

Pré-rapport du mémoire de M2 Pre-report of the Master's thesis

Édition/Edition (2019-2021)

Étudiant(e)/Student:

Prénom, Nom / First Name, Family Name : Hyejin Kim

Titre du mémoire M2 / Title of the Master's thesis : Transmission of Memory: Heritage Trail and Jeju Uprising

Mobilité / Mobility:

Veuillez souligner les établissement !/Please, underline the insititutions ! Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem, Budapest (ELTE)

École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales de Paris (EHESS)

Università degli Studi di Catania (UNICT)

Univerzita Karlova, Prague (CUNI)

Université Laval, Québec (UL)

<u>Directeurs de recherche / Supervisors¹</u>:

Prénom, Nom / First Name, Family Name : Péter Erdősi

Titre /Title : assistant professor

Université/University: Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem, Budapest (ELTE)

Évaluation/Evaluation:

Veuillez consulter le tableau de conversion ci-dessous!/ Please, consult the grade conversation chart below!

Note dans l'établissement / Grade at the institution: Note dans le 2eme établissement (ELTE) / Grade at the 2nd institution (ELTE): 5 (Note dans le 3eme établissement / Evaluation – grade at the 3rd institution:) Note TEMA+ / TEMA+ grade:

Pré-rapport / Pre-report :

max. 4500 caractères espaces inclus/max. 4500 characters including space

¹ Le pré-rapport est écrit par le 2eme directeur (ou par le 2eme et 3eme directeurs)qui ne participe pas à la soutenance et inclut des questions à aborder lors de la soutenance./The pre-report is written by the 2nd supervisor (and in case the 3rd supervisor too), who does not personally take part in the defense and it includes questions to be addressed to the student during the thesis defense.



Hyejin Kim has written her MA thesis about the memory of a sorrowful event, the massacres committed in the turmoil of the uprising of April 1943 in Jeju, an island of the Republic of Korea, associated with communist ideology and formerly labelled as the "red island". Both the choice of the memory of the "April 3rd Incident", "4.3", as a research subject and the subsequent elaboration of the master's thesis show that the author used the two years of her studies at TEMA+ very efficiently: after an initial research proposal encompassing a wide array of "dark heritage" phenomena, she could find a well defined research subject having relevance for international memory and heritage studies, besides its importance for South Korean audiences from academic, moral and civic aspects; in fact, a thesis like this, written with a critical apparatus, may give a scholarly contribution to the rethinking of a troublesome twentieth-century event of great importance, the memory of which, after long decades of suppression, came to the forefront of discussions only recently, to the extent that it grew to become a theme of state-wide discourses on peace-making in the context of political democratisation in the Republic of Korea. This process, leading from the suppression of memory to its re-emergence, would provide plenty of opportunities for a chain of studies. Avoiding the risk of grasping too much of what this broad topic can offer, Hyejin has chosen a more manageable but at the same time essential segment when she decided to adapt the problem of historical phenomenon in the background of the thesis to the very same geographic area where the massacres had happened: the island of Jeju where the caves of which were hiding the bodies of the victims of "4.3" and have recently been acknowledged as sites of painful memory. Not only the choice of the subject is successful: Hyejin chose a method which helped her get close to the victims' families and other groups of social actors. Walking the heritage trails in the island, she could reach the sites of the atrocities, and people along the trails: local communities where families of the victims live and remember, memory workers involved in the management of these routes, as well as visitors. Walking, on the other hand, appears here not just as a research method, it is identified as a cultural practice of experiencing and transmitting memory; this perception is legitimate and seems to be quite innovative for memory and heritage studies. In addition to the research of the trails, Hyejin has scrutinised the Jeju 4.3 Peace Park as a central site of commemoration and musealisation (a less dynamic, more static one than the trails), using various observation techniques on spatial, iconographic and textual content. A deliberate research design allowed her to carry out a twofold comparison of the different representations of the tragic event; the walks of the six heritage trails have become comparable to each other, the web of which could be equated with the Peace Park. The variety of actors she encountered supports a multiscopic approach highlighting both the official narratives and the personal, unofficial memories. The field trip to Jeju, carried out in a moment of relative ease between two pandemic waves, in September and October 2020, has yielded plentiful supply of data, transformed into academically valid analysis on the pages of the thesis, framed by theories and concepts borrowed from memory and heritage studies. Hyejin's own interviews and personal observation techniques have enriched the geographical, social, and anthropological content of the chapters, helping the reader get involved in the exploration of the field. The logically structured thesis includes seven chapters. The first three chapters serve as preparatory ones, introducing the subject and explaining the conceptual and methodological framework, on a theoretical level and in relation to "4.3". Chapter 4 explains the changing naratives concerning "4.3", and in this way, it paves the way for the analysis of the Peace Park. Chapter 5 and 6, focusing on the six trails, constitute the second half of the thesis. The conclusion summarizes the findings in a concise, yet meaningful manner. To the 105 page-long main text (containing more than 200 footnotes), a source list, a bibliography and four appendices are added.



Both the contents and the formal aspects of the thesis meet the criteria of academic writing in general and MA theses in particular. If I, as a historian working mainly with texts, were to mention a minor flaw in a critical assessment like this, it would be the relative disequilibrium between the amount of written primary sources (such as official documents, press articles etc.) on the one hand, and the information collected during field work on the other. While the latter is praiseworthy indeed, as I said, and matches the conception of this research, the former might perhaps be enhanced, in a scrutiny, for instance, of archives and the local printed and electronic media. But it is true that a text-focused approach might generate another type of research with different preferences, and I am aware of the difficulties caused not only by the pandemic but geographic distance too, so this remark does not belittle my positive evaluation of the thesis. The output of the research has fully confirmed the expectations attributed to the chosen topic, goals and methods. To evaluate this result, I am giving the grade 5, the top one on the scale used at ELTE, corresponding to A on the scale used at CUNI. Should Hyejin Kim aspire to follow this research direction after her MA studies, the scope and depth of the subject may allow her to encounter further academic opportunies.

Questions:

In the thesis, you have analysed the present-day system of the commemoration of "4.3" in the island of Jeju. If a group of heritage experts decided to launch a project for the further development of the existing system of commemorationin Jeju, what would it include, in your opinion? What elements would you change? What advice would you give to the practitioners of memory institutions concerning the future of the memory of "4.3" in Jeju? In another words, how the academic achievements of your thesis would contribute to shaping the future of the day-to-day practices you encountered during your field trip?

Jured 11 1/2

13 June 2021

Date, Signature (digital)

TEMA+ Grade conversion table

ELTE	EHESS	UNICT	CUNI	UL	Notes TEMA+
(Hungarian)	(French)	(Italian)	(Czech)	(Canadian)	
5	16-20 (pas de 19 et 20)	30 (A, Excellent)	A	95-100 (A+, 4,33) 90-94 (A, 4,00) 85-89 (A-, 3,67)	Très bien/Excellent
4	14-15	27-29 (B, Very Good)	В	80-84 (B+, 3,33) 75-79 (B, 3,00) 70-74, B-, 2,67)	Bien/Good
3	12-13	23-26 (C, Good)	С	66-69 (C+, 2,33) 63-65 (C, 2,00) 60-62 (C-, 1,67)	Assez bien/ Amply sufficient
2	10-11	21-22 (D, Satisfactory) 18-20 (E, Sufficient)	D, E	55-59 (D+, 1,33) 50-54 (D, 1,00)	Passable/ Satisfactory/ Almost sufficient
1	0-9	1-17 (F, FX)	F	49 et moins (E, 0,00)	Insuffisant/ Insuficient

