time when foreign photographers were invited to (and still had the flexibility to wander off the streets of) Pyongyang and elsewhere, but these are few and far between.[88] Aside from the fact that I, as a Republic of Korea national, do not have on-site research access—another legacy of the Korean War—I have no interest in including, and exploiting, photographs of DPRK to produce an index of North Korean ethnography that hinges on a sense of liberal superiority. There is a future for such a focus: some South Korean artists have made photographs of the Korean Demilitarized Zone from the South Korean side, or juxtaposed photographs of Arirang Mass Games with those of South Korean rallies against North Korean military activities.[89] Although it is not within the scope of this book, I have learned from thoughtful analyses on the geopolitical entanglement of history, representation, and aesthetics of North Korean photographs by scholars of Korean photography and look forward to more work being done in that arena.[90] For now, I hope that the troubling absence of North Korea in my project makes conspicuous the place from which the history of Korean photography is being enounced, experienced, and anticipated. This absence is where the book aches. It is the hauntology of Korean photography after the war.

NOTES

Introduction. The Time of Korean Photography

1   Benjamin, "Theses on the Philosophy of History," 261–62.

2   For example, Justin Carville questions the boundary of Irish photography when photographs resist national identification in the historico-political complexity of Northern Ireland and the postcolonial memories of the place. Carville, *Photography and Ireland*.

3   The translation I find most accurate is "Front leaning rest position!"

4   Chatterjee makes an important claim that informs the epistemological challenge in producing a national history of photography (emphasis added): "History, it would seem, has decreed that we in the postcolonial world shall only be perpetual consumers of modernity. Europe and the Americas, the only true subjects of history, have thought out on our behalf not only the script of colonial enlightenment and exploitation, but also that of our anti-colonial resistance and postcolonial misery. Even our imaginations must remain forever colonized.... *The most powerful as well as the most creative results of the nationalist imagination in Asia and Africa are posited not on an identity but rather on a difference with the 'modular' forms of the nation society propagated by the modern West.* How can we ignore this without reducing the experience of anti-colonial nationalism to a caricature of itself?" Chatterjee, "Whose Imagined Community?," 214–25.

5   Although nationalism is not necessarily a driving force for the historicization of a national photography, it readily becomes a defense mechanism against applying modern genres of photography shaped in Europe and the United States (an example will be discussed later in the chapter). Chakarabarty, on the other hand, finds that nationalism presents a meaningful question regarding vision and imagination, challenging the easy identification of realism or facts with the political. Chakrabarty, *Provincializing Europe*, 149–50.

6   It is common to refer to specific photographic works of countries according to nationality—for example, British photography, Japanese photography, and so on. However, treating photographs as capable of representing the national approach to the medium as a whole—if such a thing exists—is a fallacy. For studies on the discourse of the nation and photographic archives, see Caraffa and Serena, *Photo Archives and the Idea of Nation*.

7   Geoffrey Batchen has critiqued how "photography's other history is to be fashioned from accounts of the medium's representations of non-Western peoples." Batchen, "How the Other Half Photographs: Looking Globally." Jasbir Puar also discusses how difference continues to be "difference from," not "difference within." This "'difference from' produces difference as a contradiction rather than . . . recognizing it as a perpetual and continuous process of splitting." Puar, "'I Would Rather Be a Cyborg than a Goddess,'" 53.

8   Historians and critics of photography have debunked the myth of photography as an invention. Yet the scholarship of the medium's history still demands the establishment of an identificatory, ethnographic index for a non-Western history of photography, an index that is compatible, understandable, and parallel to the epistemology of photography as inherently European.

9   Chow, "Theory, Area Studies, Cultural Studies," 114. Emphasis added.

10   Pinney, "Locating Photography"; Cadava and Nouzeilles, *Itinerant Languages of Photography*.

11   Jennifer Nash draws from the voices of feminists of color, which "have been deeply critical of diversity logics, arguing that it is a practice of 'benign variation' that 'bypass power as well as history to suggest a harmonious empty pluralism.' [. . .] Taken together, these scholars reveal the host of ways that diversity operates in apolitical and often anti-political ways to selectively usher a few bodies into exclusive institutions." Nash, *Black Feminism Reimagined*, 24.

12   Lowe, *Intimacies of Four Continents*, 7. Similarly, Jasbir Puar discusses the "cherished categories of the intersectional mantra—originally starting with race, class, gender, now including sexuality, nation. Religion, age, and disability—are the products of modernist colonial agendas and regimes of epistemic violence, operative through a Western/Euro-American epistemological formation through which the notion of discrete identity has emerged." See Puar, "'I Would Rather Be a Cyborg than a Goddess,'" 55.

13   It has been difficult to do so when the liberal university uses non-white, non-Western identities as signs of an inclusive and diverse place of knowledge making and sharing.

14   Puar, "'I Would Rather Be a Cyborg than a Goddess,'" 55. Also see Nash's thoughtful analysis of reclaiming intersectionality through the affect of defensiveness in black feminism today. Nash, *Black Feminism Reimagined*.

15   This task of satisfying identitarian logics is familiar to anyone whose studies involve non-Western, nonwhite, or nonnormative subjects, and this familiarity is part of the fatigue Puar discusses via Chow. In defiance against such identitarian logics, the Burmese photographer Min Ma Naing, for example, discusses how she is often confronted with the critique from international curators and editors seeking images of political turmoil and civilian oppression: "I don't find Burmese aesthetics in your work." Min Ma Naing, "Beyond Burmese Esthetics."

16   Chuh, "It's Not about Anything," 175.

17   Chuh, 174.

18   Chuh, 176.

19   Yoneyama, *Cold War Ruins*, 57.

20   Puar, "'I Would Rather Be a Cyborg than a Goddess,'" 50.

21   Muñoz, *Sense of Brown*, 78. In his discussion on Nao Bustamante's performance as Carmelita Tropicana, Muñoz relates the shifting personifications to queer assemblage itself, to always becoming. Resonating with Puar, becoming, for Muñoz, "eschews notions of fixed organic unity for anticipatory formations. . . . Becoming is a kind of deterritorialization of the body itself, where stable molar identities are interrupted and new molecular formations take place. Becoming is about the interstice, about the threshold, dislocation, and destabilization."

22   Gi-Wook Shin describes how Korea's ethno-nationalism, based on common ancestry and heritage, was not only shaped by modernity, but also determined "the forms and nature of modernity" the country took on. It is not uncommon to see conflations of nation and nationalism, nation and modernity, and nationalism and modernity in that context. Shin, *Ethnic Nationalism in Korea*, 13.

23   Benjamin, "Theses on the Philosophy of History."

24   Barthes, *Mythologies*, 137–50. Emphasis in original. Pinney, "Locating Photography," 30.

25   Barthes's antithesis of "bourgeois ex-nomination" is "revolutionary denomination," which "announces openly as revolution and thereby abolishes myth." Barthes, 147; Pinney, "Locating Photography," 40.

26   For instance, in *Itinerant Languages of Photography* (36), Eduardo Cadava emphasizes "itinerancy" as the essence of photographic images; it also helps to shift the focus from "the relation between photography and travel" to "the itinerancy

of the practices and discourses of photography themselves." Yet while Cadava and Gabriela Nouzeilles remark on "an explosion of 'world photography'" and how all of its archives and histories "deserve to be studied 'independently' and in relation to one another," they nonetheless immediately turn to the "nominated" difference of Latin America being at "the forefront of the development of new aesthetic paradigms in modern and contemporary photography," which was the focus of their 2013–14 exhibition and accompanying catalogue. The itinerary of photographic practices and discourses does help us reach more nuanced scholarship of the violent and entwined histories of capital, industry, colonialism, technology, and knowledge production; but the nominated difference is still presented as the very episteme that "deserves" to receive scholarly attention and institutional funding. Cadava and Nouzeilles, *Itinerant Languages of Photography*, 18.

27   Barthes, "Great Family of Man," 100–102.

28   Barthes's work has inspired contemporary reflections on photography's essence, including its relationship with death. For example, see Batchen, *Photography Degree Zero*; "Life and Death," 108–29.

29   Barthes, *Camera Lucida*, 97. Pinney considers Barthes's conjuring of the three tenses an ontological exploration of photography, which is potentially a more meaningful question than focusing on cultural differences as the medium's ontological beginnings. Pinney, "Troubled by Photography."

30   Barthes's powerful and deeply admired reflection on the "death in the future" of photography, as he writes on Lewis Payne's portrait, is commensurate with death in Christianity: "There is always a defeat of Time in them: *that* is dead and *that* is going to die . . . they are dead (today), they are then *already* dead (yesterday)" (*Camera Lucida*, 96). The impending yet suspended death, which has happened at the time of viewing, showcases the multiple tenses of photography. It is, however, the possibility of conflating these deaths, including those of Payne, Jesus, and Barthes at different times and locations, that the default of ex-nomination allows. In other words, it is not the different times that a photograph engages with per se that a project of "national" photography finds its onto-epistemological limits, but the ex-nominated location from which different times are conjured, iterated, and compared. And conversely (and subsequently), to conjure, iterate, and compare different times in hopes of being ex-nominated. Subjects are legitimized and valorized as academic when they are mapped onto the temporality of modernity vis-à-vis European thoughts.

31   Gordon, *Ghostly Matters*.

32   Barthes, "Great Family of Man," 102. By contrast, Ariella Aïsha Azoulay's more recent approach to the *Family of Man* exhibition sheds light on its lasting humanitarian impact as a "visual universal declaration of human rights," countering Barthes's critique. Azoulay, "'Family of Man.'"

33 Moten, *In the Break*, 203.

34 Moten, 204–5.

35 Moten, 205.

36 Moten, 196.

37 Moten, 208.

38 Barthes, *Camera Lucida*, 34, cited in Smith, *At the Edge of Sight*, 28, 30.

39 Smith, *At the Edge of Sight*, 35.

40 Smith, 38.

41 Eng, "Feeling of Photography, the Feeling of Kinship," 346n10. Also, Elizabeth Abel examines Barthes's essentialization of the language of photography, juxta-posing it against Benjamin's approaches. Abel, *Signs of the Times*, 62–67, espe-cially "Signs of Race in the Language of Photography."

42 For example, to self-reflect on and reassess their interventionist guerilla performance at the opening of Matthew Barney's solo exhibition at the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art, Tina Takemoto pays attention to the ways that Barney and Barthes both deploy Japan in their work as "an inspiring 'situ-ation for writing' that need not bear any resemblance to any actual location." Referring to him as the master of semiotics, Takemoto notes that Barthes is "willfully indifferent to the historical, cultural, or political realities of Japan in order to fulfill 'the possibility of difference, of a mutation, of a revolution in the propriety of symbolic systems'"; Japan is approached "as an empire of foreign, traditional, and antiquated signs that can be manipulated to create entirely new symbolic systems for the West." See Takemoto, "Drawing Complaint," 87–88.

43 Hirsch, *Family Frames*.

44 This logic operates efficiently in linear time as we are asked to look back (usu-ally through the image of the Other) and to look forward (in anticipation of the diversified Self). See Smith and Sliwinski, *Photography and the Optical Uncon-scious*, 15.

45 Smith and Sliwinski, *Photography and the Optical Unconscious*.

46 Benjamin, "On the Concept of History," 389–400.

47 Benjamin, "Little History of Photography," 510, quoted in Smith and Sliwinski, *Photography and the Optical Unconscious*, 11–12.

48 Benjamin, "On the Concept of History," 391, quoted in Smith and Sliwinski, *Photography and the Optical Unconscious*, 12.

49 Chakrabarty, *Provincializing Europe*, 107.

50 Chakrabarty, 100.

51 "Minor" methods and affect have been explored by authors such as Hentyle Yapp and Cathy Park Hong. Yapp, *Minor China*; Hong, *Minor Feelings*.

52   Gordon, *Ghostly Matters*.

53   Gordon, 27.

54   Chakrabarty, *Provincializing Europe*, 108.

55   Chakrabarty, 109.

56   Kracauer and Kristeller, *History*, 155.

57   Bhabha, "'Race,' Time and the Revision of Modernity," 203. Emphasis in original.

58   Bhabha, 201.

59   Bhabha, 202.

60   Bhabha, 194. Bhabha refers to Fanon, "The Fact of Blackness," 109–40.

61   Bhabha, "'Race,' Time and the Revision of Modernity," 202.

62   Bhabha, 202. Emphasis in original. He goes on to claim, "Hidden in the disavowing narrative of historical retroversion and its archaism, is a notion of the time-lag that displaces Foucault's spatial analytic of modernity and Anderson's homogenous temporality of the modern nation." See 209.

63   Lim, *Translating Time*, 18.

64   Lim, 50–51.

65   Lim's "immiscible temporality" is therefore comparable to the temporality of photography. See Lim, 32.

66   Azoulay, *Civil Imagination*, 25. Azoulay critiques the concept of "a certain instance framed by a photographer" as overemphasizing the particular time represented and doing so by erroneously conceptualizing the time of photography as if it is given by the photographer. Azoulay writes that "a photograph is never the testimony of the photographer alone, and the event of photography, unlike the photographed event, continues to exist despite all other considerations. . . . The event of photography is never over. It can only be suspended, caught in the anticipation of the next encounter that will allow for its actualization," 25.

67   Tsai Ming-liang explores the dehomogenization of global time (and being) in his 2001 film, *What Time Is It There?* Though the event of photography undoes a universal time, the concept of the camera as a clock continues to enable a particular kind of temporality in national photography by acting as a framing device for putting different spaces in a unified time via the special distance of history's enunciation.

68   Yoneyama, *Cold War Ruins*, 49. Emphasis added.

69   Thy Phu has similarly discussed the temporal and spatial disjuncture and misalignment that happens during the reenactment of the Vietnam War in the forests of Virginia in An-My Lê's *Small Wars*. Phu, "Reenactment and Remembrance."

70   Chakrabarty, *Provincializing Europe*, 113.

71 Chow, "Theory, Area Studies, Cultural Studies," 111.

72 Indeed, it would not be hyperbole to say Ch'oe shaped the foundation of the history of Korean photography and launched it as an academic field as the director of RIHP. He died in 2016 at age seventy-five. In 2018, the institute was given a new name, Research Institute for the Visual Language of Korea (RIVL), directed by Ju Suk Park at Myongji University. In honor of Ch'oe and his work, RIVL founded the Ch'oe Injin Center for Photo Research in the same year. Lee, *Han'guksajinŭi Chip'yŏng*.

73 Park, "Han'guksajinŭi Doip Kwajŏng Sŏlmyŏnggwa Chŏng Haech'ang Sajinŭi Haesŏge Nat'anan Munjechŏm Koch'al," 103–4.

74 Park, 116.

75 Park, 117.

76 However, I note that RIHP's—now Research Institute for the Visual Language— epistemic shifts and diversification are apparent. For instance, in the introduction to his publication *Han'guksajinsa* (*The History of Korean Photography*), Park takes a more investigative position to examine how the "Western" medium and discourses have clashed and evolved in the unique context of Korea. Park, *Han'guksajinsa*.

77 In examining the rise of national narratives in modern China, Prasenjit Duara aptly points out that history has been treated more as "a transparent medium of understanding than as a discourse enabling historical players (including historians) to deploy its resources to occlude, repress, appropriate and, sometimes, negotiate with other modes of depicting the past and thus, the present and future." National narratives in modern China, in turn, "transformed the perception not only of the past but also of the present meaning of the nation and the world." Duara, *Rescuing History from the Nation*, 5.

78 Kim, *Interrogation Rooms of the Korean War*, 3.

79 Shin, *Ethnic Nationalism in Korea*, 7.

80 Shamsul A. B.'s discussion on "methodological nationalism," referred to by Yoneyama, is applicable here. Yoneyama, *Cold War Ruins*, 243n30.

81 Curiously, the group is more concerned about Western imperialism than the Japanese colonial era, during which photo groups and salon competitions were popularized.

82 Sakai, "Translation and Image," 85.

83 Sakai, 86.

84 Sakai, 86.

85 Liu, "Eventfulness of Translation," 18.

86 Lim, *Translating Time*, 250. Emphasis in original.

87 Lim, 250. Lim refers to Johannes Fabian and Dipesh Chakrabarty.

88   Marker, *Coreénnes*; *Puknyŏksaramdŭl (Coreénnes)*.

89   See, respectively, Jongwoo Park, *Inside DMZ-Guard Posts*, 2009–2017, chromogenic color print; Suntag Noh, *Red House I, II & III*, 2001–2005, color photography. Noh's newly edited series was shown at Seoul Metropolitan Museum of Art's exhibition, "North Korea Project (Pukhan Project)," which was held for the seventieth anniversary of independence in July 21–September 29, 2015.

90   One is Boyoung Chang's work on the representation of North Korea in Europe and North America juxtaposed against South Korean artists' work, exploring the ramification of Western representation of the North Korean leaders and authoritarian state. Chang, "Imagining the Other Korea."

Chapter 1. War and the Image of an Orphan Nation

An earlier version of this chapter was published as "Orphan Nation: Representations of Korean War Orphans in Contemporary Visual Culture," in *The Eye on War: Constructing the Memory of War in Visual Culture since 1914*, edited by Ann Murray, 226–36 (New York: Routledge, 2018). The photo series by Agnès Dherbeys was introduced previously in "Undoing the Cold War Temporality: Transnational Adoption in Agnès Dherbeys's *Omone* and *Retired*," in *Visual Representations of the Cold War and Postcolonial Struggles: Art in East and Southeast Asia*, edited by Midori Yamamura and Yu-Chieh Li, 212–31 (New York: Routledge, 2021).

1   Yoneyama, *Cold War Ruins*.

2   Yoneyama, 49. Emphasis in original.

3   The UN forces combined soldiers from sixteen countries, listed here in order of the number of soldiers sent to Korea: the United States (302,483), the United Kingdom (14,198), Canada (6,146), Turkey (5,455), Australia (2,282), the Philippines (1,496), New Zealand (1,389), Thailand (1,294), Ethiopia (1,271), Greece (1,263), France (1,119), Colombia (1,068), Belgium (944), South Africa (826), the Netherlands (819), and Luxembourg (100).

4   The Korean War was crucial to the process of the United States becoming the world's most militarized nation and expanding its political influence across the world. Around the time of the Korean War, the US signed treaties with forty-two allies, which enabled it to establish over 2,700 US military bases outside the United States. This political change is referred to as "Globalization of Containment Policy." Yi Wanbŏm, "Han'guk chŏnjaengŭi chŏngch'ichŏk yŏnghyang," 8.

5   The United States' two-per-family international adoption limit was annulled in 1955 so that Harry and Bertha Holt could adopt eight Korean war orphans. Mass Western adoption of Korean children followed.