● フィアターラ・パトリック 特定助教

Patrick VIERTHALER (Assistant Professor)

研究課題： ポスト冷戦時代の歴史認識論争のグローバル・ヒストリー
―「冷戦前線」地域における加害者／協力者の記憶を中心に―
（Contested memories of perpetration and collaboration in former “Cold War frontlines”: A global history of post-Cold War mnemonic disputes）

専門分野： 韓国現代史、冷戦史、マスメディアと文化的記憶
（South Korean contemporary history, Cold War history, mass media and cultural memory）

受入先部局： 人文科学研究所（Institute for Research in Humanities）

前職の機関名： 京都大学大学院文学研究科現代文化学専攻
（Division of Contemporary Culture, Graduate School of Letters, Kyoto University）

これまでの研究では、特定の集団がどのように「歴史」を記憶し、このような「歴史」をめぐる議論が政治・社会・学術研究にいかなる影響を及ぼすかを分析してきた。具体的には、韓国の人々がどのようにかつての独裁と現在に至る南北分断を記憶しているのかを研究してきた。特に、1987 年以降、政治・メディア・学者と市民活動家がどのように分断と「建国」の文化的記憶をめぐる議論に関わっているかを分析した上で、現代韓国が「非対称の記念」状態にあると主張した。

白眉プロジェクトでは、これまでの研究を土台に、グローバル・ヒストリーの認識論を新しく取り入れたいと考えている。つまり、グローバルな空間の中の「類似性」や連関性に着目する研究手法である。そのために、今後の研究では韓国を「冷戦前線」、さらには深刻な左右対立の事例として捉える。類似の事例として、日本、ドイツやオーストリアを分析対象とし、共同研究ではフィンランドやギリシャも焦点に入れようと考えている。

My research focuses on how collectives remember and dispute “history,” and how debates over “history” influence politics, society, and academic research. In my research to date, I have analyzed how South Koreans collectively remember inner-Korean division and three decades of autocratic rule. In particular, I have inquired into how politics, journalism, scholars, and civic activists in post-authoritarian South Korea are engaged in struggles over the collective memory of August 15 as a day of both liberation (1945) and division (1948), and argued that the South Korean mnemonic landscape after 1987 is best described as an “asymmetry in remembering” between the two dominant socio-political camps.

For my study at the Hakubi project, I plan to, on the one hand, continue my research into Korean history, but also build upon this fundament to analyze the South Korean case further in a global Cold War context. I aim to shed light on eventual “synchronicities,” between South Korea and similar case studies. To do so, I define South Korea as a “Cold War frontline” whose geopolitical future was unclear as of 1945. Further, I see South Korea as a country with an intense domestic socio-political polarization. Frontlines, I hypothesize, include most notably Japan, Austria, and East/West Germany, but also Finland, Greece, and others.

Cultural Memory

Cultural memory is a model of collective memory that is defined as a memory concerned with an “absolute past” and shaped by “elite bearers of memory” (Jan Assmann). Although initially proposed in the context of the study of ancient Egypt, the model has been used to dissect modern-era memory constructs as well (Aleida Assmann). Over the decades, several scholars have shown how memory in the contemporary period is shaped by a complex nexus of different actors in an intertwined relationship: political actors, scholars, intellectuals, journalists, and civic activists, and emphasized the need to write a “social history of remembering” (Peter Burke).

Crucially, cultural memory is never static but remains constantly re-negotiated. What is remembered and what remains “forgotten”? And why? This leaves scholars with the task of inquiring on how different memory communities either engage with each other or — in extreme examples — constitute mutually exclusive “communities of interest” or “memory silos” incapable of compromise and communication, which may result in a socio-political state of “asymmetric remembering” (and forgetting). In this context, some scholars highlight the role of an increasingly fragmented mass media in this process (e.g., Jeffrey Olick or Jill Edy).

Asides from the obvious role of politicians and scholars, my own research has contributed to understanding the role of journalism (Vierthaler 2018, 2020, 2022, 2024) and popular historiography (Vierthaler 2021) in contestations over collective memory in South Korea.

Towards a Global History

Unlike simple contrast or comparison, global history aims at uncovering underlying structural conditions and temporal synchronicities within a demarcated space invisible to scholars of national history (Sebastian Conrad). In other words, global history aims to uncover connections without a clear connection. Despite a heavy reliance upon prior studies by researchers of national histories, aspects invisible to scholars of nationalist historiography become visible by moving one's line of sight toward this global context.

In South Korea, the history and memory of former colonial collaborators who went on to form the backbone of the anti-communist establishment after 1945 is at the center of discussions over cultural memory. Known as "pro-Japanese collaborators" (*ch'inilp'a*), the personnel and institutional continuities between the colonial and post-colonial periods remained a taboo for several decades. Only in the 1990s, following decades of democratization activism, did calls for shedding light on this past influence a significant part of South Korean society. The debate over collaborators and their role in Korea's twentieth-century history can be said to be at the core of the discourse on cultural memory, which came increasingly be referred to by some as "history wars" (Kim Chŏng-in) or a "psycho-historical fragmentation" (Kim Mi-kyoung) in recent years.

Fig. 1 – "History wars" in South Korea as seen in one of countless demonstrations opposing a planned nationalization of South Korean history textbooks in late 2015. The initiative was propelled by President Park Geun-hye, the daughter of former of president and dictator Park Chung-Hee. Protestors feared a whitewashing of colonialism and military dictatorship. Source: *OhmyNews*, October 16, 2015.

In domestic South Korean discourse, (West) Germany is regularly cited as a positive counterexample that has managed to purge former perpetrators after 1945. However, this is only true to a certain extent. Looking beyond the surface, post-war continuities in the bureaucracy or police are not so different from those in similar Cold War "frontlines" such as Japan, Germany, or Austria.

Analytical Space: Cold War Frontlines

In this context, I employ Cold War "frontlines" as an analytical space. The four countries chosen for my individual research share several characteristics, most notably: a de jure status of a defeated nation and a resulting Allied occupation after 1945, an unclear geopolitical future in the wake of WWII (fig. 1), anti-communism as a decisive factor in the formation of collective memory after 1948–49, and an increasingly domestic polarization against a "re-remembered" past since the 1980s and 1990s.

For the Hakubi project, I aim to thus focus on five critical junctions to write a global history of South Korea's "history wars": (i) the roots of socio-political polarization, i.e., the history of denazification (Germany, Austria), demilitarization (Japan), and decolonization (South Korea) and the impact of the Cold War in the failure of such; (ii) the formation of a post-1945 cultural memory; (iii) the beginning (or absence) of domestic disputes over cultural memory; and (iv) the nature and characteristics of such disputes. What structural conditions and synchronicities lie can be uncovered? Why do certain topics become contested while others remain forgotten?

References

Vierthaler, Patrick. "Founding Father or Traitor to the Nation? Contested Memories of Syngman Rhee in Mid-1990s South Korea," *Korean Studies* 48 (2024), 373–420. https://doi.org/10.1353/ks.2024.a931007

Vierthaler, Patrick. "The Anti-Chosun Movement: Journalism, Activism, Politics, and Historical Memory in Post-Authoritarian South Korea, 1998–2002," *European Journal of Korean Studies* 21, no. 2 (2022): 111–162. https://doi.org/10.33526/ejks.20222102.111

Vierthaler, Patrick. "The New Right and the 1948 Foundation View: A Failed Revision of South Korean Cultural Memory," *Vienna Journal of East Asian Studies* 13 (2021): 1–31. https://doi.org/10.2478/vjeas-2021-0001

Vierthaler, Patrick. "A Reconsideration of the New Right's Formative Period (2003–2008): Conservative Experiences, Mass Media and Cultural Memory in Post-Authoritarian South Korea," *European Journal for Korean Studies* 20, no. 1 (2020): 35–84. https://doi.org/10.33526/ejks.20202001.35

Vierthaler, Patrick. "How to Place August 15 in South Korean History? The New Right, the '1948 Foundation' Historical View and the 2008 Kŏn'gukchŏl Dispute", *Vienna Journal of East Asian Studies* 10 (2018): 137–174. https://doi.org/10.2478/vjeas-2018-0006