

Ravina's recasting provides constant fresh insights. It shows that Matthew Perry's 1853 visit created less short-term shock than old narratives suggest, it repositions the late Tokugawa government as a vital regime that anticipated many of the Meiji reforms, and it makes clear that officials who stayed home while the Iwakura Mission was abroad from 1871 to 1873 were far more than caretakers. The analysis of why the "demoralized, disorganized, and seduced" daimyo "quietly faded from the scene" in 1871 ploughs new soil (p. 134). The picture of Ōkubo Toshimichi's people-be-damned approach to governance in the mid-1870s is vivid. And the contention that 1881, when gradualists ousted progressives from the government, "marked the end of the Meiji Revolution" (p. 203) is persuasive.

The work occasionally appears overly eager in its determination to revise—and that leads to some omissions and distortions. In arguing that the Tokugawa's "closed country ... policy emerged only in the 1790s" (p. 58), Ravina sloughs off the intentional exclusion of most foreigners in the early Tokugawa years. His concentration on political thinkers obscures the role strategy and power played in mid-century struggles. He pays scant attention to things that rightly belong in the *bakumatsu*/Meiji narrative: the leadership debates following Perry's initial visit; the unrest created by the radical "loyalist partisans, commonly called shishi" (p. 99); the 1868 Restoration itself; and the roles of leaders like Kido Takayoshi (not even mentioned in a sparse index!) who balanced Ōkubo. Moreover, the heavy emphasis on politics deprives his narrative of much of the dynamism that made this era vibrant, such as the changes in daily life, the personalities (and youthfulness) of the nation-shakers, and the explosion of cultural forms.

As political history, however, *To Stand with the Nations of the World* makes a powerful contribution. Challenging tired dichotomies (Japan versus the West, tradition versus modernity), Ravina provides a provocative framework for seeing the middle decades of the 1800s as a single whole in which leaders on all sides were determined to take "universal" practices from both the contemporary West and their own past to create a strong nation-state. "The revolutionary force of the Meiji Revolution," he concludes, "came from ... the resolute sense that the ancient past could guide the future and that universal truths could enhance and advance local virtue" (p. 214).

JAMES L. HUFFMAN
Wittenberg University
jhuffman@wittenberg.edu

Figuring Korean Futures: Children's Literature in Modern Korea. By DAFNA ZUR. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2017. xii, 286 pp. ISBN: 9781503601680 (cloth, also available as e-book). doi:10.1017/S0021911818002838

Dafna Zur's *Figuring Korean Futures: Children's Literature in Modern Korea* introduces us to the kaleidoscopic world of Korean children's literature from 1908 to 1950. As the first book-length English-language study of Korean children's literature, it covers a truly impressive range of primary and secondary materials. Zur sets forth the scope of her research as "poetry, prose, illustrations, and miscellaneous textual forms published in children's magazines or newspaper columns aimed at young readers" (p. 6), but her discussion at times spills over to even more diverse texts, such as a collection of translated folktales (p. 83) and a radio script (p. 129). Her main argument is that colonial-era Korean

writers created an idealized closeness of children to nature through the notion of *tongsim*, which she translates as “the child-heart.”

Organized chronologically, the six main chapters examine an extensive array of topics related to children’s literature published over the first half of the twentieth century: the image of youth (undistinguished from children) as a means to promote the ideology of “enlightenment and civilization” in early colonial Korea (chapter 1); the emergence of child-friendly illustrations and a written language appropriate for young readers in the 1920s (chapters 2 and 3); the portrayal of children as proletarians in leftist children’s magazines (chapter 4); the tension between the attempt to raise future imperial soldiers and the struggle to find hope in children through laughter and lightheartedness in wartime (1937–45) children’s magazines (chapter 5); and the postcolonial reclamation of national language and history in children’s magazines and newspapers during the postliberation period (1945–50) (chapter 6). In the epilogue, Zur suggests that after the Korean War (1950–53), “the bond between child and nature” was no longer tenable, and children came to be viewed instead as future agents of science and the “ultimate masters” (p. 192) of nature.

Zur identifies “the most striking feature” of the discourse on *tongsim* (*tongxin* in Chinese or *dōshin* in Japanese) as “the perception of the child’s existence on the threshold of culture: the child was closer to the flora and fauna than to acculturated adults” (p. 6). She observes that “[i]n Korea, philosophies of the human mind and theories of child development, both local and global, shaped the belief in the existence of ... the *tongsim*” (p. 5). While appreciating the utility of this term in analyzing modern childhood and its surrounding culture, I am curious whether she regards *tongsim* as historically unique to colonial Korean children’s literature, a modern construct globally emergent over the last few centuries, or an idea dating back to ancient China. Does *tongsim* suppose the Cartesian separation between mind and body? Or could it be a twentieth-century reappropriation of the ancient or early modern sense of the word? If the tie between nature and child was broken after the Korean War, can we detect similar phenomena outside North and South Korea? Instead of showing how she conceptualizes the age-old term *tongsim* for her inquiry, Zur simply states—after citing a long list of thinkers like Mencius, Liang Qichao, John Locke, Sigmund Freud, Carolyn Steedman, Jacqueline Rose, and Karatani Kojin as representative theorists of the child-heart in East and West—that, “I, too, argue that Korean children’s literature ... was developed alongside the concept of the child-heart” (p. 6). She then stresses the importance of this notion in studying colonial-era Korean children’s literature: “It is the *tongsim* that required a ‘translation’ of the world, but that also embraced contradictory impulses of nature and culture, those very same elements under threat by the colonial regime” (pp. 6–7). Readers likely would have appreciated a more rigorous definition of the original term. It also would have been helpful if Zur had shared the process via which she decided to translate *tongsim* as “the child-heart” rather than possible alternatives such as “the childlike mind” or “the child-mind.”

Irrespective of these issues, I would like to emphasize that *Figuring Korean Futures* opens a lot of doors to future research. Anyone who embarks on the challenging task of writing about Korean children’s literature will have to study Zur’s book closely. It might also inspire some East Asianists to investigate the transnational evolution of the notion of *tongsim/tongxin/dōshin*. As a remarkably rich study of modern Korean children’s literature, this book will be most welcomed by students and teachers of East Asian culture, literature, and history, as well as by scholars of children’s literature around the world. Written in a jargon-free manner, it is suitable for undergraduate as well as graduate courses.

YOON SUN YANG
Boston University
ysoonsun@bu.edu