

repressive rule. Furthermore, Kim concludes that the legacies of Park Chung Hee include the *chaebol* system, money politics, and the repressive policies of the KCIA, which have had quite a negative and lasting legacy.

Although differing historiographies appear in the book, overall it is characterized by a consistent feature. That is, this book contends that one of the essential characteristics of the Park Chung Hee era was that almost all areas of society were driven by the decision making of Park Chung Hee alone. Therefore, as the introduction suggests, Western theories and concepts, such as the Weberian Developmental State, are insufficient to fully elucidate the Park Chung Hee era.

What is also noteworthy is that the book asserts that the United States' role should not be overemphasized. For example, Park's establishment of the Yushin system was entirely unilateral. However, as presented in chapter 16, entitled "The Security, Political, and Human Rights Conundrum, 1974–1979," and chapter 17, called "Search for Deterrence: Park's Nuclear Option," during this period the Park regime was quite limited in its policy options, eventually leading to the downfall of the Yushin system. Thus, Park's unilateralism can be explained by the differences in the degree of hegemonic influence of the United States before and after the Nixon administration. In other words, considering that the creation of Park's Yushin system was not a political phenomenon peculiar to 1972 Korea, as a similar system appeared in the Philippines in the same year, the relatively autonomous power in South Korea can be explained as a result of the weakening of U.S. hegemony following the introduction of the Nixon Doctrine, rather than as the outcome of Park Chung Hee's policy.

Finally, the last chapter of this book, which compares the policies of the Park Chung Hee administration with those in other governments, as well as Park himself with other leaders, is an important attempt to confer universality on the Park Chung Hee era within world history. This endeavor contributes to comparative studies that are so crucial in arriving at a more accurate understanding of Park Chung Hee and his era, even though more precise examination should be needed in the future.

TAE GYUN PARK
Seoul National University
 tgpark@snu.ac.kr

One Alliance, Two Lenses: U.S.-Korea Relations in a New Era. By GI-WOOK SHIN. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2010. xv, 276 pp. \$65.00 (cloth); \$22.95 (paper).

doi:10.1017/S0021911812001623

One Alliance, Two Lenses is an innovative and unique study of the asymmetrical nature of U.S.-Korea relations. Focusing on the period between 1992 and

2003—a time of intense geopolitical change, deepening democratization in the ROK (South Korea), and heightened tensions over nuclear armament in the DPRK (North Korea), this book explores key conceptual differences in how South Koreans and Americans made sense of their bilateral relationship and, in turn, how these differences resulted in mounting tensions for this decades-long alliance. The book argues that the key difference between the U.S. and the ROK's perception of the alliance hinged on the distinction between policy and identity. Despite the extensive U.S. involvement in the formation and history of the ROK—from its role in dividing the Korean Peninsula at the 38th parallel to its ongoing deployment of tens of thousands of U.S. military troops—the United States rarely, if ever, viewed its relationship with South Korea as anything more than a “matter of policy.” When disagreement occurred over such key issues as nuclear proliferation in North Korea, for example, the United States treated them primarily as “policy rifts,” with little spillover to its sense of nationhood or place in the world. In contrast, South Korea's perception of the alliance has been directly influenced by its changing sense of national identity. In the context of rapid economic development and national democratic transformation, South Koreans began reassessing their attitudes towards the United States and the ongoing U.S. involvement in national affairs, especially in relation to the DPRK. Although conservatives and progressives staunchly disagree on the value and continued necessity of the U.S.-ROK alliance, what is significant, according to Shin, is that these debates are deeply embroiled in South Koreans' evolving sense of themselves as a nation and their position in a changing regional and global order.

To provide evidence for the book's principle claims, *One Alliance, Two Lenses* relies on content analysis of news coverage in five major daily newspapers: the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, and the *Wall Street Journal* in the United States and *Chosun Ilbo* and *Hankyoreh Shinmoon* in South Korea. Unlike opinion-editorials, which mainly capture differences in ideological positions, and survey data, which tends to focus on general attitudes at particular moments on particular issues, news media content analysis generates data regarding the “processes by which the particular views of a foreign nation are discussed, debated, established and reformulated” (pp. 28–9) over time. Chapter 2 provides a detailed explanation of the methodology, including the treatment of news sources, the codes used to identify similarities and differences in media environments, and measures used to test reliability and validity. This chapter is written mainly for sociologists, political scientists, and other social science researchers and is especially useful for those interested in the mechanics of conducting news media content analysis.

The remaining chapters engage in an extensive discussion of the book's research findings in relation to four basic themes: South Korea's views about North Korea and the ROK-DPRK relationship; South Korea's views about the United States and the U.S.-ROK relationship; U.S. views about South Korea and the U.S.-ROK relationship; and U.S. views about North Korea and its role in the “Axis of Evil,” coined by the Bush administration. Numerous figures and tables are provided in each of the empirical chapters and are followed by detailed

explanations of differences in the extent, depth, and tone of news coverage for various issues, from the economy and national security to human rights and cultural trends.

The strength of each empirical chapter lies in the presentation of clear and accessible arguments that both enhance and add complexity to the book's key claims. For example, in chapter 4, Shin analyzes the "progressive conservative perception gap" (p. 103) in South Korean news coverage. He finds that both progressives and conservatives recognize the need for engagement with North Korea, but they possess fundamentally different understandings of how to do this. Whereas conservatives emphasize the need for continued ties with the United States to deal with the ongoing security threat that the DPRK poses to South Korea, progressives emphasize the importance of independent engagement with the DPRK and view the United States as one of the greatest impediments to achieving peace and stability on the peninsula.

Another key research finding is the divergence between U.S. and South Korean news coverage of each other. Shin found that almost half (44.7 percent) of all news and editorial coverage in major South Korean newspapers addressed U.S.-related issues. Conversely, U.S. news media coverage of the ROK was episodic and disconnected. News coverage of other countries, such as Russia, China, Japan, and Israel, far surpassed that of either South or North Korea, reinforcing the idea that Korea is not a "significant other" to the United States on any register. The only time any emotional content about Korea appeared in U.S. news outlets was in their coverage of the DPRK as a security threat. While the reporting was consistently negative and one-dimensional, it still amounted to a negligible proportion in relation to other countries.

Despite the book's unique approach, the arguments in the book could have been greatly strengthened if there was a deeper historical and theoretical engagement with the dynamics of U.S.-Korea relations. Although some contextual information is provided, the explanations would have benefitted from a more nuanced historical lens. For example, Shin attributes the emotionally laden nature of debates in South Korea over North Korea to the issue of ethnic nationalism and a shared investment in the lives of their Northern brethren. While such feelings may be dominant, other issues are not sufficiently explored, such as the role of negative emotional sentiments about North Korea as a continued legitimating force in formal politics and the convergence between conservatives' attitudes toward North Korea and the power base of the ruling economic and political elite.

Religious politics are also not considered when discussing conservatives' attitudes toward North Korea, which points to a broader problem in the book's treatment of the key concept, "identity politics." Given the centrality of this concept to the author's arguments, there is very little elaboration of what exactly this term means and what value it adds to understanding U.S.-Korea relations. Identity politics are narrowly conceptualized as perceptions about national identity, with little consideration of the significance of other factors, such as gender, religion, and class, in contending Korean identities.

Also, there is insufficient attention paid to the material and institutional power asymmetries between countries, not only between the United States and South Korea, but also between the United States and North Korea, and South Korea and North Korea. Very real material differences influence how and under what conditions disagreements can be resolved between nations, including the absence of a peace treaty between the United States and North Korea and the size and growth of U.S. military power and reach, especially in the context of the “war on terror.”

Nevertheless, the book is a significant contribution to existing social science research on contemporary Korea. It is written in a clear and accessible manner and it will be a useful addition to undergraduate and graduate courses about Korean politics and politics in Asia, more generally. It will also be a valuable text to assign in courses about U.S. geopolitics and comparative politics and courses in sociology and political science with a topical focus on East Asia or a methodological focus on media content analysis.

JENNIFER JIHYE CHUN
University of Toronto
 jchun@utsc.utoronto.ca

SOUTH ASIA

South Asian Texts in History: Critical Engagements with Sheldon Pollock.
 Edited by YIGAL BRONNER, WHITNEY COX, and LAWRENCE J. MCCREA. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Association for Asian Studies, 2011. xix, 403 pp. \$35.00 (paper).
 doi:10.1017/S0021911812001635

This volume of tribute to Sheldon Pollock, by general acclamation the most influential and game-changing Sanskritist of the last fifty years (at least in the United States), grew out of a conference at Columbia University (Pollock’s present institutional home) in 2008, organized by several of Pollock’s students at the University of Chicago, where he was for many years a professor of Sanskrit. The editors were all his students, as were fourteen of the sixteen contributors. Among the greatest tributes to Professor Pollock is that so many of his students turned out to be so good, as the present volume amply testifies. Among their strengths is that they have learned to critically examine the Sanskrit and vernacular texts in hitherto unexamined sociopolitical and material contexts. In addition, however, they often challenge Pollock’s conclusions, even as they adhere closely to his overall methodology.

The volume is divided into five distinct areas that have been of abiding concern to Pollock: the *Rāmāyana*; the literary culture of classical Sanskrit