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ABSTRACT

In South Korea livability concerns have become an increasing focus of public interest as a means to elevate the quality of people’s everyday lives in the city. However the social issue of livability has been overlooked while the central government remains focused on neoliberal economic policies, and limiting the participation of civil society in the planning. The gap between livability aims and their relevance in the public conscience is increasing as greater attention is given to the global economic crisis, and the stagnation (or downturn) of local economies, particularly within secondary cities in South Korea. Without emphasis on local culture specific to each region, cities are beginning to look similar and populations are becoming increasingly disconnected from their unique historical and cultural identities.

This paper addresses the way in which community building efforts, through participatory planning, can make secondary cities livable. Through the review of case studies of Maül Mandülgi movements, this study will explore which occurrences fit the livable city framework, how the movement influenced local governance, to include positive relationships between people and their government, and how positive social and physical changes were made by enhancing conviviality in the community. After identifying the conditions of cities that were successful in community building, this study will present how local cities were able to revitalize themselves through the livable city in the lifeworlds frame.

A qualitative research method has been selected for this research, and was conducted with archived documents written by community members, and also by outside members in order to maintain an objective perspective. In this research the cultural framework of the livable city is addressed, and successful cases, and policies, in South Korean society introduced.
This research analyzes the following four cases, the Sŏngmisan network in Seoul; Samdŏk-dong in Daegu; Hanggung-dong (Maŭl Renaissance) in Suwon; and Munhwa-dong (Si-hwa Munhwa Maŭl) in Gwangju where living spaces were improved by residents well before the central government adopted Maŭl Mandŭlgi as a government policy in 2000, and established themselves as potential models of livable communities. These cases elucidate the key components of a livable city in South Korea, and makes a strong argument for the adoption of key policies in secondary cities, to improve their communities through Maŭl Mandŭlgi; participatory community building.
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CHAPTER ONE: OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

With the rapid economic development of East Asia occurring over the past half century, livability has become an increasingly important issue among community residents. Livability is defined as ‘suitable for living in, habitable’, or ‘pleasant to live with’ in the dictionary. In the urban dictionary, the word “Livability” is frequently used to indicate the quality of life influencing the well-being of human settlement. Development throughout East Asia has been significantly influenced and shaped by neoliberal principles. The proponents of neoliberalism believe that human well-being can best be achieved by unfettered market forces. They emphasize corporatization of the state, privatization of land, unregulated trade and markets, and advocate for confining the role of the government to assist private entrepreneurial initiatives (Harvey, 2005).

In urban development emphasis has been placed primarily upon physical expansion and contemporary infrastructure to serve private economic interest, where the quality of people’s daily lives and the livability of cities, as a social experience, are viewed as secondary outcomes of cities as engines of growth (World Bank, 2009). In secondary cities strategies for promoting livability continue to be ignored, or sidelined at best, due to the recent global economic crises, starting in 2008, and the downturn of local economies. Providing people with key infrastructure and facilities, along with subsidies to improve basic needs, are factors for promoting livable cities. However, while cities have different characteristics and potentials, excessive concentration by the central government on the capital region has resulted in the decline of secondary cities, and neglect towards the quality of people’s daily lives in the community, during the development process, and has exacerbated fundamental gaps between cities in capital and non-capital regions.

A city is more than a physical space; it is a living organism where social interactions and
cultural practices, among communities, are the foundation for living as well (Jacobs, 1961; Cresswell, 2011). In order to provide a solid foundation for future communities, a new focus on livability is necessary. Therefore, the “livable city” should promote conviviality, in which people can engage and foster the value of a place and social actions are encouraged and inequalities are reduced (Harvey, 1972; Peattie, 1998; Douglass, 2007; Ho, 2008).

The social and cultural meanings embedded in urban spaces that enhance social and personal identities within neighborhoods, and other life spaces of the city will be considered as a vital factor in revitalizing a secondary city as opposed to only attracting businesses and investments for economic growth. In many secondary cities are long-time residents who have formed strong bonds within their neighborhoods, and communities. Connections to both the city and social networks of people have encouraged a strong civic-minded community.

Despite these positive attributes, why are local cities less competitive than the capital city, and people in local cities leave their hometown for the capital city? Why do these local cities adopt policies that cause people to lose their sense of place and historical identities? With the “livable city” approach to development and revitalization, the goal is not to transform secondary cities into capital cities, but instead to reinforce the unique identities of secondary cities by focusing on their local cultures and the need to overcome the economic, political, and socio-cultural dominance of the national core metropolis. With this in mind, the development of a new paradigm of economic development within livable cities is necessary. A new standard that focuses on social justice and the revitalization of local communities through the promotion of networks of human resources, creativity, culture, and economic empowerment rather than solely material goods. Reflecting on these conditions, the aim of this study is to develop a policy framework from theoretical
underpinnings for participatory community planning as a way to improve the quality of life in secondary cities as convivial livable cities and, in so doing, generate grassroots processes for economic resilience.

**BACKGROUND AND FOUNDATION FOR THE RESEARCH**

In past years the government of South Korea (hereafter, Korea) controlled economic planning and suppressed society, while at the same time protected and highly regulated its domestic economy. However, the East Asia and world economic crises of 1998, 2001, and 2008 compelled Korea to change its economic system into a neo-developmental hybrid of neoliberalism and developmentalism, namely, shifting from a state-driven economy to a strong state supported neoliberal policy regime of public-private partnerships. The country has increasingly opened itself to global competition and investment, and stronger state-corporate alliances in both economic and city-building.

The impact of the economic crisis also created openings for corporate successes in reducing life-long hiring practices, resulting in job security becoming unstable, an increase in temporary contract workers, and releasing of the protection of cities in favor of exposure to global inter-city competition. The advent of a new era of policies directed toward endless hyper-competition for global investment, resulted in further strategies to promote economic restoration, while livability, and social and cultural considerations of quality of life are ignored or sidelined at best. This approach towards development is commonly found in secondary cities pursuing a status on par with their capital region. Cities in Korea are facing a two-fold crisis; one of livability, and another of economic resilience.

Since 1995, the central policy of the national government, *Segyehwa*, which means
globalization in Korean, encouraged secondary cities to address local political issues through their own strategies. This left the central government to concentrate its political efforts on the globalization of Seoul, and secondary cities to manage themselves without oversight or support.

The majority of political elites in Korea view urban planning as the cornerstone of modernization, and, most importantly, a means of decolonization and nationalization. The Korean government was quick to adopt the planning strategies and designs of western countries, not only to compete in the global economy but also to portray the country as “global,” which can be viewed as being synonymous with being “Western.” That is to say, cities influenced by the flow of capital and consumer goods have incorporated the concepts of contemporary neoliberal interpretations of western modernity into their developmental planning strategies. Their primary focus was investment efficiency, with a high emphasis on physical expansion, and infrastructure improvement and little to no focus on the quality of everyday community life in city spaces.

This form of development has eroded human life in the public sphere, as well as the uniqueness of place, and provided little economic benefit to local communities. Although local governments have eagerly pursued a national identity associated with modern, globalized spaces, many residents of secondary cities still relocate to Seoul to gain economic and social advantages. As a result, the Seoul Capital Region accounts for half of the population of Korea, and continues to increase. Secondary cities, on the other hand, are losing their economic base through the shift of manufacturing to China and Southeast Asia and are confronting prospects of long-term decline.

Cities in non-capital regions in Korea should compete with not only those in different countries, but also within a country. Figure 1-1 presents the map of South Korea. The development focused on the capital region, the Northwest including Seoul, and Southeast, Busan, Ulsan, and
some of South Gyeongsang regions. Concentrating industries and population in a capital city, or cities in a capital region, compared to small and medium-sized local cities, resulted in economic, or social gaps, and decline of secondary cities.

Decreasing of industry influenced to job losses, young people left for other cities resulted in population aging and financial difficulties of the local government (Jang, 2010; Seo, 2014). According to the table 1-1, although the fiscal self-reliance ratio has been decreased since 2000, there still exists gaps between cities, especially, between cities in a capital and non-capital region. Seoul (80.7%) and Gyeonggi-do (61.6%), the capital region; Incheon (62.5%) where the central government supports to develop as an international hub city because there is an international airport and close to the capital region; cities in South-east region like Ulsan (62.3%) and Busan (50.9%) where the central government focused to promote heavy industry during 1970s and 1980s maintain higher than 50% of self-reliance ratio, but that in other regions in North-east and South-west stays around 10-30%. Population in these regions are on decreasing, infrastructures and facilities are less advanced than other regions. As seen in the figure 1-1, transportation lanes connect between Seoul and Southeast regions are more equipped than between other areas.
[Table 1-1] Fiscal Self-Reliance Ratio by City (Unit: %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whole Nation</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seoul Special City</td>
<td>94.8</td>
<td>96.1</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>85.8</td>
<td>84.3</td>
<td>80.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busan Metropolitan City</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>50.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daegu Metropolitan City</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incheon Metropolitan City</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwangju Metropolitan City</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daejeon Metropolitan City</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>50.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulsan Metropolitan City</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>62.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sejong City</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gyeonggi-do (Province)</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>61.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gangwon-do (Province)</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chungcheongbuk-do (Province)</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chungcheongnam-do (Province)</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeollabuk-do (Province)</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeollanam-do (Province)</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gyeongsangbuk-do (Province)</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gyeongsangnam-do (Province)</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeju Special Self-Governing Province</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Korean Statistical Information Service (KOSIS)

Given the current capital city-dominating structure, and high level of government support for it, secondary cities cannot successfully compete in terms of developmental resources; particularly in the global South. However, hope can be found in a counter-movement in Korea, namely, the rise of civil society, democratization, and devolution of power to local levels of governance. Historically, following the revolution that showed the power of people in April 19, 1960, a military dictatorship reigned over Korea’s civil society until the late 1980s. Over more than two subsequent decades, corruption, abuse, and exploitation compelled students and laborers to push back against the government and fight for a change in leadership. Through continuous protests, Minjung Undong, the people’s movement, against the authoritarian government culminated in a political transition from a military regime to a democracy in June of 1987 (Choi, 2010). This was a beginning step in the rise of Korea’s civil society, and while the central
government still had dominating power to govern the nation, during this transition, Non-Government Organizations (NGOs) were created and quickly increased in numbers to monitor political corruption, abuse of state power, and fight for consumer rights, and environmental protection.

In the 1990s, as civil unrest began to stabilize, the NGOs that once watched politicians and large companies soon turned to civil infrastructure and the daily lives of the people. The focus of many NGOs transitioned to fundamental aspects of civil society such as improving school zones, enhancing public spaces, and creation of community-oriented activities for local residents (Kim, 2003; Park, 2003; Koh, 2009). Self-reflection about the costs of such development, and rise of civil society, have changed these trends for Korean government and civil society to pay more attention to the quality of life. The criteria for good urban planning has been changed to emphasize human values, everyday life experiences and citizens’ active participation in the community.

This grass-roots movement expanded throughout the nation and was titled Maül Mandŭlgi, which means community building. Maül Mandŭlgi has been developed from the ground-up by local people starting in the 1990s (MLTMA, 2009; Duri Space Institution, 2011) while going through the industrialization and urbanization. It started from simple, small-scaled, activities, such as cleaning the neighborhood, creating a flower garden within the neighborhood, or holding community events by residents, and developed by collaborating with civil society groups.

This came to be strongly supported by the government beginning in 2007, when the Ministry of Land Transport and Maritime Affairs (MLTMA) began the Making A Livable City Project, (살기 좋은 마을 만들기 사업, Salgi Chohŭn Maül Mandŭlgi Saŏp). The central government outlined a basic framework of the project, referring to existing community activities by residents,
or civil society groups, and left specific strategies to be decided by local government. Before the government’s intervention in community building, there were no standard rules for community activities. Each main subject in different communities called their initiatives a different name, such as village making, city making, or urban regeneration. Since it was difficult to distinguish scale, or region, from activity names, any program focused on community well-being, through residents’ involvement, were regarded as part of *Maül Mandülgi* (Kim, 2006; MLTMA, 2009; Lee, 2012) and included into the *Salgi Chohŭn Maül Mandülgi Saŏp*.

Many activities within the community were organized under the local government’s direction during this project period. Some local governments supported existing community building actions initiated by residents, while other local governments planned new activities under the central government’s guidelines. Residents initiated and managed *Maül Mandülgi* movements in several areas. They initiated these movements, but in several cases local governments came to manage the *Maül Mandülgi* process to develop activities throughout the city. In other cases the local government initiated the *Maül Mandülgi* process through collaboration with residents, experts, and activists to develop new strategies for the city.

Due to the popularity of urban regeneration, community building movements have been also developed as government policy where subsidies are given to the public for communal improvements after the *Salgi Chohŭn Maül Mandülgi Saŏp* had finished. Korea’s concept of urban regeneration is to revitalize the country by introducing new physical, social, or economic functions to existing downtown areas which are deteriorated from neglect and aging industrial structures (KURC, 2011). As the attention of the government has recently turned to human lives and cultures, focus is shifting to small communities, local cultures, and cultural clusters of citizens with common
Maūl Mandūlgi in Korea can be considered as a barometer of development of democracy and decentralization of political authority, or globalization from below in that greater power is granted to its citizens. Globalization from below involves solving community issues by taking positive action to improve neighborhoods. Examples of these include creating a co-parenting system and programs for children and the elderly, building community gathering places, and finding historic places and enacting measures to preserve them.

These communities have strong active networks, assist their community in revitalization, and keep their identities intact despite the impacts of economic and developmental planning. Through Maūl Mandūlgi people began to actively participate in local issues through concern for their families, their neighbors, and their community (MLTMA, 2009; Duri Space Institution, 2011). By living their daily lives and strengthening relationships, these networks of citizens represent successful community building where participation is key. However, the current political direction of Korean cities will present obstacles for enactment of Maūl Mandūlgi policies that are in opposition to neoliberal economic strategies that have dominated local culture in recent years, and are shaping developmental planning methods.

Globalization, as an uneven economic process, has created a fragmented and uneven distribution of resources (Appadurai, 2000:4). Through urbanization it has shifted the distribution of people and capital within cities and the country as a whole, and has transformed urban spaces into ‘Mega-Urban Regions (MURs).’ MURs are huge and functionally integrated metropolis (Douglass et el, 2007), in which mega urban projects are prioritized for restructuring and revitalization of the local economy (Marcotullio, 2003). The formation of MURs, in recent history,
has resulted in numerous shopping malls and commercial buildings, within urban spaces, instead of local stores and vernacular architecture.

This global culture, produced through shopping malls and commercial buildings of the neoliberalized public sphere, is privatized, and, as a result, is not open to everyone and has prohibited classes of people from taking part in political events that occur within these spaces. This exclusion is the unintended result of MURs and wanting to create an urban space to be easily replicated, for financial reasons, and aesthetically pleasing, to attract business, rather than livable for the community. Urban spaces dictated by capital dismiss local citizens from the planning, development, and finalization of projects, and ultimately define who can participate and have a voice in the public sphere.

Capital-oriented concepts have resulted in cities losing cultural ownership of their land. Their historical identities are being replaced by new identities shaped by Korea’s neoliberalization and economic growth. While residents of Seoul claim to share an identity of modernity and progress, defined by industrialization, globalism, and multiculturalism, they view Koreans living in other regions of the country, specifically in second tier cities like Daegu, Gwangju, and especially in rural areas, as pre-modern and less developed. As a result of this perception, in order to assert their value and place in Korean society rural and non-capital cities are abandoning their regional identities, which are perceived as backward by the national elite, and adopting the neoliberal developmental planning strategies of Seoul.

This emphasis on the market system causes urban development to take a top-down approach that benefits the parochial interest of private companies and the local elite. Since the 1990s, urban governance has shifted to local governments, which lead local development, while citizens become
increasingly concerned for their rights. Civil society groups and local residents have voiced their

distress about local development diverging from community interest, and have tried to protect local

resources, such as vernacular architecture, historic geography, and shape the development of expanding urban areas (Wu, 2000). However, due to financial and political reasons, local governance does not operate efficiently enough to benefit local residents. This accentuates the fact that local governments are less competitive and less aggressive in the development process when compared to the national government.

Current civil movements place a high emphasis on human rights and the quality of life for the public. This focuses on realizing goals at the local level, and finding problems and forming solutions from local administrations. However, NGOs that started from local regions have difficulties in terms of resource and problem posing (Koh, 2009). Civil society organizations founded in local regions have vulnerable financing, local people inexperienced in terms of civic awareness and low participation (Lee, 2003). Local NGOs are not a lower branch of the central government (Kim, 2003). Rather, as members of local communities, they should lead people to be concerned about their community well-being, and appropriately support them to promote changes to be evident in the scenes of everyday life. Thus, the grassroot movement of Maül Mandülgi, which focuses on the community unit to convey their own identity, presents a good opportunity for members in the network to collaborate and further develop the growth of the local governance system.

The gaps between capital and non-capital regions are significant. Most populations, industry, and investment are primarily concentrated in Seoul and the Gyeonggi-do region (refer Table 1-2); Eastern regions, Daegu and Busan, are more economically developed than Gwangju in the west.
However, Gwangju is socially and politically progressive where a participatory budgeting system has begun for the first time and most local governments adopt the fiscal system to promote their civil society. Incheon and Ulsan cities have a larger Gross Regional Domestic Product (GRDP) and Fiscal Self-Reliance Ratio compared to other metropolitan cities. Incheon is located close to the Seoul/Gyoung-gi region, has Incheon National Airport, and is fostered by the government as an international city. Thus, the Fiscal Self-Reliance Ratio in Incheon is higher than average, and international/domestic investment is promoted. Ulsan presents a higher amount of GRDP and Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) than other metropolitan cities because it is an industrial city where there are automobile, shipbuilding, and petrochemical plants. Compared to other metropolitan cities, Incheon and Ulsan are richer metropolitan cities.

[Table 1-2] Index in Seoul, Gyeounggi-do, and Six Metropolitan Cities in Korea

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whole Country</td>
<td>50,004</td>
<td>1,274,989</td>
<td>51.1 (average)</td>
<td>16,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seoul</td>
<td>9,976</td>
<td>288,626</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>5,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gyeounggi-do</td>
<td>11,937</td>
<td>250,857</td>
<td>71.6(^2) (Suwon: 60.2)</td>
<td>1,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busan</td>
<td>3,445</td>
<td>63,564</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daegu</td>
<td>2,475</td>
<td>38,751</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incheon</td>
<td>2,793</td>
<td>60,635</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>3,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwangju</td>
<td>1,514</td>
<td>26,770</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daejeon</td>
<td>1,540</td>
<td>28,675</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulsan</td>
<td>1,116</td>
<td>70,648</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source from: Author based on National Statistics Office (NSO, 2012)

\(^1\) Arrived amount is smaller than reported amount (1,000 KRW is around 1 UDS).
\(^2\) There are 31 of cities and counties in Gyoung-gi province, and exist huge gaps, such as population, domestic income, and fiscal self reliance ratio among regions.
As the concept of cultural identity appeared as a popular issue among citizens, secondary cities like Daegu remained focused on creating a unique image for global marketing. This approach is used as a method for city development, especially, for the economy (Choi, 2009). With the “livable city” approach to development and revitalization, the point is not to transform non-capital cities into capital cities, but instead, to reinforce the unique identities of local cities by focusing on local cultures and to develop the need to overcome the economic, political, and socio-cultural dominance of the core city.

Each city has the potential for revitalization if effective local community building initiatives can be implemented with fidelity. With this in mind it becomes necessary to develop a new paradigm of economic development based upon the cultivation of livable cities that focus on social justice and the development of local communities through the promotion of human resource networks, creativity, and culture rather than economic growth solely through material goods.

**PROBLEM STATEMENT**

The issue of livability has garnered greater attention over the past half century, yet rapid economic development remains the primary emphasis amid neoliberal principles in East Asia. This perspective encourages business-friendly policies, which focus more on market values than on the daily needs of the community. While citizens’ voices have become neglected by the government and other influential economic bodies; many of whom do not have personal interests in the communities that they affect. Through business friendly policies, urban planning has become profitable ventures for large firms and private investors. In an attempt to create a new global metropolis, large cities pursue mega-construction projects such as stadiums, apartment complexes, and commercial buildings, which in turn provide private investors and contractors with extremely
high profits. Small and medium sized cities also participate in this developmental exercise, and vernacular buildings and neighborhoods, characterized by distinct culture and history, have been eliminated and replaced with “modern” structures that are considered a sign of neoliberal globalization.

Although the paradigm has shifted to give more rights to citizens, neoliberal ideas, which focus on production, market, and finance are increasingly supported by Asian nations emerging into the major global markets. Brecher and Smith (2000) criticized the perspective that the government has authority over globalization, and defended the belief that citizens do in fact have the potential to lead this movement as well as, if not better than, governmental bodies. This coincides with the globalization from below perspective, which focuses on human rights and social justice. The proponents of globalization from below believe that local communities have an influence on global changes, and support the movement within local cities so that it can be spread throughout global nations (Park, 2004).

The desire to develop a world renowned city that is respected for its support of growing communities, for embracing both traditional culture and modern development, and also the ability to draw financial investments, is backed by both the Government and its Citizens. However the styles and approach of each group clash in conflict on the pathway to this ultimate goal. Totalitarian governments pursue recognition for their cities through economic, and construction development. This strategy is a continuation of post-war East Asian policies, and has now become the common practice of present-day politicians as immediate gratification and results are needed to justify political terms of office.

In contrast to this, community groups and citizens, at one time, were also focused on
economic development and financial security for their communities. Yet, over time, this mentality changed, as many East Asian countries and its citizens have emerged as strong competitors in global markets. Present-day citizens and their affluent communities are increasingly reaching overall satisfaction of economic security, and are now focusing on cultivating long forgotten traditional culture, and increasing the avenues and opportunities in which citizens may voice their opinions, to cultivate vibrant communities, on their way to a world renowned city.

While actions by local organizations and residents become more spirited, competition among cities, especially cities in Asia, is creating uniform environs as cities are building skyscrapers and landmarks in an attempt to set themselves apart from each other. These structures are representative of technological and financial prosperity, and can be a good source of tourism, but they are not symbolic of the cultural soul of their city. Amid the rise of commercial developments and the subsequent decline of cultural distinctivity, the blatant disappearance of community life within the city arises. Where does the vitality of the people, who live among these buildings, exist? Does the glamour of a city cultivate a better life for its citizens? Does an advanced economy enhance the lives of a nation? To answer these questions potential directions are explored thru this study in which Korean cities, and other Asian cities facing similar problems, can progress, while at the same time protect local cultures and maintain economic development for national prosperity.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to examine how to revitalize secondary cities through participatory community building movements in Korea. It is clear that local cities in non-capital regions do not have as much competitive power in the economy as cities in the capital region.
Therefore, new concepts and methods are required to revitalize these local cities, into livable cities. A healthy living culture will create an economy, but an economy would not necessarily promote a healthy living culture. As Lisa Peattie (1998) wrote, people desire conviviality for its own sake. People’s participation in the community building movement is an effort to enhance daily life and produce a livable community. When these efforts are accumulated, each individual community building will create various activities to be a convivial city. That is, many small activities become 1,000 points of light to transform into a livable city.

Most local cities, including Daegu, in non-capital regions are far behind those in the capital region in terms of capital and economic resource. However, local cities have their own cultural and historic resources, old buildings and street structures built before modernization during Japanese annexation, and community life. Therefore, new concepts and methods are required to revitalize these local cities. Cities were evaluated based on governments and national elites’ achievements in economic and physical development during the industrialization period. As people began to give greater attention to quality of life, the criteria has changed to emphasize human values, everyday lived experience and citizens’ active participation in the community. Based on the experiences of community building movements in this research, one can posit that local autonomy and residents’ active participatory planning can be a factor in promoting a livable city model.

On the basis of the context described above, the main questions becomes: How do local cities in non-capital regions of Korea revitalize in a socially just and culturally vital manner by focusing on people’s lifeworlds of social and cultural relationships to form a livable city?

This research will attempt to study how community building movements can contribute to
revitalizing communities and make cities livable. Residents in local cities should have the same rights to activities in social spaces and built environments as people in the capital region. The participatory planning process can aid residents in this respect, and has resulted in a different urban form other areas of cities while supporting daily life activities and social interactions. The concept of a convivial city, which focuses on the importance of meaningful social relationships in the daily life of a city, provides local citizens with the indications of a livable city.

**SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY**

The social, cultural, and economic gaps between capital and non-capital cities in East Asian regions, including Korea, have influenced not only the city’s population, municipal finance, and educational facilities, but also urban facilities, infrastructure, and urban space utilization. This disparity has caused the population and industry to concentrate in specific area which affects the vitality of urban spaces. Quality of life, particularly community well-being, has been raised as a major urban issue by the citizens of Korea, causing the Central government to establish *Maül Mandūlgī* as governmental policy.

Various books and news articles have been published to introduce community activities to the public. They vary in content from overviews of multiple activities in various communities, to in-depth analysis of community activities over a period of time. The purpose of these published writings is to educate people about the influence they have on their community and urge them to take action. However, most articles focus on building a Korean type of *Maül Mandūlgī*, different from foreign cases. The result of this are messages that consider *Maül Mandūlgī* a secondary activity by residents, and separate residents’ actions from political and economic issues of the central government.
What people do through *Maül Mandūlgi* is changing the perception that ordinary people are incapable of influencing political issues. The act of citizens discussing among themselves about daily issues and finding solutions is the basis of living politics. This study will discuss the evolution of *Maül Mandūlgi* movements toward living politics, how *Maül Mandūlgi* movements have made cities livable, and how local cities should progress with respect to the development of Seoul. The longevity of living politics is based upon the success of *Maül Mandūlgi*, which works for citizen rights, and is not an effort of temporary policy based on popularity by politicians.

This study, however, primarily compares Seoul with other secondary cities throughout Korea and depends upon existing documents from scholars and activist of the *Maül Mandūlgi* movement. The activities of communities in each city have been collected from accounts spanning more than ten years, and introduced through published books, articles presented in forums, and newspapers.

Issues of immigrant inequality cannot be observed due to limited documentation. There are many studies on immigrant settlement in Korea, however their activities related with urban issues, particularly active immigrant participation, are difficult to highlight in living politics. In most studies, immigrants are considered as a segment of the population who need help from local residents rather than fellows who contribute to an active community. Cases are based on the residential zone of big cities in each region, the number of foreign wives and laborers are smaller than industrial zones, and rural regions. For further research about this, another research topic such as diaspora, or place-making will be more appropriate.
ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

The objective of this research was to look into participatory community building movements in the capital, and secondary cities of Korea, to determine the effective core elements to make them livable, and discuss effective policy options for local cities. Cities are a viable entity where people and places are continually evolving. Social interactions and cultural practices, among people and communities, are the foundation for living, and it is the responsibility of the “livable city” to promote healthy conviviality. This hospitality allows people to remain engaged in valuable social interactions, and also results in a decrease of social inequalities. Placing an emphasis on cultural meanings, embedded in urban spaces, is considered a vital factor in vitalizing the city to enhance social and personal identities within neighborhoods and other life spaces, as opposed to purely attracting business and investment for economic growth.

Recent research has shown that the grass-roots approach towards community building results in practical changes better than policy changes from the top-down (Lee, 2006). Therefore, factors such as the levels of participation, imbalance of power between participants, and alternative approaches to foster creative ideas rather than spreading governmental policies to all communities are explored in this study. This study is organized as follows.

Chapter 1 provides a general overview of the study. This chapter describes background information, the purpose of this research, and states critical topics for this study.

Chapter 2 reviews related theories on planning that are pertinent to this research. These theories will consider how the concept of a livable city has changed, and what factors are required to nurture a livable city. Then a theoretical framework will be outlined to guide the rest of this research.
Chapter 3 describes in detail the research questions and methodology utilized in this dissertation and research process. A brief description of the qualitative research method, the case study and grounded theory methods, and why those methodologies were employed for this research as opposed to other forms of qualitative research will be presented. This chapter will also address the research framework to present the process.

Chapter 4 examines Korea’s socio-political changes, and urban development policies by periods after independence. The Korean government has developed a 10 year periodic Comprehensive National Territorial Plan (CNTP), covering all fields of locations of industry, transportation, land use, and environment, and has invented along with the domestic and international paradigm shift since the 1970s. Territorial policies supported the economic development plan, and shifted focus towards balanced development in the 2000s. With the rise of local autonomy and community issues, the government developed the Salgi Chohŭn Maŭl Mandŭlgi Saŏp, Making Livable City Project. It is the bottom-up movement expanded and popularized by the government, but gives some implications for local governance to progress local policies.

Chapter 5 presents successful cases of Maŭl Mandŭlgi, in Seoul and Suwon, of the capital region, and the others in the non-capital region of Daegu and Gwangju. The cases are chosen based on the livable city framework by their own features: The Sŏngmisan network in Seoul capital city, the progressive residents-led community network; Samdŏk-dong in Daegu metropolitan city, led by NGOs but residents became actively involved to make a convivial community; Suwon, well-organized intermediate system between the local government and residents; and Gwangju, initiated by the local government’s active support followed by reduced intervention during the movement.
Compared to other scaled-up cases, which were stopped after project budgets were exhausted, or their project period ended, these cases had all started from residents’ needs, developed by residents’ collaborative efforts, and remains consistent with respecting each community’s variety by trial and error.

Chapter 6 analyzes the cases in chapter 5 and drives policy suggestions and tools for these cities to revitalize and become livable. It will briefly introduce conditions of cities, planning policies implemented by local governments, and actions by local activists and residents. Through the policies which have been developed, conflicts that come to the front, and how people overcome these problems, this study will find ways in which policies and local governance can be helpful to build continuously convivial communities.
CHAPTER TWO:
THE CONCEPT OF A LIVABLE CITY AND FRAMEWORK FOR RESEARCH

This chapter examines related terms and studies to help the reader understand the concept of a livable city. Globalization impacted not only the world and local economies, but also culture and the built environment. Foreign Direct Investment (FDI), Multinational Corporations, and Mega-projects (re)shaped the urban area (Wu, 2000), in turn producing similar “world city” designs, and the socio-political experiences associated with it, throughout Asia-Pacific (Marcotullio, 2003). An over-supply of construction projects resulted in an increase in vacancy rates, in urban spaces, and has exacerbated inequality through uneven investments with cities. Private developers have taken control of economic activities and rights to the public sphere. Privatized and commercialized public spaces limit the everyday activities of people, and large scaled mega-projects, with emphasis placed on futuristic global designs that overwhelm local residential communities and deprive them of a sense of place. These factors negatively influence ‘local capacities for place-making’ (Ho & Douglass, 2008:199) and the social interaction of people in built environments (Jacobs, 1961; Peattie, 1998; Gehl, 2003; Friedmann, 2009).

With an influx of material and human resources, Asian cities like Seoul and Tokyo are continuously growing and becoming more competitive, economically and culturally, throughout the global community. Secondary cities and smaller local cities, in Korea and Japan, are experiencing population outflow and declination compared to the capital cities. When local areas decline, local governments establish business-friendly policies to attract new investment into the city (William, 1985; Schill, 2002) and turn to construction projects such as highways, facilities, and commercial buildings as an economic driver to revitalize urban areas and remain economically
sustainable. However, with prioritization of the economy, there is a real danger of marginalizing social issues, and the everyday needs of residents, or values like social justice being replaced by economic assets, real properties, market values, and construction.

Livability has an intimate connection with quality of life. It comes from resident’s daily, social, and cultural activity, and current studies emphasize place-based initiatives in livability (Douglass, 1998; Rogerson, 1999; Harvey, 2009; Douglass, Ho, and Ooi, 2010). Some cities, which reflect a function of their heritage, and current capacity for global capital, are more competitive than other cities, and this gives a ‘spatially differentiated pattern of competitiveness’ (Rogerson, 1999: 971). Therefore, livability is ‘the perceived experiences by people who live, work, or recreate in places’ (NRC, 2002:19), while the livable city is interwined with the quality of life of its citizens, and emphasizes that every citizen has the right to access services, contribute to a diverse economy, with an emphasis on affordability, and enjoy public spaces.

2.1 LIVABLE CITY AND THE QUALITY OF LIFE

2.1.1 Discussions on the Livable City

Livability within cities has many different meanings, and all have been used in various ways by different institutions. The United Nations Development Program (UNDP) established the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) in an attempt to assist developing countries with reducing extreme poverty and enhancing health and environmental sustainability. The World Bank (1996) emphasized the importance of ‘growing basic urban services, environment, and finance.’ Their criteria underlining livable cities determined that residents should retain the ability to find jobs that pay a suitable wage, basic needs, and services such as food, shelter, safe water and adequate sanitation (Vliet, 2002:35; Economist; Mercer). This concept also emphasized a citizens’
access to city services, jobs, fair cost of living, public transportation, safety and security, events, access to education, and open spaces.

These definitions are useful to measure what people have, but it fails to highlight the need for cultural initiatives to protect and promote the unique identity of a city, and the value of safe, and nurturing, settings for children. They also tend to steer attention away from the social and public life of cities, including the spaces needed for it to flourish. The consulting group Mercer considered a socio-cultural environment and recreation as important factors for livable cities, in addition to economy, availability of consumer goods, social services, education, housing, natural environments and transportation (www.mercer.com). For the classification of livable cities, the Economist Intelligence Unit (EIU) included factors such as: low crime and no threat of conflict (military or otherwise), health care, culture and environment, social freedoms, education, infrastructure, quality of public transportation, and the availability of good housing (but not associational life, culture, or public spaces). In addition to the UNDP and MDGs’ emphasis on the satisfaction of basic needs, and economic and physical development, quality of life is also a vital factor which includes criteria such as housing, safety, a green environment, access to public spaces, and, most recently, an integrated community.

The International Making Cities Livable Council (IMCLC) considers the city as a work of art and respected its unique identity. To promote the idea of a livable city, the council emphasizes the public realm, such as squares and market places, as places for interaction between people of diverse backgrounds. This concept is similar to True Urbanism which promotes not only the individual’s, but also the community’s well-being. Activities to improve livability under the concept of IMCLC are to ‘rebuild the community with human scaled urban fabric; compact urban
neighborhoods for diversity of ethnic and cultural identity; multifunctional town squares which are capable of regenerating civic engagement; and democratic participation’ (http://www.livablecities.org/about/mission).

Recently, the EIU has been concerned with ‘who’ is in charge, and has placed an emphasis on ‘community involvement’ to influence citizens to play a greater role in self-determination (Economist Intelligence Unit, the Economist, 2010). It is not only the concept of strategic governing and local knowledge of design, that has made stakeholders’ participation more important, but also its inclusiveness and accessibility (ADC Cities Report, 2010). Along with an emphasis on geographical community, the LivCom Awards, launched in 1997, selected livable communities and municipalities on the basis of ‘natural and built landscape enhancement, consideration of unique arts, culture, and heritage in the planning, [and] community participation and empowerment.’ These awards support a planning strategy that celebrates, local culture and historic identity, and recognizes local communities who participate in the planning process.

Livability 101 by the American Institute of Architects (AIA) asked its participants to identify the key characteristics of a livable community. The response to this question emphasized that a livable community imprints its own unique identity on the planning process and helps to ‘manage growth and change to maintain and enhance its community character’ (American Institute of Architects, 2005). The AIA supported the community’s role and stated ‘livability is best defined at the local level.’ With this contribution to the concept of livability, emphasis was placed on the ‘sense of place’ and fundamental principles are defined as: 1) human scaled design, 2) variety of lives, 3) mixed-use development, 4) preserving urban centers, 5) a variety of transportation options, 6) vibrant public spaces, 7) neighborhood identity, and 8) protection of environmental resources.
From these indicators of quality of life, place, social value, and community well-being are given more emphasis today than in the past. With an emphasis on the participation of community members, current livable cities take these aspects into consideration while also preserving its local autonomy, and historic and cultural identities. These criteria start from cities that should have the same rights, to activities in social spaces and built environments, as people in the capital and non-capital regions. Therefore, the concept of a livable city in this study is ‘conviviality, place making, and right to the city.’ In addition to encouragement of those factors, local autonomy and residents’ active participatory planning are important elements for promoting a livable city model.

2.1.2 The Definitions of Community

A place is more meaningful than a mere geographic space, because of the social construction of people within it. Social spaces are filled with a great diversity of knowledge, cultivated and shaped by human activities to produce and consume (Foucault & Miskowiec, 1986; Lefebvre, 1991; Creswell, 2009; Friedmann, 2009). On the one hand, Oldenburg (1982) focused on neutral places where people could gather and interact without any special purpose and be part of a ‘social existence’ with ‘opportunities for experiences and relationships’ (p.270). People with different backgrounds observe each other and scenery, have daily conversation, and spontaneous social involvements (p.275). Lefebvre and Foucault’s idea of spatiality in human life and power within a space encouraged the creation of spaces in which diverse subjects live and mix cultures. Multiple cognition and emotions of space users were engaged with the construction of a subjective place, and as their mental process solidifies it manifested as a collective reality.

On the other hand, people in the same community share everyday life, have something in common, and create spaces together. Hillery (1955) selected the most commonly mentioned
factors to determine what is a community from previous research, the composition of community, geographic area, common ties, and social interactions. Through social interactions between individuals who have common ties, within a geographic area, people build-up a sense of community; which is the feeling of belonging to a group. Wellman & Wortley (1990) emphasized the relationship between community members and emotional support. The feeling of attachment to ones’ community, ‘shared emotional connections’or ‘fulfillment of needs’ (McMillan and Chavis, 1986;9) enhanced the ‘social ties and personal networks’ (p.59) between residents and neighborhoods (Nasar, 2003).

Through literature reviews and considering research methods, the term ‘community’ in this research means the group of people who share space and have emotional ties in a network of social interactions within the same legal administrative territory. It is not a separate concept of urban or rural expanses, but of a group of people, or region, who share the same identity.

2.1.3 Quality of Life and Livable City

Figure 2-1 summarizes the quality of life criteria that emerged through literature review. The criteria for quality of life has been divided into four categories: ‘environmental well-being,’ ‘physical well-being,’ ‘social well-being’ and ‘economic well-being.’ Environmental well-being includes clean air, water, and overall ecological surroundings. Physical well-being is the physical environment of the space, which includes infrastructure, facilities, houses, and public spaces. Social well-being involves security, healthcare, and social welfare of the community. Economic well-being is to secure the livelihood, job opportunities and investments. These factors reflect current trends which emphasize human lives and empowerment within neighborhoods, and take into consideration the social well-being of a community which, in turn, promotes a livable city.
[Figure 2-1] The Criteria for Quality of Life

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental well-being</th>
<th>Physical well-being</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clean water</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean air</td>
<td>Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green space</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecology</td>
<td>Public space</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community well-being</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal and Community’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Well-Being in Daily Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic and Cultural Preservation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social well-being</th>
<th>Economic well-being</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>Livelihood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care</td>
<td>Investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social welfare</td>
<td>Economic Resilience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the past, livability meant a better economic life and physical environment. With such importance placed on the economy, urban experiences have occurred while the government and its corporative economy have developed urban spaces for purposes of maximizing profits. There is danger of marginalizing social issues such as the everyday life of residents, or values like social justice, being replaced by economic assets, real properties, market values, and construction. The socio-political experiences associated with it, throughout the Asia-Pacific (Marcotullio, 2003), and privatized and commercialized public spaces limit the everyday performances and activities of people. Recently, an emphasis on human values and everyday life has been on the rise; linking people from various cultures in the urban landscape encourages them to have a ‘sense of social unity’ and a part in restoring vitality in the big city (Hurley, 2006:21).

The great city is where factors in the city, such as local governance and quality of life, interact within global and economic contexts. In the livable city concept, the sites of social quality, and of community life, must be respected, built up, and restored, as a continuous network (Salzano, 1997, “Seven Aims for the Livable City” cited in The World Urban Forum 2006). Governance, a
reinvented partnership between government and citizens in the private and third sector, is active and creates a citizenship and place where human, social, cultural, and environmental capital can be nourished for great cities that are more advanced than world cities (Ng and Hills, 2003). In this research, revitalization is defined to include social and cultural aspects in order to activate conviviality and enhance a sense of place in the city which stimulates economic resiliency. It is the ‘rebuilding of spirit’ as well as buildings (Williams, 1985:151). This research is more concerned with human values, people considered as “socially weak,” and the underserved communities of those people.

2.2 CONCEPT OF THE LIVABLE CITY IN THIS RESEARCH

2.2.1 Concept of the Livable City

The concept of a livable city involves an active social interaction and an environment that amplifies social and cultural livability (Jacobs, 1961; Oldenburg, 1982; Soja, 1996; Gehl, 2003; Douglass, 2007; Friedmann, 2009). In a livable city the people’s social and cultural lifeworlds are respected, and residents have the authority to initiate building their community and fully participate in the planning process. Habermas suggested that cultural value should be understood separately from economic strength. He argued for the concept of ‘lifeworlds’, which emphasizes the role of social capital such as culture, society, personality (Baxter, 1987:47-48), and how these factors reproduce integral societies, and promote socialization. ‘Lifeworlds’ is a human-centered perspective that calls attention to social relations and the importance of a sense of place (Baxter, 1987; Butz & Eyles, 1997; Fraser, 1990), as opposed to the systemic perspective of capitalism which emphasizes economy and state.

Jane Jacobs (1961) determined the quality of built environments by activities that residents
make outdoor, and criticized dreary and monotonous city life which people simply go through the motions of a mundane world. She disparaged large government sponsored development projects (led by the parochial interests of a small group of experts) for ignoring the everyday lives of the communities that inhabit the spaces of that city. Like Habermas’ concept of ‘lifeworlds,’ Jacob’s understanding of space addresses the value of everyday socio-cultural activities. Illich (1973) also asserted that economic well-being must be understood as more than just a factor for enhancing the quality of human life. He emphasized mutual changes between human activities and positive voluntary participation, rather than indiscriminate economic growth. Therefore, a livable city can be a place that protects and encourages the quality of human life or ‘lifeworlds.’

Community building through participatory planning is to foster cultural lifeworlds in secondary (livable) cities. Communities are more than capable of using their local knowledge to find solutions for (re)vitalizing cultural dynamics, while residents celebrate and reproduce their cultural identities through active participation in the planning process (Cornwall & Jewkes, 1995). Communities in secondary (livable) cities build up global networks to foster cultural lifeworlds and aspire to retain local autonomy (Appadurai, 2000). The collaboration among networks promotes, and protects, the “rights of citizenship,” the cornerstone of democratic local governance (Blair, 2000). The collaborative strategy between residents and the local government redistribute power and resources in the planning process, and empowers the underserved minority groups and local residents instead of national officials. One’s right to citizenship comes primarily through participation. Active participation demands that local authorities serve their communities better, and people have an affection for their places.

Furthermore, eagerness to participate in planning is residents’ way to take ownership of their
neighborhoods, stake a claim to their right to the city, and think creatively. Instead of intentionally chasing economic resiliency, a “creative city” with an “experienced economy (Pine and Gilmore, 1998)”, is preferred. The creative city relies on cultural uniqueness and authentic cultural practices that intrinsically involve historic preservation and a living culture in the urban habitat and its built environment.

People in the city should be given access to the entire urban area and the opportunity to build a sense of place throughout, as well as equal access to the resources of the city. Capitalism has prevented groups of people from obtaining rights to their city, and globalization has contributed to the emergence of new issues within the public sphere. Globalization continues to exacerbate inequality and adds new dimensions restricting the rights of local residents. A city of social justice is where people are satisfied with basic needs, and both the “haves” and “have-nots” have access to information, the activity of production and distribution, and political discussion to claim their right and place through public discourse within the public sphere (Harvey, 1993:97; Fraser, 1990). This encourages marginalized groups to be empowered to cultivate a voice and build their cultural identity.

3 Experience Economy: Creative city is the society in which creative ideas, cultural contexts, or experience makes more profits than material goods. When experiencing customized activity, it becomes an unforgettable memory, and people are willing to pay more money even it is more expensive than buying goods and products (Pine and Gilmore 1998:97). Disneyland is an example of an experience economy which offers a special experience, but spaces and places in secondary cities implying their history and special identity will offer an ‘authentic’ experience for the places as Creswell defines ‘placeless’ and ‘displace.’ Therefore, local residents can lead to building a livable city by making places where diverse people can interact and experience special experiences. One of the ways to strengthen identity is to preserve local stories and features. Historic remains such as a deteriorated port, abandoned factories and warehouses, rail roads, and mines can function in other ways, such as reused housing, studios, restaurants or community centers. Historic preservation helps to keep its own histories in the region and have local identity within the city.
2.2.2 Factors for the Livable City: Conviviality and Historic Preservation

Conviviality presented in the context of a livable city is one where the status of various cultures coexist, perform with ‘human energy’ (Peattie, 1998:252), and also in a variety of spontaneous interactions (Friedmann, 2009). When the streets are full of lively social interactions, vigorous activities, and vernacular figures, they reflect the unique identity of the place, while historic heritage sites encourage the cultivation of a sense of place. Conviviality can be promoted through both the physical environment, and an emotional attachment to a specific place. The sense of place fosters a connection to a certain place, influences behaviors (Bolton, 1992), and encourages personal experiences (Cresswell, 2009). In addition to this, the question of “who has the right to the city?” should also be considered when enhancing conviviality of the streets. While local cities have irregularities where disorder can exist, and each city requires policies appropriate to specific areas (Scott, 2010), communities in different regions have diverse identities, and they should be inspired by their own policies, rather than applying generalized policies and scaled up plans.

Along with conviviality of the place, historic preservation is another element for the livable city. Fostering industries based on cultural assets in the city, points to the importance of contributing to economic resilience and cultural diversity. Many localities have tried to form their own markets where the profits from development returns to the city, instead of leaving the local economy for corporate headquarters elsewhere (Kang, Nam, & Kwon, 2009). An emphasis on local cities does not mean to exclude other cultures, but encourages cities to respect one’s own local cultures and identities. Jacobs (1961) disparaged large government sponsored development projects, led by the parochial interests of a small group of experts, for ignoring the everyday lives of the communities that inhabit the spaces of the city. She stressed that what was truly required in
the city are not skyscrapers and large-scale construction projects, but rather historical buildings and residents who freely conduct social activities on the streets (Jacobs, 1984).

Places should be socially restructured to protect historic architecture and local culture, and physically reorganized to enhance cultural vitality with economic vigilance. In this perspective, ‘small’ community places has merits to be ordered, structured, and identified by themselves (Friedmann, 2009), and to keep localities by the inhabitants. Those neighborhood can be more vibrant; constantly restructured, and meaningful to people’s everyday lives (Friedmann, 2009:11) in the process of protecting its historic and local identities.

2.3 RESIDENTS’ PARTICIPATION IN THE PLANNING PROCESS

2.3.1 Collaborative Planning Approach and Local Governance

For the livable city, residents must participate in making their own living spaces in which political power is gained through financial ability and people who afford to consume make their voices louder (Harvey (2007) cited in Kim, 2009). Before the social discourse to adapt radical changes, emphasizing material conditions strengthened suppressive relationships in lifeworlds, and thwarted free communication among people who were not rich, and non-politicians (Kim & Han, 2005).

In this context, collaborative planning is a good method of approach to participatory community building. A collaborative planning approach takes more work than a top-down comprehensive planning approach for community building since community building through collaborative planning seeks to include all stakeholders in the planning process. It is a process of reaching agreement and learning about local society through interactive actions, using communicative processes, that seeks to promote full consent of the people involved. Although
developmental planning, organized and implemented by the national government, appears to be efficient and beneficial to local communities, it excludes residents, especially the urban poor, from the planning process. Contrary to this approach, community building through collaborative planning seeks to include all participants and promotes their right to contribute.

Although this is a difficult and lengthy process, it encourages building a livable community where everyday life supports human values and cultural identities. Collaborative planning addresses problems and conflicts in society, and develops a problem solving process inclusive of all participants. In the process of citizens’ participation, and communicative action in collaborative planning, social capital (trust, sharing knowledge, and cooperative relationship) is formed and raised to reach an agreement in construction of governance.

Collaborative planning emphasizes local governance, a system in which local governments and various political subjects interact and make mutual decisions to solve various living agendas such as poverty, crime, economic development and environmental issues. Local governance can be understood as horizontal, or a collaborative organization, which responds to market failure and government failure between interdependent participants such as the nation, market, and civil society (Jessop, 2000; Kim, 2012:39). It is a democratic system to share the authority of decision-making within local society, and a process to develop civil society and change the power structure of local governments through participation of local participants (Kim, 2003:10).

The collaborative approach emphasizes the importance of an inclusive planning process, but there is still an issue of power imbalances among participants (Forester, 1989; Innes, 1999; Hickey & Mohan, 2004; Taylor, 2005). To address this imbalance of power, collaborative planning seeks to make the public sphere equally accessible to all participants. That is to say, the voices of
underserved communities are empowered, and members can communicate and interact freely, without constraints, within the planning process. Fraser (1990) advanced Habermas’s discourse contending that the public sphere should be a place that anyone can access and raise public issues regardless of gender, class, race, and age, and provide fair opportunity for everyone to contribute to the planning process.

Building upon the works of Habermas and Fraser, the collaborative approach should include all participants and provide them with impartial power to influence decision-making during the planning process. As the central government recognized the necessity of a citizens’ participation in policy procedures, it provides legal and institutional guarantees. Including and supporting citizens to participate in the planning process, by allowing people to have enough time and information, to share appropriate financial, human, and technical resources to increase efficiency, will be helpful for the successful collaborative planning method (OECD, 2001a, 2001b). Continuous interaction and networking are most important in the collaboration of every subject of the society (Kwon and Choi, 2006:2, cited in Ha, 2011:24).

2.3.2 Life Politics

People in traditional society were understood as collective forms, but, in the process of modernization, they became self-determined, and made educated choices about their own lives with respect to long-term consequences such as well-being, environment, and health issues (Roos, 1999; Jang, 2002; Seo, 2009). With this shift, a new form, life politics, stood up to the side effects of modernization through a reflective democracy (Giddens, 1991). Life politics has been developed for practical use by civil society. In spite of various discussions and applications to society, there is no clear definition. Thus, further research is required to reflect upon the category,
subject, and fields of life politics. In this research, fundamental ideas and aims of life politics will be briefly discussed.

Existing politics, or representative democracy, is considered as aiming at gaining government power, democratization, and class struggles among professional politicians. On the other hand, life politics is defined as a politics of space which improves nation’s quality of life (Choi, 1997). It is a citizen-centered action in local areas that effects citizens’ self-awareness, action, and time spirits, taking care of ordinary people’s well-being culture, medical service, social security, and housing (Jang, 2002; Kim, 2009; Seo, 2009). Since considering citizens’ demands from below, life politics manages issues of living subjects to protect the basic values of human life, and health concerns, which have been ignored by politicians (Jang, 2002; Lee, 2003; Park, 2004; Ha, 2012). However, living subjects in life politics are not just issues of personal choice, or lifestyle, but related with “life course, life chances, relationships, self-realization, happiness and misery, and well-being (Roos, 1999),” that individuals recognize as those of social entities.

Life politics aims to create new political structure from life experiences, or consciousness. It stands against the power from the state and capitals, and endeavors to enhance quality of life values such as self-examination, mutual exchange, and communication (Ha, 2006:196). Therefore, community building and life politics can be understood as working cooperatively. For example, the Kanazawa network⁴ in Japan is an organization for local residents’ to make cooperative movements for the region, and influence local politics to elect local politicians, and guide political

---

⁴ In the case of Japan which most influenced Korea’s life politics, particularly the Kanagawa network (https://kanagawanet.org/index.php), political experience has been spread into local society. Residents actively involved in political election, make their own voices in the political decision-making process.
agenda. The network is a pursuit of citizen led politics through participation, autonomy, respect for communication, solidarity, and decentralization (Jang, 2009; Jeong, 2009). In Korea, ‘life politics’ was introduced by politicians, and widely used as a political tactic and election pledge during the general election in 1992 (Ha, 2012:154). Recently, civil organizations like the YMCA, resident committee groups, and grass-root movement organizations have commonly used the term to encourage people familiar with local society to participate in social issues.

Active citizens realized one’s autonomy is an important element for life politics, and the need to participate in the political process. They are matured as political subjects, and demand that the government change political agenda by participating in the process (Ha, 2011:17) more than changing politics by election. Citizens consider how to make decisions that influence their own lives (Roos, 1999), suggest ‘small’ issues in daily life as a political agenda, make decisions, and set up principles to address them. Members in the community play main subject roles in the life politics (Kim & Han, 2005; Kim, 2009; Ha, 2012:153) to solve conflicts and look for substantial changes in their daily lives. Influenced by the Japanese model, and scholars who advocate lifeworlds and the public sphere like Habermas, Giddens, and Beck, Korea’s civil society emphasizes decentralization and participation. For general welfare and democratization Giddens insisted on decentralizing authority from the national government, placing it with local governments, and encourage citizens to participate in important national policy decision-making (Ha, 2006).

Maul Mandulgi, as a form of life politics movement, is active with residents as the central figure, taking care of community’s physical improvement, recognizes issues in the neighborhood and society together, and, by extension, residents bring regional issues into the public sphere and
make efforts to change the national agenda themselves. Grass-roots movement is powerful when individuals voluntarily desire to change the surrounding environment and system. When each individual requires one collective opinion from the government, it can be formed into policy.

2.3.3 Residents’ Participatory Budgeting

Citizens’ participation means that citizens, directly influenced by policy, participate in policy formation and the implementation process (Cho, 1998:267). People can have their voices heard through publications or participation in seminars, debates, and public hearings. Active participation is to acknowledge people’s roles in the policy process, forming a partnership between the government and nation through communicative actions, and sharing responsibilities (Lee et al., 2004:132).

From the bottom-up perspective, nations are not simply the policy consumers, but also producers (Lee et al., 2004). Therefore, a nation’s opinions are significant in deciding policy, and also how, and when to apply them. Local governments have an equivalent scale of budget plan to the central government since the local self-governing system, but, decision-making in budgeting is only in charge of administration though budgeting is closely related to public life (Choi, 2012). Being involved in budgeting is one method of residents’ participation.

Participatory budgeting is one example where local residents join in the budgeting process of local governments. This system encourages residents to participate in the local government directly by controlling financial management (The Seoul Institution, 2005). A participatory government opens to all people the budgeting processes, the compilation of financial initiatives, execution, and settlement of the budget, to the public. It trains participants and configures the compiled result so that non-expertised citizens are able to understand the budgeting process (Lee
et al., 2004:126). Most important in this participative budget process is the encouragement of people to recognize, and improve their autonomous capabilities by vitalizing everyday participation (E-un, http://grasslog.net/home/). Jin (2004) saw civil society’s participation in local budgeting in positive light, because it takes external control of the proprietary operation of the closed administration with expertised terms and financial information, and places it within the local council’s deliberation process.

By opening the process to citizen participation, transparency and operational efficiency can result. It should also mentioned that a participatory budgeting system is one form of city governance that can replace representative democracy with participatory democrarcy, or decision-making by consensus (The Seoul Institute, 2005:28). However, there are concerns where certain groups of people can excessively push for their own interests (Lee et al., 2004:128). In addition to this, residents may only take responsibility for the selection of projects, and not for the end result (The Seoul Institution, 2005:32). When problems, related with budget and allocation, have been solved, people may feel a participatory budgeting system is no longer needed (Lee, Ho, the director at Grass-root autonomy institute, http://grasslog.net/home/).

2.4 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

People produce social structures that influence human activities by encouraging, or prohibiting certain actions within the space (Lefebvre, 1991), and the space can be transformed by changing the built environment and the concept of the space into a special place by using their own memories and activities, making the urban space a production of interrelations (Lefebvre, 1991). In the experiential space of listening, watching, and physical contact, people feel comforted by spending time there (Tuan, 2005). Through place making, people grow a sense of place and
attachment obtained by the process of nowhere becoming somewhere to human beings. Ho and Douglass (2008) argued that providing ‘identity, meaning and collective memory to a specific location’ transforms the space into a place. Compared to a home or workspace, a public space has a great deal of potential for place-making inclusive of diverse activities because it is open to the public and not confined to a specific use.

Cities are composed of various structures and places, and they have been transformed by civil society, and, as a result, civil rights discourses have greatly influenced the shaping of urban spaces and communities. Urban form is characterized by both physical and human dimension, and supports people’s activities and results in making cities livable. The cultural and social livability in current cities are based on the concept of an equally accessible public sphere of social interaction. At the same time, livability focuses on ‘community participation’ looking for its own needs with empowerment. This is more efficient on a small scale, or in a small neighborhood.

From the theoretical and empirical research perspective, a community well-being and preservation of its own history are vital factors for the creation of a livable city. This research assumes that the livable city model can be achieved through the residents’ active participation in the community building process. A socially livable city will attract more people to become involved in growth of the place, thus revitalizing the city with conviviality.

Figure 2-2 explains the framework for a livable city and community building through participatory planning. Scholars have agreed that participatory planning does not just mean residents are merely a part of the planning process, but they have actual power to effect decision-making in their own communities. Citizen participation should be one of citizen ‘control’ planning as Arnstein asserted (Arnstein, 1969, refer figure 2-3). The process of conflict management and
place-making for community building can be handled by the national government, local
government, the private sector, civic groups, or residents. Every individual or group has a different
understanding of information, and perspective about a problem, and they can share their
knowledge to provide alternative plans to produce space.

[Figure 2-2] Framework for Livable City: Community Building through Participatory Planning

Residents have different ways of thinking shaped by their unique social contexts (Warren,
1993), and active participation promotes the rights of citizenship and provides the opportunity for
democratic governance (Gauventa & Valderrama, 1999). They learn from participation and
develop new and improved strategies for current and future problems like the distribution and
balance of power among actors with regards to decision-making, and attitudes toward the historic
and cultural identity of place. As people in the community become more empowered, and the
movement of grass roots-led community building is expanded to the city, each city can recover their own sense of place and historic identity.

[Figure 2-3] A Ladder of Citizen Participation

Local autonomy provided through active local governance, focusing on local history and historic preservation movements, will encourage local neighborhoods to keep, and celebrate, their local identities resulting in city’s unique built environment. Such a city is decentralized and inclusive, where all people of the city participate in the planning process to build their own place. While there are more opportunities to participate (Taylor, 2005) within civil society than ever before, power imbalances still persist between participants (Forester, 1989; Gaventa & Valderrama 1999; Lennie, 1999; Taylor, 2005).

To complement this issue, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) articulated ways to participate in the nation’s policy-making process, to provide
information, consultation, and active participation (OECD, 2001a:23). During the process, information is given to the nation from the government because it is a one way process, and the discussion allows the nation to give feedback to government. The consultation involves nation’s voice, but it is a limited method because it is controlled by the government.

When citizens actively participate in the process to select discussion topics, and suggest policy alternatives, they can carry considerable weight in the planning phase although the final decision is still with the government. With the understanding of information and keeping in mind the theoretical framework, this research will investigate participatory community building cases in Korea to prove framework for livable city requirements and determine the essential principles of the livable city.
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND FRAMEWORK

In this chapter, the research framework, methodology, and research questions regarding this study will be introduced and will discuss how those methods have guided data collection, analysis, and the research process.

This research examines planning development in Korea and recent Maül Mandŭlgi projects that were evaluated as successful in (re)vitalizing communities and some local cities by scholars and activists. ‘Successful’ in this research does not equate at financial improvement, but rather an increase in social interactions among residents, vitalizing community spirit, and citizens taking responsibility for their own neighborhoods. Through the review of case studies of Maül Mandŭlgi movements, this study will explore which occurrences fit the livable city framework, how the movement influenced local governance, to include relationships between people and the government, and how positive social and physical changes were made by enhancing conviviality in the community. After identifying conditions of cities successful in community building, this study will present how local cities were able to revitalize themselves through the livable city in the lifeworlds frame.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study focuses on why some community programs adapt well in one community, but not in other communities. What factors make people think they live in a livable community, what makes people interact in certain situations, and what are the appropriate roles of governance to make a livable city?

Among the research methods, qualitative research methods in conjunction with case studies and grounded theory are used in this study. The primary focus of the qualitative research methods
is to determine the cause of the social phenomena, human experiences, and their actions and reactions (Creswell, 2007) through understanding the context of social issues, and discovering issues, or problems, by drawing upon people’s stories, feelings, and hidden facts. Social and cultural occurrences, in qualitative research, can be construed as subjective judgment on behalf of the researcher, such examples are critical to the theories and conclusions presented here. In the future, biases can be accounted for by designing and combining quantitative and qualitative research methods.

In order to carry out qualitative research, researchers construct an overall picture through inquiry, and, collect data through various methods including document research, in-depth interviews, observation, patory observation, and extract results by a non-mathematical analysis process (Creswell, 2007). Through the case study method, researchers can compare factors in cases, and highlight general points to underpin the current model, or opposition to theory by choosing the appropriate numbers of cases. The case study method is used when researchers delve into one or more clearly identifiable cases, and draws general theories, or comparisons, from the data (Yin, 2003; Stake, 2005; Creswell 2009). The investigator can select one case study to illustrate an issue, or select multiple case studies to show different perspectives of social problems, processes, or events (Creswell, 2009).

While case study is useful to support the current theory, or provide evidence against theories currently accepted (Vanevera, 1997), it is difficult to select the number of cases and the most relevant ones. Researchers should be careful to choose the proper numbers of cases, because choosing too few can produce random data and partial correlations between cases due to a lack of data points (Vanevera, 1997:51). Too many cases for a single study can create a shallow
argument (Creswell, 2009), and difficulty in generalizing a theory.

The purpose of grounded theory is to describe, generalize, and unearth theories (Creswell, 2009). Researchers interpret data, conceptualize them, and theoretically formulate the relationship from facts (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Comparison, theoretical questions, theoretical sampling, concept development, and their relationships are executed during coding (Strauss & Corbin, 1994:280). Grounded theory is not just to estimate existing theory, but also used to build a theory (Creswell, 1998), and narrow gaps between theory and empirical research (Glaser & Strauss, 1967).

Grounded theory raises broad questions and allows researchers to further advance detailed questions relevant to research issues and enquiries (Charmaz, 2008). During the data coding process, researchers must consider: the details of the social phenomena (Glaser, 1978), the appropriate application of the data set (Glaser, 1978; Glaser and Strauss, 1967), theoretical categorization of the information (Glaser, 1978), implication of the data, and the varying perspectives of the diverse participants (Charmaz, 2008).

Case Study and Grounded Theory Methods for This Research

A case study is applied to examine each Maül Mandúlgí case to understand various social phenomena and determine important common characteristics such as the satisfaction of residents and visitors. A visible result through statistics or mathematical technique can be more clear and easier to obtain, but human’s daily lives are diverse, complicated, and difficult to reduce to statistics alone. In particular, livability cannot be quantified by the number of stadiums, convention centers, or GDP. It is difficult to judge whether Maül Mandúlgí is successful, or not, if the only means of measurement are through the increase of visitors or neighborhood income. In Maül Mandúlgí, the process itself is more important than results, and is evaluated as a long-term issue.
While studying cases, researchers can relate one case to others if the observation correspond with their expectation. This can be true if the theory fits into the empirical situation and the theory is applicable (Creswell, 2007; Yin, 2014). If not, ten researchers must find other factors to apply or refute the theory. There are many cases and examples of Maůl Mandůlgi in Korea, but four cases were selected for the purposes of this research to observe similarities and differences of the movements according to who led the significant activities (citizens, central and local governments, and/or intermediate systems), what types of activities occurred, and the geographical location of the activities (cities in capital or non-capital regions).

To observe processes within several cases, a qualitative research method will be more applicable than quantative research to determine the amount of income and the volume of manufacturing output. In order to obtain related information, this research has been conducted through reviewing government reports, academic papers and books, local news papers between 1990 and 2015, personal blogs, youtube video materials, and joining conferences or forums in which local activists and residents participated.

During field research in Korea 2011 and 2012, I worked as a research assistance at the Korean Research Institute of Human Settlement (hereafter, KRIHS) from September through December of 2012, and was able to access the aforementioned documents and archives. I joined several livable city themed workshops, such as the workshop for strengthening of Maůl Mandůlgi ability in the Bucheon region, held at Bucheon City Hall in Oct 10, 2010, and several small conferences sponsored by KRIHS. Field research also allowed me to coordinate with researchers at the Daegu Gyeongbuk Development Institute, who coordinated training people in the application of Maůl Mandůlgi concepts in Daegu, two activists from the community support center
of Daegu, Namgu District, and the expert group Urban Doctor, assigned by the District office to support *Maül Mandŭlgi* projects throughout Daegu. After building networks with local participants, I had the opportunity to join resident’s meetings, and talk with local activists and academic scholars. Through these, I was able to collect community related materials, and government publications.

I also volunteered to tutor at the Youth Design Camp Workshop to make Youth-Street in July 2011. The workshop was designed to promote youth participatory planning to develop design changes for the Youth District in the Namgu district, guide teenage participants to conduct research on the site, and to assist them in developing their own design concepts for the streets. Groups of participating students met regularly, and gathered together once a week to share their progress.

Through the use of empirical cases, one focus of this research is to determine which factors are required to advance community building movements and what affects the growth of a livable city. Studying and evaluating existing systems, and proposing a blueprint through grounded theory sometimes affects policy makers to make decisions that result in direct action (Strauss & Corbin, 1994:281). Therefore, case study and grounded theory methods are useful in this research to determine factors necessary for a livable city and to suggest policy recommendations for local cities.

**RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND FRAMEWORK**

Four questions guide the research in this dissertation. Each focuses on a specific dimension of participatory planning for community revitalization. Together, the evidence and conceptual linkages among these four questions provide the research framework. The major proposition of this dissertation is that community building movements can contribute to revitalizing communities and making cities livable. In addition, the participatory planning process, in particular, has shown
a visibly different urban form from other areas of the city that is supportive of daily life activities and social interactions. Some indication of the degree of participatory planning has progressed in a political and economic environment strongly influenced by neo-liberal economic principles, and may be evident through case studies utilized in this thesis.

In non-capital regions of Korea, cities can revitalize in a socially just and culturally dynamic manner by focusing on cultural relationships to form livable cities and emphasize people’s lifeworlds. Although primary attention is given to the capital region, in terms of capital and economic resources, non-capital regions have their own cultural and historic resources: old buildings, and street structures built along with its own community life. Therefore, new concepts and methods are required to revitalize local cities, instead of duplicating capital region-centered plans. Local cities have long been evaluated by economic and physical development based on the government’s and national elites’ achievements during Korea’s industrialization period. As people began to pay more attention to quality of life, the criteria shifted to emphasize human values, everyday living experiences and active participation within the community.

The community, built through autonomous residents’ participatory planning, is influenced by the perceived quality of the urban residential environment; specifically, how it is different from top-down developmental planning in terms of community identity, residents’ connection to the community, and urban form. The cases in this research will explore the following questions:

1. What are the individual and collective socioeconomic incentives, and disincentives, associated with participation in community building?

The proposition guiding this inquiry is that while democratization and decentralization have enhanced prospects for participatory community building, the political state in Korea remains
strong and highly centralized in key areas of urban planning. Only by studying this question up close, and on the ground, can we discover if participatory planning is advancing. In principle, local governments and their citizens with a greater understanding of local dynamics, are empowered, and, as a result, become key figures in the planning phase. Autonomous participation of local residents in the community planning process can be expected to improve residents’ satisfaction and decision-making outcomes. How the participatory planning process has developed among the administration level, civic groups, community leaders, and residents to improve conviviality of the community, and what modes of conflict management have influenced the process of community building, will be explored.

2. How can improvement of the cultural environment of the community, through place-making and historically rooted urban design, influence the local economy?

The purpose of this question is to direct attention to the space-forming, space-contingent process of community mobilization and action. In the process of community building, there are many methods to improve the urban environment and cultural identity. Among them, how does preserving the historic environment affect the cultural identity and economy of the community and the city? The benefits of preserving old buildings and sites and how the spatial forms of the physical setting affect people’s behavior will be investigated.

3. What is the difference between a grass-roots movements, and a local government’s scaled-up project? What makes a city livable, 1,000 different lights of people, or 1 scaled-up construction project led by the government?

This question arises from the host of literature and case studies that conclude grassroots movements and state driven community development are often at odds with each other (Jacobs,
1961; Zukin, 1995; Harvey, 2009; Cho, 2011; Cho, 2014). Most of the communities evaluated as successful examples in Korea, two of which are discussed in this thesis, are not developed according to government guidelines. They generally emerge out of necessity, and the people’s sense of community, as well as a part of an evolutionary process of trial and error. Most of these cases were outlined and developed by the administration that managed the project budget, while residents’ participation was limited. They often began under government direction, were developed based on strict guidelines, and ultimately failed when their funding ran out.

Local governments’ comprehensive area plans resulted in cookie cutter urban forms which sell the built history and culture of the area to visitors. Citizens are more empowered than before, but a strong hierarchy still remains in the relationship with the government which traditionally has more power and control of planning than local residents. How individuals and groups seek to intervene in the power hierarchy and strengthen their voices to be influential in the planning process are also investigated.

4. During community building, what are the differences between cities in capital and non-capital regions?

Guiding this question is the proposition that localities outside of Seoul are at a disadvantage in terms of positive incentives for residents to participate in community planning. This is true for two main reasons: (1) planning continues to be dominated by the capital city, which is far away and provides no viable access from local levels, and (2) power over the economy is also concentrated in the capital city region, which results in that region having much higher levels of autonomy in terms of self-funding, e.g., tax collection. In Korea, various types of social capital and human resources are concentrated in the capital city. In the capital region, people recognize
their needs, find solutions for themselves, and request resolution from the government. This is not as easy for provincial cities outside the capital region because, human networks are wide, and a variety of non-government associations support community activities in the capital region. Young artists have a visible presence and a strong network in which they hold various community events and activities to enhance the physical environment.

Among the cities in the capital region, Seoul is a special metropolitan city where the capital region development plan is established and implemented under the control of the prime minister. The mayor of Seoul, Park, Won-Soon is a former activist, and implements community support projects to gather dispersed activities systemically, share information among networks, and provide micro assistance to the communities. In local cities, the older demographic is significantly less enthusiastic about making changes, and the lack of economic, social, and cultural capital obstruct efforts to experiment or attempt new ways of developing community life. Instead of creating specific plans for local cities, the macro development plan for the capital region is typically modified and later adopted by the provincial city. Thus, the regional development gap that emerges is inevitable in Korea. However, several local (non-capital region) cities have demonstrated their potential to develop by expanding their social networks. Using case studies, this research will investigate the different phases of *Maül Mandülgì* activities in the capital and non-capital regions, and whether these differences are autonomous or government-driven. A case in Seoul, that is regarded as the most progressive, a case in capital region, and in two local cities were selected to compare commonalities and differences in the contributing factors of the community building process.
Process for Development and Implementation

Korea’s academic and non-government-organizations have been interested in community research, and mainly focused on introducing successful Japanese cases (Evans, 2002; Seo, 2002), comparing community building movements among Asian countries (ASCOM\(^5\)), or relating cases concerned with historic and cultural preservation (Kang, Lee, & Choi, 2003; Lee & Oh, 2004; Kang, 2008; Kang, 2013). Planning institutions, academic scholars, activists, and newspapers actively introduce theories and publish empirical cases of community building.

The Center for Urban Regeneration Policy at the KRIHS have published the creative urban regeneration article series to introduce excellent domestic and foreign cases of community building to create a new paradigm for urban and regional regeneration. Private institutes and individual scholars have also published articles and books to introduce local community building activities, and categorize cases by topics, subjects, and projects to analyze. While former studies have focused on detailed programs and case introductions, this research will concentrate on the process by which those programs and actions have been decided, and practiced.

The process used in this research to develop the theoretical framework of the livable city, identifies cases that fit the research framework and analyzes them to elicit appropriate planning policies for livable cities. Among the various *Maül Mandülgı* activities since the late 1990s, the most frequently cited cases in books, articles, and conferences are selected and categorized as resident autonomy, or local government-led. Data that provides qualitative information has been

\(^5\) ASCOM is a young scholars’ network concentrated in Taiwan, South Korea, Japan and other Asian countries. This network studies community development, and exchange their knowledge, history, and experiences of each country (http://faculty.washington.edu/jhou/pacrim.htm).
collected from white papers produced by local governments, academic scholars, who stayed in the local cities and participated in projects, books, columns by activists, and news articles to introduce successful cases. Documents in Korean were gathered through internet research, visits to the KRIHS document center, requests to local governments, and participation in forums.

In order to find answers for these questions, four cases from four different cities, Sŏngmisan network in Seoul; Samdŏk-dong in Daegu; Maul Renaissance in Suwon; and Sihwa Munhwa Maŭl in Gwangju, were selected according to following criteria: (1) Academic scholars, government officials, and civil society agree upon the success of cases; (2) Since Maŭl Mandŭlg is a long-term plan, we cannot evaluate benefits, shortcomings, or estimate results in the short-term. Therefore, cases with a long history, of more than 10 years, are selected for this study; (3) Cases in this study were selected by their location: One in Seoul, the capital city; one in Suwon, which is in the capital region; one cases each in the secondary cities of Daegu and Gwangju, in order to compare the capital region with non-capital regions (see the figure 3-1); and (4) Cases were also selected to illustrate categories of revitalization: Residents Driven, then subdivided into resident-led/activist-led; or Administrative Driven, then subdivided into intermediate organization/resident organization.
Figure 3-2 presents a chronological overview of community building briefly, and table 3-1 compares the four case cities, Sŏngmisan Network, Suwon Renaissance, Gwangju Buk-gu, and Samdŏk-dong. It is categorized region, initiative, community size, funding, activity, main subject, and effect on other cities or communities. The Sŏngmisan network had started its movement in 1994, before the local self-government system resumed in Korea. Since the first local election in 1995, local citizens voted for their own city leader every four years. During the transition of political power from the central government to local governments, they structured their systems for decentralization through elections and enacting ordinances; local communities also worked for their own neighborhoods to build community attachments.

Residents in Samdŏk-dong (1997), and Gwangju Buk-gu (2000) actively advanced the
movement ahead of the Livable City Project (2005). The central government’s support for the civil movement in 1990s encouraged residents and activists to initiate activities for their communities. Compared to the previous case studies mentioned, Suwon City was late to join the community building movement (2010); and despite its delayed involvement, Suwon City exhibits a well collaborated intermediate system between residents and the local government.

Table 3-2 presents an overview of the four cases of Livable Cities mentioned in chapter 2. The framework suggests 8 elements of local governance, a sense of place, historic preservation, empowerment, decentralization, inclusiveness, unique built environments, conviviality. Four cases in this research have different conditions and processes, but also have some common traits as well. The Sŏngmisan network is representative of a progressive bottom-up community network, Suwon emphasizes the humanistic perspective through an intermediate organization and the local government’s role. Gwangju and Daegu are both secondary cities, but these two cities show differences in responding to livable city policies because of their respective locations and political history in Korea.

Since most politicians were raised in the eastern regions of the country during the development period, Daegu benefitted greatly from being located on the developmental corridor (Douglass, 1994). In contrast to this, Gwangju in the west was excluded from national politics which led progressive citizens to actively stand up to the military regime in the 1980s; a showing of the democratization movement. Various activities to build up the community have continuously occurred among residents in both cities, and both have received subsidies from the government since Maül Mandůlgi became a new national planning policy in the 2000s.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Sŏngmisan Seoul</th>
<th>Haenggungdong Suwon</th>
<th>Gwangju Buk-gu Gwangju</th>
<th>Samdŏk-dong Daegu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initiative</strong></td>
<td>Communal childcare cooperatives in 1994 (household level)</td>
<td>Collaboration between administration and residents (local government level)</td>
<td>Introduction of community building in 1995 (local government)</td>
<td>Shelters for teenage runaways in 1997 (non government organization)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community size</strong></td>
<td>Approximately 500-700 households (major participants in age 30s and 40s)</td>
<td>13,300 population 6,489 households (2013) 216,598 population 87,306 households (Paldal-gu district)</td>
<td>15,756 population 6,528 households (2012) 443,953 population 169,400 households (Bukgu district)</td>
<td>6,396 population 3,303 households (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding</strong></td>
<td>Self fund of network</td>
<td>Suwon city (local government)/ Managed by Suwon Renaissance Center</td>
<td>Self funded in the beginning, then subsidies from national and local government</td>
<td>Self funding of Kim, Kyungmin (activist) in the beginning, government later funded through Making livable city project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity</strong></td>
<td>-Education programs for community children  -Nursery, alternative school, afterschool programs  -Community festival  -Club activities (band, choir, sports)  -Community theatre  -Community business (stores)</td>
<td>-Training program to foster community leaders  -Public contest to collect public opinion and budgeting  -Comprehensive community planning by residents planning group</td>
<td>-Enhance community culture at apartment house  -Mural paintings, wall felling down  -Cleaned abandoned place &amp; made alley museum (gallery, park)  -Class for residents teaching community budgeting</td>
<td>-Break down walls, -Mural paintings -Sharing Kimchi and side dishes -Banquets for village elders -Preserving Biotope -Festivals (became puppet-mime festival with network in the world)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Subject</strong></td>
<td>Residents and community members</td>
<td>Maül Renaissance Center</td>
<td>Local government, Residents organizations</td>
<td>Activists, volunteers and Residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effect</strong></td>
<td>Spread community building in the nation and encouraged the maül gongdonche saop, community project in Seoul city</td>
<td>Emphasized the role of the intermediate system between local governments and residents</td>
<td>Expand participatory budgeting systems in the local governments</td>
<td>Boom of break down walls not only in Daegu, but also in the whole country, to increase community access</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: the author
Participatory community building will be examined with an analysis of changes in the community and residents through Maũl Mandūlgi activities, and the government’s approach toward these activities. Since community building is regarded, by some officials, as the last resort to overcome an immediate crisis, the government instead focuses on short-term projects that show immediate visible results, instead of deep-rooted investment plans.

The community building process, as followed in this thesis, typically begins with residents initiating activities to increase interactions between neighbors, and beautifying their neighborhood environments. This encourages conviviality and economic resiliency showing that these are motivating factors in growth of livability. Operating businesses and making goods within the community are encouraged and recognized as important actions to circulate money within the local area. People build networks between communities, and expand their activities throughout these connections to make a livable city. Understanding different systems and programs in each community provide clues for cities to advance their own unique identities. Based on community building experiences in Korea, autonomy and residents’ active participatory planning are recognizably important factors in promoting a livable city model.

Before investigating the details of these four cases, Chapter 4 will briefly introduce urban planning history, discuss Maũl Mandūlgi movements, and Korea’s community building efforts first; then, the four cases will be introduced and compared in Chapter 5, and more discussions and conclusions will follow in Chapter 6.
### Table 3-2: Comparison of four cases of *Maül Mandŭlg*_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sŏngmisan network Seoul</th>
<th>Suwon city Suwon</th>
<th>Gwangju Buk-gu Gwangju</th>
<th>Samdŏk-dong Daegu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Governance</strong></td>
<td>Emphasize horizontal relationships, Life politics against administration</td>
<td>Collaboration between the administration and residents</td>
<td>Collaboration between the administration and residents</td>
<td>Collaboration between civil organizations and residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sense of Place</strong></td>
<td>Making a village with their own hands, very strong attachment to the community</td>
<td>Preserving historic heritage, and community culture, within the Fortress by local artists</td>
<td>Decorating the neighborhood to building museum/art center</td>
<td>Making a village by long-time residents, strong attachment to the community and hometown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Historic Preservation</strong></td>
<td>Campaign of protecting Mt. Sungmi (natural environment)</td>
<td>Prohibit all developments near the Suwon Hwaseong Fortress, a UNESCO world heritage</td>
<td>Abandoned residential zones transformed into a street art museum with existing structures protected</td>
<td>Campaign of protecting naturally formed narrow alleys and Japanese styled housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Empowerment</strong></td>
<td>Community work is operated by residents. Practice life politics</td>
<td>The local city supports and empowers residents</td>
<td>The local city supports the empowerment of residents</td>
<td>Rent tenants, but try to be empowered with assistance by civil activists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decentralization (finance)</strong></td>
<td>Residents solve financial matters with their own efforts, such as community businesses</td>
<td>Participatory budget system, Maul Renaissance center has authority within the community</td>
<td>Local government’s active support, first participatory budget system in Korea</td>
<td>Individual activist used his own money, and attracted support from governments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inclusiveness</strong></td>
<td>Every ‘member’ participates actively with right to the community and responsibilities</td>
<td>Community support center educates residents to actively participate</td>
<td>Local governments provide opportunities to participate with residents</td>
<td>Civil organizations cooperate with residents who settled over 30 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unique built environment</strong></td>
<td>Multi-unit dwellings, community stores. Box-shaped buildings for studio rooms from the influx of capital</td>
<td>Development/redevelopment plans are restricted because of world heritage, Old buildings and alleyes are preserved</td>
<td>Large apartment complex and deteriorated residence coexist. Old areas shift to become art galleries, community activities occur in apartment complexes</td>
<td>Small alleys and Japanese styled housing present modern time. The modern history is preserved in the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conviviality</strong></td>
<td>Regular/occasional community festivals, events, activities are held by members Liberate community</td>
<td>Concern on city image making</td>
<td>Concern on city image making</td>
<td>Entire community turned into the party place during world puppet-mime festival,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result</td>
<td>Expanded to Seoul city’s community network movement</td>
<td>Maul renaissance, intermediate system to modify between stakeholders</td>
<td>Expansion of participatory budget system; <em>Maŭl Mandūlgī</em> in cultural method</td>
<td>Falling down wall is expanded to Daegu city and the whole country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: author
CHAPTER FOUR: KOREA’S EFFORTS TOWARD A LIVABLE CITY

For a better understanding of Korean government efforts to make livable cities for Korean people, this chapter briefly covers its political history and city planning centered on the capital region. Until the 1990s, all political decisions for local cities were made by the central government; even the designation of mayors, and citizen’ participation was limited.

Korea’s main focus was economic modernization, and territorial development, covering industry and transportation infrastructure. Plans for land use were executed according to national plans, centered upon political-economic strategies that supported large companies and their construction-oriented developments. These developmental policies focused on the capital region, and this resulted in uneven development in physical expansion, investment and business among regions. As a part of the modernization and homogenization process, local vernacular physical and cultural heritages were destroyed and unique community needs were ignored. Consequently, people increasingly migrated, in search for academic and financial opportunities into the capital region, from the 1960s onward, while the populations in cities in the non-capital regions declined (Cho, 2011; Jang, 2010; Kim et al., 2016; KRIHS, 1999).

Regional disparities manifested as unequal distribution of social opportunities, resources, and authorities (Cho, 2011), and non-capital regions lagged behind in development. To reduce gaps in livability between capital and non-capital regions, in the 1960s policy makers, in non-capital regions, made efforts to increase growth and slow rural to urban migration. The central government also engaged in community mobilization efforts via the Saemaıl Undong, which means the new village movement (Douglass, 2014; Kim et al, 2016; KRIHS, 1999; Soh & Kim, 2010). However, they overlooked one important fact: Cities with stable economies, a variety of job opportunities, well-maintained modern facilities, and medical, educational, and cultural
performance services attract people; yet these factors are not the only factors essential for retaining people residents when they have settled into communities.

The need to improve the quality of life of citizens in both capital and non-capital regions is the issue facing Korea today. The Maül Mandülgi movement has been proposed as an alternative to developmental plans recognizing that fact that the public has grown weary of repeated superficial policies without recognizing fundamental problems (Lee, 2016; Yu, 2011). It is a grassroots community building effort to encourage residents to enhance the quality of life in their neighborhoods while developmental plans focused on promoting chaebŏls that expand the industrial complex and competitiveness, in exports so that the country can grow national wealth.

4.1 DEVELOPMENT OF URBAN POLICIES IN KOREA

4.1.1 Korea’s Treatment of City Life Over Time

The National Archives of Korea address the importance of preserving national land, and the justification of government management with comprehensive planning, to recover land damaged during the Japanese colonization, the Korean War, and industrialization (These are based on the article 120 (2) of the Constitution, and the article 2 of the Act on Comprehensive Plans for Construction in the National Territory). Under the comprehensive development plan, cities were predesignated to produce specific products based upon national priorities as opposed to regional priorities.

Urban policy development in Korea differentiated the capital (a special administrative city under the control of the central government) and non-capital region cities, because policy planners believed that through the growth pole theory that the development of the capital region would lead local regional level development. However, Seoul is the center of politics, transportation, economy, and culture in Korea, and because it was managed separately, the capital region increasingly
dominated all other non-capital regions over the past several decades.

Since the 1980s, the central government tried to control the capital region from the 2nd CNTDP. However, the regional disparity between capital and non-capital regions remains large to this day. Urban policies for provincial cities were determined through the CNTDP guidelines, however funding was decided at the central government by the Ministry of Land, Infrastructure and Transport and by presidential authority and the National Assembly.

Korea’s unequal distribution of development can be attributed to its modern history. Korea was a pre-modern agricultural society where per capita income was in the range of $67 USD annually (National Statistics Office, NSO). In the 1950s, radical land reform was carried out, which contribute to the transition to modern society (Jeong, 2010; Kim, 2010). Land reform leveled rural society, which eliminated the yangban landed class, and gave great autonomy to the state, and led to rural-urban migration as children left very small farms for a new life in the city. In addition to land reform, Korea’s Independence from Japan (1945), and the Korean War (1950-53), were also contributing factors in the rapid increase in urban population. Slums and illegal shacks, without properly equipped infrastructure proliferated within and on the fringe of cities. At this time, eradicating poverty, and accommodating the immigration of people were bigger issues than satisfying communities’ needs.

Later, military regimes ruled over the country for over thirty years (1961-1993), and, to justify their reins over the government, focused more on the nation’s economic growth than on the individuals’ quality of life. In the 1960s, the government established industrial growth poles across

---

6 Because refugees forced to move abroad during the Japanese colonial era came back, people defected from North Korea, and migrants from rural areas had settled urban areas.
7 Housing shortage rate was 50.2% in 1955 (NSO), and the population density of Seoul reached 9,110.8 person/km² in 1960.
the country with particular emphasis on the southeast coast, creating a bipolar national development pattern. A few of the chaebōls monopolized large-scale construction projects, and dominated all major industrial manufacturing and service sectors, and industrial complexes. They also increased their dominance in local regions (Hong, 1995; Kim, 2001; Shin, 2006), while local culture and “mom-and-pop” stores were displaced by chaebōls’ franchise stores in 1990s and 200s (So, 2009; KSW, 2011). In the 1970s, Saemaŭl Undong was one important element of the de facto national regional development strategy, and it will be briefly discussed in following chapter 4.1.2.

[Table 4-1] City Population and density in 1960

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Density (person/km²)</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>population</th>
<th>Density (person/km²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nation</td>
<td>24,994,117</td>
<td>253.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seoul</td>
<td>2,444,883</td>
<td>9,110.8</td>
<td>Gyeonggi-do</td>
<td>2,758,027</td>
<td>246.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chungcheong Buk-do</td>
<td>1,369,313</td>
<td>184.6</td>
<td>Chungcheong Nam-do</td>
<td>2,525,646</td>
<td>311.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gyeongsang Buk-do</td>
<td>3,850,102</td>
<td>202.8</td>
<td>Gyeongsang Nam-do</td>
<td>4,179,202</td>
<td>339.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeolla Buk-do</td>
<td>2,395,023</td>
<td>277.6</td>
<td>Jeolla Nam-do</td>
<td>3,553,475</td>
<td>295.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwangwon-do</td>
<td>1,636,726</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>Jejudo</td>
<td>281,720</td>
<td>157.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: National Statistics Office (NSO)

While economic growth accelerated urbanization, in the capital region, it drew rural populations to large metropolitan cities like Seoul, Daegu, and Busan. The population in Seoul, Gyunggi-do, Gyeongsang Buk-do, and Nam-do increased during the 1960s, as seen in table 4-1. Urban policies, made by elite groups hired by the central government, lacked consideration for existing neighborhood communities, and the urban poor. In 1966 slums were demolished to
standardize lots through land readjustment\textsuperscript{8}, and to construct basic infrastructure, and evictees formed shanty towns along the hillsides in the outskirts of cities.

In the 1980s, residents and construction companies began joint-redevelopment, and constructed multi-unit dwellings to provide five million homes to increase the supply of housing. Housing Site Development Projects based on the Housing Site Development Promotion Act\textsuperscript{9} were implemented to demolish existing ‘communities’ of sub-standard homes and build new affordable ‘residences’. As seen in figure 4-1, developmental plans and policies for city regions, such as land readjustment, housing site preparation, and housing site development were implemented between the 1960s and 1990s. This resulted in boom of apartment building construction throughout Korea, but Korea lost its vernacular buildings, creating an image of an ‘apartment republic’ (as described by French geographer, Vale'rie Gele'zeau), or a concrete jungle.

[Figure 4-1] Housing and Urban Policy responding to Urbanization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Readjustment Project</td>
<td>Housing Site Preparation Project</td>
<td>Housing Site Development Project</td>
<td>Urban District Development Project</td>
<td>Participatory Community Building</td>
<td>Manage by objects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\begin{itemize}
  \item Control and Demolish
  \item Comprehensive management
  \item District reconstruction
\end{itemize}

Source: re-organize

\textsuperscript{8} Land Readjustment is a method to manage urban development, or redevelopment processes. A public authority, such as the central government, assembles land from private owners, changes existing land use, and reorganizes it for the public use. The private owners are paid for the land, and new facilities and infrastructures are installed in the newly built-up plots (Konursay, 2004; Learn about City Planning).

\textsuperscript{9} Housing Site Development Promotion Act (HSDPA) stipulates special cases about acquisition of housing site, development, supply and maintenance in order to simplify the procedures for the central government to solve housing shortage issue (National Law Information Service in Ministry of Government Legislation, http://www.law.go.kr/main.html). Current HSDPA is about government driven housing site development on a large scale, and it contributed to 103% of housing supply rate of the nation.
In the 1990s, the central government tried to achieve a balanced development by enhancing infrastructures in local regions at the expense of local governments as their role in the planning process was increased. However, development-oriented government and the chaebol’s involvement in the planning process, to accumulate wealth by investing in social overhead capital (SOC), kept the land in imbalance. National and municipal governments continuously planned mega-projects, while companies’ profited and unemployment rates increased from the economic crisis. Redevelopment projects quickly progressed from the mid 1980s to the late 1990s, and most shanty towns were swept away by the late 1990s through housing environment improvement projects.

In the early 2000s the central government’s focus turned to transforming Seoul into a world city, and also another developmental plan, titled ‘New Town Project’ with the purpose of improving residential environments, expanding infrastructure, and recovering urban functions, dominated by housing and urban development. The New Town Plans started in 1961, and aimed to provide the public with housing, but the New Town Project, initiated in 2002 by Mayor Lee, Myung bak, was driven by financial profits and political gain (Lee, 2015). When another financial crisis in 2009 impacted Korea and other East Asian countries, political agendas and practical activities shifted to support community-driven movements instead of mega-construction projects.

In Korea, people-driven development only became possible after 1995, but even then the government continued to pursue corporate-led spatial development. However, the rise of civil society’s organized participation and Maül Mandülgi began to show countervailing forms of production of space that had important implications for secondary city revitalization. The

---

10 According to the statistics by Korea Institute of Finance (KIF), total unemployment rate reached to 7%, and especially unemployment rate of 15-29 year old was 12.2% in 1998 (Gyeongbuk Mail Daily Newspaper, 2013).
following table 4-2 presents a summary of Korea’s development plan by decade.

[Table 4-2] Timeline of Changes of Land Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>Political, Economic, and Social Situation by the Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1950s</td>
<td>· Devastated land from colonialism and Korean War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Regional unbalance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Radical land reform carried out, eliminated landlords</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Creating very small owner operated farms (0.25 Ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Average)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960s</td>
<td>· CNTDP Law enacted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· The 1st &amp; 2nd Five-year Economic Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Industrial structure modernization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Growth pole approach to regional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970s</td>
<td>· The 1st CNTDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· The 3rd &amp; 4th Five-year Economic Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Policy for efficient land use, environment, control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· population in large cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Saemaŭl Undong strategy for rural development and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· food production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980s</td>
<td>· Real estate speculation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Apartment Complex Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· The 2nd CNTDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· The 5th &amp; 6th Five-year Economic Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Policy for natural environment, dispersing population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· to non-capital region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· 2 million housing program implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990s</td>
<td>· The 3rd CNTDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· The 7th Five-year Economic Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Policy for suppressing capital region, reducing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· regional disparities, advancing national</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· competitiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000s</td>
<td>· Era of Diversity/Global Competition: emphasize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· locality, global issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Technology, knowledge and information advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· The 4th CNTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· The 1st Five-year Balanced National Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Five-year Regional Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Policy for Green Growth, Globalization, and Economic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Cooperation &amp; Land Integration between Korea and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Northeast Asia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2011 Annual Report on National Territorial Plan and Use

4.1.2 Sae-Maŭl Undong (SMU), Citizens’ Mobilization

In the 1970s and 1980s, following heavy investment in urban economic development and infrastructure the government implemented a “Saemaŭl Undong” (SMU), or “New Village Movement” for self-sufficiency of rural region. SMU was promoted for adopting community development and modernization (Korea Saemaŭl Undong Center). The movement was planned and implemented by the central government to overcome poverty through the collective efforts of the whole community.
The SMU was a motivational campaign and physical environment enhancement program. The government set “guiding spirit, diligence, self-help, and cooperation” as key values to be fostered (Korea Saemaul Undong Center), and provided financial support for agricultural production and building materials, such as cement and steels. These materials were provided to make modern houses, with flushing toilets and kitchens, and improve community facilities by building farm roads on a neighborhood basis. Consequently, these rural people achieved a rise in income and community environment improvement through active participation.

Douglass (2014) describes the SMU as having been seen as a top-down movement despite the potential to be a community-centered bottom-up maŭl mandŭlgi because of the authoritarian regime. He described the SMU by saying “represents a bridge between the traditional community development approach popular in the earlier postcolonial world and the then emerging models of economic sectors and the role of agriculture in providing foundations for the expected national urban-industrial transition, which was beginning to take off in Korea in the late 1960s” (Douglass, 2014: 6).

The purpose of the SMU was to create a community-unit management system so that each community can establish physical, social, and economic foundations in the community, and improve their living environment through residents’ active participation (Soh and Kim, 2010; Kim, 2011; Korea Saemaŭl Undong Center). Through generating self-confidence, farmers can discover their ability to improve their community environment (Kim, 2011). From a political perspective, the SMU is the first campaign in which local officials were placed in charge of enhancing rural society (Brandt 1979, Burmeister 1987, Korea Times 2010).

The SMU is considered to have contributed to building up local governance, accumulation of social capital (Soh & Kim, 2010), and has been designated as the best practice for solving
absolute poverty in rural regions and strengthening residents’ capability of self-sufficiency (UNESCAP, 2002). Due to this success, the Saema’il Undong has been exported to some Asian and African cities to train people in the spirit of community unity and physical project possibilities (Korea Saema’il Undong Center).

4.1.3 Estimation of Korea’s Developmental Plans

Korea’s urban policies have been developed and institutionalized by successive authoritarian governments (1961-1992), and local governments, in cooperation with the central government’s policy framework. On the one hand, enhancing government capacities contributed to Korea’s rapid economic growth by quickly responding to various issues during the economic and social development process. However, developmental master plans in the 1970s and 1980s primarily focused on economic goals and urban projects that functioned for the chaebol led economy. There were collusive links between the government and businesses, to create unimpeded economic development, and no specific strategies were formed to address living culture. Five Comprehensive National Territorial Development Plans (hear after, CNTDPs) repeated planning principles without significant difference between plans to construct infrastructure, and plans to support economic development.

These developmental plans were weak in their lack of public input, and destructive to local identities and vernacular architecture within communities. While enterprising municipal governments still believe in attractive international competitions and constructing the tallest buildings to make cities rich, community building movements have been initiated by locally founded NGOs, and residents working cooperatively, to regenerate local regions, and develop a convivial community. With the interests of the general public on local politics, and their community issues during the 2010s, Korea’s planning paradigm diverted to human and place-
based community recovery. The central and local governments promoted urban regeneration projects focusing on preservation and management over destruction and reconstruction.

The bottom-up movement of community building was implemented with the title of *Maŭl Mandūlgi Saŏp* by various government agencies, and encouraged local governments to develop projects with residents’ participation since 2007. During this process, local governance played a greater role in civil society in making decisions rather than relying upon the national government, while local governments have evolved to make decisions on their own agendas.

4.2 MAKING A LIVABLE CITY PROJECT

4.2.1 Salgosipŭn Dosi Mandūlgi Saŏp

The Ministry of Land, Transport, and Maritime Affairs (hereafter, MLTMA) initiated the Salgo Sipŭn Dosi Mandūlgi Saŏp, which means making a livable city project, in 2005.

[Figure 4-2] Structure Map of Making a Livable City Project

Source: Ahn (2009), Making a city where people want to live, MLTMA

---

11 The Making a Livable City Project has changed its title to ‘Urban Vitality Improving Project’ and is currently underway.
The Salgo Sipŭn Dosi Mandŭlgi Saŏp primarily focused on revitalizing small and medium sized cities in local areas. The MLTMA sorted urban functions into living, work, and leisure places, and these categories were further sub-divided into nine major factors including: housing, education, medical, safety, traffic (living place); job openings (work place); environment, landscape, and culture (leisure place) (Kim and et el, 2006). Objectives, visions, and policy strategies were established in each field as seen in figure 4-2. With the institution of a support system, 94 model projects, called Sibŏm Saŏp, were advanced and implemented during 2007 and again in 2009. Having different features in population, economic size, environment, and political process in cities and towns, the project regions were divided into Sibŏm dosi, a model city, and Sibŏm maŭl, a model village.

[Table 4-3] Model projects for the Salgo Sipŭn Dosi Mandŭlgi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sibŏmdosi</strong></td>
<td>- Local governments promote specialized development plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model city</td>
<td>- Experts, local residents, civic organizations, and local governments cooperate to form an urban vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sibŏmmaŭl</strong></td>
<td>- Focused on neighborhood units, and local issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model village</td>
<td>- Residents, community leaders, and civic organizations cooperate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gyehoek biyong chiwŏnsaŏp, Planning cost support</td>
<td>- Subsidies awarded to cities not selected for example cases, but which suggested an outstanding plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Sŏnggong model chiwŏnsaŏp**   | - Incentives awarded to cities selected as Sibŏmdosi, Sibŏmmaŭl in 2007-08 to specializing their own localities. |
| Successful model support project |                                                                         |

Source: Duri Space Institution, 2011:15

12 A Sibŏm dosi is planned for local government, si (city), gun (county), gu (district) in non-capital region s. A Gyehoek biyong chiwŏnsaŏp dosi, a planning cost support city, was selected to complement cities not selected in 2007 and 2008, but was abolished due to budget limits. Instead Sŏnggong model chiwŏnsaŏp, a successful model support project, was introduced to cities selected in 2007 and 2008 (see the table 4-3, and table 4-4).
Experts and activists in the planning field held lectures and discussed the meaning of a livable city, the importance of communities and related theories, and policies to improve the community environment. Training programs like *Dosī Daehak*, urban schools, were opened for 4 to 6 weeks for residents interested in participatory planning. In conjunction with this, online support systems, a livable city committee, livable city support conferences, help desks, and community building related departments were also established.

In this project, the central government had a master plan to designate project cities in non-capital regions. However, not all communities had specific operational strategies to obtain government subsidies, and were not given an equal opportunity to be involved. Therefore, government subsidies were given to very few local regions, and communities, because in certain localities people positively participated in addressing their neighborhood’s issues, searched for those opportunities through the Internet, and their networks, and applied for government projects continuously. On the other hand, other communities were excluded from these benefits because of an absence of human resources, and lack of information about procedures (Kim & Kim, 2012).

Other challenges included local government’s simplified method of community building by neglecting the diverse characteristics of each community in favor of administrative efficiency, instead of focusing on their own locality’s unique characteristics. Model projects were arranged by the government’s framework, and subsidies were conditionally provided to local governments year after year. Local governments looked toward their communities and made attempts to formalize a livable city with little results as projects were planned for just three year periods and administrators raced to get visible results within this period of time.

For example, the success of mural paintings, funded by *Salgosipūn Dosī Mandūlgī Saopération, encouraged dozens of local cities to plan wall paintings. Most of these cities could not maintain
their activities after the ‘event’ finished, because local governments lacked the understanding of community building and residents’ participation. Appearances, or methods for visible results, were more important for local governments than the process of participation and inspirational philosophies behind community building programs. Furthermore, the MLTMA handed the project to local governments after 2009, and the local governments and residents did not have enough budget for future plans.

[Table 4-4] Development of Making a Livable City Project between 2007 and 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Annual project</td>
<td>- Annual project</td>
<td>- Three-year project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection</td>
<td>Documents of Project Plan (80%) Visiting field (20%)</td>
<td>Urban prize evaluation in 2007 (40%) Project proposal (42%) Visiting field (18%)</td>
<td>Urban prize evaluation in 2008 (30%) Project proposal (42%) Visiting field (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support &amp; Manage System</td>
<td>Completion Report Casual monitoring</td>
<td>Completion Report Casual monitoring</td>
<td>Completion Report Train people in charge Build Monitoring DB Community Center and Urban Doctor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: extract from Duri Space Institution, 2011

Above all, the greatest fault with *Salgo Šipŭn Dosi Mandŭlgı Saŏp* was lack of local residents’ autonomy. Local governments were given subsidies by the central government, instead of giving them to the residents who lived in the area assigned to the project. These subsidies were only passed on to the community after residents submitted formal development budget plans. The power balance among related people and groups, and financial autonomy of communities, were important factors in sustaining community building.
Fortunately, *Salgo Sipūn Dosi Mandūlgi Saŏp* contributed to popularizing the idea of participatory community planning. Social environment and community building movements were previously popular among civil organizations and certain groups of people. It became more widely known to ordinary people who had no interest in it, or knowledge of participation implementing until after it was promoted by the central government as the nation’s project.

4.2.2 Other Livable City Projects Promoted by the Government

The MLTMA was not the only department to develop livable city related projects. The Ministry of Public Administration and Security (hereafter, MPAS) also promoted the project ‘*Salgi Chohŭn Chiyŏk Mandūlgi Saŏp,*’ Making a Livable Region Project in 2007, and developed basic models for a livable region. The Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MAF) directed ‘*Sinhwallyŏk Saŏp,*’ New Vitality Project, which focused on rural areas; The Ministry of Environment operated ‘eco city,’ and the Ministry of Culture and Tourism (MCT) led ‘*Gago Sipūn Sŏm Mandūlgi Saŏp,*’ Making an Attractive Island Project, to attract tourists to islands in Korea (see table 4-5).

For the last ten years, several government departments have implemented similar projects with different titles, and fit communities into standardized plans and policies. However a lack of communication among public officials in different departments resulted in overlapping policies. Since the central government has the power of budget control, it took the lead in the decision-making process, and local governments merely implemented policies. Local residents were just recipients of information rather than partering in the planning process. This did not demonstrate political decentralization nor local self-governmence.
Table 4-5] Livable City related Projects by the Government (1,000 KRW=1 USD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervising department</th>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Budget in 2007 (million KRW)</th>
<th>Region selection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Public Administration and Security</td>
<td>Select Regions and Support</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>30 regions were selected in 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry</td>
<td>Construct Garden City Project</td>
<td>28,829</td>
<td>55 regions were selected in 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 were added</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Land, Transport, and Maritime Affairs</td>
<td>Model Projects for a Livable City</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>5 cities and 25 villages were selected in 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Culture and Tourism</td>
<td>Attractive Island Projects</td>
<td>13,450</td>
<td>4 islands were selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Maritime Affairs and Fisheries</td>
<td>Resort Fihery Village Making</td>
<td>3,544</td>
<td>2 regions were selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Knowledge Economy</td>
<td>Industrial Environment Reorganization</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MLTMA (2009:68)

4.3 CIVIL SOCIETY AND COMMUNITY BUILDING IN KOREA

Korea’s civil society has been formed from the process of challenging the power of the military, bureaucrats, and chaebŏl (business conglomerates) (Choi, 2010, Kim, 2003; Lee, 2003). In appearance, the legal procedure of decision-making and information networks of the country looked well equipped after the 1990s. The political authority had been transferred from the military to civilian, and from central to local governments with a growing focus on local issues and participation in social issues. However, economic growth is still the driving socio-economic concern for the main political and economic forces; a chaebŏl-centered economic system, concentric elitism and government support (Choi, 2010) still dominate society.

The current economic policy is not much different from that of a developmental state (Choi, 2004; Shin, 2006). Former businessman and president Lee, Myung-bak (2008-2013) enacted corporate-friendly policies of deregulation, tax reduction, and a low interest rates for companies. The Park, Geun-hye regime (2013-present) announced a reduction in regulations, to allow
struggling small and medium businesses to compete with large companies. The Lee government prohibited civil organizations from participating in political actions, and the government imposed fines, or restricted subsidies (Jang, Sep 25, 2008; Kim, 2009), if organization joined a public demonstration (Kim, 2009). The Park regime is criticized for not communicating with the public during the decision-making process, and ignoring people’s right-to-know (The Voice of Seoul, 2012; Newday21, 2013; Hong, 2015).

As authority and wealth are centralized in the capital region by selected groups, small and medium sized agents of economic activity, at the local level, have found it difficult to sustain business stability, and influence local cities to maintain economic, cultural, and social improvements at their own pace. While non-capital regions are declining, there have been some movements initiated by residents at the local level to revitalize regions and communities. Living issues such as free school meals for poor students, local welfare, and local businesses have been emphasized and election pledges by politicians followed suit (Ha, 2011).

While the government refuses to disclose some information and limits public involvement in political affairs, the public’s active participation in social issues has increased. Average citizens have more opportunities to join in politics through public hearings, or conferences, and share information and opinions through newspaper editorial pages, and personal blogs. They parlay a public participation system set up in ordinance and technologies into joining local politics so as to become active participants (Choi, 2000; Kim, 2003).

The spread of Maül Mandülgi experiences in the nation, and the government’s support of them, has encouraged the general public to participate in local governance. Maül Mandülgi will be discussed in greater detail in the following section.
4.3.1 Maŭl Mandŭlgi in Korea and Machizukuri in Japan

In Korean, Maŭl is a small unit of a village where people live, work, and play; where daily activities occur. Mandŭlgi means ‘to make’ or ‘to build.’ A network of people with cooperative activities in the village is considered a community. Thus, Maŭl Mandŭlgi can be understood as improving the physical environment of a neighborhood, and, at the same time, building of close relationships between its people. This is a type of place-making in which community and local members have the right to make their own decisions within their neighborhoods. The cooperations of local governance and residents’ active participation are vital factors in making a livable community to lead a livable city.

In Japan, a Machizukuri, has the same linguistic meaning as Maŭl Mandŭlgi in Korea. It is not just a spontaneous grass-root movements, but a legal policy for residents influence local governments with systemized local governance. The administrative support system, such as professional advice and ideas, data management systems focused on activities, fund raising and cooperative operation of public-private partnerships are well organized. Local residents actively request that their administrators fulfill specific roles for community building.

‘Citizen participation,’ ‘decentralization and decision-making,’ ‘focusing on local welfare and enhancing local spirit,’ and a ‘gradual phased approach’ are the main aspects (Evans, 2002). Like a Maŭl Mandŭlgi, Machizukuri is not just for beautifying the village. All efforts to work together to form a framework for promoting environmental maintenance, building, and enhance physical and social environments for an energetic atmosphere in each region are also a part of this policy (cited in Jeon, Kim & Hwang, 2008).

Japan’s local community initiatives are promoted not only in the capital city of Tokyo, but also in secondary cities such as Kobe, Yokohama, and Osaka. Different from featureless local
cities in Korea, Japan’s secondary cities are well known for their unique ‘history of planning legislation’ and ‘progressive local governance’ (Evans, 2002). Residents’ voluntary activities supported for the central government to relieve uneven development between regions in the 1970s (Suh, 2002), and spread out to the entire country in the 1980s. After the Machizukuri Ordinance in Kobe city in 1981, cities prepared a legal foundation to facilitate movement and the City Planning Act (Choi & Lee, 2005; Huang & Watanabe, 2008). In 1998, the Non-Profit Organization (NPO) Act was established to encourage citizens to cooperate with the administration through legal channels (Liling & Watanabe, 2008).

Japanese cases give lessons in which vital factors and methods for community building processes are most successful, but, some dimensions of community building remain unaddressed like whether or not specific community representatives can act and work for the whole community’s benefit, or how to get approval from higher administrative at the prefecture level (Evans, 2002). Considering the time it takes for plans to be implemented, the planning authority in local governments are more efficient in obtaining prompt and direct reactions from residents. This residents-local government synergy (Douglass, 2002) is another factor used to advance the movement by itself.

4.3.2 Ma’il Mandulgi, Korean Version of Grass-Roots Movement

Korea’s development process was similar to Japan’s (Lee, 1994; Park, 2004), and the community building movement is commonly known as being influenced by Japan. However, there were also pre existing autonomous rules and regulations for cooperation for rural community life in Korea such as Hyang-yak, the self-regulating village code, and Du-re, the farmers’ cooperative group. These were regarded as the main impetus for Saaema’il Undong (SMU) in 1970s and 1980s (Goh, 2006; Douglass, 2014), where the spirit of the community remained in the public so that it
can be the foundation of promoting Maül Mandŭlgi. Maül Mandŭlgi is one of the movements to recover close connections between people, and self-reliant neighborhoods, while the community norms, formed naturally between people, become weaker during urbanization.

The movement run by a few progressive people in the neighborhood became an official planning method by government administrations and experts in 2000 (Kim, 2012). It expanded to the whole country while civil organizations responded to pending issues in local areas. The government’s political backing of NGO supported projects, led to the enacting of Maül Mandŭlgi ordinances in 2000.

[Table 4-6] Definitions of Maül Mandŭlgi in the Local Ordinances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Name of Maül Mandŭlgi</th>
<th>Ordinance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gwangju metropolitan</td>
<td>Beautiful Maül Mandŭlgi in Buk-gu</td>
<td>…all activities encourage residents to have the right and responsibility to cope with community issues and create local communities where residents build social networks and take care of each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>city [2004.3.25]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ansan city</td>
<td>Good Maül Mandŭlgi</td>
<td>…the “good maül Mandŭlgi project” included following projects which residents themselves recreate their village to make a comfortable and pleasant community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2007.9.27]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gangjin-gun [2008.1.16]</td>
<td>Livable Maül Mandŭlgi</td>
<td>…all activities encourage residents to make decisions on community issues and restore local communities where residents build social networks, and help each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suwon city [2011.5.4]</td>
<td>Good Maül Mandŭlgi</td>
<td>…all kinds of activities in various sectors, such as education, culture, welfare, environment, landscape, and economy for residents to make a livable community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seoul metropolitan city [2012.3.15]</td>
<td>Maül Kongdongch’e Mandŭlgi support</td>
<td>…activities to improve residents’ quality of life by enhancing and develop localities, and using human and physical resources in local areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Gwangju metropolitan city, Ansan city, Gangjin-gun, Suwon city, and Seoul metropolitan city
During this time a Korean Maǔl Mandǔlgi Institution was established in 2004, and it operated the movement in combination with city building (Kim, 2012). ASCOM (Asian Communities), an academic exchange network between countries of Korea, Taiwan, and Japan, was established in 2006, and comparative studies focusing on community building were actively developed.

There are some definitions of Maǔl Mandǔlgi within various ordinances in table 4-6. These local governments have made accumulated efforts and practical improvements to enhance the sense of community among residents while there are also local governments which imitated others.

4.3.3 Issues in Maǔl Mandǔlgi

The main themes in Maǔl Mandǔlgi are active participation of an autonomous citizen and building social networks between people and places, to achieve the right to the city and conviviality. With the reputation of this movement, the central government adopted Maǔl Mandǔlgi as a method of urban regeneration. Some politicians included Maǔl Mandǔlgi in their election pledge as alternatives for a new town. However, there were no specific strategies to connect small-sized community movements to a greater scope of urban regeneration. The recognition of Maǔl Mandǔlgi as a government policy contributed to stimulating the movement throughout the whole country, but some model cities remained stagnant, with no results, because of the shallow understanding of the community, and community building process.

Another issue of Making a Livable City Projects through participatory community building was the selection of old cities. The concept of urban regeneration in Korea focused on relatively deteriorated cities, not on one city by time series analysis (Lee, 2008). Emphasizing the significance of quality of life, the government stayed within a developmental perspective, and cities focused on physical advancement and the number of facilities. This material cognition
caused local cities to compete for financial investments, instead of internal growth, and local
governments implemented policies of the central government instead of relying upon their own
local knowledge (Choi, Kim & Hong, 2006).

The local governments’ dependence upon the central government and lack of philosophy for
their own city, was also a problem. Local society needed to be self sustaining, and should have
found creative strategies to enhance the community’s cultural and social well-being. However,
they still followed the same obsolete methods as before, and waited for government assistance or
subsidies.

The articles listed below show problems which arose from some local governments’ attitude
toward the livable city. They focused on developing plans to attract international attention and
investment, instead of residents’ well-being, which resulted in an insufficient budget. Excessive
developmental plans caused the financial crisis in Incheon, Hwa-sung, An-san, and in extreme
cases, it led to a budget deficit and fiscal bankruptcy. The harmful effect of shortages in local
autonomy affected citizens by reducing the funding for welfare (see the articles below regarding
the evaluation of the Local Self-Government System in 2010).

The average financial self-sufficiency of the nation is falling much faster than last year. And the number
of local governments whose financial self-sufficiency is less than 30% will be up to 152. The financial self-
sufficiency of local governments began to drop as fast since 2000, 63% in 1997, but declined below 60% in 1999,
as 59.6%, 57.6% in 2001, 54.8% in 2002. (Hwang, 2010, Aug 15)

The display and wasteful budget operation of the local government had brought about a financial crisis
in local governments in capital region which had been evaluated relatively better financial independence.
Because of useless construction work, such as building new government office buildings and paving existing
roads even though new, local governments waste a large amount of finances to pay interest. For example, the
city of Incheon held a debt of $10 trillion and had to pay $0.3 trillion a year as interest. Hwa-sung and An-san
sell the private land, and some other local governments declared the deferment of payment for the debt because
of finance deficiency. (Kim, Kim, Oh & Huh, 2010, July 13)

The issue of decreased budgets for welfare, resulting from local governments’ financial regression during the Lee, Myung-bak administration has emerged as a hot issue in local elections in this coming June....The National Assembly Budget Office expects that a grant from the national to a local government will decrease because of the reduction of corporation tax and comprehensive real estate holding tax... Thus, the local tax revenue will be reduced up to $24 trillion until 2012...The deterioration of local finance will reduce the welfare project... Daejeon city reduced 152 trillion KRW in 61 welfare project...Choongbuk reduced 24% of the budget in elderly business... (Lee, 2010, March 2).

In addition to this, the disadvantage to local cities are that political, economic, and human resources, along with information, are typically concentrated within the capital region; even community building is more active in Seoul and Gyeonggi-do than in other cities today. In the capital region, most citizens are interested in changing their living places on their own. Because various people from different regions are assembled in the capital region, they are more flexible in responding to changes from having already experienced industrialization and urbanization. Administration and head quarter buildings are also located in this region, and it is faster and easier to access information than in local cities.

On the other hand, in non-capital regions, powerful conservative families dominate local society and politics13, and local governance is not fully recognized by residents. These powerful families support the conservative governing party, while the local government remains focused on the nation’s major political issues instead of the everyday lives of local residents. This centralized political structure discouraged activities and the movement of local residents founded in local areas (Kim, 2003). Powerful local families, and chaebols dominating the local economy

13 Ha (2009) criticized local self-governing system in the beginning encouraged conservative supporting local groups of the central government to come out to the official stage of local politics. The author asserted that this phenomena discouraged decentralization and real democracies and intensified the central political power.
is a huge concern (Kim, 1992; Cho, 2011). Cho (2011) suggested that the local government should regulate money entering local regions in order to support local economies and prevent subordination to *chaebōls*.

Not only have there been the regional differences in capacity for implementation, but in some cases *Maǔl Mandŭlgi* was just another top-down plan creating new hierarchies between participants. Community building should be developed cooperatively as a neighborhood, but it has been progressed as a national policy wherein the central government sets the policy in some areas. Local governments implemented the central government’s policy, and ignored residents in the final decision-making process excluding them from participating in the determination of their own community issues.

The Making a Livable City Project began with good intentions, but in the process, local governments interfered with residents’ participation in order to get budgets approved by the central government. The current system of *Maǔl Mandŭlgi* projects are through the government, and local governments receive funding from the central government after reporting projected budget use and results. This resulted in performance oriented projects, or projects transforming into public displays of policy.

Conflicts against the local government arose as residents became disappointed with local administrations. To make a livable city through participatory planning, the government must give complete authority to communities and allow them to plan and advance issues without time limits. Park (2004) emphasized that decentralization begins at the local community level where daily life exists, and suggested building a global network for connecting communities and promoting social exchanges among them.
In some respects another mistaken premise is that community building is not a ‘business’ that requires profit, nor has an exact starting and ending point. In actuality each community begins from a different initiation point, and is driven by various motivations and active participations.

When people make an effort to revive their sense of community, and improve the community network in a cultural way, the local economy will gradually follow. Citizens, as political subjects, should improve their quality of life and make their voices heard by the central government. Despite the growth of civil society, the government regards citizens not as people who can express their opinions freely and make decisions on national issues, but as non-political and passive social service receivers in Korean society (Kim, 2009). Lower classes struggling in a market-oriented neoliberal society (Shin, 2006: 27), were not trained to make their voices heard by the government, and were excluded from political decisions, and welfare benefits, when compared to the middle classes.

Chapter 4 briefly introduced Korea’s urban planning history, and discussed Maǔl Mandŭlgi movements, and Korea’s community building efforts. In the next chapter, Maǔl Mandŭlgi cases in Korea which were initiated by residents, but progressed by the government, will be observed. Four Maǔl Mandŭlgi cases in four different cities, will be introduced, to demonstrate the requirements of Maǔl Mandŭlgi to develop a livable community and expand to become a livable city.
CHAPTER FIVE: CASE STUDIES: MOVEMENTS OF 1,000 LIGHTS

This chapter introduces four Maül Mandŭlgi cases, in four different cities, in order to show what vital elements of Maül Mandŭlgi are needed to make a livable community and develop it into a livable city. These four cases include the Sŏngmisan network in Seoul; Samdŏk-dong in Daegu; Hanggung-dong (Maül Renaissance) in Suwon; and Munhwa-dong (Si-hwa Munhwa Maül) in Gwangju where living spaces were improved by residents well before the central government adopted Maül Mandŭlgi as a government policy in 2000, and established themselves as imitable livable communities. The first two cases were both initiated from and maintained continuously by residents, but have different social and economic conditions. The latter cases were also initiated by residents, then subsequently taken over and further advanced by progressive local governments.

Through scrutinization of the initial movement involving participation from leading groups and participants, it is evident that contributing effort from local citizens and the local government is very important in creating ownership for a local community. From the investigation of these case studies in Korea, I assert that decentralization and residents’ participatory planning in community building are required to enhance citizens’s quality of life resulting in livable cities.

5.1 CASES: RESIDENTS’ AUTONOMOUS ROLES

Both the Sŏngmisan network and Samdŏk-dong neighborhood were initiated by and are still maintained by residents. Primary focus was given to the residents, and activities were developed to focus on the everyday lives of citizens and also created to each community’s circumstances. This was possible because individual community members closely monitored the movement to detect problems in the neighborhood, and brought this to the attention of leading community members. Consequently, it had a greater effect on the community than the government’s planned
construction projects, or large-scale physical form changes.

5.1.1 Sŏngmisan Network

Until the early 1990s, centuries old elements of Korean culture laid the social foundation for children who grew up while eating, studying, and playing together under the cooperative attention of the entire neighborhood. As community values were replaced with neoliberalism, society moved toward individualistic and consumer-oriented ideals, and the rich competed among themselves for admission to luxurious educational institutions. On the other hand, highly educated young professionals, in their 30s and 40s, who specifically targeted infant care, moved into the Sŏngmisan area and established communal childcare cooperatives in 1994. While raising community nurseries and continuing to enhance the educational and social environment for children and residents, those young couples have affiliated themselves with the neighborhood. As a result, around 1,000 people with 40 community groups, organizations, clubs and meetings at different scales in the community are in operation (Galsoup, 2010; Whi, 2012).

The residents tried to find and solve community issues themselves, even those traditionally handled by the government, or market economy, such as education, shops, and welfare. Instead of depending on politicians for help, the members of this community raised funds for the nursery operation, showed strong ownership and responsibility through both regular and spontaneous meetings at the care center, and focused on preserving the natural environment and human based spaces. These actions strengthened the intangible cultural patterns of the community to run the village (Galsoup, 2010). Community cooperation is a cultural process of identity, trust, place-making, and reciprocal and redistributive institution building (Peattie, 1994; Zukin, 1995; Douglass, 2007, 2012; Masayuki and NIRA, 2007; Park and et el., 2014; Cho & Douglass, 2014).
After building up the community, social cohesion among residents intensified, and the future of the community is actively examined. The efforts to build structure and economic cycles within the community such as establishment of cooperative associations, and community businesses (café, restaurants, and etc) are part of their future plans. This demonstrates that the community can influence the urban form of the city as capital affects.

Mt. Sŏngmi Protection Campaign

While developing community cultures, the Sŏngmisan community had some difficulties. In 2001, the city of Seoul unilaterally decided to build water supply facilities around Mt. Sŏngmi where kids play and residents exercise (Park, 2012). Despite strong opposition from local residents, the development company aggressively pushed ahead with their plans. Physical confrontation between residents and hired “service guards” (gangsters) were covered by the media, construction was halted, and the government came to the discussion table. Sŏngmisan residents and Seoul city were engaged in a fierce battle through public hearings and investigations. Residents in Sŏngmisan and local civil groups actively cooperated, and public opinion siding with the resident’s opposition narrowly won at the resident survey, resulting with the cancel of construction. This event was called the 1st campaign for protecting Mt. Sŏngmi. This was a typical conflict between a traditional administration-led planning and a community-led city planning effort (Park, 2012), although it is uncommon that the public won.

A second protection campaign was directed against the construction plans of the Hong-ik Foundation to move their attached elementary, middle, and high schools into Mt. Sŏngmi in 2005. The Sŏngmisan network recognized the problems, and developed opposing activities to the construction as similar to the Mt. Sŏngmi Protection Campaign in 2003. However, the construction
was planned on private land, leaving local residents with little public recourse. Mountain areas were destroyed and demand for housing, near Mt. Sŏngmi, encouraged land owners to remove existing detached houses and build box-shaped multiplex housings to maximize their rental potential.

Consequently, the influx of capital changed the city’s urban form and community life. Land values soared, the street scape was simplified, and tenants from other cities moved into studio apartments for school, or work. Daily lives became focused on school and work, and not community issues. The Sŏngmisan network is struggling against these changes originating from construction projects by the Hong-ik Foundation and administration. Hong-ik University recently planned to build additional dormitories for foreign students and faculty, igniting the conflict again (Son, Mar 21, 2013).

An involvement, in politics and the decision-making process of its own community issues, was a necessary step to protect the community’s social, cultural, and natural environment from being ruined by mass capitalization (Hwang, 2007). Sŏngmisan people were willing to experiment with something new, or regarded impossible for residents, like attempting communal childcare cooperatives, organizing a local political party, putting up candidates for local elections (Kim, April 15, 2014) who reflect residents’ values, against professional politicians, and promote community business. During the fight against developmental plans, the network gathered support from citizens through demonstrations, film making (Ch’um ch’unŭn sup, Dancing forest), performances and music festivals, and informative lectures to place importance upon the community rather than capital-oriented development.
Evaluations of the Sŏngmisan network are the most encouraging, yet there are also critical opinions that suggest that the Sŏngmisan network rides upon the coattails of rich residents (Making a Livable City seminar hosted by KRIHS, 2012). Residents’ wealth can be advantageous because most projects will succeed with stout financial support. However, it is not a decisive factor in community building, as is obvious from recent case studies of Maül Mandŭlgį. Several local governments began their Maül Mandŭlgį movement with guaranteed financing and programs, by the central government to, but end up with nothing, and in some cases financial crisis. In Sŏngmisan, passionate members of the network established rules that respect individual independence and cooperation within the community, instead of dependence upon economic, or political principles.

The Sŏngmisan network also has difficulties with protecting the neighborhood from damaging influences. With more opportunities to participate within civil society than before (Taylor, 2005), there were still power imbalances between stakeholders (Forester, 1989; Gaventa & Valderrama 1999; Lennie, 1999; Taylor, 2005). Usually the government kept control over information and decision authority, where the administration directed planning without conferring with local residents. During the second campaign, the Sŏngmisan network petitioned the city government and City Council of Seoul, but information about construction was concealed from the public. Regional members of the National Assembly were on Hong-ik Foundation’s side (capital) and those of the City Council supported the development plan (Sŏngmisan village in the city, community, 2010, http://blog.daum.net/kommune/).

While resisting the government, people realized it would be difficult to voice community sentiments during the planning process because of the power hierarchy against big companies and
government officials. In need of politicians capable of speaking for the community, the Sŏngmisan network tried to reduce this power imbalance by electing resident candidates to local elections in 2010 and 2014.

During these difficulties, the Sŏngmisan network tried to stabilize their economic status, and operated community businesses for financial independence, by enhancing cultural associations. In the beginning, community members opened stores to provide good food for children within the neighborhood. Their effort to support community members spread to others outside the community. A consumer cooperative has earned approximately 5 billion KRW (equivalent to 5 million USD), and an organic ice cream store has earned approximately 0.1 billion KRW (0.1 million USD) in 2011 (Yu, 2011). Despite this hard work, the theater and school are still experiencing financial difficulties (Kim, Feb 19, 2012), but residents continue to support these important facilities instead of selling them because the area is used as a children’s play-ground, as gathering places, and as a place for performances for the community.

In short, with more opportunities to participate within civil society than before (Taylor, 2005), there are still power imbalances between stakeholders (Forester, 1989; Gaventa & Valderrama 1999; Lennie, 1999; Taylor, 2005). This is especially true for relationships with the government, who traditionally have more power and control over planning than local residents. Instead of giving up, the Sŏngmisan network members actively argued against unfair power imbalances. Instead of being selfish, they work together for the public good. The Sŏngmisan network, showing positive participation and autonomy among residents, presented a level of citizen control, the highest level in the ladder of citizen participation (Arnstein, 1969), and interactive (empowering) participation (Agarwal, 2001).
The various efforts of the community have made the neighborhood popular, leading to a 66% increase in the area’s population, generally due to education and child care purposes (Dec 30, 2012, Yeonhap news). Over time, the living culture in the community became varied and the economy showed signs of revitalization. After the Sŏngmisan network became known, people interested in communal education and community spirit moved into the area, and visitors increased (around 1,200 people visited the community annually, The Report of Sŏngmisan Maǔl, 2012). In the case of the Mapo Consumer Cooperative, around 2,000 households have joined since opening in 2000, and between 2007 and 2008 it increased by 1,000 members (Whi, 2012).

5.1.2 Samdŏk-dong in Daegu

Samdŏk-dong is a small neighborhood located in downtown Daegu, a secondary cities of Korea which is located 235km (146miles) southeast of Seoul. When compared to other areas of Daegu city, infrastructure and facilities in Samdŏk-dong were well equipped. Because this area was a Japanese residential zone during Japanese occupation, major administrative institutions, such as courts, prisons, tax offices, the national police agency, and official residences of the monopoly bureau were located here, and was the richest village in Daegu until the late 1960s.

Road systems in Daegu city follow a grid line that was advantageous to growing the city during the industrialization period with easy accessibility and good connections to other cities, but it simplified the appearance of the city. Different from other areas in well-aligned cross striped roads, Samdŏk-dong, specifically Samdŏk-dong 3-ga (3rd street) is known for its unique urban forms, traditional Korean homes, Japanese style buildings, and narrow alleys which were naturally formed in the past. It is a small area where 6,396 residents (3,303 households in 2013) live in a 0.64km² area. Most have lived in the community for more than 30 years (Jung-gu district
community center), and autonomous urban experiments to build close relationship among residents were attempted by civil organization and residents in late 1990s. A mixture of historic buildings, alleys, and modern buildings make Samdŏk -dong a good place to observe the modern culture of Daegu city.

On the other hand, the area has aged, and apartment complexes (condominium), have become the primary housing option replacing detached homes, and landowners have moved to suburban areas because new towns were built in the surroundings of Daegu. In these aged neighborhoods, renters started to move in at high rental rates (Kim & Kim, 2010; Cho, Feb 13, 2013). In the 2000s, low-wage temporary employees and self-employed small business owners, focusing on the commercial center in downtown, began to move in this neighborhood as tenants (Kim & Kim, 2010:16) due to its geographic location, close to the commercial zone, and redevelopment plans by the government. In addition to existing tenant residents, new types of tenants entered the community and the bonds within Samdŏk -dong became weaker, and the demand for redevelopment plans became stronger.

*Increasing Social Interaction among Residents: Wall Removal and Mural Paintings*

In 1998, an activist with the YMCA, Kim, Kyung-Min newly moved to Samdŏk-dong 3-ga, led the social and cultural revolution in the community. At first, Kim was seeking solutions for youth problems, from family dissolutions due to the IMF crisis, in the community. He had built shelters for teenage runaways in front of his home in Samdŏk-dong to care for teens, and residents opposed the shelter for fear that the teenagers would cause trouble and negatively influence other

---

14 Shelters for teenage runaway is classified as unpleasant facilities that residents averse to and normally established in commercial zone. However, Kim believed youth can be changed within the community and it worked.
neighborhood children.

Instead of forcibly imposing the shelter on residents, Kim opened opportunities to introduce the troubled youths and residents naturally through community events. He literally broke down the walls between his house and the community (Kim & Kim, 2010; Lee, May 17, 2012) to increase interaction with his neighbors, and planned programs for teenagers and residents together in the alleys and streets. In the beginning, there were concerns about crime and privacy issues (Kim & Kim, 2010), but, in the end, his house became a community gathering place, exhibition, and performance space.

Additionally, painted murals, recycled bicycles and mime festivals were organized in conjunction with the local government, civic groups, local college students, and residents of the community. For the mural paintings, recycled materials such as sawdust, beverage cans, and bottle caps were used to offset costs and create an artistic design. These activities were regarded as an active model for community building and revitalization effort through small-scale changes among urban activists and scholars. This concept quickly spread out into the community and became a precursor to the social movement to reshape the surrounding urban environment.

Not only did physical changes occur within the area, but changes to social aspects of the community also changed. The term place-making means transforming a physical and abstract space to a socially close and specific place through the establishment of relationships within it (Foucault & Miskowiec, 1986). Place-making in Samdŏk-dong started from action of openness and dialogue among residents. Later, the local government provided administrative support and mediated interactions between residents and the central government. Experts voluntarily gave technical advice where professional skills were required, and civic groups were actively involved
in training and educating residents. Artists, volunteers, students, teenagers in the shelters, and children in the community participated together in building and decorating their community (Kim & Kim, 2010; Lee, 2012).

Action to protect the community from the redevelopment boom

Beginning in 1999 the Samdŏk-dong community experienced a “development boom.” It also encountered redevelopment issues, and had difficulties in keeping its community identity intact. The first boom was an increase of studio buildings due to a surge in demand for affordable rentals for students and workers coming from other regions of Korea. Some landlords destroyed existing single houses and constructed flat studio buildings to get more tenants, and permanently influenced the appearance of the neighborhood. Fortunately, some landlords adhered to the residents’ petition to prevent further damage to the community, and this studio building issue was mitigated.

The second challenge, brought about by a construction company, was more serious than the issue of studio buildings. A decision was made to raze a part of Samdŏk-dong, and build an apartment complex. Residents were divided into two sides, and caused great tension. Because of the financial windfall for the landowners, who own houses or land but do not live in the neighborhood, were in favor of the developmental plan. However, tenants wanted to remain in the community, and preserve their neighborhoods.

During the conflict between residents with different interests, real residents accumulated strong attachment to their community, maintained tight bonds with each other, and formed residential associations to deal with development issue. A growing consciousness of civic rights encouraged local residents to participate in consensus building, and all related people, developers and local bureaucrats, landowners, and tenants were involved in the decision-making process.
Local civic associations had played a key role of reproducing a local identity. They supported the community while handling the part which requires a professional field knowledge such as legal processes and construction plans.

While mounting resistance against the redevelopment process, residents learned the significance of speaking with a unified voice, collaborating with civil organizations, handling of formal documents, and collecting and sharing of accurate information was helpful to engage discussions (Kim & Kim, 2010). Stakeholders banded together to object to redevelopment plans and influenced the decision-making process of government and developers in this crisis. *Magojae*, a hub of activists in Samdŏk-dong, became a community center for gatherings and meetings (Kim & Kim, 2010:104), and it reflected the importance of a public space where people can gather and share their opinions with one another.

*Samdŏk-dong identity through the Mime festival and community events*

*Mŏmŏrisŏm*¹⁵ is a title of the annual puppet-mime-festival in Samdŏk-dong. Initially it was created in 2006 to handle conflicts between residents divided during the capital-driven developmental boom. Activist Kim consulted with the Korea Mime Institute (expert) and developed the puppet show idea to combine with mime performances. Today, the puppet-mime-festival has become a global event which invites foreign performers of puppet show and mimes from other countries, and raises significant funds from performances and donations. The village festival organizing committee consists of residents, and manages the festival for community

---

¹⁵ It is a name of floating island that barely keeps its position because being pushed by big flow. Finally it settled down at the certain place (Kim & Kim, 2010). Activists and residents named the title of festival because being similar with Samduck-dong’s situation to keep their everyday life against the capital and wish to protect their place of lifeworlds.
members. This is one of the community businesses that charges admission fees to visitors, non-community members, and sell festival supplies in local stores.

Samdŏk-dong festival is a space program to build up amicable connections between people and public spaces, and served as a cultural content program as well (Kim & Kim, 2010). The main goal of the festival is residents’ enjoyment, and not the number of visitors, nor financial profits. Accordingly, community members actively participated in building close relationships between residents and place, and the residents’ opinion is a top priority for choosing the performances and troupes (Cho, Seong-Jin, the artist in Samdŏk-dong, cited in Kim & Kim, 2010:146). Through this process, Samdŏk-dong ‘residents’ stand to benefit the most from this community building movement.

In this festival, the use of unique stages is also notable. The mime-festival does not require special stages, nor rent performing places. Instead, community spaces, including roads and individual houses within the community, are transformed into a great festival stage (Kim & Kim, 2010:141). During the festival, local residents restrict vehicle traffic on neighborhood streets, and open their front yards to become performance stages. Some residents offered their home bathrooms to visitors during the festival (Ibid. p.143; Nam, 2009; conversation with activist in Daegu, Park, Jae-Woo, 2013). Residents and audiences shared the space and anyone in the community could enjoy the performances, increasing conviviality in the city.

Thoses who assessed results through economic and physical factors had a negative perception in Samdŏk-dong, and said the movement was over valued because there is no statistics to show a substantial growth in community income as a result of the community building movement. However, they do not understand internal exchange, or connection among residents.
Income did not increase rapidly, nor did people move into the area in great numbers, but, a social network was built up and expanded during place-making activities. Residents’ sense of attachment to the community strengthened. Residents are proud that they protected their community and did something constructive for their neighborhood through their own efforts. Because of these interventions, the residents’ ideas of space changed at a steady pace, and are poised to overcome new difficulties in the future.

5.1.3 Conclusion for Cases of Autonomous Movement by Residents

The Sŏngmisan network and Samdŏk-dong have something in common. At first, the Sŏngmisan network raised children with community values, and developed programs to maintain a close link among community members. They also ran community businesses, club activities, and festivals. Due to their efforts to protect the community environment against construction plans, the village’s historic appearance was maintained, only urban form was changed on a small scale, and trust among residents accumulated. While the Samdŏk-dong neighborhood aided to expand social networks within the community, through the puppet-mime-festival, by encouraging residents to participate in the planning of their own community.

Secondly, in their respective situations, both share the experience of standing against large intrusions based upon financial gain. The Sŏngmisan network opposed one developers’ plan to demolish Mt. Sŏngmi, in order to keep the natural and social community environment for local residents. With the success of this opposition the Samdŏk-dong neighborhood subsequently resisted the redevelopment boom. Over time the natural environment has deteriorated in the process, and the urban form has been standardized. Through winning and losing experiences against developers, the Sŏngmisan network came to take an interest in the politics of life, and
publicize the community through on-going campaign activities, like conferences, films, and songs. For Samdŏk-dong, the residents and civil groups cooperated to protect the community against the developmental plans, and the neighborhood gained the confidence to operate organized movements in order to protect their neighborhood.

Thirdly, both communities have a place to gather and discuss within the neighborhood. The community theatre in Sŏngmisan, and magojae (base for activists) in Samdŏk-dong, are meeting places for discourse on community issues. Not only these places, but also elsewhere within the community, such as low wooden benches in front of the community center, the green store where house wives sell recycled items, and also all of the community stores in the network were part of the public sphere where people freely engaged in daily discussions on political and social issues. Most ideas and discussions came from unofficial meetings such as drinking parties or sit-in campaigns. At these informal meeting places, residents took immediate action on these ideas soon thereafter.

Lastly, through sharing activities and standing against unwanted development, Sŏngmisan and Samdŏk-dong expanded diverse networks inside and outside the community. Sŏngmisan started from parents’ sharing information to raise kids, later more people interested in this community culture gathered in this area, developed community programs to decorate landscape or small social/cultural events, and expanded this network outside of the community. In Samdŏk-dong, one activist moved into an old and stagnated neighborhood, tried to build trust and a strong bond among residents like old village town, and resulted in maturation of cultural awareness of the residents. During the development of these programs to bind neighborhoods together, the network expanded to other cities, and even out of the country.
There are differences as well. The Sŏngmisan network in Seoul is abundant in human resources, with young educated middle-class who have the knowledge to plan and shift actions promptly. They quickly took action to struggle against larger financial interests, to protect the community environment, and to realize the importance of directly participating in politics. When confronted with the power imbalance against the government and huge capital resources, they actively resisted to injustice, and organized a political party to express their opinion clearly.

On the other hand, Samdŏk-dong has been active since one activist moved into the neighborhood, but not all residents were receptive to the changes this introduced into the area. The community foundation was stable and people had a strong bond with one another, but they were tentative with the acceptance of unfamiliar changes. Most residents were distrustful of the new comer’s strange plans within the community. Thus, activists and artists gradually developed a trustful relationship by staying in the community and co-mingled with residents over the course of 10 years. When residents were able to welcome the ideas of the civic groups, they collaborated and actively participated in projects that were for the overall benefit of the community.

These two cases tell us that community building is not only successful and lively when the community has many resources in it. Rather, regardless of wealth in the community, activities occur when residents join in the participatory planning process, and make their own plans. Although most residents in Samdŏk-dong are tenants who do not possess property, they still make strong efforts for a livable neighborhood. Through sharing daily culture and activities, the Samdŏk-dong community was revitalized in spite of the lack of capital.

As Habermas was opposed to the expansion of capital and power-oriented systems, with emphasis on the lifeworld and public spheres, it is an issue of the value of communication in daily
life and independent participation (Park, 2005). The public sphere, thought to be limited to the bourgeois, and the political elite, should be a place that anyone can access and raise public issues regardless of gender, class, race and age, and provide fair opportunity for everyone to contribute to the planning process (Fraser, 1990). Building from the works of Habermas and Fraser (among others), the collaborative approach should include all related people and provide them with impartial power to influence decision-making during the planning process.

5.2 LOCAL GOVERNMENT-LED PROGRAMS

Large-scaled housing site development plans by the central government were planned in many other local cities including the Samdŏk-dong neighborhood. They caused immense population outflow into newly developed towns, while urban spaces lost vitality, houses, and infrastructure of downtown areas in local cities were poorly managed (Kim, Sun-Hoe, July 2013). Two local cities, Suwon and Gwangju are regarded as examples of successful administrative support to strengthen residential participation as politicians have gleaned a better understanding of local issues and become more responsive to citizen’s desires and needs (Blair 2000). Many local governments adopted community building through participatory planning as one of urban policies.

5.2.1. Maŭl Renaissance in Suwon

Suwon, Gyeonggi-do’s most populous city,\(^\text{16}\) was known for active civil society, a supportive local government, and a well-organized intermediate system to play a mediation role between the government and residents with respect to Maŭl Mandŭlgi. Community projects and community businesses were legally based on the Chohŭn (Good) Maŭl Mandŭlgi Ordinance, and

\(^{16}\) Population is 1,168,889 (1,140,122 are local and 28,767 are foreign residents in August 31, 2013, Suwon city webpage, https://stat.suwon.go.kr/sub/present/Population.asp).
the citizen group evaluates their process to improve upon so that the positive effect can last.

The administration actively encouraged residents to participate in city affairs since 2010, the 5th local election. Both the mayor and deputy mayor are experts in urban and environmental fields, and administratively support participatory Maül Mandůlgi. Residents handle neighborhood issues, small-scale projects such as improving, or repairing the environment, and city administrators managed large-scaled projects like construction of urban infrastructure (News articles; Yu, 2011; Suwon City Internet Broadcasting Weekly/ Daily News, 2012, Nov 12).

[Table 5-1] Administrative Support Group in Suwon city

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support group</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good Maül Mandůlgi committee</td>
<td>Develop a Maül Mandůlgi operational plan for the year: Program/proposal admission, Modification/ cancelation, and Support, business plan and promotion (Lee, 2012).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative supporting consultative group</td>
<td>Check whether the activities violate the related laws or not, examine practical issues such as project validity and propriety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maül Renaissance special committee</td>
<td>Deliberation and approval of annual project plan/budget which Maül Renaissance submit to Suwon city (Lee, 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate support system (Maül supporting group)</td>
<td>Activity support of youth groups interested in the community issue, expert group of artists and researchers, and each governance organization (Lee, 2012)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Suwon Maül Renaissance Center Webpage, translated by author

As presented table 5-1, administrative support is well organized, and the good administration committee, residents participatory budgeting, citizens’ jury, Maül Mandůlgi ordinance, the ombudsman system are promoted (Ha, 2011; Kang, 2013, May 7) to cooperate with Maül renaissance center. The good Maül Mandůlgi committee is a consulting group for administrative support of urban planning, environmental policies, urban regeneration, culture/tourism, landscapes, housing and construction, traffic, roads, economy/energy, and green spaces/parks (Maül Renaissance Center webpage). It suggests and deliberates upon main policies
and business plans of *Maül renaissance*. The administrative supporing consultative group checks if plans are legally available and practical, the *Maül renaissance* special committee examined the annual plan and its budget, and the *Maül* supporting group supported activists and people interested in *Maül Mandülügi*.

A *Maül Mandülügi* bureau, organized in December 2010, is to manage and support community building, at different levels, with systemized operations. Tasks were deputed to civil society and the *Suwon Maül Renaissance Center* opened a community support center in June 2011 to bridge between the government and residents. *Maül Renaissance center* is an intermediate system, responsible for designing neighborhood plans and budget, and manage networks so that they directly provide residents and local governments with administrative, financial, and professional assistance when required. Suwon city was more flexible support and respect civil society than other local cities.

*Maül Renaissance Center*\(^{17}\): Turning point of *Maül Mandülügi* in Suwon

The *Maül Renaissance Center* is Suwon’s basement of their *Maül Mandülügi* movement. Its policy vision is to recover neighborhoodship, to realize participatory and collaborative governance, and to build new futuristic creative cities (*Maül Renaissance Center* webpage). Under the direct control of the deputy mayor, the center is managed in trust by the Suwon Agenda 21 promotion council, and empowered to promote plans and play practical roles. It directly communicates with residents and administration, and mediate them (refer figure 5-1). Active governance was

\(^{17}\) The name, Maül Renaissance is selected from a naming contest in 2011 among 1,078 citizen participants (Kim, Sun Hoe, July 2013). Renaissance represents ‘reborn,’ and Suwon city looks back on the past where the environment, culture and welfare were harmonized through voluntary activities among community members.
structured among the administration, municipal assembly, citizen and civil organizations, and worked well through the organized intermediate system.

[Figure 5-1] Structure and Process of *Maŭl Mandŭlgi* in Suwon

Source: *Maŭl Renessiance Center*. [http://www.maeulcenter.or.kr/jsp/04_business/business02-1.jsp?mCnt=lm2&sCnt=sm4](http://www.maeulcenter.or.kr/jsp/04_business/business02-1.jsp?mCnt=lm2&sCnt=sm4), author translated in English

Administrative and political circles, that is, the mayor and the local national assembly have a friendly attitude toward citizens’ *Maŭl Mandŭlgi*. Through the city’s and residents’ efforts, Suwon city won the Prime Minister’s award among local economy revitalization cases in 2013.

---

18 “Members of the Suwon national assembly believe that they can exert influence on the region through the *Maŭl Mandŭlgi* project...while experiencing residents’s active participation, they discussed an increase in budget for the community where they are involved...” Chief Lee, Geun-Ho, a representative of Suwon Maŭl renaissance center, is confident that budget and plans are ready with only implementation left (Tippling, 2013, Feb 17).
A new program, Suwon Maũl gyehekdan, a residents’ planning group for neighborhoods, was considered a good model of citizen participation and highly touted by the government. The city was tasked with strengthening expert supporting systems and suggesting bottom-up urban planning models (Park, S.C. June 19, 2013).

The Maũl Renaissance Center sponsored public contests, presentation meetings, resident education, workshops, and community visiting programs each year\(^\text{19}\). The center designed plans on different scales for neighborhoods and cities, and provided residents and civil organizations with professional and administrative information, training programs, and financial support when needed. For neighborhoods, the projects are based on developing community programs and decorating communities. City projects support large scaled villages to construct facilities, sometimes, two to three neighborhood units collaborated to run a community business plan (Yu, 2011). During this process, any opportunity within the range of 5 million to 40 million KRW (equivalent to 5,000 to 40,000 USD) can be discussed (Kim, D. C., Mar 9, 2013).

The center chief Lee, Geun-Ho voiced some concerns about the intermediate system and pointed out the gap between practical and realistic knowledge, and the problems gained from field experience. Suwon city and Maũl Mandũlgi activists both agreed with the concept of community participation, enhancement of social values, and the aims to achieve them step by step. However, each participating group had different ideas about the time-line and scale of development.

---

\(^\text{19}\) The project that invites public participation in the Maũl Renaissance Presentation about the contest: 90 promoting agents, 1,404,281,000 KRW budget. Select citizens of the public participated in the project: 58 promoting agents, 446 million KRW, 96 applications in 2012, selected 80 projects, support 855 million KRW. The center operates expert system. Any residents who want to participate can apply and the center will support them (Lee, 2012).
Experts and activists were adamant about specialized issues, and had to balance that fervor between organizations. Practical issues such as interdepartmental corporation and information sharing still remained, while financing continued to be the biggest issue; communities cannot solely depend on government subsides. The center sought different profitable models, from current budgets, but it was not easy to find a steady source for finance within the community (Kim, D. C., Mar 9, 2013). Yu (2011) evaluated *Maül Renaissance* in Suwon as a process to learn democracy by developing the capacity for resident autonomy with a long-term perspective. Discussions in the institution are determined through the legal and democratic process, while the chief and staffs share authority and responsibility by providing necessary information to the public, compromise, and consent to one another.

**[Table 5-2] Operating Programs of Maül Renaissance Center**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governance building</td>
<td><em>Maül Renaissance</em> open square (small group discussions by topics)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and operation</td>
<td><em>Maül Mandulgi</em> nationwide network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Maül</em> designer workshop (experts workshop)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University network in Suwon (linked with college courses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advisory group for projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Civil immediate support network (Participates in <em>Maül Mandulgi</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td><em>Maül</em> school (for promotion subject of public competition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>empowerment</td>
<td><em>Maül Renaissance</em> school (establish community plans)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban school (operate by team units)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residents education (developed by residents’ application)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Maül</em> school for youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training community worker (training community leader)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visiting domestic and international communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Find and use</td>
<td>Research community to link public contest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community resource</td>
<td>Activistists in the center execute self-investigate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and promotion</td>
<td>Publish news letters on <em>Maül Mandulgi</em>, run a website, have a report meeting of <em>Maül renaissance</em>, study international/domestic cases and research trends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public contest</td>
<td>Hold public contests for <em>Maül Mandulgi</em> projects and educate residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitor the public contests (keep the process and support)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advisory group for the public contests (<em>Maül renaissance</em>-related)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Maül Renaissance Center Webpabe, http://www.maeulcenter.or.kr/ml/infoPlan
Another such popular *Maŭl Mandŭlgi* movement, Hangung-dong, in Suwon city will be introduced. It had started from residents and artists, who collaborated with the city and renaissance center to enhance the neighborhood environment through art projects and exhibitions.

*Hangung-dong: A Case of Residents-began and led Cultural Maŭl Mandŭlgi in Suwon*

In Hanggung-dong, residents and artists work together to display annual public art projects in alleys throughout the neighborhood. It is a good opportunity for young artists to show their talents, and, also for residents to participate in improving their community environment by collaborating with them. It started as a small event for residents, but participants continuously joined the project with creative ideas, and, through collaboration with the *Maŭl* renaissance center, and support from the local government, the artists’ network greatly expanded.

In the past, the Hanggung-dong was filled with people who visited the conventional markets, shopping malls, and theaters located within this area. However, Suwon Hwaseong Fortress, surrounding this neighborhood, was designated as a world heritage site, by UNESCO, in 1997, and the policies focused solely on protecting this cultural asset and all developmental plans inside the Fortress were prohibited. As a result, the community inside the Fortress became physically stagnated, and lost vigor within the social environment (KRIHS, 2011; Seo, J.H. September 16, 2011; Art project with neighbors, *Haenggungpeople* webpage, 2012).

Ms. Lee, a sculptor and founder of *Hanggung-dong people*\(^{20}\), is a resident (13,420 residents in this area, 12,359 local and 1,061 foreign, Suwon city webpage) in this neighborhood. She embraced the community spirit along with the history of Hawaseong Fortress as an important

---

\(^{20}\) An artists-residents organization for community building in Hanggung-dong
intangible cultural heritage (Oh, 2013), and, to invigorate this depressed area, remodeled her 40 year-old house into an alternative space, ‘Noon’ in 2005, with her husband. She wanted the alternative space to serve as a platform between artists, residents, and tourists to revitalize Hanggung-dong.

In 2010, Mr. & Mrs. Lee held an art project called Hanggung-dong People with their neighbors. Artists and residents worked together on mural paintings from May to Oct, 2010. During this process, the alternative space became the base to discover artists and share information among them. The Hanggung-dong resident autonomy committee, the Hanggung-gil development committee, and residents joined to support and participate in the project. With administration support and the people’s interests in the project, the Suwon cultural art development funded project, continued into 2011; when it was then called the Art Project With Neighbors.

For the ‘Art Project With Neighbors: Hanggung-dong People 2012,’ elders in the community were paired with artists and encouraged to participate in making an art village. Lectures about humanities, singing popular songs, pansori (Korean folk play to tell a story using songs), and instrumental music, performed in every small alley to create a new culture during the project period. These events were planned and operated by residents who wanted to contribute their talents to their community. The project explored the history of people and sense of place in Hanggung-dong through forms of art and language, and improved the role of art in human life (Art Project With Neighbors, Haenggung People webpage, 2012).

Hanggung-dong has been designated as a Maül business by the Ministry of Public Administration and Security (MPAS) in 2011 and won an award for excellence in creative tourism business by the Korea Tourist Service, Inc. in 2012 (Yu, K.Y. March 9, 2012). Viewers visiting the
alternative space ‘Noon’ increased from 200-300 to 2,000 people per month, and many couples and families visited alleys filled with mural arts (Oh, 2013). Residents still volunteer their own private living places to serve as public spaces. They continue to run improvement projects with the government through the Maül Renaissance Center and 191 projects are in currently progress (Oh, 2013).

5.2.2 Gwangju Buk-gu

Gwangju\(^{21}\) is another secondary city that is located in southwest Korea, and well known as a socially progressive city where the Democratization Movement\(^{22}\) occurred. Gwangju city and the 5.18 Foundation initiated a world human rights cities network at the local government level, and tried to enhance human rights that the urban poor and minorities lacked. With an advanced civic awareness toward democratization, Gwangju Buk-gu (the local government) had introduced Maül Mandūlgi (at the local government level) during the first local government elected by popular vote in 1995 (Beautiful Maül Mandūlgi white paper, 2010) and implemented resident participation in budgeting for the first time in Korea in 2003.

\(^{21}\) Population of 1,483,818 in 2012 (Gwangju City, 2012)

\(^{22}\) Gwangju Democratization Movement, or called 5.18 civil revolution, occurred in May 18, 1980. In an unstable political situation after the assassination of president Park, Chung-hee, Chun, Doo-hwan staged a military coup on December 12, 1979. Democratic struggles by students, and right to live struggles by laborers spread throughout the nation. The Chun government put martial law into effect in May 17, 1980 for a military take over (dictionary for modern history in Korea, http://terms.naver.com/entry.nhn?docId=920498&cid=830&categoryId=830). Gwangju protested strongly against this, and Chun called upon military troops to repress protestor demonstrations. From May 18 to 27, citizens in Gwangju and Jeollanamdo requested to abolish martial law, asking for the resignation of Chun and his military regimes, and establish a democratic government. Many people in Gwangju were killed and injured during this demonstration against the government. Exact casualties are not clear, but according to statistics of applied victims from the May 18 Memorial Foundation, 240 died, 409 went missing, and 2,052 were injured. The document on the May 18 democratization movement has registered Memory of the World in May 25, 2011. (Dictionary for modern history in Korea, http://terms.naver.com/entry.nhn?docId=920499&cid=830&categoryId=830; The May 18 Memorial Foundation webpage, http://eng.518.org/index.es?sid=a5)
Maül Mandülgi: Beautiful Maül Mandülgi in Buk-gu

The structure of administrative and support center for Maül Mandülgi in Buk-gu is centered on residents. The local government created a ‘resident autonomy team’ in 1999, to directly support Maül Mandülgi within the community center. The team within the government administration was expanded to three agencies, in 2000; ‘Resident Autonomy,’ ‘Private Cooperation,’ and ‘Living Administration’ under the ‘Resident Autonomy division.’ In 2007, an ‘Exclusive Charge for Maül Mandülgi’ team was added, and the Maül Mandülgi support center was created to support the Resident Autonomy division as seen in figure 5-2.

[Figure 5-2] Sutrcture of Administrative and Support Center in Buk-gu Maül Mandülgi

When the Maül Mandülgi movement in Gwangju Buk-gu was designated as a model city, the district office reorganized the system and established five themes. The district office shared

---

23 The Town is the World (every neighborhood has a village vision, agenda, regulations, meetings, and newsletters); Humans are the Future Hope (every neighborhood activates individual programs for children, male, female, elders, and multicultural to foster human resources); Learn About One’s Own Community (diverse study clubs, program to learn about the community, small library program, and living culture program); Expand Social Network (active community program in small alleys, neighborhood meeting, village festival, and neighborhood governance structure); Learn From the Process (Maül Mandülgi network center, grass-root
duties and built networks among participants. The local government provided residents and civil groups with administrative and financial support, and professionals gave advice to promote community projects. Activities were divided by period with goals in each stage: establish an introductory base (2000-2003), set and institutionalize (2004-2006), and develop and spread out (2007-2009). Existing residents’ activities were reorganized into three movements: cultivating the living condition of the neighborhood, fostering community leaders, and forming local communities (Gwangju Buk-gu district office).

**The village in poem and picture: representative project of Maül Mandülgi in Buk-gu**

Among the various neighborhoods, Munhwa-dong neighborhood was the most well known Maül Mandülgi case in Gwangju. The si-hwa munhwa Maül took first place among all villages of the livable city projects in 2007, and received the grand prize at the Resident Autonomy Fair in 2008 (Beautiful Maül Mandülgi white paper, 2010; MLTMA, 2007; Jang, August 4, 2013). In 2013, si-hwa munhwa Maül won an award of excellence in a local culture brand contest24, hosted by the Ministry of Culture, Sports, and Tourism (MCST) and was awarded 40 million KRW (approximately 40,000 USD) in project funds.

Korea’s National Housing Corporation’s advanced housing site development plan was implemented in Munhwa-dong. Instituted in 1980s, it was designed to be a half residential area where apartment complexes for low-income families coexisted with a natural village (Jeon, Kim & Hwang, 2008). Since the government had developed this area about 30 years prior, but not

---

24 2013 local culture brand contest by MCST is a project to select an excellent cultural brand in a region/city unit to spread a local culture development model centered on people. This is the 2nd year (park, August 4, 2013).
maintained, urban infrastructure became deteriorated, some spaces were abandoned, and used as a foul-smelling waste area. Residents in Munhwa-dong wanted to change the space, and began to clean the neighborhood at their own expense.

In 2000, the area was rehabilitated into ssamji park\textsuperscript{25}. In 2002, a local poet and writer Mr. Lee, Jae-Gil led the campaign to transform the area into a cultural village. Residents decorated the neighborhood with poems, pictures, sculptures, made decorative doorplates to hang on every house, and built flower beds along the bottom of neighborhood walls. The Gwangju YMCA and \textit{Good Neighborhood Making Groups} participated in painting murals and planting fruit trees (Jeon, Kim & Hwang, 2008). This was named as a \textit{Si-Hwa Munhwa Maŭl Golmok Yesulgwan}; an alley museum in the cultural village with poems and pictures.

Later, the Munhwa-dong neighborhood was included in a ‘beautiful \textit{Maŭl Mandŭlgi}’ project hosted by the Buk-gu district, with a resident autonomy committee, administration, and experts (Gwangju Jeonnam development institute, 2005). It started on a small scale, as seen in table 5-3, such as wall paintings, mosaic plates of poems and pictures, and decorating alleys with art pieces. It cost 9.6 million KRW (around 9,600 USD), of which 1.6 million KRW (equivalent to 1,600 USD) came from the residents (Moon, 2008). With the success of the project, the second project was selected as a model by the local government, and the scale became bigger.

\textsuperscript{25} Ssamji means a small pouch in Korean to attach waist, made of paper, cloth, or leather to carry cigarette and metal on flint. Ssamji park is a small sized park located inside a city for neighborhood. Benches, lamps and green space are equipped in the park, and it is always open to the public. Normally the park locates at a nodal points of main pedestrian road (Real estate dictionary, http://terms.naver.com/entry.nhn?docId=586336&cid=2893&categoryId=2893; personal blog, what is Ssamji park?, http://rja49.tistory.com/2060
The second projects were to decorate the walls around apartment complexes with art pieces, to hold essay contests, and to establish poetry books. It cost 34.8 million KRW (around 34,800 USD), while 6.8 million KRW (around 6,800 USD) came from residents’ donations. As this area became well known as a cultural space, 10,000 people visited in 2012 (Jeon, Kim & Hwang, 2008). The resident committee campaigned to designate the area as a cultural district, and proposed to construct an art museum and exhibition area to exhibit local artists (Jeon, Kim & Hwang, 2008; August 3, 2013, dokseo newspaper; Jang, August 4, 2013; Park, August 4, 2013).

[Table 5-3] Annual Projects of Cultivating Living Place in the Neighborhood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Project name</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Project name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Build Small Parks</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Si-Hwa Munhwa Maül I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Install Symbolic Sculptures for Harmonization</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Si-Hwa Munhwa Maül II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Si-Hwa Munhwa Maül Mndlgi</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Make Doorplate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Construct Trails</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Moon, Yeon-Sic (2008), A study of a citizen’s consciousness survey of community making: focused on Gwangju metropolitan city Bukgu Moon-Hwa-Dong.

Improved community environment, by local artist groups and residents, were developed as specialized image of ‘art’ and ‘culture’ by the local government (Moon, 2008). While this was considered an example of cultural movements starting from small neighborhoods and influencing a whole local region (Jeon, Kim & Hwang, 2008; Lee, 2012), it seems that residents’ spontaneous movements are being adopted into the local government’s business plan for city marketing.

The projects became simple, and the local government and resident committees focused on building facilities to embody their achievements as the movement became institutionalized, scaled up, and subsidized. Gwangju Buk-gu is certainly progressive and mads various efforts for residents’
autonomy at the local government level compared to other local governments, but it also suffers from unsustainability and lack of security because of the limitation of residents’ participation (Beautiful Maǔl Mandûlgi White Paper, 2010). It would be better to build a small cultural center that is operated by the residents, and fitted into the theme of Maǔl Mandûlgi, rather than constructing a convention center, or commercial high rise buildings, using local government funds to showcase a glamorous landscape.

The Gwangju Buk-gu district office had constructed a convention center and symbolic road, which connects Mt. Mudeung and the 5.18 National Boundary of Grave Sites on the axis of si-hwa munhwa Maǔl (MLTMA, 2007; Beautiful Maǔl Mandûlgi White Paper, 2010), aiming to connect open spaces on the basis of culture (poems) with people. The government’s intention to construct parks, trails, and cultural facilities, for superficial environs and marketing is a scaled-up approach to attract more visitors to the region; as opposed to maintaining the existing cultural environment in which residents and local culture are the attraction.

Culture is not artificially made, but naturally formed while people continue to live. It is, in many cases, unfortunate that constructing a cultural facility is not for raising conviviality of the community, but for advertising the local government’s policy. It is more similar to a city marketing strategy, than representing the residents’ lives in the community. The Buk-gu district office attempted to encourage residents to join in the planning process, yet final decision-making was left to the chief of the district office, not with residential concensus. According to the Beautiful Maǔl Mandûlgi White Paper (2010), scholars and residents committee in Buk-gu were selected by the administration as a weak point of Buk-gu Maǔl Mandûlgi. Unlike the Sŏngmisan network where residents identify their needs in the community and act directly toward political issues
related with their community, the Buk-gu Maül Mandūlgi participated in the process by asking the government administration to intervene for residents.

*Participatory Budgeting*

Gwangju Buk-gu can be labeled as a progressive city as it is the first city to adopt a participatory budgeting system in Korea. A participatory budgeting system encourages residents to directly participate in the process of compiling the budget, and has the intention to improve the transparency of financial management and responsibility, and strengthen citizen capabilities (Jin, 2004; Kim, 2007; Kang, 2011). In 2004, Gwangju Buk-gu introduced a participatory budgeting system and announced the *Resident Participatory Budgeting Operating Regulations* for a legal and institutional foundation in 2004.

The operating regulation in Buk-gu is composed of six chapters and 33 articles that include public disclosure of financial management (article 3). All information is released and receives resident participation, from the budgeting stage, by the head of the district office (article 5), establishing a citizen committee for budgeting consists of 100 people (article 7), holding budget policy debates to collect residents’ ideas before the compilation of the budget (article 20), and establishing a research society for residents participatory budgeting to operate an efficient system (article 31) (Gwangju Buk-gu Residents Participatory Budgeting Operating Regulations, http://elis.go.kr/newlaib/laibLaws/h1126/laws_list.jsp?lawsNum=29170116201011, retrieved on Oct 1, 2013).

The local national assembly and citizen committee primarily suggest budgets. However, the budget is only completed after having gone through deliberations and modifications by the public-private committee. While the original budgeting process fairly simple, the process of achieving
fiscal democracy in participatory budgeting is further complicated with the addition of training for residents, and consideration of public opinions (Jin, 2004: 35). The process and period of participatory budgeting in Gwangju Buk-gu is summarized in table 5-4.

[Table 5-4] Process of Residents Participatory Budgeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Detailed process</th>
<th>Month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educating citizens technical terms to</td>
<td>Budget Presentation</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>encourage participation</td>
<td>Explain methods, and encourage village chief, members of local conference, and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>citizens to participate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget School</td>
<td>Educate citizen committee members, local conference, and citizens</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local conference</td>
<td>Collect citizens’ opinions through local conferences by individual communities</td>
<td>7-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Policy debate (Pre-briefing)</td>
<td>Plan Audit collects residents’ opinions</td>
<td>8 or 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruct Fiscal Guidance</td>
<td>Plan Audit instructs all administrative organizations</td>
<td>8-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collect residents’ opinions</td>
<td>Administrative organizations present written requests on webpages and collect</td>
<td>9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collect opinions of local conferences and</td>
<td>requests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>submit written requests</td>
<td>Open written requests to the public</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliberation and Adjustment of the budget</td>
<td>Administration consultates and adjusts, and presents the results to the public</td>
<td>October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Policy debate (by detailed field)</td>
<td>Each department explains written budget requests to a citizen committee and</td>
<td>9 or 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>collects residents’ opinions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council discussion</td>
<td>Chairman and vice chairman discuss budget proposals before presenting to the</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General discussion on policy and going</td>
<td>Planning Audit, collecting residents opinion</td>
<td>10, or 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public with budget proposals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conciliation committee meeting</td>
<td>Adjusting and reflecting of the meeting from participatory budgeting councils</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget proposal Confirm</td>
<td>After collecting residents’ opinions and getting approval from the head of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>district office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit to the assembly</td>
<td>Review the budget proposal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Feedback</td>
<td>Feedback from residents</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Citizens’ participation in the financial decision-making process trains and empowers the average citizen. At the beginning of the budgeting system in 2005, participatory budgeting was new to citizens, and involvement was very low. Participation is now increasing, with an average of 10-30% of proposals presented by citizens are being adopted (Gwak, 2009; Gwangju Buk-gu district).

5.2.3 Conclusion of Cases of Local Government-Led

Several local cities adopted policies and physical models of livable city projects in Seoul City, to pursue maximum profits and quantitative growth. It resulted in producing similar designs of urban spaces with apartment complexes and large-scaled commercial buildings for speculative purposes. City planning became a business model consistent with cost-benefit calculations to generate profits. In contrast to this, capital-oriented activities, the “community building” approach, called Maül Mandülg, emphasizes the right of the city for all residents.

Participatory and interactive actions are the central ideas in the process of the residents’ participatory planning approach (Friedmann, 1973; Forester, 1989; Innes, 1995 & 1998; Healey, 1998). The social process of communicative action interaction and discourse among participants to reproduce and negotiate life worlds (Butz & Eyles, 1997). Cooperation through producing and consuming social relationships, through participation activities, help everyone to reach a consensus in planning. In this process, the participants share information equally, to discuss common issues, and their thoughts should be respected through the communicative action process. Mayors established autonomy support for ordinances, and promoted cultural and art projects with civic organizations and resident associations.
Neighborhoods in Suwon and Gwangju have operated community building activities since the 1990s, and further expanded when selected as model cities of government-sponsored livable city projects from 2007 to 2009. Both followed the central government’s policy, but focused on the local community and tried to give power to local governance. These two local governments tried to be independent from the central government. Recently, these cities joined together to build landmarks rather than small improvements. Cities constructed urban planning facilities such as exhibition spaces, and cultural villages to advertise their city to the outside world (Kang, March 9, 2015). Gwangju Buk-gu is constructing a poem and picture museum, with subsidies from the government, instead of using the funds designated for social services and the urban poor.

5.3 CONCLUSION OF CHAPTER FIVE

In this chapter, Maŭl Mandŭlgi projects in the four cities of Seoul, Suwon, Daegu, and Gwangju were selected, and their strengths, weaknesses, and conditions for positive participatory community building were investigated to help the readers’ understanding. The findings from these cases are compiled and analyzed to develop a list of innovative tools for community building.

The relationship between local governments and communities is presented in various ways, and it is not necessarily mutually supportive. Suwon and Gwangju, the local government-led cases, tend to be progressive cities, and are capable of supporting communities administratively and financially. However, if the local government’s capacity is weak, then the community should lead activities without assistance. Furthermore, even if the local government’s capacity is strong, not all communities can be supported.

The Sŏngmisan network is located in Seoul, and Mayor Park’s messages are supportive. However, the district office and central government have a negative view on this community
regarding them as the left, or a political opponent of the government (Hangyoreh Daily and Monthly Chosun in 2013). The Sŏngmisan village openly acts against the government’s authoritative decisions, and elects its own representatives to political positions capable of influencing the decision making process, instead of depending on sitting politicians and receiving financial support from them. Samdŏk-dong in Daegu is not against the local government, but it is processed with or without the local government’s support.

While active participants lead the community to change, residents’ participation should be applauded for not being satisfied with a one time event, but instead remaining persistent over time. In Sŏngmisan, people form various organizations to include members of different ages, interests, jobs, and races. In Hangugung-dong, elderly citizens, usually excluded from activities, were partnered with residents and directly participated in art projects. In Samdŏk-dong, people who do not participate in community building activities provide their walls to be decorated. Through this, the home owners, residents, and artists perform a mutual exchange, create unique urban form, and attract visitors from neighboring communities to their community.

Along with residents’ interests, cooperation with civil society is important as well; especially when the community’s ability, by itself, is not enough to proceed with Maŭl Mandŭlgi. An example of this cooperation would be Samdŏk-dong, a deteriorated residential neighborhood of low income tenants that might have been swept away for redevelopment projects if not for activist Kim, the YMCA, and volunteering artists. Alternative space noon in Suwon, the poet Mr. Lee, Jae-Gil, and civil organizations in Gwanju initiated improvements in this area and persuaded residents to maintain their communities’ well-being.
Each community has a different capacity and environment, and appropriate programs should be adapted accordingly instead of copying a previous project’s efforts and expecting similar results. For example, both Samdŏk-dong and Hanggung-dong planned art projects, for their communities, but operated in different ways because of differing resources. Hanggung-dong attracted young and talented artists into the community, and developed artists and residents paired program. On the other hand, the Samdŏk-dong area is aged and did not have as large a pool of artists as Hanggung-dong, therefore, college art students joined the mural painting project, and residents provided their walls to the students as canvases. Different strategies were applied to the same art projects in different communities.
CHAPTER SIX: CONCLUSION
RECONCEPTUALIZING COMMUNITY (RE-) BUILDING
FROM AN ASIAN PERSPECTIVE

This chapter analyzes the four cases discussed in the previous chapters, elucidates the components of a livable city in Korea, and makes policy suggestions for secondary cities to improve their communities through Maül Mandülgi; participatory community building. While the case cities in this research are still evolving through the participatory processes, each city illustrates different lessons on community building strategies. For example who can and who cannot participate, what activities are permissible, and how people have struggled to change unfair rules. The cases also show what is required for successful participatory community building, and what strategies are not being applied. Simple contact process for communicating with bureaucracy, methods of access to urban information, and using the public sphere such as public hearings, and conferences, would tell the effects of empowerment and participation in making these cities livable.

6.1 LESSONS FROM MAŬL MANDŬLGI

6.1.1 Analysis of Case Studies (Answers for Research Questions)

There are inspirational elements in Maŭl Mandŭlgi such as active participation of residents and collective actions for community improvements. These are equally important as the issue of connection, or bonding within the community. Similarly with the machizukuri movement in Japan of “small scale community building,” Maŭl Mandŭlgi emerged organically. Through Maŭl Mandŭlgi, people were able to implement their desire to volunteer to improve their communities.26

26 However, in Korea like in Japan, it often seemed like outside groups (scholars, activists) used the name “maŭl mandŭlgi” in order to name an existing phenomenon. At first a range of names were applied to des
Such active participation promotes the rights of citizenship and provides the opportunity for democratic governance (Gauventa & Valderrama, 1999). Social justice, open access, equality, diversity, and multiple publics within the public sphere should be promoted through collaborative planning (Fraser, 1990). People involved in the collaborative planning process must consider how to work together with all relevant parties, particularly those marginalized, and historically silenced, in society.

Both the resident groups of Sŏngmisan and Samdŏk-dong demonstrated aspects of the collaborative planning components mentioned above. They began to solve community issues through their own initiative, from the bottom up, and tried to lead activities based on the pursuit of creating linkages between the traditional community and their own identities. Furthermore, this approach has been maintained over time while involving anyone interested in community issues regardless of property, academic ability, job, and age.

The Sŏngmisan people trained themselves to communicate and how to develop plans through meetings. They eliminated hierarchical relationships between members, and all information related to community projects was shared, and everyone had a right to engage in the decision making process for the community. They admit a variety of individuals and were receptive to different ideas keeping open minds, resulting in voluntary actions to solve community problems independently, via horizontal communicative actions (Whi, 2012; Sŏngmisan Maŭl Investigation

---

27 Koreans have different forms of language depending on the age, status, and relationship. This is good to show respect, but, sometimes, emphasizes hierarchy between people, and give authoritarian feelings. Also, some people call others by their status, for example, CEO Kim, or teacher Lee. Sŏngmisan people thought that implies hierarchy and power imbalance between people. Therefore, nick-names were created to eliminate honorific words.
While promoting community planning activities in Samdŏk-dong, the activists did not force residents to follow their directions, nor appeal to their emotions. Instead, opportunities for existing residents and youths to get to know each other and work together, were arranged. While residents cooperated with activists, artists, and runaway youth, strong trust developed among them, and their concerns expanded to the entire community. Despite a small budget and a deteriorated community environment, programs such as painting contests, mural paintings, a mime festival, and community events were brought to life through everyone’s participation and contributions. These included sharing a yard for the performance stage, private restroom access for visitors, and finding recycled materials for the community to use.

From the cases, it was reconfirmed that communicative action among people in different positions, should be built upon a social infrastructure, in which information, knowledge, and understanding can flow around related people (Healey, 1998:177), and the inclusiveness and efforts to balance power among people are important factors in community building (Forester, 1989; Innes, 1999; Hickey & Mohan, 2004; Taylor, 2005). Although Sŏngmisan’s community planning efforts could be considered very successful, it is unique in being located in the Mapo district of Seoul which has strong social capital and attracts residents.

Suwon and Gwangju Buk-gu presented cases where the local governments and intermediate level entities, such as community support centers and resident councils, played creative roles in local governance. They emphasized decentralization, instead of following the existing framework of the central government’s guidelines. Communities in both cities have built strong relationships with residents for a long period of time, and initiated their own activities for their
neighborhoods. In the meantime, the central government, in following global trends, shifted their priorities from a purely construction and modern image focus to historic preservation and traditional identity, and community building became one of the planning policies. Existing community programs were fit into this framework, and instituted as local government policy to revitalize small/medium sized local cities.

The difference between Suwon, Gwangju and other local governments are that these two cities established an intermediate system to provide residents more discretionary power and liberty. While local governments provided administrative and financial support, the intermediate system helped the government and residents communicate, relieve conflicts, and train residents to improve their communication methods, expand their human network beyond the reach of the immediate community, and explore avenues for financial stability so that residents can promote community building on their own even without government support. Through this relationship, local governments improved their reputations as progressive and human-oriented cities and residents were able to strengthen their communities.

The local government’s position in relation to the communities in these four cases are markedly different: hostile (Sŏngmisan), amicable, or showing neglect (Samdŏk-dong), and actively supportive (Suwon and Gwangju). Sŏngmisan is the most self-reliant and shows a high level of participation compared to the other three communities (refer figure 6-1). Samdŏk-dong residents were vigilant about community issues, and the development of the city, where the community is involved, through cooperating with civil organizations. The cities of Suwon and Gwangju encourage citizens to participate in community issues by providing training programs and support systems.
Though they may fail at problem solving, from time to time, participating people learn how to deal with community issues through their participatory experience. Participants learn from their experiences and, as result, can develop new and improved strategies for current and future problems. Ironically, the Sŏngmisan network has been developed through struggling, and interacting with external forces such as the government, local government, and financial capitals. They refuse nominal, or passive participation (Agarwal, 2001). Instead, they actively plan and lead their activities, and empower all members in the community through active participation. People in Samdŏk-dong also learned methods to negotiate and officially present requests for what they want of the government while they collaborated with civil organizations and activists in order to fight against development boom.

[Figure 6-1] Level of Participation and Decentralization of four communities

Source: author, referring Douglass (2001), and Agarwal (2001)
6.1.2 Other Necessary Factors besides Residents’ Participation

Financial independence of main agents, such as community and civil society from the local and central government, and local governments from the central government, is an important issue of decentralization. Residents and local governments should use their budgets to lead local-oriented projects, but not all communities and local governments are wealthy enough to operate such projects. In most cases, local governments are subsidized by the central government and implement projects that correspond with the central government’s vision.

Sŏngmisan has sought ways to find financial stability by retaining residents’ money for their own projects. They created Dae-dong gye, a community bank, in 2006 and planned budgets for community projects. Certain amounts of money were assigned to regular improvement of the neighborhood, and any individual, or organization, can borrow money for community related projects (Yang, 2011, Apr) such as a community picnic, running community stores, and annual community festivals. Samdŏk-dong is not a rich community, and cannot afford what the Sŏngmisan community has accomplished. Instead, the people of Samdŏk-dong searched for alternative methods to advance community activities with a small budget, and recycled materials to reduce prices. Activists and residents announced what they would do in the community, and steered spontaneous collaborations between residents and local art major students.

After the collaborations gained popularity, some communities became subsidized by the local government, and neighborhoods used this money to maintain mural paintings and community facilities, as opposed to constructing ostentatious buildings to show off their new financial tributes from the community. In the case of local governments, it is difficult to have substantial financial autonomy due to the lack of production facilities in local regions, low rates of local taxes and
continuous population outflow (Ha, 2011), but cities like Gwangju Buk-gu and Suwon try to reduce inappropriate budget use through participatory budgeting systems by using money for needed projects instead of needless construction work.

Along with financial independence, intermediate organizations and administrative cooperation are helpful for local cities that are not knowledgeable in community building. While members in Sŏngmisan were able to handle their own networking, and expanded activities into politics to solve their community issues, the Maŭl Renaissance Center (Suwon city) and residents committee (Gwangju Buk-gu district office) played active roles at the local government level. They appropriately established and implemented policies within the frame of institutionalized roles, worked to incorporate residents’ voices while allocating and executing budgets, and support community projects through the political system. In Samdŏk-dong, the YMCA encouraged residents, initiated programs, and completed paperwork for funding applications.

Within the planning process, both the government and the intermediate systems should provide all people with full and equal information to be equally empowered (Innes, 1998:60) and involved. Information is produced through a social process and it becomes ‘intellectual capital’ (Gruber, 1994; Innes et al., 1994). People produce and consume social relationships in society through communication, and members can communicate and interact without constraints during the planning process. Developing consensus for everyone should be built through interaction and discourse. Therefore, information exchanges occur freely in a public sphere, and the public sphere should be equally accessible to all interested people.

Finding and fostering people willing to participate in community events, are also an important issue to continue participatory community building. The Sŏngmisan and Samdŏk-dong
cases show the creativity and passion available through investing human resources, and how they played significant roles in building active and livable communities. Therefore, the chief of the Renaissance Center emphasizes cultivating young leaders for the future (Kim, 2013, Mar). Foley & Putu (2005) suggested that civic education to empower excluded people is vital, through acquiring knowledge and experience, because they can benefit from any positive opportunities to participate. For sustainable community building, it is important to train and secure social capital, and fit people into the appropriate positions to succeed.

6.1.3 Findings for the Research Questions

Case cities give clues to the questions’s answers:

Question 1: What are the individual, and collective, socioeconomic incentives, and disincentives, associated with participation in community building?

During the community building process, factors considered as obstacles, or disincentives, were solved through participants’ efforts. From the Samdŏk-dong case, most residents were old and poor, and were distrustful of the newcomers’ strange plans to make changes within the community. Although tentative towards accepting change, or the unfamiliar, residents have a stable community foundation amongst themselves. Therefore, when they had an opportunity, the emergence of activists for changes, both activists and community members collaborated and actively participated in projects that were to the overall benefit of the community through the gradual development of a trusting relationship by activists co-mingling with residents for over 10 years.

During this process, participation helped to develop civil society and the attention given to the needs of local leadership. In 2006, during the opposition against redevelopment plans in
Samdŏk-dong, alternative space *noon* in Suwon, and the poet Mr. Lee, Jae-Gil and civil organizations in Gwanju initiated improvements in this area and persuaded residents to maintain their community’s well-being.

While every community has different capacities for everyday life and environment, each community should adapt appropriate programs that address each area’s specific identity. Samdŏk-dong and Hanggung-dong both planned the art projects, but operated in different ways because of differing resources. Hanggung-dong had young and talented artists, and could develop the artists and residents paired program. However, Samdŏk-dong residents lacked young people and a pool of artists when compared to Hanggung-dong. College art students joined the mural painting project, and residents provided their walls to the students as canvases. Therefore, different strategies were applied to the same art projects as they applied to the specific characteristics of each community.

Relationships between the community and the government can also vary during the community building process. Sŏngmisan and Samdŏk-dong’s revitalization showed the importance of relationship building, and the importance of bringing in new networks through their professional social capital while also being inclusive. Sŏngmisan openly opposed and acted against the government’s authoritative decisions, and selected its own representatives as government candidates to make political decisions; they later cooperated and received financial support from the city. On the other hand, Samdŏk-dong initiated by community residents, later supported, activities expanded by local government.

In the case of Gwangju and Suwon private citizens also initiated activities that were subsequently taken over by local government. Local governments provided for residents designed events and carried out activities with funding through the intermediate system and residents’
committee. Throughout this process residents maintained a close relationship with all parties involved, and also negotiated with the local government. The intermediate system was better with managing funding and plans, while arbitrating the dispute, because they have a more knowledgable and experienced group of people.

Question 2: How can improvement of the cultural environment of the community, through place-making and historically rooted urban design, benefit the local economy?

Improving a community’s cultural environment does not instantly improve the local economy. However, it does help to build close social relationships among participants, and make people work for the community resulting in earing subsidies from the government, gaining public attention, and attracting investment from private companies or individual supporters. It was helpful that the four case cities were popular and had the social capitals to be selected as model cities during making a livable city project by the government. As a result, those cases are more frequently mentioned at the conference, or the public hearings, and have more chance to announce their efforts at the livable city-related lecture.

Residents with a close relationship with one another voluntarily established and run community businesses (social enterprises) within the community network to meet residents’ needs. Sŏngmisan and Samdŏk-dong ran these community businesses, and funded them through collaboration with the city. Sŏngmisan, on the other hand, has built a self-sustainable system for community management. Creative aspects of urban culture create the economy (Jacobs, 1961; Zukin 1997). The social well being of the residents’ has positively influenced the local economy for the benefit of society.
In Sŏngmisan, residents requested, established, and run community businesses within the community network for residents’ needs. Currently, Sohaengju, meaning Happy Houses with Communication, is providing residents with multi-unit dwelling by sharing community spaces. Fourteen activists invested in recycling stores, gave lectures, and ran a flea market every week. Besides a community kitchen, an organic side dish store started by mothers in the community for children in the community, an organic ice cream store in which five mothers initiated and invested, and organic restaurants whose ingredients are purchased directly from local producers, or through Doore Consumer Cooperatives are actively running. Mapo Doore Consumer Cooperatives, a community grocery store had 100 Households in 2,000 to 5,500 house holds in 2011. These stores are not only making profits for the community, but also regarded as a cultural and communicative spaces.

Although the scale and variety of community businessed are smaller in Samdŏk-dong than those in Sŏngmisan, Samdŏk-dong is also planning social enterprises to increase the connectivity of the community. The store called Peace Trade takes care of teenagers and supports job opportunities, a bicycle production store created jobs for the elderly by asking them to decorate used bicycles for the performance.

Question 3: What makes a city livable: 1,000 different lights (resident initiated projects), or a single large scaled-up construction project led by the government? What is the difference between grass-roots movements, and a local government’s large scale project?

Developers can make new towns with modern highrise buildings, and artificially built environments. However, they cannot create social relationship and urban vitality. This was proven through several New Town Projects situated throughout the country, a Dong-daemoon Design
Center (Seoul), Daegu baseball stadium, huge monuments with large budgets for a singular use of space during special occasions, but otherwise remain empty throughout the year. The urban space is produced through struggle over consumption by its users (Harvey, 1982; Lefebvre, 1992). Urban-orientated mobilizations influence social changes and urban context (Castel, 1983). That is, people and social cultures within the community, developed organically within a place while maturing, or collaborating, cannot be replaced by creating a physical environment.

In Samdŏk-dong, social, cultural, and economic feature of the areas were initiated by open dialogue among residents. Administrative support from the local government, and technical advice from experts were offered to residents where professional skills were required. Civic groups became actively involved in training and educating residents, while artists, volunteers, students, teenagers in shelters, and children throughout the area became active in beautifying their community.

The cases in this research show that grass-root movements, or Maül Mandülgi, concern all residents and help to develop activities, familiar to everyday lives, and suitable for each community’s circumstances. Citizens closely monitored activities throughout the community to detect problems within the neighborhood, and brought these issues to the attention of other community members. Residents build links, or networks among themselves, adopt and share similar values, and connect tightly in a social, cultural, and physical manner. Consequently, grass-root movements have a greater effect on the community than the government’s planned construction projects, or physical form changes on a larger scale.

Question 4: During community building efforts, what are the differences between cities in capital and non-capital regions?
Intensive capital regions and small centers in local cities absorbed major social resources in education, culture, and the economic field (Ha, 2012:158). In the local election in 2010, local and national politicians began to take interest in daily local issues and paid attention to life politics; this changed the local power structure between the government and communities.

From the case studies in this research, each community had its own identity and started their Maül Mandŭlgi movement for their own needs. In the capital region the movement is characterized by greater participation by young people than in non-capital regions. Community movements in the capital region benefit from the resources available to participants. For community building movements in secondary cities, local governments can provide reliable funding, and train passionate residents in pursuit of participatory planning. Grass-root movements in local regions collaborate with the local government, encouraging local residents, while staying close to them, and providing practical assistance.

6.1.4 Conclusion of Case Studies

In the past, national policy and nationwide economics were most influenced by elections (Ha, 2012), and nations regarded politics as a specialized field. Therefore, the power to make important decisions were given to soley politicians and government officials. Nowadays, the quality of everyday life, and local agendas, have become essential subjects for the people as decentralization of political administration has made it possible for local voices to be heard and, as citizens try to figure out their living environment necessities and seek solutions for themselves. Through civil society these participatory efforts, to improve their living environment, are a component of life politics. Life politics exists in the same context with Maül Mandŭlgi; that power is produced through social interactions (Taylor, 2005), and balancing this distribution of
power is required to bring idealized communities to realization. In recent planning ventures, partnerships and collaboration between ‘social partners’ are more influential than the ‘command and control’ of regulation (Healey, 1998: 170).

Many scholars give the growth of NGOs from the 1990s credit for having played a significant role in the development of Korea’s civil society in political, social, and economic perspectives (Koo, 2002; Kim, 2003; Choi, 2010), as they will continue to play an important role in the future development of local governance. The state remains powerful in Korean society (Choi, none; 108), but civil society is evolving as well, and it is necessary for not just NGOs, but also the government, and citizens, to make cooperative efforts together. Community centers should work not just to provide residents with lectures and sports classes, but to become public places to gather for political discourse, for free speech, to discuss local affairs, and enjoy the liveliness of a community. Local NGOs should question and discuss daily life issues, and encourage people’s positive participation in solving them.

The active participation of citizens is more important than that of the government’s for the processes of Maül Mandülgi. Maül Mandülgi is not a people’s movement against government policy. It is a grass-root movement and a form of life politics to solve problems in everyday lives. Therefore, the government should collaborate with communities, provide minimum support, or leave them alone. It is different from past national movements, which focused on top-down activities of the central government as campaigns led by intellectual experts. Rather than solving issues, the new movement focuses on the growth of relevance in the process. It is for citizens to ruminate about the purpose of their community and its values, recognize needs in the community, find solutions, and take action to solve these community issues (Hwang, 2007).
Table 6-1, shows the findings from the case cities of this research, their respective accomplishments in the process of their community building movement, and the three related criteria questions categorized by factors for a livable city. While all residents, civil society groups, and local governments work together for a livable city, certain factors have greater importance for certain participants. For example, the power imbalance in governance and residents’ where the local government holds most or all of the power, can be curbed by sharing information, and communicating closely with active participants.

[Table 6-1] Findings from Case Studies for Livable Cities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List of Activities in Case Cities</th>
<th>Characteristics Drawn from Cases</th>
<th>Framework Element</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular meetings on community issues • Frequent Informal meetings • Engage with experts • Diverse open methods to communicate using technology, SNS, webpage</td>
<td>• Horizontal Relationships</td>
<td>Local Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create Community Map • RPG (Role Playing Game) • Study of the history of the neighborhood</td>
<td>• Knowledge and Participation in Community Activities • Residents’ Recognition of existing, natural, and built environments within the community • Relationship between Residents in the community</td>
<td>Sense of Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training, and Education program for residents • Community Map • Managing historic sites through making signs, maps, &amp; community meeting agenda</td>
<td>• Residents’ Knowledge of History in the Community • Residents’ Efforts to Preserve Community assets • Residents’ Strategies to manage community assets</td>
<td>Historic Preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory budgeting • Open information</td>
<td>• Participants involved in Community Activities • Budget management</td>
<td>Empowerment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| •Public hearing  
•Sending messages online, directly to the mayor | •Involvement of Civil Society Groups  
Ex) civil society groups provide training or tools for residents to perform their own actions and support them? |
|---|---|
| •Local Election  
•Political and financial independence from the central government  
•Residents finding and solving community needs  
•Public hearings | •Funding Resource of Community Budget  
•Local governments’ Political and Financial Independence  
•Active Decision Maker free from Central, or Local government influence |
| •Certain groups of people started and expanded programs for elderly, youth, and foreigners  
•Government assisting residents on initiatives through cooperation instead of through simple financial assistance  
•Identified various methods to be responsive to ideas from different groups: through the Internet, community stores, and street corners | •Inclusion and Exclusion during Planning and Decision Making Process  
•Strong community advocacy capacity to protect community interests  
•Long Term Goal of the Community  
Encouraging Residents to Volunteer, Participate, and Nurture a Livable city, rather than façade of instant results |
| •Keeping and restoring old alleys and houses  
•Oppose government development plans, not approved by residents | •Recognition of Local Identity, and Efforts to Keep its own Identity  
•Unique Urban Form to be Recognized as a Certain Place  
•Variety of Activity Plans for different Places |

Resource: the author

### 6.2 CONSIDERATION ON KOREA’S LIVABLE CITY

Hall (2009) expected cities would become bigger and move toward the ‘Mega-City Region’ through conurbation. In addition to this, city functions would be redistributed between core cities and secondary cities. The urbanization rate of Korea was only 39.1% in 1960, but increased to 50.1% in the 1970s, and up to 90.8% by the end of 2009. In the rapid urbanization process, industries and economy had concentrated on large cities in the capital region and in major
industrial cities in the Southeast (Kim, 1992; KRIHS, 1982/1991/1999/2011). Recently, the population rate of the capital region compared to entire nation of Korea, has come to 48.9% of the total national population (KOSIS; The Seoul Research Data Service, 2010). Maūl Mandūlgi in the capital region areas have had the advantage to benefit from abundant social capital and a higher participation by young people. However administration concerns about possible future decline in the Seoul city residential population as people seek to live in the surrounding Gyeonggi metropolitan region has led to promotion of Maūl Mandūlgi in Seoul city.

The participatory community building movement, represented as Maūl Mandūlgi in Korea started from autonomous activities by communities, and was named in different forms by scholars and NGOs, then expanded when the central government institutionalized the movement and established related laws and orders afterwards. Although local governments brought Maūl Mandūlgi to core projects, not all local cities were successful in the project. Some local cities repeatedly focused on business values and copied the established place-based programs and policies in other cities. Therefore, Maūl Mandūlgi projects were executed on a relatively small scale, when compared to construction work by developmental states where local governments wasted their budgets on useless monuments.

Most communities, evaluated as successful, were not developed by the government’s guidelines. They began from people’s identification of the necessities for their own communities and residents’ continuous trial and error efforts. On the other hand, other cases that began with the government’s directions, and developed by institutionalized guidelines, were influenced by national/local policies, and remained incomplete after their budget ran out. Most plans were outlined and developed by administrations that managed the project budget and limited residents’
participation. Local governments’ scaled-up plans resulted in cookie cutter urban forms which tried to commercialized built history and cultures.

6.2.1 Grass-Roots Movements Against Government’s Scaled-Up Projects

Mackintosh (2009) stated “the health of the nation is measured by the health of the economy in our contemporary North,” and “thus the health and value of an individual is measured by his/her ability to consume.” Although military regimes suppressed basic democratic rights, they were welcomed by those who suffered from poverty and longed for modernization and economic growth (Shin, 2006:25). This resulted in economic inequality, exacerbating social polarization. (Shin, 2006). The domination of neo-liberalism in the 1990s, influenced deregulation and market competition, and the economic gap widened between central and local cities, high-tech and traditional industrial regions, new and old downtowns, new and declining industrial regions, and developmental and preservation areas (Cho, 2011).

An economic structure focused on chaebol, an elite-centered political structure, property-based hierarchical society, and an excess concentration on economic growth of the country over civil society has caused many urban problems (Choi, 2010: 116), and the gaps appear not only in the income difference, but also in widening growth potential (Hyundai Research Institution, 2010). In some part, this resulted from the excessive economic influence on politics while the developmental state system became weaker (Shin, 2006). Funneling attention and resources into the capital region places non-capital regions at a significant disadvantage as prospective financing and population flows towards the area of greater potential.

The Korean government implemented a decentralization policy and handed over executive authority, but held on to budgeting authority, the key feature of influencing power. Thus, it is hard
for local governments to plan and implement their own policies, without a unifying plan, and while trying to predict the desires of the central government and potential for future funding (Ha, 2011). According to the index of business survival rates, by Hyundai Research Institute in 2010, the rates in non-capital regions have declined, and the income disparity between capital and non-capital regions worsened. The Gini coefficient, calculated from per capita GRDP in metropolitan cities, was 0.194 in 2008 compared to 0.085 in 1997, before the economic crisis. This means that regional disparity more than double. Furthermore, housing prices in the capital region, from 2004 through 2008, were more than four times higher than those in non-capital regions. The disparity of income/property, and finance/educational conditions became wider (Hwang, Y. R., Jan 24, 2010).

To improve the local economy, through marketing local cities focused on constructing landmarks such as skyscrapers or masterpieces designed by well-known architects, and planned festivals, which advertised local specialized goods, instead of strengthening the unique identity of that region using its residents. They tried to revitalize urban spaces by imitating exemplary cases in foreign countries, or outstanding projects in other local cities of Korea. The movement to protect the Bukchon Hanok Village (Korean traditional house in Bukchon village) by dosi yeondai, the urban action network, in the late 1990s, awakened national concern and interest in historic preservations.

However, the plans were simply based on the idea of making luxurious hanok villages as commercial products, and were not based on local culture or the preferences of people who live in the neighborhood. It is estimated that this project does not have business value, and local governments are faced with the criticism of budget waste (Kim, March 30, 2013). The attempt to mimic external forms of specific regions and apply these to any urban place without consideration
for the distinct characteristics of the area presented many problems (Kim & Lee, 2012). These are not people in the community doing place-making by interaction and activities in their daily lives, but businessmen selling the place, and memories, to make money. It shows that top-down plans made by the government, following trends in urban promotion or selling traditions without understanding that the community, will become unsustainable, and will lead to a wasted budget.

Current cities in Korea are well equipped with infrastructure and facilities, but they lack the capacity for livability and everyday life. In order for cities to preserve their cultural and historic identities, and enhance urban conviviality through social interactions, they must create their own concepts of the city that is more in tune with their unique historic and geographic circumstances. Each community has different circumstances and various problems, and solutions cannot be the same for all. The activist Kwon, who worked for Maŭl Mandŭlgī for 10 years, stated if 1,000 villages are working toward Maŭl Mandŭlgī, there should be 1,000 cases, 1,000 problems and 1,000 solutions. He trusted that people were able to pass through many processes for a long period of time and go through many frustrations, but those failures will allow people to move forward (Kang, Aug 24, 2012).

Another factor to keep in mind is shared values among people. The head chief of the Maŭl Renaissance Center, Lee, Geun Ho remarked that sustainable growth is important as long as we live in a capitalistic society, but the value of coexisting, to live well together should be respected (Kim, Mar 9, 2013).
6.3 POLICY IMPLICATIONS FOR LIVABLE CITIES WITH RESILIENT LIFEWORLDS

6.3.1 Considerations for livable Lifeworlds

This study discussed the way in which neoliberal oriented globalization contributes to a loss of human values, cultural identity, sense of place, and a right to the city. Taking these values into account, while defining a livable city, is the way in which we can determine policy implications and future directions to consider.

The emphasis is placed upon supporting convivial community life and cultural practices since these are the foundations of my concept of a livable city in which creative ideas, cultural contexts, and experiences play a greater role than material goods that lead to economic resilience. When experiencing an activity unique to the place, it becomes an unforgettable memory, and people are willing to pay a higher price for this even if it is more expensive than buying goods and products. Therefore, I recommend that local residents focus on building a livable city, and create places where diverse people can interact and participate in special experiences. One of the ways to maintain an identity is to preserve local stories. Historic preservation helps to keep local identity in the city, even industrial remains, deteriorated ports, abandoned factories and warehouses, rail roads, and mines—can be reused in many ways.

*Historic Preservation*

Preserving historic districts is the act of not only protecting materials, historic heritage, landscape, historic buildings and structures, and monuments, but also non-materials, collective landscape, images of the place, and traditional industry and cultural activities (Kang & Choi, 2002:42). Therefore, historic sites serve as potential assets that reflect a unique identity, and can be seen in contrast to a placeless dream world like Disneyland. Cultural uniqueness and creative
innovation raises the quality of cities, and they are more able to adapt themselves to changes (Landry, 2000). Regardless of city size—creative ideas through mutual cooperation, mutual respect, and a sense of reciprocity is the vital factor for current cities.

With interest in human values of places and finding alternatives to construction, local identity and socio-cultural place-making are brought up as key meanings in the urban regeneration of Korea. While talking about the issue of local identity, Choi (2009) stressed locality takes root in people’s lives, in community-based movements, and in intimate social spatial relationships that create a city/regional image as developmental strategies while competing under the umbrella of neoliberalism. The cultural environment of the community, such as place-making and historically rooted urban design, bring economic resiliency which benefits the preservation of old buildings and sites, and how the spatial forms of physical settings affect people’s behavior.

On the other hand, some communities include residents’ participation as a mere formality, with local governments focused on obtaining funding for construction expenses to construct more facilities and highlight their authoritative abilities. Such local governments indiscriminately copied programs from other cities for their own city marketing. Consequently, budgets were wasted to build useless landmarks, convention centers, hold nameless festivals, and did little to assure residents about their local government. If their only purpose were focused on development and revenue, then cultural urban regeneration and the cultivation of community identity will be denigrated with empty voices.

Secondary cities in developing countries have convenient facilities, and infrastructure from colonial periods built to enhance imperial exploitation of the area. This infrastructure included historic settlements and traditional centers of trade; these were used for military bases because of
their location, and also for transportation, administration, and cultural activities (Rondinell, 1983). While national treasures are registered and managed by the government, historic remains in local cities, sites developed during Japanese occupation, are viewed as a threat to the Korean national identity and therefore little to no effort is placed on preserving them.

Little concern is given to the well-being of residents and their quality of life when historic sites, that reflect local values, are sacrificed to build high-rises, and local budgets are wasted for international athletic competitions to obtain subsidies and investments. Through social activities, which enhance the sense of place and local identity within local areas, people build greater fellowship and a deeper connection to their city. With these social capacities, local residents can plan for economic resiliency through a process much different from destroying historic sites for the purpose of constructing large volume buildings.

Through this research we can see that it is not only the preservation of historic sites that is important, but rather the process for historic preservation that creates ownership of a place and influences people’s social relationships, local tourism, and knowledge about the methods to improve their community. Samdŏk-dong implemented projects that had rebuilt small alleys in the downtown area, which in turn evoke the traditional image and functions of main streets, promoted reuse of local assets for cultural facilities, and transformed open spaces and factories near the main street for gatherings. Old streets were improved and abandoned facilities were reused.

---

28 For example, Daegu City built World Cup Stadium for 2002 Korea-Japan World Cup although it was used for only one game. Since Daegu City did not have sufficient planning about the transportation, facilities logistics, and how to manage and use them after the World Cup, the Stadium just remained closed after the World Cup, and was used once for the World Championship in Athletics in 2010. However, the other issues remained unsolved, and it remains closed and despite requiring a budget for maintenance.
Collaboration within local governance sets goals to increase local businesses, employees, and taxes. The local government completely supports this project and promotes neighborhood initiatives by holding events and festivals that display a local identity and highlight local celebrities of the city.

*Residents’ Participation and Activating the Public Sphere*

The primary issue is residents’ participation in planning must consist of more than physical community building, but also include social interactions in a small space (Friedmann, 2009), where they have access to knowledge, experience, and memories. All residents should share knowledge of their cities and participate in decision making. Mumford (1961) points out that those local residents are the group of people who can contribute to community planning. They figure out problems and draw the local government’s attention to their needs in a collaborative effort. Therefore, direct participation of local residents, and the inclusion of their rights in the city rebuilding process, is required while space is key for voicing public issues within the public sphere. The public sphere plays a key role in promoting social justice within lifeworlds distinct from the system, but the key question remains, is it fair for everyone?

The influence of the discourses of globalization has led societies to focus on global value, rather than locality—massive changes that have subsequently caused social and spatial transformations in the city. This brings to issue quality of life, everyday life in the public sphere, and encouraging civil society to re-construct its idea of livability. In addition to this, the national goal of ‘economic growth’ has sacrificed people in non-capital regions, while residents of rural areas, and regional cities, are unable to assert “public norms, or public concerns” (Fraser, 1990:75). Harvey (1993) claims that the right cost and distribution of profits promote social justice in the city and excluded groups should have opportunities to claim their right to the public.
To discuss community issues and encourage all residents to participate in their community, city, and the country, information and communication must flow freely between everyone, not from top to bottom. In the public sphere, information is conveyed through mutual exchange. Each governance is aware of their own roles and responsibilities, and members can request and provide assistance to each other (http://blog.daum.net/4tongpd/36).

Comprehensive planning relies primarily upon the professional knowledge of experts and is executed through a top-down process, it tends, by design, to only involve some stakeholders, specifically national bureaucrats and experts. Government implemented urban planning programs without the consensus of urban residents, purposefully excluded residents from the decision-making process, and failed to provide them with appropriate information. In community building movements, all participants should have the same rights to activities, in social spaces and built environments as people in the capital city. The concept of a convivial city that focuses on the importance of meaningful social relationships in the daily life of a city will provide them with a livable city. Furthermore, the participatory planning process has resulted in a different urban form from other parts of cities that supports people’s daily activities and social interactions.

Autonomous residents’ participatory planning is influenced by the perceived quality of the urban residential environment. That is, different from top-down developmental planning in terms of community identity, residents' connection to the community, and urban form. Residents try to protect the national and historic environment of their neighborhood, think about the problems of everyday life in the community, and make efforts to improve upon them. A communicative process that seeks to promote the full consent of the people involved and multi-faceted communicative actions among participants is necessary (Forester, 1989; Healey, 1992, 1998; Innes 1998).
Residents’ Active Participation: Life Politics, and Financial Independence

Under the concept of Life politics, the main agent to develop community’s necessity is each individual, all community members, coming together to achieve their goal. The expectation is not that powerful agents or authoritative organizations satisfy certain community desires. It is the process that ‘I’ determine what is needed in my community, and we do it together (Hwang, 2007; Kim, 2009; Ha, 2012). The Sŏngmisan is a good example of life politics which started from the community’s need to develop through active cooperation and participation by building trusting relationships. Kim (2009) gives an example of protecting Mt. Sŏngmi through the Sŏngmisan network, and also activities within the community to achieve life politics. The people of Sŏngmisan tried to deliver necessities for community well-being to the field of politics (Kim, 2014).

In 2011, approximately one hundred progressive civil society organizations including Ch’amyŏyŏndae, People’s Solidarity for Participatory Democracy, banded together and established ‘naega kkumkkunŭn nara (@mycountry21), which means civil action, my dreaming country’ (http://mycountry.or.kr/) dreams, the Korean version of American organization “Move-On (influenced by Move-On’s perspective that citizens active bottom-up participation and autonomy is important to politics and the Japanese “Kanagawa” network view of the importance of an empowered citizen’s influence on local politics). The organization encourage citizens to participate in politics by educating and training the general public through political academics, and encourage the public sphere to communicate with citizens, through events such as talk concerts, and lectures (Kim and Jeong, 2011).
However, the prevailing opinion is that, civil organizations in Korea should remain politically neutral. If civil organizations participate in political activities such as demonstrations against government policy, those organizations are soon ignored by the government, or excluded from subsidies (Jang, 2003; Kim, 2009). To stop this potential conflict from occurring, the Consumer Cooperative Act includes a clause which prohibits the political activity of cooperatives (article 4 of Consumer Cooperative Act). Thus, life politics was separated from the political system and did not have the power to change the system. Jeong and et al. (2009) and studies by other scholars have indicated that these trends to try to solve various agendas for daily life through solely non-political efforts will hamper development of life politics.

_Promoting Growth of Civil Society in Local Cities_

Civil organizations which emphasize voluntarism and professionalism, have played a significant role in preventing a few elite groups from excluding the public from the process of policy making in Korean society (Park, 2003). Civil organizations and residents can become more interested in the community and regions where they live while caring for the nation’s economy, and begin to make changes with a women’s association and a village council as the center (Jeong, 1999). The bottom-up movement of _Maǔl Mandŭlgi_ can be one part of civil society in Korea. In this respect, Kim (2003) insists that locally founded NGOs and residents in a local city have distinct advantages in advancing _Maǔl Mandŭlgi_. Nationally, the growth of local NGOs, based in local communities has increased with the growth of _Maǔl Mandŭlgi_.

Despite the local self-government system, and encouragement to increase the number of NGOs’ founded in local regions (Cho, 2000), the capital city of Seoul has the greatest number of civil organizations, when compared to other metropolitan cities. Table 6-2 shows the spatial
distribution of civil organization in major cities and provinces. Some of the difficulties which have led to the low numbers of civil organizations found in local regions include low population levels and low participation, disparate finances and a lack of civil awareness (Lee, 2003).

[Table 6-2] Areal distribution of civil society organization in Korea (Unit: numbers, %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Seoul</th>
<th>Gyoung-gi</th>
<th>Incheon</th>
<th>Busan</th>
<th>Daegu</th>
<th>Daejeon</th>
<th>Gwang-ju</th>
<th>Ulsan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>2,196</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>(54.6)</td>
<td>(8.4)</td>
<td>(3.0)</td>
<td>(4.2)</td>
<td>(2.4)</td>
<td>(2.4)</td>
<td>(3.4)</td>
<td>(0.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gang-won</td>
<td>Choongnam</td>
<td>Choongbuk</td>
<td>Gyeongnam</td>
<td>Gyeongbuk</td>
<td>Jeonnam</td>
<td>Jeonbuk</td>
<td>Jeju</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.8)</td>
<td>(2.0)</td>
<td>(2.1)</td>
<td>(3.1)</td>
<td>(2.5)</td>
<td>(3.0)</td>
<td>(4.9)</td>
<td>(1.3)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


NGOs that are founded in local regions have difficulties in terms of obtaining resources and problem solving (Ok, 2002; Kim, 2003; Koh, 2009). The partnership under this imbalanced situation can use weak local NGOs to conduct government sponsored projects, or put them into a subcontracted structure under another central NGOs (Ok, 2002).

**Concerns of Immigrant Participation and Place Making among Immigrants**

In addition to local residents, immigrants are another group of people claiming their right to the city. Immigrants tend to form disasporic communities, in foreign countries, and build physical spaces for gathering; subjectively built places where they can feel mentally comfortable and enhance livability. Immigrants keep close emotional and economic connections with their home countries through advanced communicative networks, this is helpful for establishing a positive relationship with their host country (Castles, 1998). What we should focus on is how active participation in place making occurs within, and between, these networks.
How immigrants assemble within and experience both the communities of host and home countries, through the regeneration of informal identity, is meaningful in understanding networking amongst themselves and their host countries. Moreover, immigrants need places in which they can express and embody their own identity, and build networks with home countries and people of the same cultures. Such places built in subjective perspective are public parks, conventional market areas, streets, and churches.

A good understanding of this can be found in Huang and Douglass’s (2008) work on ‘Little Philippines’, the Filipino community in Taiwan in which marginalized workers had built a ‘multicultural space’ (p.69) that can be seen as a heterogeneous place where ‘cultures mix and interact to create new hybrid forms’ (Foucault & Miskowiec 1986; Oldenburg 1982; Soja 1996). This third place is required not only for promoting foreign workers’ social life and well-being—where they can communicate with the same language, exchange information, and acquire inexpensive goods (Huang & Douglass, 2008)—but is also useful for making the host country better understand the immigrants’ unique culture as well as serving as a place to meet groups from different cultures.

Chapter two, factors for a livable city and through the literature review and case studies, the relationship among factors for livable city has been reframed in the following figure 6-2. Local governments try to be independent from the central government, and achieve local self-government (decentralization), residents learn about the community and have affection to their own community, and city (sense of place), and civil groups play roles as bridge and manage conflicts between them. While each participants’ collaborate well in each field, through Maül Mandülgi, participatory community building, the community is able to make its own convivial
places. Livable, and convivial places will influence the sense of place, local governance, and decentralization, becoming a good circle relationship.

[Figure 6-2] Livable City: Community Building through Participatory Planning

Resource: the author

6.3.2 Conclusion

*Maŭl Mandŭlgi* is not simply about making a gathering place and increasing physical contact, but building social relationships between members of the community within the place. While Lee and Newby (1983:57) asserted people do not necessarily mean that they have much to do with each other, but little interaction between neighbours, Bott (1957:99) asserted that the immediate social environment of urban families was best considered, ‘as the network of actual social relationships they maintain, regardless of whether these are confined to the local area or run beyond its boundaries’. The ‘connectedness,’ or density, and other qualities of social networks help explain
or, at least describe, key aspects of people’s experiences.

In each of the four case studies, *Maül Mandūlgī* was the name used to describe activities with different approaches for community revitalization. Sŏngmisan maybe people would describe as the most successful of all the cases.

Sŏngmisan solved their community child care issue, and the whole community was able to support the kids together through the after school programs, kids activity programs. Parents in other areas have chosen to move to this community for their child care system (The Korea Economic Daily, 2013; The Report of Sŏngmisan Maül, 2012). In addition, Sŏngmisan expanded their community programs with the support of Seoul city now. While they still have some gentrification and commoditization issues, community members continue to be active, and try to keep working on creating a participant-friendly community with participatory planning.

However, this is an ideal case and a unique situation in Korea because none of the other communities began their activities with as much social capital as Sŏngmisan and most of the local governments financially rely heavily on the central government. It means still the central government has economic power to control the community planning process for revitalization, especially for the local governments. (Currently Seoul and some parts of Gyeonggido including Suwon, Songnam and Anyang still have independent control over their budgets.) In this situation, it is a more realistic expectation that local government that are more independent can still provide professional, and organized support and work together with their communities like Suwon, or Gwangju. Even though local cities can elect their mayor they do not control their budget. This is a serious current political issue and it is difficult to say what will be the outcome.
In Seoul and Suwon cities, the communities’ experiences became good examples of *Maül Mandülgi* and were expanded to the other communities with the local government’s support. Before the local governments led the *Maül Mandülgi* project in the city, they established related orders (refer to Chapter Four, Seoul, Suwon, and Gwangju) and the city as a whole had plans for a larger picture for making livable city (refer to the Suwon article).

The inspiration of the *Maül Mandülgi* community revitalization efforts brought community leaders, activists, and community members together across the whole country to make a maül mandülgi network, and make it possible to keep sharing each community’s experiences through the official annual conferences in different cities, creating non-official meetings among different communities. For the long-term, the implications of the *Maül Mandülgi* efforts are that local governments now take some elements from livable cities as valuable factors in their planning process. Responsibility for *Maül Mandülgi* implementation is with the local residents and local governments. Financial support from local governments will continue to be unstable until the conflict is resolved between the central government and local governments over control of local government budgets.

Planning requires action (Friedmann, 1987), not just participating in the planning process, but also consideration on how to develop ideas into action is important (Blair, 2000). Promoting ‘inclusive participation’ is not included in ‘the justice of either process or material outcomes’ (Fainstein, 2000:115). Specific strategies for action and implementation are required (Baptista, 2005), and ‘developing an understanding and ownership of the strategy’ for major stakeholders are needed (Healey, 1998: 174).
Resident-led community planning is extremely difficult to achieve in practice. Most residents participate actively but civic groups or administrative leaders enact strategies, such as writing proposals for subsidies and communicating with other stakeholders. These stakeholders can prevent some residents, especially those with limited social and cultural capital, from taking a leading role. Civic groups and organizations work on various issues with a limited amount of support, and thus cannot continuously focus on one community. Achieving sustainability in resident-led community planning is easier said than done; once the budget is exhausted, unless new funds appear, the project, will generally die.

The current emphasis on local governance cannot be achieved through positive action from only one side. Voluntary participation of the people and changes in the perception of administration are necessary. Making a Livable City Project in 2007 provided momentum for local regions to strengthen their communities and announce programs. However, shallow understanding of the community and habitualized administration work, exacerbated the conflict between the government and residents, and also between residents who have different economic interests.

While planning and implementing community building, city and community accomplishments cannot be compared through a simple one standard criteria because the cities and communities have different visions and goals. Cities seek convenient life and economy which cannot be ignored. On the other hand, communities strive for comfort and culture, rather than placing an emphasis on economy. The paradigm in East-Asia is shifting from economy to culture because basic needs are already satisfied. However, developing countries are experiencing a double burden, in trying to achieve both economic development and enhancing cultural quality of life. In the past, Koreans sacrificed their life worlds for the system, but it is the time to pursue
enhancing spiritual values over material goods.

Some people criticize emphasizing community and quality of life during an economic downturn. However, Mr. Yu, Chang-bok, a member of the Sŏngmisan network, counters this argument. Through many cases in Korean community building, he realized that where the poor live with social and economic difficulty, a close community is required. He explained the initiative by Sŏngmisan draws upon a small budget. If they had enough money, they would have bought highly qualified service from the market. However, they did not have enough money for children services, and founded a cooperative care system. Their vision of Sŏngmisan is not to make cooperative rural communities, but instead expand community networks between people who require collaboration for the same goals (Hong, Yu, and Kang, 2014).

Consequently, a livable community is necessary for people in need. The problem is those people in need lack the information and knowledge to support this movement. This goes back to the issue of communities with rich human resources monopolizing subsidies from the central government, even though capital regions have more advantages than local cities. Establishing a paradigm about the livable city prior to the economy through self reflection, mutual exchange, and communication are required (Ha, 2006:196). Scott (1998) pointed out that national plans fail because the government ignores local diversity in order to make it easy to manage, instead of standardizing, and creating their own communities through active participation in planning.

This research addressed the cultural framework of the livable city, and introduced successful cases and policies in Korean society. A qualitative research method has been selected for the research, and was conducted with accumulated and archived documents written by community members, and also by outside members in order to maintain an objective perspective. While the
research analyzes and builds a framework for making a livable city through participatory community building, further study is required to refine key points of emphasis. Dependent solely upon existing documents, my views were filtered through the lenses of other scholars, my observations in the case study communities and confidential access to materials such as cooperative records, community business records, and participatory budgeting are deficient. For further study, it would be prudent to conduct in-depth interviews with local residents to learn more about their view of community building, how it has changed the community, and if they choose to call this Maŭl Mandūlgi. In addition to this, there are many successful cases in local cities in Korea, but most cases are not organized as academic sources nor well publicized, and remain unknown.
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