



Archive, digital technology, and the inheritance of the Gwangju Uprising: the affect of the post-Gwangju generation of directors in *Kim-gun* (2019) and *Round and Around* (2020)

HyeYoung Cho

To cite this article: HyeYoung Cho (2022) Archive, digital technology, and the inheritance of the Gwangju Uprising: the affect of the post-Gwangju generation of directors in *Kim-gun* (2019) and *Round and Around* (2020), Journal of Japanese and Korean Cinema, 14:1, 49-67, DOI: [10.1080/17564905.2022.2065168](https://doi.org/10.1080/17564905.2022.2065168)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/17564905.2022.2065168>



© 2022 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group



Published online: 28 Apr 2022.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 205



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



OPEN ACCESS



Archive, digital technology, and the inheritance of the Gwangju Uprising: the affect of the post-Gwangju generation of directors in *Kim-gun* (2019) and *Round and Around* (2020)

HyeYoung Cho

Film Studies Department, Chung-Ang University, Seoul, Korea

ABSTRACT

This essay explores two recent documentaries on the Gwangju Uprising: Kang Sang-woo's *Kim-gun* (*Gim-gun*, 2019) and Jang Min-seung's *Round and Around* (*Dunggeulgo dunggeulge*, 2020). The Gwangju Uprising was a pro-democracy uprising that occurred in Gwangju, South Korea in 1980. In response to the uprising, the South Korean government ordered police and soldiers to massacre Gwangju civilians. *Kim-gun* sets out in search of the identity of a young man stationed in front of a truck-mounted machine gun in a photograph taken during the uprising. *Round and Around*, commissioned by the Korean Film Archive, is an audio-visual experimental project that was produced in 2020 to commemorate the 40th anniversary of the uprising. In this essay, I demonstrate that documentary directors Kang and Jang – who belong to the post-Gwangju generation and did not participate in, witness, or live through the uprising either directly or indirectly – find a way to reconnect with and inherit the historical memory of the uprising and bring the past to the present by appealing to affect and the senses rather than simply recounting historical facts and explicating the significance of the uprising.

KEYWORDS

Kim-gun; Round and Around; May 18 Gwangju Uprising; postmemory; archive; trauma and documentary

New Gwangju documentary and the affect of the post-Gwangju generation

This essay explores two recent documentaries on the Gwangju Uprising: Kang Sang-woo's *Kim-gun* (*Gim-gun*, 2019) and Jang Min-seung's *Round and Around* (*Dunggeulgo dunggeulge*, 2020). The Gwangju Uprising was a pro-democracy uprising that occurred in Gwangju, South Korea in 1980.¹ In response to the uprising, the South Korean government ordered police and soldiers to massacre Gwangju civilians. *Kim-gun* sets out in search of the identity of a young man stationed in front of a truck-mounted machine gun in a photograph taken during the uprising. In 2015, far-right ex-army official Ji Man-won began espousing a conspiracy theory that the man in the photo was 1 of 600 North Korean special agents who infiltrated Gwangju and instigated anti-government

CONTACT HyeYoung Cho ✉ visutory@gmail.com

© 2022 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way.

violence. The documentary presents evidence to refute Ji's absurd theory. While seeking out evidence, the director meets Ju Ok, a 56-year-old dry cleaner who identifies the man in the photo as 'Kim-gun', a homeless ragpicker who collected junk on the street. Beginning with this clue, the documentary reconstructs the life story of Kim-gun and presents additional testimony from survivors of the uprising while also scrutinizing archival photos held at the May 18 Memorial Foundation. *Round and Around*, commissioned by the Korean Film Archive, is an audio-visual project that was produced in 2020 to commemorate the 40th anniversary of the uprising. The film contains no interviews or narration, and it experiments with non-linear montage using footage from pro-government newsreels, television programs, and video reports and photos produced by foreign journalists. In *Round and Around*, images stretching from the 1980 Gwangju Uprising to the 1988 Seoul Olympics of industrial development, labour repression, the forced demolition of slums and squatter settlements, and pro-democracy protests that occurred under compressed modernization reveal the unending state violence unleashed on South Korean citizens. The film uses several techniques to create spaces where the living and dead can congregate and listen to the unheard voices of victims. For example, the film features choir music based on excerpts from psalms that Jung Jae-il, music director of *Parasite* (*Gisaengchung*, dir. Bong Joon-ho, 2019) and *Squid Game* (*Ojingeo geim*, dir. Hwang Dong-hyuk, 2020), composed. The camerawork incorporates ghost-like shots that wander through the present-day, empty ruins of Gwangju historical sites; it also utilizes the expression of light from a candle, film projector, electronic particles, and nature. The documentary has been exhibited using standard digital projection and shown on an OLED screen; the documentary has also been exhibited as a performance with stage lights and fog appearing in front of a screen. Jang's genre-bending creation deconstructs the boundaries between the theatre and gallery and between cinema and performance.

In this essay, I demonstrate that documentary directors Kang and Jang – who belong to the post-Gwangju generation and did not participate in, witness, or live through the uprising either directly or indirectly – find a way to reconnect with and inherit the historical memory of the uprising and bring the past to the present by appealing to affect and the senses rather than simply recounting historical facts and explicating the significance of the uprising. I will here call the descendants of the generation who lived through the massive traumatic event as the post-Gwangju generation whose received memory is deeply connected to the previous generation's remembrances of the past and at the same time is "distinct from the recall of contemporary witnesses and participants." (Hirsh 2008, 106) As cultural anthropologist Marianne Hirsh writes, the insistence on 'post' defines both "a specifically inter – and trans-generational act of transfer and the resonant aftereffects of trauma." (106) In addition, the memory of the post-Gwangju generation is composed of the cultural experiences such as "the stories, images and behaviours among which they grew up." (106)

Both Kang and Jang are attracted to or even obsessed with specific pieces of archival footage: Kang focuses on the photo of Kim-gun, and Jang concentrates on non-human elements, such as light and shade, architectural space, and industrial machines. They desire not only to directly engage with and experience the Gwangju Uprising through archival images but also to deconstruct, rearrange, and reinterpret this history. Desire and affect create a queer gaze in *Kim-gun* and a ritual spatiality for mourning in *Round and Around*. The post-Gwangju generation apparently needs the mediation of more

intimate feeling, a familiar time-space or tangible things for them to be interested in or engaged with the Gwangju Uprising. The former attempts to access the memory of Gwangju by providing a queer gaze on a young man's photo taken during the Uprising from the perspective of the present. Meanwhile, the latter creates a ritual or religious space where the post-Gwangju generation as well as the people that lived through this period in history, the survivors as well as the dead, non-human as well as human are invited to mourn the victims by exploring the historical sites of the Uprising of both the past time recorded on the archival footage and the present time of the empty and abandoned status with highlighting the effect of different kinds of light and sound. These films constitute new approaches to the Gwangju Uprising by the post-Gwangju generation.

The first independent documentaries about Gwangju were a series of films only made by assembling video footage of the uprising taken by foreign journalists from the Japan Broadcasting Corporation, Northern German Broadcasting,² the Associated Press, and the *New York Times*. The documentary collection made by the mid-1980s was called *Gwangju Video*,³ which focused on telling the truth in multiple languages and started an aesthetic tradition of the use of found footage in documentary work about Gwangju. A series of Gwangju videos were secretly produced and circulated by underground organizations to break the silence enforced by harsh government censorship and control of the press. During the dictatorship of the 1980s, people risked their lives to spread word about the massacre to those outside Gwangju. These Gwangju videos demonstrate the mediality of the home video age, which involves the mass production of videos through replication and film screenings using VCR players. In addition, the videos made by Korean-born immigrants or students studying abroad and distributed with a help of the Catholic churches show the Korean history of postcolonial immigration across Japan, Europe and North America and the history of religious movements for democracy.⁴ *Gwangju Video: The Missing* (*Gwangju bidio: sarajin nesigan*, dir. Lee Jo-hoon), which was released in 2020, includes interviews with people who heroically produced and circulated these videos. The film also attempts to uncover concealed footage that may reveal exactly what happened during the four hours that troops fired on the crowd and who initially ordered soldiers to open fire.

In addition to these Gwangju videos, several South Korean independent documentary films about the uprising were produced in the 1980s and 1990s, during which time a socially conscious independent documentary film movement that centred the *minjung*⁵ as an agent of history emerged. Filmmakers belonging to this film movement mainly dealt with labour repression, forced evictions due to urban development, and pro-democracy struggles in their films, and they often identified themselves not as directors but activists. The film collectives or a group of labourers or evictees appearing in the documentaries were listed in the credits as co-producer or co-filmmaker without any individual's name, as the Gwangju videos did. As Park Nohchool noted, in the 1980s and 1990s, the Gwangju Video was 'ground zero' (Park 2010, 189) for the works of socially engaged film collectives such as the Seoul Visual Collective (*Seouryeongsangjipdan*), Labour News (*Nodongjanyuseujejakdan*), and Docupurn (*Pureunyeongsang*).

In commemoration of the uprising, May 18 was declared an official national holiday in 1997 and in 2002, a law on compensation for survivors and bereaved families was passed. Since this time, subsequent independent documentaries about the uprising have taken

different thematic and aesthetic approaches. That is, a new type of ‘Gwangju documentary’ emerged. Rather than simply documenting the actual events of the Gwangju Uprising, which have now been officially recognized by the May 18 Memorial Foundation and the government, these post-2000 documentaries tell the stories of previously marginalized historical actors, such as the homeless, street vendors, and women who shared rice balls, made hand-written posters, and broadcasted messages to revolting citizens on the street. Films highlighting such stories include *No Name Stars* (Oworae, dir. Kim Tae-il, 2010), *Lonely, High and Lonely* (Oeropgo nopgo sseulsseulhan, dir. Kim Kyoung-ja, 2017), *Shestory* (Swiseutori, dir. Hwang Jun-ha, 2019) and *Kim-gun*. Second, personal experience, emotion or sense are highlighted with marking filmmaker’s, interviewer’s or narrator’s own position across the post-generational, the post-colonial or the transnational in the documentaries such as *The Trail of Grandma’s Home* (Oksangjaguk, dir. Yang Ju-yeon, 2015), *Hand, Remember, Mosaic* (Son, gieok, mojaikeu, dir. Park Eun-seon, 2019), *Yarn of light* (Uriga saldeon oworeun, dir. Park Young-i, 2019), *Good Light, Good Air* (Joeun bit, joeun gonggi, 2021, dir. Im Heung-soon), and *Kim-gun*. Third, there are documentaries that explore the mediality and historical meaning of audio-visual archival footage in the digital era to inherit the memory of the Gwangju Uprising. Examples of such films include *The Hinzpeter Story*, *Gwangju Video: The Missing, Round and Around* and *Kim-gun*.⁶ In this context, ‘to inherit’ means to sort what we would inherit and reclaim what media technology we use to remember. These films commonly exhibit an ‘archive fever’ (Derrida, 1995) as discussed by French philosopher Jacques Derrida. Although an archive embodies a desire for self-preservation, it is also associated with self-destruction because it involves keeping the traces of the past after the primal memory has faded. As archive footage of the past is reassessed with an emergence of different historical perspectives and new media technologies or new footage is supplemented, the archive keeps deconstructing itself and reconstructing a new one. In doing so, the archival images by themselves work as an historical ‘actant,’ which is “a source of action that can be either human or nonhuman” (Bennett 2010, viii). These directors inherit the technique of reassembling archival footage from the heritage of Gwangju Video, but they also deconstruct the significance of previous images in a non-chronological order with the addition of outsider and future time (Derrida 1995, 9–11). Lastly, several documentaries investigate hidden or unknown truths with a recognition that past liquidation efforts remain incomplete and that far-right, historical revisionists are consistently distorting historical facts while spewing hate speech toward victims. Examples of such documentaries include *Gwangju Video: The Missing* and *Kim-gun*. These films question what roles photographs and films play in historical and political contexts in the digital era. These films also prove that non-human objects such as photographs and films can serve as historical actants depending on “the collaboration, cooperation, or interactive interference of many bodies and forces” (Bennett 2010, 21) rather than absolute evidence which informs a straight fact.

In this essay, I examine *Kim-gun* and *Round and Around* as new ‘Gwangju documentaries’ that emerged after the 2010s and present an alternative mode of remembering and mourning. I also suggest the affect and memory of the post-Gwangju generation of filmmakers, or what might be called ‘postmemory’, are created through the mediation of archival images.

Feelings of contempt and pride in *Kim-gun*

Kim-gun is an investigative documentary, and it includes interviews with Gwangju residents and photojournalists who were active at the time in an attempt to reveal the identity of a young man known only as 'Kim-gun'. The appellation 'Kim-gun' reveals little about the man's identity, as 'Kim' is a common surname in Korea, and the Korean word 'gun' is a suffix that indicates the person is a young male. The photo, which features many interesting visual details, is used to evoke the hidden memories of interviewees and it helps the filmmaker to exercise his imagination regarding history. In the photo, Kim-gun sits on top of an armoured anti-riot truck that sprays tear gas called 'Pepeo pogeu (Pepper Fog)'. Wearing a combat helmet and work gloves, he stares directly at the camera with his head turned to the side and a long belt of ammunition hanging over his gun (Figure 1).

The photo of Kim-gun is unsettling and stirring. The angle and content of this photo contrast sharply with the photos and videos that were distributed in the 1980s and the 1990s by pro-democracy groups attempting to reveal the truth behind the uprising. At the time, the authoritarian regime of Chun Doo-hwan influenced public opinion by spreading a rumour that North Korean agents had been dispatched in South Korea, and that that the uprising was a riot led by criminals, local vagrants, and gangsters. It is true that citizen militias armed themselves in self-defense; however, images of armed civilian militias were unjustly used by the government to dismiss the Gwangju Uprising as 'a riot'. To minimize government distortion of the truth, pro-democracy groups strategically selected videos and photos of victims being physically assaulted rather than photos of armed civilian militias. Video screenings and photo exhibitions organized by groups featured images of bloodied protestors, citizens who had been stripped or taken away by soldiers, coffins containing murdered protestors, and mothers crying in front of coffins and portraits of their loved ones. In this way, pro-democracy groups emphasized the innocence of victims. Representations of resistance were mainly restricted to images of crowds peacefully chanting slogans in front of the Jeollanam-do Provincial Office. In contrast, this photo of Kim-gun features an armed, unmasked,



Figure 1. Kim-gun's photo taken by photojournalist Lee Chang-seong, still from *Kim-gun*.

strong-willed man who stares intently at the camera. He is clearly not a weak victim. He looks young and confident.

Director Kang mentioned that this photo immediately caught his attention, and that it motivated him to begin making the documentary. Indeed, rather than ascertaining the man's identity, the film focuses on explaining the mysterious allure of the young man, which has captivated even far-right activists. Gwangju resident Ju Ok, who, at the age of 20, distributed rice balls to protesters during the uprising, still remembers the man in this photo. She recounts that he was a handsome man and a regular customer of her father's restaurant. Photojournalist Lee Chang-seong, who took this photo, said that he began photographing the man because he was drawn to his piercing eyes and commanding presence. Even far-right journalist Ji Man-won was impressed by Kim-gun, and he deemed him to be the 'North Korea special agent no. 1' (Jeil Gwangsu). Far-right activists claim that Kim-gun is now a high-ranking figure in the North Korean government. Ji also notes Kim-gun's fearless expression and confident attitude, which make him appear like a professional soldier. Kim-gun as represented in this photo became a central symbol in Ji's redbaiting, which sought to stoke anti-communist fear in South Korea.

In the film, Kang and a group of survivors study the details of the photo to identify the man. Studying the photo is a pleasurable process for survivors because it evokes their memories of youth. The photo has been converted into a high-resolution digital image, enabling survivors to enlarge the photo and examine specific details, such as the man's hair, clothing, eye shape, and posture as well as his gun and helmet. The film carefully documents the process of enlarging the photo. The film captures the acts of survivors scrutinizing the photo, including a scene of Ju Ok examining an enlarged photo of Kim-gun hanging inside the memorial hall, shots of a survivor pinching a cell phone screen to zoom in on the photo, a scene of photojournalist Lee Chang-seong using a magnifier to more closely examine the film negative held in the archive, and a scene of survivors gathered in a movie theatre to discuss the photo of Kim-gun projected on a movie screen (Figure 2). Each survivor relates the details of the photo to their own personal feelings while reliving past memories. The photo functions as a mediating device that enables the uprising to be remembered not just as a traumatic event but also as moments of caring, solidarity, and youth.

The film also emphasizes Ji's obsession with the identify of Kim-gun through a scene where Ji has enlarged Kim-gun's face on a computer screen and compares it with photos of actual high-ranking officers at the North Korean Workers' Party Congress. Ji and other far-right activists on the internet used facial recognition software to 'identify' 128 other Gwangju residents as North Korean agents, placing red dots on a black and white photo of a crowd and labelling them Gwangsu 1 through 128. Ji and his supporters behave as if they are digital imaging forensics experts. They take black-and-white photos, enlarge them, and compare the subjects' facial features with photos of known North Korean officials (Figure 3). However, their methods are neither scientific nor accurate. In most cases, it is clear from discrepancies in age that the claims of the far-right activists are improbable. Despite being crude, the claims of these charlatans, who pretended to use cutting-edge digital technologies, appeared on mainstream news outlets and attracted members of the younger generation who knew little about the Gwangju Uprising and generally obtained their information from YouTube. The survivors and bereaved



Figure 2. Images of Kim-gun and other militias in different frames and media, stills from *Kim-gun*.

families sued Ji for defamation. At court, they endured the insult of having to identify the members of the civilian militias in order to debunk Ji's false claims that they were North Korean agents. However, in the case of Kim-gun, no one came forward to identify him and the far right continued to place him at the centre of their conspiracy. For this reason, the director set out to locate people who remembered him and help restore his dignity.

As mentioned above, both survivors and far-right conspiracy theorists were fascinated by the image of Kim-gun. For far-right activists, he was the focus of their hatred and contempt; for survivors, he inspired pride and confidence. Survivors who were members of



Figure 3. Ji's digital drawing on the protesters' photos for distorting historical information, stills from *Kim-gun*.

the civilian militias compare their younger selves with Kim-gun and reminisce about their youth while contemplating the photograph. One survivor notices that Kim-gun's hair covers his ears, which offers clues regarding his age and occupation. At the time, excluding students, most adult men had hair that covered their ears. Kim Yong-gyun, who was also a member of the civilian militias, reminisces about the days when he was young and handsome like Kim-gun, stating, 'Kim-gun was just like me'. Another member of the militias, Yang Dong-nam, adds, 'This guy must have had a taste for American movies' after discovering that Kim-gun was carrying a rainbow-colored towel and had willow branches around his head and a long belt of unused ammunition draped over a carbine for decorative purposes. These scenes demonstrate that survivors' recollections of the uprising evoked by the photo of Kim-gun are simultaneously painful and joyful because, despite the danger of the situation, they were still in the prime of their youth.

In a book titled *In Search of Kim-gun* (*Gimguneul chajaseo*, 2021) that was published alongside the film, Kang mentions that the photo reminds him of drag performers in *Paris Is Burning* (dir. Jennie Livingston, 1990). Whereas Yang Dong-nam is reminded of American action films, such as *Rambo*, the director finds an overlap between Kim-gun and the performers, who focus on presenting themselves as beautifully as possible in the moment like there is no tomorrow (Kang 2021, 137). Kang also muses that he may have been drawn to learn more about Kim-gun 'not because he was a fighter at the forefront of the uprising but because he knew how to adorn himself with things around him even in a life-or-death situation' (Kang, 137). Kang, who has directed short films about gay characters, such as *Death of a Gay Teenager* (*Eoneu gei sonyeonui jugeot*, 2009), *A Silk Letter* (*Baekseo*, 2010) and *Clean Me* (*keullin mi*, 2014), employs a queer gaze to reinvent methods for inheriting and recreating the memory of the uprising.

However, just because the director employs a queer reading of history does not mean that it is a queer film or that certain characters in the film identify as queer. Rather, the film employs a queer gaze or queer reading to continually deconstruct binary constructions, normative judgements, and reconceptualize and reimagine the history of the Gwangju Uprising. In fact, there are considerable similarities between queer epistemology and the way the memory of the Gwangju Uprising is summoned in the film.

First, both queer people and Gwangju survivors have endured a history of repression and abuse, and for too long, they have been unable to openly discuss their experiences, emotions, and identities. Even before the uprising, Joella Province, where Gwangju is located, experienced discrimination. During the Park Chung-hee dictatorship of the 1970s, Joella Province was the base of support for the opposition party and it was subject to political repression and intentional underdevelopment. People from Joella Province also experienced social stigma. Following the uprising, hatred toward and discrimination against Joella residents became more blatant.

Second, due to their experiences, queer people and Gwangju survivors have experienced mixed emotions of both shame and pride. In her book *Epistemology of the Closet* (1990), Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick asserts that for those with non-normative sexualities, the act of coming out as queer does not erase the shame and humiliation attached to the word queer. Although the declaration 'I am queer' is based on a sense of pride, it is also associated with the history of shame and humiliation that is embedded deeply within the word 'queer'. Likewise, for Gwangju survivors, the photo of Kim-gun evokes both a sense of pride and shame. Kim-gun's photo inspires pride in Gwangju residents,

who, in their younger years, proudly defended democracy and their city from state violence. However, the photo also reminds them of the shame of being stigmatized as communists and slandered as gangsters by the authoritarian government and right-wing supporters, who manipulated photos of armed citizens to deceive the public. However, similar to Sedgwick's argument, the term queer and the photo of Kim-gun are politically potent precisely because of their ambiguity. Indeed, as Sedgwick writes, queer, and the photo of Kim-gun cleave to "that [childhood sense of shame] as a near-inexhaustible source of transformational energy" (Sedgwick 1993, 4).

Third, in the process of being stigmatized, both queer people and Gwangju survivors were subject to symbolic violence that sought to classify and categorize non-normative individuals. In heteronormative societies, discrimination and violence against queer people is justified by inciting panic over victims' perceived 'difference' as unusual beings. Therefore, when discussing victims who are presumed to be queer, their status as different from 'normal people' is consistently referenced. Far-right activists such as Ji continually highlight Kim-gun's piercing gaze, militant pose, and fearless appearance when denouncing those involved in the Gwangju Uprising as evil communists.

Fourth, there are similarities in their outward appearance and details. Differentiating details can be an expression that reveals queer sexuality. This film, under the pretext of attempting to reveal Kim-gun's identity, highlights his individual style and mode of adornment, revealing the type of person he is.

Fifth, similar to how differences within queer communities are becoming increasingly important, it is necessary to focus on the differences among participants of the Gwangju Uprising. In this sense, the act of remembering previously marginalized participants in the uprising, including Ju Ok, a woman, and Kim-gun, a homeless orphan, is important work. Indeed, solidarity is formed in the act of contemplating the lives of these marginal characters.

Using the picture of Kim-gun as a mediator, Director Kang reinterprets the memory of the Gwangju Uprising through a queer lens. Moreover, this lens enables other survivors to remember the uprising in a new way. Indeed, post-Gwangju generation's practice of using photography to mediate between the past and present and form new relationships with the memory of the Gwangju Uprising based on more familiar interpretative frames can be described as an act of postmemory. According to Marianne Hirsch, postmemory describes the relationship of the second generation of survivors with the personal, collective, and cultural trauma of those who came before. These memories are emotionally mediated and transmitted to the postmemory generation through stories told by the previous generation about traumatic experiences and through the images and behaviours related to those experiences. In other words, postmemory's connection to the past is "mediated not by recall but by imaginative investment, projection, and creation" (Hirsch 2012, 5), which is accompanied by emotions. Through this process, past experiences are "transmitted to them[the postmemory generation] so deeply and affectively as to seem to constitute memories in their own right" (Hirsch 2012, 5). Hirsch writes, "postmemory is not a movement, method, or idea' but a 'structure of inter- and transgenerational return of traumatic knowledge and embodied experience" (5–6). Hirsch takes Barthes's punctum as a basis for her theoretical framework and emphasizes that the second generation requires an intimate, affective connection to the past to internalize traumatic experiences.⁷ Archival images from the past, which serve as postmemory, "tell us more about our own needs

and desires” and “our own fantasies and fears” (Hirsh 2008, 22). That is, they do not simply bear witness or confirm the indexical veracity of claims such as ‘this happened here at this time’. Hirsch insists that just as Barthes presents the example of his mother’s photograph to discuss the punctum in *Camera Lucida*, family photographs serve as a sort of ‘umbilical cord’ during the second generation’s process of remembering and mourning (Hirsh 2008, 36). The material traces of the past in family photos allow us to access the absent but present affect of the past, resulting in a tense coexistence between private memory and public history. Thus, through these photos, the generation of the postmemory is able to access history by drawing on its own language and experiences.

Nevertheless, Kim-gun does not draw on family relationships to bring about an intimate connection with the photo. Instead, the film moves on to structure a sort of queer kinship which intertwines queer feeling with feeling of the survivors. Centring family relationships risks privileging linear, heterosexual interpretations of the past that originate only in the previous generation’s experiences. Particularly, because it has been only forty years since the uprising that numerous witnesses and survivors are able to testify. Overemphasizing or privileging the experiences of the post-Gwangju generation may partially exclude survivors of the uprising. Therefore, in Kim-gun, participants are encouraged to reflect on the photo of Kim-gun as a means of expressing the emotions that remained dormant during the process of historicizing the uprising. One of these emotions is ‘pride’ in the fact that Gwangju citizens tried to defend democracy and led a liberation from the ruthless government force by themselves.

The narration mentions that before the uprising, Kim-gun was a ragpicker who collected and sold scrap metal with other orphans. As a poor young man, he was likely ignored by society and struggled to make a living. However, as a member of the armed militia, he became a righteous warrior and actively fought for the creation of a democratic government; he was also bolstered by the support of citizens and the spirit of liberation. While viewing the photo of Kim-gun, survivors who had fought in the civil militias as young adults discuss not only their emotions of loss and fear, but also the beauty of youth, their sense of being liberated from oppression, and their feelings of solidarity, friendship, and pride as protectors of Gwangju and its inhabitants. The boldness and confidence expressed on Kim-gun’s face and through his posture – along with the gun and his hairstyle – were what far-right extremists like Ji Man-won used to insult the people involved in the uprising. Simultaneously, the particulars of Kim-gun’s appearance enabled survivors to overcome their pain, loss, sorrow, failure, shame, and negativity and find joy in reliving their days of youth and the exhilaration of liberation. Director Kang, who belongs to the post-Gwangju generation, was fascinated by the survivors and they facilitated Kang’s intimate and personal access to the history of Gwangju. Feelings of pain and joy, contempt and pride which both Kang and the survivors have in common reclassifies details neglected in the existing historical context (such as willow branches, the rainbow-colored towel, Kim-gun’s hairstyle, and his eye shape) within an archive of feeling while first disassembling and then reassembling the contemporary official archive which has monumentalized the uprising as the fixed symbol of the democratization movement in South Korea.

The film explores various ways of approaching the details of Kim-gun’s photo as a component of the digital archive and it emphasizes the historicity of photography as a medium that evokes tactile sensations. The changes in the texture of photography and

ways of seeing are the result of ongoing conversations and negotiations between memory and oblivion, past and present, the generation before and after, and truth and lies. According to Derrida, the essential meaning of 'to inherit' is not simply to receive something. Instead, when facing death and answering to an injunction, "one sorts, one sifts, one reclaims" and "one reactivates" (Derrida and Stiegler 2002, 25). To inherit presupposes a signature or countersignature of a critical selection, which is accompanied by various affective factors, skills, and even useless and trivial things. Additionally, the authenticity of an archival record is determined not by insiders to the archive but by outsiders – that is, by an authorized representative (Derrida 1995, 9–11). Thus, the archive always requires the addition of the outsider and future time. Since an archive is the accumulation of traces replenished by external factors and structured by the absence of a memory of unknown origin, it is destined to have a radically anarchic and self-destructive structure that transcends the non-chronological order (Derrida 1995, 13–14). Therefore, the archive involves radical creation and historical writing about the future. By bringing new interpretative frames to the reading of the photo of Kim-gun, it becomes a battlefield over memory and discourse; it also functions as an archive that reveals the transformability of digital images. The image of Kim-gun inspires unique fascination in observers. However, despite this singular nature of the film, it also conveys the collective spirit in the way it represents the *minjung* who have been marginalized in the history of the Gwangju Uprising. Indeed, the Kim-gun's photo continually makes space for new voices to bear witness to the truth of the uprising.

Inheritance and the creation of one's own archive become more important in the digital era, which is plagued by a flood of easily accessible data, fake news, and distorted information. Digitalization both simultaneously inhibits and enables the inheritance of memories and the act of bearing witness. Hence, both *Kim-gun* and *Round and Around* try to identify things that cannot be distorted; that is, they search for affective details and sensory elements. In the process, the mediality of digitized photographs is also deconstructed and questioned. In an interview with Bernard Stiegler, Derrida spoke about the tension between inheritance and technology, stating:

There is no inheritance without technics. Inheritance therefore stands in a relation of tension to technics. A pure technics destroys inheritance, but without technics, there is no inheritance. This is why inheritance is such a problematic and, ultimately, aporetic thing. (...) Every inheritance passes by way of singular marks, but I would not necessarily say by way of discourse or by way of languages in the strict sense. These singular marks are a challenge to technics, resistances to technologization, and they are at the same time (hence the tension) appeals to technical iterability, to *tekhnē* in the broad sense, the sense from which animality would not simply be excluded. (Derrida and Stiegler 2002, 86–87)

The emergence of the postmemory generation and innovative digital technologies have obstructed the processes of remembering and testifying, in turn complicating the inheritance process. However, since inheritance is never possible without the presence of the generation of postmemory and technology, an aporia occurs. Paradoxically, this aporia leaves traces in the technology; the traces of resistance against inheritance, which the technology tries to erase, can be found in the technology. Both films reconstruct an archive according to their own senses and affects by adopting a new technology while leaving behind traces of medial and generational resistance. They make differences in repetitions to inherit and remember their history without being reduced or subordinated to

the history of state violence that had caused the uprising. They affectively have access to the testimony of victims and survivors and open the doors to the future, deliberately getting lost in time and space that deconstruct memory, oblivion, and self-identity.

Mourning with archival images in *Round and Around*

Director Jang Min-seung is the son of renowned director Jang Sun-woo, who directed *A Petal* (*Kkochip*, 1996). The film *A Petal* tells the story of a traumatized 15-year-girl caught in the Gwangju Uprising who never talks and often stares ahead blankly. It was a groundbreaking film that, for the first time, included scenes depicting the massacre of protesters. These scenes are expressed in fragmentized flashbacks as the girl cannot explain logically her experience due to her unspeakable pain. In the end, the film reveals that she abandoned her dying mother and ran away amid gunfire to survive. The narrative of *A Petal* focuses on survivors' traumatic experiences despite pain and guilt and repeatedly returns to the scenes of the massacre through flashbacks. In the narrative, the uprising functions as a symbolic starting point for South Korean modern history as a traumatic event.

Jang Min-seung, who belongs to the post-Gwangju generation, recalls that his father and colleagues gathered at his house and talked about tragic past events; however, Jang did not fully understand the meaning of these events and could not share their emotions. Jang explained that he subsequently learned about the significance of the Gwangju Uprising from cultural materials such as films, literature, and history books as other kids did so. Whereas his father depicted the massacre as a traumatic space of pain and guilt, Jang Min-seung focused on making space where different beings can coexist, communicate, mourn, affect one another and even re-experience the uprising by mainly using archival footage. Those beings include members of different generations, the living and the dead, humans and non-humans, archival images of the past and newly recorded images of the present, propaganda newsreel made by the dictatorial government and activist films made by pro-democracy groups, and on-screen images and off-screen audiences. The space of heterogeneous beings in common with emancipatory Gwangju, where people with different backgrounds – regardless of their gender, age or class – voluntarily joined the uprising in defiance of injustice, picked up weapons to actively defend themselves against the massacre, and successfully constructed a temporary system of self-governance. For director Jang, archival images as well as the elements that make up the image, including light, sound, air, and round and square shapes, became the architectural materials necessary for creating a space for mourning and physically experiencing the Gwangju Uprising in a new way. The temporality of the narrative, the audiovisual image, the music and sound effects, and the dismantling of the boundary between the inside and outside of the screen are what make the experience of these foundational filmic elements possible – that is, they make material experience possible. Through this act of deconstruction, the post-Gwangju generation is able to understand what materials are available for constructing a new space and time and they become motivated to consider how they can be used. The post-Gwangju generation, which has come to know history through archived images, is inheriting collective memories and reevaluating the objects of mourning on their own terms. Moreover, *Round and Around* deconstructs the chronological temporality of archival images, reorganizes them according to a non-

linear temporality, and puts on a lighting performance that connects the spaces within the screen with the space of the stage outside of the screen. In this way, the film emphasizes and draws attention to elements of the cinematographic image, including light, sound, and empty spaces.

The film *Round and Around* emphasizes many forms of light, including candlelight, the light of digital bits, stage lighting, and moonlight. The word 'Remember' from the catholic prayer 'Memorare' (Remember) repeats throughout the film while abandoned spaces that are devoid of people appear inhabited by ghosts are shown on screen. In this way, the film constructs a ceremonial or religious space for the mourning of the human and non-human. Direct experience of basic filmic elements such as light and sound enable members of the post-Gwangju generation, who lack direct access to history, to approach mourning more easily and participate in the inheritance of collective memory. This approach also makes it possible to question the role of archival images – and even filmic images – as historical actants. As Jane Bennett emphasizes in her book *Vibrant Matter: A Political Ecology of Things* (2010), an actant is both non-human and human, and it never really acts alone. Moreover, she states that non-human elements such as light and sound, can function as historical actants and cooperate with humans in a tragic event or specific regime. An actant's "efficacy or agency always depends on the collaboration, cooperation, or interactive interference of many bodies and forces" (Bennett 2010, 21). *Round and Around* explores the interaction between the human and non-human, continually questions historical responsibility regarding past events, and reflects on what archival images and films can do.

As mentioned above, *Round and Around* is an audio-visual project that was commissioned by the Korean Film Archive, and consists of found footage sourced from the Korean Film Archive and the archives of public broadcasters. The film, however, consistently interrogates and reflect on the historic role of the archival image. The film travels back in time to revisit May 18, 1980, questioning what the archival image historically can do or not while comforting those who have been suffering and neglected or have had their reputation distorted by both history and cinema. However, the film does not treat the Gwangju Uprising as an isolated event or as the origin of the South Korean democratization movement. It slowly travels back in time by juxtaposing recently shot images with images from the past, such as photographs taken by people and reporters taken between the Bu-Ma Democratic Protests in October 1979 and the 1988 Seoul Olympic Games and propaganda newsreels and television news clips produced under the Chun Doo-hwan administration. In doing so, the film not only focuses on the 'Hoop Boy', an iconic figure of the 1988 Seoul Olympic Games, but also on the empty Olympic stadium itself. Jang deviates from chronological time and human-centred representations of the Gwangju Uprising and recreates the archive of what remained after the event as a means of presenting non-human elements such as light, sound, air, factory machines, construction material, and so on. As with his previous films *Void* (2016), *Voiceless* (2019), and *Over There* (2019), Jang Min-seung collaborates closely with music director Jung Jaeil on *Round and Around* to craft an exceptional audio and visual experience centred around 'light and sound'. In this context, 'light' refers both to Gwangju (光州), which translates literally to 'city of light', and the traces of historical beings that have passed through the city. The film is also about cinema and its capacity to travel through time and

across different dimensions through recorded footage. Similar to the effects of religious music and prayers, 'sound' creates a religious and ritualistic space where the audience encounters historical beings, complains to God about their suffering, and comforts the dead. *Round and Around* intentionally avoids capturing human beings with the camera, except for scenes featuring archival footage. Instead, it focuses on spaces filled with traces of human history and mechanical movements.

Round and Around emphasizes that the Gwangju Uprising was an accumulation of smaller political movements intertwined with the daily experiences and working conditions of anonymous people who have never been properly remembered by history. The film also emphasizes that the uprising did not end in 1980 and continued to influence the unfolding of history. At the end of the film, a choral rendition of 'Memorare' plays repeatedly. It embodies the aspiration to remember and actively inherit that which is beyond what has been already remembered. This meaning is replicated by each of the eighty-eight piano keys in the final sequence, which have a different sound and reason for being.

Round and Around aims to leave a lasting impression on the audience by focusing on the essence of being, that is, the basic elements of things. From the beginning, the film individually captures tiny particles of light, wisps of disappearing smoke, and various sounds (including the sound of each piano key and the mechanical noise from a factory). To do so, Jang breaks free from cinematic convention. He chooses an OLED display made from organic materials that emit light when electricity is applied to them. The OLED display ensures superior image quality without leaving an afterimage due to its fast light transmission speed. It focuses viewers' attention on the smallest particles, inducing a sensory experience that emphasizes the essence of light and darkness which, in turn, enables viewers to explore the new potential of cinema as electrons in motion. *Round and Around* creates an archive of light left behind by events, humans, and spaces. Such an approach is related to Derrida's concept of the archive. This film intends to encounter history by dissolving into light and sound, the basic elements of things. Contact with light and sound enables us to write a history from a tactile perspective. In other words, the disassembly and reassembly of sensory experiences allows us to experience history directly with our own senses. The post-Gwangju generation is able to inherit the memory of history through this direct experience of history. This is also the religious experience of making mourning possible following the collapse the binary spatiality that separates the living and the dead.

Only light can make time travel possible. Light serves not only to highlight historical beings but also to form a connection across different temporal and spatial dimensions. For example, the scene where the protesters climb onto an overpass and use a mirror to reflect sunlight into the eyes of police officers during the pro-democracy movement of 1987 creates an iconic sci-fi film moment. From the perspective of the on-screen protesters, the audience shares the position of the police officers, who are positioned outside the bottom of the frame. In this scene, the reflected light from the mirror goes beyond the screen and directly strikes the audience. This light, which makes a connection between the two- and three-dimensional worlds, between the past and the present, and between different temporal and spatial dimensions, functions as an SOS signal that cries out 'Remember!' Similarly, the film draws attention to lights connecting different moments in the scenes, such as the five-minute opening sequence of a candle flaring

up, flickering, and eventually going out, and the scene where protesters guarding their houses, which will soon be demolished as part of an urban regeneration project for the 1988 Olympic Games, project the image of a watchtower onto a crumpled, semi-transparent screen and burn the displayed screen similar to a paper-burning ritual to appease the dead. The lights represent victims of state violence in modern South Korean history.

Such cinematic moments are even more dramatic when the film is shown not at a traditional movie theatre but as part of a stage performance, such as the performance at the Asia Culture Centre in Gwangju on November 28, 2020. In the scene of tear gas being shot at protesters during the pro-democracy protests of 1987, smoke and fog fill the stage between the screen and audience. When the film juxtaposes the black-and-white photos of the Gwangju Uprising with images of present-day Gwangju, several pin spot-lights are used to blur the boundary between the two-dimensional space on the screen and the three-dimensional space inhabited by the audience. The historical figures in the images and the real-life audience coexist in a shared time-space, going 'round and around' in a liminal space (Figure 4).

The latter half of the film, which mainly features found footage from the Gwangju Uprising, speaks on behalf of and comforts the deceased, almost as if it was a *ssitgimgut* or 'grievance cleansing ritual'. Incorporated into the second half of the film is prose that curses the victims' wretched fate and cry out for their suffering to be recognized. By doing so, the film aims to comfort Gwangju residents rather than honour them as fallen heroes. Furthermore, it is worth noting that the latter half of the film begins with a newsreel produced by the National Film Production Centre that degrades Gwangju residents as members of a 'mob' and dismisses the uprising as a 'rampage'. By doing so, the film questions the ethical responsibilities of cinema. What has cinema been showing and what has it not? Can cinema be held responsible as a historical actant for historical tragedies such as the Gwangju Uprising?



Figure 4. A negative print of protesters' photo (left upper), an empty historical site of the Gwangju Uprising (right upper), eighty-eight piano keys (right lower), and a performance with stage light and fog appearing in front of a screen (left lower), stills from *Round and Around*.

The film also alternates the negative print of mothers grieving over the coffins of their children with images of the present-day locations of historical events. The former Gwangju Prison and Armed Forces' Gwangju Hospital – places where violence and torture were perpetrated by military forces – have been completely abandoned and left to nature. The camera scans horizontally across the weathered door, columns, and wall frames. Such movements create an effect similar to flickering lights, transforming these historical sites into an enormous movie theatre. With a requiem playing in the background, the film juxtaposes the camera's movements in the present with the black-and-white footage shot in the past, prompting the audience to repeatedly travel between the past and present. These cross-dimensional interactions subsequently blur the boundaries between absence and presence.

At a question-and-answer session hosted by the Korean Film Archive on 4th December 2020, Jang mentioned that the title of *Round and Around* is a metaphor for circulation and repetition. The name reminds viewers of a photo of Gwangju people surrounding a fountain in front of the Jeollanam-do Provincial Office. It also resembles the Arabic numeral for eighty and symbolizes the vanity of a world where history repeats itself. Finally, it refers to the labour of foundry workers who poured molten metal into moulds for the sake of South Korea's modern economic growth. It also reminds us of light, a basic element of cinema. *Round and Around* appears to take a materialist approach. Indeed, in the final sequence, it takes time to show each of the eighty-eight piano keys and lets the audience hear each note, trying to make audiences remember every single being and the elements constituting it. By refining history with cinema, the film never stops questioning and remembering. This eighty-eight-minute film embodies the will to comfort the deceased by drawing the audience's attention to the particles of light and breath that still persist in the air despite seeming to be absent. In this sense, cinema, which consists of particles of light and breath and the elements that constitute them, is not simply a collection of images; instead, it is proof that people have lived there. In short, it is a historical actant that enables people here live through historical events and interact with beings over there, challenging the human-centred understanding of historical agency.

Conclusion

Kim-gun and *Round and Around* deconstruct the existing archive of the Gwangju Uprising and reconstruct their own archive. It is not easy to create a new archive of the Gwangju Uprising. This is because the perpetrators who committed the massacre received amnesty in the 1990s, and they have never admitted to their crimes. Their remaining supporters regularly distort the truth, spread fake news, and spew hate speech on the internet. Human remains believed to be victims of the massacre are still being found in Gwangju to this day. In addition, neither photos nor videos offering conclusive evidence that the government opened fire first have ever been found. Meanwhile, in 1997, the South Korean government recognized the anniversary of the Gwangju Uprising as an official national day of commemoration; since then, the government has hosted a memorial service every year and has built a memorial hall. Although these actions were necessary for survivors to heal, the memorialization of the uprising may homogenize the memory and meaning of the Gwangju Uprising and, paradoxically, limit the interpretive efforts of archival and inheritance work. As Derrida wrote, "only when the assignations are

multiple and contradictory is there inheritance, only when they are secret enough to challenge interpretation, to call for the limitless risk of active interpretation" (Derrida and Stiegler 2002, 26).

Both documentaries create their own feeling and space to access the archive of the Gwangju Uprising. *Kim-gun* shares a queer (intimate) feeling, and *Round and Around* constructs a religious (teleportable) space. As mentioned above, the directors, who are addressing the audience as fellow members of the post-Gwangju generation, also have a strong desire to remember and inherit the historical event collectively via an intimate feeling. The archive of *Kim-gun* consists of images of the over-the-ear hairstyle, of handsome features, glaring eyes, imposing stature, dignified posture, a rainbow-colored towel, willow branches around a helmet, a long belt of unused ammunition over a carbine, and a tear gas truck. The archive of *Round and Around* consists of various kind of lights, sounds, air, soils, building waste, weeds and trees at abandoned historical sites where people were killed and tortured that have now become a ritual or religious space for resentment, mourning, and healing. The film *Kim-gun* never discovers Kim-gun's true name, age, or place of residence. In *Round and Around*, it is never revealed where the lights and sounds come from. However, we sense the singular nature of Kim-gun and the lights and sounds. We feel his pride and the light and sound of the victims. They become witnesses by bearing witness and we, the audience, become witnesses by inheriting the possibility of bearing witness.

Notes

1. The Gwangju Uprising has been referred to by several different names, including the Gwangju Massacre (광주대학살), the Gwangju Slaughter (광주학살), the Gwangju Revolt (광주혁명), the Gwangju Uprising (광주항쟁), the Gwangju Democratization Movement (광주민중화운동), and the Gwangju Minjung Uprising (광주민중봉기). It has been referred to using different names by various people and regimes over time depending on which aspect of the uprising the speaker wishes to emphasize. For example, a record of the US Central Intelligence Agency referred to it as the 'bloodshed in Gwangju' (광주유혈사태). Meanwhile, the Chun Doo-hwan administration, which is responsible for the tragedy, called it the 'incident in Gwangju' (광주사태). Following the emergence of the counter discourses of the pro-democracy movement, it has been called by other names that define it as a popular uprising and a struggle for democratization. The term 'May 18 Gwangju Uprising', which is used throughout this essay, is also the term included in May 2011 of the UNESCO's Memory of the World Register. Please refer the Choi's essay (2015: 113–148) for further discussion on the names of the uprising.
2. The real story of Jürgen Hinzpeter, a German reporter from Northern German Broadcasting, became very popular and was made into various genre films in South Korea after the 2000s. The story of Hinzpeter, who sneaked into Gwangju two times during the uprising, and Kim Sabok, the Korean taxi driver who drove him from Seoul to Gwangju, was made into the fiction film *A Taxi Driver* (*Taeksi deuraibeo*, dir. Jang Hoon, 2017). The film ends with footage of an interview with the real Jürgen Hinzpeter describing his efforts to find Kim again after the Uprising. Hinzpeter died in 2016 without ever finding Kim. In 2017, thanks to the film's box-office success of selling more than 10 million tickets in South Korea, the film brought Kim's story to the attention of his son and his real identity and life were finally made public. Kim died in 1984, and Kim's character in the film differs from the real Kim in many ways (Choi Min-young, 13 May 2018, 'Ttaeksiunjeonsat gimsabokssi keunadeul tejinjja abeoji alligo sipeote (Kim Sabok's eldest son said, 'I want to tell who my father was),' *Hangyeore*, https://www.hani.co.kr/arti/society/society_general/844367.html). The KBS TV documentary

A Blue-eyed Witness to May 1980 (80nyeon 5wol, pureun nunui mokgyeokja) was broadcasted in 2003 and *The Hinzpeter Story (5.18 hincheupeteo seutori)*, dir. Jang Young-joo), a feature documentary including Hinzpeter's life story and recorded videos, was theatrically released in 2018. Best-selling novelist Gong Ji-young also wrote a work of short fiction about an interaction between the ailing Hinzpeter and a Korean student studying in Berlin titled '*Gwitgae nameun eumseong* (Voice Lingering in My Ears)'; it was published in 2004 (Seoul, Changbi).

3. *Gwangju Video* includes *South Korea under Martial Law (Gyeomnyeong havi hanguk)*, a 50-minute documentary produced by the Japan Broadcasting Corporation in 1980; *A Report on Gwangju, a City of Resentment (Wonhanui ttang gwangju)*, a version sourced from a Japan Broadcasting Corporation documentary and re-edited by Jochongnyeong, a pro-North Korean residents' organization in Japan; *South Korea at the Crossroads (Giroe seon gwangju)*, a 20-min version with English narration produced by Korean students at McGill University in Canada; a version of the same video by McGill University students but with German narration; *Oh! Gwangju (O gwangju)*, produced by Koreans in New York; and *When the Days of May Come Again (Owol geunali dashi omyon)*, a 70-min documentary produced by the Gwangju Archdiocese of the Korean Catholic Church that mainly features footage shot by Jürgen Hinzpeter. Please refer the following article for more information. Chung Jun-hee, 'An interview with documentary director Lee Jo-hoon,' *Newspaper and Broadcasting (Simmungwa bangsong)*, 21 September 2020, Korea Press Foundation. https://blog.naver.com/kpfjra_/222092776628.
4. I attended a screening of the *Gwangju Video* organized by young priests in the basement of a Catholic church in my neighborhood in Seoul in 1989. It was my mother who took me to the screening. At that time, I was around 12 years old. Despite being young, I knew that my experience must be kept secret because I could feel my mother's anxiety. Although the video content was gruesome and disturbing, I felt a sense of accomplishment for attending a meeting intended only for adults. I also felt empowered when I protected my concerned mother. My second encounter with the *Gwangju Video* was at a college orientation in 1995, and this time it filled me with feelings of anger, sadness, and betrayal.
5. *Minjung* is a term originating from a perception of the people or the ruled as an 'agent of history.' In the history of South Korea, it embodies the spirit of resistance not only in the context of class struggle but also anticolonialism. The independent film movement of the 1980s in South Korea was also based on the concept *Minjung*. For more, see Jang (2006) and Jeon (2019).
6. There is also a trend of using archival footage in other recent South Korean documentaries with non-linear narratives such as Kim Kyoung-man's *An Escalator in World Order (Migugui baramgwa bul)*, 2012) and *Beep (Ppi soriga ulimyeon)*, 2014), Baik Jong-kwan's *Cyclical Night (Sunhwanhaneun bam)*, 2014), TV documentary series *Modern Korea (Modeon koria)*, 2019–2021) and Jung Yoon-suk's *Non-fiction Diary (Nonpiksyeon daeori)*, 2013). Kim Jihoon (2020) refers to this tendency as the 'archival turn' in recent South Korean documentary.
7. Bae Ju Yeon has also pointed out that the way that the details of Kim-gun's photo evoke memories and feelings is associated with Roland Barthes' concept of punctum, which Marianne Hirsch refers in her discussion about postmemory (Bae 2020, 13–15).

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Notes on contributor

HyeYoung Cho is a lecturer in the Film Studies Department at Chung-Ang University and the vice chairperson of the Korea Media Rating Board. She served as editor for the Korean-language anthologies *Sonyeodeul: K-pop seukeurin gwangjang* [*Girls: K-pop Screen Plaza*] (Seoul: Doseochulpal

yeoiyeon, 2017) and *120 Years of French Women's Cinema* (Seoul: SIWFF, 2016). She also co-edited *Hangung dakyumenteorì yeonghwaui oneul* [*The Current State of Korean Documentary Film*] (Seoul: BonBooks, 2016). She has published articles on South Korean feminist and queer film, the production of images on digital platforms, and performative and experimental documentary in various journals and anthologies.

References

- Bae, Ju Yeon. 2020. "Poseuteumemoriwa 5.18 Ttak-yumenteorì Yeonghwa Tekgimgunteneul Jungsimurot [Postmemory and the Gwangju Democratization Movement: Focused on the Documentary Kim-gun]." *Seogangimunnongchong* [Humanities Journal] 57: 5–35.
- Bennett, Jane. 2010. *Vibrant Matter: A Political Ecology of Things*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Choi, Young-Tae. 2015. "5·18 Hangjaengui Myeongchingmunje: 'gwangju'wa 'Minjung'iraneun Yongeoreul Jungsimuro [On the Name of the 5 18 Uprising: Revolve Around 'Gwangju' and 'Minjung']." *Minjuuiwa Ingwon* [Journal of Democracy and Human Rights] 15 (3): 113–148.
- Derrida, Jacques. 1995. "Archive Fever: A Freud Impression." *Diacritics* 25 (2): 9–63. Summer.
- Derrida, Jacques, Bernard Stiegler, and Jennifer Bajorek (translated by). 2002. *Echographies of Television: Filmed Interviews*. Malden: Polity.
- Gong, Jiyeong. 2004. *Gwitgae Nameun Eumseong* [Voice Lingering in My Ears]. Seoul: Changbi.
- Hirsh, Marianne. 2008. "The Generation of Postmemory." *Poetics Today* 29 (1): 103–128.
- Hirsh, Marianne. 2012. *The Generation of Postmemory: Writing and Visual Culture After the Holocaust*. New York: Columbia UP.
- Jang, Sangcheol. 2006. "1970~80nyeondae minjuhwaundonggwa 'minjung(民衆)' damnonui giwon." *Hanguksahoehakoe sahoehakdaehoe nonmunjim*. Hanguksahoehakoe [The Korean Sociological Association]. 59–61.
- Jeon, Woohyung. 2019. "1980nyeondaewa hangugyeonghwasa damnonui jeopchokjidae [Contact Zones in between the 1980s and the Discourse on Korean Film History]." *Gubohakbo* 23: 515–541.
- Kang, Sang-woo. 2021. *In Search of Kim-gun* [Gimguneul Chajaseo]. Seoul: Humanitas.
- Kim, Jihoon. 2020. "The Uses of Found Footage and the 'Archival Turn' of Recent Korean Documentary." *Third Text* 34 (2): 231–254.
- Kosofsky, Eve. 1990. *Epistemology of the Closet*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Park, Nohchool. 2016. "Gwangju Video and the Tradition of South Korean Independent Documentaries." *The Review of Korean Studies* 13 (2): 187–214.
- Sedgwick, Eve. 1993. "Queer Performativity: Henry James's The Art of the Novel." *GLQ* 1 (1): 1–16.