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Based on ethnographic field work in the summer of 2014, this research hopes to create an approach to cityscape that allows for a nuanced understanding of a world that creates, and is created by, its inhabitants. Seoul, South Korea, with its over 600 year long history, has grown into one of the largest metropolis areas in the world. Though the impacts of imperialization, war, and modernization have all left lasting impressions on the cityscape, the city’s past remains deeply engrained and the landmarks and memorials have, just as much as any other factor, shaped the Seoul of today. This research is an attempt to understand the significance of these historic sites not only in their roles as markers of the past but as parts of an active and ongoing process in the lives of Seoul’s citizens. By taking the experience of the cityscape as a point in a continuum of time and space, these historic sites gain influence in their surroundings as they are considered for their past as well as their role in the future. Further, processes of making historic sites museal or, as I forward here, “toural,” create a cityscape that is known by people who dwell within it. The establishment of a cityscape that is understood and transverses temporal and spatial boundaries, I argue, is then infused with emotion and sentiment, namely in feelings pride and shame.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Moving Through the Cityscape - 2010

The inspiration for this research came during a 2010 visit to South Korea. Getting off a bus during one of my first days there, I was told we were standing before the construction site that would someday house Seoul city hall. Caddy-corner from the city hall, half obscured by the rush of traffic, on a small square was a procession of what I recognized as palace guards in bright colors and large, circular hats. The changing of the guard before the half-park, half-museum complex of Deoksugung palace right in front of the to-be ultra-modern city hall caught my eye and brought to the fore the possibility of a connection between the two sites. With this in mind, and my trip just beginning, I remained vigilant for similar compatibilities between historical locations and their surroundings as I spent time immersed in the Seoul landscape.

A day spent in what is commonly advertised as a spot for traditional arts and tourist gifts, Insa-dong district, led to my second twinge. Between shops selling calligraphy supplies, antique Chinese medical manuscripts, modern espresso and traditional candies, and more than one place for cheap plastic trinkets and socks designed like instant ramen packages, the crowded pedestrian walkway flowed into a busy street. A turn to the left and, sandwiched between Buddhist and shaman supply stores, was the Jogyesa temple, a still-inhabited Buddhist temple I recalled reading about in English language newspapers, and which the posters advertised, was the main “temple stay” location made famous by Richard Gere. The juxtaposition of tradition, modernity, and modern packaging of tradition was striking.
A few days later, following my relatives through a subway line I hadn’t taken before, I was excited to find, quite to my surprise, a giant, walled square--Gyeongbokgung palace, the partially reconstructed palace of the first ruler of the Joseon dynasty and a common symbol of Korean heritage as the main palace of the last kingdom of Korea (1392-1897). I was perhaps even more surprised that we didn’t stay, moving from the stone walls and almost immediately onto a huge, eight-lane road through the middle of Seoul. The contrast could probably not be more obvious. Dividing oncoming traffic were large statues of Korean heroes, Admiral Yi Sun-Shin who defended against the Japanese naval fleet with 13 of his armor-plated turtle boats during the Imjin Wars (1592-1598) and King Sejong the Great (1397-1450, ruled 1418-1450), the inventor of the hangul writing system that is used to date. The road, active from both the vehicle traffic and pedestrians moving from shops or watching small performances, provided a clear path between the palace that called on the period of unified Korea and the city hall building that the heroes faced. The present, and the future, it became clearly marked, were only possible with the foundations set in the past in both reference to it and the shaping of the city around it, making the past a nearly unavoidable aspect of everyday life. Heritage and tradition, the cultural identity of Korea, was not simply something enculturated; Korean identity was stone and cement around which the modern metropolis was built.

**Research Methods**

The following research is based on and expands beyond these earlier observations. Rooted in observational and interview data, collected between June and July of 2014, this project seeks to elaborate on the “twinges” of my earlier visit. How do South Koreans, both Seoulites and from abroad, view their over 600 year old capital city? Are the references across the
cityscape accidents of time, the results of conscious planning, or the intermingling of both? In this exploration of the unfolding and crumpling of time in Seoul, larger theoretical conceptions and methodological concerns are raised, with the explicit purpose of this project directed towards a focus on the thoughts and lives of the people who inhabit the cityscape in their everyday lives.

Interviews (N = 18) were done with visitors at these sites, who were chosen based on their presence, in either English or with the assistance of an interpreter. Selection based on age or gender was minimal and only done in an attempt to gather a more balanced pool of interviewees. Ethnic identity did serve as the primary factor in interviewee selection, with ethnic Koreans making up the entirety of the interviews except for a single interview done at each site with foreign visitors. Due to the nature of visits to these locations, most interviews were done in groups ranging from two to six people with varying degrees of involvement on behalf of the interviewees. Two exceptions were interviews arranged and undertaken by Seoul city employees who served as managers for one of these sites.

Most commonly, a single interviewee took the role of spokesperson, though these roles would switch and others were welcomed and encouraged to participate based on their own comfort. The interviews followed a semi-structured format with a selected list of questions (see Appendix A) available as a guide. This list did not strictly limit questions and, often, the interviews followed streams of thought on the parts of both myself and the interviewees, who would go so far as to ask others in their groups opinions or further questions. To account for time, especially in the summer heat, a truncated list of questions would be used as a guide.
Five particular sites were selected in order to establish findings concerning different types of historical constructions: the old, recently rebuilt gate of Namdaemun\(^1\) and its surrounding market, the fortress of Haengjusanseong that repelled a Japanese invasion in 1593, the Joseon era Deoksugung palace adjacent to the modern city hall, the chief Jogye Buddhist temple of Jogyesa, and a traditional house museum at a Joseon summer resort called Namsangol Hanok Village.

These sites were not selected, necessarily, due to their popularity, size, or historical importance; while few can deny the powerful symbol of Namdaemin Gate as one of Seoul and South Korea overall, I was asked, with a mix of concern and befuddlement, why anyone would select Deoksugung Palace as a research site over the huge Gyeongbokgung a few blocks away. Rather, these locations were based on both their historical presence and their continued role as a tourism location. To varying degrees, each has impacted the cityscape of Seoul, creating an environment in which history becomes everyday while serving as nexuses of emotions.

One of the major factors in selecting these particular sites was based on my previous trip, part family visit and part pilot study, to Korea in the summer of 2010. The majority of these locations, Deoksugung Palace, Jogyesa Temple, Namdaemun Gate, and Haengjusanseong Mountain Fortress, were places that my relatives insisted were particularly important landmarks. Each area references particular events in Korea’s history, ranging from the 1592 invasion of Korea by Japan to the end of independence in 1910, all of which are commonly known by citizens of South Korea. The diversity of these sites, ranging from an active temple in the center of Seoul to a relatively remote mountain memorial of a fortress, allows this study to examine the contours of both the impact of sites on their locations as well as the relative impact different

---

\(^1\) While there is an ongoing effort to solidify Namdaemun Gate by its pre-colonial name, Sungnyemun, it is still common to hear and see, particularly in English, the gate referred to by Namdaemun, while the market associated with it and the street before it retains this name.
types of sites may have on their surroundings. Further, the relative lack of major foreign tourism at these sites, especially compared to the large and incredibly popular Gyeongbokgung Palace, increased the opportunities to speak with native visitors. While larger, and perhaps better advertised, locations may represent a more prominent display of historical landmarks, the act of visiting occurred more frequently and, due to a lack of crowds, more leisurely at these smaller sites which allowed for longer, more in depth interviews.

Participant observation was done beyond the interviews and was, by and large, intrinsically linked with the gathering of interviews; in order to obtain these interviews, the sites had to be visited. Visits to these sites were undertaken both alone and with interlocutors/interpreters, foreign and native ethnic Koreans. Regular events, including Taekwondo demonstrations and reenactments, were observed. While tours were offered at some sites, they generally require advanced group planning and were not observed. Each site was explored extensively, making note of the ways, and what, information was disseminated, the physical creation and use of space, and both the visitors and employees present. Further, to understand the areas surrounding these sites, the roads and alleys surrounding each were canvased on foot. Types of economic activity, city or neighborhood projects including statues and signs, and maps and directions were gathered in order to examine the impact of the site on its surroundings.

**Current Theory and Research on Cityscapes**

Little previous work has been done on the nuance of particular historic sites in the creation of a cityscape, despite the understanding of the power of similar monuments overall as, for example, the focus of imagine communities (Anderson 2006, Tangherlini and Yea 2008). The general gap in considering such sites is exacerbated by a further lapse in the theorizing of
landscape overall and especially the urban landscape, or cityscape. Creating a perspective to fill this gap becomes particularly important in any attempt to approach historic sites, monuments, and other significant man-made features in the cityscape beyond the level of grand processes and understanding their meaning to the people who live along side them. In the case of post-colonial and industrialized South Korea, viewing the role of these sites in creating an imagined community does not go far enough in understanding their importance. To establish a working framework in which these sites become more than icons of identity, the cityscape in which they belong must first be theorized beyond a backdrop of action and as part of a larger process in which real human emotion and thoughts are influenced by and influence. In creating this, the cityscape must be understood not only in the presence of locations, but as a world that individuals who live within it are intimately familiar with and embedded in: people distinguish an apartment building from a factory, for instance, by both indicators of its function and previous experience. In the instance of these historic sites, the understanding of what is inside shapes how it is experienced and with what feelings and thoughts.

As a theoretical starting point, the base of this research is tied to merging the concepts of “interior” and “exterior” by examining the cityscape as a landscape that is moved through featuring buildings that are understood. One of the attempts is to employ and further elaborate on the term of museality (Kreinath forthcoming) as a means to conceptualize how urban dynamics anchor the assumed temporally dislocated nature of these locations, in both the spatial sense and the “relational and contextual” sense proposed by Appadurai (1996:178). The reason for such a multi-layered analysis is inspired by Merleau-Ponty’s ([1945] 2002) observations of a house: one is able to imagine aspects of a house that are not visible based on previous understandings. The previous understandings of historic sites allow people to also imagine and remember their
presence not only in space, but time, and become an important aspect in the ways they impact the experience of the cityscape. Knowledge of histories and representations contained in these sites creates an emotional experience during visits, which are remembered as people see them, allowing people to imagine, in Merleau-Ponty’s example, not only the idea of what is inside the metaphorical house but the feelings and thoughts attached to it. The current development of landscape theory must also be understood and altered to fit the context of the Seoul cityscape. Within the broader field of anthropological landscape theory, three major strands approaches become relevant as their merger allows for fuller perspective of the cityscape, namely landscape as text, as environment, or as dwelling.

Landscape as text, perhaps best expressed by humanistic geography Dennis Cosgrove (1985), takes the view that the landscape may be, like Levi-Strauss’ natural species, good to think with. To Cosgrove, landscape is a social product, “the consequence of collective human transformation of nature” (13). The social and cultural product itself a “way of seeing projected onto land” with its own “techniques and compositional forms” (269). In this, there exists an ambiguity between the subjective and objective which is viewed as being a key component to landscape, as he posits that historical formations, particularly with industrialization, has separated the linkage between one within a landscape and one who views it. These different historical trends, however, “social and moral issues (are) addressed through landscape images” (270).

Alfred Gell’s “The Language of the Forest” (1995), as an example of the landscape as environment, takes an almost opposing position. Rather than being written on and read, he admits that his work leaves him open to accusations of “environmental-determinism” (252). In examining the impact the dense forests of New Guinea on the Umeda, namely in its prominent
usage of phonological iconism, Gell considers the ways in which the environment shapes perception. According to Gell, the Umeda’s heavy reliance on the aural component of their surroundings, rather than on the visual as in the West, leads to a closer resemblance of words with sounds and the linking of sounds with concepts that are components of larger words. The role of landscape for Gell is not as a backdrop for cultural, human activity, but as a, if not the, primary factor in it. Rather than the ecological determinism seen in the works of Leslie White and Julian Stewart, however, this view of landscape focuses in on the cognitive and, perhaps, subconscious element of landscape.

Finally, and the main framework of this work, is the concept of landscape as dwelling, forwarded by Tim Ingold (2000). Dwelling, in this instance, refers to “taking the animal-in-its-environment rather than the self-contained individual as (the) points of departure” (186-187). Landscape as a place that is dwelled in is both spatial and temporal, as Ingold points that each moment is a sliver within a gradient that also refers backwards and forwards through the history and future of both the inhabitants and the landscape itself. The introduction of the idea of the taskscape, “(j)ust as the landscape is an array of related feature, so – by analogy – the taskscape is an array of related activities” and “is to labour what the landscape is to land” (195), grants an active, human element to the landscape in which is social and temporally bound. Taskscapes, which take place in, account for, and are partially shaped by landscapes, themselves become “congealed” into landscapes. As part of Ingold’s idea, both the landscape and movement through it exists as an active continuum in both space and time; that is to say, traveling through a landscape has no true borders, as anything “can only become a boundary, or the indicator of a boundary, in relation to the activities of the people (or animals) for whom it is recognized or experienced as such” (192-193) while any moment of time exists within the range of the history
that has led to it and the future. The landscape, for Ingold, is explicitly not land, nature, space, nor is it concerned with function; rather, the landscape is “the world as it is known to those who dwell therein” and, as it is concerned with form, “the world of (a creature) being-in” in a similar way the body is considered in terms of embodiment (193). Ingold attempts to remove the binary of the individual and their surroundings by resting the dweller in a continuously active process.

These previous theories on landscape all attempt to understand the ways in which human beings and their surroundings interact and influence one another. All of these projects, despite their different approaches to the landscape, tend to share very similar positions in regards to how the categories of landscape are understood. Beyond an emphasis on the creation of the landscape category rooted in Flemish and Italian art (Cosgrove 1985, Hirsch 1995), many attempts by cultural anthropologists tend to focus on the landscape only in ‘natural’ settings (for example, see Gell 1995, Selwyn 1995, Sikkink and Choque M. 1999). This focus on the ‘natural,’ or ‘more natural,’ environment has left a major gap in the anthropological literature, especially in light of the increasing number of the world’s population living in urban environments. In particular, this project attends to issues in the creation and manipulation of urban cityscapes by major organizations (political, economic, etc.) and the contestations that may exist around them. Additionally, as opposed to ‘traditionally inhabited’ lands of smaller groups studied previously, Seoul, like many booming metropolitan areas, is a tourist hotspot with an estimated 9.79 million visitors in 2011 and rapid upward trend (Korea Tourism Organization, accessed 9/2/2014). With this in consideration, the cityscape is not only for those for whom these traditional sites represent heritage, but to display this heritage on an international stage while becoming a focal point in the conceptualization of it. As discussed later, this creates a dual perspective of the cityscape as individuals who live within it and temporary visitors experience these sites in different ways.
In the attempt to gleam a more emic understanding on these interactions between individuals and the landscape, these perspectives similarly attempt to move away from a top-down view by placing primacy on the observations of the researcher. Perhaps following in the theoretical footsteps of Walter Benjamin (2002) and his walks through Paris, the subjective experience of movement through space becomes the lens that separates the landscape from bird’s eye view, the territory from the map (Bateson 1972). With few exceptions (Kendall 2008, Park 2009), the basis for these theories and their examples across disciplines lies in these observations surprisingly little input from those who are entwined with it every day. In effect, this approach has created a new form of top-down theorization as the landscape is brought to the fore as opposed to being little more than an early chapter in ethnography or the background of subsistence strategies. The edited volume The Anthropology of Landscape, for example, makes explicit an attempt to merge a western “framing device” (Hirsch 1995, 1) and “a second landscape which is produced through local practice” (2), though does little to make clear the ways in which such a process may occur: while the landscape does become the key to the studies, they are theorized distinctly from the points of view of landscape as a symbol to be read or as an environment which creates. The inclusion of emic perspectives, accessed through participant-observation and interviews, shifts the theoretical perspective to allow for more than the discourses that surround the landscape, creating a field in which it becomes simultaneously banal and emotional in ways that escape common sources of data used, from the experience of walking to media portrayals. Further, as it is the inhabitants that are impacted by the symbolic significance of the landscape and live within the environment of it, the addition of the emic perspective not only adds nuance to their effect but serve as a correcting measure in the researcher’s own understandings.
To reframe the landscape of Seoul in light of these considerations, this thesis attempts to merge the three overarching positions into a single whole. Ingold’s dwelling perspective serves as the basis for this project, as it firmly roots the “animal-in-its-environment” (2000, 186) and, particularly relevant to this work, demonstrates the experience of landscape as a point in space and time. However, this approach will be merged with understanding the cityscape as both an environment and text while paying specific attention to the experiences and stories of those who live in it. What became clear through the interviews is that these perspectives are not reserved as esoteric, analytical concepts; nearly every interviewee was quick to reference these exact notions as they considered their motivations for their visits and the importance of these sites. By taking a more top-down, observation-centric approach, symbolic power and political meaning is examined as, simultaneously, an unfolding text and the environment in which people dwell. This approach is tempered, informed, and directed by a bottom-up perspective in which the interviews serve as the primary lens of the cityscape. This nexus of theories creates a middle-ground perspective in which the importance of the cityscape in its own right is created by and creates the emotions, opinions, and perceptions of those who live in it.

As a part of this, the role of the museal, and I argue the “tural”, in these sites becomes doubly important. Museality is the quality through which an item loses its original context and becomes a museum object or site; that is to say, items cease to function in their intended manner and, instead, become primarily objects or site for teaching (Mohr 2011). The process through which locations become museal in the South Korean context, as will be expanded upon particularly in the cases of mountain fortresses of Haengjusanseong and Namhansanseong, is two-fold as the location itself becomes a museum through the objects it holds and museal through the nature of its historic rooting. By taking the museal qualities of these locations into
consideration, the ‘interior’ of these locations becomes apparent especially given, drawing again from Merleau-Ponty’s phenomenological house, that knowledge of these locations as being museal and museums shapes the way they are perceived and conceptualized across the cityscape as the memories and understandings of these locations are known through being observed. Taking into consideration both the self-conscious, self-aware aspect to museums, especially in post-colonial settings, and the role of these locations in the creation of a city popular amongst tourists, the presentation of these museums becomes particularly important as the questioning of who target audiences are shapes both how the museum is formed and how it is conceived of by those who think of it.

This concept, however, is further problematized by the limits of the museal as something that is removed from the current, lived reality. From religious practice taking place under the foreigners’ camera lenses at Jogyesa temple to the still-producing farm lands on the aforementioned fortress mountains, the museal aspect of these sites is hampered by the continuation of life. In light of this, I propose the idea of the “toural” as a means of mitigating the process of displaying and cementing a location’s history and the concurrency of life within it. This, itself, also exists as a spectrum between the changing and the static, or toural and museal. Varying degrees of ruptures exist from site to site, as to differing levels of attempts to both historicize and display this history. Further, the motivations that exist go beyond mere academic preservation that is often associated with the concept of museal, to include income-based

---

2 The re-appropriation of objects by formerly colonized peoples and alternative forms of their display in terms of the political climate, different understandings of the object’s significance, and senses have been well illuminated (Stocking 1985, Classen and Howe 2006, Dudley 2012). South Korea’s differing position as a post-colonial country not colonized by the West presents a different example from those used in most previous research, though the role of colonization and the politically-aware display of artifacts and sites in wake of imperialization is, as will be shown, undoubtedly present.
decision making and audience selection that feed into and result from numerous references to national and ethnic pride, religion, and politics. As will be shown, every site visited was designed and displayed with an awareness their roles as tourist attractions and made varying decisions and make various plans to increase visitation. As a part of this, the role of history, as well as the emphasis and discourse on it, becomes entwined in these numerous references.

The decisions of this selection and prioritization of visitors, that is to say, for natives or foreigners, or for particular foreigners of different places of origin, as well as the decisions of which sites are to be preserved, are made within a system of power relations between the populace of Seoul and South Korea overall, major corporations and construction companies, the government on a number of scales from local to federal, and a reflexive understanding of what is important for the maintenance of identity. Unlike ‘more natural’ landscapes, the cityscape does not exist in the interplay between an observer, their histories and cultures, and the relatively untouched environment. Rather, it is one that is human-made and semi-permanent in its creation while discourses about the meanings exist under the already-decided presence and usage of the sites by larger systems and structures such as political groups. This research examines how these discourses and cultural understandings exist on the ground by opening up a field of research that has been relatively untouched. Instead of, as is often the case in landscape theory, the political communication of meanings or observing patterned behavior being the focus of understanding the landscape, the focus here is on the decisions and understandings of the people who inhabit it.

While the experience of individuals as they walk through, map, and experience the cityscape is beyond the direct scope of this project, the construction of the space in relation to these historic sites is intrinsically linked with this field and impacts the individual as they move through this space. A middle ground between the thoughts of Foucault’s Panopticism, as
presented in *Discipline and Punish* ([1975] 1995) and Michel de Certeau’s observations of walking in the city in his *The Practice of Everyday Life* (1984) emerges in light of the impact these sites have on inhabitants of the cityscape. Foucault’s conceptualization of the city starts with discipline, which “proceeds from the distribution of individuals in space” (Foucault [1975] 1995, 141). His idea of the city as one that is structured to control and make “docile” the citizenry through the manipulation of space, through enclosing, partitioning, and making functional space and the individuals that inhabit it. Drawing on the example of the ports of Rochefort, France, Foucault forwards that institutions transformed the area into a “medically useful space” out of what was “a crossroads for dangerous mixtures, a meeting-place for forbidden circulations” through means beyond the military presence there (ibid., 144). Through economic controls over commodities, military controls over the soldiers present, and administrative control to enforce law over the area, the individualizing powers of the hospital was able to create space in docile bodies for political and further administrative control. Particularly relevant to this study is the creation of functional spaces which “would gradually, in the disciplinary institutions, code a space that architecture generally left at the disposal of several different uses” (ibid., 143) and serve as a means of understanding the control and manipulation of space that shapes and extends beyond the individual. As will be demonstrated, the historic presence of these sites have been factored into the creation of functional space, with the past being taken into consideration in codification of “a useful space” (ibid. 144). In this sense, the history of the use of space around the sites has been manipulated over time and through numerous institutions of organizing power ranging from Joseon, through Japanese imperialization, and to modern political-economic forms. Under each regime, Seoul overall and
the particular sites have been reinterpreted and reconfigured to establish varying orders and functions of control.

Alternatively, de Certeau’s metaphor of walking as “speech acts” that create stories as one moves through the city appears equally true, despite its proposal to counter a Foucaultian understanding of urban space. The individual’s creation of the city through “procedures that elude discipline without being outside the field in which it is exercised” (de Certeau 1984, 96) places the primacy of observation on practices that defy the attempt to, as Foucault forwarded, code space. The subjective experiences of named spaces, which “carve out pockets of hidden and familiar meanings” that “change [places] into passages” (ibid. 104) make the city a dynamic, actively created whole. However, especially in consideration of historical sites and their maintained, and often emphasized, presences, they do not “slowly lose, as worn coins, the value engraved on them” (ibid.).

The continued presence of historic sites in the cityscape, which is the focus of this research, implies a dialectical interplay between both the Foucaultian “disciplinary institutions” (Foucault 1975 [1995], 143) and de Certeau’s walkers, as well as between space and time. The creation of these spaces have been based on numerous institutions through time that have dictated the ways in which the environment has been built. These constructions have been influenced by a multitude of factors, including geomancy and economic decisions. In the instances of historic sites, however, previous use has proven an important consideration in the creation of functional space. While the institutional dictations of functional spaces have influenced the environment through which the walkers move, the activities of these inhabitants have played a part in the direction in which functional spaces have been defined. The names of spaces, de Certeau’s rubbed coins, are often based on the physical structures at their centers.
These structures, and the continued memory of them by proxy of both the walker’s passing and the functional space, resist this erasure of meaning just as they lead to their institutional creation. To use de Certeau’s own metaphor of the city as a text, the stories of walkers is filled in with their own experiences based on the narrative structure within the Foucaultian functional space.

**Approaching the Cityscape**

In order to underpin these two theoretical approaches and establish a fuller understanding of how the environment is shaped and shapes those who dwell in it, a number of approaches were employed. These sites, Namedaemun Gate, Jogyesa Temple, Haengjusanseong Fortress, Deoksugung Palace, and Namsangol Hanok Village\(^3\), call on a common and relatively recent period of history, have differing levels of change and points of reference as well as engagements with the modern cityscape. In choosing these, the hope is that both common threads and specific creations may be observed. As the cityscape, as Cosgrove (1985) and Ingold (2000) indicate, is not composed of discrete units, arbitrary units have been particularly investigated. As a part of this, the contours of any given site’s influence played a key role in deducing the importance of a given location as a referent. While approached more broadly in later chapters, Namedaemun Gate presents the most clear case; with a market bearing its name and multiple illustrated representations, the proximity of the market to the gate enhances the prominence and ‘visibility’ of both.

---

\(^3\) For ease of reading, each site will be referred to in the same manner throughout this work, despite a linguistic redundancy in most. Jogyesa, for instance, literally translates to Jogye Temple. This decision was made for a number of reasons, primarily to serve as reminders of the nature of the site, to avoid confusion with nearby areas, Namdaemun Gate and Namdaemun market as an example, and because it is common practice through Seoul to include this redundancy on street signs and on websites.
As movement through the cityscape is intrinsically tied with an understanding, accurate or not, of the function and meaning of structures beyond their mere presence, this research focuses on the ways in which these sites have been repurposed interiorly, be it within buildings or behind walls, with references to their intended purposes (Bourdieu 1979). Viewing some of these sites as being simultaneously museums, tourist attractions, and historical sites in their own rights, the interiors were examined in terms of the types of information they portray and the target audiences they demonstrate. At the time of my fieldwork, a major change has presented a further nuance to this aspect in the form of a shifting tourist demographic. For example, with the rise of Chinese tourism, a game of linguistic catch-up has ensued in the decision to and enacting of inclusion of a new group of visitors on even the basic levels of directions or posted signs. As such, not only are the diverse target audiences, in terms of motivation and origin, important to note, but so are the actual visitors with this changing audience, intended or not, altering both the present reality of these sites and the plans for them.

Key to all of this, however, are the words of those whom inhabit these locations as their experiences of, feelings in, and thoughts on the cityscape are both the clearest forms of its impact while serving to create it. Previous attempts at capturing landscape within the anthropological data has featured a major gap in terms of how to best collect data, with methods ranging from linguistics and the ways in which a researcher experiences the landscape (Gell 1995) to examining political discourses about it (Selwyn 1995), the attempt here is to give those who live within the cityscape primacy. Above and beyond the photographic and observational data gathered over these two months, the interviews will inform the following chapters, allowing the

---

4 Chinese tourists in South Korea were reported number over 4 million in 2009 (Kang 2009), with worldwide projections placing China to be the number one country of origin for tourists by 2020 at an estimated 115 million people a year (Shie 2007).
cityscape to be examined not just in terms of a history as written in it, but as a living, lived in environment.

**Chapter Outline**

The layout of this research is an attempt to unfold the layers of the theoretical concepts outlined above by establishing the impacts of these locations on the cityscape overall before moving into the presentation of each site and, finally, the emotions and thoughts imbued within them as they are experienced by their visitors. Chapter one serves as an anchor for the research by providing a brief description of each site, in terms of their unique histories and physical presence. The histories of Korea, Seoul, and the development of historical sites as a project overall will be, in part, unfolded over the course of these site descriptions. Each has its own historical reference and presence, which is selected upon to be displayed or obscured to visitors. As such, this chapter will be presented in the order of their most prominent and commonly referenced historical moments while the passage of time will remain generally to be seen in regards to its impact on these sites. With the establishment of these locations and their referenced histories, their influence on their surroundings, presentation of their importance, and the rooting of the experience of visitors can be explored.

Chapter two, “The Merging of Time and Place,” keys in on, particularly, the concept of dwelling proposed by Tim Ingold (2000) and the ways in which time and place merge into a solitary yet fluidly transversible whole. As Ingold notes, movement and presence through and in a landscape is not bound either spatially or temporally. Rather, all boundaries that exist are products of human action and delimitation made on objectively continuous space. Further, time becomes important in that animals are products of the labor of their predecessors and will create
what their descendants also move through. Particularly in light of the historic nature, and even more with regards to the toural elements, these sites manifest clearly both the spatial and temporal dimension of Ingold’s theory. This chapter focuses on the ways in which the presence and references of these sites alter the ways in which individuals perceive of their environment and move through it. Further, with an eye towards the future, something will be said of the plans made for these locations from the view of site managers, many specifically in regard to tourists and the reconstruction of the past in the present.

Aspects of the museal/toural come to the fore in chapter three, “The Presentation of History in Seoul.” In this, the aspects of the toural will be refined and nuanced. Drawing on the examples of these sites, the contours between this concept and the museal may more fully be explored. In particular, goals and motivations, as well as the shared yet differentiated space of local and tourist will be examined. With this in mind, the plans made in terms of space, as explored in chapter two, become components of identification, presentation, and representation. Audience selection in regards to “touri-alization” must balance between the academic and preservation of normal musealization with the added dimensions of economic decision making and the needs of those who inhabit the space. These second features are, themselves, aspects loaded with concepts of ethno-nationalism, as the preference for tourists, at times, comes in conflict with the needs, presumed or real, native Koreans and Seoulites. The presentation of specific histories to particular audiences contributes to the knowledge individuals have as they

---

5 I use ethno-nationalism particularly in reference to the fact that in South Korea, considered ethnically “homogeneous” (CIA World Factbook, accessed 10/27/14). Korean-ethnic population, appears to have little division between Korean as an ethnic group and Korea as a country. Even in regard to the division of the peninsula between North and South Korea, matters of nationalism are often framed in regards to the correct course of Koreans as an ethnic whole (Shin et.al 1999). Linguistically, the Korean term for nation, minjok, also refers to ethnicity (Ryang 1990).
move through the cityscape, further informed by the influence of these sites on the cityscape at large, and guide the ways in which the sites are experienced and conceived of by visitors.

“Pride, Shame, Politics, and Parks,” the fourth chapter, takes these concepts into consideration as the focus shifts solidly on the ways in which these sites are used and the understandings and uses visitors have of them. Drawing from the words of the interviewees, this section particularly hones in on the discourses people came to in reference to the sites they visited. These locations, by and large, were considered with a mixture of pride, at the long history and international visitors they represented. Simultaneously, people spoke of the shame of Koreans in regards to their poor maintenance of the locations, their lack of attention to their past, and their place on the international stage. This mixture, in turn, turned to the political field and the short-fallings of the government in site upkeep and protection. As many of these sites are themselves often staging grounds for political commentary and protest, while also being punctuated by a history or spatial reference to political discourse, they become permeated within and without by this field. All of this, however, becomes wrapped into the most common, practical view of these sites: parks.

The combination of these perspectives creates a more complete understanding of the cityscape of Seoul as part of a mutually creative process with those who exist within it. Particularly in regards to the historic nature of these sites, the cityscape as both a spatial and temporal continuum is emphasized as a constant reference in each of these sites. The histories of the sites are then presented in different ways and to different audiences, which in turn becomes part of the influence they have on the cityscape overall. Further, these references to the past and considerations for the future come together in the presence of visitors in the form of emotional experiences. Without expanding not only the notion of the cityscape but the lens through which it
is understood, these sentiments and thoughts, expressed in politics, reflexive views of the other, or even the motives and results of visits, would remain obscured: the very foundations for the modern metropolis becoming only reminders of lost past.
CHAPTER 2
SITE DESCRIPTIONS

In order to approach these sites, as well as their influence on the cityscape, the creation of their interiors as museal or toural, and to understand their emotional power, they themselves must first be presented. As their presence within the cityscape serve as markers of Korea’s history they naturalizing narratives of the past in the lives of people who pass by or visit them. These sites and the narratives they house and emanate further serve to advertise and bring pride to people by means of visits from foreigners. The presence of these locations, as tourist attractions and historical anchors in Seoul, then expand their influences into the surrounding areas in regards to the types of businesses present, references to the location, and the establishment of a larger narrative of Korean history. This chapter serves to anchor these sites in terms of space and time by presenting them here as one moves through them and, wherever possible, demonstrating their historical references as they are experienced in their movement. Rather than presenting an overall history of the city, the information presented here is organized to show the patchwork of modern Seoul as it relates to its past and present. Each site has been arranged in a semi-chronological order with regards to its most commonly referred to point in history while their narratives will take the place of grander histories. The following descriptions will be the main references thorough the remainder of this research project and are presented here as closely as possible to the experience of visiting.
Haengjusanseong Fortress

While not in Seoul proper, Haengjusanseong, or Haengju Mountain Fortress, overlooks the western highway into and out of the city, a white-stone obelisk observable from the top of the heavily forested mountain as one leaves Seoul. Originally built during the Three Kingdoms period (57 – 668 BCE) by the Baekje Kingdom, the fortress’ position over the Han River stood in defense of their capital, Wireyseong, in the area of modern Seoul (Hawley 2010). This fortress gained prominence, however, during the Imjin War (1592-1598 CE), in which it served as the site of a major defeat of Japanese invasion forces in protection of the capital. At this point, the unused fortress was quickly reinforced, leading to the stunning military defeat of a force of 30,000 soldiers by 3,000 individuals led by Kwon Yul.

The defenders themselves have become references, reminders of ethnic-national sacrifice and triumph that spans across social rank and gender. Kwon Yul’s use of professional and volunteer soldiers, warrior-monks, and women has become immortalized through the site. As one enters, immediately to the front and right, looms a monument of the general in full armor,
hands before him at the hilt of his sheathed sword. Behind him is a cement semi-circle featuring bronze plates, each depicting the separate classes from which the defenders hailed; from right to left, the professional soldiers, the volunteers, and the warrior-monks all battle across the short stone walls. To the farthest left are the women, who gather rocks in their long aprons, a style which has since taken on the name of the mountain, haengju. In each cast, atop his horse and with his sword drawn, Kwon Yul issues orders and rallies his diverse troops. Next to each bronze, the role each has played has been described, etched into black stone.

As one continues following the sloped, easily bending paths up the mountain, the shared role of the site’s base as a place of leisurely strolls and outdoor sitting becomes clear. A few hundred paces up the path and to the left, areas have been reserved as a lawn plaza and separate sitting area and photo exhibition, displaying professional shots taken at the mountain over the seasons and for various events. In the lawn plaza, a metal cylinder with two rings has been placed into a beaten dirt circle with broken and weathered wood and rubber arrows for tunho, an ancient Korean game similar to horseshoes. Through the few trees surrounding the plaza and rest
area, the cityscape of Seoul and the numerous bridges and highways over the Han River can be seen in the background. Immediately across the path, a much more heavily wooded resting area skirts the walkway, with displays giving information about the local fauna. From this point, the path divides into three areas: the climb leading to the top and museum, a path towards a shrine to Kwon Yul, and an earthen-path climb along the former walls of the fortress.

The implementation of military technologies, including recurve short bows, cannons, and the \textit{hwacha}, an antipersonnel weapon that fired around 100 arrows or 50 rockets, feature prominently in the site today. The museum, nestled off the main path about half way between the parking lot to the summit, displays recreations and artifacts from the era, as well as paintings of the battle, General Kwon Yul, and depictions of his other victories. Housed within this museum, electronic media has been installed, from a repeating video on the \textit{hwacha} to an interactive game in which the player controls a hwacha and, in the style of Whack-a-Mole, fires on Japanese invaders while avoiding Korean defenders. Next to a banner about the plight of Comfort Women,\textsuperscript{6} written in Korean and English, a museum sign stresses the reasons for Korea’s victory here:

- “Predominate strategies of General Gwon Yul and his staffs.
- Use of scientifically designed latest arms.
- Natural and geographic conditions that formed a position taken up with a river and cliff behind the troops.
- Perfect unity of the private sector, public sector, troops, monks and women who fought at the risk of their lives.”

The black walkways that guide tourists through what would be thick forests to the top of the mountain also prominently displays these weapons of war, painted as those in the museum’s.

\textsuperscript{6} Comfort woman are the common title for women, mostly Korean taken, during Japanese imperialization and forced into sexual service for the Japanese military. Denialists or apologists amongst the Japanese government have caused a server rift in relations between the two countries. See Izumi 2011, Varga 2009, Min 2003.
Following the path towards the shrine, Chungjangsa, a substantial change of scenery occurs as even the walkways shift from black asphalt to painted like golden bricks, divided by a swerving streak of grey under a red arch. Unlike other walkways, the forest closely nudges against the path as it curves around the mountain before opening up to the shrine itself. Signs indicate the traditional proper way to pass through the wooden entry through the wall made of large brick; one enters through the right and exits through the left, though such places would usually be closed to the public. Despite this declaration of tradition, the instructions were only loosely followed by visitors and little impacted the flow of people. The shrine’s nameplate, another sign explains, was painted by Park Chung-Hee, the controversial president from 1961 to his assassination in 1979, as part of his campaign to reinvigorate heritage tourism and rebuild the mountain after its devastation during the Korean War (1950-1953). After one climbs the large granite stairs, the shrine itself is sparse with only a cauldron for incense, along with the sticks themselves and cheap, disposable lighters attached with string and tape. Overlooking the entry from the opposite wall hangs a framed painting of General Kwon Yul.
The mountain top, in addition to a panoramic view of Seoul, the Han River, and the Haengju Bridge that spans across it, features the majority of the buildings and monuments dedicated to the battle. The large obelisk features prominently, surrounded by various pavilions, monuments, and observation binoculars. The white stone obelisk, first seen as one approaches the mountain from Seoul, features the general and a small troop of his trained soldiers under large engravings of Chinese characters. This is one of two daecheopbi, or stone victory monuments, at the top of this mountain; the other, originally carved in 1602 and weather worn to the point that the engraved characters are nearly illegible, rests nearby under a protective housing. Across the mountain’s top is a modern building, though created in traditional style, with a wooden sign post in English explaining it as “Haengju Sansong (Mountain Fortress) The Visual Education Center.” From this vantage point, the sound of traffic and small aircraft can be heard, mingling with the sounds of the forest and the din of older women chatting under a brightly painted gazebo.
Namdaemun Gate

Namdaemun (Eng: Great South Gate) or Sungnyemun (Eng: Gate of Exalted Ceremonies), was built as one of the eight entrances of Seoul as it was made capital under Joseon’s third king Taejong in 1391 (Hulbert 1962). Located with a nearly direct line of sight, once all the more clear without the construction of the large office buildings and city hall that now exist, to Gyeongbokgung, the main palace of the old kingdoms, the gate served as a major component of economic and symbolic life. This view itself is a matter of recent rediscovery as the Japanese capitol building turned national museum that once blocked this line of sight was demolished in 1996 after 70 years (Kirk 1999). Since 1414, the gate itself has marked not only the entrance to the city, but also its major marketplace. Its role as a proper gate, however, was cut down in 1907, during Japanese imperialization of the country (1910-1945) (Rii and Choi 2008). Without its walls, however, the double-pavilion continued to serve as a symbol of Seoul and Korea overall, named as a cultural treasure by imperial scholars.

Beyond the view, much is new about the large stone-and-wood gate. From the deep green and vibrant red paint to the bright, clean stones of the wall, the gate itself is a recent site in the Seoul cityscape. While the gate was renovated a number of times through its history, the two most recent construction projects took place since the second half of the 20th century. After the large-scale destruction of Seoul during the Korean War, the administration of Park Chung-Hee rallied for the restoration of multiple historic sites, including Namdaemun. During this nationalistic program, starting in 1961, slogans such as “Reconstruct the Nation” were used and Namdaemun was named National Treasure no 1 (Rii and Choi 2008, 3-4). The second, much more recent, construction project was its nearly complete rebuilding following an arsonist’s attack in 2008.
In 2006, public access to the gate was opened for everywhere except the top-most level under the guardianship of the Cultural Heritage Administration, a federal organization (Korea Times, 02/11/2008). On the night of February 10, 2008, the gate was set ablaze by a disgruntled 69-year-old man to raise awareness of what he believed was the unfair settlement by the government for his land (Chosun Ilbo, 02/13/2008). The nearly 600-year-old structure that stood at the center of a major rotary in downtown Seoul was nearly completely destroyed, with little more than the wooden frame remaining. In the following months, crowds swelled to pay tribute and shamanic rituals took place at the remains as the government vowed to rebuild (Rii and Choi 2008). Perhaps since the first time since the 1996 debate over the Korean-ness of the Japanese-appointed National Treasure (Pai 2001), the gate was a topic of great discussion.

In May 2013, the white walls that surrounded the reconstruction were removed and Namdaemun, with heightened security and a large beaten-earth and grass visiting area, was reopened. The original doors, still plated with red metal sheets and rivets, remain open during the day, one of the few elements spared from the fire. Using historic documents and techniques, the
The open gate during the day, used as an area for a small stroll.

vast majority has been rebuilt and looks it. Just past the doors, the golden and green royal dragons painted on the ceiling looks fresh amongst the bright blue, red, and green wisps of cloud on their black background. Along the pavilions, repeated patterns of yin and yang, thinner and more tightly wound than the Chinese counterparts, have been painted on the body while pink and red Rose of Sharon, the national flower of South Korea, decorate the ends of the roof’s supports. Contrasted with the new stone, the arch of the gate’s entry is aged and evidence of the fire can still be faintly seen in the blackened blocks.

Most importantly, and perhaps the most tragically ironic aspect of Namdaemun’s recent story, is the remade name plate. The plate, written in Chinese characters, was originally written to symbolize fire; the unique arrangement of the plate vertically made the characters appear like fire, while the south corresponds to the element. As I was told by a number of informants, the plate alone was also the reason reconstruction was seen as a failure. Being seen as the most important aspect of the building, the pavilions indeed being said to “not matter at all,” the
incorrect colors of the new sign invalidated the project and, as will be discussed later, was a failure on the part of the city and a point of shame.

The reconstruction, however, has returned a major symbol to the area. Beyond the line of Gyeongbokgung Palace, City Hall, and Namdaemun, the nearby market that takes its name from the gate has regained its referent. Namdaemun Market is a mixed open air and contained marketplace, redesigned in the 1960s after another fire (Nam 2011). While more detail will be provided later (Chapter 3), the role Namdaemun plays in the market goes beyond the name. The entrances, themselves called gates, feature signs shaped like the proper gate. As one walks through the crowded paths, shared by vendors selling tourist trinkets, socks, and various snacks, and the buyers from Seoul and beyond, towards Gate One, Namdaemun stands immediately across the street, often illuminated between its display lights and the LCD car advertisement from a nearby office building.
The role of this landmark for commerce goes beyond the market, as even the nearby underground walkways are often filled during the days by blankets covered in miscellaneous items for sale, including paintings of wild horses, batteries, and battered children’s books. Indeed, one of the few things for free in the area is the visit inside Namdaemun’s new security gates. Signs outside the low fence give details about the history of the gate, from its hours to its service as Joseon’s capital’s gate and role in the king’s ritual against drought or natural disaster to its reconstructive history. Inside, however, little detail is given. The small space carved out in the center of the city is mostly comprised of small, grassy hills and sand between the sidewalk and the stone immediately under the gate’s eaves. Besides the office building for the dual security guard-tourist guide, with another posted history untranslated from hangul, the gate is allowed to speak for itself as a symbol of Seoul.

**Deoksugung Palace**

Deoksugung Palace sits in the center of power of Seoul. Originally established as a Joseon royal home, not palace, Deoksugung gained its importance during the Imjin Wars. With the sacking of Seoul by Japanese forces, it remained the sole standing home (Hulbert 1962). As a palace, it was renamed *Gyeongun-gung*, or “Good Fortune for the Country,” to remain a symbol of Korea’s struggle and perseverance against the invasion. The role of the palace as a center for an embattled Korea would continue through history and has marked the scenery of today.

The smallest of all the palaces, Deoksugung was replaced as the primary palace shortly after, and was renamed *Sugung*, the west palace. It remained little altered or used from 1618 to 1884. In an attempted coup, led by progressive elements in Korea sided with the Japanese was
used because of its defensible position (K. Lee 1984). Though the time spent at Deoksugung was short, the palace would again be used as a primary palace in 1897, with the establishment of the Great Korean Empire (1897-1910).

With growing Japanese influence across northeast Asia in the 1890s, empire building in Korea came to a head in 1895 after Japanese defeat of China in the Sino-Japanese wars (1894-1895). Korea became a diplomatic battle ground between western and eastern forces, culminating with the assassination of Queen Min on October 8, 1895 and the fleeing of the king and prince to the Russian legation on February 11, 1896 (Nahm 1993). A group of nationalist Koreans, forming “The Independence Club,” put pressure on the king to leave Russian protection, return to Gyeongbokgung palace, and declare Korea an empire. King Gojong did indeed leave the Russian legation and declare himself emperor, changing his reign name to Kwangmu, or “Martial Brilliance” (K. Lee 1984). However, his imperial palace would not be the vast
Gyeongbokgung, but small Deoksugung, again renamed Gyeongun-gung, the closest palace to
the Russian and American presence in Seoul (ibid.).

It is from this moment in history that Deoksugung underwent the majority of changes that
would transform it into what it is today. Emperor Gojong’s love for the palace, along with the
modernization efforts and political situations of the time, left a permanent mark on the palace,
and Seoul by proxy. Today, the palace holds a unique combination of traditional Korean and
western architecture, a blending contributed to Russian A.I. Sabatin and Englishman J. R.
Harding. Even after he passed his throne to his son, Gojong continued to live in the mixed
palace, changing the name to what it holds today, Deoksugung, or “Virtuous Longevity,” in the
hope for his continued health and long life.

The architectural blending seen today is only about one third of the palace grounds that
once existed, with reductions made for enlarged roads and large portions sold in 1933, the year it
was officially made into a park. The traditionally styled, pavilion-style main gate that stands
The traditional-style houses that now serve as museum displays. Entry is strictly off limits and prevented by guards.

today faces out towards the ultra-modern city hall and one of the busiest streets of Seoul, the open courtyard off the street wedged between the palace, the packed road, and a popular American donut chain. When the changing of the guard is not being reenacted by men in the bright robes, tall hats, and usually false beards, it is often filled with a mixture of tourists taking pictures or trying on costume hanbok (traditional Korean clothing), business people, and assorted political movements. To enter, one pays the marginal fee of 1,000 won ($0.93 USD) unless exempt under the categories of “Children under age 7, Permanent Residency (F-5) status holder (age 65 ~), Culture day (last Wednesday of every month), Those wearing a hanbok7 (traditional Korean clothes).” The large stone wall one passes through wraps around the smaller park and palace. A generation ago, this was a popular date spot for young students; today, however, the walls of Deoksugung are said to curse any couple walking by, dooming them to break up.

7 I am unsure if the costumes occasionally offered nearby would qualify for this discount.
Past the walls and away from the busy street, lush green dominates the palace grounds. Through the trees, casting shade over squares of grass or pathways and sitting areas of grey earth, the Korean-style buildings are the first in sight. Immediately past the gates, information and security booths flank the gate, with a modern gift shop disguised in traditional forms just beyond to the right. Along the slanted tops of the stone walls, the sounds and sights of the busy Seoul streets and high-rises make the peaceful historic site even more serene through the sheer contrast, a sentiment echoed by interviewees. Following the dirt path, one is led to the main sitting room of emperor Gojong; the pavilion entry, granite steps, and stone tortoises still guide visitors to the largely empty throne room, the large wooden chair facing the viewers. Between the throne room and the gift shop are the now-empty living quarters for the royal family. Long buildings, raised off the ground to provide the floor heating known as *ondol*, form a rectangle that visitors may casually peruse. The buildings themselves have been prepared for such visits, with cement filling the roof’s corners and vibrant paint remarkably fresh.
As one continues following the dirt path along the wall, a general rest area positions one at the corner, showing the contrast and division of Korean and western architecture the site is known for. Here, a small display of Korean technology is housed: a *hwach'a*, large bell, and water clock. A concession stand and restrooms, like the gift store near the entrance, have both been designed to blend with the Korean architectural aesthetic. In sight, buildings almost more suited for Europe than a Korean historic site are in plain view. Columned, white-stone buildings that once served as Gojong’s living quarters now house the Korean Museum of Modern Arts. The buildings forming an L-shape around Korea’s first modern fountain, metal seals shooting water away from the central font. Nestled even further behind these tall, neo-classical buildings is a small, sheltered and lush walking area. Following the path through the short natural trail deposits visitors behind the traditional houses to an open-air stage. Centered behind the two contrastingly styled sections of Deoksugung is the most blended single building. Past the thin, green poles, gold-painted grates of traditional royal design segmenting each post, that surround the stage are the pavilion roof’s true support beams: grey stone, European columns between large red-brick corners.

**Jogyesa Temple**

Jogyesa temple, despite its recent history, is often framed as a deeply historic site. This conception of tradition in a site created just over 100 years ago is perhaps best understood with the close linkage of the location and the Jogye Order as the affirmed sect of Korean Buddhism. The order dates back to the 14th century during the Koryo dynasty as a uniting of the Nine Mountain Sects of *Son*, or Zen, and the *Kyo*, the Textual school, and is credited with a less sectarian form of Buddhism compared, particularly, with Japan (Nahm 1993). The modern
formation of the Jogye Order, however, is again a much more recent development. After the Japanese imperial attempts at introducing Japanese style Buddhism, namely in the practice of marriage, the Jogye Order known today came about as a result of the politically entwined and supported Buddhist Purification Movement started in 1954 (Yoon 2012). The purging of non-celibate monks, placed in power by the imperial government, led to sometimes violent conflict and governmental, arguably non-constitutional, intervention and the prominence of the Jogye Order as the representative of Korean Buddhism (Mun 2007).

It is from the Jogye Order that Jogyesa, their head temple, takes its name. The original temple, created not far from its site in downtown Seoul and in view of the traditional Insa-dong street, was founded in 1910 and echoes the same history of the modern order. Built as Gakhwangsa, the original temple was created as the center of the Japanese-sponsored organization “Union of the 30 Main Temples” which was an effort to unite the temples across Korea under the Taego, or non-celibate, sect (of Taizé 2008). The success of the Taego Order
permeated so deeply that the temple was eventually renamed Taegosa before taking the name of its rival order in 1954.

Today, little of the history of conflict and post-colonial religious purging is seen in the temple. The only remnants is now on an informational plaque outside the temple’s pavilion entry, distancing itself from the original Gakhwangsa temple and minimizing the conflicts between the two orders, which will be discussed more in later chapters. Now, the temple is presented as something between a tourist destination and an active temple, drawing on the past and present to create a space to cater to both audiences. Few signs like the historical plaque are displayed through the actual worship grounds, with information available at numerous offices staffed with volunteers to help foreign tourists. Those that are present, however, focus on the trees within the temple grounds, notably the lacebark pine, appointed Natural Treasure No. 9, which grows between gravel parking lot and the elevated worship area.
As one walks up the few short stairs through the entrance, guarded by large, armor-clad metal cutouts, one is greeted by a large opening to the temple’s grounds. Immediately to the left are small offices, built in traditional, wooden style, advertising “Information for Foreigners.” Just beyond the small ATM is a two-story, drab-grey western style building which houses the Dutch coffee house and gift store, where one may purchase chants on CD, beads, icons, or donations of grain for the monks. To the right, past the parking lot, are the large, square glass buildings that contain the order’s offices, a small coffee and tea shop, and the recently reopened museum. Three statues stand between the museum and temple grounds: a granite turtle holding a black plinth, a stone wheel with a depiction of Buddha in the center, and a stone Buddha altar. The altar, facing visitors as they walk towards the main worship area and nestled under the lacebark pine, is designed in chibi aesthetic, a Japanese animation term for the reimagining of characters as young children. Coins, and occasionally snacks such as ginger biscuits frequently given with the purchase of a designer coffee, are often found in his outstretched left hand and offerings of bottled water and flowers from the gift shop are presented on the table before him.

Tourists snap pictures amongst bowing worshipers and grey-clad monks under the Chinese Scholar Tree in the earthen courtyard. Dominating the scene is the daeungjeon, Main Dharma Hall, the worship center of the temple. The large building, elevated off the ground by a stone foundation at least three feet tall, the wooden building’s intricate carvings and paintings contrast with the relative simplicity of its design. The hall is comprised of little more than a wood-floored worship area, where believers kneel to chant and pray, before three ten-foot-tall golden Buddhas sitting in lotus position. A small table is placed before the Buddhas’ elevated platform where monks lead chants and worship. Natural lighting that pours in from the green shuttered walls is amplified by the shaped lights that surround the statues. Outside, over the wide
lip of the temple’s platform where people often sit to hid from the summer sun, the roof’s underside has been painted with vibrant blues, greens, reds, and yellows. At the corners of the sloped roof, horned dragon heads look out.

Next to a sitting area that hugs the plain building, a small section of the temple grounds has been reserved for the burning of incense. Often, practitioners would visit here before circling the giant stone pagoda as the golden outline of Guan Yin overlooks from a nearby building owned by the order. A belfry and secondary worship area flank another small office for foreigner tourists, this one providing information for the order’s Temple Stay program. Beyond the confines of the quiet, sparse worship area, downtown Seoul’s presence is unavoidable with the glint of skyscrapers and shadows of cranes.

On the busy street along Jogyesa, the temple’s presence is felt. More than simply the presence of the grey-robbed monks, the industry of Buddhism is seen and heard. Recorded chants play from statue stores. Nearly every store front along the entire stretch of road references
the temple, if it is not directly owned by the order. Immediately across the street, in four-story, metal-paneled building is the headquarters for Jogye’s Temple stay, with blocky cartoon figures from Buddhist mythology advertising from the street. Tea shops, worship paraphernalia vendors, and clothing stores spread from this religious epicenter, the pink lotus sticker displayed in many of the shops’ windows making the reference and belief of the owners clear beyond economic exchange.

Tucked around the corner from this religiously affiliated street is another area that is often associated with Jogyesa. Insa-dong is a street designated by the Seoul government in 2002 as a “designated cultural area,” geared specifically for tradition and tourism. Marked at the shared corner by a giant bronze calligraphy brush, the street once housed mostly traditional art supplies, antique shops, and book stores. Today, in light of increased tourism, the merchant street has experienced a twist in its wares and vendors (Korea Herald, 11/27/2012). Art galleries and shops selling “Buddha-chic” clothing dot the strip, often closed to traffic, while space is predominately used for shops selling a mixture of tourist trinkets and traditional goods. It is not unusual, in Insa-dong, to pass through the doors of a shop surrounded by socks, bookmarks, and fans to enter into a traditional goods vendor, selling hand-made wooden masks or casts of much more obscure elements of Korean history than the latest K-Pop boy band. Street vendors are also established along the road, selling everything from Turkish ice cream to Buddhist-style wooden utensils. Beyond the busy central road, restaurants advertising authentic Korean food are tucked into the narrow side streets. Tradition, be it marked in the temple or the stores beyond its grounds, has been packaged around Jogyesa with a particular eye towards tourism.
The path leading up to Namsangol Hanok Village. Before this point, buildings block in both the right and left of the road.

**Namsangol Hanok Village**

Of all the sites selected, Namsangol Hanok Village is the most recreated, the history of its mountain location a loose reference in the present display of traditional houses. The south mountain, *Namsan*, is renown for its beauty, and much less so for its association with the political and military past of Seoul. Until 1945, the summit was the home to the Chosen Jingu, a State-Shinto shrine Koreans were forced to worship at; the site would eventually house the Ahn Jung-guen Memorial Hall in remembrance of his assassination of Japanese Prime Minister and former Resident-General of Korea Ito Hirobumi. Today, Seoul Tower overlooks the city from its peak, accessible by road and cable car. In its past, however, the mountain housed the Korean Central Intelligence Agency, known at the time for its holding of opponents to president Park Chung-Hee. The valley at its foot, Namsangol, housed the garrison of both Japanese Imperial forces as a military headquarters and the Korean Army’s city defense forces.
Immediately inside Namsangol Hanok Village. The photo-op cutouts can be seen on the left, styled after Korean Drama costumes.

The Namsangol that is experienced today is the result of the 600 year anniversary of Seoul in 1994. On this occasion, the Korean military was moved from the mountain base, a large time capsule was buried in the center of the grounds, and the area was made a park. In 1997, five hanok, or traditional Joseon-style houses, from around Seoul were brought to the valley and opened to the public in 1998. Along with the infusion of history, the landscape of the mountain was altered, creating a hybrid of historic presentation and modern park, a symbol of Seoul and a tourist destination.

Coming off the full streets of downtown Seoul, Namsangol Hanok Village is accessible from a small alleyway, passing convenience stores and Munhwa Broadcasting Network headquarters. The almost hidden entry, I was told by workers at the site, was a remnant of the sites military past: the area was made to house soldiers and be defensible, not to draw in visitors from the street. The last building before the park grounds advertises hanbok costume rentals and pictures with the ability to wear the clothes into the park itself. Just beyond the small parking lot,
Looking into the hanok village from the gift shop. Costumed staff often lead events such as traditional medicine tourism initiatives and tea sampling.

reserved for foreigners and usually filled with buses used for Chinese tour packages, the short wall that surrounds the park is broken at the end of the alley by the large, three-entry pavilion gates. In stark contrast with the cramped walk to the site, the open and lush park floods the eye as one passes under the sloped roof.

Inside, a wide path leads into the main courtyard of the park. On either side, stands of traditional figures with cut out faces give tourists a photo opportunity, including a stylized Joseon warrior, noble men and women, and a couple in marriage clothes. A small, thatch-roofed hut contains traditional wooden back slings for visitors to don. A similar style building has been erected across the courtyard, displays of woven goods hang strung across a rope along the roof and old men in traditional peasant clothing practice the craft in the simple structure’s shade. Separated by a small sitting area and vending machines, stone bleachers have been built into the hill to view the stage, where the site puts on various performances such as taekwondo demonstrations. Hugging the stage from beyond is giant sitting pavilion where people sit along
the edge and children run along the open wood floor. The view from the rectangular pavilion is stunningly different depending on which direction one faces. Towards the gate, an idyllic pond has been built, with squares of lotus and lily pads floating over schools of koi. Trees border the pond, shading small benches among patches of flowers. In the opposite direction, the green mountain is in plain view, topped by Seoul Tower on the distant peak. Further walled off, the roofs of the hanok are just visible from this vantage.

Through another gate, the transplanted houses have been arranged in no particular order, though each remains segregated in a scaled-down version of Korean style courtyards. The homes of people ranging from royal in-laws to carpenters are displayed to demonstrate the social scale of relative elites in late Joseon. Each home allows one to walk along the elevated walkways and peer through open sliding doors where old-style furniture has been arranged next to small plaques telling their purpose. Occasionally, as one walks through courtyards and gates to different houses and sections, men and women in traditional clothing sit in the rooms, conducting hands-on traditional lessons in calligraphy or health-conscious tea drinking. In some areas, tourists from around the world in rented costumes have their pictures taken in a Joseon setting.
As one walks through the buildings, the walkway curves around the back, leading one to either the Millennium Time Capsule or the *Namsan Gugakdong*, a traditional music hall. The path towards the time capsule leads to the meteor crater that it rests in. A slopped path winds to the bottom, where the tunnel to the capsule itself houses digital displays where one may explore the items buried and their symbolic meaning. To be opened in 2394, a cement circle encases the capsule, engraved with the kind regards and best wishes of the 1994 mayors from Seoul’s sister cities around the world. Curving back towards the main courtyard of the park, the music hall’s complex is simple in its traditional design. Rooms form a circled hall around an open area for recitals, where gift shops, information offices, and a coffee shop remain open during the day. The balance struck with the site, as was explained by the management team, has been a difficult one as the multitude of roles for Namsangol demand different, and at times contrasting, responses.

**History and Location**

As a cursory introduction to these sites, it becomes clear that the reference and power of their histories are selected upon and displayed according to specific audiences and with certain goals. Indeed, the very presence of these sites within the cityscape is, itself, a selection upon history by multiple sources; that is to say, certain events and certain locations are made important, allowed to stay in the processes of change and emphasized in their presentation. Beyond this, the “influence” of their presences varies at each site. From the heavy presence of Buddhist shopping near Jogyesa Temple to the almost invisible entry to Namsangol Hanok Village, the references to history and location beyond the confines of the individual site demonstrate the continual aspect of landscape theorized by Ingold (2000). With these sites in
mind, both in terms of their physical presences and historic significances, the next chapter focuses particularly on the interplay of time and place, moving from the anchor presented here to explore the numerous references and interpretations of place and history as well as some of the plans developed for the future.
CHAPTER 3
MERGING TIME AND PLACE

The examination of these historic sites in the Seoul cityscape must go beyond a binary of presence or absence, or even the significance of the individual location and the events that have become part of their importance. Rather, this chapter focuses on the ways in which the locations become part of the fabric of Seoul and how they construct, and are constructed by, their existence in space and across time. In order to approach this, historic sites are seen here as having differing influence over their surroundings, which creates a thematically similar environment. This, in turn, reinforces these sites as integral elements in the cityscape: the influence of a traditional site in making the area a traditional place, for instance, further increases the site’s prominence as traditional. The inherent temporal dimension of these sites in the cityscape is, itself, also a factor in a site’s influence as not only is their historical importance considered but so are the plans for the site and the significance of them for the future.

A warning shared amongst landscape theorists is against the conceptualization of landscape as bounded units (Cosgrove 1985, Ingold 2000, Tangherlini and Yea 2008). Locations are not locked into the frame of a camera nor are city blocks or neighborhoods impermeable boundaries. To different degrees, a continuum of the landscape exists as one passes through it; while the environment changes, either gradually or suddenly, they all exist within a singular whole. Noted, practical boundaries exist beyond the philosophical truth of this statement, the landscape may as well end at the sea if the mover doesn’t have a boat, but the core of such a
belief provides for an important starting point for understanding how an individual moves through space.

However, there exists a difference between boundaries and limits that must also be conceptualized for this approach. While a landscape can be said to continue, theoretically, *ad infinitum*, forests become plains, lakes are lost in the horizon, and certain buildings are no longer important to the part of the city one is in. It is this element of sites that becomes particularly relevant in this study. In order to speak of the ways in which a site impacts the environment around it, their own slice of the cityscape, they will be spoken of in terms of the site’s “influence.” This implies that each location, in some way, shapes the urban environment. This influence, as will be demonstrated, goes beyond simply the direct references made to them and towards the way the project a unified, “dwelled in” world. Each site ranges in their influence on the area around them as, for example, historical significance and visibility impact the range and forms that they shape their surroundings. This influence, thus, is felt in a number of ways: from the naming of entire districts to small subway maps and from the reinforcement of tradition to the music of panhandlers.

Ingold points out the taskscape, the labors of the past, present, and future, adds a temporal aspect to the way a landscape is experienced (Ingold 2000). The history of these sites, as presented in the preceding chapter, serve as the foundation for which they are conceived of today; each site, in their own ways, makes references to and has been established because of these pasts. Historical sites in Seoul provide for an interesting element in this as they simultaneously represent the history of labor while being modern components with plans for the future. In some form, they are both within and outside of the taskscape at different levels. While some sites rest nearly entirely on their deep histories, others may fall into the category of
“invented tradition” (see Hobswam and Ranger 1983) and are, at a minimum, more recent representations of the past.

As Seoul has modernized, these historic sites serve almost as anchors of Seoul’s, and Korea’s, past. Each location demonstrates a different aspect of history, a different moment of time in the taskscape that is “excluded” from the world of the skyscrapers and traffic of the capital. They remind residents of the foundations upon which this modernity has been built, both as a continuum and a break of history. However, while they are, on one hand, separated from the present through museal and toural processes, as will be explored more fully in the following chapter, they have had an undeniable influence on the ways in which the modern city has been built, with the city being literally around them. Further, their presence today changes the lives of those who dwell around them, seeing and visiting them. The future, as my respondents made clear, is also considered for these sites as they continue to serve as the foundation of a Seoul-to-be.

The creation of the Seoul cityscape, especially in regards to historic sites, becomes a tapestry of influences that transverse time and expands beyond their immediate vicinity. In terms of the influence these sites have on the cityscape, the two inter-related aspects of direct reference and thematic consistency or relatedness will be examined. Of particular interest in this regard is how far the limits of an influence of each site can be examined and the different ways and extents they manifest. Secondly, while the historical and contemporary moments will have been more thoroughly explored, special attention will be paid to the future. In examining both the plans for sites and the views of the visitors, the future of these sites, and of Seoul as a city living within its history, is demonstrated to be a distinct consideration to the inhabitants of the city.
PlACES OF THE PAST

The continued presence of these sites in the cityscape is a combination of power structures over city planning, a testament to them as symbols, and, considering the war that ravaged Seoul, sheer luck. As the city, passing through imperialization, war, and modernization, has changed, it has also grown and developed around these areas. Particularly after Park Chung-hee’s heritage revitalization and preservation programs of the late 1960s, heritage became a matter of national attention. Indeed, his mark is literally written on some sites, such as the name plate of General Kwol Yul’s shrine, written by President Park with signs to bring attention to this fact. Districts and streets in the city are named after landmarks that are, or even were, housed in them while industries and entire market places grow next to them.

Direct references to these locations are the easiest way to discern the influence a site has over its surroundings. From signage to the names of shops and streets, displays of these sites serve to both emphasis their presence while drawing upon it. National Treasure No. 1, Namdaemun is perhaps the most visible in terms of references. While two of the other Great Gates of the old Seoul city walls have been memorialized in the naming of a gu, the largest administrative district of the city, Namdaemun remains the most prominent. The pure visibility of the site from city hall is emphasized by the numerous traffic directions to both the gate itself and the Sungnyemun/Namdaemun rotary. The busy traffic circle in the middle of the city ensures

---

8 Imperialization attempts in Korea have been linked with attempts of ‘Japanization,’ which, in this context, may be defined as “the Japanese idea of assimilating and absorbing other races into a single culture” (Higuchi 2001, 20; see also: Berreman 1944, Y. Lee 2010). This should be separated from the more contemporary, economics-based idea of copying Japanese management styles (see Wood 1991).
9 Dongdaemun gate, however, is not within Dongdaemun-gu due to administrative changes.
that the newly rebuilt site is seen by drivers, pedestrians, and the many bus passengers as they move through downtown Seoul. Foot traffic is also dually directed by maps showing Namdaemun as a site and in terms to the famous marketplace that takes its name. Markets and shops take part in this direct reference beyond the accident of location. Throughout Namdaemun Market, for example, the shape of the gate is displayed or stores take their name from the gate. On a smaller scale, a similar occurrence may be seen near Jogyesa Temple, as storefronts post pink lotus flowers demonstrating their connection through faith with the site. Indeed, one of the most striking instances of direct reference was in a similarly economic vein. On several visits to the site, an older man sat before the gates of Jogyesa Temple next to a small, makeshift shrine adorned with images of Buddhas. Chants and drums played from a little blue stereo that comes preloaded with old Korean pop music as he asked for “donations.” When asking my interpreter what he made of the request for donations, he answered, with a pause, that this was simply a form of begging under the guise of religion.
Performance is one of the few direct references to Deoksugung Palace. Outside the walls of the palace, in an open courtyard that hugs the street and in view of city hall, a changing of the guard takes place every day but Monday at 11:00, 2:00, and 3:30. In bright uniforms of blues, reds, yellows, and blacks in different combinations to denote rank, actors play instruments and march in formation for the 30 minute ceremony. Banners are raised as rows of guards wielding weapons common during the Joseon era form rank before crowds of gathering tourists and office workers moving along the sidewalks. The commanders bellow orders over the sound of cars before exchanging the password that proves the authenticity of the new guard shift. Such a scene, only found in front of Deoksugung Palace and creates a major, yet temporary, direct reference displayed beyond the confines of the stone boundary.
The lack of direct references, through signs and names may be just as telling of the power of a site’s influence in the surrounding cityscape. In the small town surrounding Haengjusanseong Fortress, for instance, very little evidence of the historic site can be seen at all, with bicycling appearing to have a larger influence. The appearance of the fortress is diluted and far-spread through Goyang, the city that administers it. Throughout the city, tourist sign posts include Haengjusanseong Fortress as a key tourist spot. Coinciding with the village that surrounds the site, it is also noted as part of a bicycling path that winds up the mountain and is completed at the fortress walls. Namsangol Hanok Village is, without a doubt, the most hidden of the sites investigated, with little more than a subway exit and signpost from the main street directly marking the collection of houses.

Much more subtly reaching out from these sites are the indirect, thematic elements that they reinforce and help to create. The cityscape, much more than the explicit mentioning of historic locations, is shaped by these thematically linked areas. This is not to say, of course, that there always exist tightly constructed and consistent neighborhoods. Contestations exist on nearly every level, from modernization efforts to the recreation of tradition, as seen in debates about the sale of traditional wares versus tourist trinkets in Insa-dong (Korea Herald, 11/27/2012) to the protests of a church near Dongdaemun, or the “Great East,” Gate against the cities attempt to recreate the old walls, a project that will be explored more later. Further, the activities of the millions of individuals that live within Seoul adds a creative element of their own agencies and motivations that create, and at times openly defy, larger structures and discourses of the cityscape.

The presence of historic sites in Seoul have, through their selection and presentation by larger structures and their emphasis and acceptance by the populace, have enforced their
influence to create thematically similar areas in the cityscape. Perhaps the most prominent is the interweaving of tradition and modernity within downtown Seoul. Namdaemun Gate, Jogyesa Temple, Namsangol Hanok Village and Deoksugung Palace are all located within surprising proximity within a single district, Jung-gu, literally translated as “central district.” If one set out knowing of each site’s location, and equipped with a good pair of shoes, it is possible to walking to all of these locations in a single day. The ribbings and half-scoldings I received from a multitude of sources for walking so far in a day serve as a fairly clear sign, however, that the city was not meant to be experienced in this way. Rather the cityscape is understood in terms of associated and connected areas that are formed from the constituent parts.

Another aspect in which the influence of a site shapes its surroundings can be observed in Jogyesa Temple’s economic relation to the surrounding block, forming one level of thematic consistency within the neighborhood. Much more prominent in the cityscape, however, is the popular tourist attraction of Insa-dong market street. The collection of antiques, traditional crafts, and modern gifts alongside tea and coffee shops, art galleries, and restaurants was developed specifically to draw in foreigners, though the location downtown means a marked influx of office workers during lunch and at the end of business hours. Interviews of temple-goers made explicit the connection between the site and this street, as a means to draw in foreign visitors to the temple but also with the much closer association: “Insa-dong/Jogyesa, Jogyesa/Insa-dong” as one woman mentioned. Besides the few stores that specifically offer Buddhist-related goods, one particular indirect reference provided a curious comparison. A form of women’s clothing that I haven’t seen sold elsewhere in Seoul, made from cotton in muted colors and in a merged style of modern fashion designs and traditional hanbok or robes appear
both on the street parallel with Jogyesa Temple and within Insa-dong. These clothing stores, as well as the art galleries, seem targeted to and mostly visited by Seoulites.

Given Deoksugung Palace’s integral link with the political history of Seoul, it becomes impossible to disentangle the site and its surroundings, creating its own thematically similar area through its historic influence. Portions of the complex have been lost to development and the walls rebuilt to fit the new, smaller grounds with few markers of what was once the seat of the Great Korean Empire. What has replaced it, though, is the creation of new power entities or the expanded influence of older ones. Churches, businesses, and government offices surround the outer walls while the English and Russian embassies remain adjacent to the palace they influenced in terms of both architecture and importance. Adjacent to the palace is the former imperial municipal government building and city hall turned metropolitan library tucked under the recently opened, ultra-modern city hall building. If one stands in the courtyard outside Deoksugung Palace facing the projection of Seoul’s history and simply turns to the right the sight of a Dunkin’ Donuts under a “Chinese Free Talk Café.” In ways, Deoksugung Palace,
despite its lack of direct references, is one of the causal factors in creating the melded world around it as power referenced power.

Likewise, Namdaemun Gate’s historical presence has created the cityscape around it as a center for commerce and exchange. The Joseon market around its gate was made permanent in the shopping malls and stalls of the adjacent area that takes its name. This direct reference, in turn, influenced the areas around it as a central shopping area. Shinsegae, one of the oldest department stores in Korea, is headquartered at its main store on the fringe of Namdaemun Market. Adjacent to the market block is the original Bank of Korea building, now a museum, which has also directed the building of the bank’s new building behind it. Across from all this is Myeong-dong, a district synonymous with its shopping as much as Namdaemun Gate is with its own. While Myeong-dong has developed into its own area, the economic power and influence of the gate’s history no doubt had an impact on its growth. Indeed, there even appears to be a
Just beyond the eaves of Namdaemun Gate, Shinsegae Mall’s English-language sign is clear at night.

separation of the two as Myeong-dong has been filled with upscale, international stores as opposed to the local stalls of Namdaemun Market. Between my first visit in 2010 and this research, I have noticed remarkable changes in the number of shoppers to each area, with Myeong-dong thriving as Namdaemun Market, ironically a source of its origin, appears to be slowly emptying. Despite the apparent decline of the market’s influence, the recent events surrounding the gate itself have become a political and cultural factor in the mind of many visitors to other sites. This may, in a way, give the gate the widest spread of indirect influence as each historic site in Seoul becomes connected with the rebuilding of the gate.

The proximity of Jogyesa Temple, Deoksugung Palace, and Namdaemun Gate and their shared connection with Seoul’s history helps stitch together the core of Jung-gu as an area rich in tradition. Gyeongbokgung, the largest temple complex of the Joseon dynasty, is the beginning of a line that cuts through the modern and historic city in a nearly perfectly straight line. The main gate of the palace, Gwanghwamun, or “May the Light of Enlightenment Blanket the World” Gate, opens to the previously mentioned statues of King Sejong and Admiral Yi Sun-Shin. This
imaginary line moves between city hall and Deoksugung Palace before ending at Namdaemun Gate. The importance of this connection, originally, was linked with geomantic understanding of the south as the most auspicious direction. Today, this line is partially obscured by the office buildings that breathe life into the city, though one is still able to make it out from certain vantages. Even this, however, is a relatively new view as the former Governor-General Building stood between the two gates; an effort, believed by some Seoulites, to have been made to “…hide our emperor” and that “(t)he Japanese tried to cut the straight line of the Korean spirit!” (Kirk 1999). About a block’s walk away, Jogyesa Temple and Insa-Dong lie just off the road parallel to Gwanghwamun.

These sites create a cityscape in the middle of Seoul in which historic buildings coexists with modern skyscrapers and busy streets. Each exerts its influence on smaller areas, shaping small sections of the Jung-gu as a merging of the past and present by way of reference, as in Jogyesa Temple, or directing historical changes, as with Namdaemun Gate and Market. These smaller areas of influence, in turn, influence the larger cityscape as they become sutured together through their own mutual references and the emphasis of history in their presentation, a concept explored more in the next chapter. However, certain sites hold more influence than others, seen with the primacy of Gyeongbokgung palace in the historic line and the secondary element in Deoksugung Palace. Namsangol Hanok Village, also in Jung-gu, has nearly no influence on its surroundings despite Seoul Tower’s position on the top of the shared Namsan mountain being visible nearly anywhere in the city. Haengjusanseong Fortress, outside of Seoul, has only the subtle power on the highways leaving the city in the white obelisk towering over the trees as one approach the large Haengju Mountain.
The Planning for the Historical

Just as the past has shaped the present cityscape, the future is a constant consideration at each of these locations, creating a cityscape that is rooted not only in the spatial but, as Ingold suggests, is also experienced in the form of a taskscape that exists through time. From visitors to urban planners to government officials, these historical sites are understood to have a forward trajectory with varying opinions of the ways in which they should be manipulated and preserved. In my fieldwork, two major streams of thought about the future were expressed by different vantage points and relations to these sites. Visitors, nearly unanimously, expressed the urgency and need to preserve historic sites for future generations. Advertised city projects, of which the city wall renewal will be taken as an example, and an interview with the management team at Namsangol Hanok Village forwarded the need to expand and revitalize locations.

Regardless of the site, visitors made their considerations of the future orientation of the cityscape clear to me that there exists a pressing need to preserve them for later generations; they are important because they crystallize Seoul’s, and Korea’s, past and serve as reminders of it. When asked, every interviewee stated distinctly the need to keep these sites the same, in contrast with a failure in the reconstruction of Namdaemun Gate after the 2008 fire. Interestingly, the benefit of these sites for younger generations came across regardless of the value individuals saw of a single site: in a group interview, a middle-aged man in the family turned to me and, in an English aside, stated that Deoksugung Palace was not important to the “Korean Spirit,” though he agreed with the older man who took charge of the interview that these sites are good for children to visit on fieldtrips. One mother at Namsangol Hanok Village made visits to historic
sites a matter of ongoing, seemingly inevitable processes in regards to economics and modernization for her children: the globalizing generation should know where they come from to converge the differences in the world, this mixing requiring knowledge of one’s past as a base of self.

As stated, the burning of the Namdaemun Gate served as a major turning point in Seoulite’s attention to historic sites. With the rebuilding and partial remodeling of the gate, the old city walls and its other entries became a priority across the city. Since then, Dongdaemun Gate has begun renovation in order to make it similar to Namdaemun Gate, expanding on the walls and the inclusion of a courtyard and path underneath. The Great West Gate, Seodaemun, which was destroyed during Japanese imperialization to make way for tramlines (Chosun Ilbo 10/22/2009), is also being completely rebuilt in its original location. Beyond the gates, the walls themselves have become the center of plans to become a tourist destination. The city walls, partially rebuilt over the years, are being advertised as a form of walk tour that combines the
history of “the oldest and longest city walls in the world” (Seoul Metropolitan Government) with heritage and modern sites one may visit along the paths. As one informant mentioned, the burning of Namdaemun Gate is also what spurred this project and in the same year as the fire, 2008, the city purchased land alongside Dongdaemun Gate to rebuild the wall and open it as part of this tourism experience.

Plans for merging the present and past are similarly expressed by the management team at Namsangol Hanok Village. Recently formed after the merging of the hanok village and music theater, the team came in control within the last year and spoke frankly, consisting of two young managers and an elder tour manager, about the present circumstances and goals of the site. Despite the asynchronous element of the site, with houses from different areas of Seoul that were built and occupied at different times, they spoke of the village as an opportunity. Though they spoke of the need to balance tourist and Seoulite needs, and acknowledged the dominance of specifically Chinese tourists as visitors, their long term plan focused much more on the reintegration of the hanok into contemporary Korean life. The mixed context of the individual buildings, they said, may be overcome by storytelling, while the hanok as a traditional form may be brought into the context of the now by focusing on the buildings themselves instead of folk life. An example forwarded were small concerts held within the buildings themselves to demonstrate the natural acoustics of the old style house. Koreans, one said, understand the importance of the hanoks, but do not appreciate them, finding them boring. To counter this, he wanted to create a way in which the contemporary was based on the traditional: “Don’t change the hardware, but the activities.”
Seoul Cityscape as a Continuum

The cityscape of Seoul is neither bounded by lots and neighborhoods nor by the strict division of time into the past, present, and future. Rather, they become part of an overall whole that then creates Seoul as a city with “culture,” as one interviewee explicitly stated. These sites gain their prominence through their historical rooting, as symbols of times past or icons of perseverance, presented in ways explored more in the following chapter. This continued presence, for many of these sites, has shaped the way the city has grown and changed around it, from the establishment of businesses to the grounding of political power. As they have been mutually transformed through time by the processes of change that they also impact, the present becomes a product of the dialectical relationship between sites and urban development. With both the past and present of sites, the future is then actively considered. In light of everything from large scale events, most pronounced in the tragedy of the Namdaemun Gate arson, to the jobs of new management companies and their need to increase tourism, present considerations and historic source materials are considered in shifting ways. Despite its historical importance, in the recent past Namdaemun Gate itself, as one interviewee told me, was a “house for pigeons” before the fire which spurred the urgency of historic preservation across Seoul and plans that literally reshape the modern city to mirror its ancient walls. The (re)creation of this emerging history, and a key aspect to the influence some of these locations have on the cityscape, is explored through the presentation of these pasts and the ways in which audiences, real or desired, impact the consideration of how they are presented.
CHAPTER 4
MUSEALITY, TOURALITY, AND AUDIENCE SELECTION

In refining views on the cityscape, an understanding of the interior allows for a unique consideration. By taking into account the knowledge, real or assumed, of a location’s function in the cityscape it becomes more than a collection of buildings and signs; rather than simply the presence or absence of a structure, homes, stores and offices become the fabric of the environment. Similarly, people who pass by historic sites understand the significance of them through either first hand knowledge or assumptions based on either larger discourses or visits to similar ones. In order to establish an approach that addresses the issue of the interior of these locations, the presentation of their histories will be framed in terms of the museal or, as I forward, the “toural.”

Critical approaches to museum studies have identified the museality that changes utilitarian objects, be they for ritual, war, or everyday life in their original contexts, into artifacts or museum displays. I make the argument that similar processes may occur beyond objects and may alter the land itself as locations cease to be palaces and fortresses and become simultaneously museums and museal. They not only house objects associated with their histories, but they are artifacts in their own rights as original purpose and context is lost and transformed into the no-longer-living object of the past. In terms of the cityscape, the knowledge of these sites as museums and museal, the histories they both represent and display, are as much a factor in their influence and importance as their mere presence.
However, the concept of museality begins to limit the capture of the full reality in areas that are, indeed, still living. My proposal of the toural as an extension is an attempt to account for the instances where the presentation of a history exists at the same moment that the original intent continues. The toural object never fully becomes artifact, but it is displayed as an item that simultaneously is a representation of the past while presently serving its original purpose. The nature of toural sites and objects, as being simultaneously serving their original function while being made to be “solely observable,” presents the catering to two disparate audiences as the function is to serve the observer and the user. The nuances of the toural as an addition to the museal, as will be shown, subtly yet substantially alter not only the presentation techniques employed but the ways in which people interact with the site in the cityscape.

Audience selection and audience reality in relation to the development of these museal and toural sites will be lastly addressed. The targeting of certain groups shapes the ways in which both sites and histories are presented and, therefore, lead to different experiences of the cityscape. Key to this is language selection and prioritization as the most prominent and most exclusive element in audience selection. Information becomes selectively disseminated and understood as consideration is given to who will visit which sites and what information is appropriate for select visitors. However, changing demographics in tourism in South Korea and the decline of English as a *lingua franca* with this increase in East Asian visitors means that even previously inclusive tactics have lost part of their power to reach foreigners. Further, as some interviewees have pointed out, the audience realities also shape Seoulite’s understandings of sites as either for foreigners or as being differentiated experiences between citizens and tourists.
The Museal and the Toural in Seoul

The creation of museal sites requires, on some level, the end of one purpose for another. Sites created with a distinct purpose lose their original intent and context, often through the process of time: changes in technology and social structure eliminate the need for some while destruction due to war and urban development have removed the purpose or even the structures of the sites. The toural, in contrast, relies on the continued use of a site, with human activity keeping the purpose of the place ongoing. A caveat of such an approach, however, is how convincingly an ‘original purpose’ can be established. For instance, a building space originally created as a storefront may be used for a small congregational church; as long as the people who inhabit the space continue with the understanding that it is for that purpose, the site may be considered living. The creation of the toural and of the convincing establishment of an original purpose will be demonstrated with the example of Jogyesa Temple, which served as the launching point of this consideration.

At the vast majority of these sites, the museal presentations of the site’s history serves as one of the main attractions. In some instances, most notably Namdaemun Gate, the location itself is museal and little else is present, including the walls for which the gate was built to function in. In most others, however, the history is firmly rooted in museum displays. Haengjusanseong Fortress provides a remarkably clear example. The walls that once built up the fort are long gone, comprising an earthen trail to the peak. In the place of barracks and defensive positions are now signs and memorials that include details about the battle that once took place here. In a museum created to match an historical architecture, despite its automatic doors and air conditioning, houses the weapons of war and paintings of Kwon Yul in his different victories. The battle itself has been made an object to be observed here through a video game in which one plays as the
The top of Haengjusanseong Fortress. Gone are the walls, replaced by monuments despite retaining its title as a defensive position.

shooter of a hwa’cha, or rocket-firing machine, to eliminate Japanese invaders. Even the shrine to Kwon Yul has a museal aspect, with the majority of visitors I observed examining it without stopping to light incense or otherwise worship.

In regards to a site that has a more observable impact on the cityscape around it, Deoksugung Palace’s role as a museum and as a museal location may also be observed. Again, signs throughout the palace post speak of the area in the past tense as, today, there is no political power seated in what is now a park. The former homes of Korean elite are now abandoned, entry forbidden, though they are maintained to be seen only as the way those with power once lived. Unlike the period of the Emperor Gojong’s reign, his throne room is freely approachable to anyone. Similarly, his attempt to modernize the palace is now a crystalized remnant of the past, the European architectural styles of the early 1900s a thing of today’s past. These buildings are, interestingly, also the only ones used today as they have been made the National Museum of Modern and Contemporary Arts. In the corner of the palace grounds, various objects from the Joseon era, including a water clock and hwa’cha, are on display under a small shelter. The
process of making Deoksugung Palace a museum and museal has impacts on the ways in which people understand the site. Though this discussion is the focus of the next chapter, this processes, established by the Japanese imperial government in 1933, has turned what was the center of the Great Korean Empire into a public park.

The park aspect has further had its own mark on the way citizens interact with the site. As a park in the 1970s, Deoksugung Palace became a popular area for young couples, inspiring numerous songs about love and loss at the site. Today, I was told on several occasions by members of my generation, the place is now a cursed spot for couple, dooming visitors or those who walk along its walls to separate. However, this belief also seems to change, judging from an interview conducted of a younger couple sitting in the park grounds. In their interview, they spoke of remembering this place from their childhood, when they came to learn of the history of this site and Korea.

While life continues at every site, only one in my selection retains its primary function. Unlike any other site, Jogyesa Temple continues its function as a place of worship and the head
Jogyesa Temple’s central prayer hall, experienced and observed in starkly different ways by practitioners and tourists.

temple of the large Jogye Order. Despite this, the site also serves as a central tourist and historic location in downtown Seoul as tourists meander around bowing practitioners or take photographs from the edge of the central prayer hall. The creation of a place that is both to be observed and to be inhabited makes for a distinctly different type of presentation against the museal. Rather than fully removing usage and context from an object, it becomes slightly displaced as explanation and practice are simultaneously attended to. Of particular note at this site is that the temple is specifically not a museum, on of which is established in a nearby office building on the grounds, and the processes of removing the sacred from historic artifacts is similar here as at other museums.

At the center of the consideration of the toural element of this site as opposed to others are the ways in which the foreign community is directed to understand the site differently from those that inhabit it and the dual purpose of, in particular, the central Buddha at the site. Jogyesa Temple features two offices explicitly for “foreigners,” one which includes general information and another for the Temple Stay program in which the order hosts visitors to live like a monk for
The distinction between the museal and toural at Jogyesa seems purposeful, with the museum proper in the glass building in the background.

varying lengths of time. The assumption that foreigners are not Buddhist was even expressly stated by one of the volunteers who stated plainly that both my interpreter and I were “not Buddhists,” despite the fact that neither of us had shown any symbol inclined to any other religious belief. Accommodating foreigners, in light of the idea that this group is not comprised of believers, shows that the outreach is more a matter of tourism and presentation of an element of Korean heritage than it is of conversion. The central Buddha itself also provides an indicator of dual function of this site; while it remains the site of offerings in various forms, the Buddha itself is designed in a style unlike any I’ve seen before. In contrast with the grand golden Buddhas at the center of the prayer hall, the Buddha in the middle of the temple grounds is made in the fashion of a *chibi* cartoon character, a child-like and unrealistic representation. Around Seoul, similar styled cartoon characters have become mascots for everything from various *gu*, government offices, and even the Demilitarized Zone. Further, the religious nature of these sites is also still potent, unlike Kwon Yul’s shrine, as one practitioner mentioned that some citizens
avoid the temple all together due to the presence of Buddhism and despite its natural or historic significance.

**Audience Selection and Audience Realities**

The selection of audiences creates a limiting factor as it determines who the information, and perhaps even the site itself, is for; in turn, the understanding inhabitants of the cityscape have of who visits a site shapes the way they interact and experience it. This experience, however, is also shaped by the actuality of visitors who may or may not be the intended audience. The role that diverse audience selections plays in the creation of a site can be seen within Jogyesa Temple, with its binary of worshipper and foreigner. However, similar processes of deciding who the site is for, the priority of numerous guests, and the ways in which these manifest can be seen at every location. This is, however, countered with the realities of who actually visits. Changing flows of international tourism serve as a primary cause of gaps between material presented and the needs of visitors, yet there also exists elements of selected upon types of information that are disseminated to different audiences. Due to this, sites are experienced differently both within and without as certain places become more or less a foreigner or tourist place. The establishment of who a site is for through language selection is best seen in the contrast between Haengjusanseong Fortress and Namsangol Hanok Village.

When asking one interviewee if there were any sites they would consider to be almost exclusively for Korean audiences, Haengjusanseong Fortress, as well as the recently named UNESCO World Heritage Site Namhansanseong Fortress were named. Indeed, they display their histories nearly entirely in Korean. Across the fortress, information is generally divided between the prominence of Korean and the addition of English. Most signs give directions, area titles, and
general historic information in both languages, though every offered brochure is exclusively in Korean. The disparity of information on the mountain fortress becomes fully apparent in its museum and monuments. While the sign outside the museum and the warning against pictures were translated into English, the interior featured only the identification of the artifacts in anything other than Korean. From the explanation of different arrow types to the chronological history of the Imjin Wars, the site was created for Koreans to gain an understanding of their own history over the displaying of this history to foreign groups. The monument at the base of the mountain was even more linguistically exclusive as plaques displaying the different groups who defended the mountain, professional soldiers, militia members, warrior-monks, and women, featured no details in English. Interestingly, though the site was advertised across Goyang city in English, the website offered incorrect and incomplete information on its English page and, from my visits, only two non-natives were seen and they were part of a larger group of Koreans.

The focus on presenting a Korean history to a Korean audience, however, is rare as many sites embrace, or at least accept, their role as sites that present Korean culture to an international audience. At Namsangol Hanok Village, for example, very little of the site was not translated into at least one language. Each house description provided, for example, translations in English. However, use of English as a *lingua franca* at this site is quickly fading with changing visitors. Everything from maps to brochures to advertisements were displayed in four languages, displayed in the general order of Korean, English, Japanese, and Chinese. This order, coincidently, also follows the chronology of visitors to Seoul. Also following the inverse of Haengjusanseong Fortress, Namsangol Hanok Village proved to be the least considered site by Seoul natives and the most populated by foreigners. Indeed, the level of specifically Chinese visitors versus Korean made interviewees difficult to find and was the source of more than one
Namsangol Hanok Village (above) and Haengjusanseong Fortress (below)
joke between my interpreters and I about the necessity of finding a Mandarin speaker if the research here is expanded.

**Select Histories for Differing Audiences**

In forming the cityscape, as mentioned, the interior must be taken into consideration. For the purposes of this research project and the specific focus on historic sites, the ways in which locations become artifacts in their own rights provides useful insight. The reverence inspired by an imperial seat or the discipline and security of a fortress are lost in the modern presence of these sites, replaced by leisure and observation of a past that they both house and represent. Instead of responding to the form of a palace or gate as an assumed entity within the cityscape, the understanding of those who dwell within it of this changed context is taken into consideration as it is experienced. Not only do these sites anchor the city in history, but they also serve to point that the past is gone. In slight contrast to this, the toural element found at Jogyesa Temple allows for the creation of an observed site, historical and otherwise, without sealing the site, as it were, into this bygone past. In this, there is also a difference in the ways in which people interpret the temple as part of the cityscape; because it is living and present, it is religious and, perhaps, avoided unlike other religious-though-past areas in other sites.

The presentation of this information to different audiences also plays a role in the influence of a site on the cityscape. As a final example, Deoksugung Palace’s presentation of the past is translated across the site and brochures are available for purchase in a number of languages. The central location and public display of the changing of the guards makes this site relatively popular with foreigners, specifically Westerners. Interviews with foreign guests generally focused on the historical, and specifically on the traditional with critiques of the
Western architecture that seemed out of place in a Korean palace. Seoulites who were experiencing the site in regard to its history were, by and large, children led by teachers or parents. Adult Seoulites, however, viewed the purpose of Deoksugung Palace as dual: for foreigners and children it was good to learn history here, for them it was a place for rest. The presence of foreigners at all is due mostly to the dual aspect of the museality of the site as well as the ability to experience it as a historic site. The motives for visiting these sites, the perception of and from foreign visitors, and the politics that seems to be embed within them in light, as they are explored in the next chapter, are shaped with the understanding of these sites as locations of history that are shaped as museal or toural sites and the visitors that arrive. This knowledge contributes to the feelings of, pride, shame, or han, that are imbedded into the cityscape itself.
CHAPTER 5
PRIDE, SHAME, POLITICS, AND PARKS

This chapter approaches the diverse discourses at these sites as interrelated elements within the cityscape where the sites become the loci and topic of each. The framework established in the previous chapters serves to unite the contestations, emotions, and considerations as being intrinsically rooted into the cityscape of Seoul. In turn, they help to create the cityscape as they shape the perception of those who dwell in it and understand and participate in the discourse. First, the motives for visits to these sites will be examined, tempering the top-down perspective of the cityscape by demonstrating the normalization of their presence and their practical usage for the every day. Secondly, the perception of and from foreigner visitors to these sites is explored as the demonstration of differing experiences by different groups: a historic, “real” Korea for the outsider which serves as the base for considerations of Seoulite visitors’ own experiences. Finally, the presence of the political at historic sites is also analyzed in regards to the visitor’s perspectives, which are often framed as a matter of shame, and organizations that use the sites’ place in the cityscape as a platform for action.

The roles these sites play in the creation of a cityscape demonstrated in previous chapters becomes important because of the lives that are lived within it. While top-down view of a cityscape may be assumed based on clusters of types of buildings or the display of certain histories in different areas, the everyday realities of the cityscape are only accessible from those who dwell in it and are required for a holistic understanding. It is on this level that the creation of
and contestation over the cityscape forms with the interpretation of previously mentioned processes of the spatially and temporally continuous experience as well as the presentation of history and importance. The understanding of an emic view of the cityscape, I argue, is an element often missing in previous landscape theories overall and is the basis of this chapter. By addressing the motivations for native visitors, their understandings of foreign visitors, and the politics that exist in and around these, the cityscape becomes more than simply a text or background and becomes emotional yet banal.

Motivations for visits became a surprising joining of the past and the future for most native Seoulites. Especially amongst parents with their children, who made up a decent percentage of visitors, the historic nature of these sites was referenced, as was the duty to teach the younger generation for their futures. For the vast majority of visitors, however, the additional role of these sites as a place for rest, a park, was explicitly named as the key reason for their presence. In this, the spatial factor was also stated: these sites were often more “natural” than the surrounding city and provided a calm, quiet spot in the middle of the metropolis. In contrast to visits to actual parks, the historic significance of these sites as part of a Korean identity was also mentioned by most guests, though at different degrees at different sites. The cityscape, in this regard, reinforces the influence of these locations by framing them simultaneously as places of respite and spaces of heritage which become nexuses for sentimentality, making even restful visits a responsibility in the maintenance and understanding of cultural identity.

In addition to these sites as spaces of heritage, visits by foreigners, often with vastly different motivations compared to Seoulites, demonstrated a differential experience of the sites that was expressed openly by Korean interviewees when asked about their views on foreign visitors and the importance of these sites to Koreans. While many Seoulites mentioned the
normalcy of these sites for themselves, they also made note of the perspective of foreigners as observers of Korean culture instead of people at rest in a natural environment. Foreigners interviewed reinforced this view of differential experiences as the priority was to view Korea’s past. These contrasting lenses of the cityscape, however, were rarely seen in a negative light and, instead, became matters of ethnic pride at the interest of outsiders. Despite this element of pride, hints of disappointment existed in the comparison: foreigners, in a sense, were experiencing the sites correctly as Koreans have lost their connection to their history and culture.

Throughout the interviews at these sites, common themes rose concerning the importance of these sites and the ways in which they becomes centers of emotional experiences, creating a nuance in the theoretical understanding of the cityscape in regards to the sites that escapes top-down or walking perspectives. Matters of pride and shame in particular seemed central to people’s conceptualizations of these sites as history, apparent importance, and even global considerations became imbued into the sites. This is not to say that the explicit statements are constant thoughts of individuals as they move through the cityscape, though few people seemed to pause before answering these questions. Rather, they are probably most often manifest in the idle thoughts of a stroll or idling car within sight of these locations or moments of observation during visits. The normally implicit nature I believe to be true of these emotions, however, does not diminish the fact that they are created, in part, through the presence of these sites in the cityscape or that these emotions are then made part of its experience.

These feelings of pride and shame often also gave way to political statements concerning the sites’ importance and the mandate of the government to maintain them, expanding the emotional relevance of these sites beyond the individual and tying them to national and international currents. From condemnation to suggestions, the visitors interviewed nearly all
made political statements about these historic sites, and more than a few about the government’s failure. In one instance, the site served as the location for a recorded, public denouncement of a national political event. The political interior of these sites is also matched by the political exterior: the majority of these locations have become the backdrops to political dissent as protests, awareness campaigns, and petition signings. Politics permeates some of these sites in different ways as they become the topic of a debate on history’s value in the future cityscape while serving as the location for the expression of present concerns.

**Historic Sites as Natural Oases.**

My first interviews took place on a hot summer day at Deoksugung Palace in the shaded sitting area that overlooks the old throne room. Sitting nearby was a three generation family gathered around the youngest, still in a stroller. The interview was led by the grandfather, with input from his daughter while the husband mostly nodded in agreement. At one point, when asking why people visit the former palace, the older man spoke past my translator and directly at me: “Why do people go to Central Park?” The counter-question put me off guard on more than one level: first, I have never been to New York and honestly could not answer, second because I couldn’t take a guess that I felt would satisfy the grandfather’s almost accusatory tone, and finally, what this meant for this research as it was based on the idea that the history here was significant. Easterners like to keep old things, he said, but it only seemed exotic to foreigners, and even the value of children visitors was mostly based on the few artifacts displayed. For them, the uniqueness of the site was in its quiet, peaceful nature in the middle of Seoul, the prime place for rest after a meal. To my surprise, as the interview ended the husband turned to me and said in
English, “This site is not important to the Korean spirit,” in a tone that seemed to settle the matter.

While many other visitors to these sites begged to differ with that family’s finality of the value in these locations, and Deoksugung Palace in particular, to the Korean spirit, the natural environment of historic sites and the use as places of respite and relaxation was commonly mentioned. As an example, of the ten Seoultites interviewed at Deoksugung Palace, nine indicated that it was “just a place to go,” an “oasis.” The last, a mother of two visiting with her grandmother, is a former Seoultite who now lives in Southeast Asia and made the trip here specifically to teach her children the history of the site. Similar sentiments were expressed, or usages observed, at every site visited as the preservation and presentation of the history at these locations directly caused the creation of natural, green areas in the middle of the city. However, the motives for visiting often belied the impact of these sites and in no way diminished their importance in, as one interviewee at Deoksugung framed it, giving the Seoul cityscape culture.
The importance of greenery in the cityscape was pointed out to me on several occasions during this research as places that contrasted with the busyness of the urban environment, adding to the value many placed on these historic sites. One day, while standing outside between sites, I casually mentioned to my interpreter that I appreciated the presence of trees and gardens that cover a large number of rooftops in downtown Seoul. He responded that the initiative, which included increasing the trees and shrubs on the street, was a recent change. “It’s western,” he told me before going into how the inspiration for the greening of the cityscape was inspired, specifically, by American cities. The small debate about which was literally greener, the United States or Korea, came to no real definitive conclusion but served to mark the awareness and importance of nature within the cityscape, at least at the time of this research. Perhaps as a side note, one American tourist interviewed, when asked about her perception of Seoul, made particular reference to the number of trees in the cityscape compared to cities in the United States.
The dual role of parks within historic sites across Seoul is, itself, rooted in the history of these sites which has altered their presentation and fortified the motivations for visits as being simultaneously for respite and learning of the past. Deoksugung Palace was explicitly made a park by the Japanese government in 1938. Namsangol Hanok Village, likewise, emphasis the historic natural beauty of the site through its only presented historic reference: Jeonghakdong. Jeonghakdong was a Joseon-era summer resort where the natural wonder of the environment inspired the legend that blue cranes and fairies visited the location. After the 1996 movement of troops away from the site, a pond and traditional garden was built and the area was opened as a public site with a small entry fee. Today, as part of a Seoul government policy, admission costs have been waived with the intent of increasing access to historic park-like sites; the ramifications of this policy change at Namsangol Hanok Village will be explored more in the following sections.

The different ways that nature is manifested, therefore creating multiple forms of respite and experiences with these sites, can be observed at Namdaemun Gate and both mountain fortresses, Haengjusanseong Fortress and the visit to Namhansanseong. Namdaemun Gate in particular provided a unique comparison to the others as it lacked, for instance, seating and shade. In the midst of a financial sector and near a busy bus stop, I witnessed a number of office workers with rolled up dress shirts and briefcases take short strolls through near the grassy hill and flowers planted as part of the rebuilding. Unlike other sites, no walls or buildings protected against an immersion of the busy streets around Namdaemun Gate, yet even the small oasis of greenery seemed to serve as a small respite. Interestingly, interviews done here made no mention of this particular site as a park. The mountain fortresses, however, drew in individuals for both the history and the mountain itself. Haengjusanseong Fortress provided small niches for sitting in
the grass and one particular area, not far from the first slope, that faced directly into the mountain’s fortress. Indeed, more people were seated at either these spots or the pavilions at the summit than exploring the monuments or museum. Namhansanseong Fortress only emphasizes the mountain’s role as, much to my dismay and eventual exhaustion, the main point of entry to the fortress was an extremely populated hiking trail through the trees and Buddhist rock stacks. Despite the diverse aspects these sites as parks may have to inspire visits, the fact that they were still seen primarily as areas to relax also appeared to limit the range from which visitors generally came. At Namsangol Hanok Village, each interviewee mentioned that most Seoulite visitors came from the immediate neighborhood. National holidays, one mother pointed out, were exceptions as people came from across the city to sites like Namsangol Hanok Village to feel their culture and heritage. Similarly, Jogyesa Temple’s central location in the city served one practitioner as both a religious center and a place to have lunch and take a stroll, especially with the temple’s close proximity to her workplace.

Despite the prominence of the view of these sites as natural oases, the motivations for visits of these sites become linked with matters of pride and shame as they reflect on the creation and maintenance of national identity. As Hyung Yu Park (2009) suggests, historic sites become loci for emotional experiences as they relate to understanding an ethno-national self, often presented to me in terms of shame and pride. Shame and heartache in particular were noted not only as part of the experience of these sites, but as an element of what it means to be Korean, linked with the concept of han.10 Though a visit to a park or natural spot were shared by nearly

---

10 *Han* is a culturally-bound emotion perhaps best summarized as a deeply carried remorse and resentment created in relation to the hardships of the past, namely Japanese imperialization and the pains of modernization.
all visitors, there also existed a shame that more Koreans were not visiting these sites to experience their cultural heritage.

Though there appears to be a contradiction between expressed motivations of visits as areas of rest, to enjoy a natural environment, and the failure of others to experience these sites as historically important areas, no interviewee seemed to view it as such. I suspect that the main reason for this is that, whatever the motivation for a visit to a historical site, the experience was enough. At many sites, the naturalization of scenes from the past made the historical almost appear natural and, according to one informant, the heritage of these sites was not needed to be seen or known, but one could “feel” their history. The pervading aspect of a history that is part of a natural imagery becomes inescapable to Korean visitors, turning a sit in a park into a matter of pride at the taking in of the past. It is at these sites, whatever the motive for an individual’s presence that a Seoulite may “realize” they are Korean or “imagine Joseon.”

Shame felt at the lack of Korean visitors, then, may be interpreted in several ways. This forms a light criticism against those who do not attend to their duty in attending to their heritage. Interviewees mentioned that Koreans “did not appreciate” their own history or sites or lost out on the “ancestor’s wisdom and knowledge.” In turn, this stance was then given a global and future-bound trajectory as parents who did not take their children did not provide the rooting in Korean-ness that was either necessary for a changing world or their duty to share with it. On another level, feelings of shame, and pride, often came in conjunction with another subject: the presence of foreign visitors.
Reflexivity and Foreign Visitors

The centering of feelings of pride and shame on the presence of foreigners is the product of the differentiated experiences at these sites. On the most fundamental level, foreigners do not have the relationship with Korea’s history and culture as Koreans do and their visits are not a matter of creating a sense of identity within themselves. However, because of the construction and presentation of these sites as either museal or toural, foreign audiences experience these sites under the presumption that these sites are solely museums and tourist destinations. These disparate positions then become a point of reflection for Korean visitors in the consideration of their own experiences and responsibilities to and of the sites.

At each site I attempted to take at least one interview with foreign tourists in order to gauge if there was a substantial difference between the ways in which Seoulites and non-native visitors experienced them. Of these interviews, only one hinted at a park-like aspect, noting the “tranquil” and “parkish” environment at Deoksugung Palace. However most, including
aforementioned interviewee, saw these sites in the lens of authenticity against the modern cityscape as opposed to a part of it. This is created, in part, by the museal and toural observational styles that foreigners experience as they interact with these sites, centering them as an expression of an assumed past removed from the obvious changes of the modern cityscape beyond. The view of a disjointed cityscape created, as one Scottish visitor put it, “pockets of history.” Another pair of visitors actually stressed the need to isolate these traditional sites to preserve Korea’s history.

Authenticity came up in all but one interview with foreigners in relation to this disjointed view of Seoul as a city in which history exists as bubbles. Comments ranged from these historic sites being the “real” Korea to slight critiques on how new the paint looked at Namdaemun Gate. Interestingly, a Korean visitor to Namdaemun Gate stated that it was only foreigners who noticed the differences of the new and old gate besides the sign. As opposed to the view of traditional sites as natural, “not odd,” and parks that Seoulites experience, foreigners visit these sites specifically because they are advertised, arranged, and seen as being abnormal. The authentic Korea appears to be understood in juxtaposition between the modern and the historic, another common thread in interviews. As one European visitor said, it was “cruel to have these big buildings” around historic sites while an American later contrasted specifically the historic sites against pop culture. Indeed, on two separate occasions foreign interviewees noted the rapid rate of modernization in reference to these sites, suggesting that they were untouched by these processes. It is worth noting that one interview took place at Deoksugung Palace, which was once a central location for Korea’s modernization efforts, and Namsangol Hanok Village, which was constructed in the 1990’s.
These divergent experiences play a role in the creation of pride and shame or sadness expressed by native Seoulites at these sites. Korean visitors, by and large, were quite aware of the differing perceptions between themselves and foreign visitors. At Deoksugung Palace, a mother with her two grown daughters felt the sight, because of its “high culture,” was good to show to foreigners. Another, a college student at Namsangol Hanok Village, even made note of a certain museal aspect, as these houses “were selected to be seen.” The knowledge of different experiences of the site then became a center for emotional discussions of modern Korea’s relationship with its history.

The view of foreign tourists were often framed by Korean interviewees specifically in reflexive, emotional terms and never framed as economic or globalized issues, further making these sites sentimental and culturally important. This may be, in part, at the “indifference” with which one interviewee said Koreans see tourists, as, just like the sites, they are not oddities in the Seoul cityscape. This goes hand-in-hand, then, with the emotional experience she, and others, mentioned in coming to these sites; that is to say, just as the sites become naturalized parks that are also areas of pride and shame, the tourists within them become normalized yet a continuation of these same feelings. The tourists’ motivations for coming to and experiences at these sites, manifest in their very presence, became the ideal contrast with the park perspective Koreans had.

“I felt kinda sad that there’s not a lot of Korean people here (…) that they aren’t really more interested in learning about their history.” This sentiment of the failure of Koreans to experience and learn about their own culture, here expressed by a young visitor to Namsangol Hanok Village, was repeated several times during my interviews. More often, however, was a feeling of pride expressed in regards to foreign visitors: “I feel pride when I see foreigners come here,” said a young man at Deoksugung Palace. Even at some sites deemed “exotic” or
“artificial” for foreigners, visitors lamented the lack of cultural knowledge of Koreans as represented by the presence of international visitors and lack of Korean. Foreign tourists, it appears, experience these sites in the ‘correct’ way. With an eye to the history and traditions these sites represent and display, foreigners specifically visit these locations to take in the elements that Korean visitors overlook. The appreciation that foreign visitors have for the cultural aspects of what natives see as parks is then contrasted with this exact perception.

Politics around the Past.

Normally directed at the Seoul government regardless of the agency in charge of the site, politics regarding who is responsibility to these historic sites was commonly a feature in interviews with Korean visitors, often intersecting with similar matters of pride and shame at the treatment and significance of these sites. The presence of these sites in the cityscape became a matter of responsibility that transcended, yet was only addressable, in the here-and-now and was both beyond and included the individual. While these debates, accusations, and emotions became housed within the sites, the space just beyond their walls became centers for larger political movements. The congregation of people around these sites to express their political feelings creates another layer in the cityscape as these sites continue to impact the present and future. The connection of one site with all of them, partially through the realization of their importance in the cityscape, has also made the fact of the sites political.

These political statements are not merely abstract principals, but are engaged with the history of culturally significant sites within the cityscape, working from an example of perhaps the single most important, and emotion-laden, landmark in Seoul. The burning of Namdaemun
Gate in 2008 seems to have renewed interest and feelings at historic sites across Seoul. An older man at Namsangol Hanok Village put it clearly: “Damage to historic places is a personal damage” and offered the example of the gate. What was needed now, he added, was an increase of preservation and security, the responsibility of the government. A mother of two at Deoksugung Palace went so far as to complain about the state of security in particular, upset at the lack of guards at the site. Accusations of a lack of guards is particularly potent in light of the fire, as it was poor security that allowed the arsonist to so easily approach and set ablaze Korea’s National Treasure Number 1.

The presence of guards and cameras, however, seemed a secondary concern compared to matters of preservation. While this same mother also stated that the city was failing at their duty in protecting their historic sites, the majority felt it was adequately done though the thoroughly placed the responsibility on the Seoul city government. Interestingly, the Namdaemun Gate’s reconstruction also served as a launching point in this, as the nameplate was incorrectly painted.
which demonstrated a lesson to learn from or the failure of the city. Preservation, for most visitors, specifically meant fully placing historic sites in the past. “The government should not change anything,” a young man at Deoksugung Palace stated, again in reference to the nameplate. “The city should be divided. Some places should be developed, others should be preserved,” an older female worshipper outside Jogyesa said, referencing the temple as one of the areas that should be preserved. For some, preservation explicitly also includes the cityscape, as areas should be maintained or recreated as traditional areas. While speaking with a woman in the large pavilion at Namsangol Hanok Village, she commented on how the entire area should be traditional and expressed her dislike for the Japanese-style and modern buildings around the mountain site.

Park visitors were not the only ones to express political concerns at these sites and, as a group directly responsible for the preservation of a site, the management team at Namsangol Hanok Village also had issue with the city, though for perhaps more practical reasons. Part of recent city ordinances, I was informed, included the elimination of entry fees for some locations around Seoul, the village included. The elimination these dues places the management team between the city’s urge to increase Korean access to historic sites and parks and the visitors who demand the government preserve and maintain the sites. “What we are saying is that, if we charge them a little bit, then with that money we can serve them better. But, you know, Seoul government has other…It’s civic, so they think that free is much better,” one individual vented to me as the two members walked me through their plans for the future. This was said in light of the sheer volume of visitors: “There’s 2.2 million coming into this place every year. 2.2 million. At the Louvre museum in France, their annual visitors is 8.4 million. In Louvre museum, so 2.2 million is amazing. But mostly it’s because it’s free.” The free entry to the site has had an impact
on visitation to the site, though the team does not seem to believe it has been as intended: “Many tourists coming in here are Chinese tourists and the main reason they are coming in is because it’s free. Many tourist companies use this site as a trapping site. If there is a time gap between one site and another site, they come here, drop them off, look around and take pictures and go. And many of the Korean community doesn’t know there’s a site here.” The governmental plan, then, has failed as Korean visits have not, it appears, increased and upkeep becomes an issue. This, in turn, places the management team in a position in which they are unable to either maintain or grow the site. In the end, it appears, neither the government’s plans nor the political demands of the visitors are met as there is a disconnect between the target audience and the real audience.

Politics within these sites also expands beyond the consideration of the direct historical references, creating a political space in its own right. For example, Jogyesa Temple’s interior politics, due to the separation of the Buddhist order from the government, becomes a much more focused expression and direct confrontation compared to the feelings expressed elsewhere. Typically, the Jogye Order also moves beyond the city, placing itself on the realm of national politics. While visiting the temple’s café for bingsu, a shaved ice and red bean snack popular in Korea during the summer, with a history professor, we noticed a small stir behind us. At one of the traditional-style sitting areas along the back wall, cameras were being set up around a monk and rather plainly dressed man who eventually began speaking to the camera. The speech was a statement, the professor whispered to me, against the nominee for prime minister. After the sinking of the Sewol ferry earlier in the year, the prime minister at the time, Jung Hong-won, resigned. The move, seen by some in Korea as a strategy to protect the president, Park Geun-hye, led to a series of nominees who were all rejected due to scandal. The nominee at the time, Moon
Chang-keuk, would eventually step down due to a speech coming to light in which he stated that Japanese imperialization was “God’s will.”

While this sentiment was religious and Moon Chang-keuk was known for his devout Protestantism, there were no direct links to or attacks against the Buddhist order. The idea that imperialization was a positive thing, or God’s will, is also not an unheard of position within certain conservative groups. The order’s increasing presence on national politics, as represented by their open recording in front of foreigners on their temple grounds, has also impacted the political nature of the site in the cityscape. Jogyesa Temple is not simply a place for religious practice; it is the political headquarters of an opposition group. This relatively small gesture is not the first time the temple has become a center of political struggle in recent years. In 2008, as Buddhists became engaged in a political battle against President Lee Myung-bak’s administration over alleged religious bias, the head monk of the temple’s car was stopped and
searched by police on the grounds (Do 2010). The comparison was made between the sanctity of Jogyesa Temple and that of a church’s property.

Beyond the walls of these sites, politics are a very visibly part of the cityscape. Out of the five sites under major investigation, three became areas of public politics either directly before the site or in areas associated with them: Deoksugung Palace, Namsangol Hanok Village, and Insa-dong near Jogyesa Temple. Beyond these sites, protests and rallies seemed centered at historic areas across Seoul, and it was not uncommon to see unions gathered outside the Bosingak belfry or speeches in an enclave near Jongmyo shrine. Outside Deoksugung Palace was a near permanent stand to gather signatures from passersby to force the national government to go forward with investigations of the Sewol ferry sinking or in support of labor unions. In rare instances, small points were translated into English:

- President Park must keep her promise with her people.
- Laid-off laborers shall return to their work place.
- Government must reveal the truth of Ssangyong Motor case through Parliamentary inquiry.

However, this small snippet of English was the only attempt to reach out to foreigners, as none were asked to sign their petition nor was any further information given to their cause. Insa-dong also featured Sewol petitions, though only in the form of pairs of volunteers. The performance element in this area, also a common spot for clowns and buskers, was used more often, as seen with one American organization’s display to raise awareness of the plight of North Koreans or large, graphic displays in Chinese, Korean, and English about Falun Gong. Falun Gong presence was also note at Namsangol Hanok Village, the yellow banners in Chinese and Korean lining the alley to the site.

The adjustment of the sites to targeted and actual audiences through the museal and their role in shaping the cityscape around them is taken into consideration in terms of the displays of
political action in the cityscape. Deoksugung Palace’s position near city hall and the flow of Seoulites as either visitors or pedestrians makes the site prime real estate to establish a visible political display. Insa-dong, as a mixed site and with its perception as a foreign center, becomes an area in which a wide audience net is cast, both in terms of language selection and those who perform the political acts. The display to raise awareness of the lives of North Koreans, presented by Americans bordered on performance art as one woman sat tied up by heavy ropes and hooded under black cloth before a number of signs, written in Korean. Falun Gong banners, on the opposite side of the linguistic spectrum, were presented in a total of three different languages. The Falun Gong presence in front of Namsangol Hanok Village, targeting the large Chinese presence, attempted to present the accusations of their persecution in China to its citizens and, as such, the signs were predominately, if not solely, in Chinese. In each instance, the ways in which these areas are conceived of and their spatial positioning in the cityscape were
heavy considerations in terms of both who presented their political causes and to whom they presented it to.

**The Banal, The Emotional, and the Self**

The cityscape that is created, in part, by these historic sites extends beyond the realm of simply the environment in which people exist and becomes a factor in the lives of people who dwell within it. Emotions, reflecting upon both the individual and on Koreans overall, were brought on from considerations that permeated these historic sites, the people who visited them, why they visited, and the politics surrounding them. In interviews, Koreans often returned to these emotional issues of pride and shame, sadness, and heartache as they considered not just the sites, but the world in which both the locations and they themselves are a part of. To borrow a phrase from a guest at Namsangol Hanok Village, the history embedded in Seoul’s cityscape serve as the “sprouts for Korean heritage” and become loci for these emotional reflections.

By and large, native Seoumites see historic sites as a combination of museum, tourist destination, and park. The byproduct of museal and toural processes, the natural, green environment retained or recreated at heritage sites across Seoul have become valuable spaces in the cityscape. This has given Seoumites a reason for repeated visits to historic sites as an area of rest and relaxation; even those who do not visit often have made certain sites part of family outings. Despite history not being a motivation to the vast majority of visitors, it became an unavoidable aspect to their visits. While people enjoyed these “oases,” they also consider their own history as well as the present conditions and future needs for these sites. Part of this experience is a reflection of the pride felt in regards to their own history and the specter of shame at it being forgotten, real or imagined.
Another inevitable aspect of this experience is the reflexive confrontation with the Other as foreign tourists populate nearly every site, with perhaps the exception of the mountain fortresses which are themselves presented for Koreans nearly exclusively. International tourists, coming to experience these sites as museums and construct a Seoul cityscape of their own as history becomes the emergence of “real pockets” of Korea hidden behind tall buildings and busy streets. Korean visitors see these visitors as a taken-for-granted aspect of historic sites yet, much like parks, they become a lens in which to view the self. The experience of tourists becomes an ideal, of sorts, with the full appreciation of history and culture that Koreans accuse themselves of lacking. This then becomes a matter of pride in the spreading of Korea’s heritage and disappointment or shame in the lack of Korea’s own understanding of self.

The role of politics within these sites appears just as much of a byproduct of these considerations rather than the unavoidable perception. Following the Namdaemun Gate fire, the handling of historic sites is a concern in the public conscious, even if it is a fad, as one interviewee claimed: “You know Korean people, they are passionate about something now, but soon something else comes up and they don’t care anymore.” Half a decade after the arson and a year after the gate’s rebuilding, however, Koreans I interviewed continued to show concern for the way the government preserved and protected these heritage sites. The error of the gate’s nameplate in particular was perceived either as a shameful failure to respect and care for the history or as an example of the need to perfectly preserve, or rebuild, it. Rarely, if ever, were these political statements framed in positive emotional terms, as anger or disappointment tinged statements that did not state the issue as a simple matter of fact.

Of particular interest in the politics of the interior is the way responsibility falls. As stated, the Seoul Metropolitan Government generally becomes the center of conversations
regarding historic sites though, often, they are hardly involved at all. In my own small sample of
sites, two were administered by the national Cultural Heritage Administration, one by the city of
Goyang, one by a Buddhist order, and only one by the city of Seoul itself. As Namdaemun
became the center of reference for the political need for preservation and security provided by
the city, it is interesting to note that the ability to approach the site at all was put into place by
then-president Lee Myung-back and the site and its rebuilding were handled by the Cultural
Heritage Administration. However, even during interviews at the temple, the city became the
focus of responsibility, as they were the ultimate arbitrators of development that impacts Jogyesa
Temple beyond its walls. Meanwhile matters of modernization and change on the grounds, the
responsibility of the Jogye Order, was never broached. The differences of political authority over
sites also impact the range of politics that tend to take place within. While, for example,
employees at Namsangol Hanok Village expressed a level of frustration with city planning and
catering to visitors, the Jogye Order exerts itself on the national level.

Outside the sites, however, a very different stage of politics was attended to: the national
and international. No areas I investigated, or even passed, featured any displays commenting on
local or regional politics. When asking about the political presence at these sites, representing
everything from rallies to petitions, my interpreter spoke of such scenes at historic areas as
incredibly common place which fell in line with everything I had seen. The types of political
movements at these sites follow the demographics of the visitors, as international causes
typically were found around destinations most populated by foreign visitors and vice-versa. In
this, the cause and effect of the cityscape and museality/tourality can be seen. As the sites form
and are formed by their place in and through time and space, they become areas where tourists or
natives congregate. The presence of these visitors then gives an audience for different political messages while the presence of politics becomes a staple in the cityscape.
CHAPTER 6
CONCLUSION

In the anthropological literature, landscape overall has been much employed, little theorized, and rarely the focus of investigation. Efforts to capture the landscape have also fallen surprisingly short as it often becomes framed as either a matter of ecology or as meaning imbued into the environment. Perhaps the largest downfall of these approaches is the distinct focus on the etic perspective that is brought into the field: rarely are ethnographic methods employed or favored over the feelings and observations of the anthropologist. Further, while most work in the landscape has been centered on natural or minimally developed areas, the cityscape has been relatively unproblematized. The main break from this has been issues of power in relation to, for example, poverty (Song 2006).

To achieve this, the goal was to both center research and assumptions on the people who live within the cityscape and to explore a theoretical paradigm in which the merger of three perspectives of the landscape allow for an more precise view on the way it is constructed and understood that is unique to the urban environment. However, it is not an attempt to invalidate previous approaches. Indeed, it is only by taking the three theoretical approaches common in landscape, as environment, as text, and as dwelling, that the nuances of the cityscape may come to light. Buildings and areas have power, real and symbolic, and this becomes the environment in which people dwell through space and time.

Unlike the environments of forests and valleys, farms and groves, the cityscape is distinct in a subtle yet significant way: the dominance of buildings. Specifically in regards to the historic
sites studied as part of this research, the concept of museality was applied and expanded as a way of bringing to light the knowledge people have of what lies inside. Unlike a purpose-built museum, however, the history of many of these locations was directly tied with the past they present. Just as the artifacts they house, the sites themselves become museal as the context is removed and the attempt is made to crystallize the structures in time.

Though museality helps construct the interior spaces of these historic sites, the grounds of Jogyesa Temple, problematized this precisely because of the still-living quality which not only inherently defies the attempt to keep it in the past but also becomes a different process with distinct motivations. Tourality, as opposed to museality, is a process by which the continued use of, in this instance, a location is negotiated with the attempt to cater to and attract individuals to observe rather than participate. This differs also from heritage reenactments as the performance is done sincerely; that is to say, there is a qualitative difference between, for instance, the chanting of monks and prostrating of worshippers before the Buddha and the changing of the guard in front of Deoksugung Palace performed by actors. At Jogyesa Temple, the Order attempts to separate the museal and the toural was physically embodied with the segregation of the museum to an entirely different building and a lack of labeling of artifacts across the temple grounds. The selective display of information required for approaching monks, for example, also makes distinct the different ways in which audiences are to engage with the site overall. This particular selection makes worship a Korean performance while strict observation is for foreigners.

In order to re-establish the focus of landscape, and specifically cityscape, on the people who live within their symbolic and material environment, a methodology that conjoins the three aforementioned theoretical positions was employed. Previous research, in general, lacked insight
gathered from interviews and participant-observation. It was with these types of data that my own expectations were quickly dashed as everything from my site selection to my eager excitement at the history of these locations were both kindly smiled upon and subject to raised eyebrows and outright questionings. Even from my interpreter and key informants, questions like “Why would you choose Deoksugung Palace?” or comments such as “They’re just historic areas. Americans don’t have a date at the White House” were forwarded. The importance I believed to be present at these sites from my earlier visit to Seoul was only partially true; beyond the grand nature of these sites’ historic significance, the understanding of their continued function as parks or the normalization of these images would be missed if the research were contained to observations and walking. These sites as parks, incidentally often mentioned as good places to go on dates, and as places of emotional reflections on identity became clear only through the basic steps of interviews and conversations that go unquestioned in mainstream socio-cultural anthropology yet are remarkable rare in landscape analysis.

The role of these sites as loci for emotions and identity formations expands beyond simply their rooting in history; they become symbols and reminders of Koreaness and changes in time that have a trajectory forward in time. Namdaemun Gate’s prominence as a key symbol of Korea made it a common sight even in American fast food restaurant chains on the other side of the city, an attempt to appeal to ethno-national pride in a foreign place. Indeed, it was at the gate where, in a group interview consisting of two young Korean ladies who brought a Chinese tourist from Holland, one Seoulite mentioned feelings of inadequacy on the global stage, at the weakness of Korea, and a feeling of sadness. She tentatively added, to make sure I was aware of the concept, han. Sentiments like these, combined with the pride that becomes embedded at these locations, is lost by looking simply at maps and presentations of history. Even at Namsangol
Hanok Village, an artificial reconstruction of context of real houses from across Seoul with little historical reference at the site itself, was a place where one could feel being Korean.

The politics that permeate the interior of these sites hint at the emotions associated with Korean heritage sites. In this instance, the failures of the government belie the lack of respect or pride in the past. Koreans overall, it was mentioned repeatedly, did not appreciate their history and culture and, unlike foreign visitors, did not attend to their responsibilities in taking in and understanding their own heritage. The handling, or expected handling, of these sites by the government reflected these same processes as it was their duty to preserve and protect the heritage to be absorbed in park visits or taught during children’s school trips. A part of this expression of the demand for preservation, of “not changing anything,” also reinforces these locations as museal museums, sealing them in the past to be observed in the present and into the future.

**Moving Through the Cityscape - 2014**

Getting off the subway during one of my first days there, I barely recognized the square of Seoul city hall. The old building that once stood across from Deoksugung Palace was wrapped by a smooth, rounded glass building. The palace, however, changed little; even the one-handed wood carver that I had seen years before continued his work, his depictions of Christian images and the wooden ducks on stilts that once filled village lakes leaning against the wall. Soon, however, even the stark changes of city hall became as natural a scene as the yellow ribbons and boats posted on stalls between Deoksugung Palace’s gate and the wood carver. Here they attempted to gather signatures to push the national government to investigate their response to the sinking of the Sewol ferry that ended with the deaths of over 300 people, mostly young
students. It also quickly became clear, after it was brought to my attention, just how differently
the space inside Deoksugung Palace was utilized by Seoulites and tourists as old men would visit
near the small coffee shop or families and couples sat under the shade and Western and Chinese
tourists roamed near the throne room and used often over-sized cameras to take photos of the
empty houses.

The short walk to Jogyesa Temple also demonstrated stark contrast of audiences as
bowing worshippers moved past similarly oversized cameras, many pointed in the interior of the
seemingly always active prayer hall. In a nearby sitting area between the museum building and
historic post office people enjoyed their lunches or a short break to the recorded sounds of prayer
drums mingled with the chants of monks from the hall. Insa-dong, maybe a five minute walk
away depending on the traffic of the busy street, is a stark contrast of sounds and images of the
relatively calm temple with street performers drawing crowds at the closest entrance and a dull
roar of international languages engaged in the purchase of souvenirs. Clusters of pedestrians
form around the rare car or taxi that tries to move through the street. This area that, as my
interpreter told me, “we (Koreans) would never go to” is starkly contrasted a road just across the
street and behind another tourist attraction, Tapgol, which was Seoul’s first park. The linguistic
diversity quickly dies where old men are commonly drunk by the afternoon, making the street
rowdy: at the same street, just outside of sight from Insa-dong, I watched a fight end with a
flipped table and two men gleefully beating bronze drums to the delight of nearby patrons.

Namdaemun Gate’s recent reopening provided me with another new scene, the brightly
painted and lit double pavilion a dramatic change from the white walls that protected the site
during its rebuilding. Evidence of the fire can still be seen in the stones that were not replaced,
the new white blocks hinting at the walls that the gate used to serve contrasting with the grey to
black ones that support the structure. Gate One of Namdaemun Market provides the clearest view of the gate under a constant digital advertisement for Chevy cars from a nearby office building. At the market, stalls and stands selling clothing and tourist trinkets obscure the malls and buildings behind them. At nearly every corner, lit in yellow, are ginseng shops selling various types of the roots floating in amber liquid. The streets that I remember being congested with late night shoppers and abuzz with the shouts of merchants in Japanese and English are now much emptier and quieter. The tourists have moved across the street to Myeong-dong to shop at the Gap or Adidas outlets, though the language hasn’t with Chinese dominating both the shouts from merchants and the advertisements for “foreigner event” discounts.

Namsangol Hanok Village was the only site I had not visited previously and a problem noted by both visitors and workers was the general lack of knowledge about the site’s existence. The modern history of the site was considered part of the reason that so little of the village was seen and why it held so little influence on the city; as a military garrison, it was not meant to be seen. The relatively long and narrow alley, without sidewalks and barely the room to hold two cars made sense as a defensive measure. The entry seemed almost unceremonious as the city almost appeared to disappear at the mountain base, though the illusion is quickly shattered by the houses and offices that peak in from over the walls. During the day, taekwondo demonstrations on a stage before the large pavilion drew crowds, the martial artists in costumes resembling old kung-fu movies and ended with international flags being waved before photo-ops. On the other side of the pavilion was almost the opposite scene of a small grove of trees around a calm pond. As I took pictures of the lotus flowers and lily pads that floated on the surface after my fifth or so visit, the wonder of the old buildings over and the realization that the demonstration was a
repeated set of acts, I could see the ease with which the view of these sites as parks can be adapted.

The trip to Haengjusanseong Fortress required rather intensive research and trial and error, with my first attempt to take the subways and buses ending with three hours of wandering an area of Goyang City looking for an internet connection before I decided that Insa-dong and Jogyesa Temple needed a more thorough examination. My second trip met with almost the same fate, after finally finding the correct bus on the Korean-only maps, it dawned on me that I wasn’t sure how to exit the bus and decided to take a taxi three stops later. I took the opportunity of the two hour walk back to Goyang City proper, forgetting earlier that I still didn’t understand buses and taxis were rare at a mountaintop, to walk through the small village and past its many bicycle shops and small, bicycle themed cafes. Haengjusanseong Fortress as a site that prioritizes Korean visitors was established beyond the museum displays and, supported by a visit on a closed Monday despite the website’s assurance of it being open, an element even on the ability to arrive at it. The fortress, I also realized, had almost no influence beyond its grounds except for one major element. Sitting on the short bus ride between the edge of Seoul and the edge of Goyang City, I looked at the green mountain and immediately knew it as my destination: the white plinth devoted to General Kwon Yul and the defenders continues to watch over Seoul from the mountain top.

The area of what is now Seoul has been continuously inhabited since around 4000 BCE and has served as auxiliary capital of one kingdom, the main capital of two others, and continues to act as such for the Republic of Korea. This history is instilled in the very fabric of the city as it has recovered from wars and rebuilt itself after imperialization. The construction of skyscrapers and tram lines, housing, subways, power lines, and roads have crisscrossed the city and, as one
old man stressed to me, survival and development after the wars caused just as much, if not 
more, damage to the old cityscape as conscious acts of eroding Korean culture by the Japanese. 
Through all of these events, or perhaps because of them, these sites have remained, both 
physically and in the memory of the people who inhabit the city. They have become references 
of Korea, parks, centers of emotions, tourist attractions, considerations of cultural self, and 
backdrops of protests. The city that has grown around these sites and incorporated them into the 
cityscape, influenced and influencing the sites as meaning infuses the environment. These 
historic sites have become the foundations for the modern.
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APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE GUIDE FOR INTERVIEW

1) What brings you to this given site?
2) What is it that you like at this site?
3) How do you feel being at this site?
4) What do you associate with this site?
5) What do you believe is the importance of this site? Sites like this?
6) Why or why aren’t historic sites important to keep in the Seoul cityscape?
7) How do you believe the presence of these sites impact your life?
8) How does landscape matter to you?
9) What are your feelings on the development of Seoul as a modern city?
10) How well do you think Seoul has dealt with keeping its history as it has developed?
11) What do you think the reason is for keeping these sites? Why these over others?
12) What do you feel makes Seoul different from other cities? Cities you have visited?
13) What does it mean for you to be Korean?
14) What do you feel is the importance of history to being Korean?