2001-05

WORKING PAPER

Improving quality of life culture in Korea Eight strategic suggestions for a cultural policy problem

Van der Staay

Korea Institute for Health and Social Affairs

Improving quality of life by culture in Korea Eight strategic suggestions for a cultural policy problem

Van der Staay

Korea Institute for Health and Social Affairs

Korea Institute for Health and Social Affairs
San 42-14, Bulkwang-dong, eunpyung-ku,
Seoul 122-040, Korea
ISBN 89-8187-074-8 93330

CONTENTS

Chapter I. A second look at culture and development

The discussion on culture and development seems to have entered a new, more cultural phase.

It is nearly half a century ago that Margaret Mead published her Patterns of Culture and Technical Change (1955). In it she drew attention to the anthropological context into which modernity was injecting itself. But nobody yet seemed able to imagine that modernity could reach so far and so deep, and that the new culture of modernity could replace and wipe out cultural forms that had existed for centuries, if not millennia.

From the 1950's onwards culture would be seen as a factor of resistence, a formidable opponent to change. The traditional way of life was an obstacle to be overcome by any possible means, if one wished successfully to reap the fruits of modernity: wealth, health and respect in an ever widening circle of developed nations. Economic development could be achieved as a matter of course by ignoring culture. Villages could be uprooted and displaced, religious sensibilities counted for nothing measured against the promised gains of development. Monuments as ancient and sacred as the temples of Abu Simbel in the Nile valley could not stop new nationalist leaders from adopting Russian models of development: flooding whole areas irrevocably and building dams for the production of electricity. Europe, and still mainly European UNESCO, tried to mitigate the cultural consequences of ruthless development. In saving the temples of Abu Simbel culture was recognised as being important but also museamised. Culture would be saved as a legacy from the past, but the future clearly belonged to development.

One cannot say that there was a fundamental change in this

attitude, but the practice became more sophisticated. The brutal eradication of existing culture, if it stood in the way of development, seemed lacking in intelligence and efficiency. The costs were relatively high. Disaffection of population, even local resistance and revolt, told the developers that the going was not that easy. Taking culture into account to a certain degree might be advisable and smooth the path of progress. Could local customs and institutions not be used, and harnessed to the yoke of development? Out of the studies of culture as an adversary grew a new appreciation of culture as a factor in development. People and their values might prove beneficial to the development process after all. This clearly was not a sufficient change of heart. It left intact the paramount doctrine of development that is was unquestionable benefit in itself.

Yet out of this approach of taking account of people and their culture grew an awareness that people mattered after all. In this, the insight of the Dutch development advisor, Prince Claus of the Netherlands, struck a clear note. People, he told international development organisations, cannot be developed; they can only develop themselves. This brought a fundamental change of perspective to those who share his views. Not only were people made interesting, and no longer seen as obstacles, or merely collaborators in development, they were the originators of development. People and their cultures were not only recognised, but they were seen as the prime movers of the development process. This of course tied in with the widespread movement of empowerment, starting in the 1970's, which saw the giving of power to minorities as one of the tools of development. The poor, women, ethnic minorities, sexual minorities had to be empowered to achieve their own liberation. This was at least the belief in progressive circles. It was a minority belief not widely shared, and certainly not in the centres of powers related to development, by governments, the Monetary Fund or the World Bank.

However, the recognition of the importance of people and their values was a decisive step forward in thinking about

development as such. If people were to be empowered to develop themselves, they should be given the right to impose their own values. Values became important as an expression of self, of identity. If development was after all something not imposed on people, but wanted by them as opposed to former dogmatic top down development, would not development have to take into account their diversity of cultures? Indeed a number of more or less declamatory roads to development were proclaimed: non-aligned development, Burmese development, Islamic banking, Asian values supporting Asian Tigers, and so on.

This people-power reasoning led not only to a diversification of the meaning of development, but also to the proverbial tower of Babel, i.e. to mutual incomprehension and the danger of relativism. Relativism here is meant as the giving up of any hope of finding common values in the achievement of development. This relativist, even cynical approach to the multifarious ways to development, in which development could be the means to any cultural result, struck a deep hole in the centre of development. It meant that development was no longer in possession of some guiding culture, western or otherwise. Development had briefly entered its nihilistic phase, and had become in a sense valueless, without value. An aim only unto itself.

This crisis at the centre of development philosophy was bravely tackled at a monster conference on cultural policies held in 1982. The Mexican hosts of this conference (Mondiacult) may not have foreseen the wide-ranging implications of the reversal of values that was embedded in its so called Declaration of Mexico. Basically, the message was very simple. If economic development had lost its way, some central core of belief should be reinstated. Culture could be the aim of development, not its means. On the global level, values should be found to guide development. After all, if peoples' lives were the aim of development, the collective will of the people should guide the development process. Culture beats economics.

As a participant at this conference, I must admit having overlooked the far-reaching impact of our Declaration and the watershed-like divide that this reversal of roles between culture and development indicated. On the one hand it was easily observable that power in the world was still, as it is today, in the hands of the economic elite that gathers at the World Economic Forum of Davos. The crowing of cultural luminaries like France's Jacques Lang (then minister of culture and prominent at Mondiacult) could be constructed as a symptom of weakness. Moreover the failure of political hegemony over economic development in the communist countries did not bode well for a new attempt to ride the economic tiger. All this made for scepticism. I returned from Mexico with the depressing feeling that we had achieved not much more than the pitting of the word culture against the manifest realities of economic development.

Somehow I was wrong. In the twenty or so years after Mexico the discussion of the relationship between culture and development seemed to change, just as the triumph of economic development seemed to become almost complete. Perhaps it was the very success of economic development in certain countries that made obvious a hollowness in the development process. Though the means might deliver the wished-for effects, and nobody seemed to wish to change course completely, world capitalism started to look at itself in the mirror and did not quite like what it saw. It saw a world in many ways out of control, with dwindling natural reserves, a devastated ecology, growing pollution and global warming. It saw persistent inequities in the distribution of power, economic or otherwise. It saw huge population shifts away from traditional agriculture into the broken-back economy of megacities. It also increasingly had to cope with public opinion and critical movements which rattled its cosy self confidence. Most importantly, people all over the world were worried. They did not reject the brave new world of economic development, and indeed were voting by their feet and flocking to the biblical fleshpots of Egypt, wherever these

appeared. But they felt worried nevertheless, not about the past, but about their future and that of their children.

I think this is much the situation today. The twin regulatory processes of the market and democracy have acquired great prestige, the first for its efficiency, the second for its avoidance of insoluble strife and as a platform . If one wants efficiency and harmony in the development process, one should clearly lean towards the market and democracy, and forget about command economies or dictatorships. But both regulatory frameworks tell us little about the future. At any moment the market or democracy may go haywire. Therefore there is a great cultural challenge at the core of present-day thinking, to define the future of mankind as a whole. How far can population, indeed the economy, grow; can geosphere and biosphere deteriorate; can cultural traditions disappear; can values be left out of the development equation without courting catastrophe? These are important questions which have to be debated.

There exists no world parliament to effectively debate all this, since the structures of the United Nations family of organisations is, as the word implies, an assembly of states, sending their diplomats and occasionally experts to peacefully settle differences. The United Nations is not a world parliament. Whatever may be globalized in this world, it is not the will of the people. There is not a single forum for the vox populi. The world may not be ready for this type of gathering; one would still be at a loss to assemble the founding fathers for it. But the clear need exists to take into account the wishes of the people and their values, if one wants to solve the battle between culture and development.

In this wide framework of future construction, a small book (or rather a small part of a medium-sized book) took up the challenge of answering the questions which values should guide development. The book was the result of a contorted process of decision-making that started with the strangely heroic Mondiacult

conference of 1982. It goes under the innocuous title of "Our creative diversity" and was the result of work by a committee of international experts. It tried to act as an embryonic world parliament by listening to countless shouts and murmurs in many corners of the world. It tried to define the outlines of global ethics, a set of common values that should guide development. For this we must thank the economist Paul Streeten, who conceived of this non-economic approach to development. In recent years the ethical approach to the process of development has gained in prestige, while the status of the purely economic approach to the world's future has been questioned. The Nobel Prize awarded to the Indian economist Amartya Sen has confirmed this alternative approach.

If one takes seriously what was described above, and considers culture as the prime mover of the development process, at least for the time being, one should have the courage to state a few obvious facts. People all over the world are struggling to find answers to new problems. It is quite probable that certain answers will be more successful in coping with these problems than others. The answers will not only be different from those of the past, but also not immediately widely known or respected. It behoves good governance to make these good practices known as quickly as possible, and to discuss their implications and values. This can only be done by intelligent scouting. There is no bureaucratic formula for this scouting process. It depends on scouts in many parts of the world, a network that carries the information, platforms of communication for testing the value of these solutions, but of all things it depends mainly on eyes, ears, noses of intelligent people to discover them. So the scouting of exemplary solutions to the problems of culture and development becomes a strategic priority and even a must. Especially if this implies the positioning of development in a wider cultural context. This would immensely enhance and amplify the so far abstract discourse of finding a global ethics to guide development.

Chapter Ⅱ. Eight strategic suggestions for a cultural policy

1. Cultural policy and centres of power

If we define cultural policy as the changing of a cultural situation by more or less powerful means, we should first consider where the power of cultural policy lies. This is a strategic question for those who have the ambition, as Korea seems to, of including the whole population and the whole of leisure in cultural policy initiatives.

There appear to be three major powerbrokers in the cultural field: the cultural marketplace, dominated by an economic elite; the public sphere, dominated by the political elite and its administration; and the voluntary associations or movements, dominated by social elites, that are emerging in many parts of the world.

A well thought out cultural policy would try to balance these three factors, so that they would work together. A different balance may be achieved in different places. In Europe, for instance, which has a strong and long history of public intervention, the lifestyle of the population is still dominated by the cultural influences of the market. In the Netherlands, which also has a long tradition of cultural policy at the local level, the influence of the market in the cultural lifestyle of the population is balanced by voluntary associations. Of the hundreds of local museums the great majority have been created by private initiative and are run by voluntary associations. These associations organize major festivals, bringing together hundreds of thousands of people participating in cultural or sports activities. In any year amateur participation dwarfs participation in official, professional art many times over. The power of official cultural policy is limited.

I think, without knowing the Korean situation, that it is reasonable to assume that public arts and public programs will always be a relatively weak player in the leisure time activities of the population as a whole, though of course one of great importance. This importance is conveyed by such means as giving official recognition to certain activities; in education and information; by institution building, sometimes supported by the law; and by providing support and setting up commissions. These are the classical mainstays of cultural policy.[1] By these means cultural policy can strengthen continuity, quality, diversity, innovation, in the overall cultural situation, in a way the market or voluntary movements will not always be able to do well.

In our area of rapid globalization we should perhaps accept that the market is the cultural force that is making the most rapid advance. That the public sphere has yet to become strong and that voluntary organizations are an emerging influence in cultural growth.

2. Scientific analysis and cultural policy

Scientific information can be very helpful in developing cultural policy. Statistical databases and surveys, together with policy oriented analysis, can give the public player in the field of leisure and culture a much better view of what the field actually

1) When reviewing the Report (1995) of the world commission on Culture and Development, named after its chairman Mr. Perez de Cuellar, it occurred to me that there is an unexplored field of cultural policy alongside "classical" cultural policy. This policy concerns values and norms. I suggested calling this general cultural policy as opposed to the classical or specific cultural policy. As this general cultural policy would link the fields of ethics and aesthetics to centres of power, the relationship between culture and power would become even more hazardous than that relation already is in specific cultural policy. Yet no specific cultural policy can exist without some reference to general cultural policy. See the Book Review for the European Journal of Cultural Policy, Dublin, 1996.

looks like. This scientific analysis cannot be taken for granted. It does not exist everywhere. Many professional people in the arts or in the administration of culture do not look outside their direct field of interest. I can understand that. But for policymakers it is strategic to have this overview of the field.

It is possible to gain a quantitative picture of developments in leisure time from scientific surveys. Analysis of *time budget data* has helped modernize culture in my country, for instance by indicating at what time of the day people have free time available for shopping or other leisure time activities and when they do not. Another instrument with which to obtain information about culture is the *value survey*, by which I mean a specialized form of survey normally associated with public opinion research for politics or the market. From existing value surveys we can, for instance, learn that the lifestyles and values of young people in China or Japan are changing and diverging from those of the adult population. As young people tend to carry this lifestyle over into their grown-up lives, we may assume that the future cultural situation is already present in its embryonic form. Youth lifestyle movements, and especially the values they adhere too, seem to me extremely significant for cultural policy development.

Value analysis is, for instance, to be found in the two recent World Culture Reports by UNESCO.[2] For these reports it was not feasible to arrange new value surveys, so secondary analysis of existing databases was substituted. Even if they were less than perfect, they do provide an insight into what people are thinking in many countries. The main impression one gets is that the populations surveyed are more varied in their opinions that we would usually suppose. It also emerges clearly that youth is very open to new ideas.

For UNESCO it was not feasible to commission a worldwide value survey. At the national level the Netherlands does have this unique opportunity as far as its own population is

2) World Culture Report 1998, Paris 1998;
World Culture Report 2000, Paris 2000

concerned, through its Social and Cultural Planning Bureau,[3] [an advisory body] which commissions time budget surveys and public opinion surveys on a regular basis. The surveys touch on religious and ethical questions, moral dilemmas, women's liberation, attitudes towards migrants and so on. They make it possible for governments to take the long view, and not to give in to sudden hypes in the media or politics, or sectarianism.

My two examples, time studies on leisure and public opinion polls on values, are not what normally comes to mind when we think of cultural statistics. These statistics are interesting in themselves and should be available. But if you want to step outside the usual boundaries of cultural policy, as seems to be the Korean ambition, and reach out to the population as a whole, you should also have new scientific tools for knowing what is out there. These data should be used and analyzed by a special policy-oriented scientific unit or network.

There is another aspect to the dispassionate study of the values, opinions and behaviour of the population. It also strengthens the *democratic process*. Though public opinion may well be reflected through political channels, these channels will select what they think important; that is their task. But it helps to look at public opinion with a dispassionate eye and get the picture directly.

Recently world leaders have been surprised by demonstrations of young people outside the venues of their gatherings. They need not have been surprised if they had taken account of public opinion surveys. Analysis has shown for years that there seem to be two extremes to the classical political

---

3) Social and Cultural Planning Bureau
P.O. Box 16164
2500 BD The Hague, The Netherlands
T: +31 (0)70 3407000
F: +31 (0)70 3407044
E: info@scp.nl
www.scp.nl

spectrum in Europe, one to the left and one to the right of a moderate centre. Those at the far right are frequently not very well educated, materialistic and have no interest in politics, those to the far left are mainly well educated, idealistic and are interested in politics.[4] The very simple conclusion of this summary description (which in its brevity approaches a caricature) is that the majority of the protesters at, for instance, the Genoa Summit are potential participants in the democratic process, by virtue of their education, idealism and interest in politics. On the other hand, those on the far right seem to be less so inclined, and are more difficult to assimilate in the democratic process. Knowing public opinions strengthens the democratic process.

3. Culture for the millions

If we are to take the Korean ambition of providing culture for the millions seriously, we should perhaps start by recognizing that the market, and especially the commercial electronic media, are already doing this. They are already occupying the high ground. A few weeks ago, while I was visiting a small scale publisher of quality books in Morocco, I looked down from the 13th floor and was astonished to see the whole sprawling city of Casablanca covered with and even disappearing under satellite dishes. These millions of eyes and ears are not connected to quality books. They are connected to mostly commercial culture.

What culture? A year ago I visited the producers of a number of the soap operas watched by viewers in the Middle East. These soap operas are created in Mexico City, and their export to the Middle East has become a major industry in Mexico.

This international world of disk-vision creates an interesting situation in which there is a gap between disk-vision and daily

4) Adriaan van der Staay: Public opinion and European unity: a learning experience; in Experiencing Europe, Maastricht 2000

life, between recognized culture and unrecognized culture, between the culture of the cultured and the culture of everybody else. But it is inconceivable that the presence of disk-vision culture, which consumes much of the leisure time of the population, will not in the long run influence their values and behaviours. If we were to take up the challenge of asking what positive influence public cultural policy could exert here, we would improve a central aspect of leisure.

However there are two other areas which are of great interest to all of the population and which, at least in Europe, are not always seen as part of cultural policy: architecture and nature.

4. Architecture and public opinion

The urban dwelling and the town itself are the context of life for ever more people. The majority of the world population already lives in an urban setting. What we call public space, which is the space everybody can make use of, envelops an important part of our everyday life. For example in commercial shopping malls and traffic highways. Specifically, public transportation and official buildings come to mind when one thinks of how cultural policy could enhance the everyday quality of life for the population.

I am aware of the fact that I am speaking in a part of the world which has, or perhaps had, the oldest and most refined tradition of building cities and houses of all, the Chinese, Korean, and Japanese traditions. At the same time these traditions have nowhere been more rashly uprooted for some form of globalized building than in East Asia. A cultural continuity has been broken. Priority should be given to preserving those quality parts of the urban landscape that are still there, and retaining the skills to preserve them. This has been understood by some courageous individuals, voluntary and professional associations. Cultural policy should support them.

Thirty years ago, when I was working as the director of the Rotterdam Arts Foundation, I worked in a city with hardly anything left of its architectural heritage, because of the war. Everything had to be rebuilt. I made improvement of the cityscape a main priority, because this links quality with the greatest number of people. Creating a political awareness that quality counts, that good town planning, good transportation, good building immensely enhances the human and aesthetic quality of life is not easy.

In the case of Rotterdam, which calls itself the largest port in the world, it was only natural to internationalize the issue of quality. International critics, architects, discussions and conferences, innovative pilot projects, insoluble problems tackled by geniuses, major international events were all marshalled to elevate the critical awareness of local political and public opinion. This awareness had hardly existed before, though of course people would judge privately, and not without merit or reason. I think this architectural initiative of the 70's, which has now grown beyond recognition, has made Rotterdam a much more interesting city to live in. Yearly events of architecture, exhibitions, books and films, institutions and buildings have clearly created a participation in the quality of architecture that did not exist before. Architecture and city planning is a cultural responsibility too.

The quality of life of a city depends largely on the role nature is allowed to play. It is both a traditional given and a future challenge. Gardens, parks, landscape all contribute greatly to the quality of life. Because of its implications, and because it is discussed too little in cultural policy, I will discuss this matter in a little more depth.

5. Nature and the urban setting

It is hard to see how one could have a culture of quality

without a culture of nature. Did not the Chinese humanist Lin Yu Tang simply ask the question: how can a man live without a garden? Landscapes, parks and gardens have delighted civilized people for thousands of years. Yet landscapes, parks and gardens seldom attract much attention in cultural policy today. And what is even more telling: cities and dwellings are created, in which gardens or parks are marginalized. These horticultural delights still exist for the rich and famous. But as a private luxury. This leaves us with great modern cities where it is frequently impossible to communicate with nature, to look at the sun, the moon, the stars, to see mountains or water, or look at the unfolding of flowers and participate in the antics of animals and birds. We have entered a cultural period in which the man-made world dominates. When we talk about public spaces, we seldom include gardens.

This has many causes, one of which is purely cultural. Economic growth and demographic pressures coincided with a building and planning movement, international modernism, that seemed to give cultural legitimacy to the eviction of nature from the city. The last century was the century of a utopian modernism that relished a world that would be man-made, and neglected the natural world. Its great spokesman Le Corbusier kept nature at a distance, as a green backdrop, and did not create gardens.

So much of the defence of the garden had to come from private citizens, rich or poor. But it seems to me that something, at least in the Western world, is changing. People in Europe are getting richer and, having left the city for a house in a natural setting, having filled their houses with man-made things, they are again creating gardens. Moreover, parks have become the backdrop for many activities, sports, and festivities. Golf courses with their designed parks are proliferating. Yet this does not reach the level of spirituality you are looking for. In all this, man dominates and nature is seen as another form of consumption. It does not quite re-establish contact with nature.

There are signs, albeit a minority movement, that the

garden is being rediscovered as a point of contact between nature and culture. There is of course the ecological movement, which holds nature to be sacred, and which considers nature parks as a kind of shrine. There is also this curious American movement of the therapeutic garden, which seems to recognize that the garden has much to offer in re-establishing mental and physical health in people. There is an upsurge of interest in books about garden history.

If one was to make the landscape, the park and the garden a pivotal feature of cultural policy in Korea, this would doubt contribute greatly to the quality of life there, and perhaps to the mental health of its people. Moreover, I am aware that the cultural tradition of the garden in East Asia naturally lends itself to the fusion of the man-made environment and nature. The two great garden traditions of the world may perhaps be called the paradise garden tradition of the West and the *landscape garden* tradition of the East. This latter tradition has, by its fundamental acceptance of man as part of the landscape and by the discovery of miniaturization, made it quite easy to insert natural elements into the man-made world. In 1990, at the international symposium about the Authentic garden, I had the pleasure of listening to your compatriot Byong-E Yang. He first introduced me to the specific language of the Korean garden. I was struck by the openness of ancient Korean gardens to natural phenomena, like river beds and rocky embankments.

It would be interesting to know what decentralized cultural policy could do with this idea of giving landscape and garden a central importance. On the one hand traditional agriculture may provide a link to the protection of the quality of the landscape, on the other hand voluntary associations might be interested in enhancing the quality of miniaturization of landscape. And both together might influence local awareness of the importance of nature.

6. Slow food

I wonder if cooking is not a neglected field of culture and development. In recent years the art of preparing good food and eating it has become something of a cultural and political battlefield. This is evident in the reaction of many to globalization and the provision of high-tech simplistic food by MacDonalds. Increasingly the importance of keeping authentic traditions of national and regional cuisine is emphasized. Yet, like all culture in a globalizing world, cooking is changing fast. For two centuries already Indian cooking has become much hotter by the introduction of the South American pepper. In the last century the pizza has travelled from Naples to the US and back to Italy transformed. Today there is a cosmopolitinization and creolization of food. There are nationalist battles going on around the origins of shoarma and kebab.

In a rather more serious vein I could point out the increased importance of the study of the history of the art of cooking. Recently the cultural historian Claudia Roden was awarded the Prince Claus Award for her work on the Mediterranean and Middle Eastern kitchen.

Being Jewish and from Egypt, she now has a definite impact on the all too globalizing hotel kitchen world of Egypt, in teaching them to rediscover the original recipes of the countryside. In the same way she helps with the emancipation of the Sephardic tradition of eating and cooking in Israel. Cooking is a matter for cultural policy.

Indeed cooking not only concerns all families, but it also strongly concerns the self-definition of a culture. So if the Korean new cultural policy were looking for a subject that would interest local communities and (culinary) elites at the same time, it might well be regional cooking. It is elsewhere.

Actually, underneath the rediscovery of traditional and regional cooking lies a broader concern than the question of local traditions in a globalizing world. It is one that concerns the

whole lifestyle of our emerging cultures.

The association of fast food with globalization is not accidental. It points to a world in which fast living reaches into every corner of our lives. The fast work time is linked to a fast leisure time.[5] This fast culture never stops, seven days a week and 24 hours a day. This fast-track orientation of our emerging culture is well symbolized by fast food. So it is worth noting that a counter-movement, called Slow Food, has arisen in Italy, which is now expanding to a wider area around the slow art of traditional cooking. The production of quality ingredients, the knowledge of where to get them, the careful preparation of food, the rituals concerning the eating of good food, have branched out into a concern with the quality of our daily lives. This has found its way into a journal called Slow Food, but also into yearly festivals at which slow food is celebrated. This may well indicate that fast track society is reaching certain cultural limits, and may be in search of moments of immobility and repose, recuperation and even meditation. So the question of the art of cooking is not that far removed from the question of immaterial quality after all.

7. Cultural identity and learning from others

Indeed for cultural policy, cultural identity is a motivating force. Most people have several loyalties. They define their identities first by their family allegiance, then by the local identity, then by their nation, and finally by some international standard. Research has shown that these cultural identities need not be exclusive. Yet the local cultural identity may have a great

5) In an essay which has not yet been translated, Andries van den Broek and Jos de Haan summarize the findings of Dutch leisure time research. They analyze cultural participation of the population in a period of increasing cultural competence and growing competition among leisure time activities, and provide three scenarios.
(Andries van den Broek & Jos de Haan: Cultuur tussen competentie en competitie, Amsterdam/Den Haag 2000)

motivating force, as we can witness in sports. So some form of regional or international competition may drive the local population to develop cultural skills. This happens in traditional societies, like on the island of Bali, Indonesia, where local musical groups compete with each other. But it is also a driving force in modern societies, as the Olympic games show.

Yet there is a paradox within the concept of cultural identity. Local ambition may be a motivating force, but does not by itself lead to cultural competence. There is no magical path to achieving quality. There is no magical way of being recognized by others for one's ambition. One can only lift oneself to a higher level of competence or value or recognition by being *taught by others*. And though people cannot be culturally developed, but can only develop themselves, as a wise man said, they can still only develop themselves by accepting being taught by others. In my example, the Balinese village that wants to acquire proficiency in music or dancing will send out its young people to other villages that are renowned for their skills. Or they will invite travelling teachers.

So the paradox of cultural identity is that it is both an energizing force and a fundamental impediment to cultural development. Cultural identity will be an obstacle to cultural growth if it does not reject its limits, and accept openness to others, and the necessity of change.

8. Cultural scouting

Looking around us from a global point of view, we can see cultural identities, for instance Korean culture, yet we see every identity in flux. If we look backward at those same cultural identities, taking the long view, over thousands of years, we see something else. We mainly see people acquiring *new elements of culture*. Technical skills, but also new values. We see cultures change. Existing cultural identities may be fiercely defended, but

they have largely been taken over from others in bits and pieces. For instance, England today will defend its cultural identity vis a vis continental Europe, despite the fact that it took much of its culture from there. Though we should not ignore the importance of identity questions in the short term, the most important fact in the long-term development of culture may be cultural change, meant as the acquisition of new skills and values. This is not widely understood. We perhaps need a 21st century Charles Darwin to explain *cultural evolution by cultural selection.*

As I said before in the introduction to this paper:

People all over the world are struggling to come up with new answers to new problems. It is quite probable that certain solutions will be more successful in coping with these problems than others. These successful answers will be different from those of the past. They will not be immediately widely known or respected. It behoves good governance to make these good practices known as quickly a possible and to discuss their implications. This can only be done by intelligent *cultural scouting.*[6] There is no bureaucratic formula for this scouting process. It depends on scouts in many parts of the world, a network that carries the information and perhaps platforms that will test the value of these solutions.[7] But above all it depends on the eyes, ears and noses of intelligent people to discover them. It is this scouting avant-garde, in a world of as yet virtual culture and development, that Korea could and should be part of.

---

6) Adriaan van der Staay: A Second Look at Culture and Development, in Prince Claus Fund Journal # 4, The Hague 2000.

7) Since 1997 the Prince Claus Fund for Culture and Development is active in this field. It has recently decided to put international cultural scouting at the centre of its concerns. It is establishing a network that functions for cultural scouting and transmission of innovative results between the western and non-western worlds of culture.

Prince Claus Fund for Culture and Development
Hoge Nieuwstraat 30
2514 EL Den Haag, The Netherlands
T: +31.70.427 43 03F: +31.70.427 42 77
E: info@princeclausfund.nl www.princeclausfund.nl

Chapter Ⅲ. Afterthoughts

As a contributor to the seminar on Productive Welfare in Seoul, being a first time visitor to Korea (a country I knew only by hearsay and study) I had to adjust my contribution at the last moment. This prompts an afterthought on the experience, which I also tried to work into my very restricted contribution to the panel discussion.

To be frank I felt astounded at that modernity of Korea. Korea clearly had fully entered the modern age. In certain aspects it even might be ahead of Western developed nations. It was struggling with the same problems about culture and development that were testing the consciences in the Western world, exactly because of this modernity. So I decided to take the risk of addressing the audience as if it were - my case - a European audience. Even using the European or British version of the common international English language, as a sign that the speaking of this language does not of necessity imply the sharing of all the American values.

At the present moment Korea and the Korean audience seemed to be quite competent to cope with the problems of modernity, as was shown by the creativity shown in responding to the Asiatic economic crisis of 1998. Instead of falling back on defensive positions, Korean politicians seemed to have taken the road of investment in a campaign of further modernisation, specifically by creating some form of modern welfare state. In doing this Korea proved to be quite capable of solving its own problems and analysing its own experiences. Yet it had shown itself not adverse to taking counsel with others. I felt pleased that the contacts with Europe seemed to be increasing, and that they were added to, not substituting the existing contacts with the US.

In the course of the seminar I was struck, not for the first time, by the distance that seemed to exist between the discourse.

the way of thinking, the professional network of people tackling problems of welfare and people involved in the problems of cultural policy. Basically the tradition of welfare policy had become the realm of economists and the more or less quantitative disciplines. Cultural policy seemed to be approached in a much more qualitative, historically oriented and sociological manner. Moreover, if one excludes the field of education from the field of cultural policy, leaving only the arts, science, cultural heritage and the media as central areas, there appeared an enormous financial discrepancy between the huge amount of capital circulating through welfare channels, compared with the trickle that flows through the cultural policy ones. This is by the way one of the structural problems facing UNESCO within the family of specialized agencies of United Nations. Economic development, social security, health and welfare are infinitely heavier subjects than culture, even including education. Though culture and education might be the entrance to solving many problems in the other fields.

But I thought that at the end of the day this weakness might also be a strength. Culture could be seen as a mover, a somewhat eccentric force to development. Especially if welfare is seen as enhancing the quality of life. So I felt justified in addressing myself to the community of people interested in cultural policy, with the message not to be cowed by the quantitative preponderance of the economy. If cultural policymakers retrench themselves in a narrow definition of culture policy, they may miss the chance of contributing importantly to the quality of life. They should participate in wider cultural debates, for instance concerning the ethics of development or the culture of common people.

I did not have the occasion of seeing much of Korean daily life. But it is obvious to this superficial visitor that Korean culture is a soft presence in a harsh world of economic development, that may manifest itself creatively again and to the benefit of the Korean people.

Abbreviated Curriculum Vitae:

Adriaan van der Staay (1933) studied Social Sciences at the University of Utrecht. From 1968 through 1979 he was the director of the Rotterdam Arts Foundation. In this period he pushed for innovation and internationalizing cultural policy. From 1979 to 1998 he was the director of the Social and Cultural Planning Bureau of the Dutch Government. This bureau provides a scientific database and analysis for cultural policy, among other things. Today he is the vice-president of the Prince Claus Fund for Culture and Development. He was chairman of the World Decade for Culture and Development (UN/UNESCO) from 1990 to 1992.