

Reading English Literature and Korean Scholars' Search for "Authentic Subjectivity"

Jonggab Kim
Konkuk University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb>

 Part of the [American Studies Commons](#), [Comparative Literature Commons](#), [Education Commons](#), [European Languages and Societies Commons](#), [Feminist, Gender, and Sexuality Studies Commons](#), [Other Arts and Humanities Commons](#), [Other Film and Media Studies Commons](#), [Reading and Language Commons](#), [Rhetoric and Composition Commons](#), [Social and Behavioral Sciences Commons](#), [Television Commons](#), and the [Theatre and Performance Studies Commons](#)

Dedicated to the dissemination of scholarly and professional information, [Purdue University Press](#) selects, develops, and distributes quality resources in several key subject areas for which its parent university is famous, including business, technology, health, veterinary medicine, and other selected disciplines in the humanities and sciences.

CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture, the peer-reviewed, full-text, and open-access learned journal in the humanities and social sciences, publishes new scholarship following tenets of the discipline of comparative literature and the field of cultural studies designated as "comparative cultural studies." Publications in the journal are indexed in the Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature (Chadwyck-Healey), the Arts and Humanities Citation Index (Thomson Reuters ISI), the Humanities Index (Wilson), Humanities International Complete (EBSCO), the International Bibliography of the Modern Language Association of America, and Scopus (Elsevier). The journal is affiliated with the Purdue University Press monograph series of Books in Comparative Cultural Studies. Contact: [<clcweb@purdue.edu>](mailto:clcweb@purdue.edu)

Recommended Citation

Kim, Jonggab. "Reading English Literature and Korean Scholars' Search for "Authentic Subjectivity"." *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture* 16.6 (2014): [<https://doi.org/10.7771/1481-4374.2535>](https://doi.org/10.7771/1481-4374.2535)

This text has been double-blind peer reviewed by 2+1 experts in the field.

This document has been made available through Purdue e-Pubs, a service of the Purdue University Libraries. Please contact epubs@purdue.edu for additional information.

This is an Open Access journal. This means that it uses a funding model that does not charge readers or their institutions for access. Readers may freely read, download, copy, distribute, print, search, or link to the full texts of articles. This journal is covered under the [CC BY-NC-ND license](#).

CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture, the peer-reviewed, full-text, and open-access learned journal in the humanities and social sciences, publishes new scholarship following tenets of the discipline of comparative literature and the field of cultural studies designated as "comparative cultural studies." In addition to the publication of articles, the journal publishes review articles of scholarly books and publishes research material in its *Library Series*. Publications in the journal are indexed in the Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature (Chadwyck-Healey), the Arts and Humanities Citation Index (Thomson Reuters ISI), the Humanities Index (Wilson), Humanities International Complete (EBSCO), the International Bibliography of the Modern Language Association of America, and Scopus (Elsevier). The journal is affiliated with the Purdue University Press monograph series of Books in Comparative Cultural Studies. Contact: <clcweb@purdue.edu>

Volume 16 Issue 6 (December 2014) Article 3**Jonggab Kim,****"Reading English Literature and Korean Scholars' Search for 'Authentic Subjectivity'"**<<http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol16/iss6/3>>

Contents of ***CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture 16.6 (2014)***
Special Issue ***Western Canons in a Changing East Asia***. Ed. Simon C. Estok
<<http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol16/iss6/>>

Abstract: In his article "Reading English Literature and Korean Scholars' Search for 'Authentic Subjectivity'" Jonggab Kim discusses the ambivalence of Korean scholars toward the reading and analysis of English-language literature because of its perceived threat to Korean national identity and a route to internationalization. Kim's study is an attempt to evaluate a dual strategy of reading, one that involves both sympathy and antipathy. Kim postulates that what Korean scholars need is not a national practice of reading, but the type of reading that takes into account Korea's historical situation with the knowledge of the field or period of the text. Based on the notion of the Korean concept of "authentic subjectivity" (주체성 *juchesung*), Kim examines the growing confidence of Korean scholars on the one hand and their insecurity and sense of anxiety over asserting their subjectivity in the production of scholarship.

Jonggab Kim

Reading English Literature and Korean Scholars' Search for 'Authentic Subjectivity'"

Korea experienced occupation and colonialism by imperial Japan and following its liberation in 1945 continued to experience the effects of colonialism by US-American military occupation. This situation impacted in significant ways on education including the teaching of and scholarship on English-language literatures (in Korea, similar to Taiwan, it is US-American literature that is often focused on). Korean scholars find themselves implicated in a colonial/anti-colonial context at the core of which lies the question of their "authentic subjectivity" (주체성 *juchesung*).

juchesung is difficult to translate because there is no straightforward equivalent in Western cultures. North Korea developed its *juche* ideology to justify the ideal of independence with its essential component of an independent stand or spirit of self-reliance devised to counterweigh US-American influence and thus *juche*'s spirit of self-reliance as the opposite of servile subjection is the essence of *juchesung* (see, e.g., Hong). It functions as a political strategy of resisting US-American subjectification for authentic national subjectification (*juchesung* also differs from the subjecthood of the grammatical subject and from the distinction between appearance and reality). Finally, *juchesung* has nothing to do with epistemological subjectivity as opposed to objectivity. The fact that North Korea adopted the *juche* ideology to strengthen its self-reliance and to justify its antagonism to the U.S. suggests that at the center of *juchesung* lies a power dialectic according to which if there is no resistance one loses independence and falls into the state of a colonized subject. However, to some extent Hegel's dialectic of recognition catches the context of *juchesung*: *juche* is ontological, not epistemological. In English, "subjective" implies limitations of one's own perspective, one cannot see all, and to see is inevitably also not to see what lies outside one's focus (i.e., Merleau-Ponty's thought).

Contrary to the somewhat similar conceptualization of the notion in English, *juchesung* is not a limitation, but an active power to assert oneself and prevail over the other. This difference has far-reaching political ramifications and determines the dialectics of reading. Take Conrad's *Heart of Darkness* for example: a subjective general reading in English implies a "naive" act of reading, ignoring the structure, stylistics, rhetoric, and so on of the text. In a *juchesuk* reading in Korean of the text lies on a different horizon with no implication of negativity and nothing to do with the presence or absence of cogito. A *juchesuk* reading makes the reader swell with self-confidence and expand like Whitman's ego, appropriating the other to him/herself. Nietzsche said that the slave thinks too much and suffers resentment, while the master enjoys to his heart's content with no need to think. The former finds his identity in thinking, the latter in blithe *jouissance*: thinking is the symptom of defeatism and pathetic self-consolation. A "Third World" critic's position is determined by his/her "subordinate" relation to "First World" critics with the consequence that his/her sense and relevance are diminished and this situation is of course untenable (on this, see, e.g., DeSousa, Henton, Ramanathan <<http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol12/iss2/>>).

A *juchesuk* reading is politically required for him/her to rescue him/herself from such a quagmire of humiliation. On the other hand, a "First World" critic may have a privilege to indulge in the *jouissance* of reading. But such a critic may be not only vulnerable to the charge of imperialism, but is also castigated for being too subjective. Both the "Third World" critic and the "First World" critic may be equally subjective, but result in so striking differences in consequence is that one is politically praised and the other ethically blamed; one is exhorted to secure more being in ontological anxiety, while the other is enjoined to think more to avoid subjectivity. Robert Young had this kind of anxiety in mind when he wrote for the translation of his book that "the enduring lesson and object of Frantz Fanon: to reassert 'subjective power' in the face of oppressive forces (Young qtd. in Kim, Young-kyu 12). The Korean translator (김용규 [Young-kyu Kim]), who understood Young's intention better than English words could express, rendered "subjective power" as "*juchesuk* power." For Yi-mun Park *juchesung* is "identical with the spirit of independence, which demands one to act autonomously without blindly following the other's opinions" (85) and this suggests a *juchesuk* person should "live his or her life as the master of him/herself" (Song 81-82): *juchesung* is authentic and independent subjectivity, the virtue which Paik requires Koreans to cultivate for decolonization and hetero-modernization.

Nak-chung Paik suggested a "dual strategy" ("이중과제"; unless indicated otherwise, all translations

are mine) of reading, that is, reading with both "sympathy and antipathy" ("공감과 적개심"). Many scholars joined him in upholding this idea resulting in the establishment of the community of "Scholars for English Studies in Korea" and the publication of the journal *영어 연구 / 외부에서 (In/Outside: English Studies in Korea)*. But Paik and the scholars sharing his cause do not exhaust the meaning of the idea of "authentic reading." While fully acknowledging their contribution to Koreanize English studies, in this study I argue that their efforts are geared too much to an anticolonial problematic and are thus in need of a switch to a postcolonial perspective without which they are in a vicious cycle reproducing a binary master/slave dialectic. Further, I posit that more fundamental than authentic subjectivity is theoretical positioning and that Paik's postulate is only one of the possible positions one can take: *juchesung* ought be redefined in terms of positioning rather than in terms of literary nationalism (on literary nationalism see also, e.g., Son <<http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol16/iss6/2>>).

Since Koreans lost their country to Japan, their struggle to restore independence had been persistent. Writers believed that the creation of a national literature would keep their spirit free and independent from any type of colonialism. Wha Im, one of the most representative literary critics of the time, lamented that the Japanese transplanted Western plants into the domestic soil. To his dismay, Im found that he and his colleagues "were lost in confusion in historically incomparable anxiety" and "the state of self-division is not psychologically motivated rupture, but the psychological reflection of the divided and extremely heterogeneous world" (Im qtd. in Jo 293). If Koreans deprived of their culture are not really Koreans, we may then say that they are split between being and non-being. The self is the other, the non-self. As such, Im found it imperative to build a unified *juchesung*, which he defined as the "self-consciousness of men of letters" (Im qtd. in Jo 293). They were conscious of themselves torn between being free and bound, Korean and Japanese, friends and enemies. However, it should not be misunderstood that Im wanted to reject literary modernization altogether and return to the premodern state. What he really wished, but failed to achieve was a dialectical synthesis, sub-lating the contradiction between the old (premodern) self and the foreign (modern) other.

The demand for *juchesung* manifested itself in diverse formulations from the beginning of the 1990s and since then numerous scholars expressed and express support for the notion. They thought/think that it would now be time to abandon a colonial frame of mind and to assert themselves culturally and thus we now have the "Korean Wave" (see, e.g., Cho; Ma). Two factors, one economic and the other political, contributed to the rise of Korean self-confidence. First, the economic development of Korea in the latter half of the twentieth century induced worldwide wonder. But more important for intellectuals was the fact that democracy was finally established in 1987, although long delayed due to the economy-first policy under the military regime. Many intellectuals spoke, fought, and wrote in support of the pro-democracy movement. Once democracy was realized, they turned their minds to the cultural and academic project of national renewal. Most outspoken among those who bemoaned the loss of *juchesung* were Hae-Joang Cho and Young-min Kim. Kim made scathing accusations of self-deception against intellectuals for their "canon-centered ideology" and "thesis-centrism." Similarly, Cho called Korean society colonial that does not produce its own theoretical frameworks.

Korean scholars of Anglo-American literature were more vulnerable to the stigma of coloniality than those in other disciplines, since their learning itself betrayed their reliance on the English language and literature (mostly US-American). To show too much sympathy with and interest in Anglo-American culture may deprive them of their already shrunken subjectivity, but they do not have the luxury of escape into ignorance. The explanation of the cultural burden scholars of English literature and culture have to embrace would not be complete without mentioning the growing institutional impact of English as today's *lingua franca*. Scholars of foreign literatures other than English can be satisfied fulfilling their roles as "importers" and translators of the culture they study, but the large number of departments of English does not allow such an easy way out. According to the Korean Center for Education, in 2013 there were 1661 university professors of English, but only 812 professors of Korean and 231 each in French and German. The university reforms of the mid-1990s contributed to the enlargement of the gap between English and other European literatures and scholars of English began to feel obliged to tackle historically important tasks and more than the introduction of English literature and literary theory. And in this vein Jin-hyun Kim has characterized the country metaphorically as "a child mentally retarded and premature at the same time" ("Title" 10). Premature in that it jumped from being an underdeveloped country to being a developed one within only two generations, but at

the same time remained immature and sometimes imitating Japan and the United States.

Modern Korea aside, in the early days of English literature instruction, scholars were not much aware of the double bind English imposed on them. Their dream at that time was not a subjective study of English nor competition with industrially advanced countries, but merely faithful imitation and adjustment in order to bridge the gap between Korea and industrially advanced Western countries, primarily the U.S. U-chang Kim conceptualized such an attitude as "Bovarysme" in an "attraction to Western Literature" based on his notion about the inclination of "Third World" people to find their ideals not at home, but in European culture. But when a large number of scholars with PhDs from the U.S. began to teach and write in Korea, the situation changed radically. The fact that the gap between Korea and European countries and the U.S. has been reduced is, however, not a pure blessing in my opinion: it also means that the many differences between Korea and the West have been lost too. It was thus natural that from the early 1990s scholars began to move to question the value of English education. The most prominent and influential respondent to this demand was Paik. Bruce Cumings mentioned that he is "a remarkable combination of scholar, author, critic, and activist" (vii) and whom Ji-kwan Yoon appraised as a better thinker than Edward W. Said ("Secularity" 387-89). His major contribution to Korean academia lies in his formulation of a modern theory of national literature in conjunction with the historical condition of the colonized past. Literature for him is an essential component of the historical fight for the human emancipation. As such, Nam Young Chung explains the most important of his thought is "the centrality of practice. Nothing can be further from his position than theoretical contemplation" ("Paik Nak-chung" 80). From the early 1990s, Paik turned his attention to the academic role of scholars of English-language literature and their duty as citizens. He thought the value of Western literature does not inhere in itself, but depends on the social and cultural context of its reception by Korean readers. Korea was forced to modernize and the aftereffects of modernization still haunt Koreans: these two facts should be foregrounded in the practice of reading and interpretation. However, Paik did not reject Western literature completely and welcomed its enlightening and emancipating function. For example, he would agree with Jung-whi Kwon that he chose English literature as a major because if he could come to know the West and that such knowledge would liberate Korea from the yoke of Japan (see Kwon and Sin). As such, English literature was both repressive and empowering, both colonial and enlightening. This ambivalent function of English led to a double bind: to read was to be enchained in the name of enlightenment, but not to read was to remain regressive.

Scholars' evaluations of Anglo-American literature varied according to their position in relation to the above-explained bipolar situation. For instance, U-chang Kim accepted English literature, although not without reservations, locating its value in the discovery of interiority and the awakening of individual desire, which were new to Koreans immersed in the collective mindset of Confucianism. For Kim, the phenomenon of cultural alienation occasioned by reading foreign literature was not limited to "Third World" readers, but universal and global. Every culture causes foundationally the subject to become alienated from the self that has to be surrendered to the discourse of the other (Lacan). Such a state of alienation is essential for the self's maturity and growth and by integrating the other into oneself, the ego's horizon expands and approaches the universal, an ongoing process through which we come to dialogic agreement "universal value and truth of all human beings" (Kim, U-chang, "The Philosophy" 320) supposedly embedded in Western literature. From Paik's point of view, however, we may infer that Kim makes an error by essentializing the historical fact of alienation as universal and thus ignores the difference between colonized and colonizer. Paik states in no uncertain terms that "to study English is disadvantageous for cultivating our *juchesung*" ("The Problem" 161) for English-speaking peoples have never suffered the pains of colonized Koreans. Paik's strategy of authentic reading is composed of two conflicting elements: sympathy and antipathy. If the former pulls, the latter pushes, achieving equilibrium: thus, when we read foreign literature our reading should be both sympathetic and antipathetic. The success or failure of our study of Western literature hinges on how well we combine and harmonize these two opposites.

It is surprising that Paik chose the term 적개심 (*jukgaesim* "antipathy") in describing the act of reading. Although the translated concept as "antipathy" has a stronger signification, in my view Paik's choice was calculated prudently (see, e.g., Kang). For Paik, the underlying notion is that reading as an act and performance becomes a problem of life and death, victory and defeat—rather than akin to the Western perception the cultivation of taste—and thus for Koreans the reading of foreign literature is to

be anchored to the pole of "the knowledge of Korean history along with some justifiable involvement with national politics" ("National Literature" 190). In Paik's conceptualization there are two methods of authentic reading: "From our own perspective we have to discover and make good use of some features of literary study which were foreign to or not fully appreciated by European scholars. And another lies in an interpretation different from those scholars of canonized works as works of the great world, which is possible only after fully appreciating their values" ("National Literature" 202-03). If one source of *juchesung* is in discovery, the other is in new interpretation. Paik thinks that Korean knowledge of the West will lead to the revelation of what remains unnoticed by Westerners. However, in spite of these apparent differences, discovery and interpretation converge on one important point, namely the production of difference.

Paik's double strategy of reading forced him to reject postmodernism and postcolonialism. His double strategy of reading goes hand in hand with his "double project of achieving and overcoming modernity in line with the discourses of national literature and of the division system" (Paik, "National Literature" 54). For Paik, postmodernism with its accoutrements, such as the death of the subject, rejection of realism, eclipse of reference, irresponsible pluralism celebrating the liberation of the signifier, and so on are characterized by negative, almost nihilistic attitudes to the traditional values of literature and realism. This explains why Paik was critical of the so-called age of theory charging that theorists eschew the traditional task of the evaluation of the relative merits of literary production. In "How to Understand Foreign Literature" he argued that the postmodern turn to value-free relativism is the most US-American style of culture, that is, nationless culture denying the national identity of cultures and their difference. If this is the case, he concluded, the situation in reality reflects the operations of US-American capitalism, which hides itself behind a postmodern celebration of the loss of reference.

In a curious turn in Paik's devaluation of theoretical frameworks is that he viewed F.R. Leavis's thought as his closest theoretical companion, sympathizing with his view of criticism as a political act performed by endless readings, and sharing with him the sense of the importance of critical evaluation and the critic's role in forming a literary tradition. Whenever occasion offered, Paik tried to persuade students and junior scholars, who had not yet encountered Leavis, to learn from his practice of close and evaluative reading. Such an effort bore fruit, resulting in an abundant publication of articles about Leavis's work. Equally fascinating and instructive for Paik is his concept of the "third realm," an ontology of literature not veering into extreme subjectivism or objectivism as Chung wrote about Paik's thought on Leavis ("Leavis' Criticism" 89-90). The third realm for Leavis is created out of the collective act of reading, as a collaborative re-creation. This collective re-creation is exactly what Paik has aimed at for his whole career as a literary critic and scholar.

Paik's call for *juchesung* reading has been followed by many scholars who felt critical about the need to "catch up" with US-American scholarship. But not all agreed with Paik's double project. For example, Seung-cheol Song questioned the validity of such a unity writing that "If it is a justifiable sympathy, it contains in itself anger" (79) and Yoon asked how the harmonious combination of sympathy and antipathy might be realizable. Despite this criticism, most agreed on the imperative of *juchesung* reading, thinking that without it they would become accomplices in English neo-imperialism. This consensus gave birth to the journal *In/Outside: English Studies in Korea* in 1995 aiming at *juchesung* scholarship in the study of English-language literatures for "the cultural hegemony of the English-speaking world with the U.S at the center is becoming more and more vigorous and extensive in the whole world" to such an extent that Korean identity is threatened, as written in the journal's manifesto (see Lee and Sul). Their role as Korean citizens and scholars reflects Paik's double strategy of reading, since they took it as the duty to "reveal and criticize negative sides of Anglo-American literature, such as its colonial inclination, and to appropriate its positive value as the common heritage of humankind" (Lee and Sul 2). If such a constructive and critical reading could be practiced well, these scholars asserted that they would succeed in domesticating English and Anglo-American literary studies in Korea would be Korean, not Anglo-American.

Dong-sik Kim asks the question of how to retrieve *juchesung* that was due to colonialism: "The purpose of literary criticism is to answer the question how to build *juche* with writing" (170; here *juchesung* being the attributes of *juche* corresponding to the relation between subjectivity and subject). The anguish of self-division has been the burden colonial intellectuals have had to suffer be-

cause without it they would lose their identity completely. Paik recommended that Koreans' sympathetic reading should be counterbalanced by antipathy and posited that it is premature for Koreans to embrace postcolonial discourses celebrating borderless nations, the end of identity, and so on. But the problem here is that anticolonialism repeats colonialism in a reversed form thus dividing the world according to a master/slave binary. If Korean intellectuals are forced to keep hold of this anticolonial consciousness, how can they overcome modernity? They run the risk, instead, of becoming reactive critics full of resentment. For Hegel, such a dialectic is not perennial, but temporal, a brief stage in world history where desire reigns. It is to his credit that Paik is aware of this danger of reactive criticism, which, he believes, can be avoided by extending the realm of "national literature" to include all of the "Third World": "A double register as part of both a national and a world tradition" as Michael Malouf summarizes David Damrosch's thought (50) and this can be applied to Paik's notion. For Hegel, the next stage after the reign of desire is the regime of reason, with no bar dividing slave and master, i.e., between the "First World" and the "Third World." The bar is replaced by the slash, as in *In/Outside*—not the play of pros and cons, but of *yin* and *yang*, "not constrained by binary thinking" (Yoon, "A New Horizon" 125). I think this is a manifestation of "overcoming," which Paik tried to achieve in terms of the dual strategy of modernity, but ironically which caused him to fail for he was too heavily embedded in anticolonialism.

In agreement with Paik, Eun-ai Sung, Gil-young Oh, Kyung-duk Lee, Myung-ho Lee, and In-chan Pak argued that "transnational universalism is yet a dangerous self-deception" (28). So I posit that the question to be asked is whether the study of postcolonialism is appropriate today? And one answer is that the younger generation of Koreans who often travel and/or study in the U.S., find only differences between Korea and U.S. but no superiority and inferiority (see Cho-han). Such a change is reflected also in "a rapid departure from nationalism" resulting in the advent of new issues like hybridity, transnationality, and diaspora (Hwang 50). *juchesung*, then, should be redefined under the light of an emerging new problematic. If *juchesung* is to be understood in terms of truth, discursive truth should not be confounded with demonstrative truth. "Truth" in literature is not something to be shown but something textual to be read and interpreted. That is the reason why Nietzsche emphasized that truth is created by the perspective one takes, so that there are as many truths as perspectives, as Alexander Nehamas explained in *Nietzsche: Life as Literature*. Truth in critical writing is justified by internal coherence, not the idea of external correspondence. In *Real Knowing: New Versions of Coherence Theory*, Linda Martín Alcoff, rejecting a view of truth referring "a transcendent phenomenon" argues that "knowledge is ultimately a product of phenomena which are immanent to human belief systems" (117). The problem, however, is that the "immanence" in literary criticism should lie in the text. As such, the scholar and critic are obliged to make "explicit the conditions of its own discursive self-constitution" and to give "a theoretical status to language in general" (Cossutta 182). What is crucial here in this self-constituting "truth event" in the sense Alain Badiou defined in *Being and Event*, namely that the scholar's and critic's position or perspective is his/her positioning not *Setzung* to use Kant's distinction in his *The Critique of Critical Judgment*: "Now the whole distinction which we draw between the merely possible and the actual rests upon the fact that possibility signifies the position of the representation of a thing relatively to our conception, and, in general, to our capacity of thinking, whereas actuality signifies the positing [*Setzung*] of the thing in its immediate self-existence" (Part II, 56). Here the latter is given naturally, while the former is invested with intentionality and then crystallized by stages of discursive practice. If the latter gives rise to a natural subjectivity on the basis of nationality, sexuality, and so on, the former bears a positional, discursive subjectivity. The problem with Leavis as well as with Paik lies in their confusion of the former with the latter; they justify their argument by referring to something external, saying "This is so, isn't it?" But as Chris Joyce pointed out, such a claim of truth is internal, not external (36). Life, supposed to be outside the text, turns out to be already inside, that is, the result of positioning.

Thus Paik's *juchesung* should be understood in terms of the scholar's and critic's position rather than his/her national constitution. As for Paik, he is able to propose a double strategy of reading, because he takes an anticolonial position, not because he is Korean. His *juchesung* is not something given by his nationality, but something produced by a positioned critical practice. More fundamental than *juchesung* is positioning and it is a position that instigates and produces truth. Yet, Paik belongs to the realistic camp and claims that the truth of discourse is justified by its correspondence with reality. Of

course, discourse is not purely self-referential, for the copula "is" refers to something outside the text, not ontically, but ontologically to use the terms Heidegger uses in *Being and Time*. The relation between discourse, reality, and subjectivity is mediated by the order of meaning. Nationality or sexuality, attached to the logic of *Setzung*, does not determine one's positioning: regardless of nationality one can participate in the formation of a truth event. Then the concept of national literature, with its territorial, national, or linguistic borders, serves only as a disappearing mediator in the dialectical process of literature's self-revelation, as Hegel delineated in his *Phenomenology of the Spirit*.

Proposing a world literature, Franco Moretti writes that we cannot but read too little or too much, swinging "between the very small and the very large" with the danger of the disappearance of the text as an entity (57). Yet, such a withdrawal of the text is not the final stage: it initiates its returning with hydra-like multitude forming many-headed differences while blurring borders between in and out, major and minor, the center and the periphery; hierarchical difference between in and out is displaced by the differential permutations of in/out (on this and in particular on the position and location of "minor" literatures, see, e.g., D'haen <<http://dx.doi.org/10.7771/1481-4374.2342>>; Juvan <<http://dx.doi.org/10.7771/1481-4374.2343>>). The difference reading produces moves in the Foucauldian heterotopia of a centerless center, with the implication that the difference among Korean scholars is more considerable than their difference from scholars in the U.S. It is the lesson of Jacques Derrida that in the absence of center every periphery occupies the central position. Again what is essential is not *Setzung*, but theoretical positioning, constituting such a centerless play of difference. Then what is *juchesuk* reading if not the reading through which the reader forms a new subjectivity free of national dictation of fixed borders and participates in the formation of a heterotopia of world literature? What constitutes the reader's *juchesung* is not filiation, but affiliation on the basis of which scholars and critics of literature establish a new network and solidarity. If authentic reading in an anti-colonial frame is characterized by resistance to shake off colonial burdens, in world literature *juchesuk* reading proceeds like the play of a child, for whom concepts such as in and out, East and West, are only toys to play with, as Nietzsche said in *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*.

If it is necessary to historicize a phenomenon of split subjectivity caused by the trauma of colonization, then it is also necessary to universalize such a split subjectivity produced by history rather than relativizing it. If so, the self-alienation of Korean scholars of English-language literature is not only the burden they have to endure as "Third World" intellectuals, but the methodological necessity for them to accept for their project of overcoming modernity. Is reading not the process of self-alienation, the reader forgetting him/herself and becoming the "other" as Georges Poulet described the process of reading and to whom U-chang Kim in "Philosophy of Foreign Literature Reception" fully subscribes? Without such a self-alienation, reading falls into the empirical and ideological self-aggrandizement fattening its belly. As such, the intellectuals' split subjectivity is not something to be hurriedly unified, but the very condition of reading, which self-reflective "First World" scholars and critics may envy. Is it not the lesson of Paul de Man that reading should never be taken for granted? Then what is more exemplary of such a reading than Korean scholars whose discipline requires them to read Anglo-American literature as foreign literature and admirable in that such an unfamiliarizing or self-imposed alienating reading becomes their habitus to the extent that they read Korean literature and culture as foreign literature and culture? Every culture, the embodied form of spirit, already begins to be petrified the moment it is materialized. That explains why we have to alienate ourselves from such a tradition in order to dissolve it and give it a new life. As Heidegger said in *What is Thinking*, thinking is a process of destroying what is familiar to us so that we can hear what is alien to us. If Korean scholars do not find *unheimlich* in *heimlich*, how could they say they are alienated from themselves? Their split subjectivity caused by the shock of modernization trained them to read new as if old, out as if in, thus their being embodying in/out play. In my opinion, it may be a good suggestion that the future of Anglo-American literature is in the hands of self-alienated non-Anglo-American scholars of Anglo-American literature.

Note: Research for "Reading English Literature and Korean Scholars' Search for 'Authentic Subjectivity'" was funded by Konkuk University.

Works Cited

- Alcoff, Linda Martín. *Real Knowing: New Versions of Coherence Theory*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2008.
- Cho-han, Hae-jung (조한혜정). "동/서양 정체성의 해체와 재구성" ("Modernity, Popular Culture, and East-West Identity Formation"). *Cultural Anthropology of Korea* 35.1 (2002): 3-40.
- Cho, Hae-Joang. "Reading the 'Korean Wave' as a Sign of Global Shift." *Korea Journal* (Winter 2005): 148-82.
- Chung, Nam Young (정남영). "리비스의 작품 분석과 언어의 창조적 사용" ("Leavis's Criticism in Practice and the Creative Use of Language"). *Scholars for English Studies in Korea* 6 (2004): 83-112.
- Chung, Nam Young (정남영). "백낙청: 민족적 실천과 '지혜'의 철학" ("Paik Nak-chung: Philosophy of National Practice and Wisdom"). *Journal of Philosophical Thought in Korea* 7.2 (1996): 79-103.
- Cossutta, Frederic. "Philosophy as Self-Constituting Discourse: The Case of Dialogue." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 39.3 (2006): 181-207.
- Cummings, Bruce. "Foreword." *The Division System in Crisis: Essays on Contemporary Korea*. By Paik Nak-chung. Trans. Myung-hwan Kim, June-Kyu Sol, Seung-chul Song, and Young-joo Ryu. Berkeley: U of California P, 2011. vii-x.
- DeSousa, Valerian, Jennifer E. Henton, and Geetha Ramanathan, eds. *New Modernities and the "Third World."* Thematic Issue *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture* Issue 12.2 (2010): <<http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol12/iss2/>>.
- D'haen, Theo. "Major Histories, Minor Literatures, and World Authors." *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture* 15.5 (2013): <<http://dx.doi.org/10.7771/1481-4374.2342>>.
- Hong, Yong-Pyo. "North Korea's Strategic Culture and Threat Perception: Implications for Regional Security Cooperation." *Korea Observer* 42.1 (2011): 95-115.
- Hwang, Jongyon. "A Postnational Turn in Contemporary Korean Literature." *World Literature Today* 84.1 (2010): 50-52.
- Jo, Eun-Ju (조은주). "임화의 '비평적 주체'의 정립 과정과 비평의 윤리" ("The Position-process of Im Wha's *The Subject of Critique and Ethics of Critique*"). *Korean Culture* 47 (2009): 283-301.
- Joyce, Chris. "The Idea of 'Anti-Philosophy' in the Work of F.R. Leavis." *The Cambridge Quarterly* 38.1 (2009): 24-44.
- Juvan, Marko. "Worlding Literatures between Dialogue and Hegemony." *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture* 15.5 (2013): <<http://dx.doi.org/10.7771/1481-4374.2343>>.
- Kang, Pil-jung (강필중). "외국문학연구의 주체성과 문학작품의 창조성" ("The Juchesung in Foreign Literature Studies and the Creativity of Literature"). *Today's Literature Review* 8 (1994): 126-147.
- Kant Immanuel. *The Critique of Judgment*. Trans. James Meredith. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1998.
- Kim, Dong-sik (김동식). "30년대 비평과 주체의 수사학" ("Literary Criticism and Rhetoric of Juche in the 1930s"). *Study of Korean Modern Literature* 24 (2008): 167-211.
- Kim, Jin-Hyun (김진현). "문명 대전환기에 대한민국의 어디로 가야 하나?" ("Where Does Korea Have to Go in the Transitional Age of Civilization?"). *Philosophy and Reality* 96 (2013): 5-67.
- Kim, U-chang (김우창). "한국의 영문학과 한국문화" ("English Literature of Korea and Korean Culture"). *In/Outside: English Studies in Korea* 1 (1996): 10-41.
- Kim, U-chang (김진현). *외국문학수용의 철학. 법 없는 길* (The Philosophy of Foreign Literature Reception: Road without Law). Seoul: Mineumsa, 1983.
- Kwon, Jung-Whee (권중휘), and Hyun-Uk Sin (신현욱). "한국 영문학의 어제와 오늘: 권중휘 선생을 찾아서" ("Yesterday and Today of English Studies in Korea: Interview with Professor Kwon"). *In/Outside: English Studies in Korea* 2 (1997): 270-311.
- Lee, Jong-suk (이종숙), and Jun-kyu Sul (설준규). "창간사" ("Manifesto"). *In/Outside: English Studies in Korea* 1.1 (1996): 2-5.
- Lee, Sanq-ok (이상옥). "영문학, 어떻게 할 것인가?" ("How to Study English Literature"). *The Study of English Language and Literature* 37.1 (1991): 277-96.
- Ma, Sheng-mei. *Asian Diaspora and East-West Modernity*. West Lafayette: Purdue UP, 2012.
- Malouf, Michael. "Problems with Paradigms: Irish Comparativism and Casanova's *World Republic of Letters*." *New Hibernia Review* 17.1 (2013): 48-66.
- Moretti, Franco. "Conjectures on World Literature." *New Left Review* 1 (2000): 54-68.
- Nehamas, Alexander. *Nietzsche: Life as Literature*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1987.
- Paik, Nak-chung (백낙청). "National Literature and Overcoming Modernity." *The Division System in Crisis*. Berkeley: U of California P, 2011: 53-67.
- Paik, Nak-chung (백낙청). "민족문학과 외국문학 연구" ("National Literature and Study of Foreign Literature"). *민족문학의 새 단계* (New Stages of National Literature). By Nak-chung Paik. Seoul: Changbi P, 1990. 175-192.
- Paik, Nak-chung (백낙청). "영문학연구에서의 주체성의 문제" ("The Problem of juchesung in the Study of English Literature"). *민족문학과 세계문학* (National Literature and World Literature). By Nak-chung Paik. Seoul: Changbi P, 1995. Vol. 2, 156-66.
- Paik, Nak-chung (백낙청). "외국문학을 어떻게 이해할 것인가?" ("How to Understand Foreign Literature?"). *민족문학의 새 단계* (New Stages of National Literature). By Nak-chung Paik. Seoul: Changbi P, 1990. 193-207.
- Paik, Nak-chung (백낙청). "토론회: 영미문학연구와 이데올로기" ("Discussion: Study of English Literature and Ideology"). *The Journal of English Language and Literature* 36.1 (1990): 157-87.
- Park, Yi-mun (박이문). "학문의 정체성, 경계선 및 주체성" ("The Identity of Learning, Boundaries, and Subjectivity"). *Korean Language and Literature* 13 (2002): 71-93.
- Pusey, James Reeve. Ed. *Lu Xun and Evolution*. New York: State U of New York P, 1988.
- Son, Hyesook. "Canon Formation and the Reception of Blake's and Dickinson's Poetry in Korea." *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture* 16.6 (2014): <<http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol16/iss6/2>>.
- Song, Moo (송무). "서양문학연구에서 주체성" ("On Subjectivity in the Study of Western Literature"). *Studies in British and American Language and Literature* 8 (1992): 77-107.

- Song, Seung-cheol (송승헌 칠이). "망각에서 지양으로. 영어영문학연구 50년" ("From Oblivion to Sublation: Fifty Years of Studies of English Language and Literature"). Ed. Research Center of Korean Culture. Seoul: Hyeon, 2006. 57-102.
- Sung, Eun-ae (성은애), Gil-young Oh (오길영), Kyung-duk Lee (이경덕), Myung-ho Lee (이명호), and In-chan Pak (박인찬). "특별좌담: 영미문학연구회와 한국의 영문학 연구현황" ("Special Round-Table Discussion: Scholars for English Studies in Korea and the Present Status of English Studies in Korea"). *In/Outside: English Studies in Korea* 20 (2006): 26-64
- Yoon, Ji Kwan (윤지관). "영어의 억압: 기원과 구조" ("The Oppression of English: Its Origin and Structures"). *In/Outside: English Studies in Korea* 12 (2002): 10-32.
- Yoon, Ji Kwan (윤지관). "한국 영문학연구의 새 지평을 열다: 안과밖의 형성과 전개" ("A New Horizon for English Studies in Korea: The Formation and Development of *In/Outside*"). *In/Outside: English Studies in Korea* 19 (2011): 117-48.
- Yoon, Ji Kwan (윤지관). *세속성인가 실천성인가: 에드워드 사이드 비평의 딜레마* (Secularity or Practice?: Dilemma of Edward Said's Criticism). Seoul: Silcheonmunhak, 1996.
- Yoon, Ji Kwan (윤지관). 타자의 영문학과 주체: 영문학 수용 논의의 비판적 고찰 ("The English Literature of the Other and Juche: A Critical Consideration of English Literature Reception"). *In/Outside: English Studies in Korea* 1 (1996): 42-76.
- Young, Robert. *아래로부터의 포스트식민주의 (Postcolonialism: A Very Short Introduction)*. Trans. Young-kyu Kim (김용규). Seoul: Hyeonamsa, 2013.

Author's profile: Jonggab Kim teaches English literature at Konkuk University. His interests in scholarship include modern and contemporary literary criticism and embodiment philosophy. In addition to numerous articles, Kim's book publications include *근대적 몸과 탈근대적 주체* (2008) (*The Modern Body and Its Postmodern Subjectivities*), *생각: 의식의 소음* (2014) (*Thinking: Noise of Consciousness*), and *성과 인간에 관한 책* (2014) (*The History of Sex*).
E-mail: <jonggab@konkuk.ac.kr>