

Introduction

Joanne Miyang Cho and Lee M. Roberts

This volume contributes to the emerging field of Asian-German studies by bringing together internationally respected scholars from three continents for an interdisciplinary collection of chapters covering cultural, political, and historical intersections of Germany and Korea from the late nineteenth century until well into the twenty-first century. *Transnational Encounters between Germany and Korea* treats the history of the German-Korean relationship with a focus on the nations' perceptions of each other from the start of diplomatic intercourse in 1883, through the Japanese occupation of Korea (1910–1945), the Cold War, German reunification, to the present. Examination especially of the increasing number of commonalities between formerly divided Germany and presently divided Korea allows this volume to showcase aspects of a transnational relationship that arguably makes Germany and Korea as

J.M. Cho (✉)

History Department, William Paterson University, Wayne, NJ, USA

L.M. Roberts

Indiana University-Purdue University, Fort Wayne, IN, USA

© The Author(s) 2018

J.M. Cho and L.M. Roberts (eds.), *Transnational Encounters between Germany and Korea*, Palgrave Series in Asian German Studies,
https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-349-95224-3_1

similar as Germany and Japan, two countries for which scholars have found countless grounds for comparison since the late nineteenth century. Like previous volumes on Germany and China and Germany and Japan in the *Palgrave Series in Asian German Studies*,¹ this volume emphasizes transnational encounters, as they apply to Germany and Korea, while making a gesture toward more clearly comparative studies. With chapters covering such topics as culture, diplomacy, education, history, migration, literature, film, philosophy, politics, and the stereotypes that have come from cultural division, this book seeks to move beyond traditional dichotomies between East and West and expose deeper affinities between the two nations, despite the differing ways that each has navigated the challenges of modernity.

Transnational Encounters between Germany and Korea presents various overt commonalities of experience between Germany and Korea from the late nineteenth century to the present, while also teasing out many of the more subtle similarities between these two nations on nearly opposite sides of the globe. In the latter half of the nineteenth century, Germany and Korea were arguably as different as two nations could be, but their relationship began through both the German exploration of East Asia and also the Korean study of German as a language of European culture and scientific achievement. Indirectly, the relationship continued via Japanese occupation (1910–1945), since Japan had long held Germany (especially Prussia) to be a model for its own project of Westernization. Over the course of the late nineteenth century and first half of the twentieth century, Korea repeatedly witnessed the impact of German culture on their increasingly powerful Asian neighbor in Japan's successes against the other two major cultural forces in the region, China and Russia.

Within a few years after the end of World War II, both nations became divided due to Cold War politics. South Korea and West Germany, on the one hand, and North Korea and East Germany, on the other hand, began to develop special relationships. The South Korean-West German relationship became cemented through their common Cold War division, South Koreans' strong interest in German culture and scholarship, as well as through West Germany's recruitment of South Korean *Gastarbeiter* (guest workers) in the 1960s and 1970s. However, their relationship was briefly tested due to the East Berlin Espionage Affair in the late 1960s. In recent years, the rapid growth of the South Korean

economy has deepened their economic ties. In the 1950s and 1960s, East German and North Korean relations became close through economic aid and on the basis of educational and technical ties. From around that time, however, due to Kim Il-Sung's *Juche* ("self-reliance") ideology, North Koreans increasingly pursued an independent course in their economy and politics, which ultimately led to the weakening of North Korea's relationship with the former Soviet bloc countries, including East Germany. This shared tension of the Koreans and Germans over being torn apart according to different ideologies not only grounds deeper comparison of Germany and Korea, but also unifies the various chapters of this volume. One day we may find that the lessons that reunified Germany has had to learn provide the perfect model for North and South Korea, should they strive simply to become "Korea" once again.

This volume grapples with questions of entangled history to explore the ways in which Germany and Korea are united in their struggle to achieve a sense of cultural unity and ultimately to overcome the effects of political division. Moreover, *Transnational Encounters between Germany and Korea* participates in recent developments in scholarship on the German-speaking world and East Asia, as evidenced in various books about Germany and China and Germany and Japan. To name just a few cases in point, we find Christian Spang and Rolf-Harald Wippich's *Japanese-German Relations* (2006), Qinna Shen and Martin Rosenstock's *Beyond Alterity: German Encounters with Modern East Asia* (2014), and Veronika Fuechtner and Mary Rhiel's *Imagining Germany Imaging Asia* (2013).² In addition, Suzanne Marchand's well known work *German Orientalism in the Age of Empire* (2009)³ has created a more general context within which to place the aforementioned publications on more specific topics that treat Asian-German relations.

In the following pages of this introduction, we will explain our transnational framework, present a historiographical overview of Korean-German relations, and point out key arguments of chapters in this volume. For scholars of German-Korean relations, this volume will seek to offer an English-language overview of many well-known points harder to find in one single volume for an English-reading audience. For the many who have little prior knowledge of the unusual series of conjunctions between these two peoples and cultures, the volume will endeavor to initiate an ever broader scholarly debate on the innumerable points of contact between the German-speaking world and the Koreans.

THE TRANSNATIONAL FRAMEWORK

During the last two decades, historians have become greatly interested in transnational history. Nowadays one frequently hears of “a transnational turn.”⁴ The primary goal of this turn is to overcome Eurocentricism or “a narrative of the ‘Rise of the West.’”⁵ In North America, many universities have changed their general education requirement from Western Civilization to World Civilization, which transnational historians have welcomed.⁶ In parallel with this curricular development, historians who are based in North America have actively pursued the study of transnational history and global history in their scholarship, producing an impressive array of works. In terms of the study of transnational history, one of the most important contributions is *The Palgrave Dictionary of Transnational History* (2009). It was co-edited by the North American historians Pierre-Yves Saunier and Akira Iriye.⁷ This book has about 400 entries on the topic by 350 authors from about 25 countries.⁸ It is no exaggeration to claim that it is something of “a landmark in the emergence of the sub-field, just as it is a key source on transnational historiography.” As a reference work, this book functions as “a way of mainstreaming and standardizing academic knowledge.”⁹ Each of these two editors of *The Palgrave Dictionary* also authored a theoretical work on the topic, solidifying their contributions to the field.¹⁰ In addition, other US-based historians, such as Charles Bright and Michael Geyer, Jerry Bentley, Pamela Kyle Crossley, Patrick Manning, Arif Dirlik, and Dipich Chakrabarty, have significantly enriched the study of transnational or global history.¹¹

Even though there is no requirement for World Civilization in undergraduate education in Germany that is equivalent to what one finds in the United States, one can see signs of a gradually globalizing historical curriculum. What is quite notable is the scholarly productivity of some transnational historians. German historians who received training in Asian history, such as Jürgen Osterhammel, Dominic Sachsenmaier, and Sebastian Conrad,¹² have been particularly active in this area. Some historians who are connected to the program “Asia and Europe in a Global Context” at the University of Heidelberg have also contributed to the understanding of transnational and transcultural history.¹³ Yet it is becoming hard to maintain the aforementioned national division due to increasing cooperation between North American and German historians,

as can be seen in Akira Iriye and Jürgen Osterhammel's series co-editorship on the six-volume work *A History of the World*.¹⁴

Before discussing some key characteristics of transnational history, we will briefly explain two related terms, global and transnational history. Most historians use global and transnational history interchangeably, but some express a slight preference for one over the other. Various German historians, for example, have shown a preference for global history over transnational history. While viewing global and transnational history as being "very close" in practice, Conrad points out that transnational history is open to certain criticisms. It simply has insufficient global contexts, and it conceptually reconnects to the nation.¹⁵ Likewise, Sachsenmaier and Osterhammel prefer global history over world history or transhistory.¹⁶ Yet historians who are connected to "Asia and Europe in a Global Context" more frequently employ transnational or transcultural than global. Marrgit Pernau uses transnational and Madeleine Herren and her co-authors prefer transculturality, due to its emphasis on cultural flow between cultures.¹⁷

Compared to Germany, in North America, there is less consensus about global history and transnational history, for historians appear to be fairly equally divided between the two. The aforementioned leading reference work in the field, *The Palgrave Dictionary of Transnational History* (2009), bears "transnational" in the title. In *Transnational History*, Saunier uses transnational history to mean the last 200–250 years, while applying "global" to the period since 1500.¹⁸ Iriye views global and transnational nearly interchangeably in *Global and Transnational History*.¹⁹ A roundtable in the *American Historical Review* (2006) is entitled "Transnational History."²⁰ Nevertheless, other leading theorists in the field employ global history in their titles.²¹ Like some of the theorists mentioned above, we regard transnational and global history as quite interchangeable, but we prefer using transnational history for this volume because of its emphasis on the "exchange process,"²² "individuals in various contexts,"²³ and "a sense of movement."²⁴

What are some key characteristics of transnational history? First, scholars who engage in transnational study reject social and comparative history for neglecting any connectedness between cultures. Transnational historians in Germany, for instance, reject the nation-focus of social historians, especially Hans-Ulrich Wehler.²⁵ Eckert offers the critique that "the overall importance of the Holocaust and the German *Sonderweg*"²⁶

in their scholarship leaves little room for intercultural dimensions. By assuming the singularity of each national culture, Conrad contends, historians have failed to see global dimensions of 19th-century Germany (a point that also applies to Europe and East Asia).²⁷ Similarly, American historian Iriye pillories American social historians' emphasis on America's national exceptionalism.²⁸ Like German global historians, Iriye has also criticized *Alltagsgeschichte* (everyday history) for its local focus.²⁹ Similarly, the historian Andrew Zimmerman criticizes both American social historians (for American exceptionalism) and German social historians (for German *Sonderweg*). He disputed the latter, since domestic politics were not the main determinant in German overseas expansion.³⁰

Secondly, transnational historians reject comparative history, since, like social history, it focuses on nationally/civilizationally unique qualities and thus fails to show the interconnectedness between them.³¹ Comparative historians see their nation/civilization as different from other nations/civilizations. They separate Western development from the rest of the world on the grounds of qualities allegedly unique to the West. Monica Juneja and Margrit Penau have criticized Hans Ulrich Wehler's phrase "comparison as the highest form of social historical research," since comparisons between civilizations could "lead to essentializing models or purely impressionistic observations and generalizations."³² While we agree with the essence of these global historians' critique of comparative history, we plead for one caveat. We do not consider transcultural history and comparative history as necessarily exclusive of each other. Indeed, comparative history can shed light on some historical topics. According to Saunier, the debate on this matter has been settled, because one can use both approaches in order to "answer different questions."³³ After all, transnational historians "have to understand what happens to the ties and flows they follow through different polities and communities."³⁴ Heinz-Gerhard Haupt and Jürgen Kocka have put forward similar arguments. Both types of history are "compatible and have many points of contact."³⁵

In contrast to social historians and comparative historians, global or transnational historians emphasize connectedness. For this endeavor, historians have employed various terms—"history as *entanglement*," "modern history as an ensemble of interweaving," and "commonalities and the exchange relationships of the world."³⁶ The authors of *Transcultural History* focus on "contact zones, adaptation and exchange processes, modes of translations, and moments of crossing borders in a global

context.”³⁷ Within this framework, Osterhammel has highlighted interconnections between Asia, Europe, and Africa.³⁸ Iriye has sought cross-cultural connections and “relevance to the whole of humanity.”³⁹ Shalini Randeria has suggested replacing a comparative model between Western and non-Western societies with “a relational perspective that foregrounds processes of historical and contemporary unequal exchanges.”⁴⁰ Randeria and Conrad have argued that during the nineteenth century, Europe and non-Europe became “indissolubly interwoven,” and thus they view it as “the starting point of a historiography of global history.”⁴¹

THE HISTORIOGRAPHY

Even though research on German-Korean relations has a somewhat brief history, since the 1980s it has produced many works on both Korea and also the German-speaking world. Especially in recent years, general interest in the two countries has grown much, as we will see below. In the following, we consider publications in three languages—German, Korean, and English. There are more works in German and Korean than in English, and thus this volume is an important addition to Korean-German scholarship in English. In addition to the list presented here, there are also numerous studies published in Germany, South Korea, and North America as topically related articles and dissertation theses, which suggest the possibility of continued growth, but these works largely have not been included in this overview.

German-language works in various disciplines that cover the German-Korean exchange have placed some weight on the division of the two countries. The title of Volker Grabowsky’s *Zwei-Nationen-Lehre oder Wiedervereinigung?* (Two-nation model or reunification? 1987) clearly communicates such well-known associations with the common political fate of Germany and Korea throughout much of the second half of the twentieth century.⁴² Similarly, Won-myoung Lee’s *Zur Frage der Nation und der Wiedervereinigung* (On the question of the nation and reunification, 1989) suggests a search for wholeness that might bring North and South Korea back together on the model of reunified Germany.⁴³ Some more recent publications, edited volumes by Hartmut Koschyk (1990) and Klaus Stüwe and Eveline Hermannsede (2011), suggest that there is room for hopeful views of the future, with respect to the North-South Korean divide.⁴⁴ In contrast to these comparative studies, several recent works focused on actual contacts in German-Korean transnational

relations. Hans-Alexander Kneider's *Globetrotter, Abenteurer, Goldgräber* (Globetrotter, Adventurer, Golddigger) (2009) gives a comprehensive account of Germans in Korea during the Yi dynasty. Eun-Jeong Lee and Hannes B. Mosler's recent book *Facetten deutsch-koreanischer Beziehungen* (Facets of German-Korean relations, 2017) is noteworthy because it traces the 130-year relations between these two countries.⁴⁵

Another pair of related topics taken up repeatedly in German-language publications is migration and the question of identity. A number of studies from both before and also after German reunification in 1990 offers insight into the cultural differences Koreans have encountered in Germany. From graduate-level dissertations, like Tai-Soon Yoo's *Koreanerinnen in Deutschland* (Korean women in Germany, 1981), which investigates the manner in which clothing styles marked a cultural shift among this group, to various monographs by professors and private scholars, researchers have paid ample attention to this theme. For example, the 1985 work *Im Schatten des Lebens* (*In life's shadow*) explores the condition of Korean miners in North Rhine-Westphalia. Yang-Cun Jeong's monograph (2008) traces the emergence of Korean-Protestant immigrant communities since 1963.⁴⁶ In a number of cases, the success (or plight) of Korean guest workers in Germany has been the focus. Jae-Hyeon Choe and Hansjürgen Daheim's 1987 volume covers one of the major questions concerning Korean guest workers in Germany, whether they should stay in Germany and become German citizens or return to Korea.⁴⁷ Jang-Seop Lee's *Koreanischer Alltag in Deutschland* (Everyday life of Koreans in Germany, 1991) analyzes various Koreans' efforts to acculturate to the German way of life.⁴⁸ Hyeon-Mi Hwang's 1999 book reminds us that a large part of the attempt to integrate takes place when learning the German language. Many Korean families in Germany have made a consistent effort to maintain the old language and culture while living in the new.⁴⁹ Several monographs in the 1980s and 1990s demonstrated that identity issues cut across numerous fields, from sociology to education and religion, for example.⁵⁰

Scholars of German language and literature or broader cultural studies will be interested also in the work that has been done on German-Korean linguistic, literary, and translation-oriented topics. Dorothea Koch's *Germanistikstudium in Südkorea* (*Germanistik in South Korea*, 1996) set a more general discipline-based tone, but there are various works that compare German and Korean culture and specific literary developments, too.⁵¹ Gyu-Chang Kim's 2001 book, which examines

Korean renderings of Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, is a case in point.⁵² Similarly, Hans-Alexander Kneider, Walter-Wolfgang Sparrer, and Hee-Seok Park offer an overview of the work of three renowned Korean figures in *Franz Eckert—Mirok Li—Yun Isang*.⁵³ It is worth noting that the composer Yun Isang has become the most well-known Korean-German, and there have been several studies on him.⁵⁴

Although not easy to find outside of Korea, there are also many Korean-language texts on the topic, and several are worth mentioning here. Among early works, one that significantly contributed to a German wave in South Korea in the 1960s and 1970s is a collection of essays by the female writer and translator of German literature Cheon Hye-Rin (1934–1965), entitled *Kūrigo amu mal do haji annatta* (And no one spoke any more, 1966). With a touch that is at once both Nietzschean and perhaps also slightly nostalgic, this author described her study of German literature in Munich and her work in German literature after her return to Korea.⁵⁵ One can sense the extensive range of literary encounters between Germany and Korea since the 1980s in the bibliographical section (Korean-German comparative literary study-related resources) of Sang-bōm Chin's *Han-dok munhak ūi bigyo munhakchōk yōngu* (Comparative research of Korean literature and German literature). Some examples of comparative study of German and Korean writers include Max Frisch and Choi In-Hun, Hermann Hesse and Kim Man-Jung, Volker Ludwig and Kim Min-Gil, Christa Wolf and Choi In-Hoon, Ingeborg Bachmann and Chun Hye-Rin, R.M. Rilke and Hann Youn-Un, Hermann Hesse and Yi Sang, Franz Kafka and Choe Sun-Cheol, Franz Kafka and Lee Chung-Jun, Johann Wolfgang von Goethe and Lee Kwang-Soo, Thomas Mann and Yeom Sang-Seop, to name just a few examples. In addition, there are several reception studies of German authors (Schiller, Kafka, etc.) in Korea.⁵⁶

In terms of non-literary works since 2000, the following publications serve as a representative sample. On the theme of war, we find Hyōng-Sik Choi's *Dog'il ūi jaemujang kwa han'guk jōn'jaeng* (Germany's rearmament and the Korean War, 2002).⁵⁷ Yōng-gwan Yi's *Han'guk kwa dog'il* (Korea and Germany, 2002), offers an overview of Korean-German affairs. By Sang-Rok Lee, You-Jae Lee, Alf Lüdtke, et al., the book *Ilsang'sa ro bonūn han'guk kūn'hyōndaesa* (Modern Korean history seen from the perspective of everyday life, 2006) draws comparisons between the two countries on the basis of the mundane life of ordinary people.⁵⁸ The theme of gendered migration has been examined in *Dog'il iju yōsōng*

ŭi salm (The lives of migrant Korean women in Germany, 2014).⁵⁹ Like the various more general works above, but with a focus on Germany, Hans-Alexander Kneider's Korean-language work *Dogil-ŭi baljachwi-reul ttara* (Following German traces, 2014) provides another overview of the developing relationship between Germany and Korea.⁶⁰ Most recently, Jin-Sung Chun's *Sangsang ŭi Athene, Berŭlin-Tokyo-Seoul* (Imagined Athens, Berlin-Tokyo-Seoul, 2015) appeared, showing links between building styles and interpretations of cultural history in East and West.⁶¹ Finally, Chun-Sik Kim's edited volume *Han'guk kwa dog'il, Tong'il yŏksa kyo'yuk ŭl malhada* (Korea and Germany talk about history education for reunification, 2016) takes up again that seeming favorite of topics seen above among German-language publications, the political divide.⁶²

Among English-language publications, to which this volume will add its own distinct contribution, there are works on some of the topics covered above, albeit not to the degree one can find in German and Korean. There are several books that emphasize "lessons" of German reunification for a possible future Korean unification. John J. Metzler's *Divided Dynamism* deals with reunification of three countries—Germany, Korea, and China.⁶³ More specifically, Myŏng-gyu Kang and Helmut Wagner's *Germany and Korea* (1995) and Ulrich Albrecht's edited volume *The Political and Socio-economic Challenge of Korean unification* (1997) point out aspects of German reunification that Koreans might bear in mind for their own potential reunification.⁶⁴ On the topic of espionage, Jeffrey T. Richelson's *Spying on the Bomb* (2006) covers links between Nazi Germany, Iran, and North Korea.⁶⁵ Mee-Kyung Jung's *Essays on Labor Market and Human Capital—Korea and Germany* (2011) seeks answers to Korea's unemployment problems in German job-training practices.⁶⁶

Other works go beyond the rather narrow set of foci on reunification and labor. Yur-Bok Lee's *West Goes East* (1988), for instance, analyzes in detail the diplomatic work of Paul Georg von Möllendorff in Korea in the late nineteenth century.⁶⁷ He tried to reorient Korean foreign policy toward cooperation with Russia, thus irking other powers. Suin Roberts' *Language of Migration* (2012) details the struggles and successes of Korean guest workers in Germany.⁶⁸ A book chapter by Hoi-eun Kim, "Measuring Asian-ness: Erwin Baelz's Anthropological Expeditions in Fin-de-Siècle Korea," analyzes Baelz's work in Korea and how it provided the ideological legitimacy for Japan's annexation of Korea.⁶⁹ Two recent volumes by Eun-Jeung Lee and Hannes B. Mosler, *Civil Society*

on the Move (2015) and *Lost and Found in “Translation”* (2015), analyze questions of civil society and the student movement, on the one hand, and the process and impact of translating policies and laws across cultures, on the other.⁷⁰ Finally, one can find that during the last ten years at least four dissertations were completed in English on the German-Korean composer Isang Yun, all of which explore Western and Asian elements in his music.⁷¹

While this list is not comprehensive, it offers a general overview of the issues and debates among scholars of Korean-German affairs in Germany, South Korea, and North America. Given that the present book covers many of the topics mentioned above, but gathered together in one volume, it is rather unusual, especially among English-language publications. The editors hope that it gives rise to both new discoveries and also reinvigorates debate on older, more widely known issues.

ORGANIZATION OF THIS VOLUME

Divided into four parts, the chapters in *Transnational Encounters between Germany and Korea* present German-Korean relations as increasingly comparable, despite their otherwise obvious differences of cultural and historical experience. Part I. “An Overview” sets the tone for the rest of the book. Especially for readers with little background knowledge of Germany and Korea, this section offers a window onto the shared past of these two countries and peoples. In the single chapter in this section, entitled “130 Years of German-Korean Relations,” Eun-Jeung Lee and Hannes B. Mosler present an overview of more than a century of German-Korean affairs. In the years prior to 1945, this chapter grants a view of Germans in Korea and Koreans in Germany. It then probes the nature of relations between the former German Democratic Republic and the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, as well as between the former Federal Republic of Germany and the Republic of Korea. For the post-unification period, it focuses on Germany’s various exchanges with South Korea, especially those of an economic and academic nature. The reader will come to see that, at least in part, the strong trade that takes place between these two nations today arises out an often positive, long-standing relationship.

Part II. “German-Korean Relations before 1945” includes several chapters from the earliest period of interactions between the German-speaking world and Korea. In “Paul Georg von Möllendorff: A German

Reformer in Korea,” Eun-Jeung Lee presents the efforts of this German linguist and diplomat, the first foreigner employed by the Korean government as an advisor (1882–1885). Möllendorff (1847–1901) was appointed vice-foreign minister of Korea by King Gojong himself and went on to leave a strongly positive impression of Germany on Koreans that has remained, to some extent, to the present day. This chapter offers a view of Möllendorff not typically known outside of Korea by showcasing his merits as a reformer. Negative evaluations of him in German archives are due largely to resentment other foreign diplomats felt toward him. From a Korean perspective, however, Möllendorff deserves recognition for his work much like that accorded to the German physician Philipp Franz von Siebold in late-Edo-period Japan.

In “Franz Eckert and Richard Wunsch: Two Prussians in Korean Service,” Hans-Alexander Kneider seeks to acquaint the reader with other influential Germans in Korea. He depicts two Prussians who served Emperor Gojong. Bandmaster Franz Eckert introduced German military brass band music to both Japan and also Korea and then composed the national anthems of both countries. Similarly important for early German-Korean relations, the second figure featured in this chapter is Dr. Richard Wunsch, personal physician of the Korean emperor. During the years of annexation into the Japanese empire, Korea received ever greater influence from German culture, albeit indirectly, in ways that affected the shape of the Korean capital of Seoul. In “Specters of Schinkel in East Asia: Berlin, Tokyo, and Seoul from a Viewpoint of Modernity/Coloniality,” Jin-Sung Chun examines the three modern capital cities Berlin, Tokyo and Seoul to show how a dominant cultural heritage was transferred to heterogeneous cultural environments in the colonial periphery, autonomously appropriated by the colonized, and eventually transformed into a postcolonial “*lieu de mémoire*.” To offer a view of the interconnectedness of these three cities, Chun discusses Prussian classicism as a cardinal legacy of German national culture, the Japanese appropriation of Prussian classicism, and then finally the German-Japanese cultural legacy in Seoul before and after the national liberation.

The chapters in Part III “A Common Fate in the Cold War Era and Beyond” show moments of convergence between the German and Korean experience in the latter half of the twentieth century, a period when these two nations were recreated in accordance with postwar ideological differences between the former allies the United States and the

Soviet Union. During this period, Koreans had to imagine Germany in terms of West and East, and Germans had understandably divided views of Koreans, since they had to reinterpret them as both North and also South Koreans. In “Korean-German Relations from the 1950s to the 1980s: Archive-based Approach to Cold War-Era History,” Sang-Hwan Seong explores transnational relations within the two Cold War blocs (South Korea-West Germany and North Korea-East Germany) in the 1950s and 1960s. Focusing on the East Berlin Espionage Affair in the late 1960s, Seong shows both friendly and also troubled postwar political and diplomatic relations between South Korea and West Germany. Relations between the former East Germany and North Korea started out quite amicable in the 1950s. Indeed, the GDR provided substantial assistance to North Korea, but between the years 1958 and 1960 Kim Il-Sung began to limit cooperation with East Germany and other socialist states.

In “Luise Rinser’s Third-World Politics: Isang Yun and North Korea,” Joanne Miyang Cho treats Luise Rinser’s role as an apologist for North Korea. Rinser showed enthusiasm for North Korea’s *Juche* ideology and praised it for its encouragement of economic and political independence and rejection of American and Soviet imperialism. On these points, the chapter presents also Isang Yun’s experience in the East Berlin Incident and connection to North Korea and his influence on Rinser. Ultimately, Rinser’s understanding of *Juche* ideology proved limited, for she failed to observe its link to North Korea’s economic downturn and international isolation. In “Liminal Visions: Cinematic Representations of the German and Korean Divides,” Bruce Williams explores the depiction of inner-national borders in films dealing with the division of Germany and Korea. The four films analyzed—Margarethe von Trotta’s *The Promise* (1995), Park Chang-wook’s *JSA* (2000), Kim Tae-kyun’s *Crossing* (2008), and Christian Petzold’s *Barbara* (2012)—reveal the ideological issues at stake in capitalist representations of the communist “other.” The films focus on both direct and also indirect border crosses, and the border spaces they depict range from highly historicized to fantastic and implausible. In each case, as Williams shows, the trope of the inner-national border underscores the film’s propagandistic nature.

In Aaron D. Horton’s “The ‘Ignorant’ Other: Popular Stereotypes of North Koreans in South Korea and East Germans in Unified Germany,” we find a comparison of the ways that North Korean refugees in South Korea and East Germans after reunification have been regarded

as ignorant, inferior people by their capitalist “cousins.” In two of the world’s most prosperous nations, North Korean refugees and East Germans have struggled to find employment and opportunity, a challenge exacerbated by negative stereotypes. They have been subjected to popular images depicting them as simple “rubes” incapable of adjusting to the hustle and bustle of modern society. Despite significant differences, Horton demonstrates, the North Korean refugees in South Korea and East Germans in unified Germany share numerous commonalities of experience. Then, in “Illusions of Unity: Life Narratives in Eastern German and North Korean Unification Literature,” Birgit Susanne Geipel compares the novels *Unter dem Namen Norma* (1994) by Brigitte Burmeister with *Mannam* (2001) by Kim Nam-ho. While the unification ideology of ethnic nationalism appears in the North Korean context, it has been viewed critically from an Eastern German post-unification perspective. This chapter reveals the contrast between the popular discontent with the post-unification situation in Germany and ideologically conformist pro-unification writings in North Korea. Kinship narratives constructed by unification ideology have generated an illusion of homogeneity impossible after decades of division.

Part IV. “The Migration of Ideas and People” presents ways in which Germany and Korea have connected via the movement of both abstract things (i.e., thoughts, interpretations of the past, artistic expression) and so very concrete human beings (i.e., guest workers, immigrants) from one country to the other. In “Depictions of the Self as Korean in German-language Literature by Mirok Li and Kang Moon Suk,” by Lee M. Roberts, the reader meets two Korean writers of German-language literature. Mirok Li (1899–1950) fled Korea in 1919 after participating in a peaceful protest against Japan’s annexation of his country, landed in Germany, and wrote of his hardships. Kang Moon Suk (1965–) went to Germany as a singer and added to her repertoire erotic poetry suggestive of her background in both Korea and also Germany. Seldom recognized for their ethnic particularity, these two writers have created a literary picture of themselves as Koreans for the German-reading public that implies ways they have adapted to and coped with German culture.

While Roberts’ chapter may offer a view of the self as depicted in the works of two Koreans in Germany, it has been difficult over the twentieth century to gain a single, unified impression of either Germany or Korea,

because both nations have represented a *mélange* of ideological extremes. Within various German-language writings by people of Korean background, however, we find some commonalities on what it has meant to be either Korean or from Korea while also living in Germany. Suin Roberts' "*Endstation der Sehnsüchte: Home-Making of Return Gastarbeiter Migrants*" tells something of a continuation of the story of roughly 10,000 Korean nurses and 6000 miners who worked in former West Germany in the 1960s and 1970s. Forty years later, some return "home" to the newly founded German Village (*Dokil Maue*), where all houses had to be built to look "German." This chapter analyzes Cho Sung-Hyung's documentary *Endstation der Sehnsüchte* (Final Station of Yearnings, 2009) and newspaper articles on *Dokil Maue* to show how the inhabitants are portrayed and portray themselves, including characteristics perceived as national (i.e., specifically German or Korean) and representations of their (acquired) German heritage and culture in their homes.

In Ho-keun Choi's "History as a Mirror: Korea's Appropriation of Germany's Experience in Rectifying the Past," the reader gains insight into how Germany's experience with facing its past has been appropriated and applied in Korean society. While Koreans have been ambivalent about their own culpability as perpetrators of historical civilian massacres, social and political interest has focused on the colonial experience. Thus, Koreans' attempts to rectify their past have not given rise to reflection on their own past mistakes, but rather highlighted Japan's responsibility for its colonial atrocities. Koreans' use of the German experience has not been grounded in honest confrontation with the past, as championed by Theodor W. Adorno, but more on selective memory and nationalist sentiment. Finally, Kyung Lee Gagum's "Goethe's *Faust* in the South Korean *Manhwa* *The Tarot Café*: Sang-Sun Park's Critical Project" examines how in Sang-Sun Park's graphic novel series *The Tarot Café* (2007), pop culture merges with canonical German literature. Johann Wolfgang von Goethe's *Faust* blends with vernacular social forms to create a South Korean version of the German legend. Although Park's work appears to be a culturally neutral pictorial narrative, it actually deconstructs conventional gender roles of female and male in South Korean society in the 2000s. Gagum illuminates this nuanced representation of a female Faust to offer insights into Korean-based recontextualizations and interpretations of *Faust* today.

CONCLUSION

Koreans and Germans might once have wondered where their respective countries lie and what people on the other side of the world eat and do on a daily basis, but roughly 130 years have passed since the establishment of a formal relationship between these two nations. While the cultural and informational flow may have often been from West to East, things have not been entirely unidirectional. Indeed, exchange has flowed from East to West, too, and with this point in mind this volume has endeavored to present a view of both Germans' perceptions of Korea and Koreans' perceptions of Germany. For the many curious out there, those willing to go abroad to work or study, the other country has perhaps never been so far away, even if information about it may have sometimes been hard to come by. This volume attempts to make such information easier to access.

As stated briefly above, *Transnational Encounters between Germany and Korea* is something of a unique work in the English-speaking world, not to mention in German Studies in North America today. While there are many other publications on German-Korean relations, none perhaps has brought together chapters on as wide a range of topics. From the general overview of connections between people of the two nations since the late nineteenth century to more specific, special interests, like literature and pop culture, the chapters gathered here represent an attempt to offer a view of German Studies as the field relates to Korea(s) past and present. In so doing, the editors of this volume strive to continue a trend that seeks to highlight the growing international breadth of today's German Studies pursued by students and scholars everywhere.

NOTES

1. Joanne Miyang Cho and David Crowe, eds., *Germany and China: Transnational Encounters since the Eighteenth Century* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2014); Joanne Miyang Cho, Lee M. Roberts, and Christian W. Spang, eds., *Transnational Encounters between Germany and Japan: Perceptions of Partnership in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2016); Joanne Miyang Cho and Douglas T. McGetchin, eds., *Gendered Encounters between Germany and Asia: Transnational Perspectives since 1800* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2017).

2. Christian Spang and Rolf-Harald Wippich, eds., *Japanese-German Relations, 1895–1945: War, Diplomacy and Public Opinion* (New York: Routledge, 2006); Qinna Shen and Martin Rosenstock, eds., *Beyond Alterity: German Encounters with Modern East Asia* (New York: Berghahn, 2014); Veronika Fuechtner and Mary Rhiel, *Imagining Germany Imaging Asia: Essays in Asian-German Studies* (Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2013).
3. Suzanne Marchand, *German Orientalism in the Age of Empire: Religion, Race, and Scholarship* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press and German Historical Institute, 2009).
4. Ann-Christina L. Knudsen and Karen Gram-Skjoldager, “Historiography and narration in transnational history,” *Journal of Global History* (2014): 144; Sebastian Conrad and Andreas Eckert, “Globalgeschichte, Globalisierung, multiple Modernen: Zur Geschichtsschreibung der modernen Welt,” in *Globalgeschichte: Theorien, Ansätze, Themen*, ed. Sebastian Conrad, Andreas Eckert, Ulrike Freitag (Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 2008), 17.
5. Conrad and Eckert, “Globalgeschichte, Globalisierung, multiple Modernen,” 22.
6. Sebastian Conrad, *What is Global History?* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2016), 1–2.
7. Pierre-Yves Saunier and Akira Iriye, eds., *The Palgrave Dictionary of Transnational History* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009).
8. Knudsen and Gram-Skjoldager, “Historiography and narration in transnational history,” 143–144.
9. *Ibid.*, 144, 146.
10. Akira Iriye, *Global and Transnational History: The Past, Present, and Future* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013); Pierre-Yves Saunier, *Transnational History: Theory and History* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013).
11. Michael Geyer and Charles Bright, “World History in a Global Age,” *American Historical Review*, 100, no. 4 (Oct. 1995): 1034–1060; Charles Bright and Michael Geyer, “Globalgeschichte und die Einheit der Welt im 20. Jahrhundert, in *Globalgeschichte: Theorien, Ansätze, Themen*, ed. Sebastian Conrad, Andreas Eckert, and Ulrike Freitag (Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 2008); Jerry Bentley, ed., *The Oxford Handbook of World History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011); Pamela Kyle Crossley, *What is Global History?* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2008); Patrick Manning, *Navigating World History: Historians Create a Global Past* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003); Arif Dirlik, *Global Modernity: Modernity in the Age of Global Capitalism* (Boulder, CO: Paradigm Press,

- 2007); Dipesh Chakrabarty, *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000).
12. Dominic Sachsenmaier, *Global Perspectives on Global History: Theories and Approaches in a Connected World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011); Jürgen Osterhammel and Niels P. Peterson, *Geschichte der Globalisierung. Dimensionen, Prozesse, Epochen* (Munich: C.H. Beck, 2007); Conrad, Eckert and Freitag, eds., *Globalgeschichte*; Sebastian Conrad, *Globalgeschichte. Eine Einführung* (Munich: Beck, 2013); ———, *What is Global History?* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2016).
 13. Margrit Pernau, *Transnationale Geschichte* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011); Madeleine Herren, Martin Rüesch, and Christiane Sibille, *Transcultural History: Theories, Methods, Sources* (Heidelberg: Springer, 2012).
 14. Akira Iriye and Jürgen Osterhammel are series co-editors of the six-volume work, *A History of the World History*. It is a joint publication of Harvard University Press and C.H. Beck.
 15. Conrad, *Globalgeschichte*, 17.
 16. Sachsenmaier, *Global Perspectives on Global History*, 19.
 17. Herren, Rüesch, and Sibille, *Transcultural History*.
 18. Saunier, *Transnational History*, 8.
 19. Iriye, *Global and Transnational History*.
 20. “AHR Conversation: On Transnational History,” *The American Historical Review* 111, no. 5 (December 2006): 1441–1464.
 21. Geyer and Bright, “World History in a Global Age”; Bright and Geyer, “Globalgeschichte und die Einheit der Welt im 20. Jahrhundert”; Crossley, *What is Global History?*; Manning, *Navigating World History*; Dirlik, *Global Modernity*.
 22. Conrad, *Globalgeschichte*, 17.
 23. Iriye, *Global and Transnational History*, 15.
 24. “AHR Conversation: On Transnational History,” 1448.
 25. Sebastian Conrad, “Double Marginalization: A Plea for a Transnational Perspective,” in *Comparative and Transnational History: Central European Approaches and New Perspectives*, ed. Heinz-Gerhard Haupt and Jürgen Kocka (New York: Berghahn Books, 2009), 61–63; Jürgen Osterhammel, “A ‘Transnational’ History of Society: Continuity or New Departure?” in *Comparative and Transnational History. Central European Approaches and New Perspectives*, ed. Heinz-Gerhard Haupt and Jürgen Kocka (New York: Berghahn Books, 2009), 49.
 26. Andreas Eckert, “Germany and Africa in the Late Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries. An Entangled History?” in *Comparative and Transnational History. Central European Approaches and New*

- Perspectives*, ed. Heinz-Gerhard Haupt and Jürgen Kocka (New York: Berghahn Books, 2009), 227.
27. Sebastian Conrad, *Globalisation and the Nation in Imperial Germany* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).
 28. Iriye, *Global and Transnational History*, 14.
 29. *Ibid.*, 4.
 30. Andrew Zimmerman, *Alabama in Africa: Booker T. Washington, the German Empire, and the Globalization of the New South* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010), 1, 3.
 31. Iriye, *Global and Transnational History*, 4–6.
 32. Monica Juneja and Margrit Pernau, “Lost in Translation? Transcending Boundaries,” in Haupt and Kocka, *Comparative History and Transnational History. Central European Approaches and New Perspectives*, ed. Heinz-Gerhard Haupt and Jürgen Kocka (New York: Berghahn Books, 2009), 107, 110.
 33. Saunier, *Transnational History*, 5.
 34. *Ibid.*, 8.
 35. Heinz-Gerhard Haupt and Jürgen Kocka, “Introduction,” in *Comparative and Transnational History: Central European Approaches and New Perspectives*, ed. Heinz-Gerhard Haupt and Jürgen Kocka (New York: Berghahn Books, 2009), 2, 19.
 36. Sebastian Conrad and Shalini Randeria, “Einleitung: Geteilte Geschichten—Europa in einer postkolonialen Welt,” in *Jenseits des Eurozentrismus. Postkoloniale Perspektiven in den Geschichts- und Kulturwissenschaften*, 2nd ed. (Frankfurt am Main and New York: Campus, 2013), 39–40.
 37. Herren, Rüesch, and Sibille, *Transcultural History*, 5–6.
 38. Jürgen Osterhammel, *The Transformation of the World: A Global History of the Nineteenth Century*, trans. Patrick Camiller (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014).
 39. Iriye, *Global and Transnational History*, 4, 11.
 40. Shalini Randeria, “Entangled Histories of Uneven Modernities,” in Heinz-Gerhard Haupt and Jürgen Kocka, *Comparative History and Transnational History Central European Approaches and New Perspectives*, ed. Heinz-Gerhard Haupt and Jürgen Kocka (New York: Berghahn Books, 2009), 80.
 41. Conrad and Randeria, “Einleitung,” 39.
 42. Volker Grabowsky, *Zwei-Nationen-Lehre oder Wiedervereinigung?: Die Einstellung der Partei der Arbeit Koreas und der Sozialistischen Einheitspartei Deutschlands zur nationalen Frage ihrer Länder seit dem Zweiten Weltkrieg: ein Vergleich* (Bochum: Brockmeyer, 1987).

43. Won-myoungh Lee, *Zur Frage der Nation und der Wiedervereinigung im geteilten Korea: ein koreanischer Weg oder die Anwendung der Deutschland-Formel als Modus vivendi?* (Seoul: Research Center for Peace and Unification of Korea, 1989).
44. Hartmut Koschyk, ed., *Deutschland, Korea. Geteilt, vereint* (Munich: Olzog, 2005); Klaus Stüwe and Eveline Hermannseder, eds., *Die Wiedervereinigung geteilter Nationen: Erfahrungen aus Deutschland und Perspektiven für Korea* (Berlin: LIT, 2011).
45. Hans-Alexander Kneider, *Globetrotter, Abenteurer, Goldgräber: Auf den Spuren im alten Korea: mit einem Abriss zur Geschichte der Yi-Dynastie und der deutsch-koreanischen Beziehungen bis 1910* (Munich: Iudicium, 2009); Jong-soo Han, *Die Beziehungen zwischen der Republik Korea und der Bundesrepublik Deutschland 1948-1986* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1992); Eun-Jeung Lee and Hannes B. Mosler, *Facetten deutsch-koreanischer Beziehungen: 130 Jahre gemeinsame Geschichte* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2017).
46. Tai-Soon Yoo, *Koreanerinnen in Deutschland: Eine Analyse zum Akkulturationsverhalten am Beispiel der Kleidung* (PhD diss, Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität Münster, 1981); C. Nestler-Tremel, U. Tremel, and W. Lienemann, *Im Schatten des Lebens: Südkoreaner Im Steinkohlebergbau von Nordrheinwestfalen. Eine Untersuchung zur Rotationspolitik mit ausländischen Arbeitnehmern* (Heidelberg: Forschungsstätte der Evangelischen Studiengemeinschaft, 1985); Jung-Sook Yu, *Koreanische Immigranten in Deutschland: Interessenvertretung und Selbstorganisation* (Hamburg: Kovač, 1996); Yang-Cun Jeong, *Koreanische Immigrationsgemeinden in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland: die Entstehung, Entwicklung und Zukunft der koreanischen protestantischen Immigrationsgemeinden in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland seit 1963* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2008).
47. Jae-Hyeon Choe and Hansjürgen Daheim, *Rückkehr und Bleibeperspektiven koreanischer Arbeitsmigranten in der Bundesrepublik* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1987).
48. Jang-Seop Lee, *Koreanischer Alltag in Deutschland: Zur Akkulturation der koreanischen Familien* (Münster: F. Coppenrath, 1991); Klaus Stüwe and Eveline Hermannseder, eds., *Migration und Integration als transnationale Herausforderung. Perspektiven aus Deutschland und Korea* (Wiesbaden: Springer, 2016).
49. Hyeon-Mi Hwang, *Identitätsentwicklung und Zweisprachigkeit im interkulturellen Umfeld am Beispiel koreanischer Kinder der zweiten Generation aus Arbeiterfamilien in Deutschland* (Berlin: Logos, 1999).
50. Young-Hee Kim, *Sozialisationsprobleme koreanischer Kinder in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland* (Opladen: Leske und Budrich, 1986); Ko-Hoon Park *Erziehung und Leben koreanischer Kinder in Deutschland.*

- Eine empirische Untersuchung* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1996); Byong Ro-An, *Die Religiosität der Koreaner in Deutschland* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1997).
51. Dorothea Koch, *Germanistikstudium in Südkorea* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1996); Ze U. Yang, *Strukturen und Elemente koreanischer Volkerzählungen: in Hinblick auf die Volksreligionen in Korea und im Vergleich mit den Kinder- und Hausmärchen der Brüder Grimm* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1980).
 52. Gyu Chang Kim, *Vermittlungs- und Übersetzungsgeschichte Goethes* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2001).
 53. Martin H. Schmidt, ed., *Franz Eckert - Mirok Li - Yun Isang* (Oberursel/Ts.: Regardeur III, 2008).
 54. <http://yun-gesellschaft.de/e/index.htm>. Accessed on February 11, 2017.
 55. Hye-Rin Cheon, *Kürigo amu mal do haji annatta* [And no one spoke any more] (1966; Seoul: Minseochulpan, 2013).
 56. Sang-böm Chin, *Han-dok munhak üi bigyo munhakchök yongu* (Seoul: Bagichön, 2012). 403–410. <https://play.google.com/books/reader?printsec=frontcover&output=reader&id=rvbkAwAAQBAJ&pg=GBS.PA193>. Note to readers: This volume contains transliterations from Korean according to two styles, both the McCune-Reischauer and also the more current Revised Romanization of Korean systems, depending on the scholar's preference in the given chapter.
 57. Hyöng-Sik Choi, *Dog'il üi jaemujang kwa han'guk jön'jaeng* [Germany's rearmament and the Korean war] (Seoul: Hye'an, 2002)
 58. Sang-Rok Lee, You-Jae Lee, Alf Lüdtke, et al., *Ilsang'sa ro bonün han'guk kün'hyöndaesa: Han'guk kwa dog'il ilsangsa üi sacro'un man'nam* [Modern Korean history seen from everyday life: A new encounter between Korean and German Alltagsgeschichte] (Seoul: Chaek kwa Ham'gge, 2006).
 59. Jaedog Han'guk Yösöng Mo'im [Korean Women's Association in Germany], *Dog'il iju yösöng üi salm: Gü hyöndaesa üi girok* [The Lives of the Migrated Korean Women in Germany: A Record of Contemporary History] (Seoul: Dangdae, 2014).
 60. Hans-Alexander Kneider, *Dogil-üi baljachwi-reul ttara. Han-dok gwangye: chochanggi-puteo1910 nyeon-kkaji* [Following German traces: Korean-German relations, from their beginnings to 1910] (Seoul: Ilchogak, 2014)
 61. Jin-Sung Chun, *Sangsang üi Athene, Berülin-Tokyo-Seoul: Gi'ök kwa gönchuk i bijönen Bulhyöp'hwa'üm üi Munhwasa* [Imagined Athens, Berlin-Tokyo-Seoul: Cultural history of the discord between memory and architecture] (Seoul: Chönn'nyön üi sangsang, 2015).
 62. Chun-Sik Kim, ed., *Han'guk kwa dog'il, Tong'il yöksa kyo'yuk ül malhada* [Korea and Germany talk about history education for reunification] (Seoul: Nutisup, 2016).

63. John J. Metzler, *Divided Dynamism: the diplomacy of separated nations: Germany, Korea, China*, 2nd ed. (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2014).
64. Myöng-gyu Kang and Helmut Wagner, *Germany and Korea: Lessons in Unification* (Seoul: Seoul National University, 1995); Ulrich Albrecht, ed., *The Political and Socio-economic Challenge of Korean Unification: Lessons from Germany's Post-unification Experience* (Berlin: Institut für Internat. Politik und Regionsstudien, 1997).
65. Jeffrey T. Richelson, *Spying on the Bomb: American Nuclear Intelligence from Nazi Germany to Iran and North Korea* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2007).
66. Mee-Kyung Jung, *Essays on Labor Market and Human Capital - Korea and Germany* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2011).
67. Yur-Bok Lee, *West Goes East: Paul Georg von Möllendorff and great power Imperialism in late Yi Korea* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1988).
68. Suin Roberts, *Language of Migration: Self- and Other-representation of Korean Migrants in Germany* (New York: Peter Lang, 2012).
69. Hoi-eun Kim, "Measuring Asian-ness: Erwin Baelz's Anthropological Expeditions in Fin-de-Siècle Korea," in *Imagining Germany, Imagining Asia*, ed. Veronika Feuchtnner and Mary Rhiel (Rochester: Camden House, 2013), 7.
70. Eun-Jeung Lee and Hannes B. Mosler, eds., *Civil Society on the Move: Transition and Transfer in Germany and South Korea* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2015); ———, *Lost and Found in "Translation": Circulating Ideas of Policy and Legal Decision Processes in Korea and Germany* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2015).
71. S. Choy, "The Fusion of Korean and Western Elements in *Isang Yun's Konzert für Flöte und kleines Orchester*" (PhD diss., University of Georgia, 2010); Ko-Eun Lee, "Isang Yun's Musical Bilingualism: Serial Technique and Korean Elements in *Fünf Stücke für Klavier* (1958) and His Later Piano Works" (PhD diss., University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 2012); Dae-Sik Hur, "A Combination of Asian Language with Foundations of Western Music: An Analysis of Isang Yun's *Salomo* for Flute Solo or Alto Flute Solo" (PhD diss., University of North Texas, 2005); Jee-Yeoun Ko, "Isang Yun and His Selected Cello Works" (PhD diss., Louisiana State University, 2008).

AUTHORS' BIOGRAPHY

Joanne Miyang Cho is Professor and Chair of History at William Paterson University, New Jersey. She is co-editor of *Transcultural Encounters between Germany and India* (2014), *Germany and China* (2014), *Transnational Encounters between Germany and Japan* (2016), and *Gendered Encounters between Germany and Asia* (2017). She is a co-editor of the *Palgrave Series in Asian German Studies*.

Lee M. Roberts is Associate Professor of German at Indiana University-Purdue University, Fort Wayne, and co-editor of the *Palgrave Series in Asian German Studies*. He specializes in Asian-German Studies. His publications include *Literary Nationalism in German and Japanese Germanistik* (2010) and chapters in *Germany and China* (2014), *Transnational Encounters between Germany and Japan* (2016), and *Gendered Encounters between Germany and Asia* (2017).

Transnational Encounters between Germany and Korea

Affinity in Culture and Politics Since the 1880s

Cho, J.M.; Roberts, L.M. (Eds.)

2018, XIII, 328 p. 9 illus., 4 illus. in color., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-1-349-95223-6