

Production of Space and Locality

Jae-won Mun

HK Professor, Korean Studies Institute, Pusan National University
E-mail: mjazz@pusan.ac.kr

Abstract

Locality is the product composed by hegemonic conflicts among discourses in and out of locals that occur through the medium of space and is connected to spatial politics appearing via space. In this context, this study attempted to think of diverse problems in producing space (counterspace) by linking it to locality. This thesis reviewed the possibility of “Totatoga” a cultural space located at the original downtown space in Busan by drawing on heterotopia by Lefebvre or Foucault who had a prospect for producing an anti-space as alternative against the contradictory space of a capitalistic society. The original town is a space of mixed remaining, ruling, and rising cultures, causing diverse entities in this connection to be engaged in hegemonic competition. The work of Totatoga going on within led to practical groping for “how we could make the space we live in.” Consequently, it was verified that the image of locality reconstructed from here contained the ideomotor

character of making alternative values.

Keywords: Space Production, Locality, Culture Hegemony,
Heterotopias, Totatoga

The question of “what is space” can be substituted for “how does different human practices create different conceptions of space and use them?” (D. Harvey)

1. Production of space/counterspace and locality

This thesis started with an intention to consider diverse problems about space/counterspace production in connection with locality.

Societal production of any space is far from a smooth or automatic process of social structure being carved on the landscape without receiving any resistance or limitations. It is practically placed in conflicts in the area of numerous struggles and in the process of continual production and reproduction through revolutionary thinking.¹⁾ When Henri Lefebvre called attention to social relationship immanent in spatial production, it was because space is the whole of relationships made by

1) Edward Soja, *Postmodern Geographies*, Translated by Lee Moo-yong et al. *Space and theories of critical society*, Seoul: Perspective and Language, 1997, p. 166.

things (objects and products).²⁾ When he explained space in terms of production, he noticed the process of production as well as the result of production. It was an attempt to integrate antitheses in philosophical thoughts of subject and object and restore the subject into the process of production. In this vein, questions of who produces space for what and for whom, how, and why are essential items. Motives of spatial production he brought up as spatial practices, representations of space, and spaces of representations cover such an essential frame of problems.³⁾

Lefebvre's book *La production de l'espace* which considered the birth mechanism of modern capitalistic space, included a notable consistent planning-planning for making "another society" (style of production).⁴⁾ While elucidating the birth of modern space in capitalism, he consistently brought up plans for a space of emancipating from modern capitalism. From a long-term perspective, this is not only theoretical but also related to practical plans. It is a new space and another (societal) space of life from the past, representing the spatial production of other styles of production. In this vein, he inquires

2) Henri Lefebvre, *La production de l'espace* (Translated by Yeong-ran Yang, *Production of space*, Seoul: Ecolivres Publishing House), 2011, p. 148.

3) Nam-joo Kim, "Dreaming about a space of difference: 'Production of space' and its practice", *Space and society*, No. 14, 2000, pp. 65-66.

4) Henri Lefebvre, Translated by Yang Yeong-ran, *ibid*, p. 587.

into a dialectic relationship between the possible and the impossible, between the objective and the subjective, in an attempt to overcome the opposition between them.⁵⁾ The paradox between “the possible and impossible,” the impossible possible and the possible impossible, is the transfer of the future vision into the present practice. Lefebvre said that as long as we were unable to conceive of an impossible future from the present practice, we had nothing to get by at present and the impossible future could only invert into possibility in present practice.⁶⁾ Here, despite some ambiguity, we can see that he, noting the production (birth) of a modern space, has a prospect of producing a space resisting the contradictory space of capitalist society after all. In his referring to a space of resistance, Lefebvre claimed that Bachchin’s carnival could crack the utopian elements made by capital and change the urban space through our everyday life. As a proposed transformational process, he portrayed heterotopias.

According to Foucault, heterotopias will expose a heteroclite system in the sense of having “parts” of diverse geometric or grammatical orders juxtaposed. That is why heterotopias are “a unique space which is different in its functions from and even opposed to the existing social spaces. Foucault’s heterotopias, which, though with a focus on “right and now,” was incessantly

5) *Ibid*, pp. 116-117

6) Nam-joo Kim, op.cit., p. 67.

put off and subverted through an “existent or non-existent” play emphasizes the instantaneity of “occurrence”⁷⁾ released from the system of “production.” In other words, it is not that heterotopias are born by the systemized, structured, and ultimate planning for a single utopia but that they obtain their meaning in local and relational circumstances. What is stressed in Lefebvre’s or Foucault’s heterotopias is the generation of “other spaces” (or third space)⁸⁾ which are relational and seceded from. This requires that we take notice of heterotopias as producing subtle differences among many influences generated between space and power rather than understanding them as a simple counterspace.

This suggests that spaces of resistance have been established in power relations.⁹⁾ How can we connect the production of such counterspaces to locality? Locality, the product, structured of hegemonic¹⁰⁾ conflicts of discourses inside and outside locals

7) Dong-geun Lim, “Space and power: Foucault’s Still other spaces”, AURI Humanities forum casebook, June 2008.

8) Foucault proposes five principles composing “heterotopology”: 1) Heterotopias obviously take very diverse forms. 2) Make the function of heterotopias that may exist in another way. 3) Heterotopias can be juxtaposed among many spaces that are not likely to subsist in themselves. 4) Heterotopias are linked to heterochronies that serves to obstruct time. 5) Though in all-time isolation, heterotopias have a system of opening and closing. (M. Foucault, “Of other Space, Heterotopias” *Diacritics* 6, 1986, pp 22-27.)

9) Maria do Mar Castro Varela & Nikita “Dhawan, Spatializing Resistance Resisting space: On Utopias and Heterotopias”, Korean Studies Institute Seminar, Mar 2011.

10) The hegemony used in this thesis accepts the discussion as “a process of culture practice” developed above while putting more weight on its variability and dynamism as the hegemonic than on its character as an established

that happen through the medium of space and it is connected to spatial politics appearing via space. Spatial politics is defined as the competition and opposition in interests of social powers surrounding the appropriation and practical use, reconstruction, dominance and control, etc. of the space. Choice and exclusion worked in such a process are not original but a conflict of discourses brought about by the crossing of subjects, objects and everyone's eyes generated in a particular period of time. Thus, the cultural hegemony as "practice" and "process" works as momentum for a new change in implementing a space.

With a focus on planning heterotopias included by an alternative space, this study is intended to explain what interconnectivity such a practical groping has with locality. To this end, first, we will explain spatial politics as the process of diverse subjects' performing hegemony, second, we will perceive such spatial politics as the root point for composing locality, and third, we will try to conceive the "space of difference" implemented through this. As a concrete example of such space of difference, we are going to look into Totatoga settled in the original downtown of Busan as a possibility for alternative cultural space.

2. Connection between the dominant, the residual, and the

system.

emergent: spatiality of the original downtown

The complexity of a culture is found not just in its variable processes and social stipulations of these processes but also in dynamic mutual relations exposed everywhere on the processes by diverse elements changing in history. R. Williams describes such cultural aspects as the opportunity for the residual, the dominant, and the emergent.

Here, the residual means the things that were formed effectively in the past but that still work actively in the present cultural process; that is, it refers to the things that do not just stop as the past element but that exist as a powerful element of forming the present. Thus, they can be seen not as the past element at all.¹¹⁾ On the other hand, the emergent means a new meaning system, values, custom, and constant creation of a new or many kinds of relationship. It differs from both the dominant and the residual. What is important in this understanding is that it does not end as the problem of direct practice. It critically depends on “discovery” of new forms or a new method of operating those forms. What we must consider repeatedly in practice especially is preemergence in actual readiness for emergence.¹²⁾ This means a state that shows active and hurried movement but that has not been fully specified yet. As seen in

11) Raymond Williams, *Marxism, and Literature* (Translated by Man-joon Park, *Literature and culture theory*, Seoul: Gyeongmoonsa Publishing House, 2003), p. 175.

12) *Ibid*, p. 183

the process of hegemonic practice, the residual, the dominant, and the emergent do not form a mutual axis of obstruction and exclusion but cross differently according to historic opportunities.

The cultural aspects Williams set forth above are connected to his explained structures of feeling. He connects the emergence of one new emotional structure at a period to the forming of a new class. He describes the emotional structure as a belief system, institution, or a complex but transcendental form that cannot be restored to explicit and general relationship, etc. For a format that well reveals such a form, he gives the genre of art that involves aesthetic imagination. Actually, the influential shapes of art are related with the dominant or residual social shapes that have already been apparent. Further, the preferential object of emotional structure in a “resolved” form for relationship is the emerging shapes. It is worth noting that “a new feeling structure” and “the emergent” are often associated with the contradiction, division, or change inside a certain class.

Based on Williams’ theory dwelled on above, let’s look into the cultural topography of the original downtown of Busan.¹³⁾ In Busan, the term “original town” has become a pronoun under the resolution among heads of the four self-governing bodies of

13) The original downtown means the region that had performed integrated functions of administration, economy, culture, and transportation for a specific city for a certain period in the past but that has been falling behind losing the function as downtown due to the emergence of a new downtown. We use the term “original downtown” because of the negative image given by the term “the old downtown.”

Chung-gu, Seo-gu, Dong-gu, and Yeongdo-gu. This term was officially accepted by the administration when on January 7, 2008, the Busan metropolitan city included “north harbor and original downtown development team” in the four teams affiliated with the city as it started the headquarters for strategic vision propulsion.¹⁴⁾ The original downtown space, interpellated inevitably and accompanying historical and cultural memories, is the space that apparently exposes the collisions and negotiations with the dominant, the residual, and the emergent, encompassing the historical ups and downs.

First, the original downtown of Busan is the space with many premodern and modern landscapes and historical sites of Busan remaining since its opening in 1876 and with related history, cultural facilities, and “story” concentrated. Such narrations work as a main element in the current process of reconstructing space. It is being positively interpellated in an effort to represent the history of modern Busan by mobilizing memory especially. The modern heritage in the past colonial times and the Korean War, among others, are being reassigned as the city’s emblem performing the function of residual culture that still has a strong effect on the current space of time. Such residual culture is always interpellated by the present request. The memories

14) Graduate School, Pusan National University, Department of Interdisciplinary Program of Art, Culture and Image Media, <Activity plan for cultural space using Busan metropolitan city urban-folk-based culture map> report, Dec 2010.

that intervene in this process are not limited to indiscriminate recollection of the past experiential incidents but are selected through constant struggle with memory by the subjects who have diverse memories. The memory mechanisms selected this way lead to the representation of specific places, which come to “be referred to and exposed” through such memory and representation.

Second, the original downtown which had played a central role as the hub of Busan since the opening of harbor relatively lost some of its functions as downtown, including administration, finance, commerce, etc., at around the relocation of the City Hall building (1998). Ever since, the greatest issue of the region has become the “(economic) activation of the original downtown.” What incited the splendid comeback of the original downtown of late is the opening of the Lotte Department in December, 2010. These circumstances convince that the original downtown is being positively cited in the space of consumption. This is also the part of positive responding to Busan city’s urban space plan (2021, Busan city’s basic plan) titled “An international culture and tourism city using historical and cultural resources.” The activity plan for “Mt. Yongdoo and Chagalchi special tourist district” being under progress as the first drive assignment for Jung-gu area in 2011 is not irrelevant to this. Where is such making a city into a tourist attraction headed for? Regarding this, Harvey’s indication is significant. He said that though it

was possible to make “otherness” and “local resistance” emphasized by postmodern politics prospering at a particular place, these are invariably subjected to the capacity of capital that generally adjusts the fragmented space and to the capitalist march of historic time made globally. Thus, he stressed the reconstruction of space by piling up capital.¹⁵⁾

Third and as to the focus of reviving the original downtown made on economic logic of late, there are practices to relocate past memories into occurring cultural times. Among these, what is noticeable is the diverse cultural network based on the original downtown. One of them, “Original downtown culture network,” consists of nine institutions including Busan Customs Museum, Forty-stair Culture Hall (including Jung-gu Culture House), Baeksan Memorial Hall, Busan Modern History Hall, Democracy Park (including Democratic Resistance Memorial hall), Busan Tower (2007), Busan Metropolitan City Central Library (2008), Totatoga (2010), and Mt. Yongdoo Art Exhibition Hall (2010) as participant organizations. (This was started as “Jung-gu” Culture Network [June 17, 2005] due to problems like cooperation and assistance with Jung-gu Office at its foundation but renamed into “Original Downtown Culture Network,” weighing the target of the original downtown’s networking including some of Eastern and Western Gu. [2009]) These

15) David Harvey, *The Condition of Postmodernity* (Translated by Dong-hee Goo, Yeong-min Pak, 2006), Seoul: Hanul Academy Publishing House, p. 280.

institutions are not simple ones like any building but perform as the memory and symbol of the premodern and modern Busan. Thus, the Original Downtown Culture Network can be connected to “the shaping of a new class” in a wish to own the region’s historical memories again in the cultural space of time. Here, a new class means the movement to recover the cultural timekeeping distance from subjects that are expected to subjugate the original downtown’s residual culture to capital. Cultural time is restrained by economic time but it tends to continue even after the end of political and economic time and be crystallized into a habitus by being internalized into the unconscious over the level of the conscious.

As seen above, the original downtown composes the present in mixture of the residual, the dominant, and the emergent as Williams referred to. In the process of adjusting this mixture, we can surmise the competition for cultural hegemony by subjects surrounding this space. The hegemonic practice as “process” goes on in the space of collision and negotiation with domination, exclusive possession, cultural exchange, and negotiation strategies. Williams expands the hegemony with a broad practical activity. Hegemony cannot just indicate a high-level clear ideology and its forms of control cannot be limited to what are often regarded as “manipulation” or “enlightenment,” either. It is related to the whole of expectations and practices across life in general. It is composite and actually

he proposes it as a live system of the meanings and values under composition.¹⁶⁾ “A live hegemony is always a process. It cannot exist passively as a dominant form. It must incessantly be renewed, recreated, advocated, and amended. Moreover, it not only receives constant resistance and restraint from new pressures but is changed and challenged by them.

Thus, the concept of hegemony should be accompanied by the concepts of counterhegemony and alternative hegemony. He stresses that these are truly eternal elements for practice.”¹⁷⁾ The most interesting and difficult in analyzing the culture of the complicated society is to grasp the hegemonic in its own process, which takes an active and formative character while taking the transformational character as well.¹⁸⁾

3. “Of Other Space”: Experiment with “Totatoga”

As a result of searching the local papers such as Kookje Daily, Busan Daily, etc. from Jan 1, 2009 through May 30, 2011, the original downtown exposed the dichotomous topography of discourse between 1) lack, crime, decay, ghost, poverty and 2) recovery, revival, vitality, development, reconstruction, old glory, and rejuvenation. While the former composed the present time,

16) Raymond Williams, Translated by Man-joon Park, *ibid*, p. 157.

17) *Ibid*, pp. 161- 162.

18) *Ibid*, p. 163.

the latter was putting on the future time to come. Here, in case of 2), it was divided again into “consumption” and “culture” and it was found that Lotte Department Store was put in the place of consumption and “Totatoga” was focally put in the place of “culture.”

Totatoga is the “original downtown space for cultural creation” made by remodeling the empty shopping mall in the area of Jungang-dong and Donggwang-dong of Jung-gu, Busan. The change from a decayed empty shopping mall into a space for cultural creation revealed primarily how a landscape or spectacle may change depending on the subject that exclusively possessed the space.¹⁹⁾ With a little more expansion, it can be connected to the campaign for “occupation” noted as a cultural practice movement on an urban space. There may be a difference in concrete strategy of practice or aspects since there is a part that is common in terms of attributes and effects which are of a “different planning” from the existing representing system.

picture (1)

This name originates from the onomatopoeia of walking forty

19) Seung-gyu Park, *Everyday Geography - Inquiring about the relationship between man and his space*, Seoul: Book World Publishing House, 2009, p. 135.



steps “tobaktobak” (exactly) and a compound word for “To” (tolerance) and “Tato” (apart and together). Here, a Chinese character “Ga” (street) was added to coin “Totatoga.” Unlike the existing villages of creation in other areas, the residences are in sparse distribution of within forty stairs and 200m in radius. Though they are scattered up apart from one another, they also gather “together to seek for a culture of understanding and communication. Such items have been literally reflected on CI (Corporate Identity). Looking at the logo design for Totatoga (Picture 1), it gave shape to an alley in the form of writing the consonants and vowels of Hangeul in connection. Seen as a whole, it takes the image of a tree with many branches. It is considered to have contained the meaning of Totatoga, which has become a connected space through the network of cultural space.

The Jung-gu local culture circles can be divided into those of the 1) Busan Democracy Park Culture 2) Mt. Yongdoo Park

Culture and 3) Forty-stairs Culture.

The first has the three axes of Bussan Democracy park Democratic Resistance Memorial Hall, Busan Liberation Memorial Hall, and Busan Metropolitan City Central Library centering around Busan Democracy Park. The second has the three axes of Busan Modern History Hall, Mt. Yongdoo Art Exhibition Hall, and Paeksan Memorial Hall centering around Mt. Yongdoo Park. The third has the three axes of Forty-stairs Memorial Hall, Jung-gu Culture House, and Busan Customs Museum centering around the Forty-stairs Culture Street.²⁰⁾ Totatoga is chiefly distributed centering on Forty-stairs Culture circles (the subject in charge by the local autonomy system was turned into the job of the Forty-stairs Culture Hall) while playing the role of cultural recognition and symbolic medium internally and externally on the neighboring space rather than the concept of superficial facilities.

Moving into Totatoga started in March 2010 (Mar 20) and it has 18 places and 36 rooms. They consist of diverse spaces including culture creation, art creation, photo, handicrafts, independent movie, little theater, traditional art, stage art training center, Indi incubating, humanities center, coral, culture magazine, culture travel, etc.²¹⁾ This study would not

20) Chong-Se Kim, "A Study on the Local Networks of the Small Medium Size Public Facilities of Culture: A Study on the Model of the Networks in the area of Jung-gu, Busan Metropolitan City", Graduate School, Pusan National Univ. 2004, p. 45.

21) For details of the project, see <http://www.tttg.kr>. For the project plan and

focus on “space for culture creation” itself but try to find “the space arrangement and its effect” by looking into the spatiality immanent in this space.

In the neighborhood of the forty stairs where “Totatoga” is located is the work of memorizing the Korean War actively proceeding. As many know, with regard to the Korean War, this space contains poverty and the sorrow of separation and, on the other hand, an underlying pride as “the center for Renaissance of culture and art.” There used to be over thirty culture spaces including Miltawōn Miltawon coffee shop, which was used during the war as an office of the National Culture Organization Association, music coffee shops (Kūmgang, ch’unch’u, Nogwōn, ch’ōngguTabang, Paekcho, Oasisū, K’ūllasik), exhibition facilities (Mihwadang Department Store Art Gallery, Busan city press office, etc.), and bars for artists (Namp’ogwan, ch’ongt’ap kū ril etc. and Cinemasimingwan, Hyōndae kūkchang, etc.) Considering the situation of Busan’s culture space in those days after the war, this large number reveals that the area of Jung-gu was the “centerpiece of culture.”²²⁾ These aspects continued until the 70’s and the 80’s, which formed the nature of space as “a new

ongoing process, see Jae-geun Cha, “Story of the original space of creation Totatoga”, Democratic Society Institute, *Reflection and prospect* No. 7, May 2011, Jeong-wan Choi, *Support Center for the original downtown space of creation Totatoga* (Casebook).

22) Department of Interdisciplinary Program of Art, Culture and Image Media Graduate School, Pusan National University, *ibid*, Dec 2012; for further details, see Busan Metropolitan City, *Busan Sisa (History of Busan)* v. 4, June 1991.

center for culture” and which still works on the contemporary culture and art people as a strong pride. That’s not all. Currently, not being as active as before, the local publishers focus on literary coterie magazine such as *chŏnmang*, *Haesŏng chakkamaül*, *P’urŭn pyŏl*, etc. and are working around the Forty Stairs. *Yangsanpak*, *Gyerim*, *Kangnarū*, *Pusanp’o*, *Hwagukbanjŏm*, etc., on this street are not just simple restraints. These restaurants are spaces that keep arousing cultural nostalgia with many stories related to culture and art people. Such traces and images are still working on the reconstruction of original downtown’s cultural landscape.

The logic of the local artists and Busan City (Jung-gu) seeking to revive the original downtown through representing the space of Totatoga is, in short, affected by the desire to restore the subject for its narration. In this respect, the original downtown space attempts to represent the old glory by strongly involving what R. Williams calls the residual in the process of restoring the culture zone.

Incidentally, in case of Totatoga, it was not initiated solely by interpellating “the residual” of the original downtown. It was initiated by the desire for a “local” space of culture centering on artists from Busan. As a practical plan, they sought for a plan deviating from the limitations of the existing spaces of creation. In other cases, local autonomy bodies created a space putting another independent organization in motion for the subject of

operation and management as well under the name of Propulsion Group subject to it. Besides, as to the budget size, Seoul has been throwing 56.5 billion won since 2008 with an annual maintenance of 8 billion won. The live-in period for writers and artists is short from one month to one year. On the contrary, in case of Totatoga, there was movement by the local artists, followed by the local autonomy body's approval. By considering the attributes of art in genre and adhesion to the region first, they designated the live-in period for each as 3 years.²³⁾ As the result, the original downtown was selected, and as historicity held by the original downtown serving as a posterior cause, it created the meaning of "reviving the original downtown's culture."

Unlike other regions, desire emphasized by Totatoga about a local space of culture is well exposed in "connectivity to locality" on which it lays importance. A summary of theses can be described as follows.

First, it forces the relativity to locality (organic community activity with the subjects of local spaces) as prerequisite for moving into "Totatoga." The writers and artists are presenting a movie, literature, or art creation with a material of Busan in their planning for assignment. Its representative examples are as follows: Giving shape to the image of Busan City, mountainside road, p'aranmult'ong (a blue pail) series of work yuk'woehan

23) Jeong-wan Choi, *op.cit.*

kongjakso (Pleasant handiworks), *Busan's People in an Alley: History of Busan Literature*"(writing Suijae), local investigation program *Looking for Alleys of Busan* implementing topology and holding local characteristics by Jungang-dong text (Tadamjae), Record of Busan's everyday space and writing work (Homilpat), managing a movie gallery café for communication with local residents (Pogidūmun), etc. The space of literary creation has already published storytelling books of Busan, *Dreaming About a Place* (Dec 2010) and *Looking for the Lost Time* (Dec 2011) which made a material of the original downtown neighborhood.

Second, it is the settled relationship with residents. Kyōngmin's apple tree in the printing alley of Donggwang-dong has become a famous story of Totatoga. An artist's work of painting the mural on the next house has made the artist and the neighbor form a close relationship. Making the alley together can be considered to reveal the possibility for a culture space in close adhesion to the region. Through such work, people began to turn out of the workplace, making a busy communication among people in the ally of Printing One, Donggwang-dong, which means there has been change in the living culture for this space. In the same vein, we can also give attention to the work of the space of photo creation, which centers on a photo education program with elderly people in the area of Jung-gu.

Third, though advocating a space of creation, it has already taken down the hedge of a personal space of creation by itself

and set a place as an open space for culture. This shows difference from the exiting space of creation. Paengnyōnōsōwon (a culture space that means a hundred wooden fish) and Suijae (meaning a space of literary creation), professing to be a humanity center and culture space, respectively, are holding a public lecture for citizens for one. Such a project for popularization is largely divided into two kinds. 1) Culture and art experiencing together with neighboring office workers characteristically of the area filled with shopping malls 2) Civil art project is on its way using the network of the original downtown. Through such work it aims to compose a “living community” as a special cultural zone in combination of Totatoga and the region.²⁴⁾

As confirmed above, the first priority of Totatoga in planning is setting the place of culture adhering to the region. Set the cause of “recreating the hollowing out of Busan’s original downtown (Jungang-dong, Donggwang-dong Forty Stairs area) with dynamic imagination possessed by culture and art,” but the most prominent of the direction of recreation is the part of “adhesion to the locality.” These items can be considered a form, in which the “public nature” of culture has taken root in the region rather than a personal space of creation. This distinguishes itself by placing culture as social aesthetics, rather

24) As a concrete practice about this, cases have been found in which some authors participating in Totatoga actually moved here (Hee-Jin Kim Interview).

than commodity aesthetics, and especially by putting it into practice on a local basis. “Totatoga” is called a test center for the regeneration of downtown because it encompasses the power of breakout crossing the control of modern society and the regulation of capital.²⁵⁾

The power of escape sensed out of “Totatoga” can be connected to heterotopias. David Harvey insists on “composing locality and its meaning qualitatively”²⁶⁾ as one strategy for opposing the modern spatial planning and its expansion. Professing that when capitalist has had control over the hegemony about the space they put little importance to local aesthetics, he mentions Foucault’s heterotopias proposing “imploding spatiality” as a means to opposing it. In fact, such a matter of locality is not irrelevant to the aforementioned local adhesion. It is because without reading out the texture of a region and by picking up stories about concrete places, it is

25) In this respect, there are also problems to work out. In fact, the period for public subscription to residence was not long enough (which seems to have been also related to the budget problem). The public subscription in progress from December 23 through January 6, 2010 is likely without sufficient publicity, which must have had limitations in the span of participation. This has caused invisible conflict between the residents and non-residents, too. In addition, except literary creation, there is an age limit of “40 years old or under.” This can work positively on the image of youth culture but can cause a conflict with the former generations who have actually engaged in culture activity in the region for a long time. Moreover, the sense of place is important to execute the cause held by the spatial characteristics of the original downtown. However, this sense of place held by Totatoga’s subjects of creation chiefly compose of the 30’s can be different in texture from the previous generations, which could pose a certain limitation.

26) David Harvey, Translated by Dong-hee Gu, Yeong-min Park, *op.cit.*, p. 353.

hard to oppose the abstracted order of time and space. In this sense, planning on “Totatoga” can be said to contain a desire for reconstructing space “unlike” the dominant order.

With regard to “being different,” K. Hetherington especially emphasizes the meaning of “alternation” and “performance” by accepting Foucault’s heterotopias. Heterotopias are nothing about resistance or order. However, by defining the setting of the style of “alternative ordering” as a thing about two it includes,²⁷⁾ Hetherington goes further from Foucault who stressed contradiction and juxtaposition to include “alternative” positively.

Accordingly, he understands heterotopias as “site of alternate ordering.” Heterotopias do not exist in the order of a thing but do in the ordering of a thing. So heterotopias are relational. Thus, what matters in considering heterotopias is not space itself but what they perform in relation with another place. It is because heterotopias perform a new pattern of ordering through a heterogeneous pattern they express.²⁸⁾ Such “(right to) difference” starts or maintains in the neighborhood of homogeneity as resistance to homogeneity, or as an external

27) Hetherington further proposes four principles about heterotopias: 1) No space cannot be described as fixed by heterotopias. 2) They have a multiple and motive meaning because they always depend on the place where doers are placed within power effect. 3) They are always defined relationally with another place or in the process of spatialization without existing on their own. 4) Accepted as something relational, heterotopias must have something unique about them serving as a passage point for them. Or any place could be described as the other. (Kevin Hetherington, *The Badlands of modernity: heterotopias and social ordering*, London: Routledge, 1997, p. 54)

28) *Ibid*, p. 40

element of homogeneity (things lateral, heterotopic, or heterogeneous).²⁹⁾

4. Conclusion

Lefebvre diagnose that such phrases as “change one’s life” or “change the society” are nonsensical without the support of producing a suitable space. He said that any idea of “changing” at all such as “living better,” “living in another way,” etc., needs to put spatial practice different from so far into practice gradually or dramatically.³⁰⁾ Spatial practice defines privileged space as simultaneously composed of locality, relationship between local and total, reproduction of such relationship, acts and signs, universalized everyday space, and symbols. This is neither a mental or literary “place” nor philosophical “topos” but a matter of political and social place.³¹⁾ Such spatial practice does not just contribute to the reproduction of dominant order but includes resistant practices released from the spatial code conferred by the dominant order; that is, by casting questions about the produced spatial structure and its meaning and by using and transforming the space, another spatial practice for making a new spatial alternative exists after shaking the existing

29) Henri Lefebvre, Translated by Yang Yeong-ran, *ibid*, p. 530.

30) *Ibid*, pp. 115-116.

31) *Ibid*, p. 420.

order and structure.³²⁾

In this respect, the cultural work of Totatoga located at the original downtown of Busan assumes a practical and motive nature of “how to keep making the space I live in.” Since Totatoga is reconstructing space based on the locality of the original downtown, this fact convinces us of more adhesion to locality. Such reproduction of space shows the will toward escaping from the code offered by dominant order, so the shape of locality reorganized from this contains the motive nature of heading for an alternative value.

As a song by a poet declaring herself to “live the tradition of blue prediction” (Lee Min-a, poem <From this stair right now>), we can put Totatoga on the place of collective subject who “dreams about a new Jungang-dong period” and who rears several new leaves of a foxtail” (Choi Won-joon, poem <Platanus and a foxtail: Dreaming about a new Jungang-dong period>) with the texture of spatiality combined between the past and the future. Thus, couldn’t we signify such a form of cultural space into the emergent “space of difference” through negotiation with “the residual”? In such a form, it is not easy to find the clue to imploding the capitalistic space restored only to economic time. This enables us to expand the problem of locality further into a practical discourse combined with values or motions.

32) Hun Park, *A study on the modern value of a historical city through the theory of spatial politics: Focused on Gongju, Booyeo and Gyeongju*, 2010, Hongik Univ. doctor’s thesis, p. 100.

References

- Choi, Jeong-wan. "Support Center for original downtown's creational space"
Totatoga (Casebook).
- Kim, Chong-Se. "A Study on the Local Networks of the Small · Medium Size
Public Facilities of Culture : A Study on the Model of the Networks
in the Area of Jung-gu, Busan Metropolitan City", Busan Univ.
Master's thesis, 2004.
- Harvey, David. *The Condition of Postmodernity* (Translated by Goo,
Dong-hwoi & Park ,Yeong-min, Seoul: Hanul Academy Publishing
House), 2006.
- Lim, Dong-geun. "Space and power: Foucault's Of Other Spaces", AURI,
Humanities forum casebook, 2008.
- Department of Interdisciplinary Program of Art, Culture and Image Media
Graduate School, *Pusan metropolitan city's plan report on activating
cultural space using city folk-based culture map*, 2010.
- Soja, Edward. *Postmodern Geographies* (Translated by Lee Moon-yong et. al.,
Theory of Space and critical society, Seoul: Perspective and
Language), 1997.
- Lefebvre, Henri. *La production de l'espace* (Trans by Yang Yeong-ran, Seoul:
Ecolivres), 2011.
- Park, Hun. *A Study on Contemporary Value of Historical Cities through
Spatial Political Theory*, Hongik Univ. Doctor's thesis, 2010.
- Cha, Jae-geun. "A story about the original downtown space of creation
Totatoga", Democracy Institute, *Reflections and visions* vol. 7, 2011.
- Hetherington, Kevin. *The Badlands of modernity: heterotopia and social
ordering*, London: Routledge, 1997.
- M. Castro Varela & N. Dhawan, *Spatializing Resistance Resisting spaces: On
Utopias and Heterotopias*, Korean Studies Institute seminar, 2011.
- Foucault, Michel. "Of Other Space, Heterotopias", *Diacritics* 6, 1986.
- Kim, Nam-joo. "Dreaming about a space of difference: *La production de*

l'espace and practice", *Space and society* vol. 14, 2000.

Williams, Raymond. *Marxism and Literature* (Translated by Park Man-joon, *Literature and Culture theory*, Seoul: Gyeongmunsa Publishing House), 2003.

Park, Seung-gyu. *Everyday geography -Inquiring about the relationship between man and his space*, Seoul: Book world, 2009.

<http://www.tttg.kr/>.

