figures such as Japanese emperors, Syngman Rhee, and Kim Il Sung at the apex. However, the author demonstrates, this aim also encountered significant challenges. Chapter 3 on wartime mobilization of women effectively illustrates tensions between men and women over the leadership of the Patriotic Neighborhood Associations. The colonial state wanted to give males the head roles. But as domestic work like the rationalization of kitchen work and air defense became synonymous with women's work, men became reluctant to participate in wartime mobilization campaigns. Instead, women took leadership roles, hoping for empowerment in a newly opened space for their agency. While the examples in colonial Korea mainly involve a small number of elite women in urban areas, such gendered tensions could broaden the scope of politics in war mobilization, which might otherwise be simplified as conflicts between the state and the general populace.

Moral Authoritarianism is a welcome addition to recent Korean historiography, offering a more nuanced understanding of state-society relations during periods of mass mobilization. Readers interested in detailed trajectories of the changes in state apparatuses and discourses will particularly find valuable sources and analyses in this work. Those interested in negotiations between the state and local people will also find valuable sources and insights.

SUNHO KO
York University
DOI: 10.1215/00219118-11591409

Shooting for Change: Korean Photography after the War. By Jung Joon Lee. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2024. xx, 279 pp. ISBN: 9781478025993.

Why do we often compel encounters with photography to yield knowledge about a place? How has South Korea, a nation-state but also a geopolitical imaginary, contributed to this habit of mind and of disciplinarity, especially within Asian studies? And what emancipatory role can photography play in helping us "unlearn" this habit? If we bring to photographs and their study an expectation to learn more about their country of origin, its people, and their culture and history, Lee's book interrogates these assumptions without completely refusing our wish to know more about Korea and Korean photography. It does this by rejecting the call to account for the "Koreanness" of Korean photography while serving as a query on the evolving interplay between knowing and becoming—what Lee calls "onto-epistemology"—of Korean photography. How we produce knowledge about and theoretically frame photography contributes to this onto-epistemology; "shooting for change" refers to Lee's praxis of scholarship as much as the photographers and the photographs she analyzes.

The book is also about the living legacy of militarism. It elaborates on three critical concepts to investigate militarism's relationship with the history of photography within the nationalizing frame, all of which rely on a sustained reflection on temporality. The first is the multitemporal event, which upends the conventional thinking of photography as capturing a moment as it "really" was; Lee shows how the supposed afterlives of the image are part of the unfolding durations enabled by

the act of photography, which constitutes an event in its own right. Per Walter Benjamin's notion of the dialectical image, the past is not entirely past; it remains available for appropriation and redemption, albeit partially. The second is the multisensorial encounter, which conceptualizes photography as a broadly affective rather than a narrowly visual medium. (Here Lee engages with prominent scholars of decolonial Black thought, such as Tina Campt and Fred Moten.) Third, photography is seen as a medium of plural performativity, rather than a procedure of spectacle making and objectification.

Lee divides the book into three thematic (rather than strictly chronological) parts, which invite rhizomatic reading across the six chapters. The first, organized around the notion of "catachrony," from Lisa Yoneyama, examines how "remembering wrong things at a wrong moment" can engender an "*unlearning* that critically unsettles the way we believe we know our history" (19). Chapter 1 explores how photography can both help solidify and undo the tripartite relationship between family, *minjok* (the ethnonation), and the militaristic nation-state by focusing on the war orphan, the figure par excellence for emphasizing the nation's victimhood and the permanent urgency of maintaining economic development and transnational militarism, no matter the cost. Chapter 2 shows how the genre of portraiture performatively produces an idealized patriarchal and monoethnic family, then expands to discuss how contemporary Korean women artists "problematize the contradictions within the rhetoric of family in the midst of racist, misogynist, and ableist campaigns" (57).

The second traces photography's pride of place in South Korea's august history of protest. Chapter 3 discusses iconic photographs from the April Revolution of 1960 and the 1987 June Uprising, while emphasizing their still unfolding duration and their refusal of fixity; Lee elaborates on Benjamin's use of a photography's "contingency" as a kind of opening that gives the photograph the capacity to connect with future events, while retroactively transforming the "original" meaning of the earlier event. Chapter 4 formulates the potent concept of "the photo public," showing how the candlelight protests of 2008 and the public's mobilization against President Park Geun-hye in 2017 mark a kind of paradigm shift in the political ontology of the protest image, from the aesthetics of martyrdom that privilege singular iconicity to the plurality of photographic performance by which one's political subjectivity is made visible and actuated.

The final part visits spaces that are emblematic of the US-ROK's military alliance: the borderlands of the DMZ and camptowns. Chapter 5 shows how such spaces reverberate as a kind of "theater of repetition" in which the victim-savior dynamic, albeit with variations, continues to dominate the memory of the Korean War. The turn to "the sonic and somatic fields of sensing" shows how enterprises like *Real DMZ Project* can produce and reproduce memories of the DMZ even while providing "a critique of the current methods of doing so" (142). Chapter 6 explores how camptowns have long served as sites of national abjection and sexual scandal, particularly through the portrayal of the bodies of Black male GIs. But more recent multimedia works such as *Narrow Sorrow* also offer "ways in which the viewer can interrogate and resist [their] ethno-nationalist symbolization" (168). Both chapters emphasize suspending the visuality of partition, exclusion, and exception so that the

affect of the multisensorial can give way to "the *enactable* possibility of the multitemporal" by helping viewers imagine forms of futurity beyond militarism (144).

While eschewing the survey form, Lee does not shirk the task of introducing crucial events in Korea's photo history to unfamiliar readers. She manages to convey the tenor of South Korea's *grand récits* of development and democratization without allowing readers to fall under their spell. Particularly emblematic of Lee's modus operandi is how she yokes together a discussion of Yi Kwangsu's 1929 family portrait with an analysis of contemporary multiculturalism and Zainichi identity. Some treatment of Yi, a legendary and notorious figure, is practically de rigueur in cultural histories of colonial Korea, but Lee dispels the monoethnic and heteronormative aura formed around the photograph with an evocatively queer reading, thereby opening new horizons of possibility for radical genealogies of photography as they might pertain to problems of genre, gender, and the nation.

Lee's work is part of a growing constellation of recent Korea-related monographs devoted to the problem of historical memory. (Of special relevance is Namhee Lee's *Memory Construction and the Politics of Time in Neoliberal South Korea*, which also draws from Benjamin's ideas on temporality.)[1] Some may feel that the insistence on unlearning and unseeing minimizes the salutary force of photography's visuality and that even more attention might have been given to past moments where photographic encounters frustrated the intended "lessons" in the first place. Still, the book's interdisciplinarity courageously confronts the legitimately pressing methodological convolutions of the day with grace and rigor by pulling together photo studies, media studies, postcolonial theory, diaspora studies, and critical Asian studies. The impact of Lee's onto-epistemological project should be felt powerfully even by scholars of Asia whose primary objects of study may not include photography.

JAE WON EDWARD CHUNG
Rutgers University
DOI: 10.1215/00219118-11591419

Note

1. Another comparable volume, recently reviewed alongside Lee's monograph in the *Journal of Asian Studies*, is Jie-Hyun Lim, *Global Easts: Remembering, Imagining, Mobilizing* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2022).

The Immersive Enclosure: Virtual Reality in Japan. By Paul Roquet. New York: Columbia University Press, 2022. 254 pp. ISBN: 9780231205344.

This is the first book on VR (virtual reality) in Japan and an immensely valuable scholarly account of VR as a form of enclosure. Given the continuing hype and reality around VR, it is a welcome and important addition to the study of that technology and to the history and cultural politics of its technological update in Japan. Its analysis of VR and the new media environment of Japan during the period under consideration—roughly the 1980s to the present—is important and insightful, key as well to pluralizing accounts of technological development that tend to center the United States by default. The book is also eminently readable and teachable. Roquet has a knack for clear prose, engrossing narrative, and conceptual innovation.