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1. Historical perspective: cultural policies and instruments

The developmental phase of Korean cultural policy reflects procedures of historical, political, economic, and social development of Korean society. The Japanese colonial period which officially lasted from 1910 to 1945, deprived the culture sector of autonomy. The colonial government’s policy goal was to eradicate Korean people’s cultural pride. During this period, Korean history and cultural heritage was subject to manipulation and distortion. Many traditional cultural practices and customs were debased to facilitate control over colonised Korea. There was no room for proper cultural policy discourse in this antagonistic period.

Political turmoil after the Second World War and the Korean War had an indirect impact on the formation of modern cultural policy. The independence of the Korean Peninsula in 1945 followed by the territorial division of the North and South caused ideological contention also in the cultural sector. Confrontation of communism and capitalism affected artistic trends, which eventually constrained both part of freedom of expression up to present years. Due to the unrest of society after the Korean War there was slight room for discussion about cultural issues thus no official policy statement on culture was made. Some effort to restore cultural self-esteem was made and a few national cultural facilities, such as the National Library, the National Museum, the National Theater, and the National Korean Traditional Music Institute, were set up.

Activities in the 1960s and 1970s are susceptible to contradictory judgements in terms of cultural development. The 1960s and 1970s saw accomplishments as well as shortcomings in the culture area. During this period, the government put in great effort to restore Korean national cultural heritage that had suffered during the colonial period. Emphasis was also put on refurbishing the national spirit to recover from the colonial setback. Institutions to preserve the traditional arts disciplines were founded along with the establishment of new cultural facilities. Enactment of the first and comprehensive legal provision to promote culture and the arts (Law to promote Culture and the Arts, 1972) was a sign of pursuit for setting up modern cultural policy. The cultural sector did not enjoy an independent policy field but most of the times combined with the field of public information. The arts and cultural sector equip itself with legal system and expansion of infrastructure whereas freedom of expression suffered in these days of external achievements. Not only did the confrontational situation between South and North but also the prolonged ruling of despotic government oppressed artistic and cultural expression.

Decades of despotic government and rapid economic development had a twofold effect on the Korean society. On the one hand, greater economic affluence triggered interest in cultural arena. On the other hand, because of the failure to democratisethe Korean political system in the
1980s, freedom of thought and artistic expression were restricted. Nevertheless, cultural policy focused on expanding tangible infrastructure. Local governments were financially supported by central government to build new cultural facilities such as theatres, public libraries, and museums. This ‘Grands Travaux’ type of policy resulted in art centres that were monotonous in design and function, and which did not reflect local cultural identity. Unbalanced growth between hardware and software, the results were also disappointing. Local governments were ill-equipped to run programmes in those facilities. Necessity for deficiency of human resources to run those facilities was another drawback.

It was only in the 1990s that cultural policy achieved an independent policy field both nominally and practically in governmental undertaking. Ministry of Culture was established independent from field of education or public information in 1990. A nationally renowned writer, Rhee, Uh-Ryung, was given the first minister’s position, It symbolised that cultural policy field was to reflect the logics of the cultural field and its professionalism by evading the appointment of a politician or bureaucrat as its head. With the inception of decentralisation policy, local issues became gain interest in cultural policy. The Local Cultural Center Promotion Act (1994) was established in this vein.

The financial crisis of Korea in 1997 turned cultural policy and administration towards a market-oriented direction. In line with the growing interest in the creative sector worldwide, the cultural industry gained substantial attention in Korea. Cultural industry was seen as a potential source of increasing wealth of a country. The IT sector, the cultural content industry, especially the game industry attracted a growing market not only locally but also internationally.

Cultural policy in the first decade of the twenty-first century continued to place great emphasis on the commercial potential of this sector. Although there have been debates on how to reinforce the non-market based art sector, a notable portion of the cultural budget was allocated to promote the cultural industry and to organise institutional support. Although the arts sector became actively involved in social inclusion and education policy, this was less visible than the cultural industry. The digital content field was integrated into the content industry field, which left the Ministry of Culture, Sports, and Tourism (hereafter Ministry of Culture) in a greater volume of budget than before. Amidst this flow of commercialisation, a remarkable advancement in arts and culture has been achieved as the Arts Council of Korea (ARKO) launched its way as an civil decision making body as the grant maker in the arts.

This was also a period of retrogression because there had been ideological divide underlying
cultural policy actors and its orientation. This contention came to the surface when the administration changed in the 2008. Cultural policy became a battleground of ideological clashes between the conservatives and the liberals. The ruling conservative party [Grand National Party] insisted that cultural policy should regain its proper place versus the leftist policy inclination of past government. Many cultural practices that did not match the conservatives orientation was accused of pro socialism and even communism, which was still a delicate issue as a divided nation. Cultural policy was susceptible to political influence more than ever after democratisation of 1990s.
2. General objectives and principles of cultural policy

2.1. Main features of the current cultural policy model

Until the 1980s, Korean political system had been characterised as great presidential power, strong central government, and a relatively underdeveloped civil society. The centralised political and administrative system in Korea had conferred the ministries with overriding power. During the democratisation period in the 1980s and 1990s, civil society actors were mobilised to participate actively in the political process, which is a legacy valued up to these days. Yet, today, cultural policy objectives are required to coincide with the overall policy vision, objectives, and agendas of the government of the time. Such a structured system of cultural policy affects the public and non-profit part in terms of funding provisions. It may be ambivalent in that this kind of influence draws concerted action and partnership to produce synergy in achieving policy goals but also deters independent agenda and priorities of the third sector participants.

The year 2005 was a turning point for Korean cultural policy in that a civil commission, the Arts Council of Korea, was established. The Council was expected to convey various voices directly from the arts field. The process of setting up an independent arts council was strenuous one that had to put together stakeholders with differing interest and ideological pursuits. With the establishment of Arts Council, Korea represents peculiar system of cultural policy where a strong governmental body (the Ministry) and a nongovernmental public body (the Council) coexist in support for the arts and culture. The Arts Council, which has its origin as an appendix organisation to the Ministry of Culture as its mission to manage the Arts and Culture Promotion Endowment, was expected to hold autonomy in setting up directions of how to support the arts with its independence. However, with its decrease in endowment and its overlapping policy area with the Ministry it faces difficulties in terms of identity and institutional role. The issue of division of labour and coordination between the Council and the Ministry remains somewhat unclear until present.

2.2 National definition of culture

The official definition of culture is to be found in the provisions of Act on Promoting Culture and the Arts (1972). ‘Culture and the arts’ refers to literature, fine arts (including the applied arts), music, dance, drama, cinema, artistic entertainment, traditional music, photography, architecture, language, and publishing (Article 1). Apart from this official definition of culture, Korean cultural policy has acknowledged the spiritual and intangible aspect and of human activity. Since the Korean Constitution proclaims in its ninth clause that “the country bears a duty to make efforts to develop traditional culture and deliver it to the future generation and thereby contributing to the progress of national culture”, all aspects of everyday cultural life from traditional conventions to
ways of living were perceived to be the area of cultural policy. This is made more vivid in another statute, namely the Cultural Heritage Preservation Act, which includes various types of intangible heritage as worthy of preservation and protection.

It is only recent that cultural industry has been occupying a stable status within the concept of culture. As the cultural policy field expanded to encompass the cultural industry, major changes have taken place. There has been a continuing debate as to whether or not the cultural industry, or called the ‘creative industry’, should be included in the category of cultural policy. Even within ‘cultural industry’, the spectrum is wide to cover artistic products (musicals, cinema, design etc.) and products of digital technology (online game programmes, game machines, character goods etc.).

For the period of 2008 to 2012, the whole digital content industry was absorbed to the field of cultural policy because technological component had been perceived to be critical for the development of cultural industry, namely “Cultural Technology”. The Ministry of Culture’s organisational emphasis has been also altered to reflect the priority for the cultural industry among its sub fields of cultural policy. Office of Cultural Content Industry was placed at the forefront among other offices. White Paper for cultural industry is published independently reflecting the importance as a quasi-independent field in the cultural policy area.

2.3. Cultural Policy Objectives (2008~2012)

Emphasis on the inherent values of arts and culture
Arts and culture have significance by themselves. Artistic and cultural creations are the source of fulfilment and achievement of artist himself but also convey profound meanings and values in life to the audience. The belief that the arts and culture are not a means to an end but an object to be recognised and respected for their own values, policy priority of the government has been laid on enhancing excellence of the artistic production and high quality of cultural life that would have eventual impact to majority of public life. This reflects the notion that arts and culture are not just about the economic benefits and auxiliary values they create. In way of acknowledging this objective present government has defined national arts institutes as the centre for excellence and public access minimising the burden of break-even management. National arts institutes are asked to create works of art that could serve as a symbolic icon of the nation, make creative experiments of artistic excellence.

Resettlement of the support system
In a way of assuring fair and efficient process of support system, management of Korean Culture and Arts Promotion Fund has been amended since 2008. The former dual reviewing system
involving council committee and subcommittee had been dissolved to minimise the alleged adverse effect of excessive peer review. Overall government subsidy has been restructured around the notion of quality and excellence of artistic creation to give more benefits to organisations that could demonstrate any competitive aspect of their work. Standard has been set to select recipient based on expectation of achieving the stated objective by concentrating resources to relatively selective few, which is called “the principle of choice and focus.” This shift in policy direction acts as a rationale to concentrating reasonable amount of fund to practically assist with creation instead of allocating small amounts to a multitude of organisations as in the past. Recipients were more assessed in their competitiveness edge on what they were doing and their impact towards the art world and the public.

Assuring cultural right to the socially excluded population
The focus is on making arts and culture available to everyone including the socially and economically marginalised group of population. With this goal in mind, the government devotes significant amount of general budget (mostly from the Lottery Fund) to run cultural voucher system and socio-cultural welfare programmes. This has been arranged to assure both consumer sovereignty and supply side aspect of cultural market.

Institutionalising welfare policy for artists
It has been a public commitment of the government how to stabilise the living condition and improve the work environment of the artists. One has been to strengthen the basis of work environment by providing various incubating programmes such as “Creative Factory”. The most important event above all is institutionalising artists’ welfare policy by legislation. The Artist’s Welfare Act is regarded as a fruitful consequence of lengthy endeavour to improve artists’ social welfare, which has to be supplemented with details year to come.

Introduction of environment sensitive cultural policy
Adoption of ‘low-carbon and green growth’ as a new national vision for Korea in 2008, arts and cultural sector had to become more aware of sustainability issues of within its ecology. Support has been given to artists and organisation that consider environmental sensitivity as subject of their genuine work or in managerial aspect such as constructing or renovating cultural facilities.

Recognising genuine importance of traditional culture in itself and as the origin of creative industry
The significance of cultural diversity has been viewed from two aspects. First, it will yield a culturally abundant life to the public, second it will have meaningful influence on flourishing of creative industry. Originality and tradition has been important from the historical and identity perspective of
cultural policy. At the same time, concerns have been widespread that uncompromising attitude regarding traditional arts and culture will lead to perishing of it all. To cope with these concerns various types of public support has been enacted such as placing traditional arts educators at schools, global promotion in arts market (such as world music EXPOs), and subsidising young performing groups. Government programmes are aimed to modernise traditional cultural resources and utilise them in a creative way in order to promote newly discovered values of Korean tradition and spirit in a global setting.
3. Competence, decision-making and administration

3.1. Organisational structure

3.2. Overall description of the system

A strong tradition of state intervention exists in many policy fields in Korea and culture and the arts was no exception. The national government played a vital role in instituting the cultural policy agenda and coordinating emerging issues in the cultural field. The most important role player in cultural policy and administration is undoubtedly the central government. There are pros and cons of having ministerial system with strong initiatives. It reinforces the perception of the public that arts and culture is a field that should be preserved by the responsibility of the government. Strong initiatives from the government side make the policy vulnerable to political changes. Every five years, accordingly to the change of ruling party and its political orientation, the government is susceptible to changes in its emphasis.

As of 2013, the Ministry of Culture is consisted of 10 sub fields excluding planning and administrative sector. Sub policy fields are for example religious affairs, cultural content industry, cultural policy, arts policy, tourism policy, library and museum, public communication affairs, sports policy, and media policy. The Ministry of Culture is one of the ministries that hold large number of appendix organisations under its jurisdiction. There are 16 organisation that are subordinate to the Ministry (directly controlled by dispatching public officials to the organisation) and 43 public and non-governmental organisations (equivalent to Non Departmental Public Bodies in the UK). There are various committees that provide policy consultation to the government. Since 2013, an emphasis on the “Creative Economy” and “Cultural Prosperity”, both of Park Geun-Hye administration’s important policy orientation, has resulted in instituting a new presidential council Presidential Council on Cultural Prosperity. The field of cultural heritage is administered by separate government entity, The Cultural Heritage Administration. It is independent in terms of that the institution has to deal independently with appropriation process and has full responsibility for obtaining the budget.

Another important body in the same field is the Arts Council of Korea. It is, in principal, an independent public organisation consisting of 12 council members as a decision making body. However, in practice it would be difficult to say the Council is completely independent since the council members are finally approved by the Ministry and the council chair being appointed by the minister of the Ministry of Culture from two candidates.
The civil society in the cultural sector was inert or latent until the actual democratisation process began. The civil society in this sector was no more than a collection of interest groups organised according to specific artistic genres. The most visible and broadly encompassing had been the Federation of Artistic and Cultural Organisations of Korea. With the progress of democracy, new civil society groups, such as the Korean Peoples’ Artist Federation and Cultural Action have come onto the scene. Nongovernmental policy research groups and advocacy organisation provided various voices and constructive criticism and opinions.

3.3. Inter-ministerial, intergovernmental cooperation (2008-2012)

Managing cultural statistics to assist with local cultural policy formation

The primary objective of local cultural policies is to nurture and develop local culture that has unique characteristics reflecting local cultural identities. To advance this objective, the role of the central government has been identified to provide an effective communication channel for the balanced implementation of different local cultural policies and to compile and manage primary reference data of the national cultural universe to enable comparison among different regions and localities. Biannual publishing of Catalog on cultural infrastructure and Local cultural statistics handbook, which contain the status of cultural facilities of localities and compilation of regional cultural budgets, represents an effort in this direction.

Supporting activities of local cultural branding

Regional imbalance has not just been apparent in the economic dimension but in the social and cultural dimensions. Rural areas have relatively poor cultural infrastructure compared to the metropolitan area and thus lack opportunities for experiencing art and culture. Rapid economic development and modernisation had negative influence in terms of preserving peculiarities of each regional culture. Disproportionate concentration of population in the capital region was also responsible for an imbalanced cultural scene. Cultural branding based on local cultural legacy and its peculiarity was regarded to enhance local competency. A national project with an emphasis to regional cultural development was “Asian Hub City of Culture” in Gwangju, a prime example of providing support from the national budget to enhance the cultural profile of local city and its sustainability.

Financial co-responsibility in expanding local cultural infrastructure

The national government supports a proportion of the budget for establishing local cultural facilities although major responsibility falls on the local government. The devolution of certain policy decisions to the locals beginning in the mid-1990s has constraint the central government’s involvement in terms of cultural infrastructure expansion. For example, the Ministry of Culture of
Culture) had somewhat passive role to match fixed amount from the construction cost of local cultural facilities when the local government directly asked for subsidy to the national budget office. Local cultural institutes run cultural programmes that respond to the demands of the local community and execute projects that help to sustain the local cultural environment.

Programme assistance for local government
The financial and administrative responsibility for supporting regional cultural activities rests with the local government. However, the central government develops various programmes budget for implementation at the local level. These budgets are meant to subsidise strategic projects in vein with the government’s cultural policy objectives but it has to be undertaken in cooperation with locally based organisations. For example, projects of “Revitalising traditional market with culture” have involved even Ministry of Food, Agriculture, Forestry, and Fisheries and Small and Medium Enterprise Promotion Agency. This project has been initiated to redirect the rapid decline of traditional markets throughout the localities, in a way to revive the function as a space of cultural communication and interaction thereby to supplement the function of pure commercial activity. To rejuvenate these traditional markets as a space for communication and as local cultural landmarks, the Ministry of Culture has provided consultation and programme support. This project has been exemplary in overcoming barriers to inter-ministerial and inter-governmental cooperation.

Consultation assistance to enhance self-sustainability of local culture
Local artists and personnel face an inferior working environment and lack educational opportunities. Thus it is crucial to strengthen the environment so as to induct, nurture and retain quality human resources. The Ministry of Culture began to provide training for local cultural administrators in 2003 and since 2006 renewed training courses extensively. Consultation support for local cultural policy addressed the issues of culturally marginalised communities, collaboration with local universities in the same field, and spawning future leaders in arts and cultural field. Areas of consultation have included: establishing a vision for local arts and cultural policy responsive to individual conditions and local communities, the need for managerial improvement of local cultural facilities, and the need for developing and creating local cultural content. Upon the selection of the subjects for consulting, comprehensive consulting services and assessment tools are provided where needed.

3.4. International Cultural Cooperation
3.4.1. Overview of main structures and trends
Interest in international cultural exchange has grown rapidly. Newly established organisations to
address this interest exist at various levels of governments and also in the non-profit field. The Ministry has focused on encouraging individual exchange and cooperation, as well as the promotion of Korean culture worldwide. Cooperative actions has been pursued on the basis of reciprocity and or taken the form of Official Development Assistance.

In 2002, a first policy report on international cultural exchange, *Long Term Development Plan in the International Cultural Exchange (2002)* was published. This is the main document that states the policy orientation in matters of cultural exchange and acknowledges the reciprocal nature and benefits of cultural exchange. Apart from the official declaration of principle in international cultural exchange, the Ministry of Diplomatic Affairs and Trade also stated that the pursuit of cultural diplomacy must take a bilateral form.

The government and the market have been prompted to pay close attention to the growing popularity of Korean pop culture since the beginning of the new century. This phenomenon, namely “Hallyu (Korean Wave)”, despite controversy regarding its commercial aspects, has been perceived as a medium to increase cultural exchange.

### 3.4.2. Public action and cultural diplomacy

At the central level three ministries are involved directly or indirectly in international cultural exchange and cooperation. The Ministry of Culture, including the Cultural Heritage Administration, has allocated the largest budget and also the support structure for cultural exchange. After the appearance of the Arts Council, both the Ministry and the Council are exploring how to coordinate division of labour in order to provide more opportunity of cultural exchange.

With the long history of public action in cultural field, the term “international cultural exchange” has been more familiar to those who have been involved in the arts and culture. Cultural diplomacy, as with its short history and its origin to public diplomacy and soft power is perceived to be strategic and bounded in terms of certifying free acting artistic and cultural will. Support for international cultural exchange takes two forms. The Arts Council and Korea Arts Management Service provide funding for individual artists and organisations. The Ministry of Culture focuses on managing overseas infrastructure to assure on-going programmes and various presentation of cultural exchange. It runs the Korea Cultural Service in 23 places around the world (http://www.mcst.go.kr/usr/culture/index.jsp) A few locations provide integrated service pertaining to cultural industry content marketing and tourism promotion. The Korean Cultural Service aims to be a place not only to introduce Korean culture to the public, but also to act as a
locus of exchange and lend diversity to the cultural setting in the host country. The Cultural Heritage Administration also executes projects with less developed countries to restore, protect, and preserve their cultural heritage.

In 2008, the Ministry of Culture introduced a new system for providing Korean language education in foreign countries, The Sejong Institute. Sejong Institute was named after the most respected king in Josun dynasty who actually invented the Korean alphabet. Korean Cultural Services ran language programmes but these classes were not meeting the steeply rising demand, especially in the Asian region. The Sejong Institute has a flexible system of forming partnerships with universities that already offer Korean language classes. Instead of creating new facilities for Korean language education, the system supports existing Korean language educational initiatives by providing professional teachers and publications required for proper education.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs has been working to establish its own field of activities in the name of cultural diplomacy. It supports cultural events and activities in embassies and consulates abroad. The public diplomacy organisation, Korea Foundation that funds international exchange for scholars and opinion leaders of various countries also provides fund for international cultural exchange. The Foundation supports activities to promote Korean studies internationally and runs four satellite agencies abroad to liaise with host countries.

Presently, the Korean government has concluded Memorandums of Understanding with 97 countries to support cultural exchange activities. Among those 97 countries, 34 countries have Committees on Cultural Exchange to develop specific action plans for an interim period of two or three years. Not all of the Memorandums include obligatory clauses, but few have content of practical benefits. It is also the Ministry of Culture’s responsibility to allocate funds to support cultural activities to commemorate diplomatic treaties. Public organisations and non-profit institutions are funded under this programme.

3.4.3. European/International actors and programmes
The longest existing international actor is Korean National Commission for UNESCO. The Ministry of Education, Science and Technology as the supporting ministry for UNESCO is the partnering ministry in charge of its budget and administrative matters. The Korea National Commission for UNESCO being an independent body and cooperates also with ministries across the government.

The Intangible Cultural Heritage Center for Asia Pacific (ICHCAP), a UNESCO category II: The
Institute was inaugurated recently. ICHCAP, which will be fully sponsored by the Cultural Heritage Agency, is expected to open officially in 2013 in Jeonju city. It will run programmes to exchange information and knowledge regarding the preservation of intangible heritage in the Asian region. It is also expected to enable networking in this area.

Earlier, the UNESCO Asia Pacific Center of Education for International Understanding (APCEIU) was established in year 2000. APCEIU has broad interest is in promoting cultural understanding in different countries as well as highlight different political, societal, economic aspects.

3.4.4. Direct professional co-operation

In the field of culture, there are three major exchange programmes at the central governmental level. The Ministry of Culture has funded the Cultural Partnership Initiatives programme from 2005 which started with promoting exchanges of cultural administrators. The participating organisations should be national, public, or non-profit cultural organisations that wish to invite administrative or managerial personnel in the arts and culture field. The programme runs for six months, 70 to 80 participants are selected yearly, and priority is given to candidates from developing countries.

A public organisation specialising in providing assistance in arts management he Korea Arts Management Service (KAMS) also runs exchange programme. While this programme is still at a development stage, it supports mid-career arts managers, including producers and programmers of arts companies and arts theatres. The scheme is somewhat unique: KAMS forms partnerships with corresponding organisations independently and facilitates selected artists to gain knowledge about their counterparts in other countries and eventually to come up with co-production ideas and results in their field of work. Until now UK-Korea Connection, Finland-Korea Connection and US-Korea Connection have been developed. KAMS hosts the Performing Arts Market of Seoul to foster communication in the performing arts. It is not a ‘market’ per se but functions as an exhibition and a means of displaying the trends and interests in the current performing arts scene.

The Arts Council Korea plays mediating role, placing outbound and inbound artists in residency programmes. It also funds an arts organisation to tour abroad but the scale is relatively small. Several international art events of significance such as the Venice Biennale receive support from the Arts Council on a regular basis.

At the regional level it is difficult to grasp the whole range of activities. Many regional and local
governments have introduced residency programmes of their own. The Metropolitan City of Seoul has delegated its arts administrative function to the Seoul Arts Foundation and it has turned specific districts into art studios. Some of the studios are open to foreign artists for residency thereby promoting artistic stimuli and exchange. International festivals are one of the main modalities for promoting international exchange at the regional level. The Busan International Film Festival (BIFF) has evolved into one of the premier film festivals in the Asian region. In addition, there are numerous international festivals representing specific arts genres such as the Gwangju Biennale, Icheon Ceramic Biennale, and Seoul International Dance Festival, to name a few. The private sector also contributes to the cultural exchange scene, especially in the fine arts field by providing for residencies within their facilities or annexes. Several non-profit art museums such as Ssamji Art Space and Young-Eun Art Museum are examples.

Some exchange activities are difficult to classify as being entirely reciprocal and commensurate in nature. The Cultural Heritage Administration has sponsored the co-operative project between Vietnam and Korea Advanced Institute of Technology to work on restoring digital images of the ancient cultural sites close to its original image. The Korea International Cooperation Agency dispatches arts education personnel to developing countries on a regular basis.

3.4.5. Cross-border intercultural dialogue and co-operation

3.4.6. Other relevant issues
4. Current issues in cultural policy development and debate

4.1 Main cultural policy issues and priorities (2008-2012)

Resolution of imbalance in taking cultural benefit
With the widening income disparities between the rich and the poor, imbalance in cultural experience of socially and geographically marginalised people has been aggravated. In order to increase public access to cultural and sport events and to reinforce leisure and welfare programmes, the government has given policy priority to the expansion of culture-travel-sport vouchers for socially disadvantaged and low income families.

Enriching cultural environment
A great emphasis is being placed on enhancing Korea’s image as a cultural powerhouse. This has taken the form of developing grand projects and institutions. Priority has been given to the establishment of the National Museum of Korean Contemporary History, the National Museum of Contemporary Art in Seoul, the Hangeul Museum, and the Asian Hub City for Culture Gwangju.

Since the 1970s, countries in Europe have tried to generate revenues from tourism by rejuvenating cities and beautifying the urban environment utilising cultural assets. Korea has also been focusing on creating cultural spaces that reflect its unique cultural characteristics to revitalise city centres. It is expected that such efforts will facilitate growth in tourism and other relevant industries. The case in point is the ongoing project to transform modern industrial heritage sites into cultural spaces.

Strengthening creativity in arts
The Korea Culture and Arts Fund moved from making one-time cash grants to providing continued and indirect funding in phases. Moreover, it has put in place a new set of operating principles such as the introduction of the chief-reviewer-in-charge position and an early and regular deliberation process. A new scheme to provide funding for multi-year basis and evaluation basis were introduced to improve the quality of creative activities.

Job creation in the arts and culture
As job creation emerged as a significant policy issue for the government as a whole, the realities of employment in the arts and culture sector also came into focus. While efforts were made to create jobs, problems in arts and culture were too complex for the adoption of the general prescription to address employment issues. Government played the intermediary role of creating jobs to enable the placement of arts educators in schools and arts institutions. It also took
responsibility for promoting business start-ups in the arts and culture such as social enterprise in the arts.

4.2 Specific policy issues and recent debates

4.2.1 Conceptual issues of policies for the arts

4.2.2 Heritage issues and policies

4.2.3 Culture industry: policies and programmes

*Cultural industry before 1988*
Recognising the importance for cultural industry had influenced by the political situation and the role of cultural policy had to take during the period of political environment between 1960s to late 1980s. As for the cultural policy in general, special emphasis was placed on the field of national and traditional culture in order to recover destructions made during the colonial period. It was also important for the government to formulate a unified national cultural identity for political and economic reasons. Popular culture in general was negatively perceived, such as consumptive, decadent, and even rebellious. Import of cultural product was controlled for historical reasons (Japan) as well as for political reasons (Western popular culture for spreading liberal thoughts). Broadcasting, cinema, songs, and publication, hose classified as cultural industry products were under censorship on political ideology and moral grounds. There was little possibility that these genres as bearing economic value not to say of societal value.

*Recognition and initiation of cultural industry policy*
It was only after 1988, where the government (Roh Tae-Woo as president) separated cultural administration from public information and established an independent ministry cultural policy. The wave of globalisation growing, Kim Yong-Sam government established division for cultural industry in 1994. This may regarded as a turning point for relevant genres because they came to be seen from an international perspective rather than object of regulation from a national perspective.

*Neo liberalism and the rise of cultural industry policy*
The financial crisis in 1997 that struck Korea massively engendered serious interest for the economic value that cultural industry could create. Kim Dae-Jung government acknowledged the cultural sector to be one of the instruments to make a breakthrough in economic hardship and furnish the environment to promote cultural industry sector in a global setting. In order to do this,
president Kim fully opened up the market for the Japanese popular culture, which was a controversial issue due to historical legacy. The first legal provision for cultural industry, *Framework Act for the Promotion of the Cultural Industries* was issued in 1999. It is essential in that the law provided comprehensive and clear definition on cultural policy for the first time. The law defines cultural industry as ‘industries related to the production, distribution, and consumption of cultural product’ by which the cultural product refers to both tangible and intangible goods and services that create economic value by embodying cultural elements. Cultural product, following the definitional logic of this law, could include familiar forms of product such as the film, sound recording, game software, animation but also theatrical performance, traditional clothing, and even traditional food.

Support and promotion for cultural industry sector was empowered by newly established organisation such as the Korean Film Council, Korea Media Rating Board, Korea Games Promotion Center. All were in fact to eliminate a former regulative function from the past organisations and confer new mission for the promotion of each industry. It provided platform of policy discourse and interaction with independent policy research function.

*From cultural industry to content industry*

Announcement of *Content Korea Vision 21* marked significant shift in the scope of what cultural industry policy should be doing for the future years to come. Digitalisation and media convergence recognise to be an important change surrounding the cultural industry the government saw potential sources of radical expansion of the content market. The term cultural industry was replaced by the term content industry, specifically the cultural content industry. To have the cultural content industry to flourish it should have close connection with the IT industry still comprising essential features of cultural industry. In *Content Korea Vision 21* this is denoted as CT (culture technology), the technology with which cultural contents can be digitalised. CT concept acquired the status equivalent to that of information technology (IT), biotechnology (BT), and nanotechnology (NT) in terms of inducing government support. Korea Cultural Content Agency (KOCCA) was established for a comprehensive promotion of the cultural content industry sector.

Subsequent action took place following the *Creative Korea* (2004) report, which introduced the Culture Industry Process System mode. It emphasised the organic connection between the input-output process, policy support, and importance of infrastructure. Infrastructure was understood to be essential in the field where government intention should not dominate over market forces. Accordingly, input infrastructure such as human resource development, technology development, financial assistance, policy research and information infrastructure became the main issued of policy support. Favourable environment for the cultural industry in terms of legal system such as
tax, copyright regulation was considered to be effective producing new systems and institutions.

The convergence of cultural industry with content industry accelerated from 2008 when the Ministry of Culture, Sports, and Tourism took responsibility of overall digital content industry sector. However, this was a period of global economic downturn and cultural industry was not an exception. Sales declined and employment opportunities shrank thus content industry’s direction also moved to creating jobs, creating business friendly environment, supporting export and global competiveness.

4.2.4. Cultural diversity and inclusion policies
Korea has been an ethnically homogeneous society for a relatively long time. This may be attributed to the legislation conferring nationality according to the ancestral grounds and a exclusive system of accepting immigrants. However, in the last 20 years, a large influx of migrants has reversed this trend. Shortages of unskilled labour, an increase in the unmarried male population in localities, and intensification of the global economy has resulted in an influx of various groups of foreigners from diverse ethnic and national backgrounds. The national statistic database shows that slightly above 2% of the national population now consists of diverse foreign nationals. This may be perceived as insignificant in comparison with other multicultural countries, but for Korea it is a striking social phenomenon due to its hitherto exclusive ideas about ethnicity and nationality. The biggest immigrant group is migrant workers with short-term residential permits for a specific employment period. Later, women emigrated for the purpose of marriage. The official records are not kept on the basis of ethnicity or race because in the present the issue is perceived as cross-border (nationality) issue rather than racial issue. The fact that the majority of migrants are Chinese-Korean may support this argument. It is notable, however, that the migrating women are mostly from Southeast Asian countries. This has triggered a different policy response of treating these women as a minority group.

There is no stated policy regarding the cultural rights of the migrant population. Programmes to preserve immigrant cultures have been attempted, but have received little social attention and have been fragmented in nature. Few publicly funded programmes to maintain second mother tongue for children of multicultural background have been implemented. Similar efforts in respect of migrant’s language have been adopted by local public administration and information and services are being provided in different languages, especially when the service is highly relevant to the minority group.

4.2.5. Language issues and policies
The invention of Han-Geul, the Korean unique alphabet system in the 14th century has made Korea
an incontestable in terms of language system. There are concerns about diminishing language diversity in terms of local dialects but remain rather a periphery issue. There is on-going debate whether or not to juxtapose Chinese character with Han-Geul that form the ideographic basis of vocabularies.

Currently issues related to language can be summarised as follows. Firstly, the Korean language environment is changing rapidly due to influences of foreign languages and internet communication. Concerns has been expressed that newly generated vocabularies substitute proper expression and this may harm the identity of official language. Secondly, there is a growing support for greater tolerance of multi-language use. This reflects the growing proportion of users of diverse languages in Korea owing to the increasing influx of people from North Korea, women migrants and foreign workers. Thirdly, with the advance of globalisation, the demand for Korean language learning has increased explosively.

4.2.6. Media pluralism and content diversity

4.2.7. Intercultural dialogue: actors, strategies, and programmes

There are two dimensions to the issue of intercultural dialogue in Korea’s current situation. Firstly, there is the question about the policy response to growing multiculturalism in the country. Secondly, there is the question of how to communicate with culturally dissimilar countries. The latter concern has surfaced because with the spread of Korean pop culture, films, and television programmes to neighbouring Asian countries has encountered both very positive and very negative reactions. It was recognised that before this kind of sudden encounter mediated by fast spreading popular culture, there had not been significant relationships with countries with different cultural backgrounds. Awareness of the need for intercultural dialogue has grown in view of this twofold reality.

The cultural life of migrant groups has also been of great interest as a cultural policy matter. The Ministry of Culture has executed surveys on the participation in and consumption of culture by this specific group. The results Survey on cultural life of migrant population (2010) suggested that more cultural programmes from the migrant’s country of origin should be provided and that the society required more multicultural awareness and understanding. The Korea Arts and Culture Education Service, a public organisation that funds and executes educational activities, has trained and placed multicultural educators in schools and cultural facilities. Cultural minorities were also eligible to participate in the programme and work as multicultural educators.

The Office for Hub Cities of Asian Culture plays the most active role in promoting intercultural dialogue in international settings. As part of the operational plan for the Asia Culture Complex in
Gwangju City in 2015, the Office organises and coordinates a multitude of projects that promote intercultural communication. For example, an annual gathering of traditional musicians in the Asian region is organised to form an orchestra and attempt new forms of performance. The Office also sponsors professional gatherings to generate ideas for artistic cooperation and co-production. KNCU (Korea National Commission for UNESCO), APCEIU (Asia Pacific Center for Educating International Understanding), ASEF (Asia-Europe Foundation) are partners in these activities.

4.2.8. Social cohesion and cultural policies

Social cohesion has become an important cultural policy issue and was instituted as a program at the beginning of 2005 to reduce disadvantage in cultural life as a result of income barriers. The policy took two forms of which one was to directly subsidise the consumer and the other to increase accessibility to culture for the disadvantaged group. The exemplary programme of the former is the “cultural voucher” service for those in the second lowest income category. About 990,000 people received these vouchers over three years period (2008-2010). The cultural voucher is valid for the purchase of performance, exhibition and cinema tickets, books, DVDs and the like. At the beginning it was administered based on a point system which required registering on a specific internet site, but as this did not reach the target group effectively, it was transformed to a debit card like system for the user’s convenience. Meanwhile, regional nodes (mostly regional arts foundations) for managing the service have been appointed to meet the specific needs of each area. To address the supply side provision of the service, arts and cultural organisations were subsidised to allocate a certain proportion of seats to the designated target group. Since this type of service rendering ran the risk of stigmatising the recipient, the national art organisation instead toured and visited social welfare organisations to increase exposure to the target group.

Disparity and polarisation was also a problem in geographical terms and for certain social groups who were being pushed to the margins of a rapidly changing society. The Arts and Culture Education Service designated three elementary schools as part of the “Arts Blooming from the Seeds” school project in the first year. As a result of 4 years of support, those schools survived by redefining themselves as a specified school in the arts and even attracted students from bigger cities.

The social enterprise scheme was another tool for achieving social cohesion through the arts. Under the scheme the social enterprise, one should either employ a certain percentage of disabled people from the lowest income strata or provide a certain portion of their service to socially disadvantaged groups. A few portion of non-profit arts organisation moves to acquire this status in order to get qualified to receive subsidy for personnel expenses.
4.2.9. Employment policies for the cultural sector

Teaching artists (TA)
The Ministry of Culture appoints artists as teachers in elementary, middle and high schools as well as some kindergartens across the country with a goal to support arts and cultural education at schools. The teaching artist programme is being run in 5,436 elementary/middle/high schools, some 1,300 welfare centres, and other public or non-profit facilities for the youth, elderly, and the disabled.

Retirees as cultural intermediary
Support is provided to those retirees who have completed courses at local cultural institutes to work as cultural animators. They serve as instructors in local cultural histories and resources in community centres, schools, and welfare institutions, performing arts and cultural programmes. This helps them to lead a productive life after retirement.

Multicultural (programme) educators
Most cultural facilities that design and implement multicultural programmes are experiencing a shortage of human resources and want to hire multicultural educators who have been trained through the courses provided by the Ministry (Korea Arts and Culture Education Service). While knowledge of local culture would be desirable for running such programmes, at present those trained through the central system are being sent to work as multicultural educators. Especially at local cultural facilities like libraries, museums and local cultural institutes which have a high demand for such educators, this program could meet multiple objectives of revitalising local cultural facilities and creating jobs. http://127.0.0.1:3924/app/index.html

Rotating librarians for “Small Library”
New jobs have been created through the “Small Library” programme under which professional librarians are hired to build library collection, provide information for the local communities, and offer cultural programmes. Through this “Small Library and Rotating Librarians” programme, professional librarians have been placed in 77 public libraries in rural areas across the country, resulting in provision of the services of a professional librarian to 344 small libraries linked to the public ones.

4.2.10. Gender equality and cultural policy
The work force in the culture and the arts sector in Korea is predominantly female compared to other sectors. However, this gender concentration is not reflected at the decision-making level. In
2008, the Ministry of Culture commissioned a research project to construct a data base system to accumulate and analyse information on the female labour force in the cultural sector (including the cultural industry).

4.2.11. New technologies and digitalisation in arts and culture

The government has been implementing digitalisation projects across sectors including arts and culture, cultural heritage, tourism, sports, and libraries. One of the core focus areas is to provide the space for cultural creation through such new digitalisation paradigms such as Web 2.0 and social networks by establishing the open, shared, cooperative environment for the creation and use of cultural knowledge. The national library system has launched a new digital library system to cope with changes in such environment. The national digital library not only concentrates in converting existing repository to digitalised content but also provides various service to utilised such information at hand.
5. Main legal provisions in the cultural field

5.1. General legislation

5.1.1. Constitution

Article 9 states that “the states have an obligation to put forth effort in bequeathing and developing traditional culture and creatively enhancing national culture”. Article 11 states that, “no person should be discriminated against by his or her gender and religion or not to be discriminated according to social status in every field of life such as political, economic, social, and cultural”. Article 22 describes “Every citizen has the freedom of arts and academic thinking”. It follows with the description that “rights of author, inventor, scientist, and artists are protected by law”.

5.1.2. Division of jurisdiction

5.1.3. Allocation of public funds

It is mandated for the government in major laws to provide public funds in the form of general budget or in specified fund to promote and support various field and genres. There are not often some legislation that do not provide any expression or clause that certifies public funding. Such legislation has symbolic value rather than the laws that express direct financial requirements.

5.1.4. Social security framework

The Korean social security framework consists of four kinds of social insurance, which are the national pension, the national health insurance, worker’s accident compensation insurance, and unemployment insurance. According to a study on artist’s welfare (2003) out of the surveyed artist group, 98% have national health insurance, 62% fall under the national pension system, and 18% have unemployment insurance. A more recent study highlights participation in the social security system by specific genre (2007). For example in dance, the study explains that 91% have national health insurance, 59% are in national pension scheme, 30% have unemployment insurance, and 35% have worker’s accident compensation insurance. A smaller proportion of those who tend to work independently such as in genres like the fine arts have coverage under each of the insurance categories, according to a different survey (2006).

In 2011, the legislation Artist Welfare Act has been enacted. The law has its original idea to certify insurance coverage from industrial disaster, employment insurance. Since the Korean adopts national health care system the above two has been problematic for the project based working artists on many cases. The Artist Welfare Foundation has been developing registration system to qualify artist as a profession and modify the transitional period of institutionalising full welfare coverage for profession in the arts and culture.
5.1.5. Tax laws
Korean tax laws provide for tax exemption on donations by individuals and also exemption of capital gains tax for works of art. For the culture and the arts, a special category is provided to promote cultural philanthropy, such as donations to the ‘Culture and Arts Promotion Fund’, ‘National Trust Fund’, and in-kind donations to museums. For the ‘Culture and Arts Promotion Fund’ the donated amount is accepted as an expense up to 50% after any possible deduction. For donations to cultural organisations in general, corporations are allowed to deduct 5% from their earnings as expenses and individuals may deduct up to 20% from earnings.

Korean corporations have an account category called “general business expense”. If a corporation spends money on cultural services instead of general business expenses or the like, it will be conferred with an additional 10% tax exemption above the prescribed limit.

The issue of imposing a capital gains tax for art works been only enacted in 2013. Laws to impose capital gains tax for works of art were initiated in 1990 but were postponed and abandoned in 2004. A revised version was passed in 2008 for activation in 2011 but has met with fierce opposition from gallery owners, auction companies, and various artist groups. The revised law included a provision imposing a 20% capital gains tax for the sale of an art work at a certain price (approximately over US $5,500). The logic behind the opposition to the legislation was that the Korean art market is not mature enough to carry the tax burden and that taxation would hinder open transactions and eventually result in the formation of black markets. The final version of levying capital gains tax to the art works has been settled to minimum price of 50 million Korean Won for each piece of work.

5.2. Legislation on culture
Korean Law has its tradition in Continental Law system. General Provision of the Constitution clearly states that “The State shall strive to sustain and develop its cultural heritage and to enhance its national culture (Article 9)”. Also under the section on the rights and duties of citizen it is pronounced that “all citizens shall be equal before the law and there shall be no discrimination in political, economic, social, or cultural life on account of sex, religion, or social status (Article 11) and “all citizens shall enjoy the freedom of learning and the arts. The rights of authors, inventors, scientists, engineers, and artists shall be protected by Act (Article 22)”. A research characterised(Korea Culture and Tourism Institute, 2010) that legislation on the arts and culture as displaying 1) proliferation of ‘promotion law’s; 2) fragmentation within the same jurisdictional field; 3) ambivalence such as the inclusion of promotional clause and regulative clause at the same time.
There are 112 laws regarding the arts and culture, cultural heritage and history (including religion), cultural industry, and broadcasting and media. The first legal provision in the arts was the *Performing Arts Act* which is described in detail in the following section. Fundamental law in this field was enacted in 1972, the *Arts and Culture Promotion Act*. It follows the German-Austrian law in emphasising the state’s role in promoting arts and culture (*Kulturfoederungesetz*). In the field of cultural heritage, the *Cultural Heritage Protection Law* has been in existence since 1962. The law has been altered to add ‘utilising and safeguarding’ the heritage to the strict principle of ‘preserving’. Various laws have been established with the advent of cultural industry or the creative industry. Reflecting the policy direction in support of the cultural industry, legislation mostly takes the form of ‘promotion act’. Regulative aspects are traditionally included in laws concerning property matters (copyright) and market operation.

5.3 Sector specific legislation

5.3.1 Visual and applied arts

5.3.2 Performing arts and music

The *Performing Arts Act* was introduced in 1961. It was somewhat equivocal in having both promotional and regulative aspects. It consists of prescription to guarantee freedom of the arts and promote ‘sound’ public performing activities. The Act mandates the state and municipalities to establish and implement plans needed to promote the performing arts, set up and operate a place for public performance, and commission individuals or organisations to manage places of public performance in order to bring in necessary expertise and efficiency. When deemed necessary for evolution of the performing arts, it also allows the state or municipalities to offer subsidies to performers. The regulative part of the Act requires the formulation of a disaster management plan to ensure the security and safety of a performance place. The management of a performing space is also required to have the stage facilities inspected periodically. The legislation also imposes responsibility to vet performances to ensure that they are not harmful to minors. This was intended to maintain public interest and ethics.

5.3.3 Cultural heritage

The *Cultural Heritage Protection Act* was enacted in 1962 in order to promote cultural development in public life and contribute to the mankind. Its prescriptions relate to the management and protection of state-owned and state-designated cultural heritage, and municipally-designated cultural heritage. The law encompasses a wide scope of objects including heritage sites, natural
monuments, intangible cultural heritage, underwater heritage, and cultural heritage located overseas. The focus has been shifting to achieve a balance between preservation and utilisation.

5.3.4. Literature and libraries
The purpose of the Library Act (former Library and Reading Promotion Act) is to contribute to the cultural development of the nation and society, to assure efficiency in furnishing and circulatng materials, to narrow the gap in opportunities to access information, and to promote lifelong education. These objectives are to be achieved by revitalising library facilities and replenishing their services. Administrative responsibility is on Library Information Policy Committee, which formulates the Comprehensive Library Development Plan. The Act enabled the establishment of District Representative Libraries to devolve social roles and responsibilities to the regional level. It guarantees the public’s right of access to wide-ranging information. In 2006, the Library and Reading Promotion Act was amended and renamed the Library Act. In 2009, the scope of library materials was expanded to cover online content, and for effective publication and distribution of materials for the disabled, the Library may request the submission/presentation of materials (online content not included) in the form of a digital file.

5.3.5 Architecture and spatial planning
Architectural and spatial planning is an area of intergovernmental and cross governmental interaction. Spatial concepts are infused to recognise cultural characters in the local area as way to produce local cultural development.

5.3.6. Film, video and photography
The Promotion of the Motion Pictures and Video Product Act was enacted to help improve the of quality of motion pictures and video products and promote the development of the film and video industry, thereby contributing to the enhancement of the people’s cultural lives and the development of national culture.

This Act regulates matters concerning the establishment and implementation of the Motion Picture Promotion Plan under the leadership of the Minister of the Culture. The Act’s objective is to advance visual culture and promote the film and video industry, to improve quality of films produced in Korea, and to promote Korean films and film industry. It states that a Film Promotion Fund should be established for the development and advancement of the film art. It also addresses itself to matters relating to maintaining of democratic order, respect of human rights and the protection of children and adolescents, such as film rating and classification and the restrictions on commercials and advertisements. In addition, the Act stipulates that films and related literature and sound materials should be collected, preserved and exhibited for their
artistic, historical and educational value and use. The Minister of Culture is responsible for the establishment and implementation of policy measures for the promotion of the video industry, and the Video Industry Promotion Council should be established and operated for the effective implementation of those measures. This Act also covers the rating and classification of video products to protect children and adolescents, and the labelling and advertisement of video products. Furthermore the Act lays ground for managing the Korea Media Rating Board to give rating for video products and their commercials and advertisements for the sake of protecting children and adolescents from harmful materials.
6. Financing of culture

6.1. Short overview
Financing for the arts and culture comes from diverse sources. State led policy framework imposes much more burden to the governmental part rather than to the private funding resources. It is notable that various endowment funds exist in the cultural sector for specific purposes. The most important funds are Culture and Arts Promotion Endowment Fund and Tourism Promotion Endowment Fund. The former has been in operation for about 30 years, collecting a certain percentage of cinema entrance fees to cross subsidise the arts. This practice was abolished in 2004 and the endowment fund is now managed by the Arts Council Korea to support the artists from the investment income of the endowment. The Tourism Endowment Fund has been the main source for building infrastructures where the interests of culture and tourism intersect. As cultural resources have become more and more important to tourism, there has been steady inflow to the cultural budget from this fund.

The percentage of whole government budget available for culture has fluctuated in the last ten years but averages approximately 1%. Since the Heritage Administration’s budget is determined independently, if one goes beyond the Ministry’s budget (to include media policy as well), the percentage would increase to 1.39% of the whole government budget.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural ministry only(^1)</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural sector overall(^2)</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Korea Cultural Policy Institute (2011)

\(^1\) Ministry of Culture and proceeds from the Culture and Arts Promotion Fund.

\(^2\) Budget for Ministry of Culture (including proceeds from the Culture and Arts Promotion Fund), budget for Heritage Administration Agency, and budget for Broadcasting and Media Council.
6.2. Public cultural expenditure

6.2.1 Aggregated Indicators

According to Korea’s Ministry of Culture’s official budget document, spending per capita is $56 on culture. However, it should be also noted that the budget for Heritage Administration is not included and some of the tourism sector budget covers cultural infrastructure and also local programmes (local cultural festivals etc.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US $ converted</td>
<td>US $ converted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (in millions)</td>
<td>Total (in millions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita</td>
<td>Per capita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean currency</td>
<td>Korean currency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,746</td>
<td>3,174,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>3,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,174,700</td>
<td>4,076,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Korea Cultural Policy Institute (2011)

6.2.2. Public cultural expenditure broken down by level of government

It is notable that despite the centralised system of supporting culture in Korea, local budgets have been consistently growing in the arts and culture. This is seen as the result of the influence of ‘creative industry’ discourse on local governments. The creative industry is seen as giving regions a competitive edge and enabling future economic growth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of total government budget including the local portion for culture</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Korea Cultural Policy Institute (2011)

Below figure shows that local government’s budget has grown to more than double of the central government’s budget. Although the responsibility for building and managing cultural infrastructure has been delegated to local governments, the central government provides a matching grant to cover infrastructural costs. Another reason for the increase in the local governments’ budgets might be the spread of government led cultural festivals and huge events (expo, etc.) throughout the regions.
Sum of cultural budget for central government | Sum of cultural budget for all local governments | Division of ratio
--- | --- | ---
2010 | 4,177,207 | 8,515,500 | 33:67

Source: Korea Cultural Policy Institute (2011)

### 6.2.3. Sector breakdown
Division of work in the Ministry of Culture makes it somewhat difficult to present a sector breakdown of the budget according to traditional classification of arts and culture. The cultural industry is the only category of expenditure to which an increasing proportion of the whole government budget has been allocated in recent years (9% in 2009 and 14.3% in 2011).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Culture and arts</td>
<td>8,976</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural industry</td>
<td>4,231</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>8,897</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>7,303</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2,338</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31,747</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Korea Cultural Policy Institute (2011)

### 6.3. Trends and indicators for private cultural financing
Private financing for the non-profit culture is not a familiar concept. It could be rather stated that private contribution for the arts has taken place through the Korean Mecenat Association from 1994. Private corporations have been finding arts and cultural organisation of their interest of support. The amount of contribution through the Mecenat Korea has been fluctuating but has reached the peak in 2007 (187.6 billion Won) and is in a declining trend until 2011 (162.6 billion Won).
7. Public institution in cultural infrastructure

7.1. Cultural infrastructure: tendencies and strategies
Expanding cultural facilities has been one of the important cultural policy objectives since 1970s. At first there was a tendency to establish huge scale, multi-purpose cultural centres. Gradually voices grew that neighbouring appropriate facilities serve the clientele better and facilities modelling after ‘Maison de la Culture’ prevailed for a while. Preserving local traditional culture has been important objective for the public sector and thus ‘local cultural centres’ have been established in almost every basic administrative unit.

Whereas in the past thirty years there has been an emphasis on establishing traditional types of cultural facilities, from the beginning of the 21st century central as well as local governments have established ‘media centres’ for amateurs to produce new media products. Several local governments have invested heavily to induce cultural content industry with expectation to produce jobs for younger generation. Recently there has been greater demand for public venues for big scale popular music performance. It is now being contested whether or not it is appropriate for the government to subsidise commercially oriented popular art forms despite fast growing audiences.

7.2. Basic data about selected public institutions in the cultural sector
Cultural infrastructure that the government is mandated to subsidise are public libraries, public culture and arts centres, and public museums. The central government provides a matching grant for the building of such public institutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of public arts centres</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average numbers of people served per facility</td>
<td>316,076</td>
<td>306,018</td>
<td>296,649</td>
<td>273,478</td>
<td>263,102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ministry of Culture, Sports, and Tourism (2011)

However, statistics concerning museums and fine arts museums (galleries) require a different interpretation. The table below shows the number of officially registered museums regardless of whether they are public or nonprofit in nature. Only museums built by local governments are given a fixed amount by the central government. Private museums receive various tax exemptions at the time of establishment. Operation costs are sole responsibility of private museums but various programme subsidies are provided through central government.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of registered museums</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>276</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of registered fine arts museums</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Libraries fall under different government authorities. The national library is under the auspices of Ministry of Culture, school libraries under the local education councils, and local libraries under local governments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of libraries</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>462</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population served per library</td>
<td>103,078</td>
<td>101,611</td>
<td>98,643</td>
<td>93,654</td>
<td>85,633</td>
<td>80,760</td>
<td>75,477</td>
<td>69,357</td>
<td>66,555</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ministry of Culture, Sports, and Tourism (2011)

7.3. Status of public cultural institutions public-private partnerships

Public private partnerships have been most active in the area of cultural infrastructure. From 2005, the Ministry of Planning and Finance has instituted the PPP system for all public buildings. The BTL (built transfer lease) was regarded as the most appropriate system, which encouraged local governments to utilise the system. About 23 facilities were built adopting this system. Since the BTL system is susceptible to the market situation its adoption has slowed down with the stagnant economy.
8. Promoting creativity and participation

8.1. Support to artists and other creative workers

8.1.1. Overview of strategies, programmes, and direct or indirect forms of support
The nature of the central government’s commitment to the cultural sector is not favourable to independent artists. The only stable and reliable source of support for the creative activities of artists is the Culture and Arts Promotion Endowment, which has been in place for over 40 years. A part of the Ministry’s budget is reserved for the artists but only within the designated policy framework and for executing public programmes. What such support emphasises is the social role of the artists rather than individual artistic aspirations. To strengthen the managerial capacity of artists (and arts groups) to access the arts market, the Korea Arts Management Service has been established. It provides consulting, education, and funding in order to develop managerial strength and capacity for international communication and cooperation.

8.1.2. Special artist’s fund
The Artist’s Welfare Act provides legal grounds to generate Artist’s Welfare Fund for the welfare of artists. This is a special type of fund with a purpose to run programmes for artists under transition between employments. It provides direct subsidy for educative purposes of artists.

8.1.3 Grants, awards, scholarships
In the public sector there exist genre specific prestigious awards and honorary awards conferred by the government.

8.1.4 Support to professional artists associations or unions

8.2. Cultural participation and consumption

8.2.1. Trends and Figures
The Ministry of Culture undertakes a biannual survey to collect data on cultural consumption of public. Figures below show a constant increase in the percentage of the population that visit cultural events, however, detailed indicators according to types activity shows variance according to overall economic.
### Expenditure for culture of total income per household (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure for culture of total income per household (%)</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of population who visit museums</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of population who visit classical concerts</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of population who visit popular music concerts</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of population who visit theatre</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of population who visit dance performance</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of population who visit traditional arts</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(All figures based on one or more visits a year)

Source: Ministry of Culture/ Korea Culture and Tourism Institute (2011)

### 8.2.2. Policies and programmes

There are two government initiatives to stimulate cultural consumption among the most disadvantaged group in society. One is issuing ‘Culture Card (cultural voucher card)’ to the lowest and second lowest income group. Eligible households are disbursed a fixed amount per person (50,000 Won/year 2011) in a checking account card. Some types of cultural voucher projects support travel costs and personal assistance to the handicapped, the elderly, and residents from geographically remote areas.

### 8.3. Arts and cultural education

#### 8.3.1. Institutional overview

Arts and cultural education has been part of the formal policy agenda since 2004 when an independent law was passed. Arts and cultural education policy is being steered by a separate bureau in the Ministry of Culture paired and executed by ‘Korea Culture and Arts Education Service’. The main characteristic of its programme is to support the artist and provide educational assistance (skills and curriculum) to the arts educators. It manages the placement process of arts educators to schools. This organisation also funds various artists and artist groups to provide arts education in cultural facilities and other community spaces. From the 2006 survey, an index to track arts education has been included as below. This well reflects the rising priority given to arts education in cultural policy field.
Percentage of people having arts education experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of education</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine arts</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical music</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional music</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinema</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>popular arts</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cultural heritage</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.3.2. Arts in schools
Arts subjects are taught by school teachers who have graduated educational college of her/his discipline. Although arts subjects are a mandate un to secondary education period, recent curricular change has given junior schools and high schools the discretion to choose among specific art forms (either from music or fine arts). This has cast worries that students may be deprived off opportunity for balanced arts education. Due to the very competitive nature of entering universities in Korea, such discretion might foster avoidance for arts education.

8.3.3. Intercultural education
See multicultural education section

8.3.4. Higher arts education and professional training
There are about 407 universities and colleges with 2.74 million students in Korea (2010) where 12% of the enrolled are in the arts major (college of arts). It is notable that Korea does not have a national conservatory system for professional education in the arts.

8.3.5. Basic out-of-school arts and cultural education
Out-of-school arts education is provided in Korea by various private music academy and arts studios. However, those kind of educational service targets children up to elementary level, because after those children enter junior school the curriculum gives more emphasis to core academic subjects such as mathematics and language.
9. Sources and links

9.1. Key documents on cultural policy
Korean Culture and Tourism Policy Institute (2002), Long term development plan in the international cultural exchange
Korea Culture and Tourism Institute (2007), Redesigning the legal system in arts and culture
Korea Culture and Tourism Institute (2011), A comparative study on OECD countries cultural budgets
Korea Mecenat Association (2012), Annual Report
Ministry of Culture, Sports, and Tourism (2006), Creative Korea
Ministry of Culture, Sports, and Tourism (2006), Power of the arts
Ministry of Culture, Sports, and Tourism (2010), Cultural policy white paper
Ministry of Culture, Sports, and Tourism (2010), Content industry white paper
Ministry of Culture, Sports, and Tourism (2010), Yearbook of culture and the arts
Ministry of Culture, Sports, and Tourism (2011), Survey of national cultural infrastructure

9.2. Key organisations and portals
Korea Ministry of Culture, Sports, and Tourism http://www.wcst.go.kr
Arts Council Korea http://www.arko.or.kr
National Center for Traditional Music http://www.gugak.go.kr/eng/
National Institute of Korean Language http://www.korean.go.kr/eng/
National Theater of Korea http://www.ntok.go.kr/english/
The National Library of Korea http://www.nl.go.kr/english/
National Museum of Korea http://www.museum.go.kr
The National Academy of Arts http://www.naa.go.kr/eng/
Korea National University of Arts http://eng.karts.ac.kr
Korea Literature Translation Institute http://www.klti.or.kr
Korea Culture & Tourism Institute http://www.kcti.re.kr
Korea Arts & Culture Education Service http://eng.arte.or.kr/arte_eng/
Arts Council Korea http://test.arko.or.kr/english/
Korean Film Archive http://www.koreafilm.org
Korea Copyright Commission http://eng.copyright.or.kr
Korea Creative Content Agency http://www.kocca.kr/eng/
About WorldCP - International Database of Cultural Policies

WorldCP is a central, web-based and continuously updated database of country-specific profiles of cultural policies. It is publicly accessible at http://www.worldcp.org/

The WorldCP database is modelled on the highly-regarded Compendium of Cultural Policies and Trends in Europe (http://culturalpolicies.net/), established by the Council of Europe and the ERICarts Institute\(^1\). The European Compendium is currently in its 17\(^{th}\) edition and covers 43 countries in Europe, plus Canada.

Both the European Compendium and the WorldCP-International Database of Cultural Policies have been recently acknowledged by UNESCO as useful information and monitoring systems for cultural policies, which provide the capacity to monitor and analyse global trends in key aspects of cultural policies from around the world.\(^2\)

WorldCP is an initiative of the International Federation of Arts Councils and Culture Agencies (IFACCA), the global network of arts councils and Ministries of Culture.\(^3\) IFACCA works with international and regional partners to oversee the development of WorldCP.

WorldCP-Asia (http://www.worldcp.org/world-cp-asia.php)

Asia is one of the most active regions under the global WorldCP initiative. WorldCP-Asia is a central component in the development of the WorldCP - International Database of Cultural Policies.

As of March 2016, 3 national cultural policy profiles have been published (India, Korea, Viet Nam) and 4 more are in preparation (Cambodia, Mongolia, Philippines & Singapore).

WorldCP-Asia is co-ordinated and funded by the Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF), the only institution of the Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM).\(^4\) Since 2011, ASEF has served as the Regional Secretariat for WorldCP-Asia

Benefits of WorldCP-Asia

- Significantly enhanced public access to national and international cultural policy information
- A consistent format and methodology for documenting policies (all country profiles are organised into 9 main chapters)
- A searchable database that makes it possible to generate comparative reports

---

\(^1\) ERICarts-Institute is the European Institute for Comparative Cultural Research (http://www.ericarts.org)


\(^3\) http://www.ifacca.org/

\(^4\) http://www.asef.org/; http://culture360.asef.org/
- Reliable information for cultural policy research and analysis
- Mechanism to assist in reporting on international legal instruments and conventions (such as the 2005 Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions)
- Availability of national arts & culture information to interested international audiences
- Complementary dialogue platforms at national, intra-Asia and Asia-Europe levels to build a community of practice among cultural policy researchers

**How are WorldCP country profiles developed in Asia?**

- Interest in preparing the profile assessed by ASEF at the national level (via civil society organisations and government agencies)
- ASEF approaches national agency responsible for arts & culture and formally invites them to participate in WorldCP-Asia
- National agency responsible for arts & culture confirms interest in commissioning the country profile
- In some countries, a civil society organisation facilitates the liaison among government agencies, authors and ASEF
- National agency responsible for arts & culture invited to provide advice on the selection of author/s
  - Profile author is an independent local research expert with cultural policy expertise
  - In some countries, it may be necessary to have more than one author to prepare the profile
  - Profile author receives a fee for writing the profile (covered by ASEF)
  - He/she retains moral rights over his/her work (publishing rights are with IFACCA as publisher of worldcp.org)
- Agreements signed
  - Agreement among national agency responsible for arts & culture, IFACCA & ASEF
  - Agreement among author/s, IFACCA & ASEF
  - Agreement between facilitating civil society organisation/s, if any, and ASEF on co-ordination arrangements
- Briefing (and, if needed, national/regional capacity building workshops) for author/s organised by ASEF
- Research and writing process coordinated by ASEF
• National agency responsible for arts & culture supports author/s by supplying relevant information and data

• Draft profile reviewed by Regional Editor for WorldCP Asia. The role of the regional editor includes reviewing profiles for accuracy and consistency of information, organisation of information in accordance with chapter structure as well as English language proofreading. The editorial review process is co-ordinated by ASEF.

• Final profile reviewed (if not approved) by national agency responsible for arts & culture

• Profile published on worldcp.org (in English) and regional language versions available as PDF files for download

  o Presentation of profiles is in English and, where possible, in the native language of the country - if the original profile is written in the native language, ASEF can cover translation costs into English; if the profile is written in English and then translated into the native language for wider dissemination, national agency responsible for arts & culture is expected to contribute to translation costs

• Profile disseminated nationally and internationally by ASEF in collaboration with IFACCA and the facilitating civil society organisation, if any

• Authors invited to participate in annual WorldCP Asia authors meeting as well as Asia-Europe authors meetings and other cultural policy forums organised by ASEF

Structure and content of the profiles

Country profiles are researched and written by local experts. Each profile is organised in 9 main chapters (which are made up of up to 80 categories and indicators)

1. Historical perspective: cultural policies and instruments
2. General objectives and principles of cultural policy
3. Competence, decision making and administration
4. Current issues in cultural policy development and debate
5. Main legal provisions in the cultural field
6. Financing of culture
7. Public institutions in cultural infrastructure
8. Promoting creativity and participation
9. Sources and links

5 Currently, Anmol Vellani is the Regional Editor for WorldCP-Asia. Vellani is a playwright and theatre director as well as the founding Executive Director of India Foundation for the Arts, a non-profit, grant-making organisation that supports practice, research and education in the arts in India.
More About WorldCP-Asia

Country profiles published

India
Authors: Ashish Rajadhyaksha, Raghavendra Tenkayala, P. Radhika
Published in: 2013
Available online at: http://www.worldcp.org/india.php

South Korea
Author: Dr. Kiwon Hong
Partners: Ministry of Culture, Sports & Tourism, Republic of Korea, Korean National Commission for UNESCO, Arts Council of Korea
Published in: 2013
Available online at: http://www.worldcp.org/southkorea.php

Viet Nam
Author: Dr. Bui Hoai Son
Partner: Ministry of Culture, Sports & Tourism, Viet Nam
Published in: 2013
Available online at: http://www.worldcp.org/vietnam.php

Country profiles commissioned

Cambodia
Authors: Chea Sopheap, Hun Pen, Onn Sokny, So Phina, San Phalla
Partner: Cambodian Living Arts

Mongolia
Authors: Dr. Dolgorsuren Jamiyan, Jargalsaikhan Tsamba
Partners: Ministry of Education, Culture & Science, Mongolia, Arts Council of Mongolia

Philippines
Authors: Emilie Tiongco, Corazon Alvina, Marian Pastor Roces, Maria Cristina Subido
Partner: National Commission for Culture and the Arts (NCCA)

Singapore
Author: June Gwee
Partner: Ministry of Culture, Communication & Youth (MCCY), Singapore

Meetings & forums

2016
Panel on at International Conference on Cultural Policy Research (July 2016, Seoul, Korea)

2015
4th WorldCP-Asia Authors and Partners Meeting and participation of Asian authors in Culture & Democracy III: A Human Rights Approach to Cultural Policies – 14th Assembly of the Experts of
the Council of Europe/ERICarts Compendium of Cultural Policies and Trends in Europe
(November 2015, Wroclaw, Poland)

2013
Launch of India, Korea & Viet Nam profiles at the 6th ASEF Experts’ Meeting & Public Forum: Creative Economy in Asia and Europe - Emerging Pillar of Economic Growth & Development and 3rd WorldCP-Asia Authors and Partners Meeting (December 2013, Hanoi, Viet Nam)

2011
2nd WorldCP-Asia Authors and Partners meeting alongside the 5th IFACCA World Summit on Arts and Culture (October 2011, Melbourne, Australia)

1st WorldCP-Asia Authors and Partners meeting (July 2011, Seoul, Korea)

Role of the Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF) as WorldCP-Asia Secretariat

- Co-ordinating and funding WorldCP-Asia
- Serving as contact point for national governments in Asia wishing to become involved with the project
- Co-ordinating the entire process (from commissioning to publishing & updating) for each Asian profile
- Liaison with Asian governments, civil society organisations (CSOs) & authors as well as with IFACCA (lead partner of WorldCP)
- Organising national and regional training for authors, where needed
- Reviewing profile content from the region and co-ordinating with Regional Editor
- Disseminating the profile among relevant stakeholders
- Building a community of practice among authors in Asia and Europe by facilitating exchange, networking and face-to-face meetings
- Finding wider opportunities for authors to share their experiences in writing the profile
- Promoting WorldCP-Asia at relevant international fora including UNESCO, ASEAN, annual European Compendium meetings and the Culture Ministers’ Meetings of the Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM)
- Organising policy dialogue platforms to bring together relevant governmental and civil society actors nationally, regionally (pan-Asian) and internationally.

Seeking partners

ASEF and IFACCA are seeking expressions of interest from regional organisations, foundations, national government agencies and national policy experts wishing to participate in the development of WorldCP-Asia.

If you are interested in becoming involved, please contact:

Anupama SEKHAR (Ms)
Director, Culture Department, Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF)
31 Heng Mui Keng Terrace, Singapore 119595
Email: anupama.sekhar@asef.org
Phone: +(65) 6874 9721
www.asef.org
www.culture360.org
Regional Secretariat for WorldCP-Asia

The Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF) promotes understanding, strengthens relationships and facilitates cooperation among the people, institutions and organisations of Asia and Europe. ASEF enhances dialogue, enables exchanges and encourages collaboration across the thematic areas of culture, economy, education, governance, public health and sustainable development.

ASEF is an intergovernmental not-for-profit organisation located in Singapore. Founded in 1997, it is the only institution of the Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM). Together with about 750 partner organisations ASEF has run more than 700 projects, mainly conferences, seminars and workshops. Over 20,000 Asians and Europeans have actively participated in its activities and it has reached much wider audiences through its networks, web-portals, publications, exhibitions and lectures. For more information, please visit www.asef.org

Lead Partner

International Federation of Arts Councils and Cultural Agencies (IFACCA)

National Partners

Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism, Republic of Korea

Ministry of Education, Culture and Science, Mongolia

National Commission for Culture and the Arts

Ministry of Culture, Community and Youth, Singapore
Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism, Viet Nam

Korean National Commission for UNESCO

Arts Council of Korea

Civil Society Partners

Arts Council of Mongolia

Cambodian Living Arts
International Partners

Council of Europe

European Institute for Comparative Cultural Research (ERICarts), Germany

European Cultural Foundation