

**The role of cultural development in urban strategy
: the Hub City of Asian Culture in Gwangju, Korea**

Thesis submitted for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
at the University of Leicester.

by

Geuntae Park

School of Museum Studies
University of Leicester

2014

The role of cultural development in urban strategy : the Hub City of Asian Culture in Gwangju, Korea

Geuntae Park

Abstract

This thesis investigates the role of cultural development in urban strategy. In particular, it reflects on the application of Western-developed theories and practices of cultural planning to culture-led urban developments in Asian cities. Through the case study of the Hub City of Asian Culture project in Gwangju, Korea by employing documentary analysis and supplementary semi-structured interviews, the thesis investigates cultural and urban policies, the background and process of the project delivery, the ways the project has affected change in the city, and future challenges for Gwangju.

The thesis identifies four key characteristics of culture-led urban development projects: these are, the emergence of most large scale culture-led urban developments out of a longer history of culturally focused planning and policy, the centrality of city image change as a key driver, as well as the pursuit of economic impact, and the engagement of local communities as, at least, an important discourse in the development and implementation of such projects. The thesis uses its identification of these characteristics as a frame to examine the case of the Hub City of Asian Culture project. It was initially anticipated that this frame for understanding culture-led urban development projects would reveal the similarities of the Asian case with those Western cases which the frame was developed. In fact the investigation has revealed that the processes of project delivery in Gwangju have shown quite different aspects from the Western examples due to the city's unique local context. Drawing particular attention to the ways in which the Hub City of Asian Culture has been implemented, and how it has tried to solve the challenges and opportunities that emerged from the local context, the research contributes to a wider discussion of culture-led urban strategy, and furthermore hopes to contribute to the developing discussion of culture-led development in Asia.

Acknowledgments

It is a great pleasure to thank all the people who helped me conduct this research and complete the thesis, in particular, my two great supervisors, Dr Lianne Gibson and Dr Ross Parry. Without their sustaining support, encouragement, and keen academic insight, the project would not have been possible.

I also thank all the scientific committees of the Asia Culture Forum, the International Council of Museums-CAMOC, Museum 2011, and the Association for Cultural Economics International, who critically reviewed my paper and allowed me to present my findings based on field work during conferences.

I'm also very grateful for the participation and support of professionals and local residents in Newcastle-Gateshead and Gwangju for this thesis. Their time and effort were invaluable.

In addition, I would like to express my thanks to the staff of the School of Museum Studies, and other PhD colleagues. Their warm and professional assistance greatly supported my life in Leicester.

Finally, I would like to say a huge thank you to SH, my wife, and, SY, my daughter. They have been the reason and the motivation for my academic life in Leicester and their enormous encouragement made this thesis possible. This thesis is for them.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1 Introduction	1
1. Aims and objectives of research	1
2. Motivation of research: the Guggenheim Museum Bilbao	6
3. Research questions	1 1
4. Methodology	1 4
4.1. Case study: the Hub City of Asian Culture, Gwangju	1 4
4.2. Data collection.....	1 5
4.2.1. Document analysis	1 5
4.2.2. Semi-structured interviews.....	1 7
4.3. Analysis of collected data	1 9
5. Structure of the thesis.....	2 1
 Chapter 2 Urban development using culture	 2 7
1. Introduction.....	2 7
2. Culture-led urban regeneration	3 0
2.1. Overview of developing cultural institutions for urban regeneration	3 0
2.2. Background and process of urban regeneration through cultural institutions: why and how cultural institutions are used for urban regeneration	3 3
2.3. The trend of adopting previous ‘successful’ examples and how they can be defined as ‘successful’	4 1
2.4. Urban regeneration through cultural institutions and local communities	4 6
3. Culture-led urban branding.....	5 2
3.1. Urban branding: definition, purpose and process	5 2
3.2. Why urban branding through culture?	5 6
3.3. Discussions on the strategies for culture-led urban branding: long-term planning	6 3 1
3.4. Culture-led urban branding and tourism.....	6 3

3.5.	Culture-led urban branding and local communities: the role of local communities and why they matter	6 6
4.	Conclusion	7 3

Chapter 3 Cultural developments on the Quayside, Newcastle-Gateshead: background, process, and changes to the area

1.	Introduction.....	7 6
2.	Cultural developments on the Quayside	8 1
2.1.	Newcastle and Gateshead in the 20 th century	8 1
2.2.	Overview of cultural developments on the Quayside	8 5
3.	Background to the Quayside developments: long-term planning process	9 1
3.1.	Early stages of the developments.....	9 1
3.2.	Birth of a new brand: Newcastle-Gateshead	9 3
4.	Changes to Newcastle-Gateshead since the Quayside cultural developments 9 6	
4.1.	Changed perceptions of the area.....	9 6
4.2.	Seeking economic impact: increased tourism.....	1 0 0
5.	After cultural developments on the Quayside: taking account of local communities	1 0 8
5.1.	Newcastle-Gateshead Initiative (NGI)'s new cultural vision	1 0 9
5.2.	BALTIC's communication plan.....	1 1 0
5.3.	Cultural Investment and Strategic Impact Research.....	1 1 1
6.	Conclusion	1 1 2

Chapter 4 The Hub City of Asian Culture project and the Asia Culture Complex in Gwangju: background and initial development process

1.	Introduction.....	1 1 5
2.	Understanding Gwangju since the 20 th century	1 2 0
2.1.	Overview of Gwangju from political, social and economic points of view .	1 2 0
2.2.	Cultural infrastructure of Gwangju and local demand for arts and culture	1 3 0
3.	Initial development of arts and culture in Gwangju	1 3 9

4.	Hub City of Asian Culture project and the Asia Culture Complex development	1 4 9
5.	Conclusion	1 6 8
Chapter 5 The Hub City of Asian Culture project and the Asia Culture Complex development: bringing a new image and initial changes to Gwangju		
1.	Introduction.....	1 7 2
2.	The Hub City of Asian Culture project and initial changes to Gwangju.....	1 7 6
2.1.	Finding a new cultural identity for the future of the city	1 7 6
2.2.	Enriching the cultural environment of Gwangju	1 9 3
3.	Future of the Hub City of Asian Culture project and local communities.....	2 0 1
4.	Conclusion	2 0 8
Chapter 6 Conclusion.....		
1.	Summary of the thesis	2 1 3
2.	Findings and contribution to the discussion about culture-led urban development	2 1 6
2.1.	Gwangju: the Hub City of Asian Culture project	2 1 6
2.2.	Contribution to wider discussion and understanding of culture-led urban development.....	2 2 0
3.	Limitations and future research	2 2 2
3.1.	Limitations of the research	2 2 2
3.2.	Future research	2 2 4
Bibliography.....		2 2 7
Appendices		2 5 8
Appendix 1. List of interviewees: Newcastle-Gateshead.....		2 5 8
Appendix 2. List of interviewees: Gwangju		2 5 9
Appendix 3. Interview procedure		2 6 0
Appendix 4. Information sheet		2 6 2

Appendix 5. Consent form for adults.....	2 6 4
Appendix 6. Consent form for young people	2 6 6
Appendix 7. Example of interview questions: professional, Newcastle-Gateshead	2 6 8
Appendix 8. Example of interview questions: local resident, Newcastle-Gateshead ...	2 6 9
Appendix 9. Example of interview questions: professional, Gwangju.....	2 7 1
Appendix 10. Example of interview questions: local resident, Gwangju	2 7 2

List of Figures

Figure 3.1 Map of North East England

Figure 3.2 Gateshead Millennium Bridge

Figure 3.3 BALTIC Contemporary Art Centre

Figure 3.4 The Sage Gateshead

Figure 4.1 Map of Korea

Figure 4.2 Asia Culture Complex image 1

Figure 4.3 Asia Culture Complex image 2

Figure 4.4 Original design

Figure 4.5 Alternative design 1

Figure 4.6 Alternative design 2

Figure 4.7 Final design

List of Tables

Table 1.1 Framework for analysing data

Table 1.2 Example of data analysis

Table 3.1 All Tourism Spending in England

Table 4.1 GDP by region, unit 10 Eok won

Table 4.2 Cultural industries status

Table 4.3 Number of cultural facilities in 2010

Table 4.4 Number of cultural facilities in 2004-2010

Table 4.5 Number of cultural facilities per 10,000 people 2004-2007

Table 4.6 Percentage of people in Gwangju who attended artistic events or visited cultural facilities

Table 5.1 Population of old city centre of Gwangju

Table 5.2 Population of Gwangju

Chapter 1

Introduction

1. Aims and objectives of research

This thesis aims to understand the roles of cultural developments in urban strategy. In particular, it aims to reflect on the application of Western-developed theories and practices of cultural planning¹ to culture-led urban developments² in Asian cities. In doing this, the thesis examines the case of the city of Gwangju, which has been developing the Hub City of Asian Culture project, the largest single cultural investment in Korea's history. Based on the investigation of the case study, the thesis argues that the project delivery, which has adopted and implemented Western arguments and practices, has moved to another phase of its development after encountering and addressing issues that are rooted in the unique local context, which focuses more on the engagement of local communities and communication with them.

In cities such as Baltimore and Liverpool, investment in cultural developments have been implemented to change perceptions of these post-industrial cities, bring economic benefits and create employment opportunities. While doing this, the engagement of local communities has been identified as an essential part of the development process in achieving sustainable impact. The thesis will explore further

¹ The definition of cultural planning, including different typologies of it, is discussed in Chapter 2. The thesis mainly discusses theories and practices of culture-led urban regeneration and culture-led urban branding.

² For this chapter and throughout the thesis, cultural development means capital focused cultural developments, rather than cultural development strategies utilising cultural programmes such as festivals or events.

how cultural planning strategies developed for Western city contexts have been adopted and applied in the context of the different urban traditions of an Asian city. Gwangju has been selected as a main case study because the city has been developing the largest cultural project in Korea, and it also has some features in common with some Western cities which have utilised culture as an urban renewal strategy. Gwangju has shown low economic performance compared to other cities in Korea, and it has experienced decline in its old city centre. In particular, the city's new urban development plan for a new city centre had resulted in urban decline in the old city centre due to a loss of core urban functions such as administration and finance. In addition, the residents in Gwangju have also hoped to have a more future facing image for the city other than its historic identity as the site of the 5·18 Democratisation Movement. In order to revitalize the city, particularly the old city centre, and to develop a new image for the city, Gwangju has adopted culture focused capital development as a solution after referencing other, primarily European, cities that had experienced similar urban decline. Although on one reading Gwangju could be understood as the mere application of cultural planning strategies developed for Western contexts – an example of 'parachuting in' – in fact this thesis will argue that the project's development and delivery, while drawing on examples from elsewhere, has been highly specific due to the pressures of local circumstance. In particular, its implementation process has identified challenging concerns from the city's unique contexts. Therefore, due to Gwangju's difference, as well as its similarities to other cities which have undergone urban renewal, it is a useful case through which to explore the relationship between Western-developed strategies of culture-led urban regeneration and culture-led urban branding, and their implementation in an Asian

city. It will allow us to have better understanding of culture-led urban development, particularly in the context of Asian cities.

There is a consensus in discussion of culture-led urban development that the engagement of local communities is significant for the sustainability of the development. The thesis argues that, in the case of the Hub City of Asian Culture project in Gwangju, we can identify two distinct phases: an initial phase, where the focus is on the high impact made by the significant investment in the capital build, and the second phase, when the initial focus on image shifts to a more grounded focus on the everyday delivery of the project. Through uncovering this process, the thesis has revealed how in this specific case of Gwangju the importance of consulting community at both stages has been highlighted.

In order to discuss this, a framework for the analysis of new cultural developments in relation to urban strategy is established through a discussion of the literature on culture-led regeneration and cultural urban branding. I argue on the basis of a review of literature and an examination of the example of a major cultural development in Newcastle-Gateshead in the UK that there are four main focuses for analysis in understanding the Hub City of Asian Culture case: the advantages of long-term planning, efforts to change perceptions, pursuit of economic impact, and engagement of local communities. The thesis argues that these analytical focuses allow an understanding of how Western rationales and practices have been adopted and implemented. In particular, it confirms that, unlike the background to adopting culture for urban strategy and the impacts that are anticipated from the project, the process of development shows different aspects due to unique contexts of Gwangju.

In addition to reviewing the literature on culture-led development and in the absence of a comparably large body of literature on Asian culture-led development³, a focused analysis of a particular 'case' of culture-led development has enabled the development of a grounded understanding of the ways in which culture-led urban development strategies and programmes are applied and the effects of that application. For this purpose investigating the example of culture-led urban development in Newcastle-Gateshead was identified as the most useful, as opposed to the cases of Glasgow, Bilbao, Liverpool or London, for instance, because in the example of Newcastle-Gateshead, there are, at least at first glance, features which are similar to the case of Gwangju, namely, a declining economy, the search for a new image for the city, and, government as a strong driving force for the development. Newcastle-Gateshead was also one of the cities included in the benchmarking studies undertaken by the Korea Culture Tourism Institute in the planning stages of the Hub City of Asian Culture project (KCTI 2009). The understanding emerging from this discussion affirms the arguments, established by academics including Miles (2005) and Garcia (2004), that new cultural projects should be developed (and analysed) with primary reference to the city's unique circumstances because the challenges and opportunities which emerge during a project's development vary in each case.

In investigating the Hub City of Asian Culture project in Gwangju, the thesis argues that, although the initial rationale behind the project was that through making a huge investment in capital cultural developments, resulting in the city drawing a great deal

³ Such literatures, for example, the work of Lily Kong (2007), exists, and there is also a quickly developing body of literature on culture-led urban development in Asian cities. The overall discussion on this subject is in Chapter 2.

of attention from other parts of the nation, such as Jeonju and Kyungju (which are also trying to use their cultural resources and assets for urban strategy), the city would benefit through the attraction of external attention and investment would follow. Instead this thesis has found that the focus of the project delivery has now been translated into how to maintain local interests in and attitudes toward the project, rather than this initial focus on externally focused culture-led urban branding.

This research, which has applied a framework of Western-developed arguments and experiences to an Asian example, examines how these rationales have been adopted and implemented according to the city's own circumstances. For this, the thesis has identified the four main characteristics of the advantages of long-term planning, efforts to change perceptions, pursuit of economic impact, and engagement of local communities in order to use them as a lens to examine the case of the Hub City of Asian Culture project in Gwangju. Although it is initially anticipated that those characteristics in culture-led regeneration and culture-led urban branding would provide better understanding of the Asian case, further investigation has revealed that the process of the project delivery, unlike the backgrounds and the impacts of the project, has shown different aspects from the Western examples due to the city's unique local context such as the local importance of the 5·18 Movement. Drawing particular attention to the ways in which the large cultural project of the Hub City of Asian Culture has been implemented, and how it has faced and tried to solve the challenges and opportunities that emerged from the local context during the process including the preservation conflicts on the 5·18 heritage building, the research contributes to a wider discussion of culture-led urban regeneration, and furthermore hopes to contribute to the developing discussion of culture-led development in Asia.

2. Motivation of research: the Guggenheim Museum Bilbao

2.1. The case of the Guggenheim Museum Bilbao

This research was initially motivated by observing the example of the Guggenheim Museum Bilbao. Since the Guggenheim opened in Bilbao in 1997, museums and cultural institutions have been widely considered as important factors in urban regeneration. In particular, the story of the Guggenheim Museum Bilbao has, through media enthusiasm, gained an almost mythic status worldwide. For instance, *The Financial Times* said that the city's economic renaissance has been so dramatic since the opening of the Guggenheim Museum Bilbao that the museum has become an icon of what architecture can do for a city in decline (Crawford 2007). It stressed that no one doubts that the Guggenheim put Bilbao on the world map (*ibid.*). This story has gathered momentum particularly through representations of its economic impact on the city. Juan Ignacio Vidarte, a former director of Guggenheim Museum Bilbao, stated that the economic effect of the museum, known as "the Guggenheim effect", is little short of a miracle (*ibid.*). According to the Bilbao Guggenheim's economic report (*ibid.*), over the past decade, people coming to see the museum have spent €1.6bn in the city, brought €260m of additional tax revenues for the local government, and, the museum estimates that it helps sustain 4,232 jobs.

The case of Bilbao's economic renaissance through an iconic museum project has been influential in Korea. The Korean media have presented Bilbao as an example of successful urban regeneration through cultural projects. For example, *Dong-A Daily*, a major daily newspaper in Korea, issued a series of articles under the rubric "Design is the future of the city", where it described Bilbao, mainly through the Guggenheim

Museum Bilbao, as an excellent example of using design for urban economic purposes (Lee 2008). In 2012, Ivon Areso, a former deputy mayor of Bilbao, came to Korea and delivered a special lecture about how Bilbao had become a world famous tourist destination. *Han Kyung*, a daily newspaper in Korea specialising in economics, reported that a previous deputy mayor had explained the process of how the Bilbao master plan was conceived and implemented so successfully (Jeong 2012). Bilbao's economic figures were also examined in the Korean media (*ibid.*; Lee 2008). In particular, Bilbao's decrease in the unemployment rate from over 25% to 3.4%, and the fact that over a million visitors came to the city annually were lauded in the media (*ibid.*). These figures, along with the economic statistics on tax revenues and jobs, played a role in making the example Guggenheim Museum Bilbao a significant influence in Korea for revitalising a city via a cultural project.

How we interpret this "Bilbao effect", in relation to a discussion of culture-led urban regeneration, can raise questions about whether focusing on the final outcomes of the cultural project, such as iconic museum architecture, can provide a meaningful solution to other cities' urban cultural projects, given that the processes of city development differ from case to case. In particular Asian cities have different historic, social, and cultural backgrounds from the European and American cities from which usually Asian cities adopt the rationales and practices for their urban cultural projects. Malcom Miles (2005) raises a concern about to what extent previous cultural policies and strategies pursued in one city can work effectively in another city whose circumstances are different. Beatriz Garcia (2004) also argues for the need to investigate the long-term benefits of cultural developments through engaging in a

critical evaluation of the trend of putting cultural institutions and programmes into each given city's urban context. Miles and Garcia both focus on the fact that, because of each city's unique circumstances, there needs to be a critical discussion of how the initial policies and strategies about urban cultural projects have been created and developed specially in the context of particular projects and cities. This is in contrast to analyses or projects which seek to directly apply models taken from elsewhere and developed for different circumstances. If we take this more specific rather than totalising approach and apply it to an analysis of the Guggenheim Museum Bilbao, we can understand this development as the product of very particular local political, social and economic contexts. The local Basque government developed an urban development policy which was focused both on image change and on supporting the establishment of better urban infrastructures, such as a new subway system and a sea port (Baniotopoulou 2001). Within this larger urban strategy, a cultural facility was incorporated as a core element with the purpose of attracting tourists and investment; and the Guggenheim Foundation, which was looking to expand and secure international development opportunities, was approached for these purposes (*ibid.*). After many negotiations and agreements, which were based on meeting the mutual goals of the Guggenheim Foundation and the local Basque government, the Guggenheim Museum Bilbao was created. In understanding the Guggenheim Museum Bilbao development as a product of local context, one part of a particular urban strategy, it allows us to obtain wider knowledge about this specific case rather than the dominant totalising representation of this development as an icon for culture-led regeneration.

2.2. Guggenheim Museum Bilbao and urban development in Asian cities

In addition to the need to consider a city's unique characteristics in relation to the development of a cultural project, the case of the Guggenheim Museum Bilbao also raises the issue about the application of the 'Bilbao effect' to Asian cities. It is notable in writing from an Asian context that much of the literature which has dominated consideration of cultural developments for urban strategies is written by and about developments in Australian, European, or North American countries. These literatures present arguments and practices pertaining to cultural planning in the context of other continents with different urban histories and traditions, however, the literature more rarely considers cultural planning in the context of Asian cities⁴. For example, there is little literature on the case of Korea and culture-led development, although see Chapter 2 for a discussion of that literature which does exist. By investigating culture-led urban regeneration rationales developed elsewhere, and their adoption and implementation in a given Asian city, the thesis aims to provide a platform for discussion of the use of culture in urban strategies and their adoption in Asian cities.

Through this chapter and other parts of the thesis, demonstrating this dichotomy between 'Western' and 'Asian' is not intended to be a generalisation about every cultural urban project. For example, the characteristics of the cultural resources which form the focus of culture-led urban development projects are also different:

Baltimore's waterfront, York's archaeological heritage, and Edinburgh's festivals (Richards and Wilson 2005). Moreover, the strategies for adopting culture also vary. For example, Graeme Evans and Phyllida Shaw (2004) define three models for urban

⁴ Although see notable exceptions such as Kong (2007).

regeneration using culture: culture-led regeneration, cultural regeneration, and culture and regeneration, all of which are further discussed in Chapter 2. Similarly, use of the term 'Asian' cities is not to generalise about cultural developments in different Asian cities, but to geographically categorise cities in Asia: in particular, the cities that have actively constructed cultural projects for their urban purposes. Lily Kong argues that there is an 'Asian' distinctiveness to those culture-led urban projects which have been developed in cities, such as Shanghai, Hong Kong and Singapore (Kong 2007).

In order to analyse cultural developments in urban strategies across the world, the thesis identifies particular characteristics of the project delivery process for large cultural developments tasked with city image-building. Such developments are typically characterised by the advantages of long-term planning, efforts to change perceptions of the place (internally and externally), the pursuit of economic impact, and the aim to engage local communities in cultural participation. By examining these characteristic features in the case of the Hub City of Asian Culture project in Gwangju, the thesis finds that even though these characteristics are general to culture-led urban development and as such provide a framework to understand the background, process, and anticipated impacts of the Hub City of Asian Culture project, close investigation reveals the distinctiveness in application of those characteristics, particularly in the process of the project development. More specifically, the thesis argues that the project development has entered a new delivery process from initial stage of significant investment and great attention drawn from the Hub City of Asian Culture project to the second stage of maintaining such initial interests and local attitudes

toward the project, after encountering and addressing challenging issues rooted locally, such as preservation conflicts on the 5·18 heritage building

3. Research questions

The research addresses this main question:

- What can we learn about the concept and phenomenon of culture-led urban development, through investigating the development and delivery of the Hub City of Asian Culture in Gwangju, Korea?

This question incorporates two concepts, cultural development and urban strategy, which are defined and discussed further in chapters 2 and 3. While the research question primarily examines a change of focus in cultural developments within urban strategies in Asian cities – in particular, Gwangju, Korea, in doing this, the thesis critically analyses and discusses the phenomenon of the development of large cultural institutions and the changes that these institutions are intended to bring to cities. The thesis ultimately intends to examine whether, and if so how, the Western-originated theories and practices of cultural developments can be applicable to an Asian case where the historical, social, urban and cultural circumstances are different.

Following this main research question, the research objectives seek to answer the questions:

- What are the main arguments in cultural urban development theories and practices as these have been developed in Western context?

- What is the background to the Hub City of Asian Culture and how can it be interpreted in the unique urban context of Gwangju?
- What have been the changes in Gwangju both intended and realised by the Asia Culture Complex and the Hub City of Asian Culture?
- How has the focus of project delivery shifted during the development process, and what have been the dimensions and outcomes of this shift in terms of local residents' attitude towards the project?
- How do the key concerns of the literature on culture-led urban development allow us to understand, or not, such developments in an Asian context?

The first research objective is to examine the background of how culture has emerged and been employed for urban purposes in Western cities. It discusses the arguments of cultural urban developments, which contributes to establishing a framework for the case study research. In particular, the theories and practices of culture-led urban regeneration and culture-led urban branding are discussed since these are main typologies of Gwangju's cultural urban strategies.

The second research objective is to investigate the background of cultural development, as situated within the various contexts of Gwangju. It explores how the projects began, understanding them in social, political, economic and cultural terms. Gwangju, in which the Western-developed strategies of using culture for its urban developments have been taking place over the last few decades, has a very strong political identity due to its 5·18 Democratisation Movement⁵, and has experienced an

⁵ 5·18 Democratic Movement, which emerged in 1980 in Gwangju, was very important in the development of the history of democracy development history in Korea and it has become a significant

economic decline in its old city centre⁶ because of its urban development plan to create a new city centre on the outskirts of the city. In addition, Gwangju has been traditionally known as an artistic town because of the famous artists based in the city. Therefore, the first objective, to consider these complex circumstances, will provide a better understanding of the Hub City of Asian Culture project within Gwangju's unique context.

The third research objective looks at the changes in Gwangju that have taken place in relation to the developments and projects of the Hub City of Asian Culture. It investigates what changes have been identified in the city during the process of development. In particular, finding a new identity for this cultural city that can replace its old political identity, and enriching its cultural environment are discussed.

The fourth objective examines closely how the focus on project delivery has changed during the development process.

In conclusion, the final objective of this thesis is to revisit the arguments of the culture-led urban development literatures, and to understand how adopting these arguments and practices has taken place in an Asian city taking account of its different social, economic and cultural contexts.

part of the strong identity of Gwangju. Further details of this, including the changing meaning of the movement for local residents, are discussed in Chapter 4.

⁶ The term 'old city centre' and 'new city centre' are used to best represent the meaning of the Korean language definitions of each part of the city. 'Old' and 'new', in this context, represent chronological differences only; further details about this are discussed in Chapter 4.

4. Methodology

4.1. Case study: the Hub City of Asian Culture, Gwangju

The detailed consideration of the the Hub City of Asian Culture, Gwangju will use a case study method as its main approach. This research uses the case study method since it is an effective way to collect data from different sources and assemble them in a particular way to develop a detailed story as a tool for understanding circumstances, conditions and relations (Berg 2009; Robson 2002; Yin 2009). In other words, the case study method concentrates on a specific phenomenon, individual, community or institution, and aims to identify interactions between, or significant factors governing them (Berg 2009). The nature of the case study method does not aim to generalise certain arguments on culture and urban strategies developed in Western contexts. Instead, the case study approach will investigate whether or how those arguments would be reflected on the case of Gwangju, an Asian city.

The chapters 4 and 5 focus on the case of Gwangju in Korea, in particular the Hub City of Asian Culture project. This is the largest cultural project in the history of Korea (Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2008). Gwangju's Hub City of Asian Culture project has been selected as a case study because this project is currently under development as the main cultural urban strategy in Gwangju, and it is one of the most representative projects for the use of culture for urban regeneration purposes in Korea. A detailed investigation of this case thus provides us with an opportunity to understand the ways in which Western models of cultural planning have been imported into Asian city contexts, and the specific opportunities and challenges which have emerged.

4.2. Data collection

4.2.1. Document analysis

Documentary resources have been regarded as a main data source for case studies (Yin 2009), and they have also been extensively utilised in this research. Documentary resources were firstly used to identify key features of the case study in order to understand what the main research focuses should be. Different types of documentary resource were utilised including:

- Government documents, such as project reports, strategies, plans and policies for culture, tourism and community, and statistics for culture, tourism and the economy;
- other public organisation documents, such as research findings, surveys and reports;
- academic papers;
- media coverage.

Government and other public organisation documents have been essential to this research, since the cultural projects in the Gwangju case study were developed by public authorities. During the process of setting up the cultural projects, and even before their main developments, the government produced a great number of documents, including reviews, policies, strategies and plans. For this case study of Gwangju, the Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture, the local authority of Gwangju, the Korea Institute of Culture and Tourism (KICT), the Gwangju Development Institute (GDI), and, the Gwangju Cultural Foundation all provided documentary evidence. For example, the Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture produces main policies and

strategies for the project. Its main documentary resources include master-plan for the project, strategies plans, and white papers. They are essential to understand the overall direction of the central government, a main funding body and driving force of the Hub City of Asian Culture project. The local authority of Gwangju provides specific information of Gwangju, such as various statistics including population trends, and economic performance, local policies for culture that are related to the Hub City of Asian Culture project. The KICT publishes academic articles and surveys on the project. As a main research institute specialised in culture, it provides other information as well such as cultural infrastructure statistics and analysis of national cultural policies. GDI and Gwangju Cultural Foundation produce local cultural strategies. As representative think tank in the region, they develop further detailed strategies and action plans for cultural projects and developments including the Hub City of Asian Culture project. There have also been various conferences and forums regarding the Hub City of Asian Culture, at which academics from Korea and other countries presented papers and discussed the Hub City of Asian Culture project, including the Asia Culture Forum 2011. Media coverage has also been used to inform the research. In particular, along with government publications, this type of material has enabled the observation of the rebranding issues and perceptions of the region from the beginning of the projects. For example, when the conflicts surrounding the Asia Culture Complex development, a main facility of the Hub City of Asian Culture project, observing local media has enabled this research to trace diverse opinions among local residents and understand the reasons behind them. The most important issue regarding analysing and interpreting collected data from various documentary resources has been to maintain a distance from the data available. Since some data were developed with marketing or

promotional purposes care has been necessary in using such data to support the arguments presented in this thesis. Therefore, continuous efforts have been made to discern the difference between fact and advocacy, and the thesis has tried to understand data from different points of view to allow for different interpretations. In addition, efforts have been made to find different resources under the same theme or subject to increase the validity of data. Indeed, these aspects are applicable not only for document resources, but also for the whole data of the research (Creswell 2007).

4.2.2. Semi-structured interviews

The research in Gwangju employed semi-structured interviews in order to supplement the documentary resources reviewed. Of the different types of interviews, the semi-structured type was adopted in order to take advantage of the flexibility and adaptability of discussion during the interview. This interview approach has been widely adopted as the questions and answers can be flexible and modified during the conversation, and can also allow the researcher to further explore important points that are raised during the interview (Robson 2002). In particular, since semi-structured interviews are designed according to a set of themes and questions that are based both on the whole research questions and the specific questions for the case study, they are effective in steering the direction of the conversation while allowing the possibility of exploring the subjects further. Due to the advantages discussed above, the semi-structured interview is one of the most frequent methods for collecting data in qualitative research (Creswell 2009; Yin 2009), and this research has thus adopted the semi-structured interview as a main way for collecting data.

The interviewees for the case study of Gwangju were selected from local authorities, professionals, academics and local residents on the basis of providing different perspectives and types of information about the Hub City of Asian Culture project and its main facility, the Asian Culture Complex (ACC), and the changes in the city brought by the project. The professionals were interviewed in order to provide information about the background and process of the Hub City of Asian Culture project. They, like local residents, also provided opinions on the conflicts surrounding the project development. Local residents were selected from both the old city centre and the new city centre in order to reflect different attitudes and approaches to the project according to their area of residence. These interviews were especially important in revealing some of the conflicts and debates surrounding the issues of architecture and conservation.⁷ Based on the above selection criteria, seven professionals working in the Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture, the Gwangju Development Institute and the Gwangju Cultural Foundation, three academics from Chonnam National University in Gwangju and nine local residents were chosen for interviews. Further details of their backgrounds and their interview questions are attached in appendix 2, 9, and 10.

In order to manage the interviews in a professional and technically ordered way, the main interviews were preceded by correspondence with each interviewee (Wengraf 2001). The interviewees were mainly approached by email before the interview. On the day of interview, in order to conduct the interviews effectively a procedural manual was prepared, which could then be referred to if necessary during each interview. It was composed of a greeting, a confirmation of necessary documents, such as information sheets and consent forms, an explanation of the role of the

⁷ Detailed information on these conflicts will be discussed in Chapter 4.

interviewees and the expected time duration of the interview. Apart from contacting interviewees and conducting interviews with them, another necessary procedure was to obtain ethical approval from the School of Museum Studies. A research ethics review should be completed for every research that involves human participants before they participate in the research. Therefore, in order to adhere to this guideline, an application form, along with an information sheet for the participants and a research consent form for the research were submitted and approved by the research ethics officer at the School of Museum Studies. Further details of the interview process and ethical approval are attached in appendix 3, 4, and 5.

4.3. Analysis of collected data

Generally, the process of analysing qualitative data can be summarised into three steps: preparing and organising the data; reducing the data into themes; and presenting the data as discussion or figures (Creswell 2007: 148). However, as Creswell (*ibid.*) and Berg (2009) state, this process can vary according to the nature of the research. The analysis of the research undertaken in Gwangju was also based on these core processes, but it has adapted them according to the specific data collected in this particular study. The framework used in this thesis for analysing data and the detailed approach it follows are found in table 4.1.

Table 1.1 Framework for analysing data (adapted from Creswell 2007: 156)

Data management	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Create data files for each case study according to the nature and theme of collected data.
Reading and taking notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Read through materials such as document resources and transcriptions or notes of interviews.• Identify key themes, arguments, and statements of each material for further classification.
Classification	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Create categories according to the above reading and taking notes process.
Interpretation	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Produce arguments from each category.• Develop further arguments from all the categories.

For example, when analysing data from interviews with local residents in Gwangju, the data were categorised into ‘Awareness of the Hub City of Asian Culture project’, ‘Gwangju and 5·18’⁸ and ‘Desirable image of Gwangju’ since they were frequently mentioned subjects of their answers. The ‘Awareness of the Hub City of Asian Culture project’ category had sub-categories of ‘Level of interest’, ‘Participation’ and ‘Expectation’. The category of ‘Gwangju and 5·18’ had sub-categories of ‘Current perception of 5·18’, ‘Meaning of 5·18 to residents in Gwangju’ and ‘5·18 within changing social, political, and economic circumstances in Gwangju’. The ‘Desirable image of Gwangju’ category also had sub-categories of ‘Image of 5·18 and the Hub City of Asian Culture project’, ‘Negative vs. positive of 5·18’ and ‘Negative vs. positive of the Hub City of Asian Culture’. These subcategories were developed in order to arrange their opinions according to their attitudes toward critical debates and conflicts. Table 4.2 shows an example of data analysis for interviews. As described above the

⁸ ‘5·18’ means the 5·18 Gwangju Democratisation Movement in 1980, which is one of the most well-known images of Gwangju. The Hub City of Asian Culture project is being developed on the main heritage site of this movement. Further details are discussed in Chapter 4.

research has classified the resources according the themes and they have been used to establish arguments.

Table 1.2 Example of data analysis

	Awareness of the Hub City of Asian Culture project		
	Level of interest	Participation	Expectation
Interviewee A	Not very interested	Not at all	High for city's new image
Interviewee B	Somewhat interested	Not so far, but would like to	Good for city's revitalisation (old city centre area)

5. Structure of the thesis

The thesis is composed of six chapters, including the introduction and conclusion.

Chapter 2 - Urban development using culture

This chapter reviews and discusses the various typologies for the use of culture for urban development purposes, with a focus on the ways in which culture has been used in projects designed to regenerate or create a city brand, as part of a larger urban strategy. This thesis argues that the two main typologies of cultural planning in evidence in the case of Gwangju are those of culture-led regeneration and culture-led urban branding because in this city the rationales behind the developments have been focused on revitalising the declining old city centre and developing a new image for the future of the city. By exploring literatures on culture-led urban regeneration and culture-led urban branding, the thesis identifies that there are four main characteristics that should be used in order to analyse the case of the Hub City of

Asian Culture project; the advantages of long-term planning, efforts to change perceptions, pursuit of economic impacts, and engagement of local communities. These characteristics are used as a frame to analyse the main case study of the Hub City of Asian Culture project in Gwangju. The nature of these general characteristics of culture-led urban development is first discussed in relation to a particular example in Chapter 3, through discussion of the Quayside cultural developments in Newcastle-Gateshead.

Chapter 3 - Cultural developments on the Quayside, Newcastle-Gateshead:

background, process, and changes to the area

This chapter examines the Quayside cultural developments in Newcastle-Gateshead, presenting it as an extended discussion of the issues outlined in the previous chapter. There are two main reasons for studying Newcastle-Gateshead. The first one is the richness of accessible data. Since Newcastle-Gateshead has been widely discussed as a successful example of using culture for urban regeneration, there are a lot of resources to analyse that are reliable for academic research. The second and more important reason for this study, is that Newcastle-Gateshead was one of the benchmark examples for the Hub City of Asian Culture project in Gwangju, which means that the Quayside cultural developments in Newcastle-Gateshead and the Hub City of Asian Culture project in Gwangju have common aspects in the backgrounds to the developments, processes of its delivery, and the impacts that were and are sought. Because of these, the local government of Gwangju investigated the case of Newcastle-Gateshead for the purposes of applying it to the city of Gwangju's urban

renewal. This thesis will analyse how Gwangju adopted and applied the Quayside example.

The four main characteristics of culture-led urban development identified in Chapter 2 are further discussed in Chapter 3. The Quayside cultural developments have been conducted as part of a long-term transformation process for Newcastle-Gateshead. As a result of regeneration, these developments brought initial economic benefits, mainly through tourism industries and, as a result of city branding, they have affected the external and internal perception of the place to produce an image of a culturally rich place in contrast to previous dominant images which constructed Newcastle-Gateshead as an old declining industrial city.

However, analysis of these developments and their impact reveals that the initial, measureable effects of the developments - in terms of economic benefit, for instance – may not be sustained over the longer term. For example, tourism to Newcastle-Gateshead has not increased after architectural completion of the key Quayside cultural developments, and the evidence showing a clear relationship between increased tourism and the Quayside cultural developments is problematic, as we shall see. In addition, the analysis shows that in relation to changed external perceptions, it has become more important to find a balance between the previous image of the city's industrial history and the new cultural identity than to replace the former completely with the latter, since local people are still proud of their industrial history and identity.

Chapter 4 - The Hub City of Asian Culture project and the Asia Culture Complex:

background and initial development process

The Hub City of Asian Culture project is discussed in this chapter through the lens of the main characteristics for culture-led urban development identified in Chapter 2 and Chapter 3. The research concludes that this project has been driven not only by economic purposes, but also with the intention to change external perceptions of the city. In particular, the thesis focuses on the challenges that the project has encountered so far during the development process, which have been a result of elements of the unique local context, such as the 5·18 Democratisation Movement. Chapter 5 discusses these challenges in detail.

Chapter 5 - The Hub City of Asian Culture project and the Asia Culture Complex

development: bringing a new image and initial changes to Gwangju

Although the Hub City of Asian Culture project, which began in 2004, is still under development (due to be completed in 2015), it has had an impact on the development of a new image of the city, and has led to the enrichment of its cultural environments. However, regarding this new image for Gwangju, the thesis further investigates the complex, changing attitudes of local communities towards its old and new images. The thesis finds that the challenges for the Gwangju developments are most particularly a product of its unique circumstances; that is, strong identification with the 5·18 Democratisation Movement and the significant decline of the old city centre. As the Asian Culture Centre, the main facility of the Hub City of Asian Culture project, is being developed in the old city centre at the heart of the 5·18 heritage site, every stage of the entire project has been fraught. These tensions have centred on conflicts between

those in favour of preservation of buildings and representations, and those who want to pursue economic benefits through constructing new facilities.

The analysis finds that, even though this outstanding cultural investment, the largest in Korea, initially brought great excitement and attention to the city, the focus of the project is now on maintaining the waning interest and changed attitudes of local communities through better communication with local residents.

Chapter 6 - Conclusion

This thesis, through the study of the Hub City of Asian Culture project in Gwangju, investigates the relationship between cultural development and urban strategy. It establishes a framework for analysis through discussion of the culture-led regeneration and cultural urban branding literatures and by studying the case of the Newcastle-Gateshead Quayside cultural developments. The four main characteristics identified: the advantages of long-term planning, efforts to change perceptions, pursuit of economic impact, and engagement of local communities in using culture for urban purposes of regeneration and branding, are applied to the case of the Hub City of Asian Culture project. The thesis, through the lens of the arguments and practices described above, finds that the Hub City of Asian Culture project shows a significant change of strategy between the first and second phase of the project development process, a phenomenon established in chapters 2 and 3 as common to such capital focused culture-led urban regeneration projects. However, the thesis also shows that the second phase in Gwangju is different from that of Western context, or perhaps more importantly, *any* other context due to its unique local history and economic situation. The thesis argues that the initial investment in the future facing symbolism

of the capital builds has given way to a focus on maintaining local residents' interest in and attitudes towards the project. This research, as a result of the findings drawn from the study of the Hub City of Asian Culture, ultimately widens and deepens our knowledge of how Western-developed theories and practices of culture-led regeneration and culture-led urban branding have been adopted and applied in an Asian city, with different circumstances.

Chapter 2

Urban development using culture

1. Introduction

This chapter explores and discusses the various typologies for the use of culture for urban purposes, with a focus on the ways in which culture has been adopted in projects to regenerate or create a brand for a city as part of a larger urban strategy. Therefore, it closely examines discussions of culture-led regeneration and culture-led urban branding – discussions which have become the rationales behind the cultural developments in Gwangju, where cultural projects aim to revitalise its declining old city centre and create a new image for the future of the city. This chapter, through exploring the discussions on those two typologies in cultural planning that have been developed primarily in European and American contexts, establishes a framework for the thesis that can be applied to the Asian case of Gwangju in order to identify how the typologies have been adopted and implemented. In particular, this chapter identifies the four main characteristics in culture-led regeneration and culture-led urban branding in order to analyse the Hub City of Asian Culture project in Gwangju: (1) the advantages of long-term planning; (2) efforts to change perceptions; (3) pursuit of economic impact; and (4) the engagement of local communities. This chapter initially explores the overall discussions about the two typologies of culture-led regeneration and culture-led urban branding, and the main characteristics are derived from this process considering their relevance to the backgrounds, processes and anticipated changes from the Hub City of Asian Culture project.

This chapter is divided into two main parts. The first half explores the discussions about culture-led regeneration, and the second half examines those discussions about culture-led urban branding. The beginning of the first section investigates the backgrounds and process of adopting culture within the urban regeneration context, and it also critically discusses whether previous examples can be adopted by other cities without further consideration. While it has been argued that cultural institutions have been used in order to address social concerns (Bianchini 1994), through this chapter this argument is questioned, and it is further argued that the discussions and arguments on this subject need further investigation, rather than uncritical advocacy.

Following on from this, the chapter is concerned with local communities and culture-led regeneration. It is argued in this section that local communities are an important issue in culture-led regeneration projects, given that the development of such projects can be particularly effective in addressing challenging issues such as gentrification, by involving local communities.

The second half of this chapter explores the discussions about the definition, purpose and process of culture-led urban branding, culture-led urban branding and tourism, and considers culture-led urban branding and local communities. Before discussing culture-led urban branding further, the chapter first investigates urban branding. In this discussion, culture-led urban branding is understood to fall within a context of urban branding strategy as a new approach; why culture has emerged as a strategy for urban rebranding is discussed. Interestingly, the background to culture's emergence in urban branding as a new approach to address globally challenging situations, such as unpredictable economic situations or declining industrial urban environments, has

similarities with the background to combining culture and urban regeneration (Bianchini 1994; Zukin 1995). Following these discussions, the strategies and issues for culture-led urban branding are explored. In particular, the importance of long-term planning is raised and reviewed as the main argument, since this point has been discussed significantly in both urban branding studies and culture and urban regeneration discussions.

The relation between culture-led urban branding and local tourism is discussed next. This discussion is based on the assumption that increasing tourism is one of the most frequently mentioned goals in the culture-led urban branding of cities (Richards and Palmer 2010). It can be identified that culture-led urban branding makes a contribution to increasing urban tourism industries, but, on the other hand, the argument that there exists a direct cause and effect between culture-led urban branding and financial benefit to the tourism industry is questionable. This aspect can be closely related to the critical discussion that in urban regeneration projects conducted through cultural institutions there is a tendency to follow previous regeneration examples, a tendency which does not provide any concrete evidence for the successful delivery of the project.

Finally, local communities within culture-led urban branding are also discussed. Like the discussions of regeneration and local communities, there are many arguments that engaging with local communities is significant in successfully and sustainably branding cities (Houghton and Stevens 2010; Insch 2011; Richards and Palmer 2010).

Particularly given that it has encompassed an important portion of the stakeholders in the culture-led urban branding process, obtaining a general consensus from local

communities is discussed as a significant aspect which is raised and identified again during the main case study of Gwangju.

2. Culture-led urban regeneration

2.1. Overview of developing cultural institutions for urban regeneration

Many examples of the use of cultural institutions for urban regeneration have been observed in the UK and in other places around the world over the last few decades. Franco Bianchini (1994), one of the first academics to discuss this subject, argues that cultural policy became more important in economic and physical regeneration strategies in many European countries during the 1970s and 1980s, and that culture has been placed strongly on the urban development agenda in Western Europe. In addition to this early argument, made in the 1990s, there have also been more recent indications of interest in culture and urban regeneration. Lisanne Gibson and Deborah Stevenson (2004: 1), after reviewing two years of newspaper articles in the USA, Australia, Canada and the UK, argued that there was a trend of “just add culture and stir”. They argue that over the previous two decades it had been one of the key local governance strategies to provide cultural resources for successful urban development. Beatriz Garcia (2004) also argued that for the last 30 years a great deal of effort had been put into using cultural projects for urban regeneration. She argued that cities in the USA developed this arts-led regeneration in the 1970s and early 1980s, and European cities such as Glasgow, Barcelona and Bilbao followed this strategy (*ibid.*: 312).

Along with those academics, government has also taken an interest in culture and regeneration. In its publication *Culture at the Heart of Regeneration*, the UK government's Department of Culture, Media and Sport (2004) argued that culture could be used for urban regeneration projects. Through discussing many examples in the UK, this report maintained that culture-led regeneration can bring a sense of place, community development and economic benefits to a region (*ibid.*). The same argument can also be observed as a major discussion in many other countries throughout the world. For example, in Korea, culture-led regeneration has been discussed as one of the most recent trends in the cultural arena (Korea Culture Tourism Institute (KCTI) 2011). The KCTI argues that many local authorities that face urban decline or sense the necessity of urban renewal are currently considering building cultural facilities for this purpose.

While this phenomenon epitomises the current trend for using cultural institutions and programmes for urban regeneration, it needs further investigation to understand the backgrounds, processes and impact of adopting culture for urban regeneration projects. Without investigating these aspects, this trend can be seen as simply following previous examples, which cannot guarantee the success of regeneration projects because of the unique circumstances of each city. In addition, although the final results, which, because they generally involve iconic architecture or mega events, attract attention from the media or public, it is also important to look carefully into the background and process of the development. This is because the final architecture or event is not a simply a ready-made product, but the result of many different aspects,

including policy and strategy, financial support, local communities, and design and construction.

For an effective discussion, it is necessary to define first what the thesis means by “urban regeneration through cultural institutions”. Graeme Evans and Phyllida Shaw (2004: 5) define three models of culture’s contribution to urban regeneration: culture-led regeneration, cultural regeneration, and culture *and* regeneration. In culture-led regeneration, culture is the engine or catalyst for regeneration. In this model, iconic architecture or cultural/artistic programmes are used for the regeneration project (*ibid.*). Cultural regeneration is a more holistic approach, in which culture is more engaged with the regenerated area’s policy and planning strategies (*ibid.*). However, by contrast, culture *and* regeneration, the third model, is an approach from a micro-point-of-view, one which uses cultural activity, such as artistic programmes, for regenerating a certain part of a city.

In addition to the above definitions, Jonathan Vickery (2007: 20) adds another model: artist-led regeneration. This model includes the emergence of artists and their studios or galleries, which make a certain place more desirable for some people. As Vickery (*ibid.*) argues, this model can belong to any of the above three definitions, since it is defined by what or who leads the regeneration project, rather than how or at what level culture is engaged with in the regeneration project. Andy Pratt also offers different dimensions for interpreting culture and regeneration together. He states that there are two dimensions to culture within regeneration: the first one concerns the construction of high cultural facilities to make cities more ‘attractive’ or ‘well-known’, and the second one concerns the ‘experience economy’, which is created by visitors

through place-based experiences (Pratt 2009: 1042). Pratt's dimensions are slightly different from Evans and Shaw's or Vickery's in that he is concerned about the effects that follow the regeneration project as well as the process of regeneration itself.

Although the above definitions provide various interpretations and viewpoints regarding culture and urban regeneration, this thesis focuses on examples where urban regeneration is the goal of building a high profile cultural facility. Therefore, urban regeneration through cultural institutions in this thesis primarily means culture-led regeneration, using Evans and Shaw's (2004) definition of this category. In addition, in this discussion, 'cultural institutions' refers to all kinds of cultural facilities, including museums, galleries, art centres, performing arts centres, music centres and research institutes.

2.2. Background and process of urban regeneration through cultural institutions:

why and how cultural institutions are used for urban regeneration

In relation to the background of combining culture and regeneration, Bianchini argues that it is the result of social, political and economic change in Western Europe. He argues that the crisis of mass production in the mass market strategy of industrialised countries became damaged by technological developments that made other industrialising countries take part in the production process (Bianchini 1994: 1-2). This change made many cities in Europe whose economies relied on heavy industrial sectors and mass consumer industries, experience various social and economic challenges, such as unemployment and polarisation of the labour market (*ibid.*: 13-14).

Bianchini argues that cultural policies were adopted by many cities to address these issues. Similar arguments have been made by Sharon Zukin (1995). She argues that, although culture has had a function in cities, over the last few decades of the twentieth century the movement to a service-oriented economy has given culture a role in urban development; this has changed the understanding of culture from just art and heritage to an economic asset, such as a symbolic institution attracting new businesses and professionals (Zukin 1995).

The above arguments indicate that culture has been introduced into urban policies for economic or social purposes rather than cultural ones. Since culture has been approached as having instrumental utility in this context, the anticipated impact of bringing cultural institutions and programmes into a regeneration project has often focused on economic effects. This subject is discussed later, in sections 3.4 and 3.5 of this chapter, where it is addressed by considering several questions, such as whether culture really works for the economy and what aspects are discussed as economic effects.

In line with this discussion, Colin Mercer suggests an interpretation of culture's role within the phenomenon of globalisation and the new economy. Mercer (2006: 1) argues that the "cultural turn" which positions and markets cities and towns through culture, is a response of cities to major forces of globalisation and the new economy, in which technology or creativity are key words. He argues that these two forces, especially the new economy, have affected the nature and structure of cities and have led to a re-evaluation of urban assets, through which culture has emerged as an important asset. Pratt (2009) also discusses social and economic change in the late

twentieth century as a background to the emergence of culture in urban development. He argues that a shift of economic base from manufacturing to service activities brought unemployment in those industries and a transfer of labour to the service sectors. This situation caused a change in society and its built environment in terms of the use of industrial spaces and buildings due to the loss of their original purposes, a loss which became the focus of regeneration projects. Pratt (*ibid.*) argues that culture was the latest theme of this regeneration.

Bianchini, Zukin and Pratt all see the change in social and economic environment in the late twentieth century as a background to the combination of culture and urban development. In summary, it is their argument that in Europe the industrial shift from mass manufacturing to service sectors created changes in the economy of the city, especially in relation to the labour market and disused industrial spaces. In this situation, facilitating cultural projects has emerged as a method of urban regeneration. However, while indicating this global phenomenon of mixing culture and urban regeneration, Gibson and Stevenson (2004) pose a few questions for further discussion. What they suggest is that there is a lack of robust research on the effect of culture within urban regeneration (*ibid.*). Although culture-led urban redevelopment has become a global trend, there is a lack of research on what evidence can be provided to justify investment in cultural institutions and programmes. This question is related to Bianchini's early discussion of a lack of comparative research on culture within urban development (Bianchini 1994), which shows that this issue has been a long-term concern. He indicates the lack of research as a concern in interpreting the phenomenon of the mixture of culture and urban development. Indeed, at an early

stage, there was scepticism about bringing culture to urban contexts with an expectation of addressing economic issues.

Bianchini (*ibid.*: 14) introduces David Harvey's argument that using cultural projects would be only a "carnival mask" for politicians, with a purpose of concealing social problems such as social inequality or polarisation and conflict. Jim McGuigan (1996) also has a critical view of urban regeneration strategies with flagship projects that target tourists and a group of people that can be categorised as middle-class. He suspects whether this 'civic boosterism' as part of an instrumental approach can really work to address the kinds of social issues faced by post-industrial cities. As discussed above, it has been consistently questioned whether culture is a useful way for implementing socially inclusive urban development. In relation to the above discussions on the utilisation of culture, there are other arguments concerning culture and local identity which provide a different approach to understanding the role of culture.

Christopher Bailey, Steven Miles and Peter Stark (2004) argue that the (long-term) impact – more specifically economic impact – of culture-led regeneration is uncertain, and that currently it relies on assumptions rather than concrete evidence. Steven Miles and Ronan Paddison (2005) also pose a question about what evidence or information cities use to decide on cultural investment. Due to its uncertainty, Bailey, Miles and Stark (2004) provide another framework to understand the effects of culture-led regeneration rather than just an economic perspective; this framework, they argue, is the contribution of culture-led regeneration to collective identity. They argue that successful culture-led regeneration revitalises identity, and also people's

sense of place. They maintain that culture-led regeneration can provide a framework within which local people can re-establish ownership of their own sense of place and space (*ibid.*: 49). More importantly, they argue that a sense of history can also be re-established through culture-led regeneration. In this context, they emphasise the importance of research about culture-led regeneration based on long-term social, geographical and historical perspectives. Indeed, this point, of the establishment of sense of place and history, has been advocated as being one of the many positive effects of regeneration projects such as those in Newcastle-Gateshead, which is discussed further in Chapter 3. In addition, the enhancement of local identity is also found in the aims and goals of the Hub City of Asian Culture project in Gwangju, which is the main case study for the thesis.

As discussed above, many concerns have been raised and discussed in relation to the evidence of culture's economic contribution to urban regeneration. However, what is interesting in this discussion of the evidence is that governments still advocate for culture's involvement within urban regeneration, in spite of all the questions discussed above. The British government has stood at the forefront of advocating the positive role of arts and culture to the public. The Department of Culture, Media and Sport in the UK published a report called *Culture at the Heart of Regeneration* in 2004, setting out an argument for the positive role of culture in regeneration. This publication, which is based on research that Evans and Shaw conducted in 2004, maintains that culture makes a positive contribution to many aspects of urban regeneration projects. Evans and Shaw (2004) suggest a list of factors which can provide evidence of culture's role in social regeneration, some of key factors are:

- A change in residents' perception of the place where they live.
- Greater individual confidence and aspirations.
- An increase in volunteering.
- Increased organisational capacity at local level.
- A change in the image or reputation of a place or group of people.
- Stronger public-private-voluntary sector partnership. (*ibid.*: 28)

Their list points to the effects of culture on local society and people, involving what kinds of changes can be obtained via culture.

The Arts Council of Great Britain's (1989) early report *An Urban Renaissance* also discusses the positives of art and culture's role in urban regeneration. This report argues, through sixteen case studies, that arts projects gave cities the benefits of attracting people to the area, and provided a catalyst of regeneration, community pride and individual confidence (*ibid.*: 5-7). These arguments about the positive effects of culture-led regeneration can be understood within what we might think of as the general goal of urban regeneration, which is to increase the quality of life in towns and cities.

The European Commission (2005) also maintains that culture has been useful in preventing and reducing poverty and social exclusion. Social inclusion, it maintains, can be increased through

Building skills and self-confidence, enriching self-esteem and identity, overcoming cultural diversity and discrimination, creating employment opportunities,

increasing access to information and services, and promoting social integration.

(*ibid.*: 1-2)

In the report, the European Commission discusses case studies in eight countries in Europe, specifically Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, Spain, Sweden and the UK, which show the positive role of cultural projects in addressing social issues. For example, Germany's Social City programme has been a combination of programmes of social protection, health care and participation in local cultural projects; also, local history groups in Denmark have provided opportunities for elderly people to find their role in society; and in Italy, projects in libraries have increased access to the Internet for disadvantaged groups (*ibid.*: 2). Although this report does not directly discuss regeneration, it can be interpreted as supporting the role of culture in addressing social issues, explaining why cultural institutions and programmes have been adopted for regeneration projects.

What we need to look at carefully in such reports and research about culture and regeneration is that they are also discussing effects that go beyond economics.

Economic contribution is one effect discussed within them, as well as other aspects such as providing a sense of place and delivering community benefits (DCMS 2004).

Along with physical and economic changes in the cities, such as changed urban landscape, new developments, employment opportunities and improved housing conditions, urban regeneration has also aimed to bring social benefits to the cities (*ibid.*). By providing new facilities for employment and culture, urban regeneration has tried to address the social problems of run-down urban areas such as unemployment and a lack of confidence (*ibid.*).

Clive Gray's (Gray 2002) theory that an attachment strategy is a characteristic of contemporary cultural policy provides a perspective on this phenomenon. He argues that the arts and culture have been attached to other policies with social and economic objectives in order to contribute to achieving goals in other sectors. This means that the arts and culture have been considered not for their own sake, but for other policy objectives. Gray (2007: 206) argues that due to weak political interest and lack of power within the arts and cultural sector, particularly among local governments in the UK, this sector has been utilised and attached to other policy purposes, such as economic growth, social cohesion and community empowerment. Although these goals, which co-opt arts and culture into other sectors, still need to provide convincing evidence of their roles, this indication of attachment is important since it allows various perspectives for interpreting culture's role in urban regeneration, especially the impacts on people and communities.

In addition to the issues of the role of culture in urban regeneration and the matter of evidence of culture's contribution, there is another frequently discussed matter affecting a city that arose following other successful examples in culture-led urban regeneration. As described at the beginning of this thesis, the research began by observing the case of the Guggenheim Bilbao Museum and the phenomenon of how other cities, including non-European cities, adopted this example in their own cases. The next section critically discusses this phenomenon.

2.3. The trend of adopting previous ‘successful’ examples and how they can be defined as ‘successful’

This section explores another important question that needs to be confronted when considering culture-led regeneration projects; the section also provides critical discussions on the tendency to follow ‘successful’ examples of culture-led regeneration projects and raises the question of what is a successful example; more specifically, how or whether we can define success in culture-led regeneration projects. The indication of simply replicating previous examples is interesting, since this pattern is quite against the trends of other research findings, which show that culture-led regeneration needs to consider various circumstances of each city. Bianchini (1994: 1) argues that general approaches to the use of cultural institutions and programmes within urban regeneration should be approached carefully, since the definition of culture and financial status, and the relationship between the public and private sectors, greatly differs in each location and context. Malcolm Miles (2005: 890) also warns of the pitfalls by querying to what extent successful policies or strategies in a region can guarantee success in a different region. For example, Miles (*ibid.*) cites John Myerscough (1988), who argues that Ipswich could not achieve the same result as Glasgow with cultural investment, since it lacks a cultural infrastructure. The main consideration here is that this argument stresses that the particular situation of Glasgow is different from that of Ipswich. This concern becomes more detailed in museums, a specific kind of cultural institution. For example, James Bradburne (2001: 76) argues that although a “high-profile new museum building” has been a part of urban development strategy since the 1960s, not every example can be described as

successful. He states that, after initial public notice and a large number of visitors in the few years following the opening of any museum, the visitor numbers then decrease; more importantly, such developments leave museums with challenging issues, such as high maintenance costs. This point is important, since if concerns are raised about a museum's finances this can affect other operations, including management, staff, opening hours and quality or quantity of exhibitions.

Robert Janes (2009: 110-111) also argues that there is a danger of expectation with so-called 'Bilbao Effect' – of enhancing awareness, attracting international tourists and boosting the local economy (explored in Chapter 1). He and Beatriz Plaza (2006), a Spanish economist, separately argue that the Guggenheim Bilbao project was part of the much larger economic redevelopment strategy of the region, including a new subway system, a sea port, an industrial park and a new drainage and water system (*ibid.*: 110). Both Janes and Plaza argue that the Guggenheim Bilbao development and regeneration of the city need to be understood within the particular environment of the region. This argument echoes that of Miles (2005), who emphasises the need to take into account the unique situation of the city while developing cultural regeneration projects. Miles (*ibid.*: 890) criticises the attitude of paying too much attention to successful examples without considering other, non-successful ones. His argument supports the opinion that it is not easy to provide an overall solution for every city's cultural development, because of the complexity of culture and related projects. From a slightly different perspective, Janes (2009: 110-111) also indicates that expectations of tourism in museum developments lie behind the trend to try to replicate previous successful examples; he has concerns about relying on cultural

tourism, mainly from international tourists, for the success of museum developments, since this industry is not consistent, and is subject to other factors such as global economic status.

The reason why planners and city authorities are inspired by previous examples, in spite of many warnings about the potential dangers of doing so, is that they see it as a way to secure success for a regeneration project (Miles 2005). Since they hope to make their culture-led urban regeneration projects successful, they tend to study other successful examples and adapt them. However, questions can be raised here: what is a successful culture-led regeneration project? How can we define 'success' in cultural developments? For example, regarding museums, it could be assumed through Bradburne (2001) and Janes (2009) that visitor numbers is regarded as one of the determining factors in the successful performance of a museum. This seems somewhat natural, since if a certain museum attracts many visitors it might mean that many people think that the museum is valuable in terms of their time and effort, which can further be interpreted to mean that the museum is successful in its management. In addition, visitor statistics are clear and easy to compare with other museums. However, it is not fair to judge the success of museums which are located in small cities only by visitor numbers, since the size of the market audience is smaller than that of some substantially larger museums – such as, for instance, many national museums. In addition, quantitative data are not the only way to evaluate a museum's performance, since museums now develop various programmes for communication and engagement with their audience, which have become one of the most important museum functions and are not the subject of quantitative judgement. As Stephen Weil

(2007) and Richard Sandell (2003) argue, more museums today are looking to their audiences and communities for their purpose, and they are no longer measured by their internal possessions, such as collections, but by external consideration of the benefit they provide to individuals and societies.

In a similar context, there are different types of impact measurements in culture-led regeneration which provide a standard for the judgement of success. Evans and Shaw (2004: 5) state that there is both 'good' and 'bad' practice in culture-led regeneration, according to whether the regeneration achieves its aim or secures community ownership. Evans and Shaw (*ibid.*) suggest two different criteria: reaching the target, and securing community ownership. The first means audience numbers, profiles or income generated, which can all be measured quantitatively; the second is not so easy to quantify. Evans and Shaw (*ibid.*) further discuss types of impact measurement, and they suggest three types, which are summarised below.

- **Environmental (physical):** land values and occupancy, design quality, quality of life such as air/water pollution, noise, liveability, open space, diversity, sustainable development.
- **Economic:** jobs (such as employment rates), income/expenditure, cost benefit analysis, contingent valuation such as willingness to pay for free activities of parks, museums, libraries, inward investment and leverage, distributive effect.
- **Social:** cohesion, inclusion, capacity, health and well-being, identity, participation. (*ibid.*: 6)

Among the three types, only the economic type can be presented as purely quantitative data, while the other types need a qualitative or mixed approach. As the

above types show, there are various aspects in evaluating whether a project is successful or not.

In addition to considering the complexity of the above measurement methods, it also can be inferred that the measurement of the success of culture-led regeneration will be challenging, since every project in each city has different environmental, economic and social statuses. This point is connected to the discussions on the danger of following previous examples (Bianchini 1994; Bradburne 2001; Janes 2009; Miles 2005): both have a common recognition that each project is developed in a unique environment. In fact, when Evans and Shaw (2004) investigated evidence of culture's contribution to regeneration, they applied different types of measurements to each project according to its unique social, economic and cultural environment. For example, Acme Studios in London was evaluated from a physical environmental perspective because of the impact of its re-use of a redundant building; an economic point of view was more predominant in Hi8us for Film and Video, due to the fact that it provided professional training and employment opportunities; and a social standard was mainly applied to the Arts in the Heart of Health in Hull, as this project aimed to enhance well-being and social cohesion (*ibid.*: 33). As these examples show, the different situations of each project need to be examined to best assess their aims and impact.

As discussed in this section, paying too much attention to other examples in order to guarantee success in culture-led regeneration projects is problematic, since this contains a risk of overlooking each project's own circumstances. Furthermore, even the criteria governing how to define success are specific to each project. The

awareness of this risk is useful when applying these discussions to the Gwangju case due to its unique social, economic and political backgrounds in the Hub City of Asian Culture project.

The next section investigates culture-led regeneration and local communities, which is one of the factors defining success noted in discussions of culture-led regeneration.

2.4. Urban regeneration through cultural institutions and local communities

The relationship between local communities and urban regeneration through cultural institutions, discussed in this section, begins with the question: who are the beneficiaries of regeneration? Miles and Paddison (2005: 834) pose a question, asking: “what do such developments actually mean in terms of the lives of those people who live in the city?” This is an attempt to discover what kinds of changes have taken place in local areas and in the communities who inhabit them through the introduction of new cultural institutions and/or programming.

For an effective discussion, it is necessary to define the meaning of local communities before exploring the term, since it can be interpreted variously according to the context. As British museologist Elizabeth Crooke (2007) indicates, community is a very complex concept, which can mean different things in different circumstances. This definition starts by accepting Gaynor Kavanagh’s (1990: 68) statement that an important part of community is “the sense of belonging that comes to those who are part of it”. More specifically, it can be defined as a mixture of three perspectives: demographic/socio-economic factors; identities (national, regional, local or relating to

sexuality, age and gender); and location (Crooke 2007). Among these three perspectives, the definition of local community used in this thesis is more likely to be based on location, meaning the people who live in a geographically proximate region, with a shared sense of place. However, since 'community' is still complex within this definition, it is supported by the other two perspectives. These are useful in categorising local communities into other groups, such as social/economic backgrounds, social class or ethnicity. These demographic/socio-economic and identity focused definitions of community are useful in developing the methodology for case study, especially when designing interviews in the region as the location and economic status informed the frame used to select interviewees.⁹

Bianchini (1994), discussing the issues and prospects related to culture and urban regeneration, argues that there are concerns about effects of gentrification on the segregation of communities. He argues that the opportunities for suburban residents and low-income citizens to enjoy a city centre's cultural developments are not properly taken into account during urban regeneration. Janet Ruiz (2004), in her report *A Literature Review of the Evidence Base for Culture, the Arts and Sport Policy*, also states that low-income groups, young people with low educational backgrounds and ethnic minority groups show less participation in cultural activities because of lack of time and economic availability, and there is often an under-representation of diversity in such programmes. Socially and economically excluded groups of people do not participate in a city's cultural consumption activities in high levels, resulting in the intensification of conflicts between citizens (*ibid.*; Bianchini 1994: 201).

⁹ See the discussion on methodology, particularly about how to select interviewees, in Chapter 1.

During the 1970s, western European countries and northern American countries showed new residential patterns in the central business districts (CBDs) of old cities (Zukin 1987: 129). Local authorities aimed to affect the phenomenon of urban decline through revitalising their city cores. For this purpose, they made huge investments in housing and cultural facilities in city centres. Currently, this phenomenon can be seen not only in western countries but also in many Asian countries, including Korea. The benefits of gentrification are less discussed than its negative effects since a great deal of academic research into this subject has focused on social issues, such as conflict and social justice (Atkinson 2002: 14). The positive effects of gentrification mainly concern physical changes. Physical and architectural renewal, increased property values and local service improvement have been discussed as some of the benefits of gentrification (*ibid.*). Urban landscapes transformed via physical renewal mark the most obvious changes made through gentrification. Brand new residential buildings and high-profile cultural facilities can play a role in changing the urban façade and external perceptions of it. Such changes also bring an increase in property values, which are a benefit for property owners. At the same time, it has been argued that better quality local services and shops are available through gentrification. However, the question still remains whether all these positive effects can be applied to all the residents in city centres: in particular, whether all inner city residents can afford housing with increased property value, and whether all of the communities can access improved services. Discussions about the negative effects of gentrification mainly concern the residents who have been living in the area that undergoes gentrification. Diverse social and ethnic groups often have different interests and patterns of consumption from those that gentrifiers want to bring, therefore it is challenging for

developers to respect and to preserve existing buildings and people's life styles (Zukin 1987: 133-135). Zukin (*ibid.*: 135) argues that a number of studies about gentrification confirm that a fairly homogeneous group of 'in-movers' reduces residential density and replaces an existing population. Rowland Atkinson (2003) develops this discussion in terms of displacement and social conflicts. He (*ibid.*: 2343) argues that, "While the visual improvements associated with such rehabilitation may be welcomed, the process has led to less perceptible population displacement and internalised social conflicts over the ownership of local space". Atkinson (*ibid.* 2002: 2-12) conducted research assessing the gentrification of neighbourhoods by reviewing wide-ranging evidence such as reports and studies, and found that the research evidence absolutely showed that gentrification has a negative impact on neighbourhoods. According to him, the two biggest effects are displacement and social conflict (*ibid.*: 7). Referring to works by Legates and Hartman (1986) and Lyons (1996), Atkinson maintains that "the majority of studies of gentrification identified displacement as a significant problem" (*ibid.*: 7-9), and that gentrification brings displacement of poor white and non-white people, the elderly, women and blue collar (working class) groups. For example, Anne Simor (1988) argues that Frankfurt's redeveloped Museum Quarter created gentrification of the local area and caused the displacement of local residents due to increased land values, rents and the cost of living.

Concerns about social or community conflict can also be understood in a similar context, since it is about a displacement of people who have lost their place to live. The change of environments and the change of people in the area bring community conflicts in gentrified areas. Gary Bridge (2006) also stresses the point that cultural

development in the city has to consider various aspects of its own neighbourhoods' circumstances. Bridge (*ibid.*: 727-728) argues that "this is not simply one of maximising some objective cultural resource across the neighbourhoods of the city. The valorisation of one set of tastes in economic, symbolic and social terms results in the displacement of other tastes ('working-class' or 'ethnic')". As discussed above, the negative effects are related to the replacement of local groups, especially of lower economic or ethnic minority groups, and social conflicts arising from this situation.

In order to address these issues, Bianchini (1994) argues for the necessity of neighbourhood-based arts facilities. His argument is supported by the two cases of Hamburg and Bologna. Jurgen Friedrichs and Jens S. Dangschat (1994) state that Hamburg developed a system of neighbourhood cultural centres that offer various programmes, including concerts and language sessions, for many people in the city. Jude Bloomfield (1994) maintains that Bologna's 'Youth Programme' of youth centres for local young people provides various services, including training, and that the centres have contributed to social cohesion in the city. The UK government has also considered the relationship between urban regeneration and local communities. The DCMS's report *Culture at the Heart of Regeneration* (2004) states that local consultation and participation with urban regeneration is critical. It maintains that

[s]uccessful regeneration programmes rely on the participation, enthusiasm and voice of local people, but it can sometimes be difficult to engage groups and individuals in the community who often see regeneration as irrelevant to them and not something in which they have a legitimate role. (*ibid.*: 35)

This statement asserts both the importance of engagement with local communities and the difficulties in working on this issue through working 'with' communities and not applying it 'to' communities (*ibid.*). The statement from the UK government concerning culture-led regeneration projects in the UK, stressing local community engagement, is useful to investigate how the the Hub City of Asian Culture project in Gwangju delivery needs to be.

The discussions above lead to the conclusion that urban regeneration through cultural institutions can have negative effects particularly in terms of the displacement of some communities (Bianchini 1994; Evans and Shaw 2004). Highlighting this concern is important, since it raises a fundamental question: who receives the benefits of regeneration projects? It is also related to the discussions in section 3.5, which critically explore the economic effects of culture in relation to who obtains the economic benefits of regeneration. The strategy of taking local communities into account in urban regeneration has emerged from these concerns. Bianchini (1994), Zukin (1987), the DCMS (2004), Ruiz (2004) and Evans and Shaw (2004) stress the importance of community involvement during the regeneration process in order to address social issues. This conclusion is critically reviewed and applied to the main case study for this thesis, Gwangju. Although the city of Gwangju has been aware of the importance of involving local communities in the regeneration project, challenges still arose when developing and implementing the Hub City of Asian Culture project. The adaptation to these new challenges and opportunities emerging from the process is discussed in chapters 5 and 6.

3. Culture-led urban branding

3.1. Urban branding: definition, purpose and process

This section, which establishes the second framework for the thesis, discusses the phenomenon of culture-led urban branding. It is necessary to define what culture-led urban branding means before further discussion of the topic, since it is composed of three different concepts – culture, urban and branding – which means it is an interdisciplinary and complex term, and can be used and interpreted widely. Since culture-led urban branding is understood under the wider concept of urban branding, it is desirable to discuss urban branding prior to culture-led urban branding.

Discussions about urban branding have been mainly conducted in urban studies and marketing disciplines, and from different perspectives and focuses. For example, Andrea Insch (2011) approaches urban branding from the idea of creating a better place to live; Alan Middleton (2011) discusses urban branding from the point of view of attracting external investment; and Gert-Jan Hospers (2011) focuses on enhancing tourism. In this section, the meaning of urban branding, its background and its purpose in the thesis are discussed.

Mihalis Kavaratzis and Gregory Ashworth (2005) provide a general overview of urban branding through introducing the process of place recognition. Kavaratzis and Ashworth (2005) argue that people generally make sense of place or construct place in their minds through three processes. The first is through planned interventions, such as planning and urban design; the second is through the way in which people use specific places; and the third is through various forms of representations, such as films, novels and paintings (*ibid.*: 507). Kavaratzis and Ashworth (2005) argue that it is

generally acknowledged that people encounter places through perceptions and images, and therefore perceptions and images are critical for the mental process of cognition. Although their arguments might not offer a complete analysis of the process of recognising a place, the first two processes are interesting since they involve physical urban environments. Kavaratzis and Ashworth find an importance of branding in these discussions, since branding works especially well with such mental processes. Urban branding works on creating perception and images of the cities and this provides an understanding of why urban branding is adopted by local authorities and planners, who aim to create new perceptions.

While the above argument provides a general overview of urban branding, there are other arguments that provide a more practical background and purpose to the concept of urban branding. Isle Helbrecht (1994: 528) argues that city marketing can bring “a new level of quality within the local development policy in terms of comprehensiveness, creativity and flexibility” and “in this way city marketing enables a strategic approach to public planning in collaboration with the private sector”.

Recently there have also been similar arguments and, interestingly, it can be observed that ‘branding’ has been used instead of ‘marketing’. This change provides an understanding of the urban branding process, establishing a relationship between the brand (city) and consumer (residents), which is discussed later in this section. For example, Kavaratzis (2004) and Alberto Vanolo (2008) maintain that city branding can be understood as a way to achieve a competitive advantage in order to increase investment and tourism. They (Kavaratzis 2004; Vanolo 2008) argue that in order to construct positive images and attract tourism and investment, city branding has been

adopted as an effective method. The working group on “Brand Management and City Attractiveness” at Eurocities (2010) also states that, since cities are competing globally to attract people, investors and business, they need to be positioned on the global map of attractive cities. Therefore, the group argues, a city branding strategy is necessary to increase competitiveness, generate jobs, bring inhabitants, visitors and events, and instil pride in the city among residents (*ibid.*: 3). In relation to this global competition, Dinnie (2011) and Insch (2011) argue that cities have adopted the concept of brand strategy from the commercial sector for the purpose of urban development, regeneration and quality of life.

The above arguments have in common the assertion of the practical purposes of urban branding: enhancing urban image and increasing tourism and investment. City branding research thus covers the two disciplines of marketing and urban studies. In particular, Eiji Torisu (2006: 339) argues that cities that have an industrial image widely share the opinion that reconstruction of their image is the starting point of urban renaissance. Newcastle-Gateshead, discussed in Chapter 3, and Gwangju, the main case study in this thesis, have both adopted this strategy. This argument can be discussed together with that of John Houghton and Andrew Stevens (2010), who argue that urban branding is one of the ways to create new identity, which can be interpreted in a similar context to the Eurocities’ argument on urban branding’s role in increasing pride in local residents (Eurocities 2010). However, for this to work they also emphasise the need for a shared vision among local communities, which is related to the significance of involving them during the branding process. This is explored later, in section 3.5.

In terms of detailed strategies and processes, Kavaratzis (2004: 61) argues that city marketing combines general marketing strategy and four additional aspects: design; infrastructure; basic services; and attractions. Kavaratzis (*ibid.*) explains that design refers to marketing a place as having a character; infrastructure means a fixed environment; basic services refer to a service provider; and attractions refer to entertainment and recreation. These strategies are implemented through various types of activities, including advertising and promotion, large-scale physical development, public art, mega-events and cultural regeneration (*ibid.*). However, regarding developing the above strategies, Kavaratzis (*ibid.*: 65) poses a question: in what ways is a city a brand, or can a city be seen as a brand? This is worth exploring further, since traditional branding engages with a product, not a city, and is related to interpreting the use of brand instead of marketing (which was explored previously). While cities have adopted traditional marketing strategies for their promotion, Kavaratzis (*ibid.*) argues that there have been some limitations in implementing such strategies, since city marketing differs from traditional product marketing.

To find an answer, it is useful to investigate the definition of brand. Kavaratzis (*ibid.*: 65) quotes Hankinson and Cowking's definition of brand; according to them (Hankinson and Cowking 1993: 10), a brand is "a product or service made distinctive by its positioning relative to the competition and by its personality, which comprises a unique combination of functional attributes and symbolic values". Hankinson and Cowking (1993) also argue that it is essential for successful branding to establish a relationship between the brand and the consumer; that is, one which connects the brand's functional attributes and symbolic values to the consumer's physical and

psychological needs. Their arguments can be applied to cities, since, like brands, cities also need to satisfy the functional, symbolic and emotional needs of the citizens (Rainisto 2003). In this context, branding provides a good start, and is useful in marketing the city and its image. There are other scholars who indicate similarities between city marketing and branding, especially corporate branding (Ashworth 2001; Ave 1994; Dematteis 1994; Kotler, Asplund, Rein and Heider 1999). Both marketing and branding need to address multiple stakeholders; both have complexity and social responsibility; and both have to work with various identities. Kavaratiz and Ashworth (2005) argue that, since corporate branding brands a whole organisation rather than a single product, this approach could be applied to city branding.

Cities have adopted urban branding from branding techniques used in the marketing sector in order to compete for tourism, investment and people (Eurocities 2010; Kavaratiz 2004; Vanolo 2008). The use of cultural programmes and institutions within urban branding is worth observing carefully, since, like urban regeneration through culture, using cultural institutions and programmes in urban branding has become a global trend. The next section further discusses this combination of culture and urban branding.

3.2. Why urban branding through culture?

In 1983, the local government of Glasgow, Scotland, launched a campaign called “Glasgow’s Miles Better” to change the perceptions of the city. During the 1970s, Glasgow experienced decline in its main industries, such as steel making, ship building

and engineering, and lost about 20% of the population during this period (Glasgow Council 2012; Alderson 2012). The “Glasgow’s Miles Better” campaign involved improving the physical infrastructure of the city, including building a new retail centre and housing (Local Government Improvement and Development 2012). In particular, they opened new cultural resources, including the Burrell Art Collection and the Scottish Exhibition and Conference Centre. The campaign went further, and resulted in the hosting of a series of outstanding events: the National Garden Festival in 1988; the European City of Culture in 1990; and the British City of Architecture in 1999. This campaign has widely been regarded as a successful city promotion, garnering world-wide recognition that has changed the negative image of Glasgow and promoted civic pride (Alderson 2012; Local Government Improvement and Development 2012). In addition, this campaign has been regarded as one of the first strategies of using culture for urban purposes on such a city wide scale in the UK (*ibid.*). The “Glasgow’s Miles Better” campaign is a good example for showing how culture can contribute to the changing of perceptions of a city, and this section further explores this phenomenon of adopting culture in order to brand cities.

Interestingly, this phenomenon is happening not only in Glasgow but also in many other cities around the world. For example, in Asia, Singapore and Hong Kong have adopted a cultural strategy attached to urban branding. Singapore began its urban strategy, entitled “Renaissance City”, over ten years ago, and it is currently in its third stage. This strategy involved developing the National Gallery of Art and refurbishing Victoria Theatre and Concert Hall. Hong Kong is currently creating the largest cultural district in the world, in its West Kowloon area. While Singapore and Hong Kong have

been regarded as hubs of business and trade in the Asian region, the above phenomena show the cities' strong interest in culture-led urban branding. Another example is the European Capital of Culture (ECC), an annual competition which operates on the basis of a competitive bidding process. In 2003, when there was competition for the ECC 2008 in the UK, many cities competed for the title, with Liverpool eventually triumphing; according to Greg Richards and Robert Palmer (2010: 35), the ten candidate cities were estimated to have spent more than £1 million preparing their bids. The phenomena discussed above, however, raise questions: why culture? Why do cities adopt culture for urban branding? Against what backgrounds and for what purposes has it happened, and what do cities expect from culture-led urban branding?

In order to investigate this phenomenon, it is useful to analyse the background of how culture has been merged into the urban branding context in order to understand the nature and issues of culture-led urban branding. Ole Jensen (2007: 212) has looked at culture's new role in urban branding, and argues that, as experience and culture gain more importance for international tourism, cities have become more engaged in cultural concepts and programming. Richards and Palmer (2010: 2) argue that cultural assets and resources have been used to create economic, social and cultural prosperity in a globally challenging environment in which the economic situation is no longer predictable. They argue that, in these circumstances, cities adopt strategies to exploit their own resources, such as histories and spaces; to affect this shift, cultural events have been created and promoted. Particularly, it has been argued that cities whose images are based on their industrial past, such as Glasgow, Rotterdam and

Liverpool, have tried to enhance their cultural image through the European Capital of Culture competition, which can bring “modernity, cosmopolitanism and contemporary creation” (Richards and Palmer 2010: 375). This can be interpreted together with Torisu’s argument that urban branding has been particularly adopted by cities which used to have an industrial image. Torisu (2006) provides more practical reasons, which can be understood in a similar context to the above arguments, explaining that there are two reasons why culture has been merged into the urban branding strategy. The first is for tourism. Torisu (*ibid.*) argues that there is an expectation of increasing tourism and job opportunities following the use of culture in a city’s branding. According to Torisu, this is particularly the case in former industrial cities which have lost many jobs due to a changing economic environment. Interestingly, this argument has similarities with that of the culture-led regeneration discussion, which was explored in section 2 of this chapter; especially, increased tourism and creating job opportunities have the same impacts that city authorities have tried to achieve through urban regeneration with culture.

However, some evidence shows that, even though culture can play a role in increasing urban tourism, the economic benefit, especially the direct relationship between tourism and culture, needs to be critically investigated (mruk 2008; Tourism UK and Lowland Market Research 2007). This is further discussed later, in section 3.4. In addition, the employment opportunities also need to be discussed not only in terms of the number of jobs, but also the nature and sustainability of opportunities (Bianchini 1994). Torisu’s second reason is the enhancement of the city’s image and attractiveness. This argument assumes that the cultural image has a positive role in

attracting people, a fact which has been widely perceived by many city planners and authorities (Eurocities 2010). In particular, this assumption plays a central role in Gwangju's urban strategy of using culture to replace its previous image. The thesis examines how this driver has affected programming in the city later, in chapters 5 and 6. In this section, the strategy of concentrating urban branding on cultural elements is discussed, examining further evidence and the relation between culture and urban branding.

As discussed above, culture-led urban branding is a strategic combination of culture and urban branding, used in order to address the challenging situations that cities have encountered. In this combination, the merger process between urban branding and culture echoes the emergence of culture within urban regeneration strategies. Culture and urban regeneration discussions have shown that culture emerged as a new agenda for urban strategies. In urban regeneration, as discussed in section 2, and in urban branding, culture has been adopted as a way to address challenging situations, one of whose main concerns is economics. This can also be found in the case study of Gwangju, presented in this thesis, which aims to create economic revitalisation through a new cultural image. With an understanding of this background, the next section investigates the detailed strategy of urban branding with culture.

3.3. Discussions on the strategies for culture-led urban branding: long-term planning

The 2003 European Capital of Culture, Graz, has been generally recognised as successfully branded since over 2.7 million people have been attracted to this small Austrian city (Richards and Palmer 2010). However, Richards and Palmer (*ibid.*) introduce this city as an example of a project that has not been successful in maintaining the impact of the European Capital of Culture title. They argue that this is the case because new cultural facilities which were constructed for the European Capital of Culture 2003 were not used properly after 2003 (*ibid.*). Richards and Palmer (*ibid.*) argue that not every successful event is sustainable. Even if this is just an example of one event – the European Capital of Culture – their argument is worth exploring further, since many cities adopt one-off, special events such as the European Capital of Culture or the Olympics, to brand themselves. Therefore, this section discusses the sustainability of culture-led urban branding.

In order to achieve successful culture-led urban branding, the necessity of long-term strategies has been discussed by people such as Richards and Palmer (2010) and Dinnie (2011). In a similar context, local authorities in Newcastle-Gateshead argue that their cultural strategies are based on long-term efforts. It has been argued that their long-term attempt to bring culture into the area, such as the National Garden Festival in 1990 and Visual Arts UK in 1996, is one of the most important reasons for the city's claimed successful regeneration (NGI 2009a; *ibid.* 2009b).

This argument is interesting because Newcastle-Gateshead also exhibits a similar feature. Before the iconic cultural developments on the Quayside, there had been a lot

of cultural events and programmes in the region, which contributed to increasing the cultural profile of Newcastle-Gateshead. The investigation of the Newcastle-Gateshead example supports the argument that cultural developments are better understood within the wider context of the region's long-term plan of urban transformation. Dinnie (2011) also emphasises the importance of sustainability in city branding by arguing that long-term commitment, rather than a series of short-term ventures, is important to produce a sustainable effect from city branding. Sicco van Gelder (2011: 37) further maintains that the development and implementation of city branding is a process that requires the long-term commitment to the involved key areas of tourism, the private sector, government policy, culture and education and people. This is challenging, since they have all different interests, and for this reason long-term commitment is necessary to produce a shared vision and precede a successful branding strategy.

This section has explored the long-term planning approach to culture-led urban branding. Returning to the beginning of this section, Palmer, Richards and Dodd (2011) argue that for most cities which have hosted the European Capital of Culture the economic benefit of the tourism generated has been short-term. They state that the most successful cities in developing tourism continuously are those that have tried to maintain their marketing and event development beyond the European Capital of Culture event. Although Newcastle-Gateshead did not host a European Capital of Culture nevertheless the branding strategies put in place for their Capital of Culture bid have been sustained over the longer term. This has primarily been driven by the NewcastleGateshead Initiative (NGI), a local-destination marketing agency which was

established by both local governments of Newcastle and Gateshead. Although they failed in the bidding process for the European Capital of Culture 2008, the NGI decided to continue the promotion and development of cultural programmes because they did not want to lose the positive effects that they had obtained during the bidding process (Carol Bell, Head of Culture, NGI interview, 26.05.10; NGI 2009a; NGI 2009b). The benefits of this longer term strategic approach to marketing for the sustainability of the effects of the culture-led regeneration in Newcastle and Gateshead will be discussed in the next chapter.

3.4. Culture-led urban branding and tourism

This section discusses tourism, which is one of the most frequently mentioned sources for the potential economic impact of culture-led urban branding (DCMS 2004). As culture-led urban branding is focused on culture within the branding context, cultural tourism, rather than the overall tourism field, is primarily discussed. However, while defining cultural tourism and discussing its economic effects, the more general nature of tourism is also discussed.

For this discussion, the meaning of cultural tourism needs to be defined. Robert McIntosh and Charles Goelander (1986) define cultural tourism as “all aspects of travel, whereby travellers learn about the history and heritage of others or about their contemporary ways of life or thought”. Bridget Beattie McCarthy (1992: 2) defines cultural tourism as “the phenomenon of people travelling for the sake of experiencing either another culture or the cultural attractions of a particular place”. While this

latter definition still covers the whole concept of culture, it has become more specific by mentioning “cultural attractions”. More recent definitions of cultural tourism, by the European Association for Tourism and Leisure Education (ATLAS), are detailed as follows (Richards 2005: 24).

- **Conceptual definition:** the movement of persons to cultural attractions away from their normal place of residence, with the intention to gather new information and experiences to satisfy their cultural needs.
- **Technical definition:** all movements of persons to specific cultural attractions, such as heritage sites, artistic and cultural manifestations, arts and drama outside their normal place of residence.

As the above definitions indicate, cultural tourism is a combination of two different concepts: culture and tourism. In the definition of cultural tourism, ‘culture’ defines the nature of people’s experience, which is shown in McIntosh and Goeldner’s (1986) definition, and ‘tourism’ provides a category in which the activities can be included according to an industrial perspective, which is shown in the ATLAS (Richards 2005) definition, which has a more practical viewpoint. In this thesis, cultural tourism is taken to mean all the activities of people who travel for cultural attractions, which includes heritage. However, what is important in this definition is the understanding of cultural tourism as being a combination of the two different concepts, i.e. culture and tourism. The notion of industrial aspects of tourism in the definition is useful in interpreting the economic impact of cultural tourism, which is discussed later in this section.

Richards and Wilson (2005) argue that culture is increasingly being used as a method of social and economic development, which means that cultural tourism is also affected by many new attractions, such as museums or heritage centres. They argue that “the production of culture” has been used by city authorities for urban development strategies, and that the strategies of iconic structures, mega-events, thematisation and heritage mining have been adopted for the purpose of attracting tourism (*ibid.*: 1210). Writing from the viewpoint of cultural tourism, they indicate that providing more cultural attractions means more opportunities for tourists. Indeed, the DCMS (2004) considers increased visitor spending to be an important part of culture’s contribution to regeneration, which can bring other economic effects such as creating employment or new business opportunities. This advocacy from the government is illustrated in the example of Newcastle-Gateshead, where the NGI (2009a; 2009b) maintains that the cultural developments on the Quayside have brought increases in tourism, discussed further in the next chapter.

This section has briefly explored the effect of cultural tourism. Although the Gwangju case is not available to measure this type of effect, since the project is still on the way to completion in 2023, this chapter has discussed this project in order to identify economic impact through tourism as one of the significant common drivers for such developments. The next section discusses another aspect of culture-led urban branding: engagement of local communities. It investigates why local communities are significant for culture-led urban branding, and what their roles are. This discussion provides a useful framework to understand the Hub City of Asian Culture project, in particular in relation to the serious conflicts between the central government and local

residents in which communication with local residents has been a challenge for that development.

3.5. Culture-led urban branding and local communities: the role of local communities and why they matter

Tourism effects, which were discussed in section 3.4, are related to the image of a city as seen by people outside the city. Since peoples perceptions are one of the factors influencing tourists' destination decisions (Leidner 2004), the image that a city has among those outside it can have significance in tourism and branding strategies. However, there arises a question in this discussion in relation to the city's perception among residents of a city. What is the role and effect of the domestic perception of local communities in culture-led urban branding? Since the image or perception of a city can be interpreted from two distinct perspectives, external and internal, this question is necessary in order to understand culture-led urban branding in a holistic way. In addition, both perceptions, from inside and outside, may not always show similar aspects. Therefore, what local communities think about culture-led urban branding and what their roles are in the culture-led urban branding strategy are discussed further on in this section.

There have been many discussions on the issues of local communities and culture-led urban branding or urban branding. Kavaratzis (2004) argues that urban branding is for achieving community development and reinforcing local identity, and Insch (2011: 12) argues that "the effectiveness of city brands depends on the support and commitment

of local constituents – residents, local business operators and community groups”.

She argues that, since residents are the “lifeblood” of the community, they should be involved in determining the city’s long-term direction, including its cultural direction (*ibid.*). Therefore, it is a good starting point to create a shared vision for the city’s future. Lee, a Professor at the Graduate School of Culture at Chonnam National University (interview, 07.03.11), makes a similar point. He stresses the importance of the process of gaining a shared vision among local communities in the Hub City of Asian Culture project in Gwangju. Insch and Lee share the opinion that local communities are an important consideration in developing urban branding strategies, since all the projects of the city are ultimately for the benefit of their residents.

Houghton and Stevens (2011) even argue that the main reason for the failure of city branding is the absence of a programme for engaging local people. They argue that it is crucial in any branding strategy to generate and support a sense of ownership among local people.

These arguments can be understood in two related ways. Firstly, the engagement of local communities is regarded as a way of making the branding process more effective. The branding process will encounter trouble if there is a significant gap between the local authority’s vision and local communities’ needs. In particular, Lee (interview, 07.03.11) emphasises that the support and cooperation of local communities is essential when local authorities develop detailed programmes of events for branding purposes, since the success of these programmes is fundamentally effected by the participation of local communities. Secondly, the importance of the local community can be understood in the context of the ultimate outcome of city branding (Insch

2011). This argument is based on the fundamental goal of city authorities. Insch (*ibid.*) argues that it is a basic responsibility of the city to enhance the quality of its residents' everyday lives, such as providing housing, healthcare and education. In this context, urban branding, which aims to change the perception of the city and attract external visitors and investment, can also be interpreted as a way of providing a better environment for its residents. Therefore, it is essential for the city branding process to take account of local communities, and residents' satisfaction is an important element in city branding.

The wider discussion has tried to understand the situation from the viewpoint that local communities are stakeholders. Gelder (2011) argues that creating constructive relationships among stakeholders is important for successful city branding. Gelder (*ibid.*) argues that no single stakeholder alone has the ability to develop and implement an urban brand strategy, owing to its complexity and the fact that each city component has a different role in this process. This means proper partnerships among them are required, and, in this context, local community's involvement is essential. Houghton and Stevens (2011) also argue that stakeholder engagement is critical in city branding, and that local communities should naturally be regarded as key stakeholders. After investigating the literature on city branding, they (Houghton and Stevens 2011: 46) argue that the most effective city branding involves employing a wide range of local players to carry the message about the place. Therefore, they suggest, stakeholders, including local residents, need to be engaged at each stage of the urban branding process, which can enhance the quality of branding discussion and bring new opinions, idea and perspectives (*ibid.*). To achieve this, Houghton and Stevens (*ibid.*)

stress the importance of engaging local communities widely from the beginning of the branding process. Their arguments can be interpreted together with the discussion of a shared vision for city branding, since the engagement of various local groups, such as taxi drivers, from the beginning of the branding process is useful to obtain a shared vision of the direction of branding.

Cities, especially those perceived to be in need of an image change, have adopted urban branding strategies which are particularly focused on cultural projects, and, in this process, local communities are argued to be an important element of successful branding because without this involvement the long-term sustainability of the change is at risk. Richards and Palmer (2010) have also discussed the role of local communities in developing cultural events from the context of stakeholder analysis. They argue that this analysis can be useful in creating and developing event programmes that different groups are involved in. In support of this, Richards and Palmer (2010: 148) quote Schmeer (1994: 4), who states that “Stakeholder analysis is a process of systematically gathering and analysing qualitative information to determine whose interests should be taken into account when developing and/or implementing a policy or program”. This is a good starting point for discussions on local communities, since culture-led urban branding (through events or any other programmes) also involves different groups with various interests. In the context of events, the stakeholders include the local authority, visitors or participants, sponsors, volunteers, local industries and local communities (Richards and Palmer 2010: 149). Richards and Palmer argue that local communities are one of the key stakeholders in event programmes. In their argument, they (*ibid.*: 165) define local communities as “a combination of individual local

residents and other who inhabit, work in and otherwise have a commitment to the local area". Richards and Palmer (2010: 164) further argue that local communities are not simply observers of events or programmes, but are, rather, "active participant[s]" in the process. They also argue, therefore, that it is important to gain local residents' support for event programmes. All the above discussions maintain that the management of stakeholders is important in urban branding in order to achieve long-term sustainability.

Although it is argued that local communities are critical to cultural events or programmes, in practice it is not easy to achieve this goal. This is mainly due to the complexity of local communities' composition. For example, even though it is possible to increase the participation of certain local groups in order to develop a programme which is relevant to them, this can equally lead to the exclusion of other groups. This is a concern that Richards and Palmer (2010) and Willems-Braun (1994) highlight.

Richards and Palmer (2010) argue that participation needs to be managed carefully, since giving local ownership or pride through a programme to a certain local group can exclude other groups. Willems-Braun (*ibid.*) also argues that in many cases participation is limited to certain groups, and that it is a challenge for event organisers to overcome this situation and include many groups into the programme. This challenge is explored further and in more detail in Chapter 3, since it has been discussed as important for the future of the region by the NGI, BALTIC and Gateshead local governments (BALTIC 2010; Gateshead Strategic Partnership 2005a; *ibid.* 2005b; NGI 2010).

There is also another challenge to overcome arising from tension among local communities: differing attitudes towards the branding itself. Houghton and Stevens (2011) state that not all stakeholders are positive about or comfortable with branding. Some may be hesitant, and some may have a negative view toward the creation of a new city brand. To support their argument, Houghton and Stevens (2011) introduce the example of Middlesbrough in the UK. Middlesbrough has suffered from its poor national reputation as a place to live: for instance, the British television show *Location Location Location* rated it the worst place to live in the country. Because of this reputation, the town has developed a strategy, focused in part on the Middlesbrough Institute of Modern Art (MIMA), which asserts that Middlesbrough was a attractive creative hub with a dynamic computer gaming sector (*ibid.*: 51). However, this strategy encountered opposition from local people, including some politicians, since it is was seen as elitist, and did not represent what the town actually is. There was also significant concern that the benefits of such a strategy would go to people coming from outside the region (Houghton and Stevens 2011). The opposition of local people to the nature of the brand created is also an active factor in the challenges experienced by the cultural development project in Gwangju. Other development projects have also experienced this challenge, especially those development projects based on large redevelopments or very big events, such as the Olympics. As Torisu (2006) argues, the local public can object to huge international cultural or sports events if they think they need too much investment or if they are of tangential benefit for the local public. Palmer, Richards and Dodd (2011) also identify negative local public responses to European Capital of Culture bids. Even though there are significant

potential positive impacts for cities for culture-led urban rebranding there is also the possibility that local people can reject the impacts associated with such change.

In the case of Gwangju the thesis will discuss the ways in which the harmony between the previous image and the new image, which has become a significant issue. The thesis will argue that the case of Gwangju shows that in order for such culture-led urban branding strategies to be embraced by the local population, and therefore sustainable, it is necessary to produce harmony with previous or existing perceptions.

In Gwangju the local communities of the city have a strong sense of identity and are proud of their previous image, although some show a strong feeling of welcome and expectation toward a new more culturally focused city brand. More explicitly, Gwangju is known as the birth place of democracy in Korea, and many citizens are proud of this image, while many other citizens desire a new, cultural image for the city (Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2007). How to deal with these previous and future perceptions of the region in the successful delivery of a new cultural brand will be a fundamental factor in the development's long term success. In order to obtain harmony with previous perceptions of a city, is it more effective to introduce a new cultural brand through a steady and long-term strategy rather than to introduce it rapidly? This is investigated further through the example of Newcastle-Gateshead in Chapter 3.

As discussed in this section, local communities are an important part of the successful delivery of the cultural brand of a city. In particular, as they are important stakeholders, it has been argued that it is necessary to involve local people in the branding process (Eurocities 2010; Houghton and Stevens 2011; Richards and Palmer

2010). This argument is based on the shared understanding that the involvement of various local groups is fundamental to the construction and maintenance of a successful city brand because of its contribution to creating a shared vision for branding. It provides a useful framework to investigate the reasons behind this, and the ways in which the various conflicts and debates surrounding the Hub City of Asian Culture project development, such as debates over the architectural design and preservation methods for the heritage buildings, can be addressed.

4. Conclusion

This chapter has reviewed and explored two typologies of cultural planning – culture-led regeneration and culture-led urban branding – which the thesis argues are the key rationales behind the case of Gwangju's Hub City of Asian Culture project. This chapter, along with the next, which examines these typologies in application via the example of Newcastle-Gateshead's Quayside developments, establishes an academic framework for the thesis. The framework created in these chapters, developed from European and North American contexts, is then applied to the case of Gwangju.

The first half of the chapter has discussed culture and urban regeneration: the backgrounds and process of adopting culture within the urban regeneration context, as well as local communities and culture-led regeneration. Through this chapter, the promotion of culture within the urban regeneration context in order to address challenging urban situations, such as declining industrial status, has been discussed. While this phenomenon is widespread across the world, it has been argued that the

effects of culture-led regeneration need to be critically investigated, and the adoption of this strategy needs to be considered in the specific context of a city's individual circumstances. In addition, local communities have been considered an important factor in the success of a development, since they are at the centre of the debate about who receives the benefits of culture-led regeneration projects. The second half of the chapter discussed the background to culture's emergence in urban branding strategies, long-term planning, culture-led urban branding and tourism, and culture-led urban branding and local communities. Discussing the issues and arguments regarding culture-led urban branding is significant in understanding culture's involvement in urban strategies, since it is deeply related to changing or enhancing the perception of cities, promoting tourism industries and, overall, increasing the competitiveness of cities; these are all desired outcomes that many city planners and authorities are attempting to achieve through the development of new cultural institutions or the hosting of large scale cultural events.

The next chapter further investigates this phenomenon of the role of culture in the urban development context through the example of Newcastle-Gateshead, and examines how culture has been embedded into this urban strategy and what roles it plays. The chapter will complete the process of establishing the academic framework for the thesis that is applied to the main case study of Gwangju in chapters 4 and 5. Through this process, the thesis applies these Western-developed rationales to the Asian case, and examines how they have been adopted and implemented. In this process, the four characteristics can be summarised: the advantages of long-term planning; efforts to change perceptions; pursuit of economic impacts; and the

engagement of local communities, and how these could be applied. By identifying emerging challenges and opportunities in the everyday project delivery process, the thesis ultimately aims to provide guidelines for creating the strategies and implementing them in other Asian cities.

Chapter 3

Cultural developments on the Quayside, Newcastle-Gateshead: background, process, and changes to the area

1. Introduction

This chapter examines cultural developments on the Quayside of Newcastle-Gateshead, presenting it as a grounded discussion of the arguments outlined in the previous chapter. Chapter 2 explored the literature on using culture for urban strategies, and this chapter further examines this subject in a concrete and applied way through the example of Newcastle-Gateshead. Since the thesis aims to investigate how the arguments on culture-led regeneration and cultural urban branding which have been developed in European and North American circumstances have been adopted and implemented in an Asian context, this chapter contributes to the whole discussion of the thesis by showing how the arguments have been applied and implemented in a specific Western context. The academic framework for this thesis is then given more practical application by thinking through the theoretical framework in a particular context, thus enabling a more grounded understanding of the phenomenon of using culture for urban strategies.

There are two main reasons for studying Newcastle-Gateshead. The first one is the richness of accessible data. Since Newcastle-Gateshead has been widely discussed as a successful example of using culture for urban regeneration, there are a lot of reliable resources to analyse for the purposes of academic research. The second reason is that Newcastle-Gateshead was one of the benchmark examples driving the development of

the Hub City of Asian Culture project in Gwangju (Kim *et al.* 2008; Jeong, interview, 02.03.11). This means that Gwangju examined the case of Newcastle-Gateshead in order to translate it for its own purposes, which enables us to observe how Gwangju has adopted the Newcastle-Gateshead example. Both cities experienced economic decline in their respective city centres, and adopted culture as a strategy to combat this situation; in both cases government was the driving force behind the transformation process.

In terms of the structure of the thesis, close analysis of the Newcastle-Gateshead example provides further understanding of how the main discussion set out in Chapter 2 has been adopted and implemented in practice. Therefore, this analysis leads to the establishment of a more concrete framework that can be transferred to the investigation of the Gwangju case study.

Newcastle-Gateshead has attracted a lot of attention over the last ten or so years, ever since it established cultural developments on the Quayside. During the last decade, over £200m has been invested both in the new-build and redevelopment of a world-class cultural capital infrastructure in the area (NGI 2009a: 2); a total investment of £35.1m was also made between 2005 and 2010 through Culture10, a series of cultural programmes and events (*ibid.*: 13). The Angel of the North was named the UK's most recognisable landmark in a survey by Travelodge in May 2008, and the Sage Gateshead has been named one of the ten best buildings of the last 100 years in England in *The Rough Guide to England* (*ibid.*: 32). In addition, Newcastle was voted "Best City in the North" by *The Daily Telegraph* readers in April 2007, and Newcastle-Gateshead was rated favourite English city break from 2002 to 2005 in *The*

Guardian/Observer Travel Awards (ibid.: 32). Newcastle-Gateshead Quayside was also named as a finalist in the “Great Place” award by the Academy of Urbanism (*ibid.*).

These accolades often stretch beyond the UK to Europe and the world. Newcastle was ranked as one of the best places to live in Europe in August 2007, and was ranked third in terms of quality of life according to a Gallup poll carried out on behalf of the European Commission (*ibid.*). Newcastle-Gateshead was also considered one of the top eight of the world’s cultural centres by *Newsweek*, and North East England was recommended as a must-see destination in the new edition of *The Lonely Planet* Bluelist 2008 (*ibid.*).

Tourism in the Newcastle and Gateshead area has also increased since the Quayside developments, and is worth £1.2bn in 2009 (*ibid.*: 8). It has been claimed by the local councils of both Newcastle and Gateshead that cultural regeneration has had a huge impact on Newcastle and Gateshead over the last 10 years, in terms of the growth of the local economy, education, tourism etc. (*ibid.*: 3). For example, Mick Henry, the leader of Gateshead Council, maintained in an interview that “all the people over the world are coming to visit Gateshead-Newcastle and it’s a great place to be” (NGI 2009b: 3). John Shipley, the previous leader of Newcastle City Council, also noted that “culture has been significant for the redevelopment of Newcastle and Gateshead and it has now some greatest cultural venues in Europe” (*ibid.*).

Clearly, Newcastle and Gateshead have attracted attention due to their outstanding cultural developments, which are used by local councils to brand and market these locations. However, have these cultural developments on the Quayside, which are widely believed to have changed the image of Newcastle-Gateshead, also changed

people's lives? This is not a simple question, which can be answered "yes" or "no", but a rather difficult one that needs more investigation and analysis. As many of the above-cited comments and accolades are coming from outside the region, there might be particular concern about whether they have fully considered the impact of the cultural developments on the region, especially on local communities. It is necessary to investigate internal and external impacts together in order to further understand these changes in Newcastle and Gateshead.

This investigation also forms the structure of the Gwangju case study set out in chapters 5 and 6. Although the Hub City of Asian Culture project has drawn great attention nationally in Korea, and although there have been many advocates of its prospects for playing both cultural and economic roles in the city's development, further and more thorough studies need to be conducted in order to investigate how the project has been delivered, and what changes have been observed in the city. This is because the implementation has involved processes that differ from the initial expectations of central government and the media. This consideration of Newcastle-Gateshead provides a framework for investigating the Gwangju case study.

This chapter explores, in the case of Newcastle-Gateshead, the four main characteristics identified and discussed in Chapter 2 in relation to culture-led regeneration and culture-led urban branding: advantages of long-term planning; efforts to change perceptions; pursuit of economic benefits; and engagement of local communities. It discusses the ways in which the Quayside cultural developments have been conducted as part of a long-term transformation process for Newcastle-Gateshead. As a result of regeneration and rebranding, these developments have

brought initial economic benefits, mainly through tourism industries; and, as a result of city branding, they have changed external perceptions of Newcastle-Gateshead from an old, declining industrial city to a culturally rich place. However, through further analysis of these developments and their impact, the chapter argues that the initial, measureable effects of the developments – in terms of economic benefit, for instance – might not be sustainable over the longer term. For example, tourism to Newcastle-Gateshead has not consistently increased from 2005 to 2009 since the architectural completion of the Quayside developments. Furthermore, the evidence showing a clear relationship between increased tourism and the Quayside cultural developments is problematic, because the developments comprise only one of many factors governing tourist attractiveness, and there has not been a single dominant reason for attracting visitors to the region. In addition, based on research findings such as Bluegrass Thinking Research (2010) and Tourism UK and Lowland Market Research (2007) this chapter argues that, in relation to changed external perceptions, it has become more important to find a balance between the previous image of the city's industrial history and the new cultural identity than it is to replace the former completely with the latter, since local people are still proud of their history and historical identity.

The same analytical framework is applied to the Gwangju case study. Efforts to change perceptions can be recognised in the Hub City of Asian Culture project development, by which the local residents hope to have new image for the future of the city. In addition, engagement of local communities would also be examined during the process of creating a new cultural image, in which the previous strong local identity of

5·18 and the new cultural image collide. Thus, the thesis establishes the core structure for analysis of the Gwangju case study, from identifying key discussions in culture-led regeneration and cultural rebranding to applying them to the example of Newcastle-Gateshead.

2. Cultural developments on the Quayside

2.1. Newcastle and Gateshead in the 20th century

The City of Newcastle and the Metropolitan Borough of Gateshead are located in the North East of England. The River Tyne is the crossing point between those two local councils' areas. Tyne and Wear, where the City of Newcastle and the Borough of Gateshead are located, is the hub of the North East of England in terms not only of population but also of economy.



Figure 3.1 Map of North East England (One North East 2008b)

In 2013 Tyne and Wear had the largest population of all the seven unitary authorities in North East England, standing at 1.1 million people (Office for National Statistics 2014), with over 40% of the population residing in Newcastle and Gateshead (*ibid.*). However, in terms of understanding population data, the recent population trends of the North East as a whole need to be interpreted together, since they show the whole status of the region, which still has a lower population density than it did three decades ago. In 2013 the population of Newcastle was 286,821, while Gateshead was smaller, with a population of 199,998 (TWRI 2009; Office for National Statistics 2014). Although the population of Newcastle has slightly increased from the previous year, it is only 0.95% more than the figure reported for 1981 (TWRI 2009; Office for National Statistics 2014). Gateshead's population has also slightly increased, but is still 6.3% less than that of 1981 (TWRI 2009; Office for National Statistics 2014).

There are three main issues regarding population trends of Newcastle and Gateshead: natural change, internal migration and international migration. Since 2002, Newcastle and Gateshead have shown increases in natural change, but nevertheless have been losing population because of negative internal migration, i.e. people leaving to live elsewhere. For example, negative internal migration in Newcastle has increased from 1,440 in 2002 to 1,600 in 2008, and Gateshead has also shown negative migration during the same period (TWRI 2009). However, instead of internal migration from other parts of the UK, the two areas have been gaining populations from international migration, mainly composed of people from China and India. Indians and Chinese have been the main international migrant groups in Newcastle; Indians, Chinese and Polish have been the main groups in Gateshead (*ibid.*). Yet, although Newcastle and

Gateshead have gained people through international immigration, their ethnic minority populations are still around or below the English average. In 2011 Newcastle had a 14.7% ethnic minority population; Gateshead had a 4.0% ethnic minority population (Office for National Statistics 2012). The English national average was 14.0% (*ibid.*).

In terms of economy, the North East, including Newcastle and Gateshead, performs poorly both in terms of gross value added (GVA) per head and unemployment rate. Its GVA per head was £15,177 in 2006, which was the third lowest of twelve regions in the UK after Northern Ireland and Wales (NERIP 2008: 12), and its 6.5% unemployment rate in 2007 was the third highest in the UK (*ibid.*: 58). It has also one of the highest levels of deprivation of all English regions (*ibid.*: 168). High levels of deprivation and economic inactivity are big challenges for Newcastle and Gateshead. The 2011 census also revealed a similar result. The North East's 8% unemployment rate was the highest of all English regions, higher than the English national average of 6% (Office for National Statistics 2012).

It is important to review a couple of centuries of history to better understand the current status of Newcastle and Gateshead. Even though in recent decades it has experienced a falling population and declining economy, the Tyne and Wear region, including Newcastle and Gateshead, used to enjoy prosperity as a centre of coal mining, shipbuilding and heavy industry both in the UK and even throughout the world in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. During those times, the region was even called "the workshop of the world" (Minton 2004; Moffat and Rosie 2005). At the beginning of the 20th century the biggest source of coal in the UK was Northumberland and

Durham, and only London was said to be more important for the UK's economy at that time (Moffat and Rosie 2005: 281). The factories of the region produced various products for heavy industries and coal mining, and the shipyards along the Tyne were busy meeting the orders of customers from all over the world (*ibid.*). However, a crisis came to the region after the Second World War. The region started losing shipbuilding orders, and many workers became unemployed (*ibid.*: 334). Tyneside started experiencing change in its two most important industries: coal and shipbuilding. The prosperity of Newcastle's shipbuilding industries went, as the UK lost its strong position supplying ships for the world, and other countries, such as Japan and Sweden, emerged as strong shipbuilding countries (*ibid.*: 347). For example, between 1960 and 1965 the British shipbuilding industry is said to have fallen by 17%, while during the same period Japanese industry showed over 200% growth (Vall 2001: 59). The British shipbuilding industry was said not to have kept up with new trends in the industry, such as new construction methods, new trade routes and the rise of airlines (Moffat and Rosie 2005: 346).

The coal industry also declined in the post-war period. Even though its heyday lasted a little longer than that of shipbuilding, many pits closed down due to exhaustion or economic reasons during the 1960s (*ibid.*: 357). Alternatives to coal, including gas and oil, were emerging, and the demand for coal decreased. This situation led to coal industry workers losing their jobs (*ibid.*). At the beginning of the 1980s, about 50% of all men in Newcastle and Gateshead were employed in the shipbuilding, mining, steel and engineering industries, but only 3% were in these industries at the beginning of the 21st century (Minton 2004: 11). The decline of traditional industries which had

once brought prosperity to the region changed the economies of Newcastle and Gateshead. Since the 1960s Newcastle and Gateshead have had to manage their declining economies. They suffered from economic decline, and it was clear to both local councils that traditional heavy industries would no longer make the districts prosperous (Byrne 2001; Moffat and Rosie 2005). Their industrial structure has since become more varied; and dynamic urban planning has been developed in Newcastle, with cultural programmes and events also among their efforts. Even though the most frequently highlighted projects on the Quayside were developed after 2000, Newcastle and Gateshead had started considering culture as a method of addressing the above-mentioned challenging situations of the area from the late 20th century.

2.2. Overview of cultural developments on the Quayside

This section plays a practical role within this chapter by providing information about key developments on the Quayside. The developments are the Gateshead Millennium Bridge (GMB), the BALTIC Contemporary Art Centre (BALTIC) and the Sage Gateshead (Sage). This section describes these three capital projects since they are outstanding in terms of investment size and the level of attention they have brought both internally and externally. After this section, this chapter analyses the changes to Newcastle-Gateshead through the lens of the key characteristics of culture-led regeneration discussed in Chapter 2, namely changed perceptions and economic impact.

GMB opened in September 2001 (Gateshead Quays 2010a; *ibid.* 2010b); it is a tilting bridge for pedestrians and cyclists connecting Newcastle and Gateshead. In addition to

its practical functions, GMB has gained attention due to its architecture and design. In 2002, when the Queen officially opened the bridge, the architect Wilkinson Eyre won the Royal Institute of British Architects' Stirling Prize for GMB (NGI 2009b: 46). £9.8m of the £22m project cost was covered by the Millennium Commission, with £3m funded by the European Regional Development Fund (NGI 2009b: 46). English Partnerships, East Gateshead Single Regeneration Budget and Gateshead Borough Council covered the remainder (*ibid.*).

The construction of GMB can be interpreted as significant for two reasons. Firstly, as the first major capital project to be completed on the Quayside it enables a visitor to walk from Newcastle town centre to BALTIC or Sage. Secondly, GMB is the most recent of the Tyne bridges, and as such can be interpreted with the other bridges on the River Tyne, including the famous High Level Bridge and Tyne Bridge, which are symbols of the region's glorious industrial age (Minton 2004: 9; Moffat and Rosie 2005: 385); this is a sharing of memory, and it has been advocated as affecting local people's identity and pride, which is one of the impacts of the Quayside developments that is discussed in section 4.1.



Figure 3.2 Gateshead Millennium Bridge (©Author 2010)

BALTIC, located on the south bank of the River Tyne in Gateshead, opened in July 2002. The idea for BALTIC began in 1991, when Northern Arts (now Arts Council England, North East) announced its plan to establish major capital cultural facilities in the region (BALTIC 2010). BALTIC is said to be “the biggest gallery of its kind in the world”, which does not have permanent collections but operates various contemporary exhibitions and related programmes (*ibid.*). The project cost about £50m, and £33.4m was covered by the National Lottery fund via the Arts Council (NGI 2009b: 48). National Lottery funding also supported activities for the first five years, with £7.5m of annual support; since then, BALTIC has been funded by Gateshead Borough Council, the Northern Rock Foundation, the European Regional Development Fund and ONE North East for its management (BALTIC 2010). However, Northern Rock Foundation no longer exists, and neither does ONE North East. As of 2014, BALTIC has funding from Arts Council England and the Gateshead Borough Council.

BALTIC has a clear vision; its purpose is, according to Godfrey Worsdale, Director of BALTIC, “to present great contemporary art, and make it accessible through our education, learning and engagement programme” (Worsdale, interview, 25.05.10). For this purpose BALTIC tries to reach various audience groups – from children to adults, from accidental visitors to arts professionals, and from local residents to visitors from the other parts of North East, the UK and overseas. In 2008 BALTIC catered for about 400,000 of various types of visitors, and over 70% of them come to BALTIC for a general visit rather than for a specific exhibition (MHM 2008: 17). Visitor figures increased to 575,574 in the financial year 2012/13 (BALTIC 2014). According to Worsdale and to Ilaria Longhi, a previous community programmer, BALTIC challenges

itself by making efforts to attract audiences that have never before experienced contemporary arts by giving them a high quality of experience and encouraging them to visit again (Longhi, interview, 05.05.10; Worsdale, interview, 25.05.10). These efforts are consistent with the recommendations of BALTIC's audience profiling, maintaining that BALTIC needs to "provide its first visitors a high quality experience and a reason to return and recommend" (MHM 2008: 53). In addition to traditional museum visitor groups, such as pre-school children, school-children and adults, BALTIC also tries to attract groups not traditionally easy to reach, such as black and minority ethnic (BME) groups (Ilaria, interview, 05.05.10). In doing this, BALTIC forms partnerships with various organisations, including local council, and develops projects over the longer term (*ibid.*).



Figure 3.3 BALTIC Contemporary Art Centre (©Author 2010)

As an iconic contemporary art institution which intends to be locally rooted, BALTIC makes sustained efforts to better serve its communities.

Sage is a music centre which opened in December 2004. The project cost about £70m, of which £47m was covered by the Arts Lottery Fund and the remainder by the European Regional Development Fund, ONE North East and Gateshead Borough Council; it is now run by North Music Trust (NGI 2009b: 52; Gateshead Quays 2010c). Sage aims to be “an international home for music and musical discovery, bringing about a widespread and long-term enrichment of the musical life of the North East of England” (Sage Gateshead 2010). For this purpose, Sage plays a role as a music performance venue which tries to include every kind of music. It is also currently the home of Northern Sinfonia, an orchestra based in Newcastle and Gateshead. In addition, music education has an important position at Sage, which produces learning and participation programmes in various categories, including Music for Adults, Music for Young People, Music for Families, and Schools and Early Years Settings (Sage Gateshead 2014). The architecture of Sage has attracted a lot of attention. Sage was designed by Sir Norman Foster’s architectural firm Foster and Partners, and it was the firm’s first performing arts facility (NGI 2009b: 52). The building, with its reflective and curved roof, has become a new landmark on the Quayside, along with the Gateshead Millennium Bridge and BALTIC.



Figure 3.4 Sage Gateshead (©Author 2010)

The above three major capital investments on the Quayside are very closely located to each other and have different natures: a bridge, a visual arts centre and a music venue. They are new, iconic developments which have for some time now played an important role in rebranding Newcastle-Gateshead.

However, the buildings – the final results of capital development – are not enough to understand the whole development of the Quayside and the impact of its regeneration and rebranding; thus, what changes have these developments brought to the area, and have these impacts been maintained? The next part of the chapter investigates these changes through the key characteristics of efforts to change perceptions and pursuit of economic impact, as identified in Chapter 2.

3. Background to the Quayside developments: long-term planning process

3.1. Early stages of the developments

As described in section 2.1, in the late 20th century it was clear to local councils of both Newcastle and Gateshead that traditional industries could not bring the two towns' competitiveness back again. Therefore, Gateshead decided to find other methods, resulting in a strategy of investment in cultural projects. Newcastle also tried to revitalise its economy by redeveloping its urban heritage and architecture. Even though the major cultural infrastructures in the region were constructed after 2000, these projects were not overnight products, but must be understood in the context of other investments and developments that both Newcastle and Gateshead had developed on their own over the previous several decades. Chapter 2 argued that a long-term planning process is one of the key factors influencing the success of cultural developments.

Both the local councils of Newcastle and Gateshead and Northern Arts (now Arts Council England, North East) played essential roles in the early stages. The North East was one of the first regions in the UK to have Regional Arts organisations at a local government level (Beaumont 2005). For Gateshead, in the mid-1980s, when the Shipley Art Gallery and a small space in the Central Library were the only exhibition places in Gateshead, Ros Rigby, the first Arts Development Officer in the region, Mike White, Assistant Director for Arts and Anna Pepperall, Public Art Curator, began promoting public arts in the area (NGI 2009b: 12). During the 1980s, Gateshead Council developed an active public art programme, at least in part as a way of changing its image from a depressed industrial town (ACE 2004: 21). Newcastle

invested in its heritage, arts and architecture. The Newcastle Theatre Royal reopened in 1988 after a £9m refurbishment, and the Discovery opened in 1993 as the Museum of Science and Engineering. Other events and developments introduced at an early stage of this phase of the cultural development of Newcastle and Gateshead were the Gateshead National Garden Festival (1990), which was the fourth National Garden Festival, “The Case for Capital” by Northern Arts (now Arts Council England, North East), which called for £212m of investment in arts infrastructure for the North East (1995), Visual Arts UK (1996) and the Angel of the North, which is Antony Gormley’s iconic sculpture (1998). These were important milestones in the cultural profile of Newcastle and Gateshead in terms of the size of investment and the level of attention they brought to the region.

As briefly introduced above, the region has made efforts towards developing arts and culture over the last few decades. The cultural developments on the Quayside are better understood within this same context. They have been possible because of the “Case for the Capital” campaign, but, crucially, the success of that campaign lies in the extended efforts of previous events, such as the National Garden Festival and Visual Arts UK, which contributed to profiling and growing the region’s artistic and cultural assets and competitiveness. The next section reviews the birth of a new brand, “Newcastle-Gateshead”, as part of a discussion of a long-term cultural planning process.

3.2. Birth of a new brand: Newcastle-Gateshead

This section discusses the birth of a new brand, Newcastle-Gateshead, and the Newcastle-Gateshead Initiative (NGI), a marketing agency for the area, within the larger context of a long-term cultural planning process. Newcastle-Gateshead was created as a new brand of the City of Newcastle and the Metropolitan Borough of Gateshead for marketing purposes. NGI was established in 2000 for this purpose, and the term Newcastle-Gateshead has been used to promote the city and the borough since then. In addition, one of the most important tasks and reasons for NGI's establishment was to lead the bid for the European Capital of Culture (ECC) 2008. Before NGI was set up there was the Newcastle Partnership, looking at opportunities to promote Newcastle, but, according to Carol Bell, head of culture and major events at NGI, with the growth of opportunity on the other side of the river in Gateshead they began to look at the opportunities and developments on the Gateshead side as well (Bell, interview, 26.05.10).

As a destination marketing agency for Newcastle and Gateshead, NGI works to the benefit of both local councils. The mission of NGI is "to make Newcastle and Gateshead the best place to come to work, learn, live and visit" (NGI 2010), and its aim is "to deliver economic, employment and social benefits through culture-led tourism, and continue to stimulate regeneration" (*ibid.*). NGI was formed to lead the bid for the European Capital of Culture (ECC) 2008. Even though it lost to Liverpool, the process of bidding for the ECC 2008 was significant in that it provided NGI with confidence and a vision for the future. In 2003, when the ECC 2008 competition was over, NGI commissioned Price Waterhouse Coopers to conduct research about the

impacts of the bidding process and the future of NGI. The research identified internal and external benefits for the region from the ECC bid. The research identified that the bidding process had created more partnerships internally between different groups, which opened new methods of implementing cultural developments in the region, raised pride among local residents and encouraged them to use cultural facilities more widely (PWC 2003: 5). Externally, the research noted that the ECC bidding increased awareness of the region both nationally and internationally, established a clear and positive image, brand and identity for Newcastle and Gateshead, increased day visitor numbers by 15%, from 4.74m in 2001 to 5.44m in 2003, and brought more possibilities for potential funding in the future (PWC 2003: 6). According to Bell, NGI concluded that, if the development were not continued, there would be a loss in terms of the actual activities in the city, where around £200m worth of cultural infrastructure projects on the Quayside were ongoing, and in terms of the external perception of the area as a place to work, live, study and visit (Bell, interview, 26.05.10). The research conducted by Price Waterhouse Coopers and its findings were meaningful for NGI, since it was important for it to evidence of consensus from local residents regarding its activities, and to provide evidence to keep driving Newcastle-Gateshead's promotion, since it has been funded by both local councils. From this point of view, it was necessary to show that the bidding process had a positive impact, not only externally, but also internally, on the region.

As a consequence of its impact during the ECC 2008 bidding, NGI decided to keep promoting its programmes and events. Culture10 was NGI's new scheme for the next ten years, and was completed in March 2010. Culture10 was a programme of cultural

events and festivals across Newcastle, Gateshead and the North East of England (NGI 2010). ONE North East, Newcastle City Council, Gateshead Borough Council, Arts Council England and Northern Rock Foundation were funding bodies for Culture10 (*ibid.*). NGI announced that there were 589 new cultural commissions made through the Culture10 programme, and 6,279 artists and performers were involved in these (*ibid.* 2009a: 13). Tall Ships Races, Spencer Tunick's photographic event, and a joint performance by the pop group Pet Shop Boys and the Northern Sinfonia are examples of high profile Culture10 programmes (*ibid.* 2009b: 38-39). Even though there were a large number of events and programmes scheduled for Culture10, the evaluation report produced after the programmes were complete advised that the proposed number and range of events were too great, so the programme organisers were advised to support fewer events better, with clearer expectations of what they could deliver (SQW 2006: 58).

This suggestion, of focusing on the quality of delivery rather than the quantity, was also reflected within NGI's policy for the future, called *Twenty Years of Culture – Newcastle-Gateshead Cultural Vision – The Story Continues*, which was announced after Culture10 was over (NGI 2010). This policy emphasised widening the range of local communities that could access the benefits of the programmes, rather than increasing the number of programmes. NGI stated that to make the existing cultural infrastructure better-used by local residents, and promoting its programmes for local communities, were important parts of its new vision and plan (NGI 2010). Through this emphasis, we see another main characteristic of culture-led regeneration and culture-led urban branding, which is taking account of local communities, as identified in

Chapter 2. This is discussed later in this chapter. After the first ten years of NGI management, NGI developed a new vision and plan. This vision and plan, produced at a turning point (the lost ECC bid) after Culture10 finished in March 2010, is important to understanding the strategisation of cultural opportunities in Newcastle-Gateshead at that time. In particular, the focus on local engagement, and on better local usage of the cultural developments located on the Quayside, reveal the shift in NGI's focus slightly, away from simply doing many events and programmes targeted at an external audience and towards a prioritisation of local engagement.

4. Changes to Newcastle-Gateshead since the Quayside cultural developments

4.1. Changed perceptions of the area

Section four discusses the changes in perceptions of Newcastle-Gateshead after the Quayside developments, which comprise one of the two changes to have taken place in the area, along with increased tourism. The discussion in this section draws on the theoretical discussion in Chapter 2 regarding the ways in which culture has been adopted to address the social and economic concerns of declining cities. It has been said that the region's considerable number of arts and cultural events, from the National Garden Festival in 1990 to the many capital projects, including BALTIC in 2002, have changed the image of Newcastle-Gateshead (NGI 2009a; *ibid.* 2009b). For example, Mick Henry, the leader of Gateshead Council, argued that people chose to come to Newcastle and Gateshead, and that there had been a spotlight turned on the region because of the two cities' transformation efforts (*ibid.*: 3). Attention from the media had been focused on Newcastle-Gateshead, with the area recommended as one

of “Europe’s Secret Capitals” by *Time Magazine* in 2004 and the “New Capital of Britain” by *The Times* in 2004 (*ibid.*: 32). One of the more important aspects of these comments is not whether Newcastle-Gateshead really deserved those accolades, but the fact that people outside Newcastle-Gateshead, who did not previously pay much attention to the region, were showing greater interest, as demonstrated by tourism figures which prove that tourism increased by 30 percent over the period from 2003 to 2007 (North East Tourism Advisory Board 2008: 3). It has been argued that this increased awareness of the region, and changed perceptions of Newcastle-Gateshead, are in part a consequence of the impact of the cultural developments on the Quayside. In this section, this kind of external impact is investigated further.

In *When the Boat Comes In*, a British TV drama produced by the BBC in the 1970s, one of the main characters, Jack Ford, returns to his hometown in North East England after serving in the First World War. His North Eastern town of Gallowshields is depicted as a place experiencing serious economic depression and unemployment. One of the North East’s most famous authors, Catherine Cookson, also describes Newcastle in her novels, such as *The Fifteen Streets* (1952), as a place where residents suffer poverty. Representations such as these have been highly visible within British popular culture and have played a crucial role in forming the popular perception of Newcastle and Gateshead as poor, declining and ‘grim’ northern towns. However, since 2000, when major capital cultural projects began to be established on the Quayside, Newcastle-Gateshead has acquired a different image – one which is more cultural – and the perception of Newcastle-Gateshead from outside the region has been changed in a positive way. In June 2002 *The Guardian* captured the changing perceptions of

Newcastle and Gateshead with the title “When the Hope Comes In”, reminding readers of the previous-mentioned BBC TV drama *When the Boat Comes In*.

Contrasting with the images of the depressed North portrayed in the drama, *The Guardian* article described the significant levels of cultural investment in Newcastle-Gateshead and its resulting vitality (Hickling 2002).

Generally, people outside the region now think of Newcastle-Gateshead as a cultural centre (Bluegrass Thinking Research 2008: 41; *ibid.* 2010: 20), and they agree that there are lots of cultural things to do and exciting new developments happening in Newcastle-Gateshead (*ibid.*: 22). In addition, 71% of people surveyed for the research thought that “Newcastle-Gateshead can be proud of their achievements today as they can be of their history”, which was the third highest positive percentage in people’s attitude to the area after kind and welcoming people (75%) and great atmosphere in Newcastle-Gateshead (72%) (*ibid.*: 21).

Other visitor studies have shown that visitors have noticed positive changes in the Newcastle area. About a third of visitors with a previous visitor experience have found positive changes in the Newcastle area, and these changes are mainly related to regeneration and developments in the area (Total Research 2009: 17). Cultural merits, including the culture and history of the area, have now become one of the top three strengths of the area, along with friendly people and the nearby coastline (Tourism UK and Lowland Market Research 2007: 23). Awareness of the region has also been increased. In 2007, 52% of people surveyed from outside the region knew a fair amount about North East England, and only 11% of people knew nothing, in comparison to a survey undertaken in 2004 in which only 23% of people knew a great

deal about the region and 27% had little to say about the North East (MORI Social Research Institute 2004: 6; ONE North East 2009: 12).

Along with these studies, the accolades and awards mentioned earlier in this chapter also provide evidence showing that people outside the region have become more interested in Newcastle-Gateshead, and that this interest and attention is largely due to the proliferation of cultural developments in Newcastle-Gateshead. In terms of external changes in perception and awareness, Newcastle-Gateshead has obtained positive changes, and has increased the wider public awareness of the area by accruing more cultural assets.

However, even though the brand Newcastle-Gateshead has brought new perceptions of the region and increased public awareness, the previous images still remain, and the perception of Newcastle-Gateshead is the result of the combination of these two different images: the industrial image and the new cultural image. Although people outside the region think Newcastle-Gateshead is more cultural than it was previously, they still think Newcastle-Gateshead is also historical, industrial and traditional (Bluegrass Thinking Research 2010: 20). For example, in a 2010 survey, 76% of people interviewed said Newcastle-Gateshead was industrial, 62% of people said historical and 55% of people said traditional (*ibid.*: 18). Only 52% of people said Newcastle-Gateshead was cultural, which is the same as the number who said Newcastle-Gateshead had been regenerated (*ibid.*). These data show that there are mixed perceptions of the region, to which the cultural image has been added.

Another questionnaire in the same survey also supported this mixed perception of the region. Even though almost 60% of people agreed that “there are lots of cultural

things to do in Newcastle-Gateshead”, there was also a similar percentage of people who thought that “Newcastle-Gateshead has character and history” (65%) and that “Newcastle-Gateshead is a place that mixes traditional and modern” (63%) (*ibid.*: 21). As discussed, people are now likely to think Newcastle-Gateshead is more cultural, but they also have a multifaceted perception of the region which gives them a positive impression (Bluegrass Thinking Research 2010; Tourism UK and Lowland Market Research 2007).

The discussion in this section provides a useful framework through which to analyse the Gwangju case study. Even though the central government, which is driving the Hub City of Asian Culture project, hopes to bring a new, culturally rich image to the city, the previous image of it remains important especially to local residents who are proud of their past identity. This situation has meant that the delivery of the project must strike a balance between the old and the new image the government is seeking to create. The challenges involved and strategies for dealing with these in the case of Gwangju are investigated in chapters 5 and 6.

4.2. Seeking economic impact: increased tourism

This section analyses another change to Newcastle-Gateshead: increased tourism. The previous section and this stem from the background of adopting culture for urban strategies; that is, culture-led regeneration and culture-led urban branding. In particular, considering the point that many cities that have experienced industrial decline have adopted culture as a new way to address their challenging situation, the

adoption of culture serves as a useful platform on which the increased tourism can be investigated for its economic impact. This section assesses changes in tourism in Newcastle-Gateshead since the Quayside cultural developments. In the Gwangju case study, the economic impact is examined from a different perspective, specifically the project's impact on the creation of employment opportunities; since the project is still under development, it is almost impossible to measure its tourism impact on the city as yet.

As argued in the above section, the cultural developments on the Quayside have contributed towards bringing a positive image to the region, and they have increased wider awareness about the area. These impacts have naturally played a role in the regional growth of tourism, which was the argument put forward by local agencies such as NGI or ONE North East. It was argued by them that regional tourism significantly increased over the ten years of the development of the Gateshead Quayside (NGI 2009a; North East Tourism Advisory Board 2008). The Quayside's iconic landmarks have been said to have created both a positive awareness of the area and increased regional tourism (ONE North East 2009: 7). NGI (2009a: 8) also maintains that few people would have thought of visiting Newcastle or Gateshead for a city break or day trip in the late 80s and early 90s, but this has changed since the building of important capital infrastructures and following the bid for the European Capital of Culture 2008, since when Newcastle-Gateshead has become one of the favourite UK city break destinations (*ibid.*). For example, Newcastle-Gateshead was voted the favourite English city for breaks from 2002 to 2005 in *The Guardian/Observer* Travel Awards, and Newcastle was ranked fourth favourite UK city behind Glasgow,

Edinburgh and London by the lifestyle magazine *Condé Nast Traveller* in August 2007 (NGI 2009b: 32). More recently, Newcastle was voted third best city in Europe (second in the UK behind London) for Nightlife in tripadvisor's Travellers Choice Awards 2010 (NGI 2014).

However, apart from looking at the growth of the visitor economy in the region, it requires further investigation to identify the relationship between the cultural developments on the Quayside and their direct impacts on the visitor economy. It could be generally said that the developments on the Quayside have helped in increasing tourism to Newcastle-Gateshead; but, on the other hand, it is hard to identify quantitative or qualitative evidence which show a direct impact on tourism because the nature of visitors' activities and consumption is complex. The new cultural infrastructures form one part of the whole Newcastle-Gateshead tourist "offer"; they are not a detached or independent development out of context. Therefore, it is very hard to identify and investigate the visitors and their patterns of behaviour as they relate specifically to the developments on the Quayside. In this context, this thesis argues that the cultural developments need to be understood as merely one way of promoting and branding Newcastle-Gateshead, and should not be assessed on the basis of providing a direct source for the creation of economic benefit. ONE North East conducted research into the volume and value of regional tourism between 2003 and 2007. Since it used the same methodology consistently during those years, the results of those studies are useful if we are to identify tourism trends in the region. In 2007 tourism was worth £3.915 billion to the regional economy, which was 30% higher than in 2003 (North East Tourism Advisory Board 2008: 3). This growth is higher than in

other UK regions over the same timeframe (*ibid.*). Regarding visitor expenditure, the total expenditure of overnight visitors was £1.45 billion in 2006, which was 10.6% higher than in 2003 (ONE North East 2008: 120). In terms of the number of visitors staying overnight in the region, around 1 million people stayed in the region in 2007, which showed an increase of 12% compared to 2003 (NGI 2009a: 10). Business tourism in the region also increased. Even though Newcastle-Gateshead was not among the top destinations for association or corporate markets, as identified in the UK Conference Market Survey in 2002, it was placed sixth by usage in both contexts in 2005 (*ibid.*: 9). The growth of business tourism is important because evidence suggests that many business visitors return to the locations of conferences as leisure visitors with their families or friends (*ibid.*).

With the increase in tourism, the number of people employed in the sector also increased, by 14%, to a total of 60,775 jobs in 2007 (North East Tourism Advisory Board 2008: 3). In addition, Newcastle-Gateshead showed an increase in hotel supply to accommodate increased numbers of visitors. Between 2002 and 2007, hotel supply increased by 42.6%, with 12 new hotels opening and the addition of 1,505 hotel rooms (NGI 2008: 7). City centre hotel supply increased by over 65% between 2002 and 2008, including a Hilton on the Quayside (*ibid.*). Alongside these increases in hotel supply, the occupancy rate increased – by 15%, to 71% between 2002 and 2007 – and the occupancy rate in 2007 was higher than the UK average by 3% (North East Tourism Advisory Board 2008 4). When considering these occupancy rates alongside increasing hotel supply in the region, the numbers evidently have a positive meaning.

However, in interpreting and understanding the above tourism data, two aspects require careful consideration. Firstly, it is necessary to analyse the data together with national tourism statistics in order to understand the region's tourism within a larger, national context. Secondly, further investigation is necessary in order to understand the mutual relationships between the above tourism data and the cultural developments on the Quayside. In terms of more recent national tourism statistics, the information from the most recent years – that is, after 2007 – shows slightly different trends from those between 2002 and 2007. All tourism spending across the UK from 2007 to 2009 shows varied and complex trends according to year and region. In England, some regions showed an increase in the volume of tourism during those years, but some regions showed a decrease in all tourism spending (VisitBritain, VisitScotland, VisitWales and Northern Ireland Tourist Board 2005; *ibid.* 2006; *ibid.* 2007; *ibid.* 2008; *ibid.* 2009). In the case of the North East of England it increased in 2008, but it then fell more significantly than in other areas in 2009 (*ibid.*). The North East was one of three regions, along with the East Midlands and the East of England, which showed a decrease in tourists spending between 2007 and 2009 (*ibid.*). The decrease rate for the North East was 7.8%, far higher than the 0.38% for the East Midlands and 4.4% for the East of England (*ibid.*).

This situation can also be found when we look at the five years from 2005 to 2009. During these years, every region in England again showed varied trends from year to year, which means that no region showed a consistent trend of increase or decrease (*ibid.*). But it is noteworthy that, from a longitudinal point of view, six out of nine regions in England showed a decrease in tourism after 2005, and the North East had

the highest decrease rate, 27% (*ibid.*). These national statistics in tourism from 2005-2009, including the North East, thus show radically different trends to those between 2002 and 2007. In addition, the data from Tourism Tyne and Wear also show that the economic impact of tourism, including visitor days, employment and visitor numbers, has not consistently increased since 2005 (Tourism Tyne and Wear 2010a; *ibid.* 2010b). Rather, it has been up and down each year since 2005, but with an overall declining trend (*ibid.*).

These data are important since they allow us to make a significant interpretation: even if we agree that the cultural developments on the Quayside contributed to an initial growth in regional tourism, this growth has not been sustained in the longer term. The studies conducted by regional organisations identified that the North East showed outstanding growth in tourism, above the national average, between 2002 and 2007 (Tourism Tyne and Wear 2010a); however, more recent information, from 2005 to 2009, shows that the North East had a far higher decrease in tourism than other UK regions (VisitBritain, VisitScotland, VisitWales and Northern Ireland Tourist Board 2005; *ibid.* 2006; *ibid.* 2007; *ibid.* 2008; *ibid.* 2009). There are many factors that could explain this change of trend. The economic recession from 2008 might be the most obvious reason for the decline. However, this does not explain why the largest decrease was in the North East. Therefore, further research might need to find the reasons for this phenomenon. For example, that might be related to a trend of cultural facilities' attendance figures, which generally show decreases a few years after opening.

Table 3.1 All Tourism Spending in England (£) (VisitBritain, VisitScotland, VisitWales and Northern Ireland Tourist Board 2007-2009)

Region	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
North East	822m	546m	651m	697m	600m
North West	2,551m	2,290m	2,282m	2,338m	2,420m
Yorkshire	1,694m	1,397m	1,427m	1,397m	1,540m
West Midlands	1,411m	1,145m	1,184m	1,149m	1,214m
East Midlands	1,216m	1,113m	1,055m	1,060m	1,051m
East of England	1,742m	1,278m	1,474m	1,362m	1,409m
London	1,968m	2,270m	2,204m	2,356m	2,230m
South West	3,609m	3,682m	3,802m	3,639m	4,124m
South East	2,483m	2,429m	2,353m	2,350m	2,595m

It has been maintained that the developments on the Quayside contributed to the regional economy, especially to the visitor economy, because the volume of tourism increased after the Millennium, when the developments on the Quayside were established. This has been argued both by local councils and agencies, such as NGI (NGI 2009a; *ibid.* 2009b). However, it is hard to find any evidence showing a direct causal relation between tourism and the developments on the Quayside. Even though tourism to the region increased after those developments, this does not necessarily mean that those developments are directly responsible for enhanced tourism. This is because the patterns of visitors' motivations and activities vary, and none of the studies have established whether the cultural developments on the Quayside are the dominant attraction for visitors to the region. According to a visitor survey done in 2008, there were over 15 main reasons for visiting the North East, with no one factor

dominating (mruk 2008: 31). The most popular reason cited was “general sightseeing”, as answered by 19% of respondents, and the next most popular was “visiting art and heritage attraction including museums and art galleries”, which was the response of 16% of people, and “shopping” (12%); “visiting friends and relatives” (10%) followed (*ibid.*). Another visitor survey, in 2005/2006, showed a similar pattern. When people were asked about their activities, “eating out” was the most frequently mentioned, and “shopping”, “general sightseeing” and “visiting museums, art galleries, heritage centres etc.” were among the other popular activities mentioned (Tourism UK and Lowland Market Research 2007: 16). Even though people thought the “culture and history of the area” was one of top three strengths of the region, that was not within the top five answers for “features liked most” in the region (*ibid.*: 23). What people liked most were the “friendly people”, the “views and scenery” and “lots of things to do” (*ibid.*: 31). Thus, despite the hype, it seems clear that the Quayside cultural developments were not the main reason for tourist visits to the area.

Based on this analysis, the thesis argues that the cultural developments need to be considered as only one part of a diverse tourist offer. In the case of the Quayside cultural developments it seems clear that they have played a role in transforming the image of Newcastle-Gateshead in a positive way, enhancing the awareness of the region, and have contributed to the regional visitor economy. However, there is a distinction between arguments that present such cultural developments as *one of* many factors increasing tourism, and thus economic growth, and those who present such development as the *direct* motivation of that growth. Since this latter argument focuses more on the direct relationship between the developments and their

economic impact, rather than the context of their development process and the wider context of city rebranding, it could be misused to focus exclusively on advocating cultural developments solely on the basis of economic impact. This is the argument given by many city authorities and planners for adopting other cultural strategies, which are regarded as successful, for city redevelopment, even though there is lack of evidence showing a direct relationship between cultural developments and economic success (Janes, 2009: 68; Miles, 2005: 889, 891). To understand the nature and process of cultural developments within a wider city rebranding context, the cultural developments on the Quayside must be recognised as one of a number of strategies that are utilised in the marketing of Newcastle-Gateshead, instead of as a direct catalyst for economic growth.

5. After cultural developments on the Quayside: taking account of local communities

This section investigates how local communities have been taken account of during the Quayside cultural developments. In particular, it focuses on the new community focused policies and strategies of local councils and other public organisations. The analysis in this section is based on one of the four main characteristics of culture-led regeneration and culture-led urban branding: engagement of local communities, as developed in Chapter 2; and it demonstrates how this characteristic has been applied to and implemented in the Newcastle-Gateshead redevelopment. This discussion is reviewed in the Gwangju case study, where local communities (or, more precisely, the

relationship between central government and local residents) have been at the centre of challenging issues during the project delivery process.

This discussion focuses on the new strategies and policies of NGI and BALTIC because these organisations advertise their policies regarding engaging local communities. The thesis argues that it is time to think about how to maintain or revitalise the initial impacts of the cultural developments on the Quayside, and consider that if the last 10 years are seen as the first stage – focusing on building facilities and infrastructure, drawing attention to the project and changing perceptions – the next 10 years need to focus on strengthening the relationship with local communities and enabling better usage of the cultural infrastructures by local people.

5.1. Newcastle-Gateshead Initiative (NGI)’s new cultural vision

In 2012, NGI launched its new cultural vision for the next 10 years titled *Twenty Years of Culture – Newcastle-Gateshead Cultural Vision – The Story Continues*. After the first 10 years, which have been summarised as a period of a series of capital investments and events in the region, NGI aims to build a “sustainable culture” over the coming years (NGI 2010: 2). Through the whole vision/plan, NGI emphasises a focus on sustaining the achievements of the last 10 years and developing engagement with wider local communities (*ibid.*). The title itself indicates what its new cultural vision will try to achieve (*ibid.*: 1), and that one of the key challenges for the future is to engage more local people so that they will take more cultural opportunities (*ibid.*: 3). Based on the achievements of the last 10 years, NGI aims to have an impact through

all aspects of culture in the region. However, the most fundamental idea of the new vision is the effort to reach more local people and provide them with more chances to experience the arts and culture in the region to which the cultural developments on the Quayside have contributed. Carol Bell, Head of Culture and Major Events at NGI, explained that the next 10 years after NGI's Culture10 programme will focus on consolidating the effect of its previous programmes and making the capital infrastructures and organisations work together more effectively for local communities (Bell, interview, 26.05.10). Bell also maintained that the good networking established between the organisations in the region is significant for NGI's goals (*ibid.*). This network is important because, when the public sector is rapidly changing and less predictable, as is the case during economic recession, strong partnerships are needed to ensure collaboration to reach common goals. The ultimate goal of these partnerships is to continue the transformation of the region and provide a cultural platform for local people.

5.2. BALTIC's communication plan

In 2010 BALTIC produced a communication plan for 2010/2011. In the plan, BALTIC set one of its immediate goals as increasing the visitor numbers from Gateshead, and another as increasing awareness of BALTIC among ethnic minorities and C2DE groups¹⁰ (BALTIC 2010: 4). BALTIC noted that it was in a period of stability, and thus was able to

¹⁰ These are called the NRS social grades, defined by the Market Research Society, which are used as a system of demographic classification in the UK. The grades are categorised as A (upper middle class), B (middle class), C1 (lower middle class), C2 (skilled working class), D (working class) and E (people at the lowest level of subsistence) (National Readership Survey 2014).

focus on developing new audiences as well as developing its existing audience (*ibid.*: 5-6). According to Geoffrey Worsdale, Baltic Director, and Ilaria Longhi, community programmer, BALTIC's new plan was aimed at the local communities in Gateshead – in particular, ethnic minority groups and lower socio-economic groups (*ibid.*: 6), which were not well represented in the contemporary art centre's audience (Longhi, interview, 05.05.10; Worsdale, interview, 25.05.10). This strategy recognised the necessity of offering education and community programmes to a wider demographic of local residents, and BALTIC undertook the process of working with Gateshead Borough Council on a long-term strategy for this purpose (Longhi, interview, 05.05.10). For our purposes – thinking about stages of cultural development – it is important to note that BALTIC was preparing for another stage in its management by aiming at a new target audience. This echoes NGI's strategy of turning to more extensive audience development after the initial developments/branding were established.

5.3. Cultural Investment and Strategic Impact Research

The Cultural Investment and Strategic Impact Research project (CISIR) is a ten-year, longitudinal project begun in 2002 to examine the impact of BALTIC and Sage Gateshead by the Centre for Public Policy at Northumbria University. In their 2005 research, CISIR recommended that regional arts, culture and tourism promotional activities and marketing strategies (or campaigns) needed to be representative of the region's various local communities (Bailey, Miles and Stark 2004; Dobbs, Moore and Simpson 2005: 23). On the basis of its 2006 research, the recommendations were able to be more specific, and state that the cultural provisions in the region needed to

consider local communities and groups, especially less wealthy groups and older groups (Biddle, Archer and Lowther 2006: 38). This study also argued that the Quayside cultural institutions should support community-based activities for these groups (*ibid.*). These recommendations are noteworthy since CISIR's research was based on surveys of local residents. CISIR also argued on the basis of its research with local residents that the Quayside cultural provisions needed to embrace the local communities more widely and deeply, and that this was especially the case if the economic effects of the Quayside cultural developments were to be felt inclusively (*ibid.*: 38-39). Thus, cultural developments' focus on extending their reach to a diversity of local groups is important not only if those developments are to sustain the initial social/cultural impacts, but also if they are to ensure an inclusive economic impact¹¹.

6. Conclusion

This chapter, along with Chapter 2, has attempted to establish a framework for the analysis of the Gwangju case study. In particular, through investigating the Quayside cultural developments in Newcastle-Gateshead based on the four main characteristics of culture-led regeneration and culture-led urban branding established in Chapter 2, this chapter provides a more grounded understanding of how rationales behind culture-led regeneration and cultural urban branding have been implemented in a particular, real example of culture-led regeneration and some of the issues that arose

¹¹ Unfortunately, as the CISIR project came to an untimely end in 2006, the promise of the rich longitudinal data such a 10-year study of impact would have provided has not been realised.

from it. This framework is examined in an Asian case, Gwangju, in chapters 5 and 6, and the thesis tries to uncover how theories and practices developed in Western countries have been adopted and implemented in the Hub City of Asian Culture project.

In this chapter, a long-term process of urban and cultural development was identified as a significant contextual feature against which the Quayside cultural developments must be understood; in other words, the Quayside developments are just one aspect of the culture-led regeneration of Newcastle-Gateshead. This chapter also explored the impact of the Quayside cultural developments. These were understood through the lens established in Chapter 2, being efforts to change perceptions and pursue economic impact. In terms of the role of the cultural developments in changing the perception of the region, it was observed that the external perception of the region changed, and awareness of the region increased (Bluegrass Thinking Research 2010; ONE North East 2009; Total Research 2009). Newcastle-Gateshead has a higher cultural profile than in the past, and the cultural developments on the Quayside have contributed to this change. However, after further investigation, the discussion argues that Newcastle-Gateshead needs to seek harmony between its previous images and its new images, because there are undoubted positive memories tied to its history and past perceptions among its local people. We will explore this dynamic in more detail – the competition between city brands, old and new – in the context of Gwangju, where this is an important factor.

In terms of pursuing economic impact, the discussion found that in the example of Newcastle-Gateshead regional tourism increased initially increased, but was not

sustained during the recession (NGI 2008; North East Tourism Advisory Board 2008). I have argued that cultural developments on the Quayside need to be understood as one way of helping to market and promote Newcastle-Gateshead, instead of as a direct motivation for visiting the area. The discussion on the relationship between the Quayside cultural developments and increased tourism provides a platform for thinking about the Gwangju case study, facilitating an investigation into how the analysis of the Hub City of Asian Culture project needs to address its potential economic benefits.

After discussing the impacts, the next part of the chapter explored further discussions on the future of the cultural developments on the Quayside, particularly in terms of their need to engage with local communities. Cultural developments on the Quayside have had some initial impacts during the last ten years, but it is time to think about how to keep these impacts sustainable in the future. For example, NGI, the destination marketing agency for the area, and BALTIC, are seeking new methods of reaching more diverse groups of local people. Sage, however, shows a slightly different approach, since it has always had core missions drawn up for local people from its planning stage. Their focus is now on making their facilities more suitable and more able to serve local communities. Therefore, the chapter argues that if the last 10 years comprised the first stage, and that this stage focused on building facilities and infrastructure, the next 10 years need to involve focusing on building and strengthening relationships with the local community.

Chapter 4

The Hub City of Asian Culture project and the Asia Culture Complex in Gwangju: background and initial development process

1. Introduction

Chapters 2 and 3 have investigated the academic discussion about culture-led regeneration and culture-led urban branding, using the example of the Quayside developments in Newcastle-Gateshead. It has been found that there were initial positive impacts: increased local tourism, changed external perceptions and enhanced local identities in the region when the major developments of the Gateshead Millennium Bridge, BALTIC and the Sage were established. However, it has been further determined that ensuring the sustainability of these impacts is a challenge, and that engaging local communities has been identified as a significant factor in ensuring the sustainability of the regeneration purposes of such developments for the future. In particular, the four characteristics identified in Chapter 2 – (1) advantages of long-term planning; (2) endeavours to change perceptions; (3) pursuit of economic impact; (4) engagement of local communities – have been re-examined using the example of the Quayside cultural developments in Newcastle-Gateshead in Chapter 3. This led to the conclusion that, although there has been much attention placed in cultural investment, it has become more important to maintain initial interest in the developments, which has emphasised the engagement of local communities. These discussions are applied to the Gwangju case in chapters 4 and 5, in order to investigate how the arguments and practical applications in a Western context have been adopted

and implemented in an Asian context, Gwangju. This chapter, which discusses Gwangju's specific history and context, and the Hub City of Asian Culture project's backgrounds and initial development process, analyses how the unique local identity has been emphasised during the urban regeneration process. The processes of encountering and addressing local challenges, such as conflicts between old identity and new image, are also investigated and analysed. The next chapter, which explores the changes Gwangju has made through the Hub City of Asian culture project, will also analyse the process of how a new image and a transformed local cultural environment have been brought about. In this analysis, the four key characteristics of culture-led regeneration previously identified will be used as a frame to structure analysis of the Gwangju case. In the end, the thesis will identify two distinct phases of the project development process, in which project delivery encountered and then figured out the challenging issues arising from a local context different from the Western circumstances.

Gwangju is one of six metropolitan cities of Korea, and the most important city in the south-west of the country. Gwangju embarked on a large cultural project, the Hub City of Asian Culture, beginning in 2004, and the project is expected to be completed in 2023. The Hub City of Asian Culture is the largest cultural project in the history of Korea, with projected costs of approximately £3bn (5.3 Jo won, Korean currency) (Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2011). The project aims to establish Gwangju as a city of culture, where various cultural exchanges among Asian countries will take place (*ibid.* 2007). For this purpose, the project has involved several main developments, including the Asia Culture Complex. Through this huge, central

government-led project, the government expects to create diverse cultural activities in the city, and, more importantly, to revitalise the local economy of the city, in particular the old city centre, which has suffered from decline (*ibid.* 2007; *ibid.* 2011). These expectations of the Hub City of Asian Culture project can be understood within the general context of combining a cultural and urban strategy, as discussed in Chapter 2 and Chapter 3, since these expectations share their background with the emergence of culture within urban strategies, addressing concerns such as economic decline and the desire to bring a new image to the city. From the visitors' point of view, the project seeks to allow individuals to enjoy cultural opportunities in their daily lives, and to let people find their own cultural and artistic potential through cultural activities and other training programmes (*ibid.* 2007). Given that this ambitious project has been the largest cultural project in Korea, and has been enabled by a Special Act on the Development of a Hub City of Asian Culture (Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2006), which guarantees funding for the project until its completion, the commencement of the Hub City of Asian Culture project has drawn significant attention not only from the media, but also from other cities in Korea. Many national newspapers have shown great interest in this project from an early stage (Jung 2005; Kim 2005).

According to an interview with Park, who used to work within the Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture for government relationships, other cities, such as Busan, Jeonju and Kyungju, have already submitted their own, similar proposals, or are currently preparing them, in the hopes of becoming additional cultural cities (Park, interview, 26.01.11). Both Park and Kim (who works at the Gwangju Cultural Foundation) also

claim that these cities have mainly been motivated by the size of investment in Gwangju and the fact that finance has been secured by a special act of parliament (Kim, interview, 18.03.11; Park, interview, 26.01.11).

Even though the Hub City of Asian Culture project is still at a midway stage, in order to ensure the successful delivery of the remaining project central government has reviewed the development so far, because of the recognition that the project delivery has entered a new phase during this period in its relationship and communication with local residents. This review, which was undertaken in 2010, is the result of various opinions, conversations and conflicts regarding the project from the time it started in 2004. This chapter, before discussing what kinds of early changes have been identified in Gwangju, will therefore investigate the background of the Hub City of Asian Culture project. This will be done by positioning Gwangju in modern history and studying Gwangju's cultural infrastructure. More importantly, the initial development stages before the commencement of the Hub City of Asian Culture project, such as cultural policies and other cultural developments, will be investigated for a better understanding of the project's background. Finally, how the Asia Culture Complex development has been processed will be discussed and analysed. In particular, issues arising from the concept of the project to the recent conflicts surrounding the Asia Culture Complex will be discussed. Through all of these elements, it will be found that the initial cultural policies of Gwangju, and the other cultural assets which Gwangju already had formed a significant background to the Hub City of Asian Culture project. This finding enables us to apply one of the four main characteristics identified in Chapter 2 regarding the usage of culture for urban regeneration and branding,

advantages of long-term planning, to the case of Gwangju. For example, some significant cultural policies and strategies, including *Culture Gwangju 2020*, were developed before the Hub City of Asian Culture project started, and the project needs to be understood together with them for a better grasp of Gwangju's approach to culture-led development.

In addition to cultural policies and strategies, Gwangju has also hosted other significant cultural programmes, including the Gwangju Biennale, which is one of the most famous and long-running artistic events in Gwangju, first held in 1995 (Gwangju Cultural Foundation 2011a; Korea Culture and Tourism Policy Institute 2004b). Apart from the point that these cultural programmes show the city's commitment to arts and culture, they have also played a role in letting local residents know that Gwangju has shown actual outcomes of these policies and strategies. This wider understanding of cultural strategies and programmes is important, as they reveal the city's long-term cultural vision, which is essential in understanding the background of the Hub City of Asian Culture project.

In terms of debates and conflicts around the Asia Culture Complex, including how to preserve the 5·18 heritage building, this chapter will argue that they have meaning as a process, revealing both the challenges and significance of engagement with, and involvement of, local communities (Jeong 2010b; Lee, interview, 07.03.11; Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2011a, 2011b; Ryu, interview, 18.03.11). This chapter will investigate these conflicts and interactions between central government and local residents carefully, not only because they have brought a few years of delay to the project's development, but also because they are based on the unique local social and

economic contexts of Gwangju. This analysis is important, since it highlights how the detailed project delivery process is specific to Gwangju, and different from the Western discussions and examples. In this analysis, the significance of local residents during the project development, which has been identified as one of the four main characteristics in Chapter 2 and Chapter 3, has also been used. However, further investigation into the rise of the conflicts over the Hub City of Asian Culture project, and determining ways to address them, reveals that the project development process is different from the Western context, since the conflicts mainly arise from the unique local circumstances of Gwangju.

Chapter 5 will investigate the changes that have taken place in Gwangju since the Hub City of Asian Culture project began. Taken together, these two chapters – 4 and 5 – comprise the main case study of this thesis, to which I will apply the discussion of culture within urban contexts explored in chapters 2 and 3.

2. Understanding Gwangju since the 20th century

2.1. Overview of Gwangju from political, social and economic points of view

Gwangju, one of six metropolitan cities in Korea, has a very special identity and history in modern Korea. The city significantly contributed to the birth of democracy in Korea through the 5·18 Gwangju Democratisation Movement (Gwangju Folk Museum 1999; Gwangju Metropolitan City 2007; *ibid.* 2011), which made Gwangju an iconic city in terms of its political history. At the same time, the city has also kept its traditional image as a place renowned for traditional Korean arts. However, compared to other

metropolitan cities in Korea, Gwangju has shown one of the lowest levels of economic and industrial development (Gwangju Metropolitan City 2007). Since the complex nature of the city is a crucial context for understanding the development and significance of the Hub City of Asian Culture project, it is worth reflecting on this factor further at this point.

Gwangju is located in the south-west of Korea, and, as a metropolitan city¹², is the most important city in the region in political, economic, social and cultural terms (Gwangju Folk Museum 1999; Gwangju Metropolitan City 2011).



Figure 4.1 Map of Korea (Google maps 2011)

¹² 'Metropolitan city' is an administrative term of local governance in Korea. Metropolitan cities are important cities in terms of politics, the economy, and culture in the region. As of 2011, there are six metropolitan cities in Korea (Busan, Incheon, Daegu, Daejeon, Gwangju, and Ulsan) apart from Seoul, which is the capital of Korea.

Since 1987, the population of Gwangju has been rising, and, as of 2010, it stood at 1,467,996 people (Gwangju Metropolitan City 2007: 27; *ibid.* 2012). Even though the growth rate decreased from 2.6% in 1987 to 1.5% in 2010, mainly due to the decreasing birth rate that Korea is currently experiencing overall, Gwangju is still the largest city in south-west Korea (Statistics Korea 2011). Another aspect of the population trend is that the number of foreigners has increased significantly, from 243 in 1987, to 8,155 in 2006, to 9,684 in 2012 (Gwangju Metropolitan City 2007: 27, Gwangju Metropolitan City 2014); thus, the city has become more diverse. A similar phenomenon is observed overall in Korea, and foreigners, largely from Asian countries, including China and South East Asian countries, have moved to Gwangju for the purposes of international marriage and job opportunities (Kim 2011: 23). Although they form only 5.8% of the whole population of Gwangju, the growth of international communities has allowed other related organisations, such as the Gwangju International Centre, to become established (Gwangju International Centre 2011), and it is now an important task for the city government to work with this new multi-cultural society (Gwangju Metropolitan City 2011, Min 2008a).

Although Gwangju has been the largest and the most important city in the south-west region of Korea, its economic status, as mentioned earlier in this chapter, has not been competitive with other metropolitan cities. Gwangju shows lower economic status and under-developed industrial environments. The Gross Regional Domestic Product (GRDP) of Gwangju in 2006 was £10.8bn (190,494 Eok won, Korean currency), which was only 2.22% of the whole country's GDP (Gwangju Metropolitan City 2007: 48). Its GRDP has been steadily increasing for the last 20 years, but the amount is not very

significant when considering that Gwangju is the sixth largest city in Korea. Seoul, the largest city in Korea, with around 15 million people, accounts for the largest portion of GRDP. Gwangju's economic performance is still disappointing when considering other metropolitan cities. When looking at GDP by region between 2005 and 2009, it is obvious that Gwangju has seen the lowest level of performance. During these years, Gwangju had the second lowest GDP after Jeju among the 16 regions (Statistics Korea 2011).

Table 4.1 GDP by region, unit 10 Eok won (Statistics Korea 2011)¹³

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Seoul	198,926	208,899	220,135	236,517	248,383	257,436
Busan	45,984	48,069	49,434	52,680	56,182	55,851
Daegu	27,715	28,756	30,244	32,261	32,714	32,917
Incheon	38,842	40,398	43,311	47,780	47,827	49,702
Gwangju	17,392	18,896	20,299	21,281	21,745	22,056
Daejeon	19,314	20,030	20,802	22,186	23,218	24,405
Ulsan	40,947	41,697	43,214	48,059	52,408	50,364
Kyonggi	162,200	169,315	180,852	193,658	198,948	211,693
Kangwon	22,452	23,015	24,133	25,989	26,311	27,583
Chungbuk	26,213	26,721	27,997	30,001	30,105	31,683
Chungnam	43,706	47,497	51,361	55,148	57,974	65,760
Jeonbuk	24,548	25,221	26,488	28,586	29,471	32,018
Jeonnam	39,706	42,816	42,182	47,021	52,387	50,462
Kyungbuk	58,743	61,757	62,643	63,969	67,712	69,185
Kyungnam	55,268	58,251	61,735	69,157	74,280	75,492
Jeju	7,523	7,966	8,096	8,736	8,833	9,478

¹³ The numbers in this table are presented in Korean currency. They are not converted into GBP since the purpose of the table is simply to offer a comparison between cities.

Even acknowledging Gwangju's under-performing overall economic situation, more relevant economic circumstances to the Hub City of Asian Culture project are its declining old city centre. The old city centre, once a centre for the administration, education and economy of Gwangju, began experiencing decline from the late 20th century due to the development of a new city centre. This change in urban circumstances is one of the key backgrounds to the birth of the Hub City of Asian Culture project, since the government hoped that it would revitalise the declining old city centre through the Hub City of Asian Culture project. Pursuit of economic impact, one of the four main characteristics discussed in Chapter 2 and Chapter 3, can be recognised here in the relationship between the Hub City of Asian Culture project and the government's aim to address the decline of the old city centre. Because the project is still at the developmental stage, this will be analysed mainly via investigating the investment in cultural facilities in relation to the provision of job opportunities, one of the stated aims of the cultural development. However, the demand for economic revitalisation differs from area to area within the city, since the residents in the old city centre are more desperate to derive economic benefits from the Hub City of Asian Culture project. Even among the old city residents, the perception of the Hub City of Asian Culture project is different due to its relevance to the 5·18 Democratisation Movement, which has been a dominant image of the city. In this context, the engagement of local communities is also recognised as having complex implications for the project's development.

The environment for the cultural industries is also less vital than in other cities. Even though the government of Gwangju is proud of its traditional image as an artistic town,

the current cultural industries in Gwangju show unsatisfactory performance in terms of revenue compared to other cities or regions. The revenue of the cultural industries¹⁴ of Gwangju in 2007 was 3,342 Eok won (Korean currency), which was 1.3% of the whole revenue of the cultural industries of the country, and the number of employees was 3,650, which was 2.6% of the total number of cultural industry employees in the country (Min 2009:7). As Table 4.2 shows, Gwangju has significantly lower revenue and fewer employees in the cultural industries than the other major cities in Korea.

Table 4.2 Cultural industries status (Min 2009:7)

	Gwangju	Seoul	Busan	Daegu	Incheon
Number of employees	3,650 (2.6%)	75,719 (53.9%)	6,944 (4.9%)	4,961 (3.5%)	3,736 (2.7%)
Revenue (unit: Eok won)	3,342 (1.3%)	170,110 (66.1%)	9,330 (3.6%)	5,844 (2.3%)	3,888 (1.5%)

The situation was worse in 2002, when cultural revenue was only 0.14% and the percentage of cultural industries employees was only 0.33% of the country (Gwangju Metropolitan City 2011; Statistics Korea 2011). The only outstanding figure is the growth rate between those years, since the revenue and number of employees over this period increased by 928% and 787% respectively (Gwangju Metropolitan City 2011; Ministry of Culture, Sport and Tourism 2010). It is possible that this growth has been the result of the local government of Gwangju's programmes to develop various cultural industries since 2006, including a Computer Generated Image Centre (CGI

¹⁴ The area of cultural industries in these statistics include design, performing arts, new media, publication, comics, music, games, film, animation, broadcasting, advertising, character industries, and edutainment (Min 2009).

Centre) and a Cultural Contents Creative Studio (Gwangju Metropolitan City 2011).

This policy and strategy of the local government could be woven into the discussion on the Hub City of Asian Culture project, because one of the Hub City of Asian Culture project's goals is its economic impact on local areas. In order to achieve this goal, the project has not only developed new facilities, including the Asia Culture Complex, but has also paid attention to finding the best ways to get synergic effect from the earlier established facilities developed by the local government.

In this discussion we can observe that the pursuit of economic impact, another characteristic of culture-led urban development identified in chapters 2 and 3, is a key driver for the development of the local government of Gwangju and the Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture, the central government. The thesis will investigate this driver further, and show that the initial developments by the local government are reflected in the planning of the Hub City of Asian Culture project, and that the commencement of the project has again initiated additional development of cultural institutions, such as the Gwangju Cultural Foundation, through which the city of Gwangju will be able to create more job opportunities as an economic benefit.

Along with the above economic background, it is essential to be familiar with the 5·18 Gwangju Democratisation Movement in order to have a better understanding of modern Gwangju, since this movement has been one of the strongest identities of Gwangju in modern history, and has played a great role in giving Gwangju the reputation as the birth place of democracy in Korea (Min 2008a; Min 2008b; Min and Lee 2010; Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2005; *ibid.* 2007). The 5·18 Gwangju Democratisation Movement, which took place from 18th to 27th May, 1980, was a

movement in which the citizens of Gwangju rose against Doo-hwan Chun's military dictatorship (Sim 2007; The May 18 Memorial Foundation 2011). During the movement, which has been described as one of the most tragic incidents in modern Korea, 154 people were killed, 74 went missing, and 4,141 were wounded or placed under arrest (Sim 2007: 37; The May 18 Memorial Foundation 2011). Although the 5·18 Democratisation Movement is recognised as an important movement for democracy in Korea, it took a long time for the movement to attain this current recognition (Lee 2001; Sim 2007; The May 18 Memorial Foundation 2011). Under the regime of Doo-hwan Chun,¹⁵ this incident was initially denounced as a rebellion organised by communists who were acting in the region. Even after Chun's regime was over, it took more than ten years for the government and the people outside the region to acknowledge this Movement as a significant moment in Korean democracy. Efforts have been continuously made by academics, regional politicians and people related to the Movement to let people know the truth and the meaning of the 5·18 Democratisation Movement; this process was often hindered by, for example, conservative national leaderships (Sim 2007; The May 18 Memorial Foundation 2011). However, the country gradually began to recognise the nature of this Movement, and in June 1988 it was officially named and memorialised as the 5·18 Gwangju Democratisation Movement (The May 18 Memorial Foundation 2011). In 1988 the official government hearing concerning the Movement was also held, and hidden facts were revealed to the public that had previously been concealed by the military

¹⁵ Doo-hwan Chun was an army general and dictator of South Korea from 1980 to 1988. Mr Chun was sentenced to death in 1996 for his brutal reaction to the Gwangju Democratisation Movement. However, he was pardoned by president Young-sam Kim on the advice of then president-elect Dae-jung Kim, whom Chun had himself sentenced to death a few decades earlier (Lee 2001; The May 18 Memorial Foundation 2011).

dictatorship. According to the May 18 Memorial Foundation (*ibid.*), “This hearing was televised all over the country and it played an important role in spreading the truth of what had happened in Gwangju”. In addition, the government established the 5·18 *Special Law* in 1998, which made the military group of 1980 legally answerable for their actions (Lee 2001; Sim 2007; The May 18 Memorial Foundation 2011). Through all these efforts, the 5·18 Gwangju Democratisation Movement was recognised as an important demonstration movement in the modern history of Korea. Consequently, during recent history the 5·18 Movement has become a strong part of the identity of Gwangju, and people have come to be proud both of the Movement and of being a citizen of the city (Choi 2010; Lee and Min 2010; Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2007).

This strong identity has affected the project development process of the Hub City of Asian Culture. Since its main facility, the Asian Culture Complex, has been developed in the area of the 5·18 Gwangju Democratisation Movement site, the different local perceptions and approaches to preserving the building within the movement site have caused significant conflicts between local residents and central government. The emergence of these conflicts, and the ways in which they have been addressed, shows how the unique local context has affected project delivery process. These conflicts have multi-faceted aspects, involving local communities and central government and disharmony between old city residents and new city residents according to their relevance to the Hub City of Asian Culture project, particularly in terms of economic impacts. The Movement took place mainly in the former Office for Jeollanamdo Province, which is now the site of the Asia Culture Complex development. This creates

interaction between the Hub City of Asian Culture project (including the Asia Culture Complex development) and the 5·18 Gwangju Democratisation Movement. While the local government of Gwangju and its residents are still proud of the 5·18 Gwangju Democratisation Movement, the perceptions of the Movement and the site have been complicated by the decline of the old city centre, where the Movement took place and where the Asia Culture Complex site is located, because of the new city centre development. In particular, the residents of the old city centre and the people connected with the 5·18 Gwangju Democratisation Movement display different opinions on the development of the Asia Culture Complex and how to interpret the remaining 5·18 Gwangju Democratisation Movement's heritage. Along with local and central governments, these groups of local residents have been at the centre of various conflicts and discussions on the Asia Culture Complex development. This will be discussed later in the chapter (section 4).

As discussed above, Gwangju is an important city in the south-west of Korea, especially in modern politics (Gwangju Metropolitan City 2011; Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2007). However, Gwangju has shown poor economic performance and industrial development in recent history. This has made local people wish for something that can bring economic prosperity to the city, and, because of this, economic needs and financial benefit have become the most important criteria when local government is about to embark on a new policy or project (Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2006). When considering the background of culture's emergence within urban policy and strategy, in particular within the discussion of culture-led regeneration and culture-led urban branding, it was found that economic revitalisation and changing perceptions (or images) of the city have been the main rationales for

culture-led urban development projects. Chapter 2 and Chapter 3 identified these characteristics as key. These rationales are also important in the Gwangju case, but how exactly these characteristics have been part of the cultural development and strategy there, and whether the desired impacts have been, or are likely to be, achieved, will be further discussed over this and the next chapters.

The citizens of Gwangju are still proud of their political movement for democracy (*ibid.*). However, today, the people of Gwangju are more likely to give priority to the economic growth of their city (*ibid.*). In this context, it is noteworthy to identify that the Hub City of Asian Culture project has begun as a solution to two different issues: bringing economic prosperity and maintaining the city's cultural pride (*ibid.* 2007; *ibid.* 2008). The next section will review Gwangju's cultural infrastructure further.

2.2. Cultural infrastructure of Gwangju and local demand for arts and culture

A middle-aged woman interviewed for this research said that there were not many cultural facilities in Gwangju, including museums, cultural centres and libraries, when she was young (Choi, interview, 09.03.11). She repeatedly made the point that “people were not interested in culture or art things at that time”, and that economic growth was the first and only concern for people some decades ago (*ibid.*). Another young woman interviewed also stated that, although there might be more facilities now, she still felt that the city lacked cultural facilities compared to Seoul or other metropolitan cities (*ibid.*). Even though these comments are personal opinions, statistically there is a lack of cultural facilities in Gwangju (see following section) (Jeong 2009b; Ministry of

Culture, Sports and Tourism 2010). This phenomenon might not be a problem restricted to Gwangju, since many cultural investments are focused in the Seoul metropolitan area (Busan-Kyungnam Social Research Centre 2004; Korean History Research Group 2000; Ministry of Land, Transport and Maritime Affairs 2011). However, it is helpful to describe the status of the cultural infrastructure in Gwangju for a better understanding of the background of the Hub City of Asian Culture project.

2.2.1. Cultural infrastructure of Gwangju

The national investigation done by the Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism in 2009 identified that Gwangju had the second lowest cultural facilities provision¹⁶ (museums, galleries, libraries, cultural centres and cultural houses) among 16 local areas (Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism 2010: 3). As Table 4.3 shows, Gwangju has 42 cultural facilities, which is the second lowest number after the 29 of Ulsan (*ibid.*). This is slightly over 10% of the 349 in Kyonggi, which has the most cultural facilities in Korea (*ibid.*). In all the categories of cultural facilities, Gwangju has fewer provisions than the other areas; in particular, Gwangju has the lowest number of museums of all the regions.

¹⁶ In this investigation, cultural facilities are defined broadly, to include museums, art museums, libraries, cultural centres and cultural houses. Cultural houses are very similar to cultural centres, but there is no specific differentiation between cultural centres and cultural houses in this investigation.

Table 4.3 Number of cultural facilities in 2010 (Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism 2010: 3)

	Total	Libraries	Museums	Art museums	Culture and arts centres	Cultural centres	Cultural houses
Seoul	283	94	102	31	15	25	16
Busan	65	27	13	3	7	12	3
Daegu	47	20	9	2	8	8	0
Incheon	61	24	19	4	5	8	1
Gwangju	42	16	6	6	5	8	1
Daejeon	50	19	15	6	2	5	3
Ulsan	29	9	7	0	3	5	5
Kyonggi	349	143	106	28	26	31	15
Kangwon	163	50	60	10	14	18	11
Chungbuk	105	30	37	6	12	12	8
Chungnam	136	50	39	5	15	17	10
Jeonbuk	119	43	30	3	17	14	12
Jeonnam	114	52	34	12	14	22	10
Kyungbuk	174	55	60	6	20	23	10
Kyungnam	162	50	50	5	17	20	20
Jeju	101	21	43	14	2	2	19

This phenomenon has been noted since 2004, when the government started a national survey on the status of cultural facilities. From 2004 to 2007, Gwangju was placed the fourth lowest area for cultural facilities (Ministry of Culture and Tourism 2004: 3, 2005: 3, 2006: 3, 2007: 3); in 2008 and 2009, Gwangju was placed the second lowest for cultural facilities (Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism 2008:3, 2009: 3).

Table 4.4 Number of cultural facilities in 2004-2010 (Ministry of Culture and Tourism 2004; *ibid.* 2005; *ibid.* 2006; *ibid.* 2007; Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism 2008; *ibid.* 2009; *ibid.* 2010)

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Seoul	167	185	217	230	221	243	283
Busan	42	43	52	53	55	53	65
Daegu	23	27	28	31	40	43	47
Incheon	23	23	23	24	41	47	61
Gwangju	28	30	31	32	32	37	42
Daejeon	32	35	35	39	42	43	50
Ulsan	11	13	14	16	17	20	29
Kyonggi	158	174	218	248	275	308	349
Kangwon	78	79	79	100	133	140	163
Chungbuk	54	57	64	69	83	87	105
Chungnam	77	81	86	99	113	117	136
Jeonbuk	76	81	87	91	92	105	119
Jeonnam	79	84	85	91	122	125	114
Kyungbuk	93	109	116	120	153	161	174
Kyungnam	98	101	106	122	129	134	162
Jeju	44	48	57	66	70	78	101

While tables 4.3 and 4.4 show the total number of cultural facilities, regardless of population, analysing the number of cultural facilities per 10,000 people (see Table 4.5) also shows that Gwangju has a below average proportion. In 2007, the average number of cultural facilities per 10,000 people among the 16 areas was 0.38. However, the number for Gwangju was 0.23, which was far below the average, placing it tenth of 16 local areas (Ministry of Culture and Tourism 2007: 4, 13). A similar result could be found for the years 2004-2006. The number of cultural facilities per 10,000 people in

Gwangju has always been below average, and lower than in many other areas (*ibid.*

2004: 4, 14; *ibid.* 2005: 4, 13; *ibid.* 2006: 4, 13).

**Table 4.5 Number of cultural facilities per 10,000 people 2004-2007 (Ministry of Culture and Tourism
2004; *ibid.* 2005; *ibid.* 2006; *ibid.* 2007)**

	2004	2005	2006	2007
Average	0.29	0.31	0.34	0.38
Seoul	0.16	0.18	0.21	0.22
Busan	0.11	0.12	0.14	0.15
Daegu	0.09	0.11	0.11	0.12
Incheon	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09
Gwangju	0.20	0.21	0.22	0.23
Daejeon	0.22	0.24	0.24	0.27
Ulsan	0.10	0.12	0.13	0.15
Kyonggi	0.15	0.16	0.20	0.23
Kangwon	0.51	0.52	0.52	0.66
Chungbuk	0.36	0.38	0.43	0.46
Chungnam	0.40	0.41	0.43	0.49
Jeonbuk	0.39	0.42	0.46	0.48
Jeonnam	0.39	0.42	0.43	0.47
Kyungbuk	0.34	0.40	0.43	0.44
Kyungnam	0.31	0.32	0.34	0.38
Jeju	0.80	0.86	1.02	1.18

There are few cultural facilities in Gwangju compared to Seoul or other areas in the country. It is difficult to find a reason for this phenomenon, due to a lack of academic research on this subject. However, we can infer two possible explanations, both from an industrial development history of modern Korea and from comments made by professionals at central government and by local people. Firstly, this situation needs to

be understood within the context of overconcentration of Koreans in Seoul and the capital area, which is Kyonggi. For several decades, the population, economic resources and cultural infrastructure have been overly concentrated on Seoul and Kyonggi (Kim 2010; Minister of Land, Transport and Maritime Affairs 2011). Many young people have been drawn to Seoul, owing to the large number of high quality universities located there (Busan-Kyungnam Social Research Centre 2004). The headquarters of leading companies are mainly in Seoul, and many of their business complexes are also located in Seoul or Kyonggi. Because good human resources come to Seoul, companies also stay in Seoul to find qualified employees (Busan-Kyungnam Social Research Centre 2004; Korean History Research Group 2000; Minister of Land, Transport and Maritime Affairs 2011). This makes a circle of overconcentration of people and industries in Seoul and Kyonggi. This phenomenon has been a critical issue of national development in Korea for decades (Choi 2007; Korean History Research Group 2000; Minister of Land, Transport and Maritime Affairs 2011). Cultural provision is not an exception. A number of cultural institutions are based in Seoul or Kyonggi, from where it is easier for them to secure funding and attract many visitors (Jeong, interview, 02.03.11; Lee 2010; Park, interview, 26.01.11). In 2010 there were 349 and 283 cultural facilities in Kyonggi and Seoul, respectively; the area with the next most cultural facilities was Kyungbuk, with 174, which is approximately 50% of the number Kyonggi has (Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism 2010: 3). In terms of the numbers of cultural institutions, Seoul and Kyonggi overwhelm other areas. This phenomenon is more marked when looking at museums and galleries alone. The 267 museums in Seoul and Kyonggi account for over 40% of the total number of museums across 16 local areas (The Korean Museum Association 2011).

Another possible explanation for Gwangju's lack of cultural infrastructure can be found in the process of the development of Korea after the Korean War. After the Korean War, the main priorities of national leadership were given to the economic growth of the country (Choi 1997; Yoo 2006). This was entirely natural at that time, since the whole country had suffered three years of war, which brought huge damage to every aspect of society. From the 1960s to 1980s especially, Korea achieved outstanding economic growth, and many industries, especially construction and other heavy industries, prospered (Choi 1997; Yoo 2006). The significant economic growth of Korea during those times was called the 'Miracle of Han River' by other countries (Lee 2004: 1; Yoo 2006: 54), and Korea was included as one of four 'Asian Dragons', along with Hong Kong, Singapore and Taiwan (Nam 1997: 97). Since many policies were focused on growth and development during this period, the cultural sector was, relatively speaking, not a great concern for politicians or the public. Even though there were some museums, libraries and other cultural facilities, they did not attract a great deal of attention from the people (21st Century Presidential Consulting Committee 1994). Gwangju's lack of cultural facilities can be understood within the wider historical, social and economic circumstances of Korea. Even though there is a lack of academic research on this issue, the people interviewed at central government argued that the public, generally speaking, were not interested in arts and culture in the 1980s, and that they did not even want them (Lee 2011; Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2006; 21st century presidential consulting committee 1994). Although it may need further investigation, looking at Korea's development process during the late twentieth century provides a good background to the lack of development in the cultural sector in general in those times.

2.2.2. Demand for the arts and culture among local residents of Gwangju

As discussed above, Gwangju has significantly fewer cultural facilities than other areas. However, what is interesting about Gwangju is that people's demand for arts and culture is very high; indeed, it is higher than in most other areas (Kim 2007; Korea Culture and Tourism Policy Institute 2004b; Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2005).¹⁷ *The Survey Report on Cultural Enjoyment*,¹⁸ which was conducted in 2008 by the Korea Culture and Tourism Institute, identified that 81.4% of people in Gwangju had attended one or more artistic events, such as exhibitions, plays and classical concerts, in the year before the study (Korea Culture and Tourism Institute 2008: 220). This percentage is the highest among the 16 local areas. In the same survey, the percentage of people who visited cultural facilities was 78.8%, which is the highest again, and far above the national average of 45.2% (*ibid.*: 251). In addition, in terms of cultural tourism, 78.8% of people in Gwangju said that they visited one or more culture-history heritage sites, which is also the highest in the country (*ibid.*: 285). A previous survey in 2006 showed similar results. 75.9% of people in Gwangju attended one or more artistic events, which was the second highest after Incheon, with 76.4% (*ibid.*: 324). In terms of visiting cultural facilities, 56.3% of people visited them; this was also the second highest after the 61.5% of Chungbuk (*ibid.*: 326). Research done in 2004 showed that Gwangju had the highest percentage in terms of museum visits

¹⁷ There is no extant research investigating the reason for this phenomenon. Some local residents interviewed for this thesis merely said that it might be because of their inherited nature, which is based on their locality, since the city has been traditionally famous for the arts. However, this was the opinion of just a few local residents, not the result of solid research on this subject.

¹⁸ More recent data after 2011 have not been published, since new survey methods are being developed by the Korea Culture and Tourism Institute in advance of a new survey due to take place in 2014.

among the seven largest cities in Korea (Korea Culture and Tourism Policy Institute 2004b: 39). Also revealed through analysis of these surveys is that the percentage of people in Gwangju who attended artistic events or who visited cultural facilities has been increasing. As seen in Table 4.6, the percentage of people who attended artistic events increased, from 67.2% in 2003 to 81.4% in 2008, and the percentage of people who visited cultural facilities also increased, from 41.4% in 2003 to 78.8% in 2008 (Korea Culture and Tourism Institute 2008: 220, 251, 324, 326, 330, 332).

Table 4.6 Percentage of people in Gwangju who attended artistic events or visited cultural facilities (Korea Culture and Tourism Institute 2008)

	Percentage of people who attended artistic events (rank)	Percentage of people who visited cultural facilities (rank)
2003	67.2 (5 th)	38.9 (5 th)
2006	75.9 (2 nd)	56.3 (2 nd)
2008	81.4 (1 st)	78.8 (1 st)

Along with these surveys, qualitative evidence gained for this research from interviews with local residents also supports this finding. The majority of people interviewed claimed a high demand for cultural facilities (Kim *et al.*, interview, 05.03.11; Park and Choi, interview, 09.03.11). The younger generations especially are more interested in cultural environments and arts activities, and they argued that there needs to be more opportunities for local residents (Choi, interview, 09.03.11; Kim, interview, 05.03.11). This research does not take these interviews as solid evidence supporting the quantitative studies explored previously, since they cannot be generalised to represent the entire opinion of local residents. Rather, the aim of incorporating the results of these interviews is to observe individual opinions of local residents

represented in the qualitative data. Therefore, the interviews play a supplementary role in understanding the meaning of the quantitative data, which show high demand from local residents for arts and culture. Although all the above investigation reports and interviews did not clearly identify the reasons for this phenomenon, they support the idea that the people of Gwangju have a high demand for the arts and culture.

Gwangju has two cultural situations that appear to contradict each other. The first is that the city does not provide enough cultural facilities for its citizens; the second is that, in spite of its lack of facilities, the local residents of Gwangju show a high demand for arts and culture. This has been identified by different surveys carried out by various organisations, and through interviews with local residents (Kim *et al.*, interview, 05.03.11; Korea Culture and Tourism Institute 2008; Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism 2008). Affecting this phenomenon are the aims of the Hub City of Asian Culture project, it is claimed. For example, the Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture clarifies that one of the project's goals is to provide a high quality cultural facility in the region to meet and enhance local people's cultural needs.

3. Initial development of arts and culture in Gwangju

3.1. The early stages of cultural policies and strategies of Gwangju

Even though the Hub City of Asian Culture project has been mainly driven and developed by central government (the Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism), the city of Gwangju has also developed its own cultural plans and strategies over the last decade. The early plans and strategies produced or commissioned by the local

government of Gwangju were not directly related to the Hub City of Asian Culture project. However, the investigation of these previous plans and strategies was carried out by central government professionals and other relevant people at an early stage of the Hub City of Asian Culture project, and some of these plans were adapted and revised for the Hub City of Asian Culture project. For example, the intent to provide cultural opportunities through good quality facilities, which was a goal of the *Culture Gwangju 2020 Plan*, has been realised through the development of the Asia Culture Complex. This part of the chapter will review the various cultural policies and plans that Gwangju has developed on its own over the last ten years, and their contribution or relevance to the Hub City of Asian Culture.

Before discussing Gwangju's own cultural development plans, it is useful to understand the 4th *National Land Development Plan* of Korea, which was developed by central government before the millennium, in order to get a broader overview of the national development process of Korea from a macro point of view. The National Land Development Plan is part of an overall master plan on how to develop the country in a balanced way, and this started in 1972 with the 1st *National Land Development Plan* (Minister of Land, Transport and Maritime Affairs 2011). The 1st Plan, for the period between 1972 and 1981, focused on economic growth; the 2nd Plan, for the years between 1982 and 1991, focused on reducing overconcentration toward Seoul, and on enhancing the quality of life; and the 3rd Plan, for the period between 1992 and 2001, aimed at effective local development (*ibid.* 2003: 2). The 4th Plan, covering 2006 to 2020, focuses on developing new growth and resolving the unbalanced development of Korea (*ibid.*: 2-3). This latter plan tries to solve the problem of there being too much

focus on the development of the central-southeast axis, with the aim of generating more balanced growth in the country. In this context, Gwangju is very important, since it is the core city of the south-west of Korea, which is a less-developed area of the country. Therefore, the 4th *National Land Development Plan* has already positioned Gwangju as a centre for high-technology industries, arts and culture for the future (*ibid.*: 7-8). This point is an important background to the development of the Hub City of Asian Culture project, since one of the main policy backgrounds of the project is to promote balanced national development through establishing Gwangju as a Hub City of Asian Culture.

While the above plan has been developed by the central government, the city of Gwangju has also developed various cultural plans and strategies of its own. Among them, the *Gwangju Metropolitan City Arts and Culture Long-term Strategic Plan* (1997), the *City of Light Gwangju 2020* (1998), the *Contemporary Art Museum Plan* (2000), the *Culture Gwangju 2020 Plan* (2000) and the *Plan for Cultural District for Urban Vitalisation* (2002) are the main plans of relevance to the Hub City of Asian Culture project. The *Gwangju Metropolitan City Arts and Culture Long-term Strategic Plan* maintained the necessity of establishing cultural heritage sites in Gwangju, and also of building various museums for public use (Chonnam National University Humanities Science Research Centre 1997). The *City of Light Gwangju 2020* plan argued that the city needed a contemporary arts centre and specialised museums, such as a natural history museum, a museum of modern history and a food museum (Gwangju Metropolitan City 1998). This plan also suggested the creation of themed walking routes, such as an art street or sculpture park street (*ibid.*). This concept of making

themed routes continued for more than a decade in the city of Gwangju. For example, the city of Gwangju has been promoting the 'Urban Follies' project as part of the Gwangju Design Biennale in 2011, in which different architects created different concepts of a street within the old city centre area (Gwangju Biennale 2011). A research group at Chonnam National University also suggested a 5·18 street across the whole city to bring the meaning of 5·18 to the people and to protect the city's disappearing heritage (Lee, interview, 07.03.11). Although the details of presentation were different, this example shows how previous plans have been continued and adopted within more recent plans. The *Contemporary Art Museum Plan* suggested creating a new art museum which differs from other history museums in the region in terms of the subjects it covers (Gwangju Metropolitan City 2000). Even though a new art museum was not realised, this plan examined the arts environment of Gwangju, and as a result the plan reflected the new needs of the city's contemporary arts sector. The *Plan for a Cultural District for Urban Vitalisation* suggested that city planning should focus on pedestrians, and urged a transformation of the city centre toward a cultural and information space (Gwangju Jeonnam Development Institute 2002). Gwangju has developed these various cultural plans and strategies over the last 15 years to enrich its cultural profile. Although not all of the plans were implemented as actual development projects, through them we can identify the city's long-term endeavour to enhance its cultural environment.

Although all the above plans and strategies were produced at the early stages of the cultural policies and strategies of Gwangju, the most important plan of relevance to the Hub City of Asian Culture project is the *Culture Gwangju 2020 Plan*, since it

contains many similar ideas and suggestions to Hub City of Asian Culture project. For example, the *Culture Gwangju 2020 Plan* suggests creating eight cultural districts in Gwangju, and identifies several ways to enhance the regional cultural and tourism industries (Chonnam National University Humanities Science Research Centre 2000). It also suggests designating the old city centre area as a cultural district (*ibid.*). These three ideas can be directly connected to the Hub City of Asian Culture project, since the project also promotes seven themed cultural districts; and it is also one of its aims to enhance cultural industries in the area (Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2007). More importantly, the Asia Culture Complex, which is at the centre of the Hub City of Asian Culture project, has been developed in the old city centre area, which the *Culture Gwangju 2020 Plan* also suggests as being a good locale for a cultural district. Of course, there are many divergences between these two plans, since there is a gap of over five years between them. However, it is important to investigate the *Culture Gwangju 2020 Plan* as part of the background to the Hub City of Asian Culture project, since through the two plans – in spite of their time difference – cultural resources of Gwangju were critically identified, and individual development plans to increase Gwangju's cultural profile were suggested, resulting in similar outcomes for the plans. Ji Won Kim, at the Gwangju Cultural Foundation, which was involved in making the *Culture Gwangju 2020 Plan*, also maintains that one should study the *Culture Gwangju 2020 Plan* and the Hub City of Asian Culture project plans together, given that they have overlapping goals and strategies. Kim states that the project shows that Gwangju already had a vision for the city of culture before the Hub City of Asian Culture project officially started in 2004 (Kim, interview, 18.03.11).

Not all of these strategies are directly relevant to the Hub City of Asian Culture project, and the goal of Gwangju's own policies introduced above was not creating the Hub City of Asian Culture project. However, the thesis argues that the Hub City of Asian Culture project needs to be understood together with different plans and strategies that the city of Gwangju has developed for its own purposes over the years. This is because there are many common arguments and goals that link these various projects, such as creating the main cultural facility and developing themed cultural districts or routes within the city, even though detailed ideas for their practical implementation are different (Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2007); this shows that the concepts and plans for the Hub City of Asian Culture project, including the Asia Culture Complex, have undergone decades of discussions in the region. It is also because these plans and strategies provided significant information on the cultural environment of Gwangju, which was essential at the initial research stage of the Hub City of Asian Culture project in order to understand the local context. Due to this information, which mapped Gwangju's cultural environment and suggested context appropriate plans and developments, it can be argued that Gwangju's previous cultural plans and strategies provided an important, context specific influence on the development of the Hub City of Asian Culture project.

3.2. Cultural assets of Gwangju

Along with assessing the policies and strategies that Gwangju has developed during the last fifteen years, this section will review other cultural assets which the city already had before the beginning of the Hub City of Asian Culture project. This is

because, like the policies and strategies discussed previously, those cultural assets that Gwangju has kept for a long time are also useful to help understand the background to the Hub City of Asian Culture project. By confirming the city's cultural richness in spite of lack of facilities that can share them with the public, these cultural assets provided an appropriate rationale for the beginning of the whole project. Whereas policies or strategies are not easily delivered to local people, artistic events or cultural programmes are more likely to be remembered and recognised by citizens (Kim *et al.*, interview, 05.03.11; Park *et al.*, interview, 09.03.11). For example, although not many local people interviewed for the research were aware of the cultural plans that Gwangju had made in the past, all of them were familiar with the Gwangju Biennale, since it has been the most famous arts event in Gwangju since 1995 (Jeong 2009a; Gwangju Biennale 2011; Yoon *et al.*, interview, 09.03.11).

Gwangju had hosted various cultural events and festivals before the Hub City of Asian Culture project launched in 2004. Many of them are still taking place in the city, and more events and festivals have been added since 2004. Considering the history and size of the events or festivals, the main examples are the Gwangju World Kimchi Culture Festival, which has run since 1994, the Gwangju Biennale (from 1995) and the Imbangwool Traditional Music Competition and Festival (from 1997).

The Gwangju World Kimchi Culture Festival is an annual cultural tourism event that combines the traditional food of kimchi (and Korea's food culture as well); and it promotes local tourism by attracting domestic and international tourists (Gwangju Cultural Foundation 2011). Gwangju and the surrounding area have been traditionally well known for their high quality food (Gwangju Metropolitan City 2011; Gwangju

Cultural Foundation 2011); the city has been using this resource for local tourism and has marketed kimchi, which is the most representative food of Korea. For example, in 1999 and 2000 the festival took place in Japan for marketing purposes. The reason why this section pays attention to this event, which is not entirely about arts and culture, is that this food festival marks one of the earliest efforts of Gwangju to pursue economic impacts, such as increased local tourism, and to brand the city through approaches other than conventional industrial sectors, like the motor industry. After this festival, more varied events, including events more related to arts and culture, began to be developed. The Imbangwool Traditional Music Competition and Festival is one example of such a development.

The Imbangwool Traditional Music Competition and Festival is one of the largest music festivals in the region. Imbangwool is the name of a well-known traditional musician from the region, and the city of Gwangju has hosted the competition and festival to memorialise Imbangwool (Imbangwool Traditional Music Competition 2011; Gwangju Cultural Foundation 2011). The size of the event has grown to such an extent that it has become a national event that attracts people from all over the country (Imbangwool Traditional Music Competition 2011). This event might be less well-known to the public than the Gwangju Biennale, but it shows that Gwangju has attempted to develop its own cultural events after the Gwangju World Kimchi Culture Festival and Gwangju Biennale, which began a couple of years earlier. These festivals and events were taken into account by the Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture at the initial stage of preliminary research for the project, and it has attempted to

accommodate them within the whole project (Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2007).

The most important cultural event in Gwangju in relation to the Hub City of Asian Culture project is the Gwangju Biennale, as it has been the largest and most symbolic arts event in Gwangju prior to the Hub City of Asian Culture project. For example, according to the survey, people in Gwangju consider the Gwangju Biennale to be the most representative artistic event in the region (Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2007; Korea Culture and Tourism Policy Institute 2004a). The first Gwangju Biennale was held in 1995, and now it attracts about 130 artists from over 30 countries (Gwangju Biennale 2011). Since there was no such event for contemporary art in Gwangju before this biennale, the birth of the Gwangju Biennale attracted lots of attention from local people, and they still regard it as the most symbolic arts event in the region (Choi *et al.*, interview, 09.03.11; Lee and Yoon, interview, 05.03.11). What needs to be focused on regarding this contemporary art event is not the quality of the art works displayed or the artists in attendance (artistic quality is not the main focus of the thesis), but rather the fact that the Biennale has taken place in Gwangju for almost 20 years, and has become the most representative arts event of the city in local people's minds. The Hub City of Asian Culture project also considers the Gwangju Biennale as an important cultural asset, and seeks to share mutual benefits with it. For example, the area where the Gwangju Biennale takes place is at the centre of a Cultural Zone which is itself a part of the whole seven cultural zones that the Hub City of Asian Culture project is planning to create (Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism 2007); the project has been trying to develop programmes or events that connect the

Asia Culture Complex, the main facility of the Hub City of Asian Culture project and the Gwangju Biennale.

Along with the events that began before the commencement of the Hub City of Asian Culture project, there are other cultural events that were initiated after 2004, when the Hub City of Asian Culture project began. The earlier ones showed the city's efforts to use culture for urban strategies, which the project also reviewed in order to identify Gwangju's cultural assets and derive mutual benefits for the city, the events and the Hub City of Asian Culture project. The later ones confirm that the local government's endeavours have continued since the Hub City of Asian Culture project's commencement. The Gwangju Design Biennale, which started in 2005, the Jeong Yul Seong Music Festival, which began in 2005, and the Asia Content and Entertainment Fair, which started in 2006, are the main examples of these cultural events, all of which commenced after 2004. Each of them has its own purpose and background, but there is a common aspect in that they all began with the efforts of Gwangju towards becoming a city of culture (Kim, interview, 18.03.11; Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism 2007). Therefore, they share a goal of marketing a cultural Gwangju and enriching its cultural profile. This is especially true of the purpose and background of the Asia Content and Entertainment Fair, which looks for business opportunities for cultural industries in the area (Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism 2007). The Hub City of Asian Culture project also tries to enhance the cultural economy and cultural industries of the local area.

Gwangju has traditionally been an artistic town, with many well-known historical artists coming from the region, such as Baek-Ryon Huh and Geon Huh, who painted

Asian paintings, and Jiho Oh and Hwanki Kim, who painted Western paintings (Kim and Lee 2008: 21). In addition, the region has been the hub of Namdo Pansori, a traditional late nineteenth century style of music performance (*ibid.*). The Gwangju of today is also trying to establish itself as a famous artistic and cultural town through various festivals and events. The Hub City of Asian Culture project's master plan recognises the importance of reflecting Gwangju's existing cultural environment, since it is understood by central government that to construct new facilities alone cannot make a city more cultural (Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2007).

4. Hub City of Asian Culture project and the Asia Culture Complex development

The Hub City of Asian Culture project is currently in the middle of its development, and it is focusing on creating the Asia Culture Complex, which is the main facility of the project. However, care needs to be taken when considering the Hub City of Asian Culture project and the Asia Culture Complex development in a way more focused on the outward manifestations of the project, such as the amount of investment or the size of the new buildings, rather than the contents, functions or processes of the development. Although financial benefits are undoubtedly an important part of the whole project, the project also needs to be analysed from different perspectives. This is because the nature of the Hub City of Asian Culture is unique, unprecedented and complex, and thus has caused a great deal of discussion within the local communities (Jeong 2009a; Ryu 2010; Ryu, interview, 18.03.11). The next part of our discussion will therefore explore the details of the Hub City of Asian Culture and its main facility, the

Asia Culture Complex, particularly with respect to how the project has been progressed since its inception in 2004.

4.1. Overview of the Hub City of Asian Culture project

The Hub City of Asian Culture is the largest cultural project in the history of Korea, with an investment of about £3bn (5.3 Jo won in Korean currency) (Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2007). The project started in 2004, and will be completed in 2023 (Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2011). It originally began with the Presidential campaign of Mu-hyun Roh as the 'Gwangju as a Cultural Capital' proposal in 2002. After he became the President, the 'Gwangju, a Hub City of Asian Culture' project was launched in 2003, and a professional committee was organised for this project in 2004, which marked the official start of the project (Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2007). The vision for the Hub City of Asian Culture project is to make Gwangju "Asia's cultural window to the world" (Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2008: 4), and the project aims to make Gwangju a city in which various Asian cultures exchange and communicate with each other, and to enable all Asian cities to grow together. The project has three policy objectives for this vision: to become a city of Asian arts and peace, a city of Asian cultural exchange, and a futuristic city with a culture-based economy (Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2005: 6; Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2008: 4).

What we need to recognise within these objectives, which were developed by central government, is that there are some common aspects between them and Gwangju's

existing identities and prospective needs for arts and culture. For example, Gwangju as a “city of Asian arts and peace” reminds us that Gwangju already has the image of being an artistic town and identity as a birthplace of democracy in Korea. “A futuristic city of culture-based economy” shows two different desires of the local people: high demand for arts and culture, as discussed in section 2.2, and the desire for economic growth, all of which come from the city’s current unsatisfactory industrial status.

These commonalities between central government’s objectives and local circumstances have been significant for the Hub City of Asian Culture project when engaging with local communities. As Lee (interview, 07.03.11) argues, this is because sharing the vision and objective of a project is critical in making local communities become more involved in the project.

To realise its vision and policy objectives, the Hub City of Asian Culture project has four core missions: to establish and operate the Asia Culture Complex as a cultural power plant; to develop a culture-based urban environment; to promote the arts and culture/tourism industries; and to reinforce the city’s cultural exchange functions (Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2008: 5; *ibid.* 2005: 6).

The first mission is concerned with the Asia Culture Complex; this is the current main focus of the project. This complex facility is very difficult to define in a single description, since it functions variously as a museum, theatre, park, research institute, agency, and, in some ways, a company (*ibid.* 2008: 7). This thesis will pay particular attention to the Asia Culture Complex, since its development process has provoked a lot of discussions and conflicts, both due to its architectural design and to the symbolic meaning of the 5·18 Movement site, which is where the Asia Culture Complex is being

constructed. Although the Hub City of Asian Culture project's objectives imply consideration of local concerns and needs for the project, the architectural design and construction process of the Asia Culture Complex has been met with challenges from locals. This will be discussed later, in section 4.3.

The second mission concerns the cultural circumstances of the city of Gwangju. The Hub City of Asian Culture project will establish seven Cultural Zones, and each zone will be developed differently according to its own theme (Hub City of Asian Culture 2011; Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2008: 7-8; *ibid.* 2005: 7). The Hub City of Asian Culture tries to develop a theme for each zone in two ways: (1) to find a new theme; and, (2) to utilise the existing cultural heritage (*ibid.* 2007). Along with the seven Cultural Zones, this mission aims to construct a cultural infrastructure across the whole city (Hub City of Asian Culture 2011; Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2008: 7-8; *ibid.* 2005: 7). The second mission tries to enhance the cultural environment of the city overall. In this process, the necessity of working with the city's existing cultural assets, heritage and artistic events (such as the Gwangju Biennale) has been emphasised.

The third mission has an economic orientation. As discussed earlier, in section 2.1, Gwangju's economy is in need of regeneration, since its economic performance is underdeveloped compared to other metropolitan cities and its industrial environment is also in decline (Statistics Korea 2011). Local residents in Gwangju have been unsatisfied with this situation (Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2006; Park *et al.*, interview, 09.03.11), and both central and local governments needed a specific plan in order to address this issue. In the process of producing plans for urban and industrial

renewal, government became interested in arts and culture; this was especially so in the context of the people of Gwangju's high demand for more cultural provision (Korea Culture and Tourism Institute 2008). It was found in chapters 2 and 3 that cities in other parts of the world experiencing decline also chose culture as a way of promoting urban revitalisation. Gwangju has adopted this strategy, and local residents' high desire for arts and culture supported this approach. Therefore, the third mission can be understood as a way of combining these two demands of the local people: economic growth and cultural need. One of the comments heard very frequently during the interviews for this research was about "the city living on culture" (Hub City of Asian Culture 2011; Kim *et al.*, interview, 05.03.11; Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2008:8), and the third mission reflects this desire of local residents for the city to profit and 'live' from culture.

The fourth mission concerns the positioning of the Hub City of Asian Culture. It is noteworthy that the project focuses on a concept of exchange. The reason for this can be found from two different perspectives of the project. The first is political. The project hopes to distance itself from a discussion of cultural imperialism (Kim, interview, 26.01.11; Lee, interview, 18.02.11). Since the project deals with Asian culture, not just Korean culture, the government has been worried about some challenging questions from other Asian countries, such as "why is Gwangju the hub city of Asian culture?" or "Is Gwangju trying to be the centre of Asian culture?" (Kim, interview, 26.01.11; Lee, interview, 18.02.11; Park, interview, 26.01.11). Indeed, one manager at the Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture commented during the interview for this research that "It was like a cultural war among the big three

countries of China, Japan and Korea. If we are to compete with the cultural superiority or excellence of other countries, that would not be good for our project due to the number of collections or their economic power. Instead, we focus on exchange and networking". Since the Hub City of Asian Culture is not competing with other cities in Asia for the title of cultural capital or cultural centre, the project emphasises that the city of Gwangju aims to be a platform on which all different cultures can exchange and communicate (Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2007; *ibid.* 2008).

The second perspective is practical, in that it is related to the nature of the facility. Since exchange is the main concept of the Hub City of Asian Culture project, this makes the Asia Culture Complex, the main facility of the whole project, free from the duty of acquiring its own collection because acquisition is not its main priority (Kim, interview, 26.01.11; Kim, interview, 08.02.11). Therefore, this mission justifies the point that the Asia Culture Complex does not need to be a world class institution in terms of the extent of its collection. Although the Asia Culture Complex archives the cultural resources that the Asia Culture Complex develops and promotes, this is different from the traditional meaning of collecting. By emphasising its exchange function, the Asia Culture Complex aims to develop its own form of management, different from other existing cultural facilities. Through all these missions, the project aims to enhance the quality of life and enable self-realisation through education; create employment opportunities for individuals; attract qualified human resources; enrich civic cultural activities and expand the local economy of the region; promote a model of balanced national growth and enhance the cultural status of Korea among Asian countries; increase the diversity of Asian cultures; support sustainable growth

through cultural resources; establish trust and peace through cultural exchange across Asia; provide a better understanding of Asian culture; and make an alliance with other Asian countries, all in order to identify the cultural value of Asia for the world (Hub City of Asian Culture 2011; Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2008: 15).

As clarified within its missions, the project seeks to achieve these various impacts through various targets. However, it is currently not easy to investigate what kinds of impacts there have been with different targets, since the project is still in the middle of development. What changes have been possible at this stage for individuals and the city of Gwangju, such as bringing a new image for the city and enriching the city's cultural environment, will be discussed further in the next chapter.

4.2. Overview of the development of the Asia Culture Complex

This part of the chapter investigates the Asia Culture Complex further, not only because this facility is the primary focus of the whole project, but also because it has brought a lot of controversial discussions on itself, including design debates and preservation conflicts. The Asia Culture Complex is the main facility for the Hub City of Asian Culture, and is located on the site of the former Office of Jeollanamdo Province and its vicinity, which is also a heritage site of the 5·18 Movement. The architectural design was selected through an international competition, and the winning award went to Gyu-Seung Woo, who designed the building with a concept of 'the forest of light' (Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2008: 2). This concept highlights the 'light' to which the name of Gwangju relates. The noteworthy aspect of this design is

that the building has its main facilities underground, which later brought about a debate about the landmark since the design was against the local desire for more iconic, outstanding architecture. How this landmark debate arose, and how it reached a compromise, showing the process of addressing local contexts, will be discussed later, in section 4.3.



Figure 4.2 Asia Culture Complex image 1 (Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2011)



Figure 4.3 Asia Culture Complex image 2 (*ibid.*)

The Asia Culture Complex is composed of five different facilities (Hub City of Asian Culture 2011; Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2008: 12-13; *ibid.* 2005: 11):

- Cultural Promotion Agency.
- Asian Arts Theatre.
- Cultural Exchange Agency.
- Asian Culture Information Agency.
- Edu-Culture Agency for Children.

The Cultural Promotion Agency works to find cultural resources¹⁹ in Asia and to support making them useful in the cultural industries (Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2008: 12). This agency has three sub-facilities: the Culture Contents Development Centre, the Cultural Contents Production Centre and the Multi-Functional Exhibition Hall (*ibid.*: 12). This agency, along with the Asian Arts Theatre, plays a role in communicating with external organisations in particular through showing the outcome of the Asia Culture Complex's activities, research etc on outside individual or institutional audiences.

The Asian Arts Theatre has two performance spaces, the Grand Performance Hall and the Multi-Functional Auditorium (*ibid.*), and is intended to be the venue for various Asian cultural performances. Unlike other parts of the Asia Culture Complex, the function of the Asian Arts Theatre is more specific in terms of performance, and, considering that this facility is a window to showcase the outcome of the activities of the Asia Culture Complex, it also contributes to communicating with audiences.

¹⁹ 'Cultural resources' in the Asian Culture Complex means not only cultural or artistic assets, but also something that has the potential to become a product for cultural industries (Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2009).

The Cultural Exchange Agency is composed of three facilities: the 5·18 Memorial Hall, the Asian Culture Exchange Centre and the Business Strategy Centre (*ibid.*: 13). This agency plays the role of a hub facility for the whole Asia Culture Complex, whose functions include supporting exchange with other organisations inside and outside Gwangju and operating the visitor centre (Kim, interview, 08.02.11).

The Asian Culture Information Agency is a facility for research and education. It has the Asian Culture Research Unit, the Asian Cultural Resource Centre and the Asian Culture Academy (Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2008). These three centres conduct research on Asian cultural resources, and collect and classify them so that industrial sectors can utilise those resources. For example, the agency conducts research about myths or traditional stories in central Asia that have the potential to be ‘products’, in order to make them fundamental resources for the all other activities (exhibitions or performances).

The Edu-Culture Agency for Children has two sub-facilities: the Edu-Culture Contents Development Centre and the Children’s Edu-Culture Museum (*ibid.*: 13). The agency works to develop cultural contents for children’s education and encourage children to learn through aesthetic experience (*ibid.*). In terms of its function, this agency is more independent than the other agencies.

The Asia Culture Complex is an institution that has various functions. The work flow of the Asia Culture Complex can be summarised thus: the Asian Culture Information Agency finds cultural resources among Asian countries and collects, classifies and digitises them for the use of the public and industry. The Cultural Promotion Agency cooperates in this process, supporting it through technical assistance, and generates

cultural products based on those cultural resources. The Cultural Exchange Agency supports all these procedures by offering any necessary services, including providing administration support and handling copyright issues. The Asian Arts Theatre is the place for testing and promoting those products. The Edu-Culture Agency for Children is more detached from all these activities, but it still plays a role in providing cultural resources and products for an edu-cultural purpose.

The next section explores the Asia Culture Complex development process so far; in particular, it examines the conflicts surrounding the Asia Culture Complex. By investigating the backgrounds and processes, and the ways to address them, this chapter will highlight how the local context has been dealt with in the Hub City of Asian Culture project.

4.3. Conflicts in the Asia Culture Complex development process

Along with its functions and facilities, it is also important to review how the Asia Culture Complex has been developed from the beginning, since it has provoked many conflicts and debates in the region; the process of overcoming them has revealed the significance of considering the unique local context. After experiencing these locally rooted, challenging circumstances, the project delivery has begun to enter a different phase. Two of the most significant issues for local people have been the landmark debate and the preservation conflict. It is in examining the nature of these debates and responses to them that we can most understand the ways in which the Hub City of

Asian Culture project has been required to adjust its implementation in order to respond to locals.

The landmark debate is about the architectural design of the Asia Culture Complex. There was a debate mainly between central government and local communities on this issue. The central government's design, which is based on Gyu-Seung Woo's plan for the competition, was to put the main facilities underground; but local communities wanted a more outstanding and iconic architectural design that could attract more attention from audience and media (Ryu 2010: 80; Kim, Jeong and Doh at Gwangju MBC panel discussion 2008). The architect designed the main facilities to be underground in order to respect the meaning of the 5·18 Democratisation Movement site, where the Asia Culture Complex is located. His concept was to memorialise and show respect for a space of unique heritage for the city without interfering with the existing buildings (Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2007). Therefore, he placed the main facilities underground and designed a park above ground. However, the residents of Gwangju wanted a more iconic design so that the building itself would attract tourists and play a role as a tourism destination (Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2010). They appreciated the architectural concept of the architects, but the concept was not what many local residents had hoped for.

Even though the divergent wishes for the design was one important reason for the debate, other significant issues were a lack of communication at the early stage of design and the attitude of each side toward alternative ideas. It could be understood as a natural desire for local people to have more iconic architecture to attract more attention, since the region lacks outstanding developments (Kim, Jeong and Doh,

Gwangju MBC panel discussion, 2008). A panel discussion involving local residents for the purpose of providing a public forum for debate revealed that there was a consensus amongst at least those who attended this discussion that the people of Gwangju would prefer to have an iconic new building, as it was thought that such a building would attract attention to the region (Kim, Jeong and Doh, Gwangju MBC panel discussion, 2008). If the reason for the debate were only this, it could have been resolved more easily and quickly. However, there has been an issue of lack of communication between the two parties, central government and local communities. According to Na (Professor at Chonnam National University) and Min (a local resident), local people maintained that if central government had managed the architectural competition process more carefully, and considered more opinions from local communities before and during the process, the landmark debate might have not happened (Min, interview, 10.02.11; Na, interview, 11.02.11). On the other hand, because of their different standpoints, the central government thought it had followed every proper step in deciding on an architectural design, in spite of local people's argument that there had been no opportunities for them to be involved in the competition procedure; when this issue was raised, both central government and local people were very unsatisfied with the situation (*ibid.*).

These arguments went further, and the conflicts became more like emotional criticism than constructive discussion, which raised another issue. Discussions on the architectural design became diverted to a debate on cultural elitism, which simply divided the whole discussion into two categories: cultural elites who supported the government's design and non-cultural elites who supported a more iconic design (Kim,

Jeong and Doh at Gwangju MBC panel discussion 2008; Ryu 2010: 80). Indeed, local residents regarded central government's approach to this issue as looking down on regional culture, assuming that local people had a lack of understanding of the cultural and architectural concept of the design (Jeong 2010b; Ryu 2010).

Following several meetings and discussions between the two parties, however, a compromise was reached, with agreement on a revised architectural plan (Jeong 2009b). Even though their opinions about the initial design were quite different, both the central government and local communities were aware of the fact that it was too late to produce a totally new design (Min, interview, 10.02.11; Na, interview, 11.02.11; Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2011a). Therefore, discussion of alternative courses of action continued, and eventually led to settling on a revised plan.

While this debate apparently reveals the conflicts over the design, the process of the debate's development also shows an aspect of the conflicts between central government and local residents. This conflict is an example of how interpretations and approaches to the project can differ according to the related parties, and how it is difficult to reach a compromise. The local academics interviewed for this research recollected that this is a collision between local and central, rather than simply a debate on the design itself (Jeong 2010b; Ryu 2010).

Their argument was supported by another conflict that occurred after this landmark debate. Although both central government and local residents realised the importance of mutual communication and understanding based on respect in this conflict, it was still a challenge to meet the needs of both. Considering the point that these debates and conflicts were about the involvement of and communication between the two

parties, it is argued that the engagement of local communities, one of the four main characteristics identified in chapters 2 and 3, emerged as a significant issue in the case of Gwangju.

The other conflict that occurred concerned how to preserve the original Office for Jeollanamdo Province. This conflict provided more opportunities to examine the engagement of local communities, since this conflict involved the issues of local identity related to 5·18, which is still important to local residents. There has been a conflict on how to preserve a part of the remaining building that holds 5·18 heritage importance (former Office for Jeollanamdo Province) in which the Asia Culture Complex is located. This debate has focused on a specific part of the building, and was raised after the landmark debate was addressed. The central government hoped to dismantle that particular part of the whole building, as laid out in the original architectural design, but there are local people (especially those related to the 5·18 Movement) who want to preserve the building in its entirety. This has been a more serious issue than the landmark debate, since 5·18 has now been involved in the discussion. The conflict occurred in 2008, and it was not clearly resolved for the next few years, in spite of the government producing a final, alternative design that was announced after a long period of compromise with local communities, especially 5·18-related organisations (Lee, interview, 18.02.11; Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2011a).

As Figure 4.4 shows, the original design involved demolishing a certain part of the building, marked with a circle. However, the argument that this part also needed to be preserved was raised by 5·18-related people and organisations, and a couple of

designs (shown in figures 4.5 and 4.6) were discussed as alternatives. There have been six public-opinion surveys on this issue, most of which have showed that the majority of the residents hoped to keep the original plan, which means demolition of that part of the building (Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2011). Four surveys showed that more people wanted to destroy it; one survey showed the opposite result; and one survey, which asked which value was more desirable, the Asia Culture Complex or 5·18, showed that people regarded the Asia Culture Complex as more desirable.

Although admitting that the survey results could vary according to the methods used, nevertheless the surveys apparently showed consistency in the opinions of the majority of Gwangju residents that the original plan was the preferred plan (*ibid.*).

Although the debate was apparently centred on the decision about how to preserve that specific part of the building, further investigation finds that the division of opinions does not merely reveal conflict between central government and local residents (Jeong 2009b; Ryu 2010), but that in fact there was no local consensus on this issue. The old city centre residents generally hoped that the Asia Culture Complex should be completed without delay, therefore they were not interested in how to preserve that specific part of the building, which means they were more likely to agree with the government's idea to keep the project moving forward (Kim *et al.*, interview, 05.03.11). However, people related to the 5·18 Movement did not want to lose any part of the building, since it holds the memory of the 5·18 Movement and forms the most significant part of the 5·18 heritage (Min, interview, 10.02.11; Na, interview, 11.02.11). An old lady who lost her family during the 5·18 Movement even stated that "you cannot even take a piece of brick from the building" (Park, interview, 26.01.11).

This division could be seen not only among local people, but also among academics in the region. Academics such as Jeong at the Gwangju Development Institute and Ryu at Chonnam National University argued that the whole project is more important than a specific part of the building (Jeong 2009a; *ibid.* 2010; Ryu 2010). In this argument, they emphasise that the Hub City of Asian Culture project, including the Asia Culture Complex development, is an important opportunity for Gwangju to enhance the city's profile, and that the city should not lose this chance because of conflicts about the preservation methods (*ibid.*). They also argue that the project does preserve most of the 5·18 heritage, and that the removed part is insignificant (Jeong, interview, 02.03.11). On the other hand, other academics, such as professor Na at Chonnam National University and Min at the Gwangju Development Institute, argued that, even though it would take more time and money to change architectural plans to preserve all the heritage buildings, it is necessary to do so, as it enables the fuller preservation of 5·18's meaning and Gwangju's identity (Min, interview, 10.02.11; Na, interview, 11.02.11).

In spite of all these debates, the most common overall position is that people (1) do not want to lose the meaning of 5·18 and that (2) they are in general support of the Asia Culture Complex development (Lee, interview, 18.02.11; Na, interview, 11.02.11; Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2011a).

The final alternative design, shown in Figure 4.7, which the local council also agreed to, was suggested by central government, and construction has now been re-started (Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2011). The final design attempts to make a compromise between the various positions by finding a way to preserve the part of

the building that had been at stake. Thus, through engaging with and responding to the local community, the Hub City of Asian Project has developed by incorporating local and more specific desires into its larger strategic city branding development.



Figure 4.4 Original design (Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2011)



Figure 4.5 Alternative design 1 (*ibid.*)



Figure 4.6 Alternative design 2 (*ibid.*)



Figure 4.7 Final design (*ibid.*)

As discussed above, the Hub City of Asian Culture – more specifically, the Asia Culture Complex development – has faced challenging issues. The raising and solving of these issues, which has brought to light unique contexts of the city, has delayed the construction of the Asia Culture Complex for over two years, although some say that this delay has caused economic challenges as well (Park *et al.*, interview, 26.01.11). However, the research indicates that this practical disadvantage will not always have negative implications either for the Hub City of Asian Culture project or the Asia Culture Complex development in the future. This is because these phenomena, including discussions, conflicts and even sharp confrontations, can be remembered as paths to the completion of the whole project. These phenomena show that people have become more interested in the Hub City of Asian Culture and the Asia Culture Complex development, and that people and governments have learnt how to reach a consensus for the development process (Jeong 2010b; Jeong, interview, 02.03.11; Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2011a; *ibid.* 2011b; Park *et al.*, interview, 26.01.11; Ryu, interview, 18.03.11). Whatever their motivations, local people are now becoming more involved in this project, and the government also confirms that the

project should engage more with local communities, which is a new phase that the project delivery has entered into.

5. Conclusion

This chapter has discussed the basic profile of the city of Gwangju, and its positioning within the modern history of Korea, from political, social, economic and cultural perspectives. Following this, the cultural infrastructure of Gwangju and the city's initial cultural plans and strategies have been discussed, along with its cultural events and festivals. After this, the Hub City of Asian Culture project and the Asia Culture Complex development have been discussed further, to better understand the project and how it has developed since it started in 2004.

Gwangju, the sixth largest city of Korea, has experienced low economic performance and an under-developed industrial environment compared to other cities and regions in Korea (Statistics Korea 2011). However, local people in Gwangju have been proud of its 5·18 heritage and its traditional image as an artistic town (Gwangju Folk Museum 1999; Gwangju Metropolitan City 2007; *ibid.* 2011). Especially given that the 5·18 Movement has been the most significant political movement in the modern history of Korea, the people of Gwangju have been very proud of the fact that their city is the birth place of Korean democracy. Gwangju also has been called an artistic town, since many well-known artists were born and raised in the area (Gwangju Folk Museum 1999; Gwangju Metropolitan City 2011; *ibid.* 2007). However, despite its traditional fame as an artistic city, the current provision of cultural infrastructure in Gwangju is

not satisfactory, and there is less provision than in other cities (Ministry of Culture and Tourism 2004; *ibid.* 2005; *ibid.* 2006; *ibid.* 2007; Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism 2008; *ibid.* 2009; *ibid.* 2010). Unfortunately, Gwangju has experienced lower performance, not only in its economy and industries, but also in its cultural infrastructure. Even though its cultural environment has been lacking, there is a high demand for the arts and culture among the local people of Gwangju (Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism 2008; Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2007). This high desire for the arts and culture by local people, in spite of the under-developed cultural infrastructure of the city, is noteworthy, since it has played a role in providing the background of the Hub City of Asian Culture. For example, it is one of the purposes of the Hub City of Asian Culture project to provide a quality cultural experience for audiences. Gwangju's previous cultural plans and cultural assets are also significant in gaining a better understanding of the Hub City of Asian Culture project, since some of them have provided initial ideas concerning the Hub City of Asia Culture project development, and have also identified cultural assets and resources available for the project. Gwangju has also held many cultural events or festivals continuously, including the most symbolic Gwangju Biennale (Gwangju Biennale 2011; Gwangju Cultural Foundation 2011). Considering the efforts of Gwangju's local government and the advantages of long-term planning, a characteristic identified in Chapter 2 and Chapter 3 regarding culture-led regeneration and culture-led urban branding is recognised here (Chonnam National Univeristy Humanities Science Research Centre 1997; *ibid.* 2000; Gwangju Metropolitan City 1998; *ibid.* 2000; GwangjuJeonnam Development Institute 2002). This chapter has argued that these events show that

Gwangju has tried to enhance its cultural profile over the last 15 years, and that the Hub City of Asian Culture should be understood within this context.

The Asia Culture Complex lies at the centre of the early stages of the Hub City of Asian Culture project. However, due to its complex nature, the huge size of investment and the unprecedented and unique nature of the project, the Asia Culture Complex has faced many challenging issues, such as the landmark debate and preservation conflict (Kim, Jeong and Doh at Gwangju MBC panel discussion 2008; Ryu 2010: 80). The different opinions of local communities and central government on the architectural design of the complex and how to preserve a certain part of the 5·18 heritage have brought conflicts and debates (*ibid.*) in which we can testify to and identify another characteristic of culture-led regeneration and culture-led urban branding: the engagement of local communities. Even though these conflicts may look like merely a division of and/or distraction from the project, it is argued here that they could actually be a turning point in the Hub City of Asian Culture project delivery process. During the debate process, many people became interested in the project and hoped to voice their opinions on each issue (Park *et al.*, interview, 09.03.11). In addition, after overcoming these issues, the central government, local government and local communities all realised the importance of communication and engagement (Lee, interview, 18.02.11; Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2011b; Ryu, interview, 18.03.11), which has brought the project delivery process forward to the second phase, to local communities; this is different from the first one, which focused on initial investment and infrastructure. Since central government and local communities have

learned how to reach a consensus on the issues, they can now be expected to work together more productively in the future, when other issues arise.

As explored in this chapter, the Hub City of Asian Culture and its main facility, the Asia Culture Complex, have shown a complex nature and progression. With all the background information about them, the next chapter will investigate what kinds of changes have been noticeable at this early stage of the project. Although the project in Gwangju is still at an early stage, there have also been several changes noticeable in Gwangju, such as bringing a new image of the city other than 5·18, and enriching the cultural environment with more facilities. The next chapter will further explore these changes by using characteristics identified in chapters 2 and 3, specifically the ways in which the Hub City project aims to change perceptions of Gwangju, and the ways in which it aims to have economic impact.

Chapter 5

The Hub City of Asian Culture project and the Asia Culture Complex development: bringing a new image and initial changes to Gwangju

1. Introduction

The previous chapter discussed the background to the Hub City of Asian Culture project and the initial development process of the project. It investigated the city of Gwangju within the modern history of Korea, and identified its lower performing economy and industries (Gwangju Metropolitan City 2007; Statistics Korea 2011). However, it was also identified that Gwangju has high demand for arts and culture compared to other cities, and that the city has developed various cultural plans and events on its own for over 15 years, which has contributed to the beginning of the Hub City of Asian Culture project (Chonnam National University Humanities Science Research Centre 1997; *ibid.* 2000; Gwangju Metropolitan City 1998; *ibid.* 2000; GwangjuJeonnam Development Institute 2002). In this discussion, the advantages of long-term planning, identified as one of the main characteristics of sustainable culture-led regeneration and culture-led urban branding, have been applied to this process.

The development of the Hub City of Asian Culture and its main facility, the Asia Culture Complex, was also discussed. Most of all, it was found that the development has faced many challenging issues due to its complex nature and unique local circumstances, including the 5·18 Movement, and among them the landmark debate and preservation conflict were discussed further. What was argued regarding the early developmental stage of the Asia Culture Complex, especially as expressed in the conflicts and debates,

is that all the concerns and issues enabled the project development to involve processes of greater engagement and involvement of local communities, processes through which the central government, local government and local residents learned as important aspects of the project's delivery (Jeong 2010b; Lee, interview, 18.02.11; Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2011a; *ibid.* 2011b; Ryu 2010). In chronological order, this chapter will review what kinds of changes the Hub City of Asian Culture project has brought to Gwangju and its citizens since the beginning of the project in 2004; the discovery of a new cultural image for the city and enrichment of the cultural environment of the city will be discussed further throughout this chapter.

Finally, the thesis, after the exploration set out in this and the previous chapter, argues that the Hub City of Asian Culture project has moved to its second phase of development, after encountering and overcoming challenging issues and conflicts which arose from the local context of Gwangju, such as the 5·18 Democratisation Movement. The thesis will confirm that the four main characteristics identified in Chapter 2 and Chapter 3 about culture-led regeneration and culture-led urban branding have been examined and recognised in the case of Gwangju. The application of them has provided a framework to understand, in particular, the backgrounds and impact of using culture for urban strategies; how the Western arguments and their practical application have been adopted and implemented in Gwangju; and what kinds of changes have been observed in the region. However, more importantly, the case of Gwangju has revealed the many different challenging issues, rooted locally, that it has faced in the process of adaptation, and how it has tried to address them in its own way.

This chapter will discuss two changes that can be observed to have happened in Gwangju since the Hub City of Asian Culture project began: finding a new value for the future of the city and enriching the cultural environment of the city – both parts of the overall aims of the project. The two main characteristics identified previously, changing perceptions and the pursuit of economic impact, will be re-visited in this discussion, since Gwangju, facing a dilemma of choosing between its previous image, represented by the 5·18 Movement, and a new, cultural image, has tried to secure a new image for the future, and enriching local cultural environments has increased local job opportunities. The surveys and researches on local perceptions of the image of Gwangju conducted by the Gwangju Development Institute identifies that, although local people in Gwangju still think that the 5·18 Democratisation Movement gives a representative image of the city, they are now more likely to acknowledge that the image of the city is one of Asian culture for the future (Min and Lee 2010). Considering that there have been various debates, and sometimes sharply divided discussions, on the development of the Asia Culture Complex and the bringing of a new cultural image into the city, it is interesting to find that local people are satisfied with this new cultural image and hope to develop the new culture-led urban branding of the city. This indication is significant because it shows that all the concerns that have been raised in Gwangju since the beginning of the Hub City of Asian Culture project do not necessarily mean that people in Gwangju do not want to proceed with the project. Instead, it could be interpreted as growing pains that local people in Gwangju have experienced while facing and developing this unprecedented project. It will be argued that people in Gwangju have found new value for the future of the city through the

Hub City of Asian Culture project. Efforts to change perceptions – one of the main characteristics – are re-identified in this argument.

In addition, there have been various cultural developments in the area since the Hub City of Asian Culture project began. For example, the setting up of the Gwangju Cultural Foundation and the Graduate School of Culture at Chonnam National University, the plans for the Cultural Contents Technology Research Institute (CT Research Institute) and the relocation of the Korea Creative Contents Agency (KOCCA) to the area are new developments in the region. The Hub City of Asian Culture project does not have any official relationship with all of these initiatives, such as in relation to funding or governing structure, but the project has been an important background for them (Gwangju Cultural Foundation 2011; Graduate School of Culture at Chonnam National University 2011; Kim, interview, 18.03.11; Lee, interview, 07.03.11). It is argued in this chapter that at this early stage the Hub City of Asian Culture project has played a role in enriching the cultural environment of Gwangju. Although it may need further longitudinal investigation to see how this enrichment has contributed to the local economy, the overall increase in cultural industries can create more job opportunities, and this creation is already bringing economic benefits to the city.

After reviewing these changes in Gwangju, the thesis will discuss a future strategy for the project. Although some changes have been noticeable even at this early stage of the project, there are also indications that the project needs to be more engaged with local communities in the future (Park *et al.*, interview, 09.03.11; Ryu, interview, 18.03.11). In fact, many local people are still not very aware of the project, and other academic researchers and professionals emphasise the need for ongoing community

involvement with the project (Jeong 2010b; Lee 2010; Kim *et al.*, interview, 05.03.11; Park *et al.*, interview, 09.03.11). In addition, the central government declared its focus on future plans, according to which it is one of their core tasks to communicate with local residents and encourage them to be more involved with the project (Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2011b). It is found that engagement of local communities has been continuously stressed in the Hub City of Asian Culture project. This chapter evaluates all these arguments carefully, relating them to lessons that governments and local people may have learnt during the initial process of the project development.

2. The Hub City of Asian Culture project and initial changes to Gwangju

2.1. Finding a new cultural identity for the future of the city

This section investigates a change noticed in Gwangju in relation to the new image created by the Hub City of Asian Culture project and its main facility, the Asia Culture Complex development. For this discussion, changing perceptions is identified in Chapter 2 and Chapter 3 as one of the four main characteristics in culture-led regeneration and culture-led urban branding rationales and practices. Since the cities experiencing decline have adopted culture as a new urban strategy, they also have tried to bring a new image and to change perceptions of the city. This phenomenon has also been found in Gwangju. However, the situation is more complex in this case, since the city has adhered strongly to its previous identity, derived from 5·18. In particular, since the Hub City of Asian Culture project and its main facility, the Asia Culture Complex, is being developed at the site of the 5·18 Movement, the collision of the two different images of 5·18 and culture, respectively, has been inevitable. This

collision has been represented as conflicts between central government and local residents, as discussed in Chapter 4. Throughout this section, the thesis explores how local residents perceive the existing identity of 5·18 and the image of culture. In particular, it focuses on the specific circumstances of the old city centre, where the collision of the two images is most vivid.

2.1.1. Perception of local people about old identities: Gwangju and 5·18

Gwangju has been well-known as a city of democracy and traditional arts, and it also has an image as a city of food and education (Gwangju Metropolitan City 2011; Ko 2002). However, in its modern history, Gwangju is best known for being the birth place of Korean democracy. This is because of the 5·18 Democratisation Movement²⁰, which happened in Gwangju. Since this Movement was one of the most tragic incidents in the modern history of Korea, it is very natural for people in Korea to be reminded of the 5·18 Democratisation Movement when they hear the name of the city of Gwangju (Min and Lee 2010). Especially, the perception of Gwangju among people outside the city shows that the 5·18 Democratisation Movement is the most representative image of Gwangju (*ibid.*). It means that this Movement still presents a strongly symbolic image of Gwangju, even though it has been over thirty years since the 5·18 Democratisation Movement occurred.

The Hub City of Asian Culture project took significant account of this situation since its inception, as it is one of the most obvious aspects of the city that the project needed to know about (Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2005; *ibid.* 2007). Indeed, at

²⁰ See section 2, Chapter 4 for further information about the 5·18 Democratisation Movement.

the initial stage of the Hub City of Asian Culture project, when the central government was developing the project's fundamental concepts and goals, it paid great attention to the 5·18 Democratisation Movement, and tried to establish a connection between this Movement and the project (*ibid.* 2007). As a result, the symbolic meanings that the 5·18 Democratisation Movement has brought to Gwangju and to the country, such as peace, freedom and human rights, were adopted for the Hub City of Asian Culture project, and in the end the Movement was concretised as an important part of the main concepts of the whole project and its policy objectives: to create a city of Asian arts and peace.

In addition, and more importantly in terms of space and location, the Hub City of Asian Culture project cannot be separated from the 5·18 Democratisation Movement since the Asia Culture Complex is being developed in an area that was one of the most important sites of the Movement. For example, the preservation conflict discussed in section 4.3 of Chapter 4 gives an example of the significant relationship between the Hub City of Asian Culture project and the Movement. This was a conflict concerning the preservation of the 5·18 heritage, and eventually expanded into a debate on how the project has dealt with the Movement and its symbolic status in Gwangju. For local residents, 5·18 and the Hub City of Asian Culture project have been tied together both geographically and psychologically.

General perceptions of the 5·18 Democratisation Movement among people have been studied and explored in research conducted in 2010 by Nan-gyung Lee and Incheol Min who are researchers at Gwangju Development Institute. They identified that 79.6% of people outside Gwangju consider the 5·18 Democratisation Movement the most

representative image of the city (Min and Lee 2010: 58). They also showed that 47.8% of people outside the region think about the 5·18 Democratisation Movement when they hear of Gwangju, followed by the Gwangju Biennale, with 35.6% (*ibid.*). Local people in Gwangju also showed a similar range of opinions, thinking that the most representative image of Gwangju is the 5·18 Democratisation Movement (78%), followed by the Gwangju Biennale at 59%. Regardless of the region the respondents belong to, it seems, people think the 5·18 Democratisation Movement is the main image for Gwangju.

The interviews with local academics conducted for this research also support the above results. Gan-chae Na, a professor at Chonnam National University and a director of the 5·18 Democratisation Movement Research Institute, is one of the people who has tried to keep alive the meaning of the Movement and to ensure that its value and heritage are inherited by future generations. He argued that the 5·18 Democratisation Movement is the most important asset of Gwangju of which people have been proud (Na, interview, 11.02.11). Muyong Lee, another professor at the same university, also argued that the people of Gwangju need to maintain the Movement's tangible as well as intangible heritage, since it has been a source of great pride for them (Lee, interview, 07.03.11). For this purpose, Lee designed the 5·18 Route, which connects many different 5·18 heritage sites in Gwangju together, for people to have a better understanding and memory of the Movement (Graduate School of Culture 2010). Na and Lee both argued that the 5·18 Democratisation Movement is the most important image of Gwangju, and that people have been proud of this and so its heritage needs to be preserved.

Along with the academics, local people interviewed for this research also generally showed pride in being citizens of Gwangju because of the 5·18 Movement, and thought this democratisation movement one of the most significant turning-points in Korean politics (Kim *et al.*, interview, 05.03.11; Park *et al.*, interview, 09.03.11). This viewpoint could be found even in young generations who did not experience the Movement directly, as well as amongst older generations who did witness the Movement. Even though young people did not experience the Movement, they have been able to gain knowledge about it through their families, media and education, and from the activities of organisations including the local government of Gwangju and other 5·18 related ones. Park and Choi (Interview, 09.03.11), who are in their early twenties, stated that

5·18 is like a symbol of Gwangju. We did not experience it but we have heard over and over again about it from our parents and teachers. It's never unfamiliar and we are very proud of those people and this city.

For more elderly people, this pride becomes stronger. For example, Lee (Interview, 05.03.11), in his late sixties, and who experienced the Movement, stated that "Gwangju is 5·18 and 5·18 is Gwangju. How can we separate these two?" Apparently it seems that people are generally proud of the Movement and of being a citizen of Gwangju where the Movement took place.

However, opinion on the 5·18 Democratisation Movement showed slightly different results depending on where those expressing them were currently based, such as the old city centre or the new city centre. In general, people do not disagree about the importance of the 5·18 Democratisation Movement, but the citizens of the old city

centre show a small difference of opinion toward the Movement since the Hub City of Asian Culture project and its main facility are being developed in the area. People in the old city centre are more likely to agree with the idea that a huge national project, rather than the 5·18 Movement, could be their new image and identity. The next section will discuss this further. This is an interesting phenomenon, since the old city centre is the place where the 5·18 Movement took place; considering the history and symbolic meaning of the place, it is rather ironic that the old city residents hope for a new image and identity for the city. The reason is because of economic decline in the area, which has made people desire projects that can revitalise old city centre. Economic necessity is emphasised, and the project supported for practical reasons. The 5·18 Democratisation Movement has symbolic meaning in Gwangju, and the citizens of Gwangju have been and are proud of this. They have tried to ensure that the Movement is recognised as a demonstration of people's right to resist, as discussed in section 2.1 of Chapter 4, and they, like Na and Lee, have also tried to maintain and pass on the values of the Movement to the next generation (Lee, interview, 07.03.11; Na, interview, 11.02.11; Sim 2007; The May 18 Memorial Foundation 2011). As discussed earlier in this section, the significance of the Movement has been reflected in the master plan of the Hub City of Asian Culture, and democracy and peace, which are the values of the 5·18 Democratisation Movement, have become the initial, core concepts of the project (Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2007; *ibid.* 2008).

What we need to investigate further in regards to this issue, however, are the changes in people's perceptions of the 5·18 Democratisation Movement, especially among

people in the old city centre where the Movement took place in the past, and where the Asia Culture Complex is currently being developed. Even though they still think the 5·18 Democratisation Movement is an important asset of Gwangju, they argue that the city needs a more future-oriented image and driving force, such as the Hub City of Asian Culture, since the Movement which took place in the past cannot show a vision for the future of the city (Kim *et al.*, interview, 05.03.11). This phenomenon is very interesting, since, while the old city centre has been one of the most important heritage sites of the 5·18 Democratisation Movement, on the other hand it has experienced economic decline for the last two decades. It may seem partly contradictory that people at the heart of the Movement's heritage hope to develop a different value for the city other than the 5·18 Democratisation Movement. This situation is complex, since many aspects are involved in it, such as the economic situation of the old city centre, the process of the development of the city of Gwangju and the Hub City of Asian Culture.

2.1.2. The Asia Culture Complex and bringing a new cultural image

The interviews with the old city centre residents conducted for this research generated a strong voice about the 5·18 Democratisation Movement and the Asia Culture Complex. Observing the opinions of these residents, which are summarised below, it is identified that they differ from the traditional perceptions many others have about the 5·18 Democratisation Movement. This section will discuss how local residents' perceptions of the Movement have been changed – in particular among the residents of the old city centre. Later, it will further discuss why this change has

occurred, by investigating the unique urban circumstances of the old city centre in Gwangju. In this discussion, the efforts to change perceptions of the city, one of the four main characteristics identified in Chapter 2 and Chapter 3 regarding culture-led regeneration and culture-led urban branding is applied to the investigation. Given that it is one of the backgrounds to and goals of Western regeneration projects to change the image of a city, in particular for cities experiencing economic decline, the same effect has been sought in the Gwangju case due to the fact it is also experiencing economic decline. However, the introduction of a new image for Gwangju has been challenging, due to its previous strong and long-lasting identity derived from 5·18. In the Gwangju case, these two different images are represented as conflicts between residents in the old city centre and those in the new city centre.

The 5·18 related organisations, and people related to 5·18, they have done enough, they have really done enough. I do not want to see them any more if they keep objecting for (the sake of) objection. (Yoon, interview, 05.03.11)

In any case, the construction of the Asia Culture Complex has to be re-started shortly (even if it's in the 5·18 site) and the old city centre should be revitalised with that. (Kim, interview, 05.03.11)

We cannot be held back by the past and 5·18 forever and we now absolutely need something new, especially something to live on. (Lee, interview, 05.03.11)

Although the above comments are individual opinions, which cannot represent the whole opinion of the citizens of Gwangju, the strength of these opinions provide a good reason to investigate this phenomenon further. Indeed, the Association of

Chungjangro Retailers in the old city centre area, and the local authority of Dong-gu, in which the old city centre area is located, have also pronounced that the city, especially the old city centre, needs to utilise the Asia Culture Complex for economic purposes, which the 5·18 Democratisation Movement cannot do (Gwangju Buddhist Broadcasting Service 2011; Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2006; Sohn 2011). These opinions, then, are examples of changing perceptions of local people about the 5·18 Democratisation Movement. For people, especially residents in the old city centre, the Asia Culture Complex development and the Hub City of Asian Culture project have gradually become as important as 5·18 for the future of the city.

A quantitative survey conducted by Min and Lee (2010) also supports the above argument. It identified that, even though local people think that the 5·18 Democratisation Movement is the most representative image of Gwangju, citizens are more likely to have in their minds an image of the city of culture in the future. 53% of people who answered said that the Hub City of Asian Culture is the image they hope to develop for the future, which is more than the 51.5% who viewed Gwangju as the city of democracy, peace and human rights (*ibid.*: 67). Lee and Min also identified that the Hub City of Asian Culture is the brand that most citizens aspire to for the city. 43% of local people want the Hub City of Asian Culture to be the brand of Gwangju (*ibid.*: 69), which is much more than the 14% who want the 5·18 Democratisation Movement as the brand (*ibid.*). These data show that the Hub City of Asian Culture project has been perceived as being as important as the 5·18 Democratisation Movement among local residents.

Other research conducted by the Korea Culture and Tourism Policy Institute in 2004, at the initial stage of the Hub City of Asian Culture project, showed results consistent with the Lee and Min 2010 findings. The research found that the expectations of local people toward the Hub City of Asian Culture project can be assessed as better than average, which means they have positive expectations of the project (Korea Culture and Tourism Policy Institute 2004b). These expectations are explained in more detail in the research. When people were asked whether they think the project would contribute to the economy of the city, 54.7% of responses were positive, which is higher than the 14.1% negative responses and 31.1% neutral (*ibid.*: 124). 44.2% of people also agreed that the project is a development strategy which has been reflecting well the nature of the city (*ibid.*). It is also higher than the 18.8% of people disagreeing with this statement and the 36.9% of people showing a neutral opinion (*ibid.*: 125). More importantly, local people hoped that the image of the city would be revitalised through cultural tourism and the culture industries, which is one of the main goals of the Hub City of Asian Culture project (Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2007). 34.9% of local people wanted a city of cultural tourism and cultural industry as an identity for the city (Korea Culture and Tourism Policy Institute 2004b: 130). This is higher than the 13.6% of the city who wanted the image to be one of human rights, which is one of the old identities Gwangju has kept (*ibid.*: 131). These survey results demonstrate that the citizens of Gwangju have shown a change of perceptions on their city's identity, and they also reveal local people's demand for a new image of culture.

As the above data have shown, local people in Gwangju regard the Hub City of Asian Culture project and the Asia Culture Complex project as offering new value for the future of the city. While local communities mainly agree with this argument, further investigation identified a difference of opinion among local people according to where they live. For example, as shown earlier in this section, the old city centre residents argued that the Hub City of Asian Culture project and the Asia Culture Complex development offered important opportunities to obtain a new growing momentum for the city (Kim *et al.*, interview, 05.03.11). It is necessary to investigate the recent history of Gwangju and its old city centre in order to understand the above difference. Since Gwangju and the region were excluded from the main focus of national development for over 20 years in the past, they argue that this huge project is an opportunity for Gwangju to have a new value for growth (*ibid.*). This viewpoint provides a background to the argument held by some academics in the preservation debate. As has been discussed in the previous chapter, some academics supported the central government in its position of removing a certain part of the building (Jeong, interview, 02.03.11; Ryu, interview, 18.03.11). The reason for this was that they believed Gwangju should not lose this opportunity to secure the city's future growth. Some academics in the region see the Hub City of Asian Culture as a driving force, a very rare opportunity that the city has been given. For instance, Ryu, an academic at Chonnam National University (Interview, 18.03.11) argued that

Gwangju has to do its best to extract the most benefit from this huge capital project.

And Jeong, previously a senior researcher at Gwangju Development Institute (Interview, 02.03.11), also maintained that

We just don't have time to waste. All the residents have to focus on how to use this great opportunity for the future of the city.

People in the new city centre also have expectations for the Hub City of Asian Culture project, even though their expectations can be described as being more general. They expect that the Hub City of Asian Culture project, including the Asia Culture Complex, will play a role in increasing opportunities for the arts and offering cultural experiences for local people (Park *et al.*, interview, 09.03.11). Unlike people in the old city centre, a desperate demand or passion for the project was not found among people in the new city centre. However, the people there also agreed that the project will be certainly helpful to the city in many aspects, such as in creating jobs or changing its image (*ibid.*). For example, Choi and Park (Interview, 09.03.11) stated that

We know there is a big project going on in the old city centre. However, frankly speaking, we don't know much about it. Nonetheless, it is great for the city to have more cultural facilities, which can provide more opportunities to us.

It is interesting to find a slight difference in the perception of the Hub City of Asian Culture Project between the people in the old city centre and those in the new city centre. As briefly discussed above, unlike people in the new city centre, people in the old city centre have a very clear and strong reason for their advocacy of the Asia Culture Complex and the Hub City of Asian Culture. This is because due to their declining standards of living they are more focused on the pragmatic potential

outcomes of the project, such as economic benefits from tourism and employment opportunities. This viewpoint was found during the debate process, which was discussed in section 4.3 of Chapter 4. When there were debates on the Asia Culture Complex development, and the construction was delayed, people in the old city centre voiced their opinions that the development should be continued as soon as possible, regardless of the result of the debate. They argued that it was not only the government that was damaged; they also experienced economic disadvantage when the project was delayed (Kim and Yoon, interview, 05.03.11). Since the residents of the old city centre expected the cultural facilities of the Asia Culture Complex to bring economic benefits once it is completed, it was desirable for them to support proceeding with the project without delay.

What is interesting in this situation is that the old city centre is at the heart of the 5·18 Democratisation Movement in both a geographic and an emotional sense. Since the area was the most significant location for the 5·18 Democratisation Movement, it seems contradictory that people in the old city centre generally support the central government's plan, for example, to deconstruct a part of this heritage. Many of them currently even hope that the Asia Culture Complex and the Hub City of Asian Culture project will become the main focus of the old city centre. To understand this complex, rather contradictory situation, it is necessary to investigate the history of Gwangju's city development process.

The old city centre was, for a long time, Gwangju's core of administration, commerce and finance. However, this began to change from the late 1990s due to new development plans for the city (Cho 2010: 91; Kim 2010: 2; *ibid.*: 23). The outskirts of

the city began to be developed, as the old city centre faced problems of a lack of housing and severe traffic, as well as loss of green space and other challenging environmental issues (Kim 2010: 2). The city decided to develop new districts to solve these problems, and the old city centre gradually began to lose its core functions and went into decline. This became especially marked after two main facilities of local governance, the office for the Gwangju Metropolitan City and the office for Jeollanamdo Province, moved out of the old city centre. The office for the Gwangju Metropolitan City moved to the new city centre in 2004, and the office for Jeollanamdo Province moved to another city, Muan, in 2005. Following these relocations, other public organisations also moved to the new city centre, along with other main functions of the city such as finance, commerce and education (Cho 2010: 91; Kim 2010: 2; *ibid.*: 23).

In tandem with these changes, there has been a population decrease. As seen in the tables below, the population of the old city centre decreased from 1988 to 2008 by over 50% (Kim 2010: 3), even though the whole population of Gwangju increased by 28.5% (Gwangju Metropolitan City 2010: 13). Other statistics also reveal it's the decreasing population trend. According to the population survey in Dong-gu, the main area of old city centre, the population decreased from 114,936 in 2006 to 104,032 in 2013 (Gwangju Metropolitan City 2014). People in the old city centre who were interviewed for this research also reported the declining status of the old city centre. They took these issues seriously, and worried about the future of the area since there have not been many proper strategies to address the problems (Kim *et al.*, interview, 05.03.11). Therefore, all of them desperately wanted some opportunities to revitalise

the area (*ibid.*). For this reason, people in the old city centre believe that the Hub City of Asian Culture project, especially the Asia Culture Complex, is an alternative that can revitalise the area (*ibid.*).

Table 5.1 Population of the old city centre of Gwangju (Kim 2010: 3)

	1988	1998	2008
Population	398,780	219,447	170,535
Portion of the whole Gwangju population	35.7	16.8	11.9
Rate of change from previous year		(-)52.9%	(-)29.2%

Table 5.2 Population of Gwangju (Gwangju Metropolitan City 2010: 13)

	1988	1998	2008
Population	1,116,332	1,342,009	1,434,628
Rate of change		(+)20.2%	(+)6.9%

In order to respond to the wishes of the old city centre residents, the city of Gwangju, along with the central government, has planned various cultural developments in the area since the Hub City of Asian Culture project began. For the central government, the old city centre area is significant as the main facility of the project is being developed there. The city of Gwangju also sees the area as important as it has been a long-term aim to revitalise the old city centre, a problem for which it had to develop a strategy. In this situation, the Asia Culture Complex represents a great opportunity. For example, Jaechol Kim (2009; 2010) argues that Gwangju needs to utilise the Hub

City of Asian Culture project and promote a cultural brand as a chance to revitalise the old city centre. Especially, he maintains that, even though the Hub City of Asian Culture is a project driven mainly by the central government, the city of Gwangju also needs to implement projects around the old city centre to reap the most benefit from this huge project development (Kim 2010). Jeong-hoon Kim (2010), a director of the city regeneration department at Gwangju Metropolitan City, also argues that it is essential for the old city centre to recover its old main functions, including economic activities, and that the opening of the Asia Culture Complex will contribute to this. In addition, Inhyung Cho (2010), a researcher at Gwangju Development Institute, states that a proper industrial strategy is necessary to revitalise the old city centre, and that creating a cultural industrial cluster surrounding the Asia Culture Complex would be useful for this purpose. Seong-gu Jeong and Yoonjeong Choi (Choi 2010; Jeong 2009a; *ibid.* 2010) also hold a similar opinion: that the Hub City of Asian Culture and the revitalisation of the old city centre cannot be separated, since the Asia Culture Complex, a main facility of the project, has been built in the heart of the old city centre. They argue that the residents of the old city centre regard the Asia Culture Complex as a catalyst to bring change to the area.

As described above, all these commentators emphasise the need for strategy and planning by the local government, together with the Hub City of Asian Culture project, in order to revitalise the old city centre and the immediate vicinity. The city of Gwangju also recognises this necessity, and a separate department for the Hub City of Asian Culture has been established which has been working in partnership with the central government. Although this partnership is in its early stages, the city is trying to

develop its own projects in parallel with the Hub City of Asian Culture project. Given all of these circumstances, for the people in the old city centre the solution for the area's decline is currently much more important than the memory of the 5·18 Democratisation Movement. They are still proud of the Movement, and they also recognise the significance of its heritage; however, they hope that the Asia Culture Complex will play a more important role for the city of Gwangju and the old city centre for its revitalisation.

As discussed above, the local people in Gwangju want the Hub City of Asian Culture as a way to provide new value for the future of the city. For this purpose, they hope that the Asia Culture Complex will provide a turning point in the revitalisation of the old city centre. This expectation is especially clear among local people in the old city centre, but academics also support this argument (Jeong, interview, 02.03.11; Kim *et al.*, interview, 05.03.11; Ryu, interview, 18.03.11). As identified in the surveys and research, the people of Gwangju are currently more likely to support a new brand image rather than hold onto a previous image, as represented by the 5·18 Democratisation Movement (Korea Culture and Tourism Policy Institute 2004b; Min and Lee 2010). The old city centre residents think that the Asia Culture Complex provides economic opportunity and a chance for the revitalisation of the area, and regard it as a way to change the perception of Gwangju among other regions (Kim *et al.*, interview, 05.03.11). People in the new city centre hope to increase the cultural opportunities of the city for its citizens (Park *et al.*, interview, 09.03.11). In spite of different opinions on the project, one common aspect of local people's opinions is that they hope Gwangju develops a new brand image for the future of the city. In addition

to a finding a new brand for the city, there has been another change in the region regarding its cultural environment, and this will be discussed in the next section.

2.2. Enriching the cultural environment of Gwangju

There have been many changes in the cultural field in Gwangju since the beginning of the Hub City of Asian Culture project. For example, in terms of the opportunities in the cultural field, the Gwangju Cultural Foundation and the Asia Culture Development Agency, a part of the Asia Culture Complex, recruited a number of new employees in 2010 and 2011. More recently, the Asian Culture Development Institute, a family institute of the Hub City of Asian Culture project, also hired staff in 2013. The opportunities are expected to increase continuously, since there are more cultural institutions already created or planned to be moved into the city. The birth of the Gwangju Cultural Foundation, the establishment of the Graduate School of Culture at Chonnam National University, plans for the Cultural Contents Technology Research Institute (CT Research Institute), and the relocation of Korea Creative Contents Agency (KOCCA) to the region are examples of this phenomenon. It can be argued that the Hub City of Asian Culture project has not been a direct reason for these developments, but the initial discussions for setting up these institutions and other resources indicate that the Hub City of Asian Culture and the Asia Culture Complex have been very important factors in deciding on and planning those developments. Since those various organisations are expected to contribute to the cultural field in the region, it is argued that the Hub City of Asian Culture project has already enriched the cultural environment of Gwangju. Considering that this enrichment is accompanied by an

increase in job opportunities, the idea of pursuing economic impact, one of the four main characteristics identified in Chapter 2 and Chapter 3 regarding culture-led regeneration and culture-led urban branding, is recognised here. How this economic impact might be achieved in different ways, such as through tourism, needs to be investigated once the project's development is complete. However, at this stage, where the project is still being developed, the increase in job opportunities is surely an economic benefit the project has brought to Gwangju, the one local residents had most hoped to have. The background to the establishment of each institution and its relation to the Hub City of Asian Culture project will be discussed below.

The Gwangju Cultural Foundation was officially established in January 2011. It has a vision to make Gwangju a creative, cultural and artistic city which communicates with the world (Gwangju Cultural Foundation 2011). The foundation will work on developing the cultural policies of the region, organising cultural programmes with a local flavour, managing local festivals and events, and establishing networks with other organisations within the country and over the world (*ibid.*). The Gwangju Cultural Foundation's funding comes entirely from the city of Gwangju, which has played an essential role in its creation (*ibid.*; Kim, interview, 18.03.11). Local media and some local people in the cultural field worry about this situation, since the local authority of Gwangju can influence the management of the foundation due to its position as a funding body (Jeong, interview, 02.03.11; Nam 2011). They are concerned about the independence of the foundation from local government. Since many local cultural foundations in Korea are in a similar situation, this is not a concern peculiar to the Gwangju Cultural Foundation. However, the deep involvement of local government

with the foundation is an issue that needs to be watched carefully. This is because too much involvement or intervention from the local government could affect the operation and purpose of the foundation's work, which could also decrease the creativity and professionalism of the organisation. If the government wanted the foundation under its control, there would be no meaning in creating a specialised independent cultural foundation, composed of various professionals (Lee 2011; Nam 2011).

What needs to be observed carefully regarding the Cultural Foundation's connection to the Hub City of Asian Culture project is that the project was one of the most important background elements of the foundation. The foundation is based on a previous organisation, called the Gwangju Culture Arts Development Agency; although this agency was necessary for the cultural field of Gwangju, it struggled with its funding and organisational structure. It was not easy for the agency to secure funding from outside bodies; naturally, the programmes or events it organised were thus infrequent, and qualified professionals did not want to work for the agency (Gwangju Metropolitan City 2010; Jeong 2011). Therefore, the city of Gwangju decided to make an enlarged and more securely funded cultural foundation. Most importantly, the city of Gwangju judged that the Gwangju Culture Arts Development Agency has not enough capacity to lead the cultural field in the region, where the huge project of the Hub City of Asian Culture is being developed (*ibid.*). It can be understood that the foundation is an initiative by the city of Gwangju in accordance with the central government-led cultural project, the Hub City of Asian Culture. Although the city has many plans in relation to the Hub City of Asian Culture project, local government

hoped to have a main think-tank for the local culture field, and the Gwangju Cultural Foundation is the institution that serves that purpose.

As part of the research we investigated local opinions that the local government needs to develop its own cultural programmes in accordance with the Hub City of Asian Culture project to get the most benefit from it, and the birth of Gwangju Cultural Foundation is expected to play a role in meeting this desire. Sunjeong Park, the chief officer at the foundation, who used to be chair of the committee for the preparation of the Gwangju Cultural Foundation, stated that the foundation is a new organisation, replacing the previous one, the Gwangju Culture Arts Development Agency, which aimed to develop and execute cultural policies in Gwangju (Gwangju Metropolitan City 2010). Jiwon Kim, who works at the foundation, also mentioned during his interview that the Gwangju Cultural Foundation is closely related to the Hub City of Asian Culture project in the background to its establishment, since the project has acted as a trigger point in creating the foundation (Kim, interview, 18.03.11).

The Gwangju Cultural Foundation and the Hub City of Asian Culture project do not have any official relationship, since both have different main funding and management bodies. However, it is necessary to think of both of them together to better understand the mutual relevance: the Hub City of Asian Culture project has influenced the establishment of the Gwangju Cultural Foundation, and the Gwangju Cultural Foundation has enriched the cultural environment of the city, which can ultimately strengthen the city's cultural image and achieve the goal of the project to provide more cultural opportunities in the city.

While the Gwangju Cultural Foundation is an agency working on local cultural programmes and events, there is another example in the higher education sector, the Graduate School of Culture at Chonnam National University, which aims to produce professionals for the growing cultural field in the region. The Graduate School of Culture at Chonnam National University was established in 2006. It started accepting students from the spring semester of 2006. This is the first graduate school in Korea which specialises in the subject of culture (Graduate School of Culture 2011). There are two main academic courses in the school: the theory and planning of arts and culture; and cultural management and tourism (*ibid.*). The school used to run only master's programmes, but it launched PhD programmes in cultural studies from the spring semester 2014 (Lee, interview, 07.03.11; Graduate School of Culture 2014). According to Lee, a professor at the Graduate School of Culture, the school has been growing since its establishment in terms of the number of applicants. In its first years, most applicants came from the local region, but subsequently the origin of applicants has become more diverse, and now includes people from across the whole country (*ibid.*). He stated that this situation shows that the school has become more widely recognised for its uniqueness (*ibid.*). Indeed, the Graduate School of Culture at Chonnam National University has drawn a lot of attention from the national media because it was the first graduate school for culture (Jung 2005). It has a clear relevance to the Hub City of Asian Culture project, since the idea of the school began with the need for an institution that could play a role in producing professionals and providing training in the cultural field of Gwangju, where the cultural sector is expected to grow along with the Hub City of Asian Culture project (*ibid.*; Lee 2011). When the Hub City of Asian Culture project plan was publicised and began to be developed, one of the local

concerns was about who would work there, and thus how to fill the vacancies created from it. In particular, there was a general expectation among local communities that the project would offer a good opportunity for young people in the region (Jeong, interview, 02.03.11; Ryu, interview, 18.03.11). Lee (interview, 07.03.11), agreed with this concern, and stated that the Graduate School of Culture was designed to provide human resources for the Hub City of Asian Culture and other growing cultural areas in the region. Kim, at the Gwangju Cultural Foundation, also agreed that the school, like the Gwangju Cultural Foundation, needs to be understood in relation to the Hub City of Asian Culture project, given that such a huge project, and the development of many projects in Gwangju, definitely needs more professionals (Kim, interview, 18.03.11). With this aim, the Chonnam National University began the project of establishing the Graduate School of Culture, which can produce professionals specialised in the cultural sector. According to Lee, the students who graduated from the school found jobs at the Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture and at the Gwangju Cultural Foundation, which shows that the school is playing its expected role (Lee, interview, 07.03.11). Although it has been only eight years since the school launched, the Graduate School of Culture at Chonnam National University has widened its professional network to reach other institutions, including the Korea Culture and Tourism Institute and the Gwangju Cultural Foundation, and to professionals and artists in other cities. The school is also expected to create more networks with other developments or institutions, which will be established in Gwangju in the future. The Graduate School of Culture, which has had a close relationship with the Hub City of Asian Culture project since its establishment, is playing its role as a place for professional training and

education, and it is argued that the school has contributed to enriching the cultural environment of the city.

While the Gwangju Cultural Foundation and the Graduate School of Culture at Chonnam National University are already established developments, there are other developments which are currently in the planning stage or will be forthcoming within a few years. For example, Gwangju is trying to establish a Cultural Contents Technology Research Institute (CT Research Institute) as an important part of the Hub City of Asian Culture project. The need for the CT Research Institute has been repeatedly suggested in the region since the Hub City of Asian Culture project has been developed. This is because people think that a centre for research and development is necessary to bring the most benefit alongside the Hub City of Asian Culture, and especially the Asia Culture Complex, one of whose main objectives is to develop cultural products using digital technology (Lee 2010; Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2007). It has been argued that the CT Research Institute is essential to create an infrastructure for the cultural industry which can work together with the Asia Culture Complex to bring benefits to the region (Lee 2010). The local council has also been very enthusiastic about establishing the CT Research Institute; it has organised an open conversation and workshop, and worked together with politicians from the region to make the CT Research Institute plan more concrete (Lee 2011). As of April 2011, the feasibility of the CT Research Institute has been widely recognised by the central government, and it is said that there has been a positive and significant move towards creating the CT Research Institute. In addition, the CT Research Institute is also expected to provide more employment opportunities in the region, which is an economic benefit desired

by local residents. As with the Gwangju Cultural Foundation, the establishment of the CT Research Institute was influenced by the Hub City of Asian Culture project, and the CT Research Institute is supposed to support the development of digital cultural content, which is one of the main activities of the project.

Although the plan to establish an independent research institute is still on the way, the Korea Culture Technology Institute (KCTI) was established in 2013 within the Gwangju Institute of Science and Technology (GIST) as an immediate result of the endeavours described above to establish the CT Research Institute. The KCTI, as a part of the GIST, a research-oriented university which focuses its academic activities on promoting and developing applied science and engineering, contributes to the areas of interdisciplinary research combining science, engineering, humanities and social sciences (GIST 2014; KCTI 2014). In particular, it hopes to play a role in developing a connection between culture and technology. For example, the KCTI's research projects include cultural engineering that tries to use digital media for local communities' public arts projects (KCTI 2014). Although it currently belongs to the GIST, the KCTI aims to change its status to become an enlarged, single research institute (e.g. CT Research Institute) with about 300 research staff funded directly from the Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism by 2015 (KCTI 2014; Seo 2013). If this plan works as desired, the new institution will be contributing not only to developing research capabilities in culture and technology, but also to creating more opportunities.

The above-mentioned institutions surrounding the city of Gwangju and the region have enriched the cultural environment of Gwangju, they have contributed to strengthening the image of Gwangju as a cultural city and they have produced initial

job opportunities as well, which is included in the main characteristics identified in Chapter 2 and Chapter 3 in relation to culture-led regeneration and culture-led urban branding. In addition, the fact that the changes have been noticeable in different sectors of the cultural field can be understood to mean that the city has enhanced its cultural profile in a balanced way. For example, the Gwangju Cultural Foundation, which has been mainly driven by the city of Gwangju, is expected to act as the headquarters for local cultural policy development and execution. The Graduate School of Culture at Chonnam National University is an education facility that produces professionals which the cultural sector of the region needs. The CT Research Institute, a research and development facility that focuses on the most cutting-edge areas of culture and technology can bring mutual benefits, along with the Asia Culture Complex, to produce cultural products using digital technology. All these different types of cultural developments are the changes that the Hub City of Asian Culture project has brought to the city.

3. Future of the Hub City of Asian Culture project and local communities

As discussed previously, the Hub City of Asian Culture project, which is still at the development stage, has brought two main changes in the city of Gwangju: the establishment of a new image and the enrichment of the city's cultural environment. However, these may not represent all the changes that the project can bring into Gwangju, since the project is still being developed. For example, the changes in local tourism need to be investigated longitudinally to generate a convincing result, even though the relationship between the project and local tourism needs careful

examination in relation to identifying cause and effect, as shown in the Newcastle-Gateshead example. The Asia Culture Complex will open in 2015, and the whole Hub City of Asian Culture project will be completed in 2023, which means that there is still time to bring other changes. In order to deliver these changes effectively to the city, it is important to have a sustainable communication with local communities and enable them to be involved in the project more actively. This is because it will be very difficult for central government and the local government of Gwangju to change the nature of the city into an area for culture without the cooperation, participation and deep interest of the local people (Jeong 2010b; Lee, interview, 07.03.11; Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2007; . 2011b; Ryu, interview, 18.03.11). In particular, in light of the conflicts that have taken place during the development process over the last few years, the importance of the engagement and involvement of local people has been reemphasised by both the government – which is a driving body behind the project – and local communities, which is the first audience group (Choi 2010; Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2011b). Recognising this, the central government has made communication with local residents one of the central priorities in their plans from 2011 onwards (Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2011), which shows the importance it has placed in local communities during the project process. In this discussion, the concerns and issues for the future of the project, which are closely related to the local community (a characteristic of sustainable culture-led regeneration identified in Chapter 2 and Chapter 3) have been consistently recognised in the project's development. Thus, this part of chapter argues that keeping local communities' interest and making them more engaged with the project are essential for the successful delivery of the goals of the Hub City of Asian Culture, since the new

image of Gwangju as a cultural city cannot be obtained merely through a few developments by central or local government.

The interviews with local people conducted for this research also supported this argument. Even though people have recently become more interested in and aware of the project, they still lack proper understanding of it (Kim and Lee, interview, 05.03.11; Park, interview, 09.03.11). The reason why people are not interested in the project or not involved in it is because they think the Hub City of Asian Culture project might be just similar to other cultural facilities that they can easily see in the city already (Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2006; Park and one anonymous person, interview, 09.03.11). One local resident interviewed for the research maintained that there are many people who think that the Asia Culture Complex might be just another cultural centre in the city, and so they are not really interested in what this institution does (Park, interview, 09.03.11). This indifference comes from the idea that the existing cultural facilities have nothing to do with them (the local residents), and it can be interpreted that if the Asia Culture Complex and the Hub City of Asian Culture project are like other existing facilities, local people will not be interested in them either. This statement demands particular attention, since people who hold this opinion, and who have a vague expectation that the Asia Culture Complex will be just another additional cultural facility to the city, are more likely not to become involved with the process of the project. The more people of this kind there are, the more difficult it is for the project to achieve its goals to be a cultural city with the consensus of the local people. This point recalls the shift in the focus of cultural strategy we identified had taken place in Newcastle-Gateshead, such that after the capital developments on the

Quayside were complete subsequent cultural strategy of NGI and the Baltic for instance, focused on attracting local audience (NewcastleGateshead Initiative 2010; BALTIC 2010). Whereas the intensive focus on developing local audience was a central feature of Newcastle-Gateshead cultural policy only a few years after the physical construction was complete, it was identified in the middle of the project development process in Gwangju since the Hub City of Asian Culture project had experienced various challenging issues due to unique local context such as the 5-18 Movement.

The professionals interviewed for this research also emphasised that communication between local communities and the central government is crucial to the project's future development. Professionals from a local research institute, university and public organisation interviewed for this project argued that for the future of the project to be a success, government and local communities need to have an open mind to each other for constructive discussion, which are mainly based on the lesson obtained from the conflicts and debates which have characterised the initial years of development (Jeong 2010b; Lee, 07.03.11; Min, interview, 10.02.11; Na, interview, 11.02.11; Ryu 2010). They ask local people to have "a more respectful attitude" toward central government, which is in charge of this huge cultural project in Korea, and also propose that central government approach local communities with "more tolerance and understanding" (*ibid.*). This is actually a timely notion when looking back at the emotional criticism that each side levelled at the other rather than engage in logical discussion during the early stages of the Asia Culture Complex development, as discussed in section 4.3 in Chapter 4. At that time, the central government insisted that they did everything to listen to the opinions of the local people (Lee, interview,

18.02.11; Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2011a; Park, interview, 26.01.11); however, the sincerity of these communications could not reach local people effectively since many local communities were not really aware of the project or were not interested in it. More importantly, people felt that those communications were just a “typical procedure” rather than “a real process” of gathering local opinions and incorporating them into the government’s policy and development (Lee, interview, 18.02.11; Min, interview, 10.02.11; Na, interview, 11.02.11). Although the government could provide a list of open conversations, seminars or workshops that they organised for local communities, local people’s responses show that their efforts had a limited effect.

In May 2011, the central government published a report, *2011 Work Report: the Hub City of Asian Culture*, which showed how the project had developed, and clarified what its plans for the future of the project were. In publishing a report, it hosted an open conversation with local communities. The report clearly stated that communication and engagement with local communities is essential for the Hub City of Asian Culture project (Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2011b). The government used the slogan “Together for the future, the hub of the world: development of cultural industries together with local residents” in the report (*ibid.*: 19). There is a section in the report emphasising communication with local residents and the project growing together with local residents (*ibid.*). In this section, many issues are discussed relating to the future of the project’s development and ways to use the 5·18 heritage site at the Asia Culture Complex; also, establishing a network with local universities and other

possible programmes for the region are discussed as possible strategies to be developed by central government (*ibid.*).

Another point that needs attention is that the report specifically mentions the necessity of the revitalisation of the old city centre and the economic benefit which the project can bring into the city (*ibid.*). Even though economic impact has been one of the most important purposes of the Hub City of Asian Culture project, the project report itself does not specifically mention the old city centre as main beneficiary. This is because the central government has not regarded it appropriate to mention a certain area as beneficiary. Therefore, instead of indicating the old city centre, the central government has tried to maintain that the Hub City of Asia Culture project will bring economic benefits to the city overall, in which old city centre is involved spontaneously. This is interesting, since it shows that what local people, especially residents in the old city centre, have hoped for from the project, has been reflected in the official report in detail. The basic policies on how to revitalise the old city centre through the Hub City of Asian Culture project and other developments in the city, and how to enhance cultural industries and tourism industries in the region, are suggested in the report, all of which are of primary interest for local people. The process that led up to the report, such as open conversations, and the report that followed each conversation by the central government shows that the central government, a main driving body behind the project, does take local communities and communication with them very seriously, as the lessons from the architectural design and preservation debates prove. Based on the discussion above, it is argued that Gwangju needs to pay more attention to communicating with its local communities, since the city has a

unique situation contextualising the Hub City of Asian Culture, such as the project site being within the area of the 5·18 heritage. As discussed in the previous chapter, there have been conflicts over the Hub City of Asian Culture project and the development of the Asia Culture Complex. A lack of proper communication between local communities and the government was one of the main reasons for those conflicts, and both parties have learned a lesson on how to deal with different approaches to or opinions about the project (Jeong 2010b; Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2011b; Ryu 2010). In addition, since the main facility of the project, the Asia Culture Complex, is being developed on the former 5·18 Movement heritage site, which has been the strongest image of the city of Gwangju for decades, it is essential for both the project's outcome and residents of Gwangju that the project embraces local communities that still have a positive memory of the Movement, or who have different opinions of the Hub City of Asian Culture project. Local communities and the central government do not want to lose the spirit and meaning of the 5·18 Movement, which they have been proud of and which has been one of the most important historic turning points in the modern politics of Korea. At the same time, they hope that the Hub City of Asian Culture project will bring new momentum for future growth (Korea Culture and Tourism Policy Institute 2004b; Min and Lee 2010). After experiencing this unique and complex situation, local communities and the government have learned the importance of creating mutual respect and conducting proper communication. Since there are about ten years until the completion of the project, this realisation is timely.

4. Conclusion

This chapter has discussed changes that the Hub City of Asian Culture project has brought to the city of Gwangju. Although the project is still at the development stage, the Asia Culture Complex will be open in 2015, and programmes and other developments are becoming more definite and noticeable in the region. This chapter has investigated two changes that have been observed in Gwangju since the beginning of the Hub City of Asian Culture project: the finding of a new brand for the city and the enrichment of the cultural environment of Gwangju.

The 5·18 Democratisation Movement has long been the most symbolic identity of the city of Gwangju, and it is still one of its most representative images. However, it has been identified that the people of Gwangju would currently prefer the development of a new brand value and growth for the future of the city, and they expect the Hub City of Asian Culture to play this role (Kim *et al.*, interview, 05.03.11; Korea Culture and Tourism Policy Institute 2004b; Min and Lee 2010). The city hoped to change its image as a declining city, but the desire to escape from its old image represented by the 5·18 Movement is combined with its need to revitalise the city. The background expectations of the Hub City of Asian Culture project is different for each individual according to where they live or what they hope to get from the project. For example, the old city centre residents regard this project (and especially the Asia Culture Complex development area) as a critical opportunity to revitalise the old city centre, which has struggled with a declining economy and population (Kim 2010; Kim *et al.*, interview, 05.03.11). The new city centre residents think that providing a world-class cultural facility is one benefit of the project, which is more likely to focus on the

cultural point of view rather than an economic one (Park *et al.*, interview, 09.03.11). In spite of their different backgrounds, many people hope that the Hub City of Asian Culture project will play a significant role in creating a new image of the city and in bringing a new driving force for the city. And it is this local commitment that underlies the effort to change perceptions of the city.

The enriched cultural environment of Gwangju has also been observed and discussed. Different types of cultural institutions have been established or will be developed in the region. Although there is not any official relationship between the Hub City of Asian Culture project and those developments in Gwangju in terms of funding or organisational structure, the thesis has paid attention to the backgrounds of each development and changed cultural environment of Gwangju that has enabled the background to be established. For example, the Graduate School of Culture at Chonnam National University produces professionals in cultural affairs for the region's increasing needs (Graduate School of Culture 2011; Lee, interview, 07.03.11), and the Gwangju Cultural Foundation will be a cultural agency to develop the cultural policy of the region and execute various programmes and events, working in a parallel with the Asia Culture Complex (Gwangju Cultural Foundation 2011; Kim, interview, 18.03.11; Kwak, interview, 18.03.11). In addition, the CT Research Institute, which is currently established as the KCTI, aims to transfer its status to an enlarged institution, will provide technical benefits and deepen research capacity within the cultural sector in the region (Lee 2010). The Korea Creative Contents Agency, which will be relocated to the region in a few years, is also expected to create mutual benefits with the Hub City of Asian Culture project, especially the Asia Culture Complex development in planning

and producing products in cultural industries (Jeong 2010b; Lee 2010). These institutions, which did not exist before the Hub City of Asian Culture project, will play different roles in the cultural sector of the region, and contribute to the city of Gwangju's capacity to become a city of culture, and create more job opportunities in the cultural field.

It has been identified that the Hub City of Asian Culture has influenced the process of the establishment of the above institutions. For example, the Gwangju Cultural Foundation was established in order to develop and showcase the city's own cultural programmes. It is noteworthy that the establishment of the foundation was promoted actively after the beginning of the Hub City of Asian Culture project (Kim, interview, 18.03.11). Gwangju was in need of its own cultural organisation that could function both in its own right and in harmony with the central government for the Hub City of Asian Culture project, and the Gwangju Cultural Foundation was established based on this need. The Graduate School of Culture at Chonnam National University and the CT Research Institute also have common backgrounds in relation to the Hub City of Asian Culture project. The necessity of having professionals in the cultural field was the main reason for the launch of the Graduate School of Culture. In particular, there was a common expectation among local communities that local young people would need to take the opportunities on offer, since the Hub City of Asian Culture project is being developed in their own city (Jeong 2010a; *ibid.* 2010b; Lee, interview, 07.03.11; Ryu 2010). These practical needs of the region, which were created by the Hub City of Asian Culture project, were a primary reason for the creation of the Graduate School of Culture.

Although the above two changes have been observed in Gwangju, when considering that there are still many years of development before the project's completion in 2023 the thesis argues that it is significant to maintain communication with local communities and ensure they are more involved in the project. This is because there would be a limit to delivering the project and achieving its goals successfully without local people's participation, which has already been demonstrated through the difficulties the project faced in relation to the debate about the Asia Culture Complex's architectural design and the debates around the urban conservation of buildings associated with the 5·18 Movement. Local people, professionals and academics have emphasised the importance of the engagement of local communities (Jeong 2010b; Lee, interview, 07.03.11; Na, interview, 11.02.11; Ryu 2010), and the government has also stressed this in its recently published report as one of the most important tasks for the delivery of the project in the future (Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2011b). The whole process of addressing the unique circumstances of Gwangju: the legacy of the 5·18 Movement; the declining old city centre; the different opinions on the design of the Asia Culture Complex development; and, the different perspectives of local residents in the old and new city centres, has led to significant adjustments in the projects delivery. In the end, this lesson that the planning and implementation of culture-led urban developments must be flexible according to and in consideration of local contexts, as argued by Bianchini, Garcia, etc etc, see discussion in chapter 2 has been demonstrated in the case of Gwangju as fundamental to the successful development of the Hub City of Asian Culture.

In analysing the case of Gwangju, the four main characteristics of culture-led development have been examined in terms of the background, process and changes in the project: the advantages of long-term planning; efforts to change perception of the city; the pursuit of economic impact; and engagement of local communities. These characteristics identified in chapter 2 from the review of academic discussions of cultural rebranding and culture-led regeneration in Western cities have provided a useful framework to understand the case of Gwangju. Further I have identified the same key characteristics as defining the Hub City development in Gwangju. However, the use of this general frame to identify characteristics has also allowed me to understand the specificity of the process of development and implementation of the Hub City project.

The next chapter summarises and discusses further the findings from the case study of Gwangju. In particular, it highlights the issue above: how the main characteristics of culture-led regeneration and culture-led urban branding have been applied in the case of Gwangju, and how the application process has changed the project delivery to another phase after encountering locally rooted, challenging situations, such as the conflicts between central government and local communities; this will lead to the conclusion of this thesis.

Chapter 6

Conclusion

1. Summary of the thesis

This thesis has investigated the relationship between cultural developments and urban strategies; in particular, the typologies of culture-led regeneration and culture-led urban branding. More specifically, it has analysed the case of the Hub City of Asian Culture project in Gwangju. Based on the investigation of this case study, the thesis argues that the project delivery, which has adopted and implemented Western arguments and practices, has moved to another phase of development after encountering and addressing issues that are rooted in the unique local context; a new phase of development which makes engagement with local communities and communication with them.

In order to argue this, the thesis has discussed culture-led regeneration and culture-led urban branding, theories and practices for which have mainly been developed in Western contexts. Through this analysis, the thesis has identified the four main characteristics in culture-led regeneration and culture-led urban branding discussion and practices: (1) the advantages of long-term planning in implementing successful cultural projects; (2) cultural programming and development which is driven by an aim to change external and internal perceptions of the city; (3) the pursuit of economic impact; and (4) the necessity of engagement with local communities for the sustainability of the project. These four characteristics have then been usefully used to examine the case of culture-led development in Gwangju. The advantages new

cultural developments have when implemented against a background of cultural events and strategies developed over the longer term has been identified while exploring Gwangju's development of continuous cultural plans and policies before the central government decided to invest in the Hub City of Asian Culture project. These early policies, along with studies identifying local cultural resources, have provided valuable information for the master plan for the Hub City of Asian Culture project.

The ways in which culture-led development can be used for culture-led urban branding purposes to change perceptions of a city was also explored in relation to the challenges over negotiating the established identity of the city – the birthplace of democracy – and a more future focused identity as encapsulated by the Hub City development. Gwangju's identification with this democratisation movement has begun to lose its hold on the populace due to the decline of the old city centre. In particular, since the Hub City of Asian Culture project's main facility, the Asia Culture Complex, is being developed on the 5·18 heritage site, local residents have hoped that this facility and the cultural image represented by the project will embody their new image.

The pursuit of economic impact is also an important driver of the Hub City development since the area has lost its financial functions due to city's new urban development plan for creating new city centre. Unlike the 5·18 Movement which is a brand that, especially considering the decline of the old city centre, the location for the 5·18 heritage, local people perceive as lacking economic advantage. On the other

hand, the Hub City of Asian Culture project has promised economic prosperity in the region, a significant issue for local residents, particularly those in the old city centre.

Arguments regarding the importance of cultural project's engagement with local communities have been borne out in the case of the Hub City of Asian Culture project where the necessity for community consultation has become more imperative as the project faced challenging issues surrounding the development of the Asia Culture Complex. During the conflicts and debates, local residents and central government have shown different opinions about each issue, and even local residents have not reached consensus on the development according to the area in which they mainly reside. This collision between old identities and new, between local residents and central government, has shown the complexities of the project development process. In the end, negotiating these encounters, and addressing these challenging issues, which are rooted in local, unique contexts, has moved the focus of the project delivery process to its second stage.

The thesis has also found that there are two changes to be observed in Gwangju: (1) the emergence of a new cultural image and (2) the enrichment of the cultural environment in the area leading to the development of a growing cultural economy. It has been identified that the project's development has entered a second phase of delivery, a phase where consultation with local communities is closer to the centre of project development and implementation.

2. Findings and contribution to the discussion about culture-led urban development

2.1. Gwangju: the Hub City of Asian Culture project

Gwangju, the sixth largest city of Korea, has developed the Hub City of Asian Culture project, which is the largest cultural project in its history. Currently, the project is at the midway-stage, and is scheduled for completion in 2023; therefore, the focus has been on the establishment of the Asia Culture Complex, which is the main facility of the project, due to open in 2015. Already there have been several noticeable changes in the region in relation to developing a new image for the future of the city and enriching the local cultural profile.

What we saw in Chapter 4, at the beginning of the case study of the Hub City of Asian Culture project in Gwangju, was that the city of Gwangju has a complex nature in terms of its social, economic and cultural context – each of which are related to the background of the Hub City of Asian Culture project. For example, in the modern history of Korea, Gwangju has experienced low economic performance and industrial development compared to other large cities and regions in Korea (Statistics Korea 2011). Therefore, high economic expectations about the project have been natural among local residents, and this desire has been reflected in the plans and aims of the Hub City of Asian Culture project (Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2007). In terms of cultural perspective, although the city has also historically lacked arts and cultural provision, there are high demands for the arts and culture among the local people of Gwangju (Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism 2008; Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2007). In addition, and most importantly, Gwangju has great pride in its 5·18 Democratisation Movement, which was one of the most important

political incidents in the nation's history. This Movement is being connected to the Hub City of Asian Culture project, since the Asia Culture Complex, a main facility of the project, is currently being developed on the heritage site of the Movement; the Movement represents the traditional, old image and identity of Gwangju, which differs from the new cultural image that the city has been trying to develop.

Along with these complex political and historical contexts, the local government of Gwangju has also made long-term efforts to enhance the city's cultural profile.

Gwangju's earlier cultural plans and assets are important for understanding the Hub City of Asian Culture within the larger frame of urban strategy combining culture.

Gwangju has already developed various cultural plans and strategies to enhance its cultural profile, including the *Gwangju Metropolitan City Arts and Culture Long-term Strategic Plan* (1997), the *City of Light Gwangju 2020* (1998), the *Contemporary Art Museum Plan* (2000), the *Culture Gwangju 2020 Plan* (2000) and the *Plan for Cultural District for Urban Vitalisation* (2002). In particular, the *Culture Gwangju 2020 Plan* contains many similar ideas and suggestions as those of the Hub City of Asian Culture project, such as creating cultural districts in the old city centre and developing ways to enhance the local cultural and tourism industries (Chonnam National University Humanities Science Research Centre 2000). In addition to these plans and strategies, Gwangju has also repeatedly held various cultural events and festivals, including the most symbolic Gwangju Biennale (Gwangju Biennale 2011; Gwangju Cultural Foundation 2011). Therefore, it is argued here that the Hub City of Asian Culture project is better understood within the context of the long-term commitment of Gwangju to enhancing its cultural profile over the last 20 years.

Regarding the changes since the commencement of the Hub City of Asian Culture project, this thesis argues that there have been two changes in Gwangju since the beginning of the Hub City of Asian Culture project. The first is the finding of a new image for the future of the city, and the second is the enrichment of the cultural environment of the city and through this a developing cultural economy. Although the 5·18 Democratisation Movement has been the most symbolic image of the city of Gwangju, and continues to be one of the most representative images of the city, it has been found that local residents in Gwangju hope to develop a new image which is more articulated to growth for the future of the city. They desire the Hub City of Asian Culture to play this role (Kim *et al.*, interview, 05.03.11; Korea Culture and Tourism Policy Institute 2004b; Min and Lee 2010). The background to this expectation involves the city's poor economic situation and changed attitudes toward 5·18, which represents the traditional image of the city. In particular, the old city centre residents, who have suffered a declining economy and dwindling population, take the Asia Culture Complex development and the Hub City of Asian Culture projects as an opportunity to revitalise the old city centre, which is currently at the centre of the whole project (Kim 2010; Kim *et al.*, interview, 05.03.11).

The enriched cultural environment of Gwangju has also been presented in terms of its contribution to the development of a growing cultural economy and thus having an economic impact in the city. Different types of cultural institutions have been established in relation to the project, including the Graduate School of Culture at Chonnam National University and the Gwangju Cultural Foundation. The Graduate School of Culture at Chonnam National University is expected to produce local

professionals in the arts and other cultural fields to meet the region's increasing needs (Graduate School of Culture 2011; Lee 2011). The Gwangju Cultural Foundation aims to be a local cultural agency which will develop the cultural policy of the region and perform programmes and events (Gwangju Cultural Foundation 2011; Kim, interview, 18.03.11; Kwak, interview, 18.03.11). Since the Hub City of Asian Culture project is mainly being developed by the central government, the two above mentioned institutions are expected to play a role in creating human resources and developing a local cultural agenda, a role which the central government also stresses significantly.

Although this thesis has argued that these two changes have taken place in Gwangju, it has also been proposed that it is vital to maintain communication with local communities and ensure their involvement within the project. This is because there would be a limit to delivering the project and achieving its goals successfully without local people's participation, especially when considering that the project is still far from completion. In particular, the conflicts over the design of the Asia Culture Complex and the preservation of the 5·18 heritage building have highlighted the necessity of proper communication among project participants, including the central government and local residents (Jeong 2010b; Na, interview, 11.02.11; Ryu 2010). The process of encountering and addressing these challenging issues has shown how critical it is to deal with unique local circumstances for a project development. A government publication released in 2011 after experiencing all such conflicts and debates has also stressed this aspect as being one of the most important tasks for the delivery of the project in the future (Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture 2011b). It recalls the shift of focus in the example of Newcastle-Gateshead's Quayside cultural

developments, where developing a new audience, reaching more diverse audience groups and engaging more local residents have emerged as new priorities in the more recent (post 2010) history of the Quayside and the Newcastle-Gateshead brand.

Based on these findings, the next section will explore the contribution of this thesis to a wider discussion of culture-led urban development.

2.2. Contribution to wider discussion and understanding of culture-led urban development

As discussed in the above section, the thesis has found two main impacts that the Hub City of Asian Culture project has had on the city of Gwangju: developing a new image for the future of the city and enriching the local cultural environment. While finding these changes and investigating the Hub City of Asian Culture project further, the four main characteristics that were identified in Chapter 2 and Chapter 3 – the advantages of long-term planning, efforts to change perceptions, pursuit of economic impact and engagement of local communities – have been used as a lens through which to analyse the development. Since Gwangju has experienced decline in its old city centre, and local residents have hoped for a new image for the future of the city (although this desire has shown different levels according to the location of the city), these characteristics, derived from discussion emerging from culture-led development and culture-led urban branding in Western cities, have provided a useful framework to understand the background to the culture-led urban development in Gwangju, the process through which the project has been developed and the impacts that the

project has aimed to achieve. However, further investigation has revealed differences in applying those characteristics in Gwangju. In particular, the process of the project development has shown how the project delivery is different according to Gwangju's unique local context. For example, although the 5·18 Democratisation Movement has held symbolic meaning to the city for a couple of decades, its recent significance has not been as consistent as it used to be. This is because of the old city centre's declining economic status, where the Asia Culture Complex, a main facility of the Hub City of Asian Culture project, has been developed. Due to this reason, for some local residents, especially those in old city centre, the 5·18 Movement has become rather an obstacle, delaying the economic revitalisation. Some debates and conflicts surrounding this facility have taken place, and there have been serious conflicts between local residents and central government, and between residents in the old city centre and 5·18-related organisations and people. These conflicts, involving a complex mix of local interests and identities, have resulted in moving the project delivery process to a second phase, focusing on the engagement of and communication with local residents. Dave O'Brien and Steven Miles (2010), writing about cultural policy decision making processes, argue that cultural policy needs to be understood as a practice that reflects and affects the locality in which the policy operates, and that cultural policy is not a solution which can be applied uniformly. In particular, their argument that the local political conditions behind the implementation of cultural policy provide the ways in which cultural policy can be delivered effectively, is illustrated well in the case of the Hub City of Asian Culture project in Gwangju, considering its complex social, political and cultural circumstances. Thus, in this second stage of the project development the Hub

City of Asian Culture is placing these unique local contexts at the centre of its project delivery.

This research has examined how rationales and practices of culture-led regeneration and culture-led urban branding have been applied and adopted in an Asian context in the case of the Hub City of Asian Culture project in Gwangju. This thesis has identified a process whereby in the case of cultural development the initial symbolic investment in and excitement about culture-led urban development has been transferred to a more sustainable focus on maintaining local residents' initial interest in and attitudes toward the project.

3. Limitations and future research

3.1. Limitations of the research

While this research has tried to consider every aspect in investigating the case study of the Hub City of Asian Culture project in Gwangju, there are two points that could have been further developed. The first is the lack of an opportunity to investigate the economic change in the Gwangju case study. Unlike the Newcastle-Gateshead example, the Hub City of Asian Culture project is still only at its midway-stage of development, which means that investigating the economic effects of the project in the region is not possible. Local residents in Gwangju have clearly shown their opinions about bringing a new image for the future of the city; however, they could not provide any opinions about the economic effect of the project and the Asia Culture Complex, the main facility of the project. Since local residents, especially from the old

city centre, have high expectations about the facility in terms of the revitalisation of the area, it would be very meaningful to see whether the project can meet such local needs. During the conflict over heritage preservation that occurred during the early stages of the process, the residents from the old city centre usually supported the government's opinion about continuing the construction process; the reason behind this support is related to the declining status of the old city centre. Local residents hope to revitalise the area, and the Hub City of Asian Culture is seen as the way to achieve this goal. In this context, the investigation of the economic effects would be necessary in the future in order to observe how the project can meet local needs, and how people's perceptions toward the project would be changed according to its economic effects. For example, the number of jobs created in the area due to the Hub City of Asian Culture project, any changes in local tourism statistics, and the retention rate of Chonnam National University's Graduate School of Culture are possible subjects for further observation. This type of research requires longitudinal observation and investigation.

The second limitation is the number of people who were interviewed. However, this research does not aim to produce a qualitative (or quantitative) survey of what local people think about the Hub City of Asian Culture project. Instead, the interviews supplement the documentary resources for the research. In spite of this, more interviews, particularly with local residents, would have contributed to the thesis. For example, the possibility of introducing group interviews with local residents could be considered in future research (for the research, 20 people from the central government and local government, academics and local residents were interviewed).

Although local residents were selected from both the new city centre, which is geographically distant from the Hub City of Asian Culture project, and the old city centre, in which the project is being developed and has experienced economic decline, interviews with local residents from other regions of the city are likely to have improved the integrity of the dataset. The composition of the interviewees for the case study reflects the demographic profiles, different regions and different opinions expressed by people about their respective cultural projects. And yet, I am mindful of how more interviews with local residents may have affected the conclusions presented here.

3.2. Future research

This research began with the observation that it would be fruitful to combine culture with various urban purposes. A large number of city authorities and planners still use cultural developments in order to achieve urban purposes, such as design, regeneration or branding, and this trend is becoming more widespread among Asian cities. Many local authorities in Asia are currently undertaking cultural developments, including museums, for various purposes, including redevelopment, rebranding, increasing tourism and increasing their global status – for example, the Huashan Cultural Creative Park in Taipei, Taiwan and the 21st Century Museum of Contemporary Art and Kanazawa Citizens' Art Village in Kanazawa, Japan. Throughout this research, it has been argued that it is necessary for planners and city authorities to recognise the importance of each city's unique circumstances. Especially, in relation to Asian cities, the question can be raised about how the discussions on culture-led

regeneration and culture-led urban branding that have been developed in Western countries have since been adopted and implemented in Asian cities. In the Asian circumstance, where the importance of the region is currently increasing in many aspects, including economic, business and cultural, it is also significant for cultural developments to reflect on their own interpretation of how to position themselves within local, regional and international contexts, and how to connect each city to other Asian cities. The above mentioned cases in Taipei and Kanazawa are examples of city regeneration and branding that are closely related to their own circumstances of history, heritage and local communities. Although Taipei's Huashan Cultural Creative Park is one of the most representative examples of culture-led regeneration due to its combination of historic past architecture and contemporary creative artists' platform, and Kanazawa is one of the most frequently mentioned examples of successful urban regeneration in Asia, the processes of each project have been deeply involved with their local contexts. In particular, the thesis has found that, in applying the main characteristics of culture-led regeneration and culture-led urban branding as established in cultural planning theory and practice in Western cities, these characteristics can also be found as significant to culture-led development projects in Asian cities. However, the research also found that more significant to understanding the particular implementation and characteristic of cultural development was understanding the unique local context within which it is being developed. However, as noted in Chapter 2 the advisability of responding to local specificity was noted as a key argument in cultural planning discussions, so is there something particularly specific about Asian cities such that 'Western' cultural planning theory is not useful in this context? In the case of the culture-led development in the city of Gwangju I have

not identified such a difference, rather, the arguments of Bianchini (1994), Garcia (2004), Miles (2004) and others writing about 'Western' cities, recommending that sustainable cultural development starts from a focus on local context, should be able to encompass the distinct historical and cultural traditions of the Asian city. To explore this question in more detail another project focused on the historical urban development of cities in Asia would be required. On the other hand, another research project could explore whether or not there is an Asian distinctiveness in culture-led urban developments in Asian cities. If the investigation of a number of Asian cases has been conducted, it would be able to suggest whether there is an Asian distinctiveness regardless of nationality in addition to context specificity.

Bibliography

1NG, 2010, *NewcastleGateshead 1PLAN, Gateshead: 1NG*.

21st century Presidential consulting committee, 1994, *Korea at 21st century*, Seoul: Seoul Press.

Arts Council England North East, 2005, *Cultural Sector Development Initiative*, Newcastle: Arts Council England North East.

Arts Council England South East, 2007, *Arts and Regeneration: Creating Vibrant Communities*, London: Arts Council England.

Arts Council England, 2004, *The Impacts of the Arts: Some Research Evidence*, London: Arts Council England.

Arts Council, 1989, *An urban renaissance: sixteen case studies showing the role of the arts in urban regeneration*, London: Arts Council.

Ashworth, G., 2001, 'The communication of the brand images of cities', paper presented at the Universidad Internacional Menendez Pelayo conference: The Construction and Communication of the Brand Images of Cities, Spain: Valencia.

Atkinson, R., 2002, *Does Gentrification Help or Harm Urban Neighbourhoods? An Assessment of the Evidence-Base in the Context of the New Urban Agenda*, Unpublished paper, ESRC Centre for Neighbourhood Research.

Atkinson, R., 2003, 'Introduction: Misunderstood saviour or vengeful wrecker? The many meanings and problems of gentrification', *Urban Studies*, 40:12, 2343-2350.

Australian Expert Group in Industry Studies (AEGIS), 2004, *Social Impacts of Participation in the Arts and Cultural Activities: Stage Two Report, Evidence, Issues and Recommendation*, Canberra: Cultural Minister's Council.

Ave, G., 1994, 'Urban planning and strategic urban marketing in Europe', in Ave, G. and Corsico, F. (eds.), *Marketing Urbano International Conference*, Turin: Edizioni Torino Incontra.

Bailey, C., Miles, S. and Stark, P., 2004, 'Culture-led Urban Regeneration and the Revitalisation of Identities in Newcastle, Gateshead and the North East of England', *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 10:1, 47-65.

BALTIC, 2010, *BALTIC communications plan 2010/2011*, Gateshead: BALTIC.

Baniotopoulou, 2001, 'Art for whose sake? Modern art museums and their role in transforming societies: the case of the Guggenheim Bilbao', *Journal of Conservation and Museum Studies*, issue 7, 1-15.

Beaumont, P., 2005, 'Culture and Regeneration in Gateshead', paper presented at the Cityscape IV conference, Croatia: Rijeka.

Belfiore, E. and Bennett, O., 2007, 'Determinants of Impact: Towards a Better Understanding of Encounters with the Arts', *Cultural Trends*, 16:3, 225-275.

----, 2010, 'Rethinking the social impacts of the arts', *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 13:2, 135-151.

Belfiore, E., 2006, 'The social impacts of the arts – myth or reality?', in Mirza, M. (ed.), *Culture vultures: Is UK arts policy damaging the arts?* London: Policy Exchange, 20-37.

Bennison, B., 2001, 'Drink in Newcastle', in Calls, R. and Lancaster, B., *Newcastle upon Tyne: A Modern History*, Chichester: Phillimore and Co. Ltd., 167-192.

Berg, B. L., 2009, *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences*, Boston: Pearson.

Bianchini, F., 1994, *Cultural policy and urban regeneration: the West European experience*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Biddle, P., Archer, A. and Lowther, H., 2006, *CIRIS Report on Research Findings 2006*, Newcastle: Centre for Cultural Policy and Management, Northumbria University.

Bloomfield, J., 1994, 'Bologna: a laboratory for cultural enterprise', in Bianchini, F. (ed.), *Cultural policy and urban regeneration: the West European experience*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 90-113.

Bluegrass Thinking Research, 2008, *RIS Research*, Newcastle: ONE North East.

----, 2010, *Perceptions of NewcastleGateshead*, Gateshead: NewcastleGateshead Initiative.

Booth, P. and Boyle, R., 1994, 'See Glasgow, see culture', in Bianchini, F. (ed.), *Cultural policy and urban regeneration: the West European experience*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 21-47.

Bradburne, J., 2001, 'A New Strategic Approach to the Museum and its Relationship to Society', *Museum Management and Curatorship*, 19:1, 75-84.

----, 2004, 'The museum time bomb: Overbuilt, overtraded, overdrawn', *The Informal Learning Review*, 65, 4-13.

Bridge, G., 2006, 'Perspectives on cultural capital and the neighbourhood', *Urban Studies*, 43:4, 719-730.

Busan-Kyungnam Social Research Centre, 2004, *Regional innovation and industrial networks at Busan area*, Busan: Kyungsung University Publication.

Byrne, D., 2001, 'The Reconstruction of Newcastle: Planning since 1945', in Calls, R. and Lancaster, B. (ed.), *Newcastle upon Tyne: A Modern History*, Chichester: Phillimore and Co. Ltd., 341-60.

Cameron, S. and Coaffee, J., 2005, 'Art, Gentrification and Regeneration – From Artist as Pioneer to Public Arts', *European Journal of Housing Policy*, 5:1, 39-58.

Cameron, S., 2003, 'Gentrification, Housing Redifferentiation and Urban Regeneration: 'Going for Growth' in Newcastle upon Tyne', *Urban Studies*, 20:12, 2367-2382.

Casey, D., 2007, 'Museums as agents for social and political change', in Watson, S. (ed.), *Museums and Their Communities*, London: Routledge, 292-299.

Centre for Cultural Policy and Management, 2001, *Levels of Cultural Activity in Newcastle and Gateshead in 2000/01*, Newcastle: Centre for Cultural Policy and Management, Northumbria University.

Cho, I., 2010, 'Development of urban tailored industry for regeneration of Old City Centre in Gwangju', *Gwangju Study*, 2010:2, 90-107.

Choi, B., 1997, *Understanding of Korean economics: review of its growth and prospect*, Seoul: Beopmoonsa.

Choi, J., 2010, 'Urban regeneration in Paris and creative city Gwangju – study of Ile Seguin urban regeneration project', *Gwangju Study*, 2010:2, 2-16.

Choi, Y., 2007, *Review of Korean economic growth and local policy*, Seoul: Korea Institute for Industrial Economics and Trade.

Choi, Y., 2010, 'Regeneration of Old City Centre and creative city', *Gwangju Study*, 2010: 2, 73-89.

Chonnam National University Humanities Science Research Centre, 1997, *Gwangju Arts and Culture Long-term Strategic Plan*, Gwangju: Gwangju Metropolitan City.

Chonnam National University Humanities Science Research Centre, 2000, *Cultural Gwangju 2020*, Gwangju: Gwangju Metropolitan City.

Coalter, F., 2001, *Realising the potential of cultural services: The case for the arts*, London: Local Government Association.

Collard, P., 1996, *BALTIC Flour Mills Target Markets and Marketing Strategy*, Unclear publisher.

----, 2005, 'Cultural planning in NewcastleGateshead', *Cultural planning*, Copenhagen: The Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts, School of Architecture, 27-39.

Creswell, J. W., 2007, *Qualitative inquiry and research design*, London: SAGE Ltd.

Crooke, E., 2007, *Museums and Community: ideas, issues and challenges*, London: Routledge.

Cullen, F., 2003, *Newcastle's Grainger Town: An Urban Renaissance*, London: English Heritage.

Culture Stat, 2011, 'Number of employees at cultural industries in Korea',
<http://culturestat.mcst.go.kr/StatisticsPortal/McstPortal/statistics/viewStatOlap.jsp?TBL_MGM_NO=STBL-1015418>, Accessed 29 April 2011.

Culture Stat, 2011, 'Total sales of cultural industries',
<http://culturestat.mcst.go.kr/StatisticsPortal/McstPortal/statistics/viewStatOlap.jsp?TBL_MGM_NO=STBL-1015244>, Accessed 29 April 2011.

Davis, L., head of culture and tourism, ONE North East, personal communication, 01 April 2010.

Dematteis, G., 1994, 'Urban identity, city image and urban marketing', in Braun, O. (ed.), *Managing and Marketing of Urban Development and Urban Life*, Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag.

Department of Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS), 2004, *Culture at the heart of regeneration*, London: DCMS.

----, 2010, 'Spending Review 2010',
<http://www.culture.gov.uk/news/news_stories/7502.aspx>, Accessed 15 September 2011.

----, 2012, 'Taking Part 2011/12 Quarter 4: Statistical Release',
<<http://www.dcms.gov.uk/publications/9135.aspx>>, Accessed 3 September 2012.

Dinnie, K., 2011, 'Introduction to the Theory of City Branding', in Dinnie, K. (ed.), *City Branding: Theory and Cases*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 3-7.

Dobbs, L., Moore, C. and Simpson, G., 2004, *CISIR Report On Research Findings*, Newcastle: Centre for Public Policy, Northumbria University.

Ellis, A., 2005, 'Can Culture Save Downtown?', *The Platform*, 4:3, AEA Consulting.

Eurocities, 2010, *A shared vision on city branding in Europe*, Brussels: Eurocities.

European Commission, 2004, *The European tourism industry, A multi-sector with dynamic markets: Structures, developments and importance for Europe's economy*, Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

----, 2005, *The role of culture in preventing and reducing poverty and social exclusion*, Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

----, 2007, *The European tourism industry in the enlarged Community: Gaps are potentials and opportunities*, Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

Evans, G., 2005, 'Measure for measure: evaluating the evidence of culture's contribution to regeneration', *Urban Studies*, 42: 959-983.

Evans, G. and Shaw, P., 2004, *The contribution of culture to regeneration in the UK: a report to the DCMS*, London: London Metropolitan University.

Florida, R., 2002, *The Rise of the Creative Class*, New York: Basic Books.

Friedrichs, J. and Dangschat, J., 1994, 'Hamburg: culture and urban competition', in Bianchini, F. (ed.), *Cultural policy and urban regeneration: the West European experience*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 114-134.

G.M. Associates, 1993, *A Preliminary Feasibility Study for Gateshead MBC and Northern Arts*, Unclear publisher.

Galloway, S., 2009, 'Theory-based evaluation and the social impact of the arts', *Cultural Trends*, 18:2, 125-148.

Garcia, B., 2004, 'Cultural policy and urban regeneration in western European cities: lessons from experience, prospects for the future', *Local Economy*, 19:4, 312-326.

Gateshead Council, 2000, 'Gateshead Council General BVPI Survey 2004', <<http://www.gateshead.gov.uk/DocumentLibrary/council/consultation/BVPI0304.pdf>>, Accessed 17 May 2010.

----, 2005, 'Gateshead Council Residents' Survey 2005/2006', <<http://www.gateshead.gov.uk/DocumentLibrary/council/consultation/residents/residentsfull2005.pdf>>, Accessed 17 May 2010.

----, 2007, 'Best Value General User Survey 2006/7', <<http://www.gateshead.gov.uk/DocumentLibrary/council/consultation/BVPI0607.pdf>>, Accessed 17 May 2010.

----, 2009, 'Gateshead Council's Community Consultation Strategy: Ask, Listen, Act', <<http://www.gateshead.gov.uk/DocumentLibrary/council/strategy/communityconsultation.pdf>>, Accessed 08 December 2009.

----, 2010a, 'Gateshead Residents 2000',

<<http://www.gateshead.gov.uk/DocumentLibrary/council/consultation/BVPI0001.pdf>>,

Accessed 17 May 2010.

----, 2010b, 'Gateshead the Angel of the North',

<[http://www.gateshead.gov.uk/Leisure%20and%20Culture/attractions/Angel/Home.a](http://www.gateshead.gov.uk/Leisure%20and%20Culture/attractions/Angel/Home.aspx)

spx>, Accessed 28 June 2010.

----, 2012, 'Baltic Business Quarter',

<<http://www.gateshead.gov.uk/ING/Development/Baltic-Business-Quarter.aspx>>,

Accessed 3 September 2012.

Gateshead Quays, 2010a, 'The Millennium Bridge Leaflet', <[http://www.gateshead-](http://www.gateshead-quays.com/documents/Final%20GMB%20Leaflet.pdf)

quays.com/documents/Final%20GMB%20Leaflet.pdf>, Accessed 28 June 2010.

----, 2010b, 'Gateshead Millennium Bridge', <[http://www.gateshead-](http://www.gateshead-quays.com/gmb.htm)

quays.com/gmb.htm>, Accessed 28 June 2010.

----, 2010c, 'The Sage Gateshead', <<http://www.gateshead-quays.com/tsg.htm>>,

Accessed 28 June 2010.

Gateshead Strategic Partnership, 2005a, *Cultural Strategy Action Plan 2005-07*,

Gateshead: Gateshead Council.

----, 2005b, *Gateshead Cultural Strategy 2005-2010: Spreading Our Wings*, Gateshead:

Gateshead Council.

----, 2009, *Gateshead Vision 2030: Making Gateshead a Better Place*, Gateshead:

Gateshead Strategic Partnership.

Gelder, S., 2011, 'City Brand Partnerships', in Dinnie, K. (ed.), *City Branding: Theory and Cases*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 36-44.

Gibson, L. and Stevenson, D., 2004, 'Urban space and the uses of culture', *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 10:1, 1-4.

Graduate School of Culture at Chonnam National University, 2010, *The 5·18 Route*, Gwangju: Chonnam National University.

Graduate School of Culture at Chonnam National University, 2011, 'Introduction', <http://culture.chonnam.ac.kr/new_html/01_intro/sub01_1.php>, Accessed 31 May 2011.

----, 2011, 'Subject and course', <http://culture.chonnam.ac.kr/new_html/03_subject/sub03_1.php>, Accessed 31 May 2011.

Gray, C., 2002, 'Local government and the art', *Local Government Studies*, 28:1, 77-90.

----, 2007, 'Commodification and instrumentality in cultural policy', *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 13:2, 203-215

Gwangju Biennale, 2011, 'Introduction and overview', <<http://www.gb.or.kr/?mid=sub&mode=02&sub=01&tab=2011>>, Accessed 29 April 2011.

Gwangju Cultural Foundation, 2011a, 'Gwangju's cultural events and festivals', <<http://www.gjcf.or.kr/sub.php?mid=04/01>>, Accessed 29 April 2011.

----, 2011b, 'Introduction and background', <<http://www.gjcf.or.kr/>>, Accessed 29 April 2011.

Gwangju Development Institute, 2011, 'News – UNESCO Creative Cities Network', <http://www.gji.re.kr/xe/?mid=sub04_03&page=2&document_srl=136684>, Accessed 15 September 2011.

Gwangju Folk Museum, 1999, *History and culture*, Gwangju: Gwangju Folk Museum.

Gwangju International Centre, 2011, 'What is GIC?', <http://gic.or.kr/eng/subpage.php?wr_id=2?w=u&bo_table=cms_eng&wr_id=1&page=0 />, Accessed 29 April 2011.

Gwangju Metropolitan City, 1998, *City of Light Gwangju 2020*, Gwangju: Gwangju Metropolitan City.

----, 2000, *Plan for Contemporary Art Museum*, Gwangju: Gwangju Metropolitan City.

----, 2007, *20 years of Gwangju development: statistics between 1987 and 2006*, Gwangju: Gwangju Metropolitan City.

----, 2010a, 'Hearing for the Gwangju Cultural Foundation', <<http://www.newswire.co.kr/newsRead.php?no=497664>>, Accessed 31 May 2011.

----, 2010b, *The Statistics of Registered Population*, Gwangju: Gwangju Metropolitan City.

----, 2011, 'History and nature of Gwangju', <<http://www.gwangju.go.kr/htm/organization/characteristic.j>>, Accessed 29 April 2011.

----, 2012, 'General statistics of Gwangju',

<<http://www.gwangju.go.kr/contents.do?S=S01&M=050711000000>>, Accessed 5 June 2012.

GwangjuJeonnam Development Institute, 2002, *Plan for Cultural District for Urban Activation*, Gwangju: Gwangju Metropolitan City.

Ham, I., 2010, 'Thinking about creative class',

<<http://www.hankyung.com/news/app/newsview.php?aid=2010120731421&sid=0117&nid=&page>>, Accessed 11 June 2011.

Hankinson, G. and Cowking, P., 1993, *Branding in Action*, London: McGraw-Hill.

Helbrecht, I., 1994, 'Conflict, consent, cooperation: Comprehensive planning in Germany beyond market and state', in Braun, O. (ed.), *Managing and Marketing of Urban Development and Urban Life*, Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag.

Hickling, A., 2002, 'When the Hope Comes In', *The Guardian*, 24 June.

Hospers, G., 2011, 'City Branding and the Tourist Gaze', in Dinnie, K. (ed.), *City Branding: Theory and Cases*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 27-35.

Houghton, J. and Stevens, A., 2011, 'City Branding and Stakeholder Engagement', in Dinnie, K. (ed.), *City Branding: Theory and Cases*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 45-53.

Imbangwool Traditional Music Competition, 2011, 'Introduction',

<http://www.imbangul.or.kr/index.htm?file=doc3_01>, Accessed 29 April 2011

Insch, A., 2011, 'Branding the City as an Attractive Place to Live', in Dinnie, K. (ed.), *City Branding: Theory and Cases*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 8-14.

Janes, R., 2009, *Museums in a troubled world: renewal, irrelevance, collapse?* Routledge, Abingdon.

Jensen, O., 2007, 'Culture Stories: Understanding Cultural urban Branding', *Planning Theory*, 6: 3, 211-236.

Jeong, S., 2008, 'Strategies for 'creative Gwangju' – study on the possibility of joining UNESCO creative cities network', *Focus Gwangju*, 2008:3, 2-17.

----, 2009a, 'Hub City for the Asian Culture, for the creative urban regeneration', *Focus Gwangju*, 2009:15, 2-27.

----, 2009b, 'Brief review of the Asian Culture Complex',
<http://www.gji.re.kr/xe/sub03_08/9106>, Accessed 29 April 2011.

----, 2010a, 'Cultural policy connection between the Hub City of Asian Culture and Bitgaram Innovation City', *Focus Gwangju*, 2010:7, 2-30.

----, 2010b, 'Urban regeneration strategies for creative city Gwangju', *Gwangju Study*, 2010: 2, 2-12.

----, 2011, 'Gwangju Cultural Foundation launched', *Gwangju Dream*, January 3,
<http://www.gjdream.com/v2/news/view.html?news_type=207&code_M=2&mode=view&uid=429676>, Accessed 31 May 2011.

Jeong, Y., 2010, 'Use of local infrastructure for creative industry development', *Focus Gwangju*, 2010: 4, 3-15.

Josefek, A., Sturman, P. and Jallab, K., 2004, *Tyne and Wear Profile 2004*, Newcastle: Tyne and Wear Research and Information.

Jung, D., 2005, 'Graduate School of Culture launched', *Hankyoreh*, October 20, <<http://www.hani.co.kr/arti/society/area/73175.html>>, Accessed 31 May 2011.

Jung, W., 2005, 'Masterplan done for Gwangju Hub City of Asian Culture', *Munhwaailbo*, November 30, <<http://www.munhwa.com/news/view.html?no=2005113001016043061001>>, Accessed 29 April 2011.

Kavanagh, G., 1990, *History curatorship*, Leicester: University of Leicester Press.

Kavaratzis, M. and Ashworth, G., 2005, 'City branding: an effective assertion of identity or a transitory marketing trick?', *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 96: 5, 506-514.

Kavaratzis, M., 2004, 'From city marketing to city branding: Towards a theoretical framework for developing city brands', *Place Branding*, 1: 1, 58-73.

Kim, H., 2011, '31st anniversary of the 5·18 Democratisation Movement', Gwangju CBS, May 17, <<http://media.daum.net/society/others/view.html?cateid=1067&newsid=20110517212123628&p=nocut>>, Accessed 31 May.

Kim, J. and Lee, J., 2008, *Local economy development strategy through cultural infrastructure*, Gwangju: Honam University and Bank of Korea.

Kim, J., 2005, 'Asian Culture Complex on Track', *Hankookilbo*, October 13, <<http://news.hankooki.com/ArticleView/ArticleView.php?url=society/200510/h2005101320175875040.htm&ver=v002>>, Accessed 29 April 2011.

Kim, J., 2010, 'Assignment for urban regeneration of Gwangju', *Gwangju Study*, 2010:2, 19-30.

Kim, J.C., 2010, 'Basic direction of urban regeneration in Gwangju', *Gwangju Study*, 2010:2, 1-20.

Kim, J.H., 2010, 'Assignment for urban regeneration of Gwangju', *Gwangju Study*, 2010:2, 22-31.

Kim, S., Doh, J. and Jeong, K., 2008, *Gwangju MBC Panel Discussion on the Hub City of Asian Culture*, 18 November.

Kim, Y., 2007, 'Culture city Gwangju, and Asian arts and culture network', in Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture, *2007 Asia Culture Forum: Asia's cultural window to the world*, Seoul: Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism, 101-121.

Ko, Y., 2002, 'Cultural identity and cultural policy of Gwangju', *Social research*, 3-36.

KOCCA, 2011, 'About KOCCA', <<http://www.kocca.kr/about/greeting/index.html>>, Accessed 31 May 2011.

Kong, L., 2007, 'Cultural icons and urban development in Asia: Economic imperative, national identity, and global city status', *Political Geography*, 26: 4, 383-404.

Korea Culture and Tourism Institute, 2008, *Survey report on cultural enjoyment*, Seoul: Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism.

Korea Culture and Tourism Policy Institute, 2004a, *Culture City Gwangju Basic Plan*, Seoul: Ministry of Culture and Tourism.

----, 2004b, *Study on cultural environment for Gwnagju cultural capital*, Gwangju: City of GWangju.

Korean History Research Group, 2000, *Status of Korean local history research and problems*, Seoul: Kyongin Munhwa.

Kotler, P., Asplund, C., Rein, I. and Heider, D., 1999, *Marketing Places Europe: Attracting Investments, Industries, Residents and Visitors to European Cities, Communities, Regions and Nations*, London: Pearson Education.

Lee, C., 2010, 'No more benchmarking', In Gwangju Culture City Committee, *Citizens communication*, Gwangju: Gwangju Culture City Committee, 38-41.

Lee, J., 2011, 'Gwangju Culture Foundation Launched', *Asia News Tongsin*, April 5, <www.aneews.com/detail.php?number=198603>, Accessed 31 May 2011.

Lee, S., 2001, *Testimony of the history*, Gwangju: Jeonnam University Publication.

Lee, Y., 2004, *Korean economy and financial reformation*, Seoul: Yeonamsa.

Leidner, R., 2004, *The European Tourism Industry: A multi-sector with dynamic markets*, Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

Leidner, R., 2007, *The European Tourism Industry in the enlarged Community: Gaps are potentials and opportunities*, Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

Lewis, V., Marketing Executive, Gateshead Council, Personal communication, 29 June 2010.

Lloyd, J., 2006, *BALTIC Briefing Paper: Impact Studies and Cultural Value*, Gateshead: BALTIC Centre for Contemporary Art.

Mankiw, G., 2003, *Principles of Economics*, Andover: Cengage Learning.

McCarthy, B., 1992, *Cultural tourism: how the arts can help market tourism products, how tourism can help provide markets for the arts*, Portland: Bridget Beattie McCarthy.

McGuigan, J., 1996, 'Urban regeneration', in McGuigan, J. (ed.), *Culture and the Public Sphere*, London: Routledge, 95-115.

----, 2009, 'Doing a Florida thing: the creative class thesis and cultural policy', *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 15:3, 291-300.

Mercer, C., 2006, 'Cultural planning for urban development and creative cities', <http://www.culturalplanning-oresund.net/PDF_activities/maj06/Shanghai_cultural_planning_paper.pdf>, Accessed 25 January 2009.

Middleton, A., 2011, 'City Branding and Inward Investment', in Dinnie, K. (ed.), *City Branding: Theory and Cases*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 15-26.

Miles, M., 2005, 'Interruptions: Testing the rhetoric of culturally led urban development', *Urban Studies*, 42:5, 889-911.

Miles, S. and Paddison, R., 2005, 'Introduction: The rise and rise of culture-led urban regeneration', *Urban Studies*, 42:5, 833-839.

Miles, S., 2004, 'NewcastleGateshead Quayside: Cultural investment and identities of resistance', *Capital & Class*, 28:3, 183-189.

----, 2005a, "'Our Tyne': Iconic Regeneration and the Revitalisation of Identity in NewcastleGateshead', *Urban Studies*, 42:5, 913-926.

----, 2005b, 'Understanding the Cultural 'Case': Class, Identity and the Regeneration of NewcastleGateshead', *Sociology*, 30, 1019-1028.

Min, I. and Lee, N., 2010, *Strategies for enhancing the brand image of Gwangju Metropolitan City*, Gwangju: Gwangju Development Institute.

Min, I., 2008a, 'Image of Gwangju among foreign residents and its analysis', *Focus Gwangju*, 2008:4, 2-18.

Min, I., 2008b, *A survey of foreign residents' image of Gwangju and their life style*, Gwangju: Gwangju Development Institute.

Min, I., 2009, *State of cultural contents industry in Gwangju*, Gwangju: Gwangju Development Institute.

Ministry of Culture and Tourism, 2004, *State of cultural facilities in Korea*, Seoul: Ministry of Culture and Tourism.

----, 2005, *State of cultural facilities in Korea*, Seoul: Ministry of Culture and Tourism.

----, 2006, *State of cultural facilities in Korea*, Seoul: Ministry of Culture and Tourism.

----, 2007, *State of cultural facilities in Korea*, Seoul: Ministry of Culture and Tourism.

Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism, 2008, *State of cultural facilities in Korea*, Seoul: Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism.

----, 2009, *State of cultural facilities in Korea*, Seoul: Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism.

----, 2010, *State of cultural facilities in Korea*, Seoul: Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism.

Ministry of Land, Transport and Maritime Affairs, 2003, *4th National Land Development Plan*, Seoul: Ministry of Land, Transport and Maritime Affairs.

Ministry of Land, Transport and Maritime Affairs, 2011, 'General overview', <<http://www.mltm.go.kr/portal.do>>, Accessed 29 April 2011.

Minton, A., 2004, *Northern Soul*, London: Demos.

Moffat, A. and Rosie, G., 2005, *Tyneside: A History of Newcastle and Gateshead from Earliest Times*, Edinburgh: Mainstream Publishing.

Montgomery, J., 2003, 'Cultural quarters as mechanisms for urban regeneration. Part 1: Conceptualising cultural quarters', *Planning, Practice & Research*, 18:4, 293-306.

MORI Social Research Institute, 2004, *Fighting Brands Research Project*, Newcastle: ONE North East.

Morris Hargreaves McIntyre, 2004, *BALTIC Research Summary*, Gateshead: BALTIC Centre for Contemporary Art.

----, 2008, *The BALTIC Centre for Contemporary Art Audience Profiling*, Gateshead: BALTIC Centre for Contemporary Art.

Morris, M., 2004, 'Expansionism...Success and failures', *Museum New*, July-August, 18-20.

Mruk, 2008, *Regional visitor survey 2008 Newcastle upon Tyne*, Newcastle: ONE North East.

Nam, D., 1997, *Korean economics at the global age*, Seoul: Samsung Economic Research Institute.

Nam, H., 2005, 'First graduate school for culture in Korea launched in Gwangju', *Yeonhap News*, October 18, <<http://media.daum.net/society/nation/others/view.html?cateid=100011&newsid=20051018095619614&p=yonhap>>, Accessed 31 May 2011.

Nam, S., 2011, 'Looking at Gwanjgu Cultural Foundation', *Gwangju Daily*, September 30, <<http://www.kjdaily.com/read.php3?aid=1285772400194877s16>>, Accessed 31 May 2011.

Newcastle City Council, 2004, 'The 2003/4 General Survey of Newcastle Residents', <[http://www.newcastle.gov.uk/condiary.nsf/all/864CB16109E233BA8025712B0042FFE1/\\$FILE/Residents%20Survey%2020034%20final%20draft.pdf](http://www.newcastle.gov.uk/condiary.nsf/all/864CB16109E233BA8025712B0042FFE1/$FILE/Residents%20Survey%2020034%20final%20draft.pdf)>, Accessed 17 May 2010.

----, 2005, 'The 2004/5 Newcastle Residents' Survey',
<[http://www.newcastle.gov.uk/condiary.nsf/all/CF11E0B1BDC3640D8025712B0042FF5/\\$FILE/Res%202004%20finished.pdf](http://www.newcastle.gov.uk/condiary.nsf/all/CF11E0B1BDC3640D8025712B0042FF5/$FILE/Res%202004%20finished.pdf)>, Accessed 17 May 2010.

----, 2006a, 'The 2005/6 Newcastle Residents' Survey',
<[http://www.newcastle.gov.uk/condiary.nsf/all/355D8B546DFF90CE802571FE004F25AB/\\$FILE/Res20056%20final%20report.pdf](http://www.newcastle.gov.uk/condiary.nsf/all/355D8B546DFF90CE802571FE004F25AB/$FILE/Res20056%20final%20report.pdf)>, Accessed 17 May 2010.

----, 2006b, *Corporate Plan 2006/07*, Newcastle: Newcastle City Council.

----, 2007, *Corporate Plan 2007/08*, Newcastle: Newcastle City Council.

----, 2008a, 'The 2007/8 Newcastle Residents' Survey',
<[http://www.newcastle.gov.uk/condiary.nsf/all/A2B4C40B55C94BE480257324004EB4E3/\\$FILE/Res20078%20report.pdf](http://www.newcastle.gov.uk/condiary.nsf/all/A2B4C40B55C94BE480257324004EB4E3/$FILE/Res20078%20report.pdf)>, Accessed 17 May 2010.

----, 2008b, *Corporate Plan 2008/09*, Newcastle: Newcastle City Council.

----, 2009a, 'The 2008/9 Newcastle Place & Residents' Surveys',
<[http://www.newcastle.gov.uk/condiary.nsf/all/E426E4E6F3C568FB802574AA002DDFC7/\\$FILE/FINAL%20REPORT%202008-09%20_Place%20Survey%20&%20Residents%20Survey.pdf](http://www.newcastle.gov.uk/condiary.nsf/all/E426E4E6F3C568FB802574AA002DDFC7/$FILE/FINAL%20REPORT%202008-09%20_Place%20Survey%20&%20Residents%20Survey.pdf)>, Accessed 17 May 2010.

----, 2009b, *Newcastle City Council Corporate Plan 2009-2012*, Newcastle: Newcastle City Council.

----, 2010a, 'Best Value General User Survey 2006/7',
<[http://www.newcastle.gov.uk/condiary.nsf/all/A1ED2DDFF19D885C8025720300332943/\\$FILE/Final%20Newcastle%20Report%20-MORI.pdf](http://www.newcastle.gov.uk/condiary.nsf/all/A1ED2DDFF19D885C8025720300332943/$FILE/Final%20Newcastle%20Report%20-MORI.pdf)>, Accessed 17 May 2010.

----, 2010b, 'Community Development Vision and Framework', <
<http://www.newcastle.gov.uk/core.nsf/a/cdstrategy>>, Accessed 08 December 2009.

NewcastleGateshead Initiative, 2008, *NewcastleGateshead Hotel Investment Fact Sheets*, Gateshead: NewcastleGateshead Initiative.

----, 2009a, *A decade of world-class culture*, Gateshead: NewcastleGateshead Initiative.

----, 2009b, *NewcastleGateshead: the making of a cultural capital*, Newcastle:
ncjMedia.

----, 2010, *NewcastleGateshead Cultural Vision*, Gateshead: NewcastleGateshead Initiative.

Newman, A. and Whitehead, C., 2006, *Five Art Cities: An Evaluation Report on the Impact on Over 50s People of Participation in Activities Related to British Art Show 6*, Newcastle: International Centre for Cultural and Heritage Studies, University of Newcastle.

North East Regional Information Partnership, 2008, *State of the Region 2008*, Newcastle: ONE North East.

North East Tourism Advisory Board, 2008, *Tourism in the North East 2007/08*, Newcastle: ONE North East.

Oakley, K., 2004, *Developing the evidence base for support of cultural and creative activities in South East England*, Guildford: South East England Cultural Consortium.

O'Brien, D. and Miles, S., 'Cultural policy as rhetoric and reality: a comparative analysis of policy making in the peripheral north of England', *Cultural Trends*, 19:1, 3-13.

OECD, 2007, *Competitive Cities: A New Entrepreneurial Paradigm in Spatial Development*, Paris: OECD Publishing.

Office for National Statistics, 2011 (revised in 2014), *2011 Census: Key Statistics for England and Wales*, London: Office for National Statistics.

Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture, 2005, *The 'Culture of Light' Project Asian Culture Hub, Gwangju: Concept, Vision and Strategy*, Seoul: Ministry of Culture and Tourism.

----, 2006, *Suggestions from local people for the Hub City of Asian Culture*, Seoul: Ministry of Culture and Tourism.

----, 2007, *Hub City of Asian Culture master plan*, Seoul: Ministry of Culture and Tourism.

----, 2008, *Hub City of Asian Culture White paper*, Seoul: Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism.

----, 2011a, *Progress on preservation issue from beginning to present*, Seoul: Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism.

----, 2011b, *Project report of the Hub City of Asian Culture to public*, Seoul: Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism.

ONE North East, 2003a, *Graduates and the North East Key Issues Paper*, Newcastle: ONE North East.

- , 2003b, *State of the Region 2003*, Newcastle: ONE North East.
- , 2004, *North East Tourism Strategy 2004-2007*, Newcastle: ONE North East.
- , 2005, *North East Tourism Strategy 2005-2010*, Newcastle: ONE North East.
- , 2006a, *Corporate Plan 2006-2009*, Newcastle: ONE North East.
- , 2006b, *Tourism in North East England key facts 2006*, Newcastle: ONE North East.
- , 2007, *North East England festival and events strategy*, Newcastle: ONE North East.
- , 2008a, *North East England Volume and Value report 2007*, Newcastle: ONE North East.
- , 2008b, *State of the Region 2008*, Newcastle: ONE North East.
- , 2008c, *Tyne and Wear Volume and Value report 2007*, Newcastle: ONE North East.
- , 2009, *North East England Visitor Economy Strategy 2010-2020 Consultation Draft*, Newcastle: ONE North East.
- Palmer, R., Richards, G. and Dodd, D., 2011, *European Cultural Capital 3 Report*, Arnhem: Association for Tourism and Leisure Education.
- Pratt, A., 2008, 'Creative cities: the cultural industries and the creative class', *Geografiska annaler: Series B – Human geography*, 90:2, 107-117.
- , 2009, 'Urban Regeneration: From the Arts 'Feel Good' Factor to the Cultural Economy: A Case Study of Hoxton, London', *Urban Studies*, 46, 1041-1061.

PricewaterhouseCoopers, 2003, *NewcastleGateshead Initiative Cultural Futures: Strategic Options*, NewcastleGateshead Initiative.

Rainisto, K., 2003, 'Success factors of place marketing: A study of place marketing practices in northern Europe and the United States', doctoral dissertation, Helsinki University of Technology, Institute of Strategy and International Business, Finland.

Reeves, M., 2002, *Measuring the economic and social impact of the arts: A review*, London: Arts Council England.

Richards, G. and Palmer, R., 2010, *Eventful Cities: Cultural management and urban revitalisation*, Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann Publications.

Richards, G. and Wilson, J., 2005, 'Developing creativity in tourist experiences: A solution to the serial reproduction of culture?', *Tourism Management*, 27, 1209-1223.

Riding, A., 2007, 'The Louvre's Art: Priceless. The Louvre's Name: Expensive', *New York Times*, 7 March.

Robson, C., 2002, *Real world research*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Ruiz, J., 2004, *A literature review of the evidence base for culture, the arts and sport policy*, Edinburgh: Scottish Executive Education Department.

Ryu, J., 2010, 'Comparative study of 2004 European Capital of Culture Lille and the Hub City of Asian Culture Gwangju', *Europe Culture Arts Studies*, Gwangju: Europe Culture Arts Association.

Sandell, R., 2003, 'Social inclusion, the museum and the dynamics of sectoral change', *museum & society*, 1(1): 45-62.

Sharp, J., Pollock, V. and Paddison, R., 2005, 'Just Art for a Just City: Public Art and Social Inclusion in Urban Regeneration', *Urban Studies*, 42:5, 1001-1023.

Silverman, L., 1995, 'Visitor meaning-making in museums for a new age', *Curator*, 38:3, 161-170.

Sim, M., 2007, 'Meaning of 5·18 Movement', in The May 18 Memorial Foundation 9ed.), *5·18 Movement and politics, history and society*, Gwangju: The May 18 Memorial Foundation, 45-59.

Sohn, S., 2011, 'Gwangju old city centre, retailer's association', *Yeonhap News*, January 17,
<<http://www.yonhapnews.co.kr/bulletin/2011/01/17/0200000000AKR20110117109400054.HTML?did=1179m>>, Accessed 31 May 2011.

SQW and PMP Business Tourism Solutions, 2006, *Culture10 Evaluation*, Gateshead: NewcastleGateshead Initiative.

----, 2006, *Monitoring and Evaluation Framework for Culture10*, Gateshead: NewcastleGateshead Initiative.

Statistics Korea, 2011, 'GDP by region', <http://kosis.kr/abroad/abroad_01List.jsp#>, Accessed 29 April 2011.

Sutton, C., 2003, 'Cultural Values, Attendance and Talents: An Extended Analysis of Four Cultural Values and Attendance Surveys', Unpublished paper, Newcastle: University of Newcastle November.

The EPPI-Centre (Institute of Education, University of London) and the Matrix Knowledge Group, 2011, *Evidence of what works: evaluated projects to drive up engagement*, London: Europe economics.

The Korean Museum Association, 2011, 'Museums and Art museums in Korea',
<http://www.museum.or.kr/organ/museums01.php?sub_menu=1&MuseumIntroduce_kind=1>, Accessed 24 July 2011.

The market specialists, 2006, *Non 2005 Visitor Research*, Newcastle: ONE North East.

The May 18 Memorial Foundation, 2011, 'About the 5·18 Democratisation Movement',
<<http://www.518.org/main.html?TM18MF=A030101>>, Accessed 31 May 2011.

----, 2011, 'Business', <<http://www.518.org/main.html?TM18MF=A020101>>, Accessed 31 May 2011.

The Sage Gateshead, 2010, 'Introduction',
<<http://www.thesagegateshead.org/about/index.aspx>>, Accessed 28 June 2010.

Timothy, D., 2007, 'Introduction', in Timothy, D. (ed.), *Managing Heritage and Cultural Tourism Resource, Critical Essays, Volume One*, Ashgate: Burlington, xi-xxv.

Torisu, E., 2011, 'Policies to Enhance City Attractiveness: Achievements and New Challenges', in OECD, *Competitive Cities in the Global Economy*, Paris: OECD Publishing, 339-351.

Tornaghi, C., 2007, 'Questioning the social aims of public art in urban regeneration initiative. The case of Newcastle upon Tyne and Gateshead', Unpublished paper, Newcastle: University of Newcastle.

Total research, 2009, *'Exciting and impressive' perceptions and experiences of visitors to Newcastle upon Tyne*', Newcastle: Newcastle City Council.

Tourism Development and Investment Company (TDIC), 2011, 'Guggenheim Abu-Dhabi', <<http://www.tdic.ae/en/project/projects/cultural-1/guggenheim-abu-dhabi.html>>, Accessed 15 September 2011.

----, 2011, 'Louvre Abu-Dhabi', <<http://www.tdic.ae/en/project/projects/cultural-1/louvre-abu-dhabi.html>>, Accessed 15 September 2011.

----, 2011, 'Maritime Museum', <<http://www.tdic.ae/en/project/projects/cultural-1/maritime-museum.html>>, Accessed 15 September 2011.

Tourism North East, 2010, 'welcome to Tourism North East', <<http://www.tourismnortheast.co.uk/>>, Accessed 15 March 2010.

Tourism Tyne and Wear, 2010a, 'NewcastleGateshead Key Indicator', <<http://www.tourismnortheast.co.uk/xsdbimgs/NewcastleGateshead%20Key%20Indicators.pdf>>, Accessed 07 May 2010.

----, 2010b, 'Tyne and Wear Key Facts', <[http://www.tourismnortheast.co.uk/xsdbimgs/Tyne%20and%20Wear%20key%20facts%20and%20statsitics\(1\).pdf](http://www.tourismnortheast.co.uk/xsdbimgs/Tyne%20and%20Wear%20key%20facts%20and%20statsitics(1).pdf)>, Accessed 07 May 2010.

Tourism UK and Lowland Market Research, 2007, *A Visitor Survey 2005/2006 for North East England*, Newcastle: ONE North East.

Tourism UK Ltd., 2007, *A Visitor Survey 2005/2006 for Tyne and Wear ATP (ONE North East)*, Newcastle: ONE North East.

Trends Business Research and cogentsi, 2002, *Tourism Impact: A Pilot Study for the North East Part I Highlights*, Newcastle: ONE North East.

Tyne and Wear Research and Information, 2001, *State of the Region Profile Report 2001*, Newcastle: ONE North East and North East Assembly.

----, 2009, *Population in Tyne and Wear 2008*, Newcastle: Tyne and Wear Research and Information.

UNESCO, 2011, 'Cities Appointed to the Network',

<[http://portal.unesco.org/culture/en/ev.php-](http://portal.unesco.org/culture/en/ev.php-URL_ID=36799&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html)

[URL_ID=36799&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html](http://portal.unesco.org/culture/en/ev.php-URL_ID=36799&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html)>, Accessed 15

September 2011.

Vall, N., 2001, 'The Emergence of the Post-Industrial Economy in Newcastle 1914-2000', in Calls, R. and Lancaster, B. (ed.), *Newcastle upon Tyne: A Modern History*, Chichester: Phillimore and Co. Ltd., 47-70.

Vanolo, A., 2008, 'The image of the creative city: Some reflections on urban branding in Turin', *Cities*, 25, 370-382.

Vickery, J., 2007, *The emergence of culture-led regeneration: a policy concept and its discontents*, Coventry: Centre for Cultural Policy Studies, University of Warwick.

VisitBritain, VisitScotland, VisitWales and Northern Ireland Tourist Board, 2006, *UK Tourist 2005*, Edinburgh: TNS Travel and Tourism.

----, 2007, *UK Tourist 2006*, Edinburgh: TNS Travel and Tourism.

----, 2008, *UK Tourist 2007*, Edinburgh: TNS Travel and Tourism.

----, 2009, *UK Tourist 2008*, Edinburgh: TNS Travel and Tourism.

----, 2010, *UK Tourist 2009*, Edinburgh: TNS-RI Travel and Tourism.

Ward, D., 2002, 'Forget Paris and London, Newcastle is a creative city to match Kabul and Tijuana', *The Guardian*, 2 September.

Weil, S., 2007, 'The museum and the public', in Watson, S. (ed.), *Museums and Their Communities*, London: Routledge, 32-46.

Wengraf, T., 2001, *Qualitative Research Interviewing*, London: SAGE Ltd.

West Kowloon Cultural District Authority, 2011, 'Background of WKCD', <http://www.wkcda.hk/en/background_of_wkcd/index.html>, Accessed 5 December 2011.

Willems-Braun, B., 1994, 'Situating cultural politics: fringe festivals and the production of spaces of intersubjectivity', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 12:1, 75-104.

Wilks-Heeg, S. and North, P., 2004, 'Cultural policy and urban regeneration: a special edition of Local Economy', *Local Economy*, 19:4, 305-311.

Wilson, J., No date, *BALTIC: Vision, Plan, Situation, Background*, Gateshead: BALTIC Centre for Contemporary Art.

World Tourism Organisation (WTO), 2004, *Tourism Market Trends 2003 Edition: World overview and tourism topics*, Madrid: WTO.

Yin, R. K., 2009, *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*, London: SAGE Ltd.

Yoo, Y., 2006, *Understanding of Korean diplomacy*, Seoul: Hongik Publication.

Zukin, S., 1995, *The Cultures of Cities*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Appendices

Appendix 1. List of interviewees: Newcastle-Gateshead

Anderson, A., tourism and cultural policy manger, ONE North East, 14 May 2010.

Bell, C., head of culture and major events, NewcastleGateshead Initiative, 26 May 2010.

Bogan, A., Chamber, N. and Anand, J., local residents, 24 August 2010.

Bothwell, D., staff at Workplace Gallery, 28 July 2010.

Brebner, B. and Gough, S., local residents, 15 October 2010.

Kelly, M., O'brien, J., Meas, A. and one anonymous person, local residents, 2 September 2010.

Longhi, I., community programmer of BALTIC, 5 May 2010.

Milne, J., curator at Tyne and Wear Archives and Museums, 24 August 2010.

Paterson, L., local resident, 25 May 2010.

Richardson, B. and Gray, A., local residents, 15 October 2010.

White, H., senior manager of Tyne and Wear Archives and Museums, 29 July 2010.

Worsdale, G., director of BALTIC, 25 May 2010.

Wu, Y., local resident, 25 May 2010.

Appendix 2. List of interviewees: Gwangju

Jeong, S., director, department of urban design, Gwangju Development Institute, 2 March 2011.

Kim, H., culture city development division, Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture, 26 January 2011.

Kim, H., director, Asia Culture Complex division, Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture, 8 February 2011.

Kim, J., leader of cultural planning team, Gwangju Cultural Foundation, 18 March 2011.

Kim, S., Lee, G., Yoon, N., and Yoon, G., old city centre residents, 5 March 2011.

Kwak, K., leader of public relation team, Gwangju Cultural Foundation, 18 March 2011.

Lee, B., head, assistant minister, Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture, 18 February 2011.

Lee, M., professor, Chonnam National University Graduate School of Culture, 7 March 2011.

Min, J., director, Progress Citizens Alliance, 10 February 2011.

Na, G., professor, sociology, Chonnam National University, 11 February 2011.

Park, G., culture city development division, Office for the Hub City of Asian Culture, 26 January 2011.

Park, I., Choi, J., and two anonymous people, new city centre residents, 9 March 2011.

Ryu, J., professor, Department of French and French literature, Chonnam National University, 18 March 2011.

Appendix 3. Interview procedure

In order to manage the interviews in a professional and technically ordered way, the main interviews were preceded by a series of correspondences with each interviewee (Wengraf 2001). The interviewees were mainly approached by email before the interview. In the first correspondence, the nature of the research was introduced and the parameters of the interviews were set out and made clear. It was also clarified why they were selected as an interviewee and how their contact information was obtained. They were asked whether they could participate in the interview. Second contact with each interviewee was made again about eight to ten weeks before the expected interview days. If people agreed, the second correspondences discussed a suitable time and place for the interview. In the third and final correspondence before the interview, which was usually done a week before the interview day, a draft of the questions, research information sheet and consent form were provided. The mobile contact information of the researcher, myself, was also provided. During the correspondences, the interview procedure was also discussed. Most of the interviewees agreed with being involved with face-to-face interviews, however some of them suggested email interviews instead of meeting for reasons such as their work loads, other busy schedule or personal matters. In this case, their circumstances were respected and interview questions were sent via emails. On the day of interview, in order to conduct the interviews effectively, a procedure manual was prepared, which could then be referred to if necessary during each interview. It was composed of a greeting, confirming necessary documents such as information sheets and consent forms, an explanation of the role of interviewees and the expected time duration of the interview. Where consent was given, some interviews were recorded. In those

cases, the interviews were transcribed. After each interview was finished, the manual was checked again to confirm all the necessary procedures were followed and the questions were explored. Finally, thanks was given to the interviewees and they were advised that they might be contacted again for further questions.

Apart from contacting interviewees and conducting interviews with them, another necessary procedure was to obtain ethical approval from the School of Museum Studies. The research ethics review should be completed for every research that involves human participants before they participate in the research. Therefore, in order to maintain this guideline, an application form along with information sheet for participants and research consent form for this research were also submitted and approved by the research officer at the School of Museum Studies. In particular, since the research required the participation of several young people, more careful consideration was necessary to gain research ethics approval. Within the research ethics application form provision was made for their comfortable involvement, such as being interviewed as a group in open space. In addition, it was noted that the interview with them would follow the necessary guidelines for ethical manners, including the University of Leicester's *Research concerning Children and Young People*, the University of Leicester's *Research Code of Conduct and Data Protection Code of Practice*, and *Guidelines for research among children and young people*. The approach to young people was made after gaining approval on this and the interviews were conducted after the whole documentary procedure.

Appendix 4. Information sheet



Information Sheet for Participants

Project Title: The role of museums in city rebranding in relation to local communities

Contact Address: School of Museum Studies, University of Leicester, Museum Studies Building, 19 University Road, Leicester LE1 7RF

Date:

Dear Sir/Madam

I am very grateful that you are willing to take the time to participate in my research project 'The role of museums in city rebranding in relation to local communities'. I would like to take this opportunity to tell you more about the nature of the project, who I am and why I am undertaking this research, and how you were selected for the project. I would also like to inform you about how the data you supply to me will be used and the protections of your privacy and confidentiality that are in place.

Who is doing the survey?

Mr Geuntae Park, PhD student at School of Museum Studies, University of Leicester

What is the project/survey for?

This research is to investigate the relationship between cultural institutions – museums and art galleries – and city rebranding. Especially, the research focuses on what roles museums play in city rebranding process, what their impacts are, and how local communities have been involved with the process.

How you were selected?

You have been selected by your roles in the organisation. The staffs that are in charge of tourism, cultural program, and community works have been considered and will be interviewed.

Your role in completing the project

You will be asked some interview questions through an email. The interview will be analysed together with the replies given by other interviewees at other organisations.

Your rights

Your participation in this project is entirely voluntary and you are free to withdraw from the project at any point. If you are uncertain or uncomfortable about any aspect of your participation please contact me to discuss your concerns or request clarification on any aspect of the study.

Protecting your confidentiality

Any information you supply including correspondence between us will be treated confidentially. If you agree, your comments will be used in my final thesis and/or future publications. However, if you require that specific information given during the interview needs to be kept confidential, I guarantee that the request will be respected.

If you have any questions about the ethical conduct of the survey please contact the School Ethics Officer, Dr Giasemi Vavoula, on gv18@le.ac.uk.

Thank you very much for participating,

With best wishes,

Geuntae Park

Appendix 5. Consent form for adults



Research Consent form

I agree to take part in 'The role of museums in city rebranding in relation to local communities' project in the School of Museum Studies at the University of Leicester.

I have had the project explained to me and I have read the Information sheet about the project which I may keep for my records.

I understand that this project will be carried out in accordance with the University of Leicester's Code of Research Ethics which can be viewed at <http://www2.le.ac.uk/institution/committees/research-ethics/code-of-practice>

Material I provide as part of this study will be treated as confidential and securely stored in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998.

I have read and I understand the information sheet	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	-----	--------------------------	----	--------------------------

I have been given the opportunity to ask questions about the project and they were answered to my satisfaction	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	-----	--------------------------	----	--------------------------

I understand that I can withdraw from the study at any time	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	-----	--------------------------	----	--------------------------

I agree to my words being used in a PhD dissertation and future possible publications	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	-----	--------------------------	----	--------------------------

I agree to my words being used in a PhD dissertation only Yes ☐ No ☐

I give permission for my real name and institutional affiliation to be used in connection with any words I have said or information I have passed on Yes ☐ No ☐

I give permission that my real name be used in connection with any information I have provided or comments I have made but not my institutional affiliation Yes ☐ No ☐

I request that my comments are presented anonymously but give permission to connect my institutional affiliation with my comments (but not the title of my position) Yes ☐ No ☐

I request that my comments are presented anonymously with no mention of my institutional affiliation Yes ☐ No ☐

Name [PRINT]

Signature

Date

Appendix 6. Consent form for young people



Research Consent form for Young People

I agree to take part in 'The role of cultural institutions in city rebranding in relation to local communities' project in the School of Museum Studies at the University of Leicester.

I have had the project explained to me and I have read the Information sheet about the project which I may keep for my records.

I have read and I understand the information sheet Yes ☐ No ☐

I have been given the opportunity to ask questions about the project and they were answered to my satisfaction Yes ☐ No ☐

I understand that I can withdraw from the interview at any time Yes ☐ No ☐

I agree to the email interview and my opinions being used in a PhD dissertation and future possible publications Yes ☐ No ☐

I understand that my real name would not be used Yes ☐ No ☐

I understand that my personal details will be kept private Yes ☐ No ☐

Name [PRINT]

Signature

Date

Appendix 7. Example of interview questions: professional, Newcastle-Gateshead

Questions for Carol Bell, head of culture and major events, NewcastleGateshead Initiative

- 1) Could you tell me about NewcastleGateshead Initiative's mission and aims, policy background of establishment, and your role as a head of culture and major events?
- 2) Would you please explain to me how you co-work with other organisations in the region in achieving your aims?
- 3) Who are your main target markets?
- 4) What are different natures of NGI cultural programmes from those developed by other regions?
- 5) How do you measure your performances? Especially how do you measure social impacts and community development effects of your programmes and activities?
- 6) Does local community participate in the programme development process or marketing activities?
- 7) Do you experience any difficulties in meeting global standards and local needs together? If so, what is your strategy to address them?
- 8) What is the relationship between cultural developments on the Quayside and your Culture 10 programmes? How do they get benefits from each other?
- 9) Would you please tell me what your plans are for the future to use the benefits of the past decade of capital investment on cultural facilities in the region?
- 10) How do you sustain the interest in the longer term in Newcastle-Gateshead as a cultural centre and tourism destination? Is there also something about capitalising on the investments in the area?
- 11) What do you think is the real benefit of your activities/programmes to the local people apart from generated tourism revenue?

Appendix 8. Example of interview questions: local resident, Newcastle-Gateshead

For Asian community in Newcastle-Gateshead area

GENERAL

- 1) Would you please tell me briefly about your Asian community in Newcastle area such as population trends, positioning in the region, etc.?
- 2) What kinds of relationships or partnerships do you have with local authorities or other community groups in the region?

QUAYSIDE CULTURAL DEVELOPMENTS and ITS IMPACT

- 3) How does your community generally think about the Quayside cultural developments?
- 4) Did you have any chance to involve with those developments process as a community group?
- 5) How has your community been impacted by those developments? What kinds of impacts in which ways can you explain?
- 6) Do you think those developments have changed perception or image of the area?
- 7) Do you think those developments have changed the community's attitudes towards arts and culture?
- 8) What do you hope to get from those developments in the future?

ASIAN COMMUNITY and CULTURE/ARTS INSTITUTION IN THE REGION

- 9) Do you think your community in the region enjoy culture and arts enough? If not, what do you think will be the reasons for that? Are they just not interested in or not having many opportunities?
- 10) Have you ever been contacted by any cultural institutions in the region (such as BALTIC) to participate in their programmes? Or do you have any experience like that?
- 11) How do you think about the efforts of the cultural institutions in the region to reach/communicate with your community (or other communities)? Are they good enough or not?
- 12) What is going to be your response if your community is contacted by those institutions?
- 13) What kinds of benefit do you think your community can obtain through working with cultural institutions?

Appendix 9. Example of interview questions: professional, Gwangju

Interview subjects for Lee, B., head, assistant minister, Office for the Hub City of Asian

Culture:

- 1) The role of Mr Lee as a head of the whole project.
- 2) The issues on communication with local communities.
- 3) Investigating local opinions on how to preserve the heritage.
- 4) How to deal with the possible conflicts in the future.
- 5) Asia Culture Complex and revitalisation of the old city centre.
- 6) Expected outcomes and impacts.
- 7) Role of each stakeholder: central government, local government, and local communities.
- 8) Important issues for the future of the project.

Appendix 10. Example of interview questions: local resident, Gwangju

Interview subjects for Min, J., director, Progress Citizens Alliance:

- 1) Introduction of the Progress Citizens Alliance: goals, activities and programmes in relation to the Hub City of Asian Culture project.
- 2) How to figure out the issue of preservation of heritage site.
- 3) The relationship between the 5·18 and the Hub City of Asian Culture project.
- 4) Perception of the 5·18.
- 5) Asia Culture Complex and the old city centre regeneration.
- 6) Communication with the central government.
- 7) Challenging issues for the Hub City of Asian Culture project in the future.